LA GUERRA DEL TERROR A TRAVÉS DE LAS PALABRAS DE LOS PRESIDENTES NORTEAMERICANOS: CAMBIOS Y CONTINUIDADES

THE WAR ON TERROR THROUGH THE WORDS OF US PRESIDENTS: CHANGE AND CONTINUITY

Carlos Javier Díaz Ferrer
Universidad de Las Palmas de Gran Canaria

RESUMEN
El objetivo de este artículo es analizar tres discursos realizados sobre la guerra contra el terrorismo, todos ellos específicamente relacionados con la organización terrorista ISIS. Dichos discursos fueron llevados a cabo por Barack Obama, Donald Trump y Joe Biden. Para acometer dicha tarea, utilizaremos métodos cualitativos y algunos de los recursos retóricos relevantes, así como las teorías del discurso político aplicables a los puntos más significativos presentes en dichos artículos, lo cual conlleva la inclusión de cuatro capítulos: legitimación, apelando al sentimiento, el poder de una nación y "nosotros vs. ellos". A lo largo de este artículo, haremos uso de las teorías del discurso político de Norman Fairclough, basado en su modelo de tres niveles, así como una perspectiva dialéctica del lenguaje. Seguidamente, procederemos a la descripción de la metodología a seguir en este artículo, así como al análisis de los temas a tratar con relación a los diferentes discursos estudiados en el mismo.

PALABRAS CLAVE: análisis del discurso, análisis crítico del discurso, discurso político, 'guerra contra el terror'

ABSTRACT
The aim of this article is to analyse three speeches on the war on terror, all of them specifically related to the terrorist ISIL organization. Those discourses were made by the politicians Barack Obama, Donald Trump and Joe Biden. In order to carry out this task, we will be using qualitative methods and some of the most relevant rhetorical devices, as well as the different theories of political discourse applied to the most significant points present in those speeches, which implies the inclusion of four chapters: legitimation, appealing to the feeling, the power of a nation and "us vs. them". We will also make use of Norman Fairclough's political discourse theories, based on his model of three levels and a dialectal view of the language. Afterward, we will proceed to the description of the methodology used for the analysis of the different points present in the speeches studied in this work.

KEYWORDS: discourse analysis, critical discourse analysis, political discourse, 'war on terror'

CC BY NC ND

1. INTRODUCCIÓN

Aunque el terrorismo ha formado parte de los discursos políticos norteamericanos durante mucho tiempo, fue justo después de los ataques al World Trade Center de Nueva York, en 2001, cuando este tema en particular cobró importancia. Durante su primer discurso posterior al 11/S, el ex-presidente George Bush utilizó la expresión "guerra contra el terror" por primera vez, lo cual tuvo un impacto enorme durante toda su presidencia posterior, ya que los Estados Unidos siempre han seguido una política de no negociación con terroristas (Souza, 2003: 193).

Tiempo más tarde, en septiembre de 2014, Obama llevó a cabo un discurso sobre el ISIS, en el cual los definía como un grupo terrorista bárbaro. A pesar del hecho de que Obama fue reemplazado por Trump, todavía escuchábamos palabras y expresiones similares, en sus diferentes discursos, que hacían referencia al ISIS y a sus métodos asesinos. A continuación, procederemos a estudiar los diferentes puntos a tener en cuenta con relación al análisis del discurso (AD) y el análisis crítico del discurso (ACD), los cuales han ganado influencia e importancia a lo largo de los años. El discurso puede referirse a los diferentes tipos de lenguaje; semiótico, lingüístico y corporal (Fairclough, 2012). Igualmente, implica las diferentes maneras de hablar o representar algún aspecto de la realidad (*ibid*). El discurso se considera la forma de comunicación social más relevante; el proceso de intercambio de frases entre el hablante o escritor, por un lado, y el oyente o lector por otro. Brown (1983) mencionaba que el discurso se lleva a cabo mediante el texto, ya que únicamente puede existir en forma de texto, sea hablado o escrito.

1.1. Análisis crítico del discurso

El ACD cubre casi todos los aspectos del uso del lenguaje, tanto en materias políticas como sociales (Khan et al., 2021: 5). Básicamente, el ACD es un enfoque analítico cualitativo que se utiliza para describir, interpretar y aportar una explicación de las formas en las cuales se construyen los discursos y se legitiman las desigualdades sociales dentro de un contexto amplio (Mullet, 2018). Recientemente, existe cierto consenso en catalogar el ACD como una herramienta de análisis lingüístico que está cobrando cierta importancia para la investigación de la comunicación-cualitativa-crítica (Reynolds, 2018). El ACD es un método de análisis con relación a la ideología y el poder (Fairclough, 2013). Es un campo que abarca estudios del lenguaje que se utilizan en esferas políticas y sociales. Jorgesen y Philips (2011) sostienen que el ACD ha proporcionado métodos para el estudio empírico de las esferas sociales. Van Dijk (1998), por el contrario, manifiesta que el ACD es una investigación del discurso de tipo analítico que analiza la manera en la cual se reproducen el abuso del poder social, la desigualdad y el dominio sobre sectores de la población, al mismo tiempo que son promulgados mediante el habla y el texto en contextos sociales y políticos.

1.2. Análisis del discurso político

Las teorías del discurso político mostradas y analizadas en este capítulo serán posteriormente utilizadas a la hora de analizar los diferentes puntos objeto de estudio en este artículo. Esta sección establece una distinción clara entre diferentes contextos; tales como texto, discurso, política, discurso político así como sus características. Van Dijk (*ibid*) mantiene la creencia de que el análisis político del

CC BY NC ND

discurso (APD) analiza el abuso de la autoridad política, la supremacía o la dominación. Dicho autor ve el discurso político como una clase de géneros, más que como un género en sí mismo. Los discursos y programas políticos, los debates electorales, las deliberaciones parlamentarias y los debates gubernamentales son todos ellos, por lo tanto, géneros relacionados con la política.

Chilton (2004: 3), por otro lado, defiende la idea de que la política puede ser analizada de dos maneras: como una confrontación sobre el poder, entre personas que trabajan para mantener o incrementar su autoridad, o entre individuos que luchan para protegerse a sí mismos contra ello. Bassnett y Schäffner (2010: 2) están de acuerdo con la definición de Chilton, aunque los estudios relacionados con la política han establecido, con frecuencia, un vínculo entre la política y el poder. En opinión de los autores citados previamente, la política se asemeja más a una batalla para conseguir el poder e imponer una agenda específica sobre política, sociedad y economía.

2. OBJETIVOS

El principal objetivo de este artículo es dar respuesta a dos cuestiones concretas que se muestran más adelante en este trabajo. Para conseguir dichas respuestas, procederemos al análisis de tres discursos realizados por los ex-presidentes norteamericanos Obama y Trump, así como por el actual presidente Biden, centrando nuestra atención en cuatro temas específicos de trabajo, teniendo en cuenta técnicas de trabajo cualitativas, así como los recursos retóricos empleados más significativos. En nuestra hipótesis, surgen un par de preguntas: 1) ¿qué cambios y continuidades, si es que existen, se perciben a través de las diferentes administraciones en los discursos analizados de los diferentes políticos en este artículo? 2) ¿hasta qué punto ha evolucionado la política norteamericana anti-terrorista desde el nacimiento de ISIS hasta nuestros días?

3. METODOLOGÍA

Con relación a la metodología, hemos utilizado el ACD de Fairclough, basado en el modelo de discurso de tres niveles, así como una perspectiva dialéctica del lenguaje. Dicho método se compone de tres niveles: 1) El nivel textual; 2) La práctica discursiva; 3) El estudio de la ideología en los textos (Fairclough, 1992). El nivel textual implica: vocabulario, significado de las palabras, gramática, cohesión y expresión de la modalidad. La práctica discursiva se focaliza en: coherencia, intertextualidad y el sentido de la obligación.

Finalmente, nos encontramos con el macro nivel, el cual trata sobre la ideología y aspectos de hegemonía dentro de la sociedad. Las ideologías, como Fairclough (2003: 9) las define, son representaciones de aspectos del mundo que pueden ser mostradas y, por lo tanto, contribuir de ese modo a mantener o modificar las relaciones sociales de poder, dominación y explotación. Tanto la ideología como la hegemonía son conceptos relevantes a la hora de mantener un sentido de legitimidad. Es este bien común de sus propios ciudadanos el que la autoridad política utiliza como la razón más importante para entrar en guerra contra cualquier otra nación (Hawkins y Kim, 2021: 35).

BY NC ND

4. ANÁLISIS DE CORPUS

Siguiendo a la descripción de la metodología utilizada en este artículo, procederemos al análisis de los diferentes temas a tratar con relación a los discursos estudiados en el mismo. Los discursos analizados en este trabajo son los siguientes:

- *The White House (2014, September 10). Statement by the President on ISIL*
- *Politico (2016, June 13). Transcript: Donald Trump's national security speech*
- *The White House (2021, April 14). Remarks by President Biden on the Way Forward in Afghanistan*

Los discursos mencionados anteriormente han sido elegidos al contener claros ejemplos de los puntos analizados en este artículo. Dichos discursos han sido llevados a cabo por los tres presidentes norteamericanos que han ostentado el poder en los Estados Unidos desde el año 2014, cuando Obama definió a ISIS como una organización terrorista. Por lo tanto, hemos decidido definir esta línea temporal.

4.1. Los orígenes de ISIS

El nacimiento de ISIS en la región de Oriente Medio, en 2014, supuso el punto de partida de diferentes acciones por parte de la comunidad internacional, la cual formó una coalición global liderada por los Estados Unidos de América. El objetivo de dicha coalición era eliminar la influencia y actividad del ISIS – una organización terrorista, insurgente y clandestina, con una atracción ideológica de acólitos que actuaban a escala global (Troy, 2020: 385). Durante sus discursos sobre la guerra contra el terrorismo de entre 2014 y 2016, Obama fue específico sobre la naturaleza de las operaciones contra el ISIS. Igualmente, el ex-presidente presentó varias medidas sobre cómo enfrentarse a la presencia militar de dicha organización y reducir el impacto de la misma en el área de Oriente Medio (Hampl, 2022: 274–289).

Durante su último año de mandato, el principal problema para la administración Obama, especialmente en materia de política exterior, era la presencia creciente del ISIS y sus posibles consecuencias tanto en territorio norteamericano como a nivel internacional (Rodríguez y Aldea, 2017: 20). La dimensión de la amenaza terrorista cobraba tal dimensión que, cuando Trump tomó juramento como presidente, el reto de degradar o derrotar a ISIS era todavía una prioridad máxima (Starr-Deelen, 2018: 19).

La primera mención específica al ISIS la realizó Obama, el 19 de junio de 2014, al comentar los avances territoriales de dicha organización terrorista en la zona norte de Iraq (Fermor, 2021: 319). El grupo insurgente islamista y radical suní, el "Estado Islámico de Iraq y Siria", surge de la "Organización del Monoteísmo y la Jihad", la cual fue fundada por el militante de Jordania Abu Mus'ab al-Zarqawi, en el norte de Iraq, en 2003 (Westphal, 2018: 22).

No fue hasta después de la muerte de Zarqawi cuando algunos grupos insurgentes formaron el Consejo Shura Mujahidin, el cual proclamó el "Estado Islámico de Iraq" (ISIS), en el norte y oeste de este país, bajo la supervisión de Abu Omar al Baghdadi (*ibíd,* p.23) El grupo terrorista ISIS puede ser etiquetado como una organización multinacional la cual incluye, incluso, descendientes de musulmanes que emigraron a Occidente en el pasado.

Se estima que un 20 por ciento del número total de los miembros de ISIS provienen de Occidente (Ali, 2020: 73). A la hora de conseguir sus objetivos, ISIS no

CC BY NC ND

ha dudado en utilizar secuestros de ciudadanos de Occidente, así como las decapitaciones de ciudadanos de países que se niegan a pagar por su liberación. Las personas de Occidente son siempre objetivos oportunos, pero las decapitaciones de las fuerzas rivales continúan siendo una práctica habitual (Zech y Kelly, 2015: 89).

4.2. Legitimación

Para poder justificar el sacrificio de una guerra, los presidentes presentan al enemigo como brutal, bárbaro y malvado, representando el binomio civilización *versus* salvajismo (Franch, 2018: 317). Con frecuencia, los presidentes exageran o distorsionan la realidad para poder justificar la necesidad de entrar en guerra con otro país, por lo que usan narrativas en las que apelan a las emociones de la gente, utilizando la defensa de la civilización como principal argumento (Campbell y Jamieson, 2008).

La retórica de guerra presidencial trata de persuadir a la opinión pública de la decisión previamente tomada por el comandante en jefe de entrar en combate o continuar en la batalla (*ibíd*, p.239). A menudo, se hace uso de la narrativa, por parte de la retórica presidencial, como herramienta para persuadir a los ciudadanos de un país de la necesidad de entrar en guerra y/o soportar el sacrificio de la misma (Franch, 2018: 317).

Van Leeuwen (2007: 93) sugiere que la legitimación proporciona una respuesta a la pregunta ¿por qué?, ¿por qué deberíamos hacer esto? y ¿por qué de este modo? La guerra es una práctica social que requiere, necesariamente, ser legitimada antes de llevarse a cabo, debido a su carácter peligroso y mortal. Por lo tanto, dicha legitimación debe seguir un trabajo retórico serio, el cual es realizado, la mayoría de la veces, por los dirigentes políticos (Oddo, 2011: 289).

Esta búsqueda de aprobación citada anteriormente puede deberse a varias razones; para obtener o mantener el poder, para lograr aceptación social, para mejorar las relaciones comunitarias, para alcanzar la fama, etc. (Reyes, 2011: 782). El concepto de legitimación ha sido usado en un sentido indefinido con relación al ACD. Con bastante frecuencia, nos referimos al concepto de legitimación en conexión con el poder o fuentes de autoridad en general, como es el caso de cualquier gobierno nacional (Fairclough, 2012: 109).

Uno de los aspectos a mencionar sobre los discursos estudiados en este artículo es la justificación de las políticas llevadas a cabo con relación a la guerra contra el terrorismo. En su discurso sobre la situación en Afganistán, y teniendo en cuenta el nivel textual, de acuerdo con el modelo de discurso de tres niveles de Norman Fairclough, podemos observar como Biden usa el verbo modal *will* a la hora de mostrar una imagen de determinación y capacidad de decisión, al mismo tiempo que proyecta un sólido y poderoso mensaje al ciudadano norteamericano medio sobre la decisión de su administración de abandonar Afganistán. Sin embargo, Biden deja claro que dicha salida debe ser llevada a cabo de una manera responsable y segura, sin dejar espacio posible a la improvisación y trabajando codo con codo con los aliados:

> *We **will** not conduct a hasty rush to the exit. We'**ll** do it — we'**ll** do it responsibly, deliberately, and safely. And we **will** do it in full coordination with our allies and partners, who now have more forces in Afghanistan than we do.* (Ver apéndice 3, líneas 59–61)

BY NC ND

Obama, por otro lado, en su discurso sobre el ISIS, también usa el verbo modal *will* pero, en este caso, con la intención de dejar clara la determinación de su administración de llevar a cabo esta guerra contra el terrorismo y, finalmente, ganarla. Obama es rotundo en su discurso y en el hecho de que dicha empresa no va a ser fácil. Sin embargo, deja muy claro a su audiencia que los Estados Unidos necesitan derrotar a este horrendo enemigo que amenaza a la población norteamericana:

> *Moreover, I have made it clear that we* ***will*** *hunt down terrorists who threaten our country, wherever they are. That means I* ***will*** *not hesitate to take action against ISIL in Syria, as well as Iraq. This is a core principle of my presidency: If you threaten America, you* ***will*** *find no safe haven.* (Ver apéndice 1, líneas 57–60)

Obama igualmente defiende, en su discurso, la promesa de una victoria en la guerra que se avecina: "Our objective is clear: *"We* ***will*** *degrade, and ultimately destroy, ISIL through a comprehensive and sustained counterterrorism strategy*." (Ver apéndice 1, líneas 52–53).

Trump, sin embargo, hace uso del verbo modal *will*, pero en su caso para asegurarle al público norteamericano que, bajo su presidencia, sin duda los ciudadanos disfrutarán de una sociedad segura y libre de amenazas terroristas, al mismo tiempo que proyecta su mensaje ideológico sobre una América grande:

> *America* ***will*** *also be a safe society. We* ***will*** *protect our borders at home. We* ***will*** *defeat ISIS overseas. We* ***will*** *ensure every parent can raise their children in peace and safety. We* ***will*** *make America rich again.We* ***will*** *make America safe again. We* ***will*** *make America great again.* (Ver apéndice 2, líneas 288–292)

4.3. Apelando al sentimiento

Las emociones y el lenguaje emotivo-persuasivo generalmente forman parte de un estilo de comunicación que obtiene una respuesta emocional por parte del oyente. Por lo tanto, este tipo de lenguaje evoca emociones positivas o negativas que van más allá del significado específico de la palabra o frase utilizada (Osnabrügge et al., 2021: 886–887). Johnstone (2008: 3) sostiene que el AD no considera el lenguaje como un sistema abstracto, sino como una herramienta comunicativa que sirve para aunar recuerdos y sentimientos de opinión.

En el caso concreto de los tres políticos estadounidenses: Obama, Trump y Biden, la apelación al sentimiento se manifiesta de diferentes modos aunque, con mayor frecuencia, adquiere forma de referencia familiar, una institución sagrada para la gran mayoría de estadounidenses. Como ejemplo, podemos analizar este extracto del discurso de Obama, en el cual hace referencia a los hijos e hijas de los civiles a los que los militares norteamericanos salvan de una masacre segura:

> *When we helped prevent the massacre of civilians trapped on a distant mountain, here's what one of them said: We owe our American friends our lives.* ***Our children*** *will always remember that there was someone who felt our struggle and made a long journey to protect innocent people.* (Ver apéndice 1, líneas 141–144)

En el caso de Trump, el ex-presidente usa la figura retórica de la anáfora, poniendo el énfasis en las imágenes del horror producido justo después de la masacre que tuvo lugar en Orlando, Florida. Igualmente, la intención de Trump es la de generar frases pegadizas, las cuales permanecerán en la mente del oyente, al igual que las imágenes del horror vivido, durante un largo tiempo:

CC BY NC ND

> *The attack on the Pulse Nightclub in Orlando, Florida, was the worst terrorist strike on our soil since September 11th, and the worst mass shooting in our country´s history. So many people – it's just hard to believe, but just* ***so many people dead, so many people gravely injured, so much carnage****, such a disgrace.* ***The horror is beyond description****.* (Ver apéndice 2, líneas 11–16)

La apelación al sentimiento es el punto fuerte en el discurso de Trump (Hart, 2022: 12–13). Su proceder político es, básicamente, mantener a su base de votantes en un estado de ira perpetua y reemplazar la ideología formal por un apego emocional hacia su persona (Bostdorff, 2017). Trump también sustituye la sensibilidad común por el sentido común, por lo tanto, disminuye la necesidad de una argumentación formal (Crehan, 2018), al mismo tiempo que infringe las convenciones sociales (Gunn, 2018).

Biden también hace referencia a la institución familiar, como en el caso de Obama, con la salvedad de que el actual presidente lo hace mediante la mención al público de su paternidad, ya que su propio hijo sirve en el ejército. De este modo, logra crear un sentido de solidaridad desde la presidencia hacia el ciudadano medio que tiene a su hijo sirviendo en las fuerzas armadas norteamericanas:

> ***I'm the first President in 40 years who knows what it means to have a child serving in a warzone****. And throughout this process,* ***my North Star has been remembering what it was like when my late son, Beau, was deployed to Iraq*** *— how proud he was to serve his country; how insistent he was to deploy with his unit; and* ***the impact it had on him and all of us at home****.* (Ver apéndice 3, líneas 169–173)

4.4. El poder de una nación

Especialmente, al finalizar la Segunda Guerra Mundial, los Estados Unidos adquirieron una posición privilegiada sobre casi todos los países del resto de mundo en términos de población, recursos económicos y material militar, debido a que el daño que habían sufrido en la misma no era, ni remotamente, tan severo como el de sus aliados.

En los discursos analizados en este artículo, los tres presidentes norteamericanos hacen continuas referencias a la grandeza de los Estados Unidos utilizando, para este cometido, diferentes recursos retóricos. Dichas referencias se han repetido una y otra vez; con especial énfasis en la capacidad del pueblo norteamericano de afrontar retos bélicos, así como diversas amenazas de carácter social, económico e incluso político. En el discurso de Obama, la idea de los Estados Unidos como nación poderosa se expresa con la primera persona del plural *we*. En este caso particular, *we* no se representa como un simple grupo de invididuos, *we* engloba a una nación que está totalmente unida, a pesar de factores como la edad, la raza, el estatus social, la orientación sexual o el trasfondo político:

> ***We*** *took out Osama bin Laden and much of al Qaeda's leadership in Afghanistan and Pakistan.* ***We****'ve targeted al Qaeda's affiliate in Yemen, and recently eliminated the top commander of its affiliate in Somalia.* ***We****'ve done so while bringing more than 140,000 American troops home from Iraq, and drawing down our forces in Afghanistan, where our combat mission will end later this year.* (Ver apéndice 1, líneas 6–10)

Curiosamente, la referencia anterior a la unión de la nación, dejando de lado otros factores, es lo que impulsa a Trump a la hora de definir las intenciones criminales

CC BY NC ND

de ISIS en su atentado en Orlando. En el siguiente extracto, podemos observar como el ex-presidente republicano insiste en la motivación terrorista de acabar con los valores americanos de libertad, en este caso sexual, al mismo tiempo que enfatiza la idea de unión de la nación para afrontar dicho reto. A la hora de llevar a cabo esta práctica discursiva, Trump hace uso del recurso retórico de la anáfora:

> *A radical Islamic terrorist targeted the nightclub not only because he wanted to kill Americans, but in order to execute gay and lesbian citizens because of their sexual orientation.* ***It is a strike*** *at the heart and soul of who we are as a nation.* ***It is an assault*** *on the ability of free people to live their lives, love who they want and express their identity.* ***It is an attack*** *on the right of every single American to live in peace and safety in their own country. We need to respond to this attack on America as one united people – with force, purpose and determination.* (Ver apéndice 2, líneas 26–35)

Del mismo modo, el presidente Biden hace referencia a una nación que permanece unida en tiempos de guerra, lo cual hace mediante el uso también de la primera persona del plural *we*. En su caso, dicho *we* representa un tipo de nexo comunicativo entre el ciudadano común y la presidencia. Al mismo tiempo, Biden hace sentir al público el hecho de que el sacrificio era absolutamente necesario, ya que lograron la meta que el gobierno había propuesto en un principio: "*I said, among — with others,* ***we****'d follow Osama bin Laden to the gates of hell if need be. That's exactly what* ***we*** *did, and* ***we*** *got him*". (Ver apéndice 3, líneas 26–27)

Utilizando el mismo recurso retórico, Biden también le recuerda a la audiencia el objetivo conseguido, la victoria en la guerra, justificando ahora su salida de ella: *"****We*** *were attacked.* ***We*** *went to war with clear goals.* ***We*** *achieved those objectives".* (Ver apéndice 3, líneas 178-180)

En el caso de Trump, el ex-presidente coloca a los Estados Unidos como el garante del mundo civilizado, la única nación en el mundo capaz de liderar una coalición global contra el terrorismo, haciendo una analogía con la lucha de los Estados Unidos contra el comunismo durante la Guerra Fría.

A la hora de expresar dicha idea, Trump utiliza el verbo modal *must*, dejando clara la obligación de los Estados Unidos de actuar frente a la lacra terrorista, una tarea que, en opinión de Trump, debe liderar su país: "*America* ***must*** *unite the whole civilized world in the fight against Islamic terrorism, just like we did against communism in the Cold War*". (Ver apéndice 2, líneas 269–270)

4.5. "Nosotros vs. ellos"

En deportes y actividades lúdicas, el significado de "nosotros vs. ellos" es claro: los equipos compiten para ganar un partido o trofeo. Sin embargo, en la guerra, la competición es violenta y el rival es un enemigo al que se debe matar, no solo derrotar (Pasini 2019, 14 (2). En el siguiente extracto del discurso de Obama, podemos ver como la intención de la administración norteamericana es, finalmente, no sólo derrotar al grupo terrorista ISIS, sino también eliminarlo por completo, algo que se indica claramente en el uso de la palabra *destroy*: "*My fellow Americans, tonight I want to speak to you about what the United States will do with our friends and allies to degrade and ultimately* ***destroy*** *the terrorist group known as ISIL*". (Ver apéndice 1, líneas 1–3)

En el discurso de Obama podemos observar como "el otro" es considerado como el bando de la sinrazón y la incapacidad de razonar por medio del diálogo. Esta irracionalidad asociada al "otro significa que absolutamente nada racional o

CC BY NC ND

razonable puede emanar del espacio del "otro" (Noor, 2010: 51). Dicha apreciación se muestra claramente al citar el ex-presidente los numerosos actos criminales que el grupo terrorista ha realizado desde su creación. Obama incluso nombra a dos periodistas que fueron asesinados por ISIS, dejando clara la falta de razonamiento y diálogo por parte de los terroristas:

> *In a region that has known so much bloodshed, these terrorists are unique in their brutality. They execute captured prisoners. They kill children. They enslave, rape, and force women into marriage. They threatened a religious minority with genocide. And in acts of barbarism,* ***they took the lives of two American journalists – Jim Foley and Steven Sotloff****.* (Ver apéndice 1, líneas 25–29)

Esta estrategia discursiva de etiquetar al "otro" como irracional ha sido utilizada en numerosos discursos políticos de los presidentes norteamericanos durante décadas, donde las fuerzas comunistas eran consideradas como opuestas a un intercambio de diálogo, al mismo tiempo que sus seguidores en territorio norteamericano eran perseguidos política e, incluso, judicialmente. En el discurso de Trump, percibimos esa asociación del terrorismo con los valores comunistas contrarios a los norteamericanos, al mismo tiempo que busca la unión de los estados de Occidente para ponerle freno a esa plaga y critica la inutilidad de la política de Obama a la hora de detener el avance de ISIS:

> *America must unite the whole civilized world in the fight against Islamic terrorism,* ***just like we did against communism in the Cold War. We´ve tried President Obama´s way. He gave the world his apology tour, we got ISIS, and many other problems in return****.* (líneas 269–272)

Más allá del asesinato en sí mismo, el principal objetivo de los terroristas es, aparte de crear un ambiente global de miedo en la población en general, destruir el valor de la libertad generada en los países occidentales, de los cuales los Estados Unidos es su máxima expresión. Durante su discurso, Trump hace una clara referencia al único propósito posible para los terroristas de ISIS, la muerte de cualquier ciudadano de Occidente que se aleje de su forma de pensar, o que se atreva a hacerlo de una manera libre.

Para enfatizar su idea de contraposición a los valores occidentales de paz y libertad, Trump toma el ejemplo del padre talibán de un terrorista, ya que el mismo simboliza la antítesis de la libertad del pueblo norteamericano: "***His father published support for the Afghan Taliban****, a regime which murders those who don't share its radical views*." (Ver Apéndice 2, líneas 39–41)

Biden, al igual que hicieron sus predecesores Trump, Obama y el mismo Bush, justo después de los atentados del 11/S, define la amenaza terrorista del ISIS, al "ellos", con una metáfora, en este caso en concreto utilizando la palabra *metastasing*:

> *Over the past 20 years, the threat has become more dispersed,* ***metastasizing*** *around the globe: al-Shabaab in Somalia; al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula; al-Nusra in Syria; ISIS attempting to create a califit [caliphate] in Syria and Iraq, and establishing affiliates in multiple countries in Africa and Asia.* (Ver apéndice 3, líneas 34–37)

Al igual que ocurre con el cáncer, el terrorismo de ISIS podría extenderse muy rápida y peligrosamente si la comunidad internacional, liderada por los Estados Unidos, no le pone freno. Al igual que su antecesor George W. Bush, Obama

CC BY NC ND

yuxtapone la figura enemiga del terrorista contra una comunidad de naciones libres de la cual dichos terroristas están excluidos.

Dicha comunidad internacional debe unirse para afrontar esta amenaza terrorista, por el bien de la preservación de la seguridad común. Al hacer eso, se le presta apoyo implícito a los esfuerzos norteamericanos contra el terrorismo (Pilecki et al., 2014: 290–292).

Jagers and Walgrave (2007) manifiestan que el populismo completo consiste de tres fases; la primera, los populistas apelan deliberadamente a la población normal, trabajadora. En segundo lugar, los populistas critican las estructuras de élite en el poder dentro de la sociedad. Sin embargo, también critican las estructuras de élite fuera de la política, como los medios de comunicación o el sistema judicial.

La tercera fase es "el otro", el momento en el que se hace una clara distinción entre el grupo interno y el externo. En el discurso de Obama, el ex-presidente menciona claramente dos áreas de mundo desde las cuales procede la mayor amenaza terrorista a día de hoy, la organización terrorista ISIS:

> *And that's why we must remain vigilant as threats emerge. At this moment,* ***the greatest threats come from the Middle East and North Africa****, where radical groups exploit grievances for their own gain. And one of those groups is ISIL – which calls itself the "Islamic State".* (Ver apéndice 1, líneas 14–17)

El lenguaje y las figuras retóricas religiosas han sido utilizadas, repetidamente, por los distintos presidentes norteamericanos, a la hora de establecer la diferencia entre un grupo interno y otro externo. En su discurso, Biden hace una referencia final a la protección de Dios sobre las tropas norteamericanas en esta guerra contra el terrorismo. En este caso, y si bien el cristianismo es una referencia constante en los discursos presidenciales, sí que observamos una diferencia entre el grupo interno, los militares norteamericanos y sus familias protegidos por Dios, y el grupo externo del ISIS que no se asocia con ningún tipo de protección divina, representando la maldad en sí misma: "*May* ***God*** *protect our troops. May* ***God*** *bless all those families who lost someone in this endeavor*". (Ver apéndice 3, líneas 181-182)

Siguiendo con el tema del uso de la religión y las referencias religiosas en los discursos, es indudable que Trump ha hecho uso del Islam y lo ha categorizado como el grupo externo, cada vez que establece una relación directa del mismo con el terrorismo. Podemos ver como, en su discurso, Trump se refiere al islamismo radical como el causante del peligro para los Estados Unidos:

> *Many of the principles of Radical Islam are incompatible with Western values and institutions. Radical Islam is anti-woman, anti-gay and anti-American.* ***I refuse to allow America to become a place where gay people, Christian people, and Jewish people, are the targets of persecution and intimidation by Radical Islamic preachers of hate and violence****.* (Ver apéndice 2, líneas 69–74)

Profundizando en esa misma línea discursiva suya, vemos como, en las siguientes líneas, Trump deja clara la conexión que él mismo establece entre inmigración y terrorismo, hablando de la manera en la cual el islamismo radical está afectando al nivel de vida de los norteamericanos, así como a los cristianos y judíos que viven en los Estados Unidos.

Trump consigue que este mensaje ideológico se convierta en hegemónico, por medio de la repetición de la expresión *radical islam*, ya que supone una clara diferencia entre el "nosotros" y el "ellos"; el "nosotros", el grupo interno, representado en el cristianismo tan presente en los Estados Unidos, como signo

CC BY NC ND

distintivo del "buen norteamericano", y el "ellos", el grupo externo, ajeno, simbolizando el islamismo radical tan perjudicial para los intereses norteamericanos y sus propios ciudadanos:

> *It's not just a national security issue. It is a quality of life issue. If we want to protect the quality of life for all Americans – women and children, gay and straight, Jews and Christians and all people – then we need to tell the truth about* ***Radical Islam****. We need to tell the truth, also, about how* ***Radical Islam*** *is coming to our shores.* (Ver apéndice 2, líneas 75–79)

Trump, por otro lado, utiliza la figura retórica de la repetición, mediante el uso de la palabra *immigration*, con la firme intención de asociar islamismo radical con inmigración, definiendo de este modo al "ellos", la amenaza, frente al "nosotros", el ciudadano norteamericano, como podemos ver en este extracto concreto de su discurso:

> *What I want is common sense. I want a mainstream* ***immigration*** *policy that promotes American values. That is the choice I put before the American people: a mainstream* ***immigration*** *policy designed to benefit America, or Hillary Clinton's radical* ***immigration*** *policy designed to benefit politically-correct special interests.* (Ver apéndice 2, líneas 187–191)

5. CONCLUSIÓN

Como hemos podido ver en nuestro análisis de los tres discursos realizados por los presidentes en cuestión en este artículo, los tres políticos – Obama, Trump y Biden – construyen un discurso sólido sobre "la guerra contra el terror". El marco teórico de Fairclough, utilizado en este trabajo, demuestra el hecho de que el lenguaje puede ser usado como medio para construir una ideología, la cual puede convertirse en hegemónica, como sucede con el mensaje de Trump en el aspecto concreto de la inmigración.

Este artículo ha evidenciado, por ejemplo, que los tres políticos han seleccionado, intencionadamente, todo tipo de formas gramaticales, expresiones y vocabulario específico, en una clara intención de conseguir el mayor impacto posible en sus oyentes y votantes en general. Con relación a dichos recursos del lenguaje empleados, y concretando en la primera hipótesis planteada en este artículo, la legitimación de las políticas, hemos visto como los tres políticos norteamericanos utilizan el verbo modal *will* para mostrar la misma determinación y capacidad de decisión en sus políticas a seguir con relación a la guerra contra el terrorismo.

Por lo tanto, nos encontramos con la primera continuación en ese punto. En el caso particular de Obama, el ex-presidente demócrata hace uso del *will* a la hora de expresar garantías a la sociedad norteamericana de su compromiso a la hora de combatir y, finalmente, derrotar al ISIS. En el caso de Biden, sin embargo, el Presidente hace uso de este verbo modal a la hora de enfatizar su idea de una salida de Afganistán ordenada y segura. Trump, por otra parte, usa dicho verbo modal *will* para mostrar a los norteamericanos su voluntad sólida de poner punto y final a la inmigración que se recibe desde determinados países musulmanes que él considera fuente de terrorismo.

Al mismo tiempo, el ex-presidente republicano hace uso de la primera persona del plural *we*, de carácter inclusivo, con la intención de hacer partícipe al oyente de la necesidad de un cambio en las políticas migratorias y proteger de esta manera al

CC BY NC ND

ciudadano estadounidense. Trump, por su parte, emplea el verbo modal *must* para indicar la obligación del pueblo norteamericano de liderar el mundo civilizado en contra de la amenaza terrorista global, lo cual supone cambios de la práctica discursiva de las diferentes administraciones en esos aspectos.

En el caso de la legitimación de políticas, la diferencia entre Obama y Biden y el conservador Trump no es sustancial en el fondo pero sí en la forma. En consecuencia, sí que observamos un cierto cambio en el discurso. La retórica utilizada por Trump es mucho más agresiva y directa, sobre todo en cuanto a la definición del enemigo. En el caso de Biden, debido a que es el responsable de la salida de Afganistán, la justificación y legitimación se basan ambas en la necesidad de dar por terminado el conflicto militar en Afganistán para salvaguardar las vidas de los estadounidenses allí destinados.

Con referencia a la apelación al sentimiento, hemos comprobado como ambos presidentes demócratas hacen referencia a la familia, lo cual significa una evidente continuidad discursiva. En el caso de Obama, las referencias de tipo familiar se producen a la hora de expresar el sentimiento de esperanza y gratitud de un padre hacia el gobierno norteamericano, el cual protegió a sus descendientes durante la guerra. Una situación similar sucede con Biden, ya que su mención a la familia está basada en su vida personal, lo que deja claro a la audiencia que conoce exactamente lo que sienten los familiares de los militares fallecidos en Afganistán. Es ahí, por lo tanto, donde encontramos una clara continuidad en el discurso.

La apelación al sentimiento muestra el mismo recurso a la institución familiar, tan importante en los Estados Unidos, tanto en los políticos demócratas como en el republicano. Otra clara continuidad en el discurso. Sí que se observa un cierto cambio en el discurso de Trump, ya que él no hace referencias a su propia familia, lo cual sí se produce en el discurso de Biden y Obama. Trump, por otra parte, prefiere mantener a su público en un estado de rabia continua, con descripciones muy gráficas del daño causado por ISIS en sus atentados.

Este tipo de descripciones también se utilizan por parte del partido demócrata, especialmente de Obama, aunque no de forma tan áspera, lo cual significa otra continuidad. Trump, por otra parte, usa la figura retórica de la anáfora, un recurso habitualmente utilizado en la retórica política, con la intención de enfatizar los recuerdos del terror ocasionado después de un ataque terrorista, al mismo tiempo que deja en la retina del público las imágenes del caos y la destrucción causados por el ISIS. En este ejemplo en concreto, nos encontramos con un cambio.

En relación con el tema del poder de una nación, Obama utiliza la primera persona del plural *we*, de tipo inclusivo, como una forma de simbiosis entre la presidencia y el ciudadano medio, involucrando de esta manera a todos y todas en la noble causa de la lucha contra el terrorismo. Biden también usa la primera persona del plural *we*, a la hora de establecer las metas originales a cumplir después de los atentados de 2001.

Al mismo tiempo, el actual presidente menciona los objetivos cumplidos juntos, la muerte de Bin Laden y la eliminación de la amenaza terrorista para los Estados Unidos. Consecuentemente, podemos hablar de continuidad en este punto determinado, en ambos presidentes demócratas.

Los tres políticos norteamericanos hacen continuas referencias a la grandeza de los Estados Unidos utilizando, para este cometido, diferentes recursos retóricos. Ahí nos encontramos, nuevamente, con la consiguiente continuidad discursiva. Sin embargo, los dos presidentes demócratas utilizan la primera persona del plural *we*, de carácter inclusivo, para representar la unión del pueblo norteamericano; a pesar

BY NC ND

de diversos factores tales como la edad, la raza, la clase social, la identidad sexual o la posición política. Por lo que respecta a Trump, el ex-presidente exporta la idea de los Estados Unidos como el garante de la libertad y el mundo civilizado, como líder de una coalición global, a nivel mundial, contra la amenaza terrorista, al mismo tiempo que convierte en hegemónico su mensaje ideológico de una América grande.

Finalmente, en cuanto a la dicotomía "nosotros vs. ellos", vemos como los tres políticos hablan de la eliminación de ISIS, del "otro", no sólo de su derrota, como algo imprescindible para lograr la seguridad del pueblo norteamericano, todo ello con la ayuda del resto del mundo. Una clara continuidad en el discurso. Sin embargo, se observa una diferencia con Trump, el cual prefiere dejar al margen al mundo musulmán, al que considera la fuente de los problemas terroristas, hasta el punto de querer implementar políticas migratorias específicas contra países musulmanes. Esto supone un claro cambio en el proceder discursivo.

Podemos ver una continuidad en el caso de los políticos demócratas, ya que se focaliza claramente el origen del terrorismo en ciertas partes del mundo, lo cual no sucede con Trump, ya que el ex-presidente republicano generaliza la fuente del problema terrorista y la hace extensible a todo el mundo musulmán. Por consiguiente, nos encontramos con otro cambio en ese tema en concreto.

Igualmente, otra continuidad que se observa claramente es que los tres políticos asocian el "nosotros" con el cristianismo de occidente. Los Estados Unidos están en el lado correcto de la historia, frente a la maldad divina que representa ISIS. El cristianismo representa, para todos ellos, al "buen norteamericano", el ciudadano protegido por Dios en esa noble labor de luchar y acabar con el enemigo terrorista, el "ellos".

Por otro lado, Trump prefiere usar el recurso retórico de la repetición, mediante la utilización de la palabra *immigration*, la cual se escucha en repetidas ocasiones a lo largo de su discurso, a la hora de enfatizar la idea de un enemigo externo que, supuestamente, constituye la verdadera amenaza para la población norteamericana. Observamos otro cambio en la práctica discursiva en este mismo punto. El cristianismo también figura como un elemento que define al grupo interno, al "nosotros". Del mismo modo, con relación al simbolismo del "verdadero norteamericano", las referencias a la protección de Dios sobre las tropas norteamericanas, así como a los Estados Unidos, son constantes en los tres presidentes, especialmente en el caso de Trump, con lo cual nos encontramos con una clara continuidad en ese caso.

En cuanto al capítulo de "nosotros vs. ellos", podemos ver como los tres presidentes hablan en sus discursos de la necesidad de derrotar al enemigo, al "otro". Por lo cual, nos encontramos con una clara continuidad en ese punto. Sorprendentemente, tanto Obama como Trump usan términos similares al referirse a la eliminación de la amenaza, a pesar de pertenecer a partidos políticos contrapuestos. Biden, por el contrario, se ciñe a la necesidad de que los Estados Unidos deben abandonar Afganistán, ya que los objetivos de eliminación de la amenaza terrorista ya han sido cumplidos.

Del mismo modo, tanto Obama como Biden dejan claro a su audiencia la brutalidad y sinrazón de ISIS, del "otro", sin focalizar la culpa en ningún grupo social o racial determinado, lo que supone una continuidad. Sin embargo, Trump hace una comparación con regímenes comunistas a los que los Estados Unidos tuvo que hacer frente en el pasado, al mismo tiempo que califica al "otro" con el islamismo radical, el enemigo a batir y mantener fuera del país.

CC BY NC ND

En este particular, sí que nos encontramos con un cambio muy contundente. En el caso particular de Biden, el actual presidente utiliza la metáfora del cáncer para establecer la necesidad de eliminar la amenaza del terrorismo, justo como se hace con dicha enfermedad, antes de que se reproduzca de nuevo. En cuanto a la segunda pregunta de la hipótesis planteada en este artículo, podemos ver como, durante la administración Obama, el relato en los discursos anti-terroristas era el de luchar y derrotar a ISIS en su terreno, en determinadas zonas del planeta donde su presencia era latente.

Sin embargo, durante la presidencia de Trump, se produce un cambio en el discurso anti-terrorista, el cual se centra mucho más en el ámbito doméstico, principalmente en la exposición y explicación del desarrollo de leyes migratorias que discriminan a ciudadanos de ciertos países que, supuestamente, amenazan la seguridad de los Estados Unidos. En ese punto, igualmente, nos encontramos con un cambio en el discurso.

El último cambio significativo a destacar en la práctica discursiva de los tres políticos analizados en el presente artículo es el hecho de que, durante la actual presidencia Biden, el discurso de la guerra contra el terror está más basado en la vigilancia interna y la cooperación entre países, lo cual permitirá a los Estados Unidos continuar protegidos contra cualquier otra posible amenaza de ISIS en el futuro, independientemente de su procedencia. Al mismo tiempo, el actual Presidente insiste en recordar al ciudadano medio el hecho de que todos los esfuerzos en la guerra contra el terrorismo han sido realizados a través de una labor común.

Biden recuerda al ciudadano norteamericano el principio de dicha guerra, las numerosas pérdidas humanas, las causas de dicho conflicto y su noble fin. Por lo tanto, el Presidente justifica su salida de Afganistán con la necesidad de evitar nuevas y numerosas pérdidas, en una guerra contra el terrorismo que, tal y como la conocíamos, debe llegar a su fin, con la ayuda de Dios.

REFERENCIAS

Bassnett-McGuire, S. t Schaffner, C. 2010. *Political discourse, media and translation*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars.

Bostdorff, D. M. 2017. Obama, Trump, and reflections on the rhetoric of political change. *Rhetoric and Public Affairs* 20(4): 695–706.

Brown, G. y Yule, G. 1983. *Discourse analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Campbell, K. K. y Jamieson, K. H. 2008. *Deeds done in words: Presidential rhetoric and the genres of governance*. Chicago, IL: Chicago University Press.

Chilton, P. A. 2004. *Analysing political discourse: Theory and practice*. Londres: Routledge.

Crehan, K. 2018. *The common sense of Donald J. Trump: A Gramscian reading of twenty-first century populist rhetoric*. Amsterdam: Springer.

Fairclough, I. y Fairclough, N. 2012. *Political discourse analysis: A method for advanced students*. New York: Routledge.

Fairclough, N. 2003. *Book review. Discourse & Society* 14(6): 805–808.

Fairclough, N. 2013. Critical Discourse Analysis and Critical Policy Studies. *Critical Policy Studies* 7(2): 177–197.

Fermor, B. 2021. 'This barbaric terrorist organization': Orientalism and Barack Obama's language on ISIS. *Critical Studies on Terrorism* 14(3): 312–334.

Franch, P. 2018. Praising the fallen heroes: Storytelling in US war presidential rhetoric, from Johnson to Obama. *Language and Literature* 27(4): 311–328.

Gunn, J. 2018. On political perversion. *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 48(2): 161–186.

CC BY NC ND

Hart, R. P. 2022. Why Trump lost and how? A rhetorical explanation. *American Behavioral Scientist* 66(1): 7–27.
Hassanein, A. 2020. The rise and fall of Islamic State: Current challenges and future prospects. *Asian Affairs* 51(1): 71–94.
Hawkins, T. y Kim, A. 2021. *Just war theory and literary studies: An invitation to dialogue*. Londres: Palgrave Macmillan.
Jagers, J. y Walgrave, S. 2007. Populism as political communication style: An empirical study of political parties' discourse in Belgium. *European Journal of Political Research* 46: 319–345.
Jodok, T. 2020. The containment of the Islamic State: A realist case to engage a hybrid actor, *Contemporary Security Policy* 41(3): 385–406.
Jørgensen, M. y Phillips, L. J. 2002. *Discourse analysis as theory and method*. Londres: Sage.
Khan, M. H., Qazalbash, F., Adnan, H. M., Yaqin, L. N. y Khuhro, R. A. 2021. Trump and muslims: A Critical Discourse Analysis of islamophobic rhetoric in Donald Trump's selected tweets. *Sage Open*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/21582440211004172>
Hampl, M. 2022. The use of the Path and Force image schemas in Barack Obam's counterterrorism discourse against ISIL. *Critical Discourse Studies* 19(3): 274–289.
Mullet, D. R. 2018. A general Critical Discourse Analysis framework for educational research. *Journal of Advanced Academics* 29(2): 116–142.
Noor, F. A. 2010. Terror and the politics of containment: Analysing the discourse of the 'war on terror' and its workings of power. *Human Architecture: Journal of the Sociology of Self Knowledge* 8(2): article 7.
Oddo, J. 2011. War legitimation discourse: Representing 'US' and 'them' in four US presidential addresses. *Discourse & Society* 22(3): 287–314.
Osnabrügge, M., Hobolt, S. y Rodon, T. 2021. Playing to the gallery: Emotive rhetoric in parliaments. *American Political Science Review* 115(3): 885–899.
Pasini, M. 2019. Us vs. them: Ideology and discourse. *Nordicum Mediterraneum* 14(2).
Pilecki, A., Muro, J. M., Hammack, P. L. y Clemons, C. M. 2014. Moral exclusion and the justification of U.S. counterterrorism startegy: Bush, Obama, and the terrorist enemy figure. *Peace and Conflict* 20(3): 285–299.
Reyes, A. 2011. Strategies of legitimization in political discourse: From words to actions. *Discourse & Society* 22(6): 781–807.
Reynolds, C. 2019. Building theory From media ideology: Coding for power in journalistic discourse. *Journal of Communication Inquiry* 43(1): 47–69.
Rodríguez Toribio, I. y González Aldea, P. 2017. La política exterior de Estados Unidos en la campaña presidencial de Clinton y Trump. Los discursos sobre ISIS en la agenda mediática. *Doxa Comunicación. Revista Interdisciplinar de Estudios de Comunicación y Ciencias Sociales* 25: 13-42.
Schäffner, C. y Bassnett, S. eds. 2010. *Political discourse, media and translation*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars.
Souza, D. 2003. *What's so great about America*. Londres: Penguin.
Starr-Deelen, D. G. 2018. *Counter-terrorism from the Obama administration to president Trump: Caught in the fait accompli war*. New York: Springer.
Van Dijk, T. A. 1998. *Ideology. A multidisciplinary approach*. Londres: Sage.
Van Leeuwen, T. 2007. Legitimation in discourse and communication. *Discourse & Communication* 1(1) : 91–112.
Westphal, J. 2018. Violence in the name of god? A framing processes approach to the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria. *Social Movements Studies* 17(1): 19-34.
Zech, S. T. y Kelly, Z.M. 2015. Off with their heads: The Islamic State and civilian beheadings. *Journal of Terrorism Research* 6(2).

BY NC ND

Apéndice 1: ***Statement by the President on ISIL***

My fellow Americans, tonight I want to speak to you about what the United States will do with our friends and allies to degrade and ultimately destroy the terrorist group known as ISIL.

As Commander-in-Chief, my highest priority is the security of the American people. Over the last several years, we have consistently taken the fight to terrorists who threaten our country. We took out Osama bin Laden and much of al Qaeda's leadership in Afghanistan and Pakistan. We've targeted al Qaeda's affiliate in Yemen, and recently eliminated the top commander of its affiliate in Somalia. We've done so while bringing more than 140,000 American troops home from Iraq, and drawing down our forces in Afghanistan, where our combat mission will end later this year. Thanks to our military and counterterrorism professionals, America is safer.

Still, we continue to face a terrorist threat. We can't erase every trace of evil from the world, and small groups of killers have the capacity to do great harm. That was the case before 9/11, and that remains true today. And that's why we must remain vigilant as threats emerge. At this moment, the greatest threats come from the Middle East and North Africa, where radical groups exploit grievances for their own gain. And one of those groups is ISIL – which calls itself the "Islamic State."

Now let's make two things clear: ISIL is not "Islamic." No religion condones the killing of innocents. And the vast majority of ISIL's victims have been Muslim. And ISIL is certainly not a state. It was formerly al Qaeda's affiliate in Iraq, and has taken advantage of sectarian strife and Syria's civil war to gain territory on both sides of the Iraq-Syrian border. It is recognized by no government, nor by the people it subjugates. ISIL is a terrorist organization, pure and simple. And it has no vision other than the slaughter of all who stand in its way.

In a region that has known so much bloodshed, these terrorists are unique in their brutality. They execute captured prisoners. They kill children. They enslave, rape, and force women into marriage. They threatened a religious minority with genocide. And in acts of barbarism, they took the lives of two American journalists – Jim Foley and Steven Sotloff.

So ISIL poses a threat to the people of Iraq and Syria, and the broader Middle East – including American citizens, personnel and facilities. If left unchecked, these terrorists could pose a growing threat beyond that region, including to the United States.

While we have not yet detected specific plotting against our homeland, ISIL leaders have threatened America and our allies. Our Intelligence Community believes that thousands of foreigners – including Europeans and some Americans – have joined them in Syria and Iraq. Trained and battle-hardened, these fighters could try to return to their home countries and carry out deadly attacks.

I know many Americans are concerned about these threats. Tonight, I want you to know that the United States of America is meeting them with strength and resolve. Last month, I ordered our military to take targeted action against ISIL to stop its advances. Since then, we've conducted more than 150 successful airstrikes in Iraq. These strikes have protected American personnel and facilities, killed ISIL fighters, destroyed weapons, and given space for Iraqi and Kurdish forces to reclaim key territory. These strikes have also helped save the lives of thousands of innocent men, women and children.

But this is not our fight alone. American power can make a decisive difference, but we cannot do for Iraqis what they must do for themselves, nor can we take the place of Arab partners in securing their region. And that's why I've insisted that additional U.S. action depended upon Iraqis forming an inclusive government, which they have now done in recent days. So tonight, with a new Iraqi government in place, and following consultations with allies abroad and Congress at home, I can announce that America will lead a broad coalition to roll back this terrorist threat.

Our objective is clear: We will degrade, and ultimately destroy, ISIL through a comprehensive and sustained counterterrorism strategy. First, we will conduct a systematic campaign of airstrikes against these terrorists. Working with the Iraqi government, we will expand our efforts beyond protecting our own people and humanitarian missions, so that we're hitting ISIL targets as Iraqi forces go on offense. Moreover, I have made it clear that we will hunt down terrorists who threaten our country, wherever they are. That means I will not hesitate to take action against ISIL in Syria, as well as Iraq. This is a core principle of my presidency: If you threaten America, you will find no safe haven.

Second, we will increase our support to forces fighting these terrorists on the ground. In June, I deployed several hundred American servicemembers to Iraq to assess how we can best support Iraqi security forces. Now that those teams have completed their work – and Iraq has formed a government – we will send an additional 475 servicemembers to Iraq.

As I have said before, these American forces will not have a combat mission – we will not get dragged into another ground war in Iraq. But they are needed to support Iraqi and Kurdish forces with training, intelligence and equipment. We'll also support Iraq's efforts to stand up National Guard Units to help Sunni communities secure their own freedom from ISIL's control.

CC BY NC ND

Across the border, in Syria, we have ramped up our military assistance to the Syrian opposition. Tonight, I call on Congress again to give us additional authorities and resources to train and equip these fighters. In the fight against ISIL, we cannot rely on an Assad regime that terrorizes its own people – a regime that will never regain the legitimacy it has lost. Instead, we must strengthen the opposition as the best counterweight to extremists like ISIL, while pursuing the political solution necessary to solve Syria's crisis once and for all.

Third, we will continue to draw on our substantial counterterrorism capabilities to prevent ISIL attacks. Working with our partners, we will redouble our efforts to cut off its funding; improve our intelligence; strengthen our defenses; counter its warped ideology; and stem the flow of foreign fighters into and out of the Middle East. And in two weeks, I will chair a meeting of the U.N. Security Council to further mobilize the international community around this effort.

Fourth, we will continue to provide humanitarian assistance to innocent civilians who have been displaced by this terrorist organization. This includes Sunni and Shia Muslims who are at grave risk, as well as tens of thousands of Christians and other religious minorities. We cannot allow these communities to be driven from their ancient homelands.

So this is our strategy. And in each of these four parts of our strategy, America will be joined by a broad coalition of partners. Already, allies are flying planes with us over Iraq; sending arms and assistance to Iraqi security forces and the Syrian opposition; sharing intelligence; and providing billions of dollars in humanitarian aid. Secretary Kerry was in Iraq today meeting with the new government and supporting their efforts to promote unity. And in the coming days he will travel across the Middle East and Europe to enlist more partners in this fight, especially Arab nations who can help mobilize Sunni communities in Iraq and Syria, to drive these terrorists from their lands. This is American leadership at its best: We stand with people who fight for their own freedom, and we rally other nations on behalf of our common security and common humanity.

My administration has also secured bipartisan support for this approach here at home. I have the authority to address the threat from ISIL, but I believe we are strongest as a nation when the President and Congress work together. So I welcome congressional support for this effort in order to show the world that Americans are united in confronting this danger.

Now, it will take time to eradicate a cancer like ISIL. And any time we take military action, there are risks involved – especially to the servicemen and women who carry out these missions. But I want the American people to understand how this effort will be different from the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. It will not involve American combat troops fighting on foreign soil. This counterterrorism campaign will be waged through a steady, relentless effort to take out ISIL wherever they exist, using our air power and our support for partner forces on the ground. This strategy of taking out terrorists who threaten us, while supporting partners on the front lines, is one that we have successfully pursued in Yemen and Somalia for years. And it is consistent with the approach I outlined earlier this year: to use force against anyone who threatens America's core interests, but to mobilize partners wherever possible to address broader challenges to international order.

My fellow Americans, we live in a time of great change. Tomorrow marks 13 years since our country was attacked. Next week marks six years since our economy suffered its worst setback since the Great Depression. Yet despite these shocks, through the pain we have felt and the grueling work required to bounce back, America is better positioned today to seize the future than any other nation on Earth.

Our technology companies and universities are unmatched. Our manufacturing and auto industries are thriving. Energy independence is closer than it's been in decades. For all the work that remains, our businesses are in the longest uninterrupted stretch of job creation in our history. Despite all the divisions and discord within our democracy, I see the grit and determination and common goodness of the American people every single day –- and that makes me more confident than ever about our country's future.

Abroad, American leadership is the one constant in an uncertain world. It is America that has the capacity and the will to mobilize the world against terrorists. It is America that has rallied the world against Russian aggression, and in support of the Ukrainian peoples' right to determine their own destiny. It is America – our scientists, our doctors, our know-how – that can help contain and cure the outbreak of Ebola.

It is America that helped remove and destroy Syria's declared chemical weapons so that they can't pose a threat to the Syrian people or the world again. And it is America that is helping Muslim communities around the world not just in the fight against terrorism, but in the fight for opportunity, and tolerance, and a more hopeful future.

America, our endless blessings bestow an enduring burden. But as Americans, we welcome our responsibility to lead. From Europe to Asia, from the far reaches of Africa to war-torn capitals of the

CC BY NC ND

Middle East, we stand for freedom, for justice, for dignity. These are values that have guided our nation since its founding.

Tonight, I ask for your support in carrying that leadership forward. I do so as a Commander-in-Chief who could not be prouder of our men and women in uniform – pilots who bravely fly in the face of danger above the Middle East, and servicemembers who support our partners on the ground. When we helped prevent the massacre of civilians trapped on a distant mountain, here's what one of them said: "We owe our American friends our lives. Our children will always remember that there was someone who felt our struggle and made a long journey to protect innocent people."

That is the difference we make in the world. And our own safety, our own security, depends upon our willingness to do what it takes to defend this nation and uphold the values that we stand for – timeless ideals that will endure long after those who offer only hate and destruction have been vanquished from the Earth.

May God bless our troops, and may God bless the United States of America.

The White House. 2014. *Statement by the President on ISIL*.
<https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2014/09/10/statement-president-isil-1>
(acceso: 23/09/2022)

Apéndice 2: ***Transcript: Donald Trump's national security speech***

Thank you for joining me today.

This was going to be a speech on Hillary Clinton and how bad a President, especially in these times of Radical Islamic Terrorism, she would be.

Even her former Secret Service Agent, who has seen her under pressure and in times of stress, has stated that she lacks the temperament and integrity to be president.

There will be plenty of opportunity to discuss these important issues at a later time, and I will deliver that speech soon.

But today there is only one thing to discuss: the growing threat of terrorism inside of our borders.

The attack on the Pulse Nightclub in Orlando, Florida, was the worst terrorist strike on our soil since September 11th, and the worst mass shooting in our country's history.

So many people dead, so many people gravely injured, so much carnage, such a disgrace.

The horror is beyond description.

The families of these wonderful people are totally devastated. Likewise, our whole nation, and indeed the whole world, is devastated.

We express our deepest sympathies to the victims, the wounded, and their families.

We mourn, as one people, for our nation's loss – and pledge our support to any and all who need it.

I would like to ask now that we all observe a moment of silence for the victims of the attack.

Our nation stands together in solidarity with the members of Orlando's LGBT Community.

This is a very dark moment in America's history.

A radical Islamic terrorist targeted the nightclub not only because he wanted to kill Americans, but in order to execute gay and lesbian citizens because of their sexual orientation.

It is a strike at the heart and soul of who we are as a nation.

It is an assault on the ability of free people to live their lives, love who they want and express their identity.

It is an attack on the right of every single American to live in peace and safety in their own country.

We need to respond to this attack on America as one united people – with force, purpose and determination.

But the current politically correct response cripples our ability to talk and think and act clearly.

If we don't get tough, and we don't get smart – and fast – we're not going to have a country anymore – there will be nothing left.

The killer, whose name I will not use, or ever say, was born to Afghan parents who immigrated to the United States. His father published support for the Afghan Taliban, a regime which murders those who don't share its radical views. The father even said he was running for President of that country.

The bottom line is that the only reason the killer was in America in the first place was because we allowed his family to come here.

That is a fact, and it's a fact we need to talk about.

We have a dysfunctional immigration system which does not permit us to know who we let into our country, and it does not permit us to protect our citizens.

We have an incompetent administration, and if I am not elected President, that will not change over the next four years – but it must change, and it must change now.

CC BY NC ND

With fifty people dead, and dozens more wounded, we cannot afford to talk around the issue anymore – we have to address it head on.

I called for a ban after San Bernardino, and was met with great scorn and anger but now, many are saying I was right to do so – and although the pause is temporary, we must find out what is going on. The ban will be lifted when we as a nation are in a position to properly and perfectly screen those people coming into our country.

The immigration laws of the United States give the President the power to suspend entry into the country of any class of persons that the President deems detrimental to the interests or security of the United States, as he deems appropriate.

I will use this power to protect the American people. When I am elected, I will suspend immigration from areas of the world when there is a proven history of terrorism against the United States, Europe or our allies, until we understand how to end these threats.

After a full, impartial and long overdue security assessment, we will develop a responsible immigration policy that serves the interests and values of America.

We cannot continue to allow thousands upon thousands of people to pour into our country, many of whom have the same thought process as this savage killer.

Many of the principles of Radical Islam are incompatible with Western values and institutions.

Radical Islam is anti-woman, anti-gay and anti-American.

I refuse to allow America to become a place where gay people, Christian people, and Jewish people, are the targets of persecution and intimidation by Radical Islamic preachers of hate and violence.

It's not just a national security issue. It is a quality of life issue.

If we want to protect the quality of life for all Americans – women and children, gay and straight, Jews and Christians and all people – then we need to tell the truth about Radical Islam.

We need to tell the truth, also, about how Radical Islam is coming to our shores.

We are importing Radical Islamic Terrorism into the West through a failed immigration system – and through an intelligence community held back by our president.

Even our own FBI Director has admitted that we cannot effectively check the backgrounds of the people we are letting into America.

All of the September 11th hijackers were issued visas.

Large numbers of Somali refugees in Minnesota have tried to join ISIS.

The Boston Bombers came here through political asylum.

The male shooter in San Bernardino – again, whose name I won't mention – was the child of immigrants from Pakistan, and he brought his wife – the other terrorist - from Saudi Arabia, through another one of our easily exploited visa programs.

Immigration from Afghanistan into the United States has increased nearly five-fold in just one year. According to Pew Research, 99% of people in Afghanistan support oppressive Sharia Law.

We admit many more from other countries in the region who share these same oppressive views.

If we want to remain a free and open society, then we have to control our borders.

Yet, Hillary Clinton – for months and despite so many attacks – repeatedly refused to even say the words "radical Islam," until I challenged her yesterday to say the words or leave the race.

However, Hillary Clinton – who has been forced to say the words today after policies she supports have caused us so much damage – still has no clue what Radical Islam is, and won't speak honestly about what it is.

She is in total denial, and her continuing reluctance to ever name the enemy broadcasts weakness across the world.

In fact, just a few weeks before the San Bernardino slaughter, Hillary Clinton explained her refusal to say the words Radical Islam. Here is what she said: "Muslims are peaceful and tolerant people, and have nothing whatsoever to do with terrorism."

Hillary Clinton says the solution is to ban guns. They tried that in France, which has among the toughest gun laws in the world, and 130 were brutally murdered by Islamic terrorists in cold blood. Her plan is to disarm law-abiding Americans, abolishing the 2nd amendment, and leaving only the bad guys and terrorists with guns. She wants to take away Americans' guns, then admit the very people who want to slaughter us.

I will be meeting with the NRA, which has given me their earliest endorsement in a Presidential race, to discuss how to ensure Americans have the means to protect themselves in this age of terror.

The bottom line is that Hillary supports the policies that bring the threat of Radical Islam into America, and allow it to grow overseas.

In fact, Hillary Clinton's catastrophic immigration plan will bring vastly more Radical Islamic immigration into this country, threatening not only our security but our way of life.

When it comes to Radical Islamic terrorism, ignorance is not bliss – it's deadly.

CC BY NC ND

The Obama Administration, with the support of Hillary Clinton and others, has also damaged our security by restraining our intelligence-gathering and failing to support law enforcement. They have put political correctness above common sense, above your safety, and above all else.

I refuse to be politically correct.

I will do the right thing – I want to straighten things out and to Make America Great Again.

The days of deadly ignorance will end, and they will end soon.

As President I will give our intelligence community, law enforcement and military the tools they need to prevent terrorist attacks.

We need an intelligence-gathering system second to none. That includes better cooperation between state, local and federal officials – and with our allies.

I will have an Attorney General, a Director of National Intelligence, and a Secretary of Defense who will know how to fight the war on Radical Islamic Terrorism – and who will have the support they require to get the job done.

We also must ensure the American people are provided the information they need to understand the threat.

The Senate Subcommittee on Immigration has already identified hundreds of immigrants charged with terrorist activities inside the United States since September 11th.

Nearly a year ago, the Senate Subcommittee asked President Obama's Departments of Justice, State and Homeland Security to provide the immigration history of all terrorists inside the United States.

These Departments refused to comply.

President Obama must release the full and complete immigration histories of all individuals implicated in terrorist activity of any kind since 9/11.

The public has a right to know how these people got here.

We have to screen applicants to know whether they are affiliated with, or support, radical groups and beliefs.

We have to control the amount of future immigration into this country to prevent large pockets of radicalization from forming inside America.

Even a single individual can be devastating, just look at what happened in Orlando. Can you imagine large groups?

Truly, our President doesn't know what he is doing. He has failed us, and failed us badly, and under his leadership, this situation will not get any better – it will only get worse.

Each year, the United States permanently admits more than 100,000 immigrants from the Middle East, and many more from Muslim countries outside the Middle East. Our government has been admitting ever-growing numbers, year after year, without any effective plan for our security.

In fact, Clinton's State Department was in charge of the admissions process for people applying to enter from overseas.

Having learned nothing from these attacks, she now plans to massively increase admissions without a screening plan, including a 500% increase in Syrian refugees.

This could be a better, bigger version of the legendary Trojan Horse.

We can't let this happen.

Altogether, under the Clinton plan, you'd be admitting hundreds of thousands of refugees from the Middle East with no system to vet them, or to prevent the radicalization of their children.

The burden is on Hillary Clinton to tell us why she believes immigration from these dangerous countries should be increased without any effective system to screen who we are bringing in.

The burden is on Hillary Clinton to tell us why we should admit anyone into our country who supports violence of any kind against gay and lesbian Americans.

The burden is also on Hillary Clinton to tell us how she will pay for it. Her plan will cost Americans hundreds of billions of dollars long-term.

Wouldn't this money be better spent on rebuilding America for our current population, including the many poor people already living here?

We have to stop the tremendous flow of Syrian refugees into the United States – we don't know who they are, they have no documentation, and we don't know what they're planning.

What I want is common sense. I want a mainstream immigration policy that promotes American values.

That is the choice I put before the American people: a mainstream immigration policy designed to benefit America, or Hillary Clinton's radical immigration policy designed to benefit politically-correct special interests.

We've got to get smart, and tough, and vigilant, and we've got to do it now, because later is too late.

The media talks about "homegrown," terrorism, but Islamic radicalism, and the networks that nurture it, are imports from overseas.

CC BY NC ND

Yes, there are many radicalized people already inside our country as a result of the poor policies of the past. But the whole point is that it will be much, much easier to deal with our current problem if we don't keep on bringing in people who add to the problem.

For instance, the controversial Mosque attended by the Boston Bombers had as its founder an immigrant from overseas charged in an assassination plot.

This shooter in Orlando was the child of an immigrant father who supported one of the most repressive regimes on Earth. Why would we admit people who support violent hatred?

Hillary Clinton can never claim to be a friend of the gay community as long as she continues to support immigration policies that bring Islamic extremists to our country who suppress women, gays and anyone who doesn't share their views.

She can't have it both ways. She can't claim to be supportive of these communities while trying to increase the number of people coming in who want to oppress them.

How does this kind of immigration make our life better? How does this kind of immigration make our country better?

Why does Hillary Clinton want to bring people here—in vast numbers—who reject our values?

Ask yourself, who is really the friend of women and the LGBT community, Donald Trump with his actions, or Hillary Clinton with her words? Clinton wants to allow Radical Islamic terrorists to pour into our country—they enslave women, and murder gays.

I don't want them in our country.

Immigration is a privilege, and we should not let anyone into this country who doesn't support our communities – all of our communities.

America has already admitted four times more immigrants than any country on earth, and we continue to admit millions more with no real checks or scrutiny.

Not surprisingly, wages for our workers haven't budged in many years.

So whether it's matter of national security, or financial security, we can't afford to keep on going like this. We owe $19 trillion in debt, and no longer have options.

All our communities, from all backgrounds, are ready for some relief. This is not an act of offense against anyone; it is an act of defense.

I want us all to work together, including in partnership with our Muslim communities. But Muslim communities must cooperate with law enforcement and turn in the people who they know are bad – and they do know where they are.

I want to fix our schools, roads, bridges and job market. I want every American to succeed. Hillary Clinton wants to empty out the Treasury to bring people into the country that include individuals who preach hate against our own citizens.

I want to protect our citizens – all of our citizens.

The terrorist attack on the Pulse Night Club demands a full and complete investigation into every aspect of the assault.

In San Bernardino, as an example, people knew what was going on, but they used the excuse of racial profiling for not reporting it.

We need to know what the killer discussed with his relatives, parents, friends and associates.

We need to know if he was affiliated with any radical Mosques or radical activists and what, if any, is their immigration status.

We need to know if he travelled anywhere, and who he travelled with.

We need to make sure every single last person involved in this plan – including anyone who knew something but didn't tell us – is brought to justice. If it can be proven that somebody had information about any attack, and did not give this information to authorities, they must serve prison time.

America must do more – much more – to protect its citizens, especially people who are potential victims of crimes based on their backgrounds or sexual orientations.

It also means we must change our foreign policy.

The decision to overthrow the regime in Libya, then pushing for the overthrow of the regime in Syria, among other things, without plans for the day after, have created space for ISIS to expand and grow.

These actions, along with our disastrous Iran deal, have also reduced our ability to work in partnership with our Muslim allies in the region.

That is why our new goal must be to defeat Islamic terrorism, not nation-building.

For instance, the last major NATO mission was Hillary Clinton's war in Libya. That mission helped unleash ISIS on a new continent.

I've said NATO needs to change its focus to stopping terrorism. Since I've raised that criticism, NATO has since announced a new initiative focused on just that.

America must unite the whole civilized world in the fight against Islamic terrorism, just like we did against communism in the Cold War.

CC BY NC ND

We've tried it President Obama's way. He gave the world his apology tour, we got ISIS, and many other problems, in return. I'd like to conclude my remarks today by again expressing our solidarity with the people of Orlando who have come under attack.

When I am President, I pledge to protect and defend all Americans who live inside of our borders. Wherever they come from, wherever they were born, all Americans living here and following our laws will be protected.

America will be a tolerant and open society.

America will also be a safe society.

We will protect our borders at home.

We will defeat ISIS overseas.

We will ensure every parent can raise their children in peace and safety.

We will make America rich again.

We will make America safe again.

We will make American Great Again.

Thank you.

Apéndice 3: ***Remarks by President Biden on the Way Forward in Afghanistan***

THE PRESIDENT: Good afternoon. I'm speaking to you today from the Roosevelt – the Treaty Room in the White House. The same spot where, on October of 2001, President

George W. Bush informed our nation that the United States military had begun strikes on terrorist training camps in Afghanistan. It was just weeks – just weeks after the terrorist attack on our nation that killed 2,977 innocent souls; that turned Lower Manhattan into a disaster area, destroyed parts of the Pentagon, and made hallowed ground of a field in Shanksville, Pennsylvania, and sparked an American promise that we would "never forget."

We went to Afghanistan in 2001 to root out al Qaeda, to prevent future terrorist attacks against the United States planned from Afghanistan. Our objective was clear. The cause was just. Our NATO Allies and partners rallied beside us. And I supported that military action, along with overwhelming majority of the members of Congress. More than seven years later, in 2008, weeks before we swore the oath of office – President Obama and I were about to swear – President Obama asked me to travel to Afghanistan and report back on the state of the war in Afghanistan. I flew to Afghanistan, to the Kunar Valley – a rugged, mountainous region on the border with Pakistan. What I saw on that trip reinforced my conviction that only the Afghans have the right and responsibility to lead their country, and that more and endless American military force could not create or sustain a durable Afghan government.

I believed that our presence in Afghanistan should be focused on the reason we went in the first place: to ensure Afghanistan would not be used as a base from which to attack our homeland again. We did that. We accomplished that objective. I said, among – with others, we'd follow Osama bin Laden to the gates of hell if need be. That's exactly what we did, and we got him. It took us close to 10 years to put President Obama's commitment to – into form. And that's exactly what happened; Osama bin Laden was gone.

That was 10 years ago. Think about that. We delivered justice to bin Laden a decade ago, and we've stayed in Afghanistan for a decade since. Since then, our reasons for remaining in Afghanistan are becoming increasingly unclear, even as the terrorist threat that we went to fight evolved.

Over the past 20 years, the threat has become more dispersed, metastasizing around the globe: al-Shabaab in Somalia; al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula; al-Nusra in Syria; ISIS attempting to create a califit [caliphate] in Syria and Iraq, and establishing affiliates in multiple countries in Africa and Asia.

With the terror threat now in many places, keeping thousands of troops grounded and concentrated in just one country at a cost of billions each year makes little sense to me and to our leaders. We cannot continue the cycle of extending or expanding our military presence in Afghanistan, hoping to create ideal conditions for the withdrawal, and expecting a different result.

I'm now the fourth United States President to preside over American troop presence in Afghanistan: two Republicans, two Democrats. I will not pass this responsibility on to a

fifth. After consulting closely with our allies and partners, with our military leaders and intelligence personnel, with our diplomats and our development experts, with the Congress and the Vice President, as well as with Mr. Ghani and many others around the world, I have concluded that it's time to end America's longest war. It's time for American troops to come home.

When I came to office, I inherited a diplomatic agreement, duly negotiated between the government of the United States and the Taliban, that all U.S. forces would be out of Afghanistan by May 1, 2021, just three months after my inauguration. That's what we inherited – that commitment. It is perhaps not what I would have negotiated myself, but it was an agreement made by the United States

BY NC ND

government, and that means something. So, in keeping with that agreement and with our national interests, the United States will begin our final withdrawal – begin it on May 1 of this year.

We will not conduct a hasty rush to the exit. We'll do it – we'll do it responsibly, deliberately, and safely. And we will do it in full coordination with our allies and partners, who now have more forces in Afghanistan than we do. And the Taliban should know that if they attack us as we draw down, we will defend ourselves and our partners with all the tools at our disposal.

Our allies and partners have stood beside us shoulder-to-shoulder in Afghanistan for almost 20 years, and we're deeply grateful for the contributions they have made to our shared mission and for the sacrifices they have borne. The plan has long been "in together, out together." U.S. troops, as well as forces deployed by our NATO Allies and operational partners, will be out of Afghanistan before we mark the 20th anniversary of that heinous attack on September 11th.

But – but we'll not take our eye off the terrorist threat. We'll reorganize our counterterrorism capabilities and the substantial assets in the region to prevent reemergence of terrorists – of the threat to our homeland from over the horizon. We'll hold the Taliban accountable for its commitment not to allow any terrorists to threaten the United States or its allies from Afghan soil.

The Afghan government has made that commitment to us as well. And we'll focus our full attention on the threat we face today. At my direction, my team is refining our national strategy to monitor and disrupt significant terrorist threats not only in Afghanistan, but anywhere they may arise – and they're in Africa, Europe, the Middle East, and elsewhere.

I spoke yesterday with President Bush to inform him of my decision. While he and I have

had many disagreements over policies throughout the years, we're absolutely united in our respect and support for the valor, courage, and integrity of the women and men of the

United States Armed Forces who served. I'm immensely grateful for the bravery andbackbone that they have shown through nearly two decades of combat deployments. We as a nation are forever indebted to them and to their families.

You all know that less than 1 percent of Americans serve in our armed forces. The remaining 99 percent of them – we owe them. We owe them. They have never backed down from a single mission that we've asked of them. I've witnessed their bravery firsthand during my visits to Afghanistan. They've never wavered in their resolve. They've paid a tremendous price on our behalf. And they have the thanks of a grateful nation.

While we will not stay involved in Afghanistan militarily, our diplomatic and humanitarian work will continue. We'll continue to support the government of Afghanistan. We will keep providing assistance to the Afghan National Defenses and Security Forces. And along with our partners, we have trained and equipped a standing force of over 300,000 Afghan personnel today and hundreds of thousands over the past two decades. And they'll continue to fight valiantly, on behalf of the Afghans, at great cost.

They'll support peace talks, as we will support peace talks between the government of Afghanistan and the Taliban, facilitated by the United Nations. And we'll continue to support the rights of Afghan women and girls by maintaining significant humanitarian and development assistance.

And we'll ask other countries – other countries in the region – to do more to support Afghanistan, especially Pakistan, as well as Russia, China, India, and Turkey. They all have a significant stake in the stable future for Afghanistan. And over the next few months, we will also determine what a continued U.S. diplomatic presence in Afghanistan will look like, including how we'll ensure the security of our diplomats. Look, I know there are many who will loudly insist that diplomacy cannot succeed without a robust U.S. military presence to stand as leverage. We gave that argument a decade. It's never proved effective – not when we had 98,000 troops in Afghanistan, and not when we were down to a few thousand.

Our diplomacy does not hinge on having boots in harm's way – U.S. boots on the ground. We have to change that thinking. American troops shouldn't be used as a bargaining chip between warring parties in other countries. You know, that's nothing more than a récipe for keeping American troops in Afghanistan indefinitely.

I also know there are many who will argue that we should stay – stay fighting in Afghanistan because withdrawal would damage America's credibility and weaken America's influence in the world. I believe the exact opposite is true. We went to Afghanistan because of a horrific attack that happened 20 years ago. That cannot explain why we should remain there in 2021. Rather than return to war with the Taliban, we have to focus on the challenges that are in front of us. We have to track and disrupt terrorist networks and operations that spread far beyond Afghanistan since 9/11.

We have to shore up American competitiveness to meet the stiff competition we're facing from an increasingly assertive China. We have to strengthen our alliances and work with like-minded partners to ensure that the rules of international norms that govern cyber threats and emerging technologies that will shape our future are grounded in our democratic values – values – not those of the autocrats.

CC BY NC ND

We have to defeat this pandemic and strengthen the global health system to prepare for the next one, because there will be another pandemic. You know, we'll be much more formidable to our adversaries and competitors over the long term if we fight the battles for the next 20 years, not the last 20. And finally, the main argument for staying longer is what each of my three predecessors have grappled with: No one wants to say that we should be in Afghanistan forever, but they insist now is not the right moment to leave.

In 2014, NATO issued a declaration affirming that Afghan Security Forces would, from that point on, have full responsibility for their country's security by the end of that year. That was seven years ago. So when will it be the right moment to leave? One more year, two more years, ten more years? Ten, twenty, thirty billion dollars more above the trillion we've already spent? "Not now" – that's how we got here. And in this moment, there's a significant downside risk to staying beyond May 1st without a clear timetable for departure.

If we instead pursue the approach where America – U.S. exit is tied to conditions on the ground, we have to have clear answers to the following questions: Just what conditions require to – be required to allow us to depart? By what means and how long would it take to achieve them, if they could be achieved at all? And at what additional cost in lives and treasure?

I'm not hearing any good answers to these questions. And if you can't answer them, in my view, we should not stay. The fact is that, later today, I'm going to visit Arlington National Cemetery, Section 60, and that sacred memorial to American sacrifice. Section sisty [sic] – Section 60 is where our recent war dead are buried, including many of the women and men who died fighting in Afghanistan and Iraq. There's no – there's no comforting distance in history in Section 60. The grief is raw. It's a visceral reminder of the living cost of war.

For the past 12 years, ever since I became Vice President, I've carried with me a card that reminds me of the exact number of American troops killed in Iraq and Afghanistan. That exact number, not an approximation or rounded-off number – because every one of those dead are sacred human beings who left behind entire families.

An exact accounting of every single solitary one needs to be had. As of the day – today, there are two hundred and forty – 2,488 [2,448] U.S. troops and personnel who have died in Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Freedom's Sentinel – our Afghanistan conflicts. 20,722 have been wounded. I'm the first President in 40 years who knows what it means to have a child serving in a warzone. And throughout this process, my North Star has been remembering what it was like when my late son, Beau, was deployed to Iraq – how proud he was to serve his country; how insistent he was to deploy with his unit; and the impact it had on him and all of us athome. We already have service members doing their duty in Afghanistan today whose parents served in the same war. We have service members who were not yet born when our nation was attacked on 9/11. War in Afghanistan was never meant to be a multi-generational undertaking. We were attacked. We went to war with clear goals. We achieved those objectives. Bin Laden is dead, and al Qaeda is degraded in Iraq – in Afghanistan. And it's time to end the forever war.

Thank you all for listening. May God protect our troops. May God bless all those families who lost someone in this endeavor.

The White House. 2021. *Remarks by President Biden on the Way Forward in Afghanistan.* <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/speeches-remarks/2021/04/14/remarks-by-president-biden-on-the-way-forward-in-afghanistan> (acceso: 23/09/2022).

BY NC ND