

June 2013

A Rhetorical Analysis of Messages to America by Osama bin Laden

Meredith Taylor
Rhode Island College

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.ric.edu/honors_projects

 Part of the [International and Intercultural Communication Commons](#), [Other Communication Commons](#), and the [Speech and Rhetorical Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Taylor, Meredith, "A Rhetorical Analysis of Messages to America by Osama bin Laden" (2013). *Honors Projects Overview*. 74.
http://digitalcommons.ric.edu/honors_projects/74

This Honors is brought to you for free and open access by the Honors Projects at Digital Commons @ RIC. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors Projects Overview by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ RIC. For more information, please contact kayton@ric.edu.


1-1-2013

A Rhetorical Analysis of Messages to America by Osama bin Laden

Meredith Taylor

Rhode Island College, meleestarhaze@yahoo.com

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.ric.edu/com_hp

 Part of the [International and Intercultural Communication Commons](#), [Other Communication Commons](#), and the [Speech and Rhetorical Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Taylor, Meredith, "A Rhetorical Analysis of Messages to America by Osama bin Laden" (2013). *Communication Honors Projects*. Paper 1.

http://digitalcommons.ric.edu/com_hp/1

This Honors is brought to you for free and open access by the Rhode Island College Honors Projects at Digital Commons @ RIC. It has been accepted for inclusion in Communication Honors Projects by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ RIC. For more information, please contact hbenaicha@ric.edu, andrewjasondavis@gmail.com.

A RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF
MESSAGES TO AMERICA
BY OSAMA BIN
LADEN

By

Meredith Taylor

An Honors Project Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for Honors

in

The Department of Communication

Faculty of Arts and Sciences

Rhode Island College

2013

A RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF
MESSAGES TO AMERICA
BY OSAMA BIN
LADEN

An Undergraduate Honors Project Presented

By

Meredith Taylor

To

Department of Communication

Approved:

Project Advisor

Date

Chair, Department Honors Committee

Date

Department Chair

Date

Table of Contents

<i>Introduction</i>	1
<i>Purpose</i>	2
<i>Research Questions</i>	3
<i>Methods</i>	3
<i>Artifacts</i>	4
<i>Conflict between Osama and America</i>	5
<i>Primary and Major Sources</i>	5
Chapter Two:	8
Historical Context and Biography of Rhetor	8
<i>Introduction to Osama bin Laden</i>	8
<i>Early Life</i>	8
<i>Influences of His Father</i>	9
<i>External Influences</i>	10
<i>Bin Laden’s Involvement in the Soviet-Afghanistan War</i>	13
<i>Inspiration for the Anti-American Thoughts Following the War</i>	14
<i>Formation of the Anti-American Movement</i>	16
<i>Bin Laden Allies with Egyptian Extremists</i>	18
<i>Formation of Al Qaeda</i>	18
<i>Bin Laden Declares War on America</i>	21
<i>Bin Laden in Sudan</i>	22
<i>Bin Laden in Afghanistan</i>	23
<i>Bin Laden Postmortem</i>	25
<i>Misconceptions and Perceptions of bin Laden</i>	26
Chapter Three:.....	27
Speech One: Martyrs “[Retaliate] on Behalf of the Poor”	27
<i>Post 9/11</i>	27
<i>Speech Released on October 7, 2001</i>	27

<i>First Stage of Analysis: Description of Artifact</i>	27
<i>Second Stage of Analysis: Historical Context</i>	32
<i>Third Stage of Analysis: Evaluation of Artifact</i>	36
Chapter Four:	39
Speech Two: “Bush’s Hands Are Covered With...Blood”	39
<i>Presidential Elections of 2004</i>	39
<i>Speech Released on October 29, 2004</i>	39
<i>First Stage of Analysis: Description of Artifact</i>	39
<i>Second Stage of Analysis: Historical Context</i>	46
<i>Third Stage of Analysis: Evaluation of Artifact</i>	51
Chapter Five:	53
Speech Three: “There Is No Shame In This Solution...”	53
<i>Speech Released: January 19, 2006</i>	53
<i>First Stage of Analysis: Description of Artifact</i>	53
<i>The Second Stage of Analysis: Historical Context</i>	57
<i>Third Stage of Analysis: Evaluation of Artifact</i>	62
Chapter 6:	64
Conclusion	64
<i>Purpose of Thesis Research</i>	64
<i>Research Questions</i>	64
<i>Method Used in Thesis Analysis</i>	64
<i>Intentions of bin Laden as a Rhetor</i>	66
<i>Specific Purpose of The Three Messages of bin Laden</i>	67
<i>Summary of Analysis of October 7, 2001 Speech</i>	68
<i>Summary of Analysis of October 30, 2004 Speech</i>	69
<i>Summary of Analysis of January 19, 2006 Speech</i>	69
<i>How bin Laden Appeared to the Audience</i>	70
<i>Bin Laden’s Rhetorical Failure</i>	71
<i>Importance of This Research</i>	72
Bibliography	74
Appendix 1:	80
Three Stages of Rhetorical Criticism	80

Chapter One

Introduction, Purpose, Methodology

Introduction

On September 11, 2001 a malicious attack directed by Osama bin Laden and the al- Qaeda terrorist organization struck the Twin Towers in New York. This was the first attack on United States soil since the attack on Pearl Harbor sixty years earlier. Americans stood together in disbelief and shock, vowing to seek vengeance for the thousands of innocent lives lost. Shortly following these attacks, the United States and its allies declared war on terrorism, a war that sought justice for the attacks and an end to anti-American terrorism. Despite his role as the leader of the enemy opposition, Osama repeatedly released to the American audience speech recordings over the subsequent months and years proclaiming his justifications for the attack.

Bin Laden was an Islamic extremist who truly believed he was fighting a crusade against the West (Bergen Osama 389). Throughout his anti-Western political career, bin Laden had conducted interviews and released statements regarding his motives to the American press and media of other Western countries. Subsequent to the 9/11 attacks, bin Laden continued to release statements describing his movement and his personal motivation. These speeches were targeted at a variety of different populations. They ranged from broadly targeted messages to statements directed at specific groups such as the Muslim community, the European Union, Pakistan, Iraq, and America. Each speech had its own defined purpose. The intention of Osama bin Laden when addressing the American audience was to publicly declare his reasons for waging war against America.

In the speeches aimed at Americans, Osama used persuasive tactics to provoke an American understanding of his motives. He used an empathic approach in his argument. He tried to appear as one who understood American apprehensions regarding the war. He proposed means for ending the war, assuming that the Americans would believe he genuinely cared for their welfare. He also used religious appeals as a major persuasive tactic. These references attempted to support his belief that he was a

righteous and faith-driven leader. He alleged that Allah endorsed the retaliations against America for crimes committed against Muslim communities. There were also numerous attempts to discredit the reputation of the then President George W. Bush. These speeches depicted for the Americans a different perspective of the two leaders. Bush was portrayed as the villain in the war while Osama was the hero.

Purpose

The purpose of this paper is to analyze bin Laden's argumentation and rhetorical techniques in three speeches addressed to the American population. Persuasive techniques that were used will be described as well as the historical context surrounding the timing of each speech's release. These speeches will be examined using Campbell and Burkholder's "Three Stages of Rhetorical Criticism" as outlined in the second edition of Critiques of Contemporary Rhetoric.

Understanding bin Laden's rhetorical tactics can help us better understand the motivations, not only of al Qaeda, but of other terrorist groups that pit themselves against the American government. Al Qaeda is not the only extremist group that has an anti-American ideology. In 2010 the number of al-Qaeda members was believed to be small but the group continues to influence and train other jihadist groups (Bergen "Why"). A recent article published on CNN's website quoted the National Counterterrorism Director, Matt Olsen, who stated that the direct threat from al Qaeda has diminished but the organization has influenced other likeminded groups to implement attacks and promote its ideologies (qtd. Pam Benson). While the actual organization that bin Laden created is being reduced in size by United States troops, their beliefs continue to spread globally. The al Qaeda influence in Pakistan is decreasing, but similar organizations still pose a threat in other countries such as Yemen, Somalia, Nigeria, Iraq, and Libya (qtd. Pam Benson). Bin Laden's ideology and tactics have spread from the Middle East to the Far East and South Asia (Bergen "Why").

In order to successfully resolve the war on terror there needs to be a clear understanding of the intentions and messages of our enemies. When President Bush labeled al Qaeda the enemy he gave incorrect information to the American audience. In President Bush's address to Americans on September

11, he stated that America was attacked because it is the “brightest beacon for freedom and opportunity in the world” (President Bush Speaks to the Nation). Following Bush’s explanation for why bin Laden attacked the US, Osama released videotaped messages to clarify his true intentions and to state his reasons for engaging in war. Analyzing this speech and the two other pivotal addresses will lead to a better understanding of al Qaeda and its leaders. To best prevent another attack, it is important to learn the intentions and motivations of the organization.

There are many factors that must be taken into consideration when evaluating the messages of terrorists. An understanding of what the organization is, why there is overt conflict, what the conflict is about and when the conflict arose are all major inquiries requiring answers. The rhetor’s own personal experiences and motivations need to be addressed. A brief history of Osama’s early influences and origins of the organization of al Qaeda will help answer these questions.

Research Questions

The two research questions addressed in this paper are (1) “Why did Osama direct messages at his enemy? and (2) “what were the outcomes of his attempts?” The attempts of bin Laden to address Americans were broadcast during a time of war between the rhetor and the audience. These answers to these questions will help to identify the purpose of bin Laden’s repeated efforts to influence the Americans.

Methods

Using Campbell and Burkholder’s recommended structures for analysis, three of bin Laden’s speeches that were either partially or wholly directed towards the American audience will be examined. The first stage of the analysis will require describing each speech internally. This includes a consideration of the role that bin Laden played as an ideologue and a rhetorician. This stage will also investigate his reasoning and strategies that he applied in his remarks. In the second stage contextual and historical facts will be analyzed. This will include the history of bin Laden and the American population in reference to each other. This is an important step that will help the reader understand what motivated bin Laden to

attack the US and then try to justify his actions. Background factors need to be acknowledged because they contributed to bin Laden's initiation of the conflict and al Qaeda's ongoing propaganda campaign. The third and final stage of criticism involves evaluation of each speech. The criteria used to assess each speech will include a study of the probable effects he may have had on the audience. This also demands an assessment of the truth of his claims and a discussion of the cultural and religious values associated with the speech.

Artifacts

The three speeches to be analyzed will be the ones published on October 7, 2001, October 30, 2004, and January 19, 2006. Although bin Laden was fluent in English, he spoke to his audience in Arabic (Bin Laden et al 108). Each speech analyzed was critiqued after it had been translated into English. These speeches were chosen because of their contextual importance and the lapse of time that separates each speech. The context that surrounds each speech must be studied for the artifact to be fully understood. According to a statement in a *New York Times* article by Muhammad Salah, an expert on groups devoted to Islam, "Mr. bin Laden typically chooses his timing and messages carefully to prove a point...he is playing on the American people's desire to get out of Iraq and the Islamic fundamentalist swamp...and he is telling Bush that 'I am winning and I am still there'" (Fattah, Allam, Jehl).

All of the speeches have the same general purpose of announcing Osama's justifications for war. Each speech credits Allah for any of the alleged successes of al Qaeda. These messages differ in context and each has a specific reason for the timing of its release. The first speech, given on October 7, 2001 was given less than a month after the September 11 attacks. Jacques Steinberg, a writer for the *New York Times* said this message was released shortly after American and British leaders made proclamations regarding the beginning of the war in Afghanistan. Of the three speeches evaluated, this one seemed to contain the most religious references. In this context, the audacity of the attacks was praised. The second speech, released on October 30, 2004, was found to reiterate his beliefs that the US government deceived the American people and attempted to again justify al-Qaeda's actions. This speech was released a few

days before the 2004 American presidential elections; an attempt by Osama to influence voters through his discourse. The final speech analyzed was delivered January 19, 2006. In this message Bin Laden addressed the fact that US support for the war was diminishing and he therefore attempted to propose a truce.

Conflict between Osama and America

The War on Terror is an intercultural conflict first declared by President Bush in 2001. Leading up to this war, the al Qaeda organization had targeted numerous attacks against the United States. It was, five years earlier, in 1996, when Osama first declared war on America. Osama began to attempt to communicate his motives and perceptions to Americans following his declaration of war. These messages went unheeded by the general population. A few years later America was attacked within its borders. After these attacks, Osama repeatedly attempted to communicate similar messages to the American audience.

In terms of intercultural conflicts, the greater the distance between cultural beliefs, the more likely it is that the public understanding of the situation will be miscomprehended (Cupach, Canary, and Spitzberg 140-141). The intentions and foci of the war have different perspectives. Initially, the West focused the war against failed and rogue states that provided perceived or actual safe havens for terrorist organizations (Bonney 377). Americans were incorrectly made to believe that al Qaeda had attacked them because the organization hated freedom. There are striking differences in stated perspectives of the war between al Qaeda and Americans. Both sides view this as a defensive war and are seeking revenge for wrongs made against their communities. Al Qaeda views the war as a religious crusade, whereas America views it as a political war on terrorism.

Primary and Major Sources

Several sources used in this paper were particularly valuable for researching this paper and should be credited. Growing Up bin Laden: Osama's Wife and Son Take Us Inside Their Secret World by Najwa bin Laden, Omar bin Laden and Jean Sasson was extremely helpful in understanding the influences

motivating Osama. Najwa was Osama bin Laden's first wife and first cousin. The two married in 1974 (bin Laden et al 13). Omar was their fourth son. Jean Sasson has authored several books revealing the lifestyles of women in the Middle East. Osama's wife and son were able to transcribe exclusive dialogues between themselves and Osama regarding his childhood, family life and the motivations for his anti-Western ideals. Holy War Inc. by Peter Bergen was another valuable text used for understanding the aspirations of Osama. Bergen is a renowned journalist and director of the National Security Studies Program at the New American Foundation. He has published many articles and books relating to bin Laden and al Qaeda and has personally interviewed bin Laden. This text was a good resource for examining Osama's ideals inspired by other radicals. Bergen also published other texts helpful for this research. The bin Laden That I Know by Peter Bergen is a compilation of interviews and statements by people who knew Osama. This was a great resource for determining core beliefs of the speaker. Bergen's Holy War Inc. was also effective for understanding the rise of bin Laden and the al Qaeda organization.

Bin Laden: The Man Who Declared War on America by Yossef Bodansky also provided background for Osama's anti-West ideals. Bodansky is a political scientist who was once the Director of the Congressional Task Force on Terrorism and Unconventional Warfare for the House of Representatives. He was also a consultant for both the Department of Defense and Department of State. Bodansky provided the government with general information on bin Laden. It was later discovered that Bodansky published false information regarding Osama's early life. He had claimed that in 1975, the Lebanese Civil War stopped Osama from enjoying Beirut's nightclubs, bars, and clubs (3). Osama was portrayed as a drinker and a womanizer. Bin Laden was in Lebanon during this time frame. He later revealed that his time in Lebanon became Osama's inspiration for demolishing the Twin Towers in America. The falsity of Bodansky's statement damages his assertion concerning the un-Islamic lifestyle that he claimed bin Laden had lived. This incorrect information was countered by Bergen in his Holy War Inc. Bergen stated that "those who know bin Laden, however, describe a deeply religious teenager..." implying that Osama would never engage in such activities condemned by Islam (34). From

a young age Osama was a strict adherent to his religion and would even avoid eye contact with women he did not know in order to resist possible temptation (bin Laden et al 1). Hamid Mir, bin Laden's biographer, met with bin Laden and talked with him about Bodansky's Bin Laden: The Man Who Declared War on America (qtd. in Bergen Osama 318). Bin Laden, in reference to the book stated:

It is [a] very interesting book. And I think Mr. Yossef Bodansky is a great friend of mine. He is misguiding Americans about me. And if the Americans have this kind of information about me, then I am the happiest person on this earth (qtd. in Bergen Osama 311).

Osama Bin Laden by Michael Scheuer addressed external environmental impacts that stimulated Osama's movement. Scheuer was formerly a CIA agent. He led the bin Laden unit at the Counterterrorism Center, and later became a Special Adviser for the unit. This text confirmed the beliefs of Osama and was able to provide insight into bin Laden's political activities leading to the formation of al Qaeda, including previous beliefs and events that led to his involvement. Scheuer claimed that the Saudi Arabian government used propaganda that wrongfully targeted Osama, such as the claim that he had been a promiscuous drunken teenager (qtd. in Scheuer 9). This propaganda may have been where Bodansky got his information regarding a youthful Osama's sinful ways.

Another valuable text was Osama Bin Laden: A War against the West by Elaine Landau, which evaluated Osama's interpretations of Islam and his beliefs on how governments should rule the Middle East. Landau, an established nonfiction writer, was also able to provide insight into Osama's political activities, such as his roles in the Soviet-Afghanistan War and with al Qaeda.

Finally, Messages to the World: The Statements of Osama Bin Laden was essential to the analysis of context for the speeches that were released on October 7, 2001 and October 29, 2004. This volume was also used for the transcript of the first and second speeches. This text was edited by Bruce Lawrence and translated by James Howarth. Lawrence is an Islamic scholar and Humanities Professor of Religion at Duke University. Howarth has his master's degree in Arabic linguistics and focused his PhD thesis on the religious revival in contemporary Arab thought.

Chapter Two:

Historical Context and Biography of Rhetor

Introduction to Osama bin Laden

Bin Laden released messages targeted at Americans in order to validate his movement. Before analyzing the messages specifically directed at Americans, one must have a basic understanding of who Osama bin Laden was and what events in his life influenced his anti-Western ideologies. Osama's mother, Allia, and his first wife and cousin, Najwa, categorized him as having three main core beliefs. The first was his drive to motivate Muslims to defend their religion against the West. The second was his concern for global issues. The third was his belief that with the proper incentive Muslims would unite to wage war against the West. (Scheuer 40)

In 2001, 2004, and 2006 Osama addressed an audience that he despised and repeatedly attacked in order to express to them his perception of the war. He alleged that he was acting on the will of God to seek revenge for atrocities committed against the Muslim community. Osama was heavily devoted to his strict sect of the Islamic faith urged on him by his father. His religious ideals were one of the main influences inspiring him to declare war on the West. As Osama grew older he met other likeminded Islamic radicals and became active in defending Muslim lands against perceived infidels.

Early Life

Osama bin Mohammed bin Awad bin Aboud bin Laden al-Qatani was born on February 15, 1957 in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia (bin Laden, N.; bin Laden, O.; Sasson 301). He was named after a companion of the Islamic Prophet Muhammad, "Osama bin Zaid" (Scheuer 21). In Arabic, "Osama" is defined as "lion" (Bergen HW 47). The family's last name was originally, "al-Qatani," which was dropped when Osama's father, Mohammed bin Awad bin Laden, moved to Saudi Arabia (bin Laden et al 301). Mohammed, originally from Yemen, later moved to Saudi Arabia where he established a successful construction company (bin Laden et al 292). The construction company worked on major projects for the Saudi royal family (Bergen Holy 47). One of these was the restoration of an Islamic mosque. Landau stated that

Osama's spiritual awakening happened while he was restoring mosques for the family business; this motivated him to study Islam and to meet with Islamic fundamentalists (32). Through the construction business the bin Laden family developed a close relationship with the Saudi Arabian royal family (Landau 29). This connection later helped Osama get financial support for the Soviet-Afghanistan War (Landau 54).

Influences of His Father

Osama did not have the opportunity to spend much time with his father. Osama told his son that he only had one interaction alone with his father up until the time when he was nine years old (bin Laden et al 169). Mohammed died in a plane crash when Osama was eleven (bin Laden et al 39). Although they did not have a close relationship, Mohammed had a strong influence on Osama's life. Mohammed would frequently entertain Islamic radicals and clergy during their Hajj (Bergen Holy 48). It was through these meetings that Osama began an association with influential radicals of Islam (Scheuer 24). Bergen believes that Osama's loss of a father at a young age was a heavy influence on why he was so readily influenced by "religiously radical older men," and credits his father with the "ultimate inspiration for his jihad" (Holy 55).

His father also had a strong influence on Osama's religious beliefs. A strong believer in Islam, Mohammed ensured that his sons were also devout followers (bin Laden et al 17). Osama was raised to believe in the strict teachings of the Sunni Islamic sect, Wahhabism (Scheuer 39). Wahhabism is a form of the Sunni Muslim faith that requires followers to interpret the Koran literally (Blanchard 1; Military: Wahhabi). They also believe in living an extremely simple life (Military: Wahhabi). They see modernity as blasphemy and are against "luxury, loose administration of justice, all laxity against infidels, addiction to wine, impurity and treachery (Stout 76; Military: Wahhabi)." Followers of the faith reject the idea of modern influences on religion and wish to return back to the pure and genuine Islamic sect true to that one first established by the Prophet Muhammad (Lewis 120).

Osama learned much of his political ideology as well as his political ideals from his father. Mohammed adhered to extreme anti-Israeli, anti-Jewish beliefs and felt the Arabs were the rightful occupants of Palestine (Bergen Osama 8). According to Matthias Küntzel, a noted author and research associate for the Hebrew University, Osama's anti-Semitic ideas were inherited from his father and gave bin Laden the idea that the ultimate enemy was both the United States and Israel (Küntzel 123). He believed that "it is the Jews who have the first word inside the American government. Consequently they use America to execute their plans throughout the world" (Bergen Osama 291).

Mohammed also influenced Osama to believe that a man must practice what he preaches, in everyday life and religion (Scheuer 25). This could have been a factor in Osama's decision to walk away from his wealthy and secure lifestyle to declare war on the West. In order for Osama to demand adherence to the strict policies of governance that he desired, he had to lead by example. Osama's lifestyle reflected his extreme faith through its lack of luxury (Landau 59). Osama despised elaborate possessions and believed that his family should not be spoiled (bin Laden et al 107). Although he lived a simple life, Osama frequently used the Internet and computers for administrative and recruiting purposes for his jihad (Landau 96). However he banned the use of air-conditioning, refrigerators, heating systems, and electronic stoves in his house even though it had been equipped with these conveniences (bin Laden et al 115).

The lessons learned from his father initiated Osama's strict religious code and his hatred of the West. As Osama told his son, Omar, he believed that he "was put on this earth by God for a specific reason. My only reason for living is to fight the jihad and to make sure there is justice for Muslims...It is my mission to make certain that other nations take Islam seriously" (Bin Laden, et al 176).

External Influences

The crises and hardships that affected many Islamic states at the turn of the century were attributed by Osama to the West and its influences (Bodansky x). Osama's primary hatred for the United States stemmed from the US presence in the Middle East and their continued support for Israel

(Bodansky 199). The United States was viewed as an atheistic, immoral and fraudulent country whose presence in the Middle East prevented Islamic countries from being governed through strict interpretations of the Koran (Landau 17). The governments in the Middle East were detested because they were more involved with their economic and political ties with the West than with their devotion to Islam (Landau 17). Islamic fundamentalists convinced Osama that if Islam was interpreted and practiced in its strictest form, this would eliminate the corrupt influences of the West and exterminate its threat to Islam (Landau 33). Osama's religious beliefs inspired his drive to rid the Middle East of Western influences and to remake the Saudi Arabian government into a stricter Islamic regime.

There were certain events in his life that increased Osama's anti-West attitudes. Osama grew up during the Sahwa, which was an Islamic awakening in the Middle East. This began in 1967 with a war won by Israel against Egypt, Jordan, and Syria. The victory of Israel led many of the younger Muslims to question their countries' leadership and governments (Bin Laden et al 29). Four main events triggered the peak of the Sahwa in 1979. These events also significantly encouraged bin Laden to move towards the formation of al Qaeda (Bergen Bin Laden 1). The first event was the overthrow of an Iranian Shah by Islamic extremists (Bergen Bin Laden 1). Khomeini, believed to be closely associated with the United States, put greater priority on non-religious principles than Islamic ones (Landau 34). His removal from power proved that radical Islamic forces were able to succeed when determined (Landau 34). The second pivotal event was the forced occupation of an Islamic holy mosque by Saudi radicals (Bergen Bin Laden 1). The third event was the armistice between Israel and Egypt. The final event was the Soviet Invasion of Afghanistan (Bergen Bin Laden 1). This was the first time a Muslim state had been invaded by a non-Muslim state since World War II (Bodansky 8).

Although the strong inspiration to defend Islam and a belief in jihad came from his father, another powerful influence on Osama was his personal role in the victory over the Soviets. Bin Laden began to play a key role in political movements around 1980, when he dropped out of college to fulfill his jihadi obligations (bin Laden et al 303). This conflict inspired Osama to believe that the only way for Muslims

to survive foreign attacks was jihad (Scheuer 70). The defeat of the Soviets, added to the defeat of the Iranian Shah, gave radical Islamic followers empowerment. This was one of the first military triumphs for Islam for several hundred years, which led to the belief that they would also be successful in taking on stronger opposing forces (Scheuer 49).

During this time in his life, bin Laden began to associate himself with the movements of the Islamist group, the Muslim Brotherhood (Bergen Holy 50). The Muslim Brotherhood's philosophy combined anti-Semitic views of Nazism with anti-Jewish interpretations of the Koran (Küntzel 3). Their goal was to replace secular Islamic state regimes with rulers who would enforce policies consistent with the Islamic laws (Henderson 48-49). Two key teachers associated with this group were Abdullah Azzam and Muhammad Qutb (Bergen Holy 50).

Azzam was considered to be one of the most influential people in bin Laden's life (Scheuer 52). It was Azzam who first encouraged Osama to redirect his life into something other than his family's business (bin Laden et al 29). He was a Palestinian educator, a writer, and a firm believer in jihad (bin Laden et al 29; Bergen Holy 55). He was one of the original affiliates of Hamas and is credited with developing the first global transnational jihadist network (Küntzel 3; Bergen Holy War 50).

Muhammad Qutb provided another inspiration to Osama during his college years. Qutb was a Muslim scholar and brother to renowned Islamic writer Sayyid Qutb. Muhammad familiarized bin Laden with the teachings of his brother (Küntzel 125). Sayyid is credited with initiating the radical Islamic movement to convert followers back to a strict interpretation of Islam (Scheuer 42). His writing encouraged many of the then current Islamic radicals ("Sayyid Qutb"). After returning back to Egypt from a two year study in America, Sayyid became hostile towards the West (Lewis 76). He advocated a reform of Islamic relations, internally and internationally (Lewis 76, 77). He described the American lifestyle as materialistic and sinful (Lewis 78). Bin Laden and Sayyid had similar ideas for reform, but differed on methods to achieve a pure Islamic state. Qutb's theory involved Muslims launching offensive

attacks and dissuading followers from conflicts against the west and corrupt Islamic governments (Scheuer 42). These targets were Osama's main goals for his war. Although there were differences of opinion concerning methods, Sayyid's texts were later used by Osama in Afghanistan training camps (Küntzel 125).

Azzam had inspired bin Laden politically and got him engaged in supporting Afghanistan against the Soviets (bin Laden et al 30). Azzam had Islamic credibility along with experience with radical movements (Bergen Holy 54). In 1979 bin Laden traveled to the United States to meet Azzam and to discuss his future role in the movement (bin Laden et al 302). Shortly after the Soviet invasion Bin Laden went to Afghanistan to help with the war (Bodansky 10). After spending several days in Afghanistan, he went to Pakistan to help the Mujahideen (Bodansky 9). This was a turning point in his life; marking Osama's commitment to fighting jihad (Bodansky 10).

Bin Laden's Involvement in the Soviet-Afghanistan War

Bin Laden began his initial role in fighting what he considered to be "godless communists" through organizing supporters for the Mujahideen (bin Laden et al 303). The knowledge that he had gained from studying management and economics in college, along with the skills he gained from his family's business contributed to his ability to organize and fund his Arab fighters to help the Mujahideen against the Soviets (Bodansky 3). He used his personal wealth along with funds he acquired from the Saudi government and other sources in Pakistan to establish recruiting posts and training stations for recruits (Landau 40). Recruits were sought out from global Muslim communities (Bergen Holy 30). Initially, bin Laden personally helped fund the relocation of volunteers (John Miller). Recruits with special expertise such as doctors, bomb specialists, engineers, and military experts were enlisted (Landau 40). He was able to use resources from his family's construction business to build stock depots, hospitals and training camps for his fighters (Landau 40).

To help in the fight against the Soviets, Azzam and bin Laden established the "Maktab al Khadamat," known as the Services Bureau for the Mujahideen as well as the magazine '*al-Jihad*'

(Küntzel 126). Establishing these entities helped in the recruiting and placement of volunteers. Recruits were strategically trained and placed into fighting units, relief organizations, or other groups that were needed to support the Mujahideen (bin Laden et al 304). The Bureau helped to increase the involvement of recruits, known as the “Afghan Arabs” (Bergen Holy 57). Propaganda regarding the war was used by the Bureau and magazine to support their cause and to inspire volunteers (Scheuer 55; Bergen Holy 54). Religious references and interpretations were used to inspire and evoke feelings of religious duty in volunteers (Scheuer 55).

Despite his strenuous efforts in recruiting Arabs, bin Laden’s fighters had little impact in the defeat of the Soviets (Bergen Bin Laden 50). Mujahideen commanders were not enthusiastic about using the Afghan Arabs in battle (Scheuer 61). The Arab fighters were unruly, undisciplined, and too eager to become martyrs (Scheuer 61). The Mujahideen had a more strategic approach during battle, such as withdrawing when faced with unwinnable situations (Bergen Osama 50). Osama saw the defeat of the Soviets as a victory against “the foundation head of atheism and unbelief, the oppression of many millions of Muslim subjects, and the invaders of Afghanistan (qtd. Lewis 62). It was the first major military victory for Islam for several hundred years (Scheuer 49). After years of humiliation felt by many Muslims, there was finally a victory against one of the superpowers.

Inspiration for the Anti-American Thoughts Following the War

Following the Soviet-Afghanistan War, the Service Bureau stayed active. This allowed Osama to continue to be connected with the fighters and if needed, they could be called upon to aid Islamic movements throughout the world (Scheuer 59). With an international organization full of trained fighters who had tasted victory, bin Laden redirected his anti-West movement to the global crusade (bin Laden et al 306).

Following the war, bin Laden was admired and seen as an Afghan war hero (Bodansky 28). He gained this status following the Battle of Jaji (Bin Laden et al 305). Prior to fighting this battle, bin Laden changed roles from organizer and fundraiser to Mujahideen (Bergen Bin Laden 49). This battlefield

victory served more of a motivation to recruit others than actually having any strategic substance (Bergen Bin Laden 50). For bin Laden it had religious meaning. The battle was fought on the 27th day of Ramadan, known as the “Night of Power” (Bergen Bin Laden 57). This time is believed to be when “destiny is decided and the gates of heaven are opened and Allah will listen to the lucky ones” (Bergen Bin Laden 57). Bin Laden may have been inspired to believe that Allah had considered him one of “the lucky ones” (Bergen Bin Laden 57).

Another strong influence that helped to create Osama’s anti-West ideals arose from situations surrounding the Gulf War. Upon returning home to Saudi Arabia, bin Laden had a credible and moral reputation for his work in the war against the Soviets. Regardless of the lack of effectiveness of his fighters, he had helped in the fight to push non-believers out of Muslim lands. When Iraq invaded Kuwait the Saudi regime worried that Hussein would take aim at them next. Unsure of Hussein’s motivations, the Saudi royal family asked the United States for military help to defend itself against Saddam Hussein (Bodansky xv). Bin Laden did not agree with the regime getting help from the West, because it would bring non-Muslims into Saudi Arabia, a sacrilegious act (Bodansky 29-30). Afghanistan had defeated the non-Muslim Soviets, (without US troops) Osama believed that Saudi Arabia could do the same.

When 500,000 US troops arrived in Saudi, Osama began to publicly speak out against the West (Bergen Osama 113). He called for a boycott of products imported from the United States (Bodansky 30). He spoke to large crowds about his ideas for establishing a Muslim world and blaming the West for Muslim problems. (Landau 54). The regime reacted to this by trying to restrict Osama and placed him under house arrest (Bin Laden et al 307; Bergen Holy 81). While restricted Osama was thought to be importing weaponry from Yemen (Williams xiii). The Saudi government soon saw Osama as a serious threat. He had repeatedly denounced the regime’s decisions in public and was acquiring weapons to potentially overthrow the regime (Williams xiii). Osama was furious that the Saudi regime would not use

his fighters and instead used American troops. He told the royal family that he was leaving Saudi Arabia to shut down his businesses in Pakistan, and instead he fled the country (Bin Laden et al 307).

The Saudi rulers attempted to reach out to bin Laden after he fled the country. The King attempted to call Osama personally but Osama did not accept the phone call (Bin Laden et al 127). This was taken as an insult and ended any ties between Osama and the Saudi royal family (Bin Laden et al 127). In an interview with Peter Arnett, bin Laden said that the King had sent his mother, uncle, and brothers as messengers to him:

In almost nine visits to Koum asking me to stop and return to Arabia to apologize to [Saudi] King Fahd... [My family] conveyed the Saudi governments message that if you do not go back, they'll freeze my assets, deprive me of my citizenship, my passport, my Saudi ID, and distort my picture in the Saudi and foreign media (qtd. in Bergen Osama 151-2).

After their failed attempts at reconciliation between themselves and Osama, the regime tried to convince the West that Saudis were respectable and loyal citizens. They used propaganda techniques to discredit Osama (Scheuer 12, 9). He was portrayed “as a good boy gone bad” because of his association with the Egyptian Dr. Ayman al-Zawahiri (Scheuer 10-11). According to Jane Meyer’s article in the *New Yorker*, the propaganda portrayed his mother as the least favorite of his father’s wives and also claimed that he was a promiscuous teenager (qtd. in Scheuer 9). Neither one of these claims used in the propaganda was true (qtd. in Scheuer 9).

Formation of the Anti-American Movement

Following the Soviet-Afghanistan War bin Laden had the tools to start a war and pursue his vendetta against the West. It is unknown how many American stinger missiles were left behind for al Qaeda to gather up (Bergen Holy 76). Weapons were not the only thing discarded at the end of the war. Many of the Afghan-Arab fighters were not welcome back to their homelands (Bin Laden et al 112). The repressive governments of these countries believed trained fighters might bring political upheavals (Bin Laden et al 112). The exiled fighters followed Osama to Sudan where he gave them employment and housing (Bin Laden et al 112). The fighters told Osama’s sons that their father “was the only one who

never forgot them and never broke a promise” (Bin Laden et al 112). They referred to Osama as the “Prince” (Bin Laden et al 112). At the end of the war, bin Laden had a number of devout followers and new alliances.

Bin Laden’s role in the Soviet-Afghanistan War taught him the significance of media in promoting their cause (Scheuer 70). Besides the weapons and manpower left behind from the war, Osama also had gained the means to spread his anti-West messages. He alleged that “the media war in this century is one of the strongest methods [of warfare]” (Scheuer 70). Recruiters were taught that “America is at war with Islam” and were taught that Americans forced the formation of the state of Israel on Palestinians (bin Laden et al 193-194).

The events of the Soviet-Afghanistan War not only gave him his own personal tools to fight the war, but made it possible for him to meet other radical Islamic figures such as members of Egypt’s jihad group. Later a merger with this group led to the formation of al-Qaeda (Bergen Holy 62). With his new connections, inspiration, willing fighters, and organizational tools bin Laden began to direct a strong anti-West movement. Radicals believed that defeating the United States would be easier than the ten year war that defeated the Soviets (Lewis 62). The new leader’s intention to eliminate the United States politically was heavily influenced by the Afghan defeat of Russia. It was believed that they would be able to defeat America as they had defeated the Soviets. As stated by bin Laden “those Russians spent all of their wealth on the war in Afghanistan. When they could no longer finance the war, they fled. After fleeing, their whole system collapsed... We can do the same thing with America and Israel. We only have to be patient.” (bin Laden et al 177)

His plan to defeat the United States was not developed to measure body counts; he planned to deplete American resources. Osama declared that:

First we obliterate America. By that I don’t mean militarily. We can destroy America from within by making it economically weak, until its markets collapse. When that happens, they will have no interest in supplying Israel with arms, for they will not have extra funds to do so (Bin Laden et al 177).

Bin Laden Allies with Egyptian Extremists

As Osama began to focus on a more global and intense jihad movement a split occurred between him and Azzam. They each had different visions of what direction their next jihad movement should take. Azzam wanted the jihad movement to focus on reclaiming Islamic lands from non-Muslim countries, such as Palestine, the Soviet Union, and southern Spain (Bergen Bin Laden 74). Bin Laden aligned himself more with the Egyptian radicals' belief that urged a more extreme jihad to overthrow apostate governments among the Islamic states (Bergen Bin Laden 74). As Azzam and bin Laden came to a parting of their ways, bin Laden allied with the Egyptian extremist Dr. Ayman Muhammad al-Zawahiri who had significant political experience (Bergen Bin Laden 63).

Zawahiri persuaded bin Laden to focus his jihad movement against external governments, such as America (Küntzel 127). He also convinced him that defeating the Israelis should also be a main objective (Küntzel 127). Other fundamentalists who opposed Middle Eastern governments protested their opposing regime's political agendas (Bergen Holy 41). Osama had a different perspective and believed he was fighting a crusade against infidels.

Formation of Al Qaeda

Until 9/11 Osama was not well known to the American public. However he had been an active antagonist against the West for years before the attack. The exact year that al Qaeda first began its crusade varies according to the source, but most believe it started around the time of the Soviet defeat in 1988 (Bergen Osama 75). The term "al-Qaeda," used during the Soviet-Afghanistan war was the name for the training camps, which can be translated into English as meaning "the base" (Bergen Osama 74; Henderson 50-51). According to Küntzel, Al Qaeda developed out of the Services Bureau and became an organization of "faith-driven warriors, people with a rigorously worked-out ideological program who project all the world's evils into Israel and the 'Jew-dominated'" United States (5). Al Qaeda's beliefs resonate with declarations made by the Nazis in an earlier era (Küntzel viii).

With his managerial skills, bin Laden established al-Qaeda as a business (Bergen Holy 31). Many of the organization's finances come from legitimate businesses (Stout 73). He was able to create a system called the "Brotherhood Group" that allowed people to discretely fund terrorism (Landau 62). Radical followers were smuggled into America and Europe by employing them with the connected businesses of the Brotherhood group (Landau 62). Each organization that funded al Qaeda intentionally worked separately from each other so associations between them could not be easily discovered (Landau 83). These agencies would frequently get renamed or closed down so they could not easily be tracked (Landau 83). Its structure was similar to that of a company, with a CEO, board, and committees (Stout 73). According to a former member, there were different committees organized for different areas, such as a committee for military concerns, a fatwa committee and a group formed to make executive decisions (qtd. in Bergen Holy 31).

It is hard to know exactly who the members of al Qaeda are. There are no particular characteristics. Members are mostly Saudi Arabian and Egyptian, but also include other ethnicities (Stout 77). The wide spectrum of nationalities, languages, cultures, and religious beliefs make al Qaeda a distinctive organization (Scheuer 41). Trained recruits vary in wealth, education, and origins (Henderson 76). As fighters were trained, they were told to use only aliases and never to reveal their true identity or their past experiences (bin Laden et al 198). This was to ensure that if anyone was captured, he would not be able to reveal any information about other fighters (bin Laden et al 198). There is no known list of other radical groups that are involved with al Qaeda. Bin Laden discouraged other radical jihadist groups from announcing any affiliation with al Qaeda in order to avoid gaining more enemies and losing possible funding from wealthy investors (Bergen "Last" 29).

In the beginning, al Qaeda was formed into four branches. The first focused on the military training of recruits. The second branch was the administration, which dealt with financial concerns and dispersions. The third branch was the religious group which taught religious ideals and issued fatwas.

Finally, there was the propaganda branch. (Scheuer 73) Propaganda and the media were used by al Qaeda to recruit and inspire volunteers (Stout 77).

Some believe that al Qaeda has never truly formed into the organization many believe it to be. Skeptics see it as a collection of loosely related terrorist organizations and the understanding of it being one large group has only been assumed by the American government's agencies (Bergen Osama 75). Jamal Ismail, who was a member of al Qaeda, said that al Qaeda became a close knit organization after fears arose because the loose knit umbrella of the Service Bureau was believed to be infiltrated by members of repressive regimes (qtd. in Bergen Holy 62).

The threat behind the formation of al Qaeda lies behind the messages it sent and still continues to send to influence likeminded radicals. The Encyclopedia of Jihad was developed by al Qaeda as one of the organizations strongest encouragements to the anti-West movement. This text discusses procedures and tactics to be used for guerilla warfare in a wide variety of specific situations. It was created from information found in American Army manuals as well as lessons learned from previous Islamic military experiences (Bergen Osama 188).

Al Qaeda had been actively fighting against the US for almost ten years prior to 9/11. The first act of violence against America was in 1992 when they bombed a hotel in Yemen that was occupied by US military (William xiv). America had sent aides to Somalia to help feed citizens during a civil war. Bin Laden led the confrontation against America (Landau 75). The withdrawal of the US from this conflict was seen as a great victory for bin Laden (Landau 79). According to ABC news reporter John Miller, this victory was as if Osama had taken "a swing at the biggest kid in the school yard and given him a black eye" (John Miller). Following the retreat, Western intelligence began seeing bin Laden as a real threat (Landau 81). This conflict occurred two years after the American troops came to Saudi Arabia. The al Qaeda radicals misperceived the juxtaposition of the two events and concluded that the US intended to conquer Muslim land (Bergen Osama 137).

Al Qaeda was believed to be involved with the World Trade Center bombing in 1993 but no evidence of this exists (bin Laden et al 308). The spiritual leader of al Qaeda, Sheikh Oman Abdel Rahman, imprisoned by the US for his connection with this bombing, led Zawahiri's Egyptian radical organization before his association with al Qaeda (Henderson 48; Bergen Osama xvii).

In 1996, because of his status as a leader and a Mujahideen, Osama became known as an emir, even though he lacked the official religious training (Bodansky 186). He was honored and given the title "Sheikh bin Laden" (Bodansky 185). For those who believe in the Wahhabi faith, a follower must perform an oath of allegiance to an Islamic leader in order to achieve redemption after his death ("Military" Wahhabi). Since Osama was considered to be an emir, al Qaeda followers were presenting their oath to Osama (Bergen Holy 29-30). He was a political and religious leader to his followers.

Bin Laden Declares War on America

Also in 1996, Osama formulated a "declaration of war" (Bodansky 186). This declaration highlighted his goals to remove the Saudi government from power, to eliminate non-Muslims from Islamic holy lands, to support other Islamic extremist groups, and to get the United States out of the Arabian Peninsula (bin Laden et al 310). The message was first published in the London based newspaper Al Quds Al Arabi (Bin Laden's Fatwa). Between the time of his declaration of war and 9/11 Osama reached his "apogee of power" in Afghanistan (Bergen Osama 161). Realizing the threat that Osama posed to the US, President Clinton issued a secret order to permit the CIA to eliminate bin Laden's organization (bin Laden et al 310).

Osama actively warned the American public of his intentions prior to 9/11. In a 1997 CNN interview, bin Laden highlighted reasons for his "declaration of war." His main focus seemed to be retaliation for the humiliation of Muslim communities following the collapse of the Ottoman Empire. He reasoned his hatred of America was caused by the United States foreign policy (with special consideration to the presence of American troops in Saudi Arabia), economic sanctions in Iraq and the US involvement

with Israel and Egypt (qtd. in Bergen Bin Laden 182). The justifications for war given following 9/11 echoed similar reasons as stated four years earlier.

In May 1998, bin Laden publicly announced a union with other Islamic radical groups, one of which was Zawahiri's organization, to form the "International Islamic Front to do Jihad against Crusaders and Jews" (Bergen Osama 202). The newly united organization, which later turned into al Qaeda, was given religious permission by Sheikh Rahman's fatwa to attack American "aviation, shipping, and economic targets" (Bergen Osama 206). A "fatwa" is "a technical term in Islamic jurisprudence for a legal opinion or ruling on a point of law" (Lewis 140). This was the first time that a Muslim clergyman had permitted such an attack on America (Bergen Osama 206). This fatwa influenced the methods of the 9/11 attacks (Bergen Osama 208).

In June of 1998 bin Laden was charged by a United States grand jury with "conspiracy to attack defense utilities of the United States" (bin Laden et al 311). Two months later two American embassies in Kenya and Tanzania were attacked within nine minutes of each other (Bergen Osama 219). Osama's intentions were to lead by example, a lesson taught by his father. Six months before the attack, Osama sent out a call for followers to fight and murder American civilians and military (Landau iii). These attacks were intentionally implemented precisely eight years following President George H.W. Bush's deployment of troops to Afghanistan for the Gulf War (Bergen Osama 219). In retaliation, the US struck a training site in eastern Afghanistan (Bergen Osama 219). Osama and other leaders left the site two hours before the attack (bin Laden et al 238). By surviving this attack, Osama earned a cult rank among his followers (Küntzel 133). Again he could be considered to be one of the "lucky ones."

Bin Laden in Sudan

After Osama fled Saudi Arabia, he found a safe haven in Sudan for five years (Bin Laden et al 87). While the headquarters for al Qaeda continued to be in Sudan, the group also spread to Pakistan and Afghanistan (Bergen Holy 92). According to a former member of the organization, during this time the group aligned itself with many African radical groups (Bergen Holy 89). Al Qaeda was composed of

outcasts and refugees from political upheavals in various Muslim communities (Stout 10). The Sudanese allowed bin Laden to stay in their country and he repaid it by helping to rebuild their economy (Bin Laden et al 113). After recruits trained in Sudan they were relocated to areas around the world (Bergen Osama 144). While living in Sudan, Osama established an importing and exporting venture (Landau 59). He also opened a construction company intending to use it to build structures and move equipment for al Qaeda (Landau 63). Because of bin Laden's hefty contribution to its economy, he was free to do as he pleased in Sudan (Bergen Holy 82). He created businesses, constructed a major highway, several agricultural ventures and also built training camps for his terrorist followers (Bergen Holy 82). Bin Laden was later expelled from Sudan, after the United States pressured the country to banish him or suffer economic sanctions (Landau 101).

Bin Laden in Afghanistan

Osama finally left Sudan for Afghanistan, where he set up more training camps for his fighters (Bodansky 185). Bin Laden believed that Afghanistan would be the new Medina, a reference to the city to which the Prophet Muhammad went following his hijra (Bergen Osama 161). The similarities of the journeys was that both Osama and Mohammad left their home land and arrived in Medina/Afghanistan, and established an Islamic army that later reconquered the homeland from non-believers (Bergen Osama 161). Three of Osama's wives were said to be direct descendants of the Prophet Mohammad, which gave the two individuals an additional connection in the historic parallel (bin Laden et al 293).

The relocation helped bin Laden to expand his organization until he began to recognize his influential role as a globally recognized leader of the extremist Islamic movement (Landau 104). Both the move to Afghanistan and the formation of the Taliban regime were two markers for the expansion of bin Laden's organization (Bodansky 186). The transfer to Afghanistan was a key step in his crusade against the United States (Bergen Osama 161).

Since Osama had once been a war hero for Afghanistan, there were special considerations made for him. There was an agreement between bin Laden and the Taliban; al Qaeda would give money and

warriors in return for a safe haven (Bergen Osama 160). Although they tried, the Taliban were unsuccessful in their attempts to stop bin Laden from promoting his ideals and promoting his jihad movement (Bergen Osama 219). Osama simply ignored their repeated requests to stop attacks against the West (Bergen Holy 161).

Osama had a distinctive relationship with one of the leaders of the Taliban that gave him additional power. According to Hamid Mir, the majority of the Taliban leaders opposed bin Laden, and saw him as a risk to the first Islamic regime in recent times (Bergen Osama 236). The leader, Mullah Mohammed Omar, shared a similar Islamic belief with Osama (bin Laden et al 201). Omar was considered a devout follower of Islam who would not go against his religion (bin Laden et al 247). Osama was able to use this strong belief to his advantage. The Taliban in Afghanistan initially made it difficult for the United States to reach bin Laden (Landau 107). When the West continued to pressure the Taliban to give up Osama, Osama convinced Omar that “if you give in to the pressure of infidel governments, your decision will be against Islam” (Bergen Osama 246). Being a devout follower, Omar decided to allow Osama to stay longer.

While being protected by the Taliban, Osama and al Qaeda were able to formulate and execute plots against the US. In 2000, Osama was linked to an attack of a US Navy destroyer while it was refueling in Yemen (Landau 126). The plot against America took years of training and planning. Osama did not involve himself in the specifics of the 9/11 agenda (Bergen Osama 283). He appointed a leader of the operation in 1999 (Bergen Osama 283). In 1999, Osama’s son was warned of a plan to attack America that was so detrimental that the US would hunt down any one affiliated with Osama (bin Laden et al 311). The same warning was echoed in April of 2001 (bin Laden et al 312).

After 9/11 the Bush administration demanded the Taliban hand over bin Laden (“Bush to Taliban: ‘Time Is Running Out’”). A week after the US began bombing Afghanistan, the Taliban offered to give Osama to a neutral country, provided that the US halt the bombings and show the regime the evidence

that linked Osama to 9/11 (Kathy Gannon). Bush refused the offer by the Taliban and continued on with the war (Kathy Gannon). Following the beginning of the War on Terrorism, bin Laden went to the mountains of Tora Bora until he fled to Pakistan (bin Laden 313).

Bin Laden Postmortem

After almost ten years of war and searches for bin Laden, he was reported as being captured in Pakistan ("Osama Bin Laden Biography"). Even though Osama is deceased, it is more important than ever to analyze and understand his messages. Richard Gauvain, an assistant professor at the University of Dubai, found respect for Osama and his ideas among his students. They did not agree with Osama's radical messages but felt that since he fought for his religious and political beliefs, he should be treated as a martyr ("Osama Bin Laden as a Multi Vocal Symbol").

Just because Osama was reported dead, does not mean that his message is not still being echoed. The beliefs and tactics of al Qaeda spread to militants in South Asia (Peter Bergen "Why"). Around the time of the attack on America, al Qaeda was reported to have about 200 affiliated members (Peter Bergen "Why"). It was never the number of members in al Qaeda that was the main concern (Peter Bergen "Why"). The real concern involves the messages and program this group teaches other radical groups (Peter Bergen "Why"). There continues to be an anti-American hatred in parts of the Middle East. Instead of ending the terrorism, the War in Iraq has helped to increase al Qaeda's support (Bergen Holy 350). There were recent investigations of al Qaeda's involvement with the bombings aimed at American diplomats in Libya. There was no direct connection found between Osama's al Qaeda group and the attack (Ken Dilanian; Shashank Bengali). The Department of Homeland Security reported that the militants who implemented the attack were tied to al Qaeda but there is no evidence that the organization itself directed the bombing ("Daily Open Source Infrastructure Report 1"). Although presumed to be unconnected to the founding organization, this attack seems to echo the anti-West influences of al Qaeda.

Misconceptions and Perceptions of bin Laden

There are many common mistruths about Osama. In order to understand his intentions, it is best to clarify any misperceptions that may be associated with him. One common misapprehension is that Osama was created by the CIA. The United States certainly provided funds to the Pakistanis who distributed some of the money to fight the Soviets (Bergen Holy 67). The CIA funded roughly three billion dollars to aid in this war (Bergen Osama 60-61). The money was given to Pakistan so the United States could deny their financial involvement (Bergen Holy 67). America knew that if they were caught aiding Afghanistan during the war, this would lead to a propaganda victory for communism (Bergen Holy 67). The U.S. was so focused on the defeat of the Soviets it ignored the misappropriation of its funds by Pakistan (Landau 43). Funding Afghanistan was seen as a way to pay back the Soviets who had funded North Vietnam against the US (Bergen Holy 66). Pakistan distributed some of the money to anti-Western movements; however none of the funds have been linked to the Afghan Arabs, bin Laden in particular, or his immediate associates (Bergen Holy 67; Bergen Osama 60-61).

Another common misbelief is that Osama suffered from a kidney disorder that caused him to be on dialysis (bin Laden et al 172). This was not true; the truth was that he did frequently get kidney stones, had low blood pressure and he also suffered from diabetes (bin Laden et al 172; Bergen Holy 60).

Chapter Three:

Speech One: Martyrs “[Retaliate] on Behalf of the Poor”

Post 9/11

Osama predicted that the West would seek reprisal for the 9/11 attacks. Under this assumption he gave a prerecorded video to an Al Jazeera representative with the instructions to broadcast it following the announcement of the American objectives for retaliation (Lawrence 103). Al Jazeera, an Arabic TV network, released the video as directed. It followed an address to the United States citizens by President George Bush, along with an address to British citizens by Prime Minister Tony Blair. The US Secretary of Defense, Donald Rumsfeld, also released a statement that day regarding the upcoming war with Afghanistan. This day marked the beginning of the war with Afghanistan (Lawrence 103). Massive bombings by the United States, England, and France followed these addresses (Lawrence 103).

Speech Released on October 7, 2001

The first speech to be analyzed was released on October 7, 2001. This was almost a month following the 9/11 attacks. The transcript of this speech was found in Messages to the World: The Statements of Osama bin Laden edited by Bruce Lawrence and translated by James Howarth. As suggested by Campbell and Burkholder, the rhetorical critic before analyzing the speech itself should define any distinctions or characteristics that may bring an understanding to the acts meaning (19, 20). Elements that Campbell and Burkholder suggest as elements in this first stage of analysis include *purpose, role, audience, tone, structure, supporting evidence, and other strategies* (20).

First Stage of Analysis: Description of Artifact

The purpose of this speech was to praise the feat of the 9/11 hijackers and to publicly endorse the attack. Osama wanted this recording to follow the retaliation statements made by the West, so his explanations for the war would also be explicitly heard. He praised the assault but did not admit planning it. This message was his attempt to communicate his justifications to the world. His previous messages had gained him little publicity in the eyes of the American public. After 9/11 most of the Western world knew who he was.

Bin Laden's role in this speech was an educator and an organizer. As an educator, Osama provided examples of injustices repeatedly perpetrated against the Muslim community. These instances were meant to serve as legitimate reasons for retaliation. Osama wanted his audience to understand what motivated the anti-American movement. He implied that the hijackers were righteous in their cause and credited their success with following the will of God. He expressed the opinion that Muslims had felt "eighty years" of "humiliation and contempt" following the fall of the Ottoman Empire and their strength needed to be restored. Discrimination against the umma was seen as an acceptable reason for retaliation against the violent oppressor, America.

Osama claimed a double standard existed between the West and the Middle East. America was depicted as "the nation that punishes the weak man who has profited from the death of one of its sons, but absolves someone from a more privileged background who has profited from the deaths of a thousand of its sons." The West he said was not held accountable for causing atrocities. The Arab world was continually blamed for transgressions. When assailants attempted to defend the umma, they were instantly condemned and labeled as terrorists. Osama stated that "'freedom' and 'democracy' are actually just terror, just as resistance is labeled 'terrorism' and 'reaction.'" Osama presumed that it was not possible for the umma to defend itself without being labeled as terrorists.

Osama stated that the umma had been desecrated by America "without anyone [in the global community] listening or responding." America's international relations were said to cause pain and suffering about which "we do not hear anyone protesting or even lifting a finger to stop it." Osama alleged that the roles were reversed "after eighty years... [and] the hypocrites [rose] up to lament these killers who have scorned the blood, honor, and holy places of Muslims." The world stayed silent when the umma was desecrated, but when America was attacked "the whole world cried out" in support for the United States. These contrasting principles prompted Osama to retaliate against perceived wrongs suffered by the Muslim community caused by Western foreign policies.

In Osama's role as an organizer, he sought to inspire and recruit Muslims to join his cause by reminding them of religious obligation. He declared "every Muslim must give what he can to help his religion." Osama depicted America as waging a war against "Islam and its people on the pretext of fighting terrorism" and followers were asked to "rise up and defend [their] religion."

Osama's message was intended for both Muslim and non-Muslim citizens around the world. The majority of the speech was intended for the global audience, while parts were directed at certain designated audiences for different reasons. The Muslim community was specifically addressed in an attempt to convert fighters to join his cause. The American citizens were also targeted in an effort to explain to them his objectives for the conflict.

Osama's initial tone in this speech reflected his attitude toward his audience. The speaker's voice expressed conviction and righteousness. The words of his message also included numerous religious references to support his belief that the 9/11 hijackers were acting on God's behalf. This was reflected in the statement "God Almighty granted success...for [the hijackers] to destroy America." God was praised for the destruction of the World Trade Towers and the terror that "America ha[d] been filled with." His opening remarks praised God and described him as the leader of the crusade. Osama claimed the justifications for the attack were moral and warranted. He stated that "what America [tastes] today is but a fraction of what [the umma has] tasted for" eighty years. This timespan referred to the period following the fall of the Islamic Ottoman Empire in 1921. During this time, in the Islamic communities "sons have been killed, its blood has been shed, its holy sanctuaries have been violated, all in a manner contrary to that revealed by God." This supported his belief that the West intentionally and repeatedly attacked Islam. Americans were claimed to be "immoral, dissolute, apostates, who help the butcher slaughter his victim and help the oppressor against the innocent child." The al Qaeda movement was represented as a virtuous religious crusade with the aim to seek reprisal against the West.

An antagonistic tone also echoed throughout Osama's speech. Osama's hostile attitude was directed at America and her allies. America was criticized for its association with Israel and for its foreign policies. Both of the Bush administrations were vilified. Bush Junior was criticized for his delayed response time after the first Twin Tower had been struck. Osama condemned Bush for leaving fifty thousand of his citizens in the two towers to face this great horror on their own, just when they needed him most." The hijackers were portrayed as faithful martyrs who "retaliated on behalf of the poor, oppressed sons." This statement pertained to the hostilities of Palestinians suffered following the formation of the state of Israel (Lawrence 103). The world was said to have been divided "into two camps: one of faith, with no hypocrites, and one of unbelief." This clarified the idea that the evil West and its allies stood against the virtuous Muslim communities.

The structure of the speech is best described as the *narrative-dramatic* form as described by Campbell and Burkholder (24). In the narrative-dramatic structure, a perception of reality is depicted by putting together pieces that would help to understand the whole situation (Campbell, Burkholder 24). Using this method, bin Laden listed examples of transgressions associated with American foreign policies and religious imagery to legitimize his claim that the 9/11 hijackers were vindicated.

Numerous examples of religious imagery, alleged crimes, historical claims, and analogies were used as supporting material. Strategies that were applied throughout the message include a fortiori, labeling, enthymeme and repetition. Frequent references to God demonstrated to his audience that he was following the dictates of his faith. The religious statements also served as an attempt to gain credibility among the Muslim community.

A figurative analogy was used to compare the Greek hero Achilles to America. Osama stated that "God has struck America at its Achilles heel and destroyed its greatest buildings." In this comparison, both gods helped to destroy an indestructible entity by hitting him in his weak spot. In the Greek myth, the god Apollo directed an arrow to the one place that could kill the warrior Achilles, his heel (Hamilton

201-202). Osama believed the God, Allah, directed the arrow that struck America at its figurative “Achilles’ heel.”

Controversial historical events were used to justify the anti-Western movement and to prove America’s transgressions in foreign policies. The economic sanctions used in Iraq during the Gulf War were one such instance. America was blamed for the death of a “million innocent children...killed in Iraq.” This was also an example used to prove that the global community held America to different standards. He stated that “we do not hear anyone condemning this, nor do we hear any juridical decree from the official scholars.” Osama disparaged the rest of the world for allowing this to happen without arraigning the US.

An additional contentious historic event used to slander America involved the ethical debate concerning President Truman’s decision to drop two atomic bombs on Japan during World War II. Osama criticized the United States for the “hundreds of thousands [of Japanese citizens] young and old, [who] were killed” by atomic bombs during World War II. Osama criticized the West for not investigating or charging the US because of the devastation that the atomic bombs caused. He condemned the West for not charging America with “a war crime,” instead it was considered as “just an issue to be looked into.”

An instance of a fortiori technique the US use of atomic bombs on Japan to the 1998 bombs used on Iraq and Afghanistan. The latter bombings had been retaliation for attacks on American embassies in Africa by al-Qaeda. A correlation between the nuclear weapons and the recent bombings promoted the belief that the American criminal behavior in international relations was ongoing and that “the same [war tactic] applies” that disregards the innocent lives claimed.

President Bush was labeled as “the head of global unbelief, behind the Hubal of the modern age.” Hubal was the pagan moon god (Lawrence 105). The Prophet Muhammad was responsible for leading followers of Islam away from believing in such false gods (Lawrence 105). As stated earlier, it was believed by his followers that Osama had a similar career path to that of the Prophet Mohammad. This

subtle implication illustrated that Osama was on the same religious journey as Mohammad to free his people. Labeling Bush as a false God created the enthymeme that concluded that Osama was the righteous leader. In the modern day crusade “America and its supporters” were construed as the false god of the “modern age” (Lawrence 105). Osama gained credibility from his followers by referencing the perception that he was to lead the Islamic faith away from the false God (Western influences) and direct it back to the strict Wahhabi sect of Islam (Wahhabism).

The repetition of references to God and his role in the 9/11 attacks demonstrated the idea that this was a religious endeavor. The injustices and deaths suffered by Muslims in areas such as Palestine, Iraq, and Afghanistan were claimed to be concentrated on attacking the Islamic community instead of other possible areas for conflict. The message began and concluded with religious praise. It was presumed by him that God would “lift [the hijackers] up to the highest Paradise.” Osama believed the retaliation against America was channeled through them by God.

Second Stage of Analysis: Historical Context

The second stage of this analysis reflects the setting of the speech as well as an evaluation of the evidence used to support Osama’s justifications. In this phase the rhetorical tactics used are evaluated through developing an understanding for the surrounding elements of the speech. As described by Campbell and Burkholder, this requires an understanding of the historical-contextual framework, Osama as a rhetor, the audience, and other persuasive forces. (Campbell and Burkholder 50)

Osama prepared for this speech in isolation. The American government issued an ultimatum to the Taliban government ordering the regime to hand over bin Laden and other terrorists. Gabriele Marranci, a lecturer in Anthropology of Religion, School of Divinity and Religious Studies at the University of Aberdeen said the Taliban initially ignored this warning and refused to deport a Muslim to a non-Muslim regime without hard evidence (80). The refusal to heed the warning led to “the most massive bombing attacks anyone in that country had ever seen” (bin Laden et al 285). Osama and other al Qaeda

members fled to the Tora Bora Mountains to escape the Western invasion until they were able to get to Pakistan (Bin Laden et al 313).

The American audience was still in shock over the 9/11 attacks that had happened a month earlier. This had been the first land attack on America since Pearl Harbor in 1941. The Western audience was extremely hostile towards bin Laden. They were convinced that Osama was linked to the attacks, even after his September 16 statement that denied any involvement. The week before the speech's release, *Time* magazine featured Osama on the cover. This issue ran an article that stated "Americans do not need much convincing that Osama bin Laden is to blame for the attacks" and continued that was a good thing because the government would not be able to produce hard evidence against him (Amanda Ripley). World leaders, such as Tony Blair, stated in his address "there is no doubt in my mind...that these attacks were carried out by the al Qaeda network masterminded by Osama bin Laden" (Tony Blair). It was a general understanding in the West that al Qaeda had been behind this attack, even without the hard evidence that was requested by the Taliban.

According to Bruce Lincoln, the Professor of History of Religion in the Divinity School of the University of Chicago, this speech was the first time westerners were able to see video footage of Osama. Much of the Western world was seeking justice for these attacks, now they could put a face on their arch enemy.

The competing persuasive forces surrounding this message are bin Laden and other like-minded anti-West Islamic radicals against America and its allies. Both sides in this conflict represented themselves as being on the defensive side of the war and fighting against the evil oppressor. The hijackers were interpreted as defending Islam and protesting atrocities perpetrated on the umma. The West believed they were seeking retaliation for the 9/11 attacks and fighting against those opposed to freedom and democracy. President Bush asserted to Americans that "we defend not only our precious freedoms, but also the freedom of people everywhere" ("President Bush's Speech"). Supporters for Osama's ideas

agreed with the idea that this was a defensive attack. Susan Sachs' article in the *New York Times* quoted an Egyptian college student who believed that Osama was "defending the Arab's rights, since all Arab leaders are silent...we agree with him on his point of view, but we do not agree with his methods" (qtd. Susan Sachs).

Tests of Claims

In order to understand Osama's rhetorical statements, it is important to investigate his declarations about truth and clarity. Bin Laden tried to use rhetoric that would discredit the intentions of American foreign policy makers and strengthen his credibility. He believed that it was through America's aid citizens in Muslim communities suffered, such as in his examples given of crimes in Iraq and Palestine. There was misplaced perception of blame within the given supporting evidence. The death and destruction associated with Iraq and Israel were not solely because of America. In both cases suffering was related to decisions made by the United Nations. Both situations involved other issues and conflicting regimes. These lands were heavily populated by Muslims, but that was not the reason for conflict. Bin Laden believed that Americans "are conspiring against us until even the countries that belong to Islam [join] their side." This statement shows his perception of the US war being a crusade against Islam. In the examples of Israel and Iraq, although they may have seemed like religious wars to Osama, they were not perceived this way by Westerners.

A few historical events used as justification can be evaluated to determine the truth behind this claim. In one instance Osama blamed America for causing the deaths of millions of children because of the economic sanctions implemented by the United Nations (Lawrence 103). The sanctions were placed on Iraq following its invasion of Kuwait. Restrictions were made on foreign trade and Iraqi assets were frozen as an attempt to deter Saddam Hussein from seeking to expand his territory. It was the Security Council for the UN that implemented the decision to use these sanctions. America is a one of a collection of states that makes up this Council. According to David Rieff's article published in the *New York Times*,

“Were Sanctions Right?” America and Britain were the designers of the imposed restrictions on Iraq. This was not the sole responsibility of the United States. Also, it is not possible to determine who, if anyone was specifically at fault for these deaths. During the timespan of the sanctions there were concurrent attempts to help Iraqi citizens. The UN offered an oil-for-food program to Hussein, which was refused for five years (Sadiq, Tiller). In one theory Saddam Hussein was accused of limiting humanitarian aid for his citizens as a propaganda stunt to justify his role in Gulf war (Sadiq, Tiller). There is no definite evidence that can solely blame America for the fatalities caused by these sanctions.

Another untruthful example used by Osama in his speech referred to the destruction of towns in Palestine. The hardships of Palestinians were blamed on the West. The United States was condemned for permitting the “Israeli[s]... [to wreck] havoc and sin in Palestine.” Bin Laden described the scene as “Israeli tanks and bulldozers” [destroying the areas of] Jenin, in Ramallah, in Rafah, in Beit Jala-and other parts of the domain of Islam.” He blamed America for its failure to stop Israel’s attacks.

These events were reported in September 2001, by the Applied Research Institute in Jerusalem. The Israeli army had bulldozed Palestinian telephone and electricity cables, shops, agricultural lands, underground wells, and roads (MacAskill). The demolitions had been criticized by Western powers, but each scenario was given a justification and rebutted by Israel (MacAskill). Whether or not these justifications given by Israel were warranted is up for debate. One example of an attempt of the West to stop Israel’s actions followed a month of damages to Palestinian homes and shops in Rafah (MacAskill). The Israelis had validated this destruction by stating that the owners did not have the proper building permits, which were intentionally made difficult to obtain (MacAskill). Another example of a doubtful claim regarding Israeli actions followed their bulldozing of Palestinian refugee camps (MacAskill). This was justified by the claim that the building was used by Palestinian gunmen (MacAskill). The actions taken against the Palestinians by the Israelis were blamed on America who permitted these acts to occur. As stated previously, Osama saw Israel and America as the same entity.

Another example which Osama gave to justify the actions of the hijackers was his description of the 1998 American embassy bombings by al Qaeda. He stated “when a few of them were killed in Nairobi and Dare es-Salaam, they bombed Afghanistan and Iraq.” Bin Laden implied to the audience that the attacks were aimed at the countries as a whole. This was not true. The retaliation attacks were ordered by President Bill Clinton and were intended to specifically target individual terrorists and their training camps (“US Track Record of Retaliation”).

The complete video of this speech was not available to allow evaluation of bin Laden’s vocal tone and other non-verbal cues throughout his speech. This speech was recorded in Arabic, so the vocal tone could not be clearly recognized by the author. An excerpt of this speech was publicized on NBC Nightly News. Following the release of this video, the Bush administration restricted American media networks to playing only short excerpts from his messages with commentaries from “responsible journalists, who could be counted on to tell the desired story” (Bruce Lincoln). There was only one line from the entire message that was played. It was read as “I want to tell the United States and its people, I swear by God, by Allah, he who has raised the sky, that the United States will not have peace”(NBC Nightly News Oct 7, 2001 - America Strikes Back). The news did not include the next line in which Osama said that Americans would not know peace until “safety becomes a reality for us.” The news focused on perceiving bin Laden as the mastermind behind 9/11 and his threat to the United States.

The video excerpt showed bin Laden dressed in fatigues with a gun at his side. The interpretation of having the weapon could have meant a representation of power or violence, but in this case it seems to have been just a normal occurrence. Having a gun at his side was routine for Osama. His son Omar stated “I could not recall ever seeing my father at an arm’s length distance from his weapon, even when he was visiting my mother” (bin Laden et al 194).

Third Stage of Analysis: Evaluation of Artifact

The final stage of the analysis of this speech focuses on the evaluation of the speech itself. This focus combines the description of the message and context found in the previous two stages to form a

judgment of the act. This includes subjective conclusions about the evidence found. (Campbell Burkholder 73)

The intention of this message was to publicly declare that the attacks were justified and righteous. Osama wanted his audience to understand what motivated the attackers to hate America. America's foreign policies were contested and the successes of the assailants were praised. Throughout the message there were indirect hints of involvement in the 9/11 attack. There were implications that also suggested a leadership role. Osama vowed by God that Americans would not know safety until there was peace in Palestine and the "infidel armies leave the land of Muhammad." This meant that he played a key part in the decision to end this conflict. Bin Laden also prayed to God "for help and forgiveness" and to "seek refuge...from the evil of our souls and our bad deeds." Such statements imply guilt. Osama spoke on behalf of the attackers to portray their motivations for the attack, but included himself in these prayers by using the term "our." This terminology showed a relationship with the assailants. Osama told his audience his motives for the attack before directly admitting to being associated with the crime.

Osama focused the justifications for the attack on perceived religious intolerance of Muslims by the West, specifically America. The idea that Americans and Muslims were held to different standards in the eyes of the global community supported this claim. He believed that America and its supporters were not held liable for their transgressions. Osama claimed that the anti-American movement justified these transgressions and would reclaim the security of the umma. This message relied heavily on religious references to validate the belief that this conflict was a crusade. God was praised for the success of the 9/11 attack as well as appealed to for future endeavors. The imagery of a crusade portrayed Osama as a holy warrior defending his people. The labeling of Bush as a false idol insinuated that Osama was the one chosen to lead his people. The comparison of America to Achilles was meant to strengthen the religious perception. This reinforced the belief that the attacks were successful because of God.

This message addressed the attacks and motivations for the anti-American movement. The hijackers were praised for defending the Muslim communities. America was described as an evil entity that needed to be punished for continuous war crimes and transgressions it had perpetrated on the global community. This was the first of several released messages from Osama following 9/11 supporting his ideals and condemning the West.

Chapter Four:

Speech Two: “Bush’s Hands Are Covered With...Blood”

Presidential Elections of 2004

October 2004 was a critical time for Americans because of the upcoming Presidential elections between President George W. Bush and Senator John Kerry. Because of the United States involvement in the War on Terror, some considered this election to be the most important one they would ever have to face (“The International Press on the 2004 U.S. Elections”). A few days before the elections a video was broadcast by Al Jazeera that was made by bin Laden. It had been over a year since his last release of a prerecorded statement.

Speech Released on October 29, 2004

The second message to be analyzed in this paper was broadcast on October 29, 2004. An edited five-minute clip of the entire eighteen minute message was aired by Al Jazeera (Lawrence 237). In this speech Osama made many declarations again to justify his cause to his audience. The transcript to be used in this analysis was found in Messages to the World: The Statements of Osama bin Laden edited by Bruce Lawrence and translated by James Howarth.

Concurrent with the release of this video, the electoral polls showed the Presidential nominees were close in the polls (Mark Barabak). Bush led the polls in issues relating to defense and terrorism while Kerry led the polls in domestic and international affairs (“The International Press on the 2004 U.S. Elections”). Osama timed the video release to influence the elections (Lawrence 237). The specific way Osama wanted to affect the elections is up for debate.

First Stage of Analysis: Description of Artifact

The first stage of this analysis will describe the features of this speech that make it unique and clarify its significance. This message was clearly meant to influence voters and to publicize bin Laden’s justifications for his anti-American movement. He defended misconceptions regarding himself and his organization. Bush was blamed for continuing to keep Americans ignorant and “practicing his deception,

[and] misleading [Americans] about the real” causes for the war. The reputations of both Bush Senior and Bush Junior were defiled. The audience was led to believe that learning the truth would help to prevent another attack on America. Osama asserted that he had “repeatedly tried to convey to [Americans] in words and deeds, years before September 11” his perceptions of injustices that had been done to the umma by the American government. He portrayed himself as trying to right the wrongs that were done to his people.

Bin Laden’s role in this speech was to appear as an educator and a leader. He wanted to inform Americans about the true motives of both al Qaeda and the American government. He advised his audience on the “best way to avoid another Manhattan, the war, its causes, and its consequences.” He illustrated events that had initially inspired him to attack the twin towers. He stated that his idea for attacking the Twin Towers occurred “when things went just too far with the American- Israeli alliance’s oppression and atrocities against [the umma] in Palestine and Lebanon.” He exemplified how he came to believe that “oppression and intentional murder of innocent women and children is a deliberate American policy.”

Osama attempted to enlighten the audience about the truth and asked them to research the testimonials “of the thousands who left you on September 11.” These statements were said to be “worthy of being published and studied.” The final words made by those who lost their lives on 9/11 were meant as an additional factor to prove his claim. One such statement recalled they “were wrong when we let the White House inflict unchecked its aggressive foreign policy on the poor people.” Osama wanted to teach the audience “happy is he who learns from the experiences of others.”

As an educator, Osama hoped to “tell ... the truth about the moments when this decision [to attack America] was taken, so [Americans] can reflect on it.” Osama aimed to instruct the audience on the truth because the citizens of the United States “should know that returning to truth is better than continuing to lie.” He claimed that without the West knowing the truth behind al Qaeda’s motives “there

are still motives for a repeat [attack].” The significance of Osama’s rhetoric was described in his proverb “that a penny spent on prevention is better than a fortune of a cure.” This showed that Osama believed it important to educate the audience on the truth of his motivations. The audience had been misled; therefore the real reasons behind the war could not be resolved. Once the audience was enlightened concerning the truth, future conflicts could be avoided.

Bin Laden saw himself as a revolutionary leader motivated by God. He tried to portray himself as a just and righteous leader who was “punish[ing] the oppressors.” His perception of himself and his movement as consecrated was illustrated in the statement that “God is our master; you have none.” This implied that Americans were sinful antagonists without the support of God. Osama believed that Al Qaeda’s success was the direct intention of “the grace of God Almighty.”

This speech was specifically targeted towards the American public at a crucial time in their history. In the beginning of the speech Osama stated “People of America, I speak to you...” The intended audience is also apparent in Osama’s closing remarks, which told Americans that “your security...lies in your own hands” not the hands of al Qaeda, or those of either of the presidential nominees.

Throughout his speech, Osama discussed concerns he believed his audience needed to understand before going to the polls. He wanted Americans to have an understanding of the effects the United States government and its foreign policy had on the global community. The American public saw Osama as an antagonist of freedom and democracy. He was the face of terrorism. Regardless of their perceptions of him, Osama still attempted to communicate with the American public. Repeatedly throughout his message Osama vilified Bush. He claimed that “Bush’s hands are covered with the blood of all these casualties, from both sides, all in the name of oil and more business for his private companies.” If Osama’s motive was to get Bush re-elected then he understood that the American population would not accept such convictions. There was little chance that anything he said would have been viewed as credible.

The tone portrayed by bin Laden in this speech was empathetic and condescending. His egalitarian attitude was shown in his effort to make Americans believe that peace was attainable for them. He tried to draw sympathy from his audience by describing past aggressions against the umma that he sought to right. He asked Americans if he could be blamed for “protecting his own.” He wanted Americans to apprehend that its foreign policies created extreme hardships for the Muslim community. America’s international procedures and the US alliance with Israel were key motivators in his effort to seek revenge.

Osama’s condescending attitude was directed at American political leaders and the ignorance of its citizens. Most of his patronizing attitude was explicitly focused at the American administration, while the audience was indirectly demeaned for being oblivious to the truths about the war. Both Bush Junior and Bush Senior were repeatedly targeted. The Bush administration was accused of prolonging the War on Terror for financial gain.

Americans were subtly mocked for believing the Bush administrations declarations and the media portrayals surrounding the context of the conflict. Osama did not overtly call Americans stupid; instead he subtly made indirect comments that criticized the failure of the US citizens to research the truth. He was “amazed at [Americans]” for continuing to believe Bush’s claims about al Qaeda’s reason for war. He questioned why the audience would not investigate the truths behind these claims since “it is well known that those who despise freedom do not possess proud souls.” The failure of Americans to research the reasons for September 11 attacks was criticized in his statement that “when disasters happen, intelligent people look for the reasons behind them, so that they can avoid them in the future.” In his closing statements, Osama further condemned his audience for not being sensible and for “underestim[ing] the value of his security, his property, or his home for the sake of the liar in the White House.” The criticisms made about Americans were intended to motivate the audience to actively investigate the undertakings of the administration.

The structure of the speech was historical-chronological (Campbell, Burkholder 24). This method was used to emphasize how past events escalated into a single motive for war. The explanation of motives in the speech began chronologically with how “the events that made a direct impression on [Osama] were during and after 1982...” This was explained as his first inspiration to destroy the towers. He described the devastation he witnessed and how his experience transformed into his resolution to attack. Osama used past experiences to build his rationalizations of “self-defense” as a reason “[to] punish the oppressors” and to give “America a taste of its own medicine.” He implied engaging in a defensive war was proven by his avowal that “every action has a reaction.”

Along with the historical-chronological organization, there was also a cause and effect structure present throughout the message. One purpose of this speech was to “explain to [Americans] the reasons behind” the conflict. Osama gave descriptions of events that caused him to seek vengeance against the United States. Bin Laden identified his grounds for war and gave graphic examples as to why he felt they were admissible.

The supporting materials that bin Laden used were vivid depictions, analogies, comparisons, and his personal experiences and ideas. These were presented to highlight events that inspired the war. The evidence used was meant to clarify his perceptions as well as to educate his audience about the calamities caused by their President and his administration.

Osama used personal experiences of what he observed during the Lebanon War in 1982 to explain his initial inspiration for the September 11 attacks. This experience “unleashed a powerful urge [in Osama] to reject injustice and [provided] a strong determination to punish the oppressors.” He used a vivid depiction to exemplify the “distressing scenes” he envisioned. He painted a scene of “blood, torn limbs, women and children massacred.” He claimed that “houses were being destroyed and tower blocks were collapsing, crushing their residents, while bombs rained down mercilessly on our homes.” He condemned America for its role in aiding Israel in this war. An analogy illustrated the helplessness of

Lebanese citizens and paralleled the situation to “a crocodile devouring a child, who could do nothing but scream.”

A graphic comparison portrayed the corrupt behaviors of both of the Bush administrations with these of the Arabic regimes. The Bush administrations were compared to the regimes of monarchs and dictators in the Middle East “well known for their arrogance, conceit, and illegal theft of funds.” The “tyranny and suppression of liberties” suffered in America were blamed on Bush Senior’s visit to the Middle East.

Both Bush administrations were compared and blamed for claiming the lives of innocent Iraqis and were accused of trying to “steal Iraq’s oil, as well as commit other atrocities.” As in the October 7 speech, again America was criticized for implementing the economic sanctions against Iraq during the Gulf War. Osama condemned Bush Junior for “dropping millions of pounds of bombs and explosives on millions of children in Iraq.” This was in reference to the Iraqi casualties that occurred during the war. Following the invasion of Iraq in 2003, the United States reportedly claimed 100,000 Iraqi citizens’ lives (Lawrence 240). In this message Osama directed the blame specifically at Bush Senior and accused him of “carrying out the mass butchering of children ... the worst thing that humanity has ever known.” Bush Junior was accused of using similar misconduct. He was criticized for not fully developing a plan for the Iraq War, as well as for making falsified statements in his message to Congress that pushed for the invasion of Iraq.

Osama used analogies to portray his perception of President Bush as well as to show his audience why his message was important. The actions of President Bush were compared with “the grumpy goat who dug out of the ground the very knife [with which] he would be killed.” This implied that Bush was continuing the war to pursue his own personal gains despite its dangers. Bin Laden alleged that “the black gold [oil] blinded [Bush] and he put his own private benefits ahead of the American public interest.”

Al Qaeda's perception of the war was compared with that of Americans. Osama believed al Qaeda was succeeding based on the economic loss America suffered from the continuation of war. He claimed that "al-Qaeda spent \$500,000 on the September 11 attacks, while America lost more than \$500 billion, at the lowest estimate, in the event and its aftermath." This equated to a "million American dollars for every al-Qaeda dollar" spent in expenditures. A few days before this message was released, the Bush administration had sought roughly \$70 billion in emergency funding (Lawrence 242). Osama deduced that "the mujahidin [had] forced Bush to resort to an emergency budget in order to continue fighting" which was interpreted as a triumph for al Qaeda. As stated previously, one of the goals of the fatwa was to attack America's economy. This perceived success of al Qaeda was believed to have "been by the Grace of Allah" and was also seen as "positive and enormous and have by all standards exceeded all expectations."

Osama claimed that al Qaeda and the White House had similar objectives for the war. They were "on the same team shooting at the United States' own goal, despite our different intentions." He implied that "the White House leadership, which is so keen to open up war fronts for its various corporations, whether in the field of arms, oil, or construction, has also contributed to these remarkable results for al-Qaeda."

Bin Laden used multiple strategies to prove his claims. The a fortiori strategy was used to portray to his audience that the American government was deceitful and that he was righteously defending the umma. Osama countered "Bush's claim that we hate freedom" by rebutting the assertion and asking why "perhaps [Bush] can tell us why we did not attack Sweden, for example?" Osama clarified his intentions in the statement that "we have been fighting you because we are free men who cannot acquiesce in injustice. We want to restore security to our umma." The continuation of the conflict was projected to continue until the Muslim population was safe from further transgressions by the West. As implied in the message "just as you violate our security, so we [will] violate yours."

The repeated demeaning statements concerning President Bush's intentions were an example of the repetition strategy. On numerous occasions Osama accused Bush of misleading the American public and for having alternative motives for the continuation of the war. Osama declared that Bush had been informed by "American thinkers and intellectuals...that everything needed to guarantee America's security...was at his disposal...and that America's interest did not require him to launch into a groundless war with unknown repercussions." He claimed that Bush disregarded the hazards for the economy and military and engaged in an unnecessary war to gain profit. Osama stated "that al-Qaeda has made gains...and the Bush administration has likewise profited." The goal of his organization to weaken the American economy was perceived as successful. While the United States had suffered financially the political leaders were labeled as war profiteers.

Second Stage of Analysis: Historical Context

The second stage of this analysis critiques the evidence used by the rhetor as well as the context of the message. Prior to this speech, bin Laden was suspected to be the mastermind behind the 9/11 attacks. This was his first public admission of responsibility. This confession was released during a closely polled Presidential electoral race as a message for the voters.

Concurrent to the release of this video America was focused on the upcoming presidential elections between the Bush and Kerry. As discussed earlier, Osama had deliberately intended to influence the elections. The specific purpose for the timing of this message was to influence citizens immediately before they voted. Osama had told Americans that the future of the war did not depend on who was elected, that it was in the hands of the American people. He could have expected his video to cause voters to elect Kerry based on his own aggressive remarks about the Bush administration. He could have also assumed that his remarks would lead to America re-electing Bush. Or bin Laden could have merely wanted to openly state his reasons before voters went to the polls. Had this been the reason, then he did not have a specific candidate that he wanted to influence the voters to choose.

Bin Laden was involved in many issues debated during the electoral campaigns. Such topics included the War on Terror and the invasion of Iraq. One issue was whether or not the Iraq war was justifiable. Kerry criticized Bush for rushing into the war in Iraq and taking his “eye off the ball” (Osama bin Laden). He also condemned Bush for not capturing bin Laden in “Tora Bora, when we had him cornered in the mountains.” Despite the criticisms of Bush by both Kerry and bin Laden, Bush was re-elected. (“The International Press on the 2004 U.S. Elections”)

Bush had been openly demeaned by bin Laden for stating incorrect assertions that there was a link between al Qaeda and Saddam Hussein (Dana Milbank). This was promoted by Bush as a reason for invading Iraq. According to Osama’s son Omar, there was no connection between the two and Osama did not agree with Hussein’s dictatorship over Muslims (bin Laden et al 79). In fact, Osama often mocked Hussein for his secular ways (bin Laden et al 79). It was later reported by Thomas H Kean (R), a chairman of the National Commission of Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States that following a long investigation “there is no credible evidence... that Iraq and Saddam Hussein in any way were part of the attack on the United States” (qtd. Dana Milbank).

The obvious competing forces that were analyzed in this address were bin Laden and American politicians. There is also the possibility that the palpable hostility shown towards the Bush administration by Osama could have been a facade. As stated earlier, the Iraq War motivated many Muslims to join the anti-American activities. In order to gain more supporters Osama could have implemented a reverse psychology tactic on his audience. Since he was public enemy number one he could have known that declaring his opposition to the Bush administration would have strengthened American allegiance to Bush. A reelection would reinforce his movement. Shortly before this video was released Bush was being criticized for allowing 300 tons of missing weapons to disappear from Iraq and for altered campaign ads (Mark Barabak). Pictures of a speech given to American soldiers by Bush had been altered. In the campaign photograph, additional soldiers had been added to the visual to make it appear to be a larger crowd. The timing of the video seemed to put those issues on the back burner. Consultants for John

Kerry's campaign say that this speech was a main factor in Bush's victory (Bruce Riedel). John Kerry said in an interview with Meet the Press that he had been gaining in the polls until this recording was released (qtd. Lawrence 237). American political figures believed that Bush's re-election was the determining factor in the timing of this video. For example the Governor of Pennsylvania, Ed Rendell, said:

bin Laden is trying to help George Bush, because he is the best recruiter that al-Qaeda has. He is so disliked in the Arab world that we're creating terrorists every single day-more terrorists than we can even come close to killing ("The International Press on the 2004 U.S. Elections").

Tests of Claims

In order to properly analyze the rhetoric of Osama's message, some of his statements will be critiqued for their veracity and accuracy. As stated earlier, Osama had claimed that the America's role in the Lebanon War was his initial inspiration. This was an example used to portray the misconduct of American foreign policies. In June 1982 Israel invaded Lebanon after an assassination attempt on the Israeli ambassador to Britain ("Lebanon Profile"). The Israelis were supported by America and gave a false pretense for their motives. The true motivation of the incursion was to destroy the Palestinian Liberation Organization (Lawrence 239). This was misrepresented as an attempt to prevent Palestinian fighters from attacking civilians in Galilee (Lawrence 239). During this invasion the Israeli forces killed thousands of civilians as well as slaughtering many in refugee camps (Lawrence 239).

According to Geoffrey Kemp, who previously served on the National Security Council during the first Reagan administration, the United States had attempted to resolve this conflict. A deal was eventually made to withdraw the Palestinian militia in return for the end of the Israeli presence in Beirut (Geoffrey Kemp). Osama held America responsible for permitting the Israeli militia to conduct these massacres. As discussed previously, Osama perceived Israel and America as the same entity. Even though the acts had been perpetrated by Israeli militia America was seen as liable for the devastation by association.

Another argument used by Osama implied that the defeat of the Soviets in the Soviet-Afghanistan War was because of the ability of the Mujahideen and his Afghan Arabs to bankrupt the state. It had taken “ten years until [the Soviet Union] went bankrupt, and decided to withdraw in defeat.” The victory of the Soviet-Afghanistan War inspired the belief that al Qaeda would be able to defeat America in a similar fashion. The war had enabled his organization to gain “expertise in guerilla and attritional warfare.” Osama was committed to the idea “to make America bleed to the point of bankruptcy” which would cause their withdrawal from the Middle East.

This belief was a misrepresentation of the reason for the Soviets departure from Afghanistan. The defeat of the Soviets was not purely based on the financial depletion of the regime. There were additional factors that played a key role in the defeat of the Soviets. One such influence was financial and military aid given to the Mujahideen by the United States. Max Rodenbeck, the Mideast Correspondent for the *Economist*, argued that a big factor in the loss by the Soviet Union was American aid given to the Afghans. Once the US gave the Mujahideen stinger missiles, the Soviets lost their advantage of having “total air superiority,” which caused a major turning point towards the end of the war (Bergen Holy 76).

Another contention of Bin Laden involved the intentions of the Bush administration in Iraq. Osama criticized Bush for using the war to gain wealth for himself and his peers. He asked his audience to consider that “anyone seeing the enormity of the contracts won by dubious large corporations, like Halliburton and others connected to Bush and his administration, can be certain of” their profits. There was a link found as claimed by bin Laden. Mark Gongloff, a CNN/Money Staff Writer, wrote in a 2003 article that the “first contracts for rebuilding post-war Iraq have been awarded, and Vice President Dick Cheney's old employer, Halliburton Co., is one of the early winners.” Although there had been previous ties to Cheney, he disassociated himself from the company's interests following the 2000 elections (Mark Gongloff).

Osama asked his audience to research interviews of him that were conducted by American journalists in the 1990s as evidence that he had previously tried to communicate his ideals to the American public. This was meant to prove Bush had misrepresented Osama's reasons for war and provided evidence of the perceptions of al Qaeda's anti-America movement. The Bush administration had limited what could be published by the media regarding the war and messages from bin Laden. Osama contended that the journalists who had previously interviewed him had not been asked by the administration or the media about what they "learned from us about the reasons for our struggle." Had they been able to then Americans "could avoid perpetrating these injustices ... [and] would be on the right path towards [the] security you enjoyed before September 11."

In the 1997 interview with Peter Arnett, Osama stated his reasons for declaring jihad against America. He blamed the United States for criminal acts through its support of Israel. Osama also condemned America for being associated with loss of civilian life and property in Palestine, Iraq, and Lebanon. Osama stated that his organization would fight against American troops in their holy land. In the 1998 interview with John Weiner, Osama told the American people to "elect an American patriotic government that caters to their interests not the interests of the Jews" ("Who is Osama bin Laden"). He also relayed to Americans that he believed "the American government is leading the country towards hell" ("Who is Osama bin Laden"). As Osama had contended, he had been trying to communicate his beliefs to America through rhetoric and minor attacks for years leading up to 9/11.

The media had been instructed by the Bush administration to edit the content displayed to the masses. The five minute edited clip showed Osama wearing traditional Muslim attire instead of camouflage. There was no excerpt of this speech found online translated into English. The text used in this speech was found on globalresearch.org. This website publishes information by the Centre for Research on Globalization.

Third Stage of Analysis: Evaluation of Artifact

The third stage of this analysis evaluates the context and descriptions used to interpret the meaning of the message. This was his first admission of being responsible for the September 11 attacks. Osama tried to put blame on America's foreign policies and its alliance with Israel as key motivators for his aggression. Security and prevention were key concepts addressed in this message. Osama told his audience that he had made numerous attempts prior to 9/11 to communicate to them the wrongdoings of their government along with his intent. He tried to convince his audience that he was empathetic toward them. He indicated that the future of the conflict was in their hands and he represented the many victims targeted by America. Bin Laden used the misleading of the American public by its administration as an indication that the audience was also a victim and that they were both preyed upon by the Bush administration.

A recurring theme that Osama portrayed in this message was the idea of security. Security was described as "one of the pillars of human life" to show that everyone, not just Americans, deserved to feel safe from oppression. The lack of a sense of sanctuary among the umma was depicted as a warranted cause for retaliation. This was communicated in the statement "whoever encroaches upon the security of others and imagines that he will himself remain safe is but a foolish criminal." Another statement that depicted the defensive viewpoint for seeking safety was his claim that "every state that doesn't play with our security, has automatically guaranteed its own security." The guarantee of wellbeing for Muslims was a key notion in the continuation of the Anti-American movement.

Threats made in this message developed in a sequential manner. The attacks were as acts of defense. The future of the conflict was claimed to be in the hands of the audience. The potential for future attacks was said to be dependent on America's role in the Middle East. This is shown in the avowal "just as you violate our security, so we [will] violate yours." By making such claims, Osama appeared to place the fate of the war in the hands of the American citizens.

Prevention was another key concept of this message. Osama opened his remarks by explicitly telling Americans how they could avoid another attack from al Qaeda. He also told Americans the best way for them to actively prevent another attack was to research the events that led to the conflict. Americans were criticized for being ignorant of the true reasons for war and of transgressions associated with their government. It was articulated that learning about al Qaeda's reasons for war would be a significant step for averting future conflicts. Osama justified his retaliation efforts as not only a means to seek revenge, but to also prevent America from "killing our women and children." The idea of prevention by leaning the transgressions committed by America was given to the audience as a method to end the conflict.

The excerpt of the video did not show a gun at his side, as in the October 7, 2001 video. The camouflage attire was also not worn. The omission of the weapon and war attire gave Osama a less threatening perspective from the audience. He gave his message from a podium which gave the appearance of him as an instructor. Throughout the speech Osama repeatedly tried to justify his actions to an audience who wanted him dead.

Americans had been misled into believing that they were attacked because the assailants hated freedom and democracy. Osama attempted to revise this misconception by reiterating that 9/11 was a warranted offensive attack. This was meant to show the audience that he was acting defensively to protect the safety of the umma. The audience was led to believe the resolution of the war was in their hands. In order for the attacks against America to cease the wellbeing of the umma would first have to be secured.

Chapter Five:

Speech Three: “There Is No Shame In This Solution...”

Speech Released: January 19, 2006

The last speech to be analyzed was broadcast on January 19, 2006. It was released as an audiotape. The preceding message from Osama was aired in December 2004, at which time bin Laden tried to persuade Iraqis to boycott their upcoming elections (Fattah et al). This new message to Americans proposed a truce based “on fair conditions” he then claimed that this would allow:

both sides ... (to) enjoy security and stability under this truce so we can build Iraq and Afghanistan, which have been destroyed in this war. There is no shame in this solution, which prevents the wasting of billions of dollars that have gone to those with influence and merchants of war in American who have supported Bush’s election...

There are numerous reasons for why bin Laden selected this time to suggest an armistice. A potential reason could have involved the decline of the American support for the war. Another conceivable reason involved the concurrent waning of support for the Bush administration. It is also possible that this message could have been a reminder to Americans that he was alive, well, and committed to defeat the United States. The transcript for this message was found on the Global Research website.

First Stage of Analysis: Description of Artifact

The first stage of the analysis of the speech will focus on the content and characteristics of the message. Osama bin Laden released this speech to solidify his perceptions of the war. Specifically, he wanted to communicate to Americans his ideals “about the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan and how to end them.” His objectives were to get the audience to agree to a truce despite opposition from the Bush administration. Perhaps he believed that with the diminishing support by Americans there would be a greater chance for the audience to accept his proposal.

Osama’s role in this message was once again as an educator and negotiator. He spoke of several issues he believed to be important for Americans to understand. As in the previous speeches, he wanted to

demonstrate to his audience that he was righteous in his ways. He clarified what he believed were misrepresentations of his cause by the US administration. One such statement refuted Bush's claim that "withdrawing troops [would] send the wrong message to [al Qaeda]." Bin Laden wanted his audience to understand that the extension of the war was not necessary and was not his intention. He wanted the war to end just as much as he believed they did. Osama gave examples that suggested Bush as had alternative motives for continuing the war. Bush and the administration were accused of not getting "out of Iraq for their own private, suspect reasons." The audience was also told on how the US government was perceived as distorting the media coverage of the war to affect the assessments of the war.

Osama revealed to his audience that they should learn from the defeat of the Soviets. The Mujahideen was credited with defeating them "with simple weapons for 10 years and we bled their economy and now they are nothing." The anti-American movement involved the use of jihad which was seen as is a religious honor for the extremist followers. They were willing to continue this conflict indefinitely unless a truce was agreed upon.

This speech was intended for the American public. Numerous attempts in his past to justify and recruit support for his claims had been largely unsuccessful. Although support for the war and the administration were fading, bin Laden still faced an audience that viewed him as their number one enemy. In an effort to prove his good faith he offered Americans a "long-term truce on fair conditions." He wanted to illustrate that he understood their desires and that he had compassion for the audience.

The two previous speeches analyzed attempted to draw sympathy from the audience regarding atrocities earlier perpetrated upon the umma. In this speech, bin Laden did not focus on historical motivations from the past. He described more recent controversial events regarding the war that were meant to vilify Bush. This speech used empathetic tone that emphasized compassion for the audience. Osama identified with the American desire to end the war. He exemplified concerns regarding the

negative effect the war was having on the general American population as well as “the destruction of the soldiers’ morale.”

The structure of this speech was a problem-solution format as described by Campbell and Burkholder (24). In this type of structure, the act portrayed dilemmas that concerned the ongoing war. The overall solution given to the audience was to understand the truths behind the situations and to accept his truce. Osama tried to inform his audience about these perceptions of “repeated errors... committed” by Bush.

Osama used a similar style in addressing his audience in this speech as he had in the previous two. Examples of supporting evidence used in this message included comparisons and repetition, refutation, vivid depiction, a fortiori, and labeling. An example of a comparison used by bin Laden attempted to show a similarity between the war tactics used by the US with the vicious crimes committed by Hussein during his reign. Osama declared that “there is no difference between [US] criminality and Saddam’s criminality.” He accused Americans of “raping women and taking them as hostages.” “Reports of the horrors in Abu Ghraib and Guantanamo prisons” were used to demonstrate that Americans had used inhuman treatment which was also a trait of the Hussein regime. The Americans were accused of mistreating hostages and “burning chemical acids” on them ... using “drills on their joints... [and using] drills on their heads until they die.”

Osama repeatedly accused Bush of committing “errors” to strengthen his claim that the administration was misleading the American public. These mistakes made involved the reason for continuing the war, the propaganda broadcast by the media regarding the war, and the claim made by Bush that an offensive war was better than the possibility of having to defend against attack.

Bush’s claim that “it is better to fight [Muslims] on their lands than their fighting [Americans] on our land” was refuted by Bin Laden. He countered this statement by explaining that this was not true. He contended that the “war in Iraq is raging with no let-up, and operations in Afghanistan [were] escalating

in [their] favor...” He used the injuries and death tolls of American soldiers, the massive material losses and the suicide rates among soldiers to support this claim.

Osama explicitly illustrated the “psychological breakdown that afflicts a soldier as he gathers the remains of his colleagues after they stepped on land mines that tore them apart.” He portrayed the “psychological pressure, fear, and humiliation” that soldiers felt “while [Americans are] ignorant of [what is going on].” He contended that such feelings were the cause of “the rise in cases of suicide among [soldiers].” He referred to the suicides as “a strong message to you (the audience), written by his soul, blood and pain, to save what can be saved from this hell”. In an attempt to persuade his audience to accept his truce, he claimed that “the solution is in your hands if you care about [the soldiers].” He wanted his audience to understand his motives to end the war were not just for his own benefit, but also for the welfare of Americans.

An example of the a fortiori strategy used was when Osama responded to Bush’s statement in May 2003 that “major combat operations in Iraq have ended” (“Bush Calls End to 'major Combat’”). Osama wanted to prove that since the end of “major combat” was declared, more American soldier’s lives had been lost than before the statement was released. The war continued to claim lives regardless of how it was described.

Bush was labeled as “the Butcher of freedom in the world.” He was disparaged and accused of attempting “to bomb the headquarters of the Al Jazeera in Qatar after [previously] intentionally bombing its offices in Kabul and Baghdad.” This alleged planning of an attack was depicted as an effort to restrict the media’s portrayal of the war. The latter attacks reinforced bin Laden’s perspective that since the network had been struck twice, it was probable that the Qatar location would also be targeted. Osama contended that the Western media gave its audience erroneous reports regarding the war. This supported his belief that the Bush administration would go to great lengths to keep the truth of the war from the mainstream public. He blamed the Pentagon for publishing false propaganda to Americans that made it

appear as though the US was successfully winning the war. Bin Laden claimed that the White House altered “the truth from the ground.” The Bush administration had allegedly restricted the American media and distorted the Middle Eastern media network, Al-Jazeera.

The Second Stage of Analysis: Historical Context

The second phase of this analysis involves the contextual underpinning of events surrounding the release of this speech and the veracity behind some of Osama’s claims. For the previous five years Osama had been evading the Western forces manhunt for him in the Middle East. Despite the fact that he was in hiding, he was still able to successfully release statements. In his messages to the American audiences, bin Laden faced a lot of resentment and hostilities. Americans sought retaliation for the 9/11 attacks. They desired to end the wars, but they also sought retribution for the thousands of lives claimed. As much criticism as Bush was getting, Americans still would not have accepted bin Laden’s justifications and claims. He continued to be the face of terrorism, despite his offer of armistice.

American opinion in support of the war was decreasing as were support of President Bush. In 2001, over 80% of people polled approved of Bush’s tactics for handling the presidency (Purdum, Connelly). This number dropped considerably to 41% in a four year period (Purdum, Connelly). Following Bin Laden’s attempt to propose peace, Vice President Dick Cheney responded “we don’t negotiate with terrorists...I think you have to destroy them...it’s the only way to deal with them” (“Transcript: Vice President Cheney on ‘Your World’”).

There were many events that surrounded the timing of this message. Communities in the Middle East had been protesting casualties caused from both parties to the conflict. An article in the *Washington Post*, reported that a couple of weeks prior to the release of this message, Iraqi citizens experienced their first public denunciation of al Qaeda. The organization was condemned for bombings at a police recruiting center (Hernandez, Sarhan). A few days before the airing of this audiotape the American military bombed a Pakistani village. The intended target was Ayman al-Zawahiri (Carlotta Gall). According to a *New York Times* article by Carlotta Gall, a reporter for the Pakistan and Afghanistan news,

thousands of Pakistani tribesmen protested anti-American slogans which later led to a riot. America was blamed for numerous failed or misdirected attacks in Afghanistan and Pakistan that led to the fatalities of civilians (Carlotta Gall). Such incidents influenced Pakistanis to condemn the intrusion into its country by the US. (Fattah et al). The timing of the release of this recording could have been determined to declare to the world that Osama had not been affected by this attack. This could also have been a legitimate attempt to achieve a truce between the two conflicting parties.

Another monumental event occurred concurrent with this statement's release. What had greatly changed the perception of the Vietnam War in America resonated again regarding the War in Iraq. A few days before the release of this video, Walter Cronkite, who was once "the most trusted man in America" told reporters "it's my belief that we should get out [of Iraq] now" ("Cronkite: U.S. Should Leave Iraq Now"). The influence that Cronkite had over the American audience has been legendary. In the broadcast of "Report from Vietnam: Who, What, When, Where, Why?" that he made during the Vietnam War, he reported his opinion that the war was unwinnable and America should withdraw ("Cronkite: U.S. Should Leave Iraq Now"). After hearing this report, President Lyndon Johnson stated "if I've lost Cronkite, I've lost Middle America" ("Cronkite: U.S. Should Leave Iraq Now"). Osama could have believed that Cronkite's message would have had the similar effect on the American public. Cronkite's statement could have led Osama to believe that Americans would be willing to listen to his attempt to achieve peace.

For months leading up to the release of Osama's message Americans had been worried about possible security threats if the Arabian company, Dubai World, was permitted to purchase access to American sea ports ("Timeline of Controversial Ports Deal"). The sale was announced in November 2005 ("Timeline of Controversial Ports Deal"). This was a controversial topic and many Americans opposed this idea because of possible ties between the company and terrorists ("Key Questions About The Dubai Port Deal"). The Committee on Foreign Investments approved this deal on January 17, several days before the release of Osama's recording ("Key Questions About The Dubai Port Deal"). Knowing that

Americans were skeptical about this agreement, bin Laden could have used this timing as psychological warfare. He did not directly state anything pertaining to this deal, but the timing could have been intended to send a public message connecting the two. Dubai Worlds purchase and bin Laden's speech would both be covered in the media contemporaneously which could have made people assume the two were related.

Tests of Claims

A few statements in this message were analyzed for the validity of their claim. One such instance involved Osama's avowal to Americans that the "repeated errors your President Bush has committed in comments on the results of your polls that show an overwhelming majority of you want the withdrawal of American troops from Iraq." Polls reaffirmed Osama's statement that American support for the war had been diminishing. The "Public Attitudes Toward the War in Iraq: 2003-2008" poll performed by the Pew Research Center found that around the time this speech was aired, slightly less than 50 % of those polled believed that the troops should withdraw immediately from Iraq. This was a twenty percent increase from three years earlier. The decline of support for the war did not strengthen bin Laden's appeal for a truce. A report posted on the CBS news website found that in March 2004, 58% of those surveyed believed that going to war with Iraq was a good idea (Joel Roberts). Less than a year later, less than half (46%) held that belief (Joel Roberts). This same report cited that 62% of people polled felt that the war had a negative impact on their community (Joel Roberts).

Another claim that was investigated for truth value involved the inhuman torture incidents at Abu Ghraib and Guantanamo Bay. Osama cited specific examples of torture that were previously mentioned. These prison dialogues became controversial issues concerning the treatment of prisoners by the United States. Although it was proven that merciless cruelty had been used on the detainees in these penitentiaries, evidence was not found for the specific methods described by Osama. President Bush admitted that the torture methods used in these US prisons were sending the wrong message to the world ("Just a Few Bad Apples?"). He stated that the US was "committed to the worldwide elimination of

torture, and we are leading this fight by example” (“Just a Few Bad Apples?”). An article published in *the Economist*, in 2005 found that more than 130 individuals in the military had been disciplined or condemned for unlawful murder or mistreatment of detainees and/or citizens of Afghanistan, Guantanamo Bay, and Iraq (“Just a Few Bad Apples?”). In comparison to the 500,000 members of the military that have been deployed to these areas, these numbers could be seen as simply “Just a Few Bad Apples” (“Just a Few Bad Apples?”).

Another accusation evaluated bin Laden’s claim that Bush plotted to bomb the al Jazeera station in Qatar. Two other stations had previously been bombed during the war. The targeted station was based in a nation allied to the US and UK (“Dubya's So Dangerous”). This was used as an effort to prove that the Bush administration was purposely trying to deceive the public through the media. The events that surrounded the previous two bombings came with much controversy. It was implied that these stations were intentionally targeted to restrict their coverage of the war. In 2001, an Al Jazeera office in Kabul, Afghanistan had been hit by a U.S. missile (“Al-Jazeera Kabul Offices Hit in US Raid”). At the time, Al Jazeera had been under scrutiny by the Western forces for releasing videos by bin Laden that called upon Muslims in recruitment efforts (“Al-Jazeera Kabul Offices Hit in US Raid”). Another U.S. led missile had hit an Al Jazeera office again in Baghdad in 2003. During this strike the network was scrutinized for its “no-holds-barred coverage of the war in Iraq” (“Al-Jazeera ‘hit by missile’”).

The new allegations against Bush for the supposed planning of the attack were not proven to be true. The article “Dubya's So Dangerous,” published in the *Daily Mirror* claimed that a governmental memo had been found which revealed Bush had planned to attack the Qatar news station. It was said that the attack was not implemented because Tony Blair convinced Bush to not proceed (“Dubya's So Dangerous”). This memo was not validated by the government; therefore it was not confirmed as evidence.

Osama reminded his audience that since attacks on American soil had not been repeated after 9/11, this was not an indication that America was winning the war. The organization had “managed repeatedly to penetrate all security measures adopted by the unjust allied countries... The delay in similar operations happening in America has not been because of failure to break through your security measures.” Assaults were aimed at other regions in the world that were believed to be a threat to the umma. There were attacks throughout Europe following 9/11, some of which were directed by al Qaeda while others were made by extremists who were motivated by al Qaeda’s ideals. Some assaults were executed, while others were fortunately thwarted. One example of an occurrence happened in Madrid, Spain in March of 2004. This may not have been a direct plan of the al Qaeda organization, but the attackers admitted to being inspired by the organization (Paul Carsten). Another instance occurred in Britain in July of 2005. This was a tragic bombing that was aimed at the country’s public transport system (Paul Carsten). Fortunately other attacks were successfully foiled before the violence could be implemented (Paul Carsten).

Osama claimed that “despite all the barbaric methods, [Americans use, they] have not broken the fierceness of the resistance. The Mujahideen, thank God, are increasing in number and strength.” He referred to the “number of your dead and wounded ... not to mention the massive material losses...” to support his claim. The occupation by Americans in Iraq began in March of 2003; in May of that year Bush ordered an end to major combat. Osama said if his audience were to “compare the small number of dead on the day that Bush announced the end of major operations... with the tenfold number of dead and wounded who were killed in the smaller operations, you would know the truth of what I say.” In May, there were 175 American troop casualties reported (“Military” U.S. Casualties in Iraq). In the three years, starting from Bush’s announcement until December 2005, the casualties totaled 2171 (“Military” U.S. Casualties in Iraq). According to the report published on Globalsecurity.org, the number of fatalities increased by twelve times.

Third Stage of Analysis: Evaluation of Artifact

The final stage of this analysis required an evaluation of the speech through context and historical background. In this message bin Laden made a significant decrease in religious imagery in comparison to the other two analyzed. He praised God for his past and future successes but there were no direct religious imagery or examples used in this speech. This may have been intentional. Since he was inspired by his religious beliefs, he used some references to God, but he may have realized that repeated Islamic religious imagery was not a successful persuasive tactic for the primarily Christian American audience.

The recurring theme in this speech is the idea that Bush was misleading the public through comments and actions. Osama's stance was meant to clarify common errors that Bush had made in these respects. Using this tactic, he tried to give the impression that he was empathetic to the audience.

Osama used a personal linguistic style in this message. He repeatedly used "I" when giving opinions about the war and outcome. He spoke on behalf of his personal beliefs by using the term "I say." This showed that he was taking personal responsibility for the claims he made. The first line of the speech was "my message to you." Although he had a mass of supporters who followed him, he made himself accountable for each negative statement directed towards American government. Each time he used a "we" or an "our" statement it was in regard to perceived success, truce opportunities, or perceived dishonor perpetuated upon them.

Osama used the worldwide attacks that were planned by al Qaeda and other likeminded groups to claim that the continuation of war not only affected his affiliates and the audience, but also the global community. This added emphasis to how significant it was for there to be a truce. Osama stated that the Muslim religion "has forbidden [them] to lie and cheat." Therefore, an armistice would be respected on their end. If a truce were to be established then they would be able to "build Iraq and Afghanistan, which have been destroyed in this war." Osama told to his audience not to feel "shame in this solution, which prevents the wasting of billions of dollars that have gone to those with influence and merchants of war." Humiliation was one of Osama's motivations for war. In his effort to present a truce, Osama addressed

possible emotional apprehensions that Americans might feel that would cause them to disagree with a ceasefire such as shame, humiliation, and failure.

If the truce was not accepted by Americans, then Osama warned that it would mean America's "loss and shame forever." Americans "minds will be troubled and [their] lives embittered" from [a] continuation of the war. Osama vowed to continue the war indefinitely. He used the analogy that "a swimmer in the ocean does not fear the rain." Americans had already "occupied [their] lands, offended [their] honor and dignity and let out [their] blood and stolen [their] money and destroyed [their] houses and played with [their] security." They had already been through all that so what was a little more rain.

Chapter 6:

Conclusion

Purpose of Thesis Research

The reason for this research project was to learn the reasons behind bin Laden's war on America and his rhetorical intentions. While engaged in war he repeatedly attempted to communicate his will to his enemy. Many of his messages were edited and fragmented before being broadcast to the American public so the total message output merits scholarly attention. Moreover, the continuation of the conflict between al Qaeda and the US warrants the need to study and evaluate Osama's messages directed to Americans. Although Osama repeatedly threatened America in his addresses, the messages were not typically aggressive in style, language, or delivery. He used a rational method for conveying his message. He stated his justifications and gave specific examples to document his beliefs. He did not demand that the audience believe in his ideals, instead he implied that they should investigate his claims for themselves. In the three analyzed speeches he never asked the audience to perform a specific task. He tried to educate his audience about problems that he perceived to be the fault of the United States. However his distorted image of America caused a war that lasted for over a decade.

Research Questions

The two research questions addressed in this paper were (1) "Why did Osama direct messages at his enemy? and (2) "what were the outcomes of his attempts?" It is not common for an antagonist to publicly and repeatedly address his nemesis. Osama addressed the United States on numerous occasions, each with different intentions. As speeches were released they were intentionally timed to address then current issues important to Americans. While each speech had its own objective, all three had the same general intention of stating justifications for the 9/11 attack.

Method Used in Thesis Analysis

The method used to analyze his speeches was based on Campbell and Burkholder's structural analysis. This technique utilizes three stages of qualitative rhetorical research to evaluate artifacts. The first stage involved describing the message. This stage was important because it highlighted the contents

of a given speech and the role of Osama. The rhetor and the audience were at war. Osama, as a speaker, wanted to communicate to Americans that his aggressive actions against them were validated. In these messages Osama often used an empathic and religious tone to address his audience. This was a good technique considering the extreme hostility felt toward Osama by the audience. He also used a righteous tone to portray to Americans that his violent actions were meant to right perceived wrongs. His performance portrayed a spiritual leader defending his religion as opposed to a political warlord. He seemed to address his enemy in hopes of giving them an opportunity to redeem themselves. He believed that he and his followers were not only fighting to defend their faith but to also save their souls. The use of empathy in the messages made Osama appear less aggressive and more humane. He described the physical and psychological hardships of American soldiers in an attempt to appear compassionate. Had a more hostile tone been used, there would have been increased antagonism between himself and his audience.

This research stage also included an evaluation of the supporting materials that Osama used. Specific quotes were used in the paper to show the types of claims he made to support his purpose in a particular speech. Examples used were comparisons between the United States and notorious tyrannies in terms of war tactics and corrupt behavior. He compared the motives of his fighters to these of the United States, stating that America continuously caused the terror in the Middle East. He wanted to prove that America practiced a double ethical standard while the Middle East did not. Another frequent technique used was the labeling of President Bush as sinful and deceitful.

While the first stage of analysis evaluated the three rhetorical artifacts, the second stage analyzed the contextual and historical aspects associated with each speech. This involved researching events that surrounded the broadcast of each message. This stage also included researching for validation and truth in the supporting material analyzed in the first stage. Bin Laden consistently used specific illustrations in an attempt to strengthen his credibility with his audience. Many of Osama's claims of targeted attacks against Muslims and their properties had actually occurred, but were either exaggerated or wrongfully

blamed on the US. There were biased political attributions concerning the causes of these attacks. His claims were allegations without concrete evidence. In some circumstances America was wrongfully blamed for situations that primarily involved other entities.

The final stage of the analysis involved the author's own critique of the message. This stage required an analysis of speech purpose, quality and outcomes. After analyzing the rhetoric of each speech the purpose of the messages became evident. Osama believed that he was a religious leader fighting against perceived infidels. He alleged he was righteous in his actions and tried to prove that America sought to destroy the Muslim world. His examples were specific and detailed but also faulty. His claims were nothing more than falsified allegations. Many of the accusations misled the audience and were found to have other causes that were not named by Osama.

Despite his efforts and the growth of public suspicion of the President, and his conduct of the war, Osama did not develop credibility in the eyes of his audience. The outcome of each speech was negative for bin Laden. Osama's intention to persuade his audience that his actions were justified failed. His plea to be understood was unheeded and his proposal for a truce was disregarded. His repeated attempts to portray his message failed.

Intentions of bin Laden as a Rhetor

Osama planned to create a pure Islamic state devoid of Western influences. Although it is not evident in his messages the research suggests that bin Laden and his supporters hoped to use the attack on America as a stepping stone towards the destruction of Israel. The intent of attacking the United States was to exhaust its economy so it would stop supporting Israel. Once Israel was no longer being subsidized Osama believed it would collapse. Many of the extremists "hated Israel more than they hated America" (bin Laden et al 177). Yet, in these three speeches, there is no action specifically blamed on Israel. Osama tried to hold America liable for permitting alleged atrocities perpetrated on Lebanon by Israel. He perceived America and Israel as one superpower united in efforts to destroy Islam. Osama strangely believed the United States to be the weaker of the two. He believed that America was being ruled by

Jewish elites targeting the Middle East through foreign policies of the United States as well as Israel.

Osama had told his son that

“America and Israel are one bicycle with two wheels. The wooden wheel represents the United States. The steel wheel represents Israel... Israel is the stronger power of the two. It is best to attack the weakest point first...” (bin Laden et al 177).

Analyzing Osama’s messages can bring an understanding of his reasons for communicating with his opponents as well as to learn his reasons for war. Osama faced many challenges in his repeated attempts to communicate with Americans. The audience had no trust in the leader of the terrorist organization who led the 9/11 attacks. Americans believed that his reason for war, as President Bush stated, was that Osama hated freedom and democracy. His attempt to communicate his intentions to Americans failed partly because his audience was inaccessible. Osama’s role as the enemy made it difficult for his audience to accept the parts of his messages that reached them. His actions spoke louder than his words to the eyes and ears of his audience.

Specific Purpose of The Three Messages of bin Laden

The repeated message stated by Osama in each of the three speeches was that the attacks against the West were planned as payback for earlier atrocities committed on the Muslim community by the United States. Personal experiences and global transgressions were used as examples of motivation and just cause. His tone was not aggressive. He saw himself more an educator than a tyrant. The evidence presented specific examples of perceived wrongs. He condemned America’s foreign policies by explicitly placing the blame for crimes on the leadership of the country.

In the three prerecorded speeches, bin Laden reiterated themes of revenge, justice, threat, humiliation, and suspicion of the Bush administration. There were also repeated insinuations suggesting double standards and the belief that America and its supporters deserved to be punished. America was accused of causing atrocities not only to the umma, but also to other societies around the world. Osama believed that America needed to be held liable for its crimes. He portrayed himself as a judge who was

righting the wrongs perpetrated on the umma. The imagery used was meant to elicit sympathy and to motivate Americans to research the truth behind his claims. Specific incidents were described as a means to persuade the audiences to believe him and to understand his worldview. The audience was expected to investigate his examples and judge him to be truthful.

Osama targeted Americans in an attempt to educate the audience about his arguments for attacking the US. Examples were given as a means to validate his reasons behind his crusade. However, from one speech to the next there was a shift in themes illustrated. Each speech stated justifications but the imagery altered. From the earliest speech to the last there was a decline in religious references used. The first two speeches tried to draw empathy from the audience for the umma. The third speech focused on Osama appearing to be sympathetic toward Americans.

Summary of Analysis of October 7, 2001 Speech

The first speech glorified the hijackers and attacks made on American soil. The message illustrated why the 9/11 attack was considered necessary. This message slandered the intentions of the foreign policies of the United States. It was meant to prove the attack was retaliation for previous atrocities. Although bin Laden did not take responsibility for the attacks, he did warn of future ones. Osama stated that Americans would not be safe until the umma was protected from further attacks and Western troops left the holy lands. Such statements implied that he was involved with the 9/11 attacks.

This message contained the largest number of religious images of the three analyzed. The religious tone of in this speech was either inspirational or condemnatory depending on the listener's belief. Sachs said that the religious imagery depicted in this speech "mesmerized many Muslims." His historical and Islamic references intensified his standing among other likeminded radicals (Susan Sachs). His imagery describing the war between Muslims and the West also struck fear in others (Susan Sachs). Bin Laden asked Muslims to join in his movement and defend their religion. Such statements led to the belief of some Americans that followers of Islam were associated with terrorism.

Summary of Analysis of October 30, 2004 Speech

The second speech was intended to influence American voters during the Presidential elections. It was released a few days prior to the elections. This release allowed little time for effective damage control by the Presidential candidates, considering that the debates were over while ensuring plenty of time for the message to be heard nationally. The speech focused on advising Americans about how to end the war although no specific directions were given. Osama told his audience that the future of the war depended more on the citizens than the elected leader. Following the release of Osama's statement, the polls began to shift and favored Bush over Kerry. If bin Laden was trying to intentionally damage Bush's integrity, Osama's own personal credibility among Americans caused him to fail.

This message also provided supplementary reasons for his rationalizations. This is the first time that bin Laden publicly stated that he was responsible for 9/11. The speech introduction outlined the main purposes of the message which were to suggest how Americans could prevent future attacks, to state his perceptions and reasons for the conflict, and describe effects the conflict had on both sides. This speech focused little on religious tone and more on building credibility with the audience. This message focused heavily on the concepts of justifying retaliations and defaming the Bush administrations.

Summary of Analysis of January 19, 2006 Speech

The final speech analyzed offered a truce to the American people. It was broadcast five years after the American declaration of war and delivered at a time when American public support for the administration and war was declining. This seemed like an opportunity for bin Laden to gain more credibility and to promote an armistice with his audience, however, neither was successful. This message attempted to prove that Bush was misleading Americans. Bin Laden tried to describe to Americans the evil intentions and actions of President Bush. This message attempted to use ideas with which the audience was familiar to gain trust and to promote a truce.

Aside from praising God, there was no religious imagery in the final speech. Its purpose was to get the audience to believe that they had been misled by the Bush administration. It concentrated more on

governmental misconduct against the American people than against the umma. Americans were led to believe that a truce was available and subject to their discretion. This message contained the least number of images and religious references of all the messages analyzed.

How bin Laden Appeared to the Audience

Osama portrayed himself as an honorable and righteous man in these speeches. He claimed to be speaking out on behalf of the weak and humiliated umma. He acted as though he represented the welfare of others, instead of his own self-interest. His messages were directed to the American public in an attempt to persuade them that his actions were validated. He attempted to show Americans the misconduct and distorted statements made by their government. America's foreign policy and its alliance with Israel were offered as reasons for war. Despite the inability of the American public to end the war, Osama addressed the citizens instead of the government leaders. He knew that the administration had the power to change foreign policies.

By specifically addressing the people of the United States instead of the leaders, Osama portrayed himself as being legitimately concerned with their well-being. Perhaps bin Laden addressed Americans because they had the power to vote leaders out of office. This reason is evident in the timing of the second speech which was released days prior to the presidential elections. In this message Osama evinced a concern for Americans while alleging that the future of the conflict was not in the hands of the next leader, but in the hands of the people. By not directing the audience to a particular candidate, Osama tried to present himself as objective. However, throughout the speech he repeatedly condemned President Bush and alleged that he was misleading Americans. The other two messages presented were released between the years of Presidential elections.

In the third speech, Osama tried to gain trust from the American audience. He criticized Bush for misleading the public, yet he was just as guilty. Five days following the 9/11 attacks, bin Laden released a statement in which he stated "I would like to assure the world that I did not plan the recent attacks, which seems to have been planned by people for personal reasons" ("Bin Laden Says He Wasn't behind

Attacks"). This was contradicted in the second speech analyzed when he stated "I looked at those destroyed towers in Lebanon, it occurred to me to punish the oppressor in kind by destroying towers in America." Regardless of how much he was involved in the details of implementing the attack, Osama was responsible for its general plot. He had indirectly taken responsibility in the first speech when he gave instances of why it was vindicated and threatened Americans with the possibility of further attacks. In the final speech Osama asked Americans to trust him when he proposed a truce to them. He explained that al Qaeda would adhere to a truce because "God [had] forbidden [them] to lie and cheat." Osama had already broken this rule when he denied his involvement in the 9/11 attacks and later claimed it was his idea to target the towers. His reason for this deception was revealed to his biographer, Hamir Mir. Bin Laden stated:

"When the Americans kill Muslims in Sudan, they don't admit that we are responsible. When the Israelis kill Palestinians, they don't admit that we are responsible for the attacks...so this is our turn. We have killed them and now we are not going to admit that" (qtd. Bergen Osama 319).

Osama bin Laden was a product of his environment. The Islamic extremist ideals of his father and other radicals in his community were the initial influences for his beliefs. He believed that the West was intentionally targeting the Muslim population. Osama assumed the role of a religious protagonist who deemed it necessary to defend Islam. Despite his poor reputation in the West, Osama is viewed as a martyr by many Muslims. According to Merriam-Webster's dictionary definition, a martyr is "a person who sacrifices something of great value and especially life itself for the sake of principle." Regardless of his aggressive and warlike behaviors, this characterizes Osama. He gave up his wealth and prestige in Saudi Arabia to fight for his beliefs.

Bin Laden's Rhetorical Failure

Osama repeatedly addressed the American audience with the purpose of communicating his justifications for war. In the three speeches he used different methods to convey his message. In his first speech he used his religious belief to appear righteous. The second speech stated justifications while appealing to the audience to empathize with his cause. In the third message he appeared to understand the

concerns of Americans while he gave his reasons for the war. The significance of studying Osama's rhetoric is that over time such scholarship may prevent future conflicts from happening. This research can help to us to understand other anti-American radicals. Despite Osama's death, his radical terrorist movement and war continues on. The relevance of studying bin Laden is not just to learn history; it's also to protect the future. Osama had a distorted image of America. This viewpoint has been passed down through his supporters and other Anti-Western organizations. From an extremist's viewpoint Osama was a religious martyr who died defending his religion. His followers swore an oath of allegiance to bin Laden to carry on his anti-American movement. The best way to avoid potential conflicts with this group is to first understand why there is conflict. The better the understanding of an enemy, the better one knows how to handle the conflict. This conflict is unlike many other wars to date. Extremists believe that dying in war is a great honor and they are eager to sacrifice themselves. They believe they are fighting for the greater good and will not give up until they are victorious, and expect that it will take generations for the West to fall, but they are willing to wait. They will continue to fight until the last man is standing.

Osama was unable to fully reach his audience because of US government restrictions on the messages available to the American public. Only excerpts from the three speeches were highlighted on news programs. By allowing only certain passages from his messages to be publicized the American government prevented the public from understanding the implications of his speeches. Osama's messages were intended to state his justifications for war. The quotes used by the media did not portray his intentions as such. His messages were described by the media in a more aggressive and threatening way than intended by Osama.

Importance of This Research

Osama's purpose for waging war against America was different from that of many other leaders during times of war. He was not the head of any geographical or political state. He did not desire wealth, land or power. He came from a wealthy family and gave up material possessions to fight for his cause. He saw the war as a religious crusade meant to defend his religion and to restore the strict Islamic regimes of

the Middle East. His intent was to defeat the US by bleeding its economy dry. He believed that if America were bankrupt it would withdraw from the Middle East and would also no longer be able to aid Israel. Osama's intention in addressing the American public was to educate them about his perceived justifications for war. The repeated attempts of Osama to convey his justifications for war on Americans fell on deaf ears. Americans were seeking justice for 9/11, not justification. Despite the different approaches Osama used and the particular timings of their release, his messages did not change the perceptions of his audience. The continuation of the war and the lack of support for al Qaeda by Americans prove that Osama's speeches had a marginal effect on his audience.

While it is necessary to understand Osama's motives, the historical context sheds light on motives of other al Qaeda leaders. Not all anti-American extremists have tried to publicly justify their actions or negotiate with their enemy. Since bin Laden made such attempts, it is important to learn as much as possible from his rhetoric. Osama was not the first or the last anti-American extremist. He had alliances with many Islamic extremist groups with similar ideals, and the al-Qaeda terrorist organization he started is still active. Learning from his rhetoric can help us to better manage conflicts with other such groups. The importance of understanding ones enemy was urged by Sun Tzu, a Chinese military strategist, in the Art of War written around 500 BC.

If you know the enemy and know yourself, you need not fear the results of a hundred battles. If you know yourself but not the enemy, for every victory gained, you will also suffer a defeat. If you know neither the enemy nor yourself, you will succumb in every battle. (31)

Bibliography

1. "Al-Jazeera 'hit by Missile'" *BBC News*. BBC, 04 Aug. 2003. Web. 28 Sept. 2012.
2. "Al-Jazeera Kabul Offices Hit in US Raid." *BBC News*. BBC, 13 Nov. 2001. Web. 28 Sept. 2012.
3. "Al-Jazeera: Bin Laden Tape Obtained in Pakistan." *Msnbc.com*. Msnbc Digital Network, 30 Oct. 2004. Web. 25 Nov. 2012.
4. Barabak, Mark. "Bin Laden Video Adds Fuel to the Partisan Fire." *Los Angeles Times*. Los Angeles Times, 30 Oct. 2004. Web. 5 July 2012.
5. Benson, Pam. "CNN Fact Check: Is Al Qaeda's Core Decimated or Is Group Growing?" *CNN.com*. CNN. Cable News Network, 23 Oct. 2012. Web. 09 Nov. 2012.
6. Bergen, Peter L. *Holy War, Inc.: Inside the Secret World of Osama Bin Laden*. New York: Free, 2001.
7. Bergen, Peter. "The Last Days of Osama Bin Laden." *Time* 7 May 2012: 24-33.
8. Bergen, Peter L. *The Osama Bin Laden I Know: An Oral History of Al-Qaeda's Leader*. New York: Free, 2006.
9. Bergen, Peter. "Why Bin Laden Still Matters." *Newsweek*, 04 Sept. 2010. Web. 29 Apr. 2012.
10. Bin, Laden, Najwa; Bin Laden, Omar; and Jean P. Sasson. *Growing up Bin Laden: Osama's Wife and Son Take Us inside Their Secret World*. New York: St. Martin's, 2009.
11. "Bin Laden's Fatwa." *PBS*. PBS, 23 Aug. 1996. Web. 21 Nov. 2012.
12. Bin, Laden Osama, Bruce B. Lawrence, and James Howarth. *Messages to the World: The Statements of Osama Bin Laden*. London: Verso, 2005.
13. "Bin Laden Says He Wasn't behind Attacks." *CNN*. CNN, 16 Sept. 2001. Web. 25 Nov. 2012.
14. "Bin Laden Threatens U.S. in New Message." *PBS*. PBS, n.d. Web. 27 Nov. 2012.
15. Blair, Tony. British Prime Minister Blair Pledges Support. Downing Street, London. 14 July 2012. Address.

16. Blanchard, Christopher M. "The Islamic Traditions of Wahhabism and Salafiyya." *Fas.org*. Congressional Research Services, 24 Jan. 2008. Web. 20 June 2012.
17. Bodansky, Yossef. *Bin Laden: The Man Who Declared War on America*. Rocklin, CA: Forum, 2001
18. Bonney, Richard. *Jihad: From Qur'an to Bin Laden*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.
19. "Bush Calls End to 'major Combat'" CNN. Cable News Network., 02 May 2003. Web. 28 Sept. 2012.
20. Bush, George W. President Bush Speaks to the Nation. White House, Washington D.C. 11 Sept. 2001. Address.
21. Bush, George W. "President Bush's Speech." *PBS*. PBS, 7 Oct. 2001. Web. 30 July 2012.
22. "Bush to Taliban: 'Time Is Running Out'" *CNN*. Turner Broadcasting System, Inc. 07 Oct. 2001. Web. 08 July 2012.
23. Campbell, Karlyn Kohrs., and Thomas R. Burkholder. *Critiques of Contemporary Rhetoric*. Belmont: Wadsworth Pub, 1997.
24. Campbell, Karlyn Kohrs., and Susan Schultz. Huxman. *The Rhetorical Act: Thinking, Speaking, and Writing Critically*. 3rd ed. Belmont, CA, USA: Thomson/Wadsworth, 2003.
25. Carsten, Paul. "Al-Qaeda Attacks in Europe since September 11." *The Telegraph*. Telegraph Media Group, 21 Mar. 2012. Web. 4 Oct. 2012.
26. Cialdini, Robert B. *Influence: The Psychology of Persuasion*. New York: Collins, 2007.
27. "Complete Transcript of the Bin Laden Tape." *Complete Transcript of the Bin Laden Tape*. Global Research, 21 Jan. 2006. Web. 02 Oct. 2012.
28. "Cronkite: U.S. Should Leave Iraq Now | Fox News." *Fox News*. FOX News Network, 15 Jan. 2006. Web. 28 Sept. 2012.
29. Cupach, William Richard., Daniel J. Canary, and Brian Spitzberg. *Competence in Interpersonal Conflict*. 2nd ed. Long Grove: Waveland, 2010.
30. "Daily Open Source Infrastructure Report 1 October 2012." *Department of Homeland Security*. Department of Homeland Security, 1 Oct. 2012. Web. 9 Nov. 2012.

31. Dilanian, Ken, and Shashank Bengali. "No Evidence Found of Al Qaeda Role in Libya Attack." *Los Angeles Times*. Los Angeles Times, 19 Oct. 2012. Web. 23 Oct. 2012.
32. "Dubya's So Dangerous." *Daily Mirror*. Daily Mirror, 22 Nov. 2005. Web. 28 Sept. 2012.
33. Gall, Carlotta; Douglas Jehl; Mohammad Khan; and Salman Massod. "Airstrike by U.S. Draws Protests from Pakistanis." *The New York Times*. The New York Times, 15 Jan. 2006. Web. 09 July 2012.
34. Gannon, Kathy. "Bush Rejects Taliban Bin Laden Offer." *Washingtonpost.com*. Washington Post, 14 Oct. 2001. Web. 30 July 2012.
35. Gauvain, Richard. "Osama Bin Laden as a Multi Vocal Symbol." *Political Theology* 713th ser. 12.5 (2011): 713-21.3.
36. Hamilton, Edith. *Mythology: Timeless Tales of Gods and Heroes*. New York, NY: Warner, 1999.
37. Hernandez, Nelson, and Saad Sarhan. "Insurgents Kill 140 as Iraq Clashes Escalate." *Washington Post*. The Washington Post, 06 Jan. 2006. Web. 12 Nov. 2012.
38. Gongloff, Mark. "Iraq Rebuilding Contracts Awarded." *CNNMoney*. Cable News Network, 25 Mar. 2003. Web. 26 July 2012.
39. Hassan M. Fattah; Abeer Allam, and Douglas Jehl. "Bin Laden Warns Of Attacks In U.S. But Offers Truce." *The New York Times*. The New York Times, 20 Jan. 2006. Web. 03 Oct. 2012.
40. Henderson, Harry. *Library in a Book: Terrorism*. NY: Facts on File, 2001.
41. "The International Press on the 2004 U.S. Elections "The International Press on the 2004 U.S. Elections." *Worldpress.org*. Worldpress.org, n.d. Web. 07 July 2012.
42. "Just a Few Bad Apples?" *The Economist*. The Economist Newspaper, 20 Jan. 2005. Web. 28 Sept. 2012.
43. Kemp, Geoffrey. "The Iran Primer." *The Reagan Administration*. United States Institute of Peace, n.d. Web. 06 Nov. 2012.

44. "Key Questions about the Dubai Port Deal." *CNN*. Cable Network News, 06 Mar. 2006. Web. 28 Sept. 2012.
45. Küntzel, Matthias. *Jihad and Jew-hatred: Islamism, Nazism and the Roots of 9/11*. New York: Telos Pub., 2007.
46. Landau, Elaine. *Osama Bin Laden: A War against the West*. Brookfield, CT: Twenty-First Century, 2002
47. "Lebanon Profile." *BBC News*. BBC, 24 Oct. 2012. Web. 06 Nov. 2012.
48. Lewis, Bernard. *The Crisis of Islam: Holy War and Unholy Terror*. NY: Modern Library, 2003.
49. Lincoln, Bruce. "Bruce Lincoln, Holy Terrors: Thinking about Religion after September 11." Excerpt." *Bruce Lincoln, Holy Terrors: Thinking About Religion after September 11, Excerpt*. University of Chicago Press, 2002. Web. 16 July 2012.
50. MacAskill, Ewen. "Israel Rebuked for Razing Arab Homes." *The Guardian*. Guardian News and Media, 11 July 2001. Web. 24 July 2012.
51. Marranci, Gabriele. *Jihad: Beyond Islam*. NY: Berg, 2006.
52. "Martyr." *Merriam-Webster*. Merriam-Webster, n.d. Web. 27 Nov. 2012.
53. Milbank, Dana. "Bush Defends Assertions of Iraq-Al Qaeda Relationship." *Washington Post*. Washington Post, 18 June 2004. Web. 7 Nov. 2012.
54. "Military." *U.S. Casualties in Iraq*. Global Security.org, 22 Mar. 2012. Web. 04 Oct. 2012. <http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/ops/iraq_casualties.htm>.
55. "Military." *Wahhabi*. Globalsecurity.org, 7 Sept. 2011. Web. 27 June 2012. <<http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/world/gulf/wahhabi.htm>>.
56. Miller, John. "Greetings, America. My Name Is Osama Bin Laden." *PBS*. PBS, 1999. Web. 16 July 2012.
57. "NBC Nightly News Oct 7, 2001 - America Strikes Back." *YouTube*. YouTube, 24 May 2009. Web. 29 Oct. 2012. <<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Q-St8s9RKEU>>.

58. "Osama Bin Laden Biography." *Osama Bin Laden Biography*. War and Conflict Journal, 2 Mar. 2011. Web. 16 July 2012.
59. Pratkanis, Anthony R., and Elliot Aronson. *Age of Propaganda: The Everyday Use and Abuse of Persuasion*. New York: W.H. Freeman, 2001.
60. "Public Attitudes toward the War in Iraq: 2003-2008." - *Pew Research Center*. Pew Research Center, 19 Mar. 2008. Web. 28 Sept. 2012.
61. Purdum, Todd, and Marjorie Connelly. "Support for Bush Continues to Drop, Poll Shows." *NY Times*. NY Times, 15 Sept. 2005. Web. 3 Oct. 2012.
62. Riedel, Bruce. "The Elections Are Coming. Is Al-Qaeda?" *Washington Post*. The Washington Post, 10 Aug. 2008. Web. 07 July 2012.
63. Ripley, Amanda. "Breaking News, Analysis, Politics, Blogs, News Photos, Video, Tech Reviews." *Time*. Time, 1 Oct. 2001. Web. 28 Oct. 2012.
64. Roberts, Joel. "Poll: Fading Support for Iraq War." *CBSNews*. CBS Interactive, 11 Feb. 2009. Web. 02 Oct. 2012.
65. Rodenbeck, Max. "Their Master's Voice ". *The New York Times*, 9 Mar. 2006. Web. 19 Sept. 2012.
66. Sachs, Susan. "Bin Laden Images Mesmerize Muslims." *The New York Times*. The New York Times, 09 Oct. 2001
67. Sadiq, Sheraz, and Sharon Tiller. "The Debate over U.N. Sanctions." *PBS*. PBS, 2011. Web. 23 July 2012.
68. "Sayyid Qutb." *Columbia Encyclopedia*. 6th ed. N.p.: Columbia UP, 2011
69. Scheuer, Michael. *Osama Bin Laden*. Oxford England: Oxford UP, 2011.
70. Steinberg, Jacques. "Experts Say Bin Laden Is Distorting Islamic Law." *The New York Times*. The New York Times, 08 Oct. 2001. Web 4 October 2012.
71. Stout, Chris E., ed. *The Psychology of Terrorism*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2002.
72. Sun, Tzu. *Sun Tzu on the Art of War*. USA: Dalmatian, 2011.

73. "Timeline of Controversial Ports Deal." *CNN*. Cable Network News, 09 Mar. 2006. Web. 28 Sept. 2012.
74. "Transcript: Vice President Cheney on 'Your World' | Fox News." *Fox News*. FOX News Network, 20 Jan. 2006. Web. 01 Dec. 2012.
75. "US Track Record of Retaliation." *The Guardian*. Guardian News and Media, 11 Sept. 2001. Web. 25 July 2012.
76. "Who Is Osama Bin Laden." Interview by John Weiner. *Frontline*. PBS, May 1998. Web. 6 Nov. 2012.
77. Williams, Paul L. *Al Qaeda: Brotherhood of Terror*. NJ: Alpha, 2002.

Appendix 1:
Three Stages of Rhetorical Criticism

according to Campbell and Burkholder

I. Description (intrinsic). Read the artifact.

- A. Act's purpose?
- B. Role of rhetor?
- C. Target audience?
- D. Act's tone or attitude?
- E. Structure?
- F. Supporting materials?
- G. Strategies (styles, appeals, arguments)?

II. Contextual/Historical Research

- A. History of rhetor?
- B. History of audience?
- C. Competing persuasive forces?
- D. Testing supports?

III. Evaluation

- A. Effects criterion?
- B. Truth Criterion?
- C. Values or ethical criterion?
- D. Artistic criterion?