

2020

Middle Eastern and Western Leaders Speeches on Counterterrorism

Ranya Eid
University of Central Florida

 Part of the [Political Science Commons](#), and the [Terrorism Studies Commons](#)
Find similar works at: <https://stars.library.ucf.edu/honorsthesis>
University of Central Florida Libraries <http://library.ucf.edu>

This Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the UCF Theses and Dissertations at STARS. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors Undergraduate Theses by an authorized administrator of STARS. For more information, please contact STARS@ucf.edu.

Recommended Citation

Eid, Ranya, "Middle Eastern and Western Leaders Speeches on Counterterrorism" (2020). *Honors Undergraduate Theses*. 701.
<https://stars.library.ucf.edu/honorsthesis/701>

MIDDLE EASTERN AND WESTERN LEADERS SPEECHES ON
COUNTERTERRORISM

by

RANYA EID

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Honors in the Major Program
in Political Science in the College of Sciences
and in The Burnett Honors College
at the University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida

Spring Term 2020

Thesis chair: Dr. Güneş Murat Tezcür

© 2020 Ranya Eid

ABSTRACT

This research analyzes political leaders' response to the ideological challenge presented by ISIS and Al Qaeda. It focuses on the counterterrorism speeches given by political leaders in a number of Middle Eastern countries and the United States. The analysis of the speeches is along two dimensions: the nature of their domestic and international audiences, and the motivations behind the speeches. A sample of several dozens of speeches is analyzed. The empirical study had proved that leaders mostly exhibit differences depending on their audiences to reach a certain political goal. While leaders tend to call for unification among countries in their international speeches, they promote and advocate for their political interests domestically.

DEDICATIONS

For my mother, who always taught me that education is a priority. Thank you always for all of your love, support, and encouragement.

For my husband, who never let me fail and pushed me to always do my best.

For my daughter, Milla, who motivates me to do the best to make her proud when she gets older.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My sincerest gratitude is extended to my thesis chair, Dr. Gunes Murat Tezcur, for his diligent assistance, guidance, and patience throughout this process. Your experienced input and continued directions helped spark my interest in Middle Eastern politics, which ultimately made this thesis possible. I would also like to thank my committee member, Dr. Bruce Farcau, I have greatly appreciated the opportunity to learn from you during your undergraduate courses and this thesis. Thank you for seeing my thesis to its completion when external factors made it difficult.

Thank you all for the help you have provided me, both academically and professionally. You both made me feel as my success was important to you, and for that I am grateful. To my entire support network at the University of Central Florida, thank you as your varied support has kept me inspired and passionate.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER ONE: LITERATURE REVIEW	3
The Rise of Al-Qaeda and ISIS and International Responses	3
A Comparison Between ISIS and Al Qaeda.....	3
The Origins and Ideology of ISIS and Al-Qaeda	4
The Main Goals and Tactics of ISIS and Al-Qaeda	7
Recruitments in ISIS versus Al Qaeda	10
Saudi's Responses to the Takfiri movements since the 1980s: A domestic terrorism challenge.....	13
CHAPTER TWO: EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS.....	16
Analyzing Middle Eastern versus Western Political Speeches on Terrorism	16
The Comparative Analysis of the Speeches	20
A. US leaders' speeches: President Obama and Trump	20
B. Egyptian speeches: President Sisi	22
C. Turkish Speeches: President Erdogan.....	25
D. Jordanian Speeches: King Abdullah II	27
E. Saudi Speeches.....	29
F. Comparative Analysis	33

CHAPTER THREE: CONCLUSION.....	39
REFERENCES	42
APPENDIX.....	43
Table A.1 Descriptions of the Speeches	44
Summaries of the Speeches	47

INTRODUCTION

The rise of the Al-Qaeda and ISIS presented a major challenge to international security. In addition to the military struggle, both Western and Muslim leaders responded to the ideological challenge presented by these violent organizations in various ways. They aim to denounce these organizations as terrorist cells lacking popular support and not representing Muslims. This thesis offers a preliminary analysis of a number of speeches by prominent state leaders in order to shed some light on the ways in which they encounter Al-Qaeda and ISIS. It focuses on the differences between Middle Eastern and Western leaders in their counterterrorism speeches along two dimensions: (1) the nature of their domestic and international audiences, (2) the motivations behind the speech. The empirical study involves a sampling of several dozen speeches by political leaders that were delivered in different contexts.

The thesis includes an introduction, Literature review chapter, empirical chapter, and a conclusion. The empirical chapter analyzes speeches and other visual material from Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Jordan, Turkey, and the United States. The thesis relies on primary sources such as visual speeches, which are the most efficient way to analyze a leader's political speech. The gathered visual speeches in both English, Arabic, and Turkish are either given by the ruler or leading politicians of a given country, and they are presented to a domestic audience or an international audience. The analysis focuses on how different leaders have developed various rhetorical and ideological strategies to face the challenge presented by Salafi-jihadist organizations. An initial finding is that leaders speak differently in front of domestic and

international audiences. Leaders tend to promote their own goals and advocate for self-interest in domestic speeches, while they promote the global interest in international speeches. The general findings argue for significant similarities and differences between these countries in approaching terrorism, both domestic and on the international level. Moreover, some speeches are a reaction to a terrorist attack, and some from an interview, or just a general counterterrorism speech.

CHAPTER ONE: LITERATURE REVIEW

The Rise of Al-Qaeda and ISIS and International Responses

A Comparison Between ISIS and Al Qaeda

Terrorism is the intentional threat or use of force and violence by a non-state actor to evoke fear in the population to change behavior or affect a political outcome (Chenoweth p. 31). Many scholarly articles and books discuss terrorism, and the way each of the scholars analyze terror differs from state to state. This review is a comparative review that compares and contrasts the origins, ideologies, goals, and recruitment between ISIS and Al-Qaeda. The general findings of this literature review are that ISIS and Al Qaeda have many similarities, especially in terms of their origins and political ideologies. Regarding the former, both organizations emerged from civil war and foreign occupation of Muslim lands. Regarding the latter, both of them use religion to explain and justify their violent acts. Yet that doesn't make them the same. ISIS and Al Qaeda differ in the recruitments since ISIS uses more versatile ways of recruitment like social media, and Al Qaeda relies more on basic recruitment methods. Additionally, they differ in the tactics they use because ISIS established a state while Al Qaeda did not.

Each state differs in the way it defines terrorism and the methods used to fight it. For instance, Saudi Arabia defines terrorism by sweeping language like “insult the reputation of the state or its position” to allow for suppression of nonviolent dissent. On the other hand, U.S. Depts. of State

and Defense defines terrorism by using language more exclusive to the premeditated and political nature of terrorism. Professor Gilles Kepel attempted to trace the recent History of militants Islamist' movements across the world and to explain the rise of Islamic militancy as a modern political and sociological phenomenon. He concluded that the cataclysm of September 11, 2001, can only be described as the ultimate perversion of jihad.

The Origins and Ideology of ISIS and Al-Qaeda

The origins of the terrorist groups like ISIS and Al-Qaeda might look very similar since they are both Muslim radicals, and both emerged from civil wars and foreign occupation of Muslim Lands. Yet they differ significantly. According to Daniel Byman, Al-Qaeda's origins grew out of the anti-Soviet struggle in Afghanistan in the 1980s, but the broader jihadist movement was around well before that. "The Soviet occupation of, and eventual defeat in, Afghanistan shaped the ideology, strategy, and organization of Osama bin Laden's group, and it remains an important touchpoint for the entire jihadist movement today" (Byman, p.253). Moreover, Osama Bin Laden, the founding leader of Al-Qaeda, flew to Afghanistan to help fight with the Muslim afghans against the Soviet Union. However, when Osama bin Laden and his group of mujahedeen won the war, and the Soviet Union withdrew their troops, the jihadists wanted to expand their struggle.

Furthermore, the idea of how the anti-Soviet struggle has created a legend that became a fundamental pillar of Al Qaeda's global appeal, which is the idea that a small group of committed fighters, strengthened by their faith in God, could stand up to a superpower and change the world. This idea made not only Al Qaeda get more committed and excited to get involved in more wars, but it also recruited more Muslims at the time. Muslims thought that "holy wars" as they described should continue.

In comparison, ISIS grew out of the unstable political chaos in the Middle Eastern world. "ISIS is a product of an organic crisis in Arab politics" (Gerges, p. 290). In his book *ISIS: A History*, Gerges made a very valid argument that the success of ISIS in the region was due to the instability in the region created after the invasion of Iraq, and the chaos in Syria as well. Also, he added that the reason for the political turmoil in the Middle East was because the leaders of the Arab world could not satisfy their citizens, and they did not represent their interests. ISIS is a jihadists movement based on the caliphate model. This Caliphate model is set up by Adnani's, Baghdadi, and their associates. A crucial point about ISIS, which is that ISIS is renewable. For example, even if the caliphate in Iraq and Syria collapses the military, ISIS will return to its initial conditions by assigning a new caliphate and restore the organization again. According to Graeme Wood of the Atlantic Magazine, "The Islamic State is no mere collection of psychopaths. It is a religious group with carefully considered beliefs. Among these beliefs is a key agent of the coming apocalypse,".

Both ISIS and Al Qaeda are very similar in their use of the ideological approach to explain and justify their actions under the name of religion. ISIS has a magazine which is called Dabiq.

Together, all 15 editions of Dabiq contain an overall total of more than 2000 references of the Qur'an drawn from 76 of its 114 chapters. In the magazine, they focused on the Medinan part of the Quran since they refer to it as all Islamic. This illustrates their view of the importance of manipulating the scripture to whatever they want. Dabiq's writers' approach to the Quran, their concentration on a small selection of classical scholars, and their willingness to condemn virtually every living religious authority reveal, it has been argued, a prosaic anti-intellectualism intimately intertwined with the practical expediencies of state-building. While not to be particularly unexpected (after all, we might predict that Ad-Dawlah would choose the scriptures and commentaries that best suit its interests). There is a significant difference between the founding leader of al Qaeda Osama bin Laden and the leader of ISIS Abu Musab al Zarqawi. Bin Laden grew up at least in the upper-middle class and had a university education. In contrast, Zarqawi came from a poorer and less educated background. Zarqawi had a criminal past and extreme views on takfir, which means accusing another Muslim of heresy and thereby justifying his killing. The extreme views of Zarqawi on takfir created significant friction and distrust with bin Laden when both leaders first met in Afghanistan in 1999. (Zelin, p.1) Zarqawi felt that the umma (global Islamic community) needed to be saved, and the only way to do that is through purging it. Whereas bin Laden's number two, Ayman Al Zawahiri, believed that the problem is not about Muslims, but the 'apostate' institutions that needed to be changed. Zawahiri urged Zarqawi not to forget "that we are in a battle, and that more than half of this battle is taking place in the battlefield of the media." (Zelin, P.3)

The indiscriminate versus strategic use of violence and takfir, most importantly targeting the group's Sunni base, became an important issue taken up by Al-Qaeda in the following years. The

leading proponent of limiting takfir and knowing when to use it properly. It was even confirmed in the private communications between Al-Qaeda leaders and affiliated jihadists in other groups, that Al-Qaeda was worried about the excessive use of violence by the Tehrik-e-Taliban Pakistan. Later, because of the significant differences in takfir and the use of violence on Muslims, Al-Qaeda stated that the group is not related to ISIS in any kind, and not responsible for its actions. ISIS and Al-Qaeda's perception of Saudi Arabia differs too. Al-Qaeda in its origins didn't view Saudi Arabia as an enemy, however, after the pressure that was put on the terrorist group, and especially when Saudi Arabia allowed the American army to defend its borders in the time of the Iraq invasion to Kuwait Al-Qaeda changed its perception to Saudi Arabia completely. Moreover, Al-Qaeda considered Saudi Arabia not only an enemy but more of an apostate institution. In contrast, ISIS has always viewed Saudi Arabia as an apostate institution and an enemy. Both terrorist groups think of the Al-Saud royal family as a very important enemy to defeat since Saudi Arabia controls the holy mosques of Muslims.

The Main Goals and Tactics of ISIS and Al-Qaeda

The goals of ISIS and Al-Qaeda differ in many ways. Al-Qaeda's initial goal was that they want to free all the Muslim lands that are being occupied. Yet, eventually, their main goal shifted to destroying the United States of America and killing Americans. However, ISIS's main goal is to establish a caliphate state. Audrey Kurth Cronin argues that ISIS's main message is power and revenge, not legitimacy. According to Cronin, ISIS's origins and goals differ completely from

Al-Qaeda, and they operate differently. Moreover, one of ISIS's most important goals is to control more territory and to make a stable income. In contrast, Al-Qaeda does not seek territory but more for a temporary safe haven and does not have a stable income. Al-Qaeda's main income was from Bin Laden himself since he was very wealthy, and donors. In his article "What ISIS Really Wants," Graeme Wood described ISIS goals as if they were very similar to Al-Qaeda by saying, "they refer to Osama bin Laden with "sheik Osama "which is a name of honor."

However, they refer to Bin Laden like that because he was not only a Muslim extremist but also his main enemy was the US, which is an in common enemy between both terrorist groups. Also, he killed a lot of innocent people, which they find heroic since their counterargument is that the U.S killed a lot of innocent people in Iraq and Afghanistan. ISIS might have some similarities with Al-Qaeda since both are extremist terrorists, but that does not necessarily make their goals the same. Wood argues that the fact of the territory is the only different factor, which is also wrong because Al-Qaeda is a terrorist group that we can describe as a religious group since each member of the group is an extremist Muslim. Osama Bin Laden called on Muslims many times to kill Americans anywhere they find them and killing non-Muslims if they refuse to convert to Islam. The terrorist attack of 9/11 was an outcome of this strategy.

Furthermore, ISIS would kill anyone who is not with them, so if a foreign fighter who is not a Muslim before arrival wanted to join ISIS, they would welcome him, and then he can convert upon arrival. In the beginning, when Bin Laden flew to Afghanistan, he did not focus on Saudi Arabia nor the United States as the main enemy. However, his anger towards both of these countries grew over time. The picture of Al Saud darkened in bin Laden's eyes after the pressure

was put on him. Especially when Saudi Arabia invited the US troops to come and defend her borders in the period of Iraq invasion to Kuwait in 1990-1. The shifts in his life made him focus on the US eventually. Al Qaeda's initial goals were to "promote jihad awareness" and "prepare and equip" jihadist cadres, coordinating them to create a unified international Jihad movement. ISIS has more goals than just establishing a caliphate state.

One of the ISIS campaigns is an anti-Shia campaign. Professor Fawaz Gerges suggests that ISIS is claimed to be the most ambitious and revolutionary than any other Jihadist terrorist group. Gerges mentioned that Adnani (one of ISIS leaders) words mostly mean carrying out terrorist operations and biding its time. (Gerges, p.12) Furthermore, Gerges described the fact that Al-Qaeda is trying to position itself into an Islamic State in Iraq and Syria as a complicating factor. For the tactics, Al-Qaeda's main tactics were to work in cells located in different countries. This tactic strategy made them move easier and kept them safe for a short period. In contrast, ISIS main tactic and achievement is having a state and spreading members and foreign fighters to get more people to come to live in their state, which they call the Islamic state. The idea of establishing a state and building a new society is something Al-Qaeda never achieved.

Recruitments in ISIS versus Al Qaeda

Both ISIS and Al-Qaeda use the same approach in recruiting fighters, which is the ideological and psychological approach. The ideological approach is using the name of religion to manipulate people's minds and convince them that joining their group and fighting for them is the only way that a Muslim can defend his religion. They always talk about Muslim victimhood and how Muslim lands are occupied and argue that they are the best defenders of Muslim people, so this is another strong reason that would make Muslims join them. Moreover, they use the psychological approach by manipulating their emotions like anger and rage about the occupied Muslim lands and suffering among Muslims. "ISIS calls on Muslim Sunni youth to join them to obtain what is so-called the lost caliphate." Said Gerges.

Al-Qaeda's technique in recruiting fighters or what they call mujahedeen is by interpreting Quran to translate it into what they call God is calling on all Muslims to join the holy wars and fight to free all Muslim lands. For Example, Osama Bin Laden's 1998 Fatwa Against the West. He aimed to mobilize Muslims when he said "In compliance with Allah's order, we issue the following fatwa to all Muslims: The ruling to kill the Americans and their allies – civilian and military – is an individual duty for every Muslim who can do it in any country which it is possible to do it" then he added these words from Quran to support his fatwa "Almighty Allah also says: 'O ye who believe...Do you prefer the life of this world to the hereafter?' "(Surah Al Tawbah 9.38). Byman mentioned in his book *Al Qaeda, The Islamic State, and The Global Jihadist Movement* how Saudi Arabia and the United States supported the Afghan struggle

financially. Yet, their funds are not directed to the flow of foreign fighters. The foreign fighters collected funds from private donors and non-governmental Islamic groups. Most Saudi Arabia did subsidize plane tickets to Pakistan, but this assisted relief workers as much as foreign fighters. Byman also mentioned that he agrees with the scholar Thomas Hegghammer when argued, "Arab Gulf states and Western governments acquiesced to foreign fighter recruitment, but they did not organize it or pay for it." (Byman, p.2). To be a member of Al-Qaeda's terrorist group, a member had to be a Muslim extremist, and had like they describe it the capability to leave all the tempting things in this life; for example, women and money and sacrifice their lives in fighting for religion.

On the other hand, ISIS will recruit anyone who would be able to fight for them even if they were not Muslims nor religious. This tactic of recruitment in ISIS led to many psychopaths and adventure seekers joining the group eventually who are just seeking to kill. "The reality is that the Islamic State is Islamic, very Islamic. Yes, it has attracted psychopaths and adventure seekers, drawn largely from the disaffected populations of the Middle East and Europe," writes Wood. At the same time, both Al-Qaeda and ISIS recruit foreign fighters. Thomas Hegghammer focused on the idea that foreign fighters are the key to understand transitional Islamist militancy. Hegghammer talks on how there were Muslim foreign combatants in the Arab- Israeli war in 1948 yet were mostly paid members of the Arab League-sponsored Army of Salvation (Jayesh Al-Inqadh) and thus not private volunteers of the kind that proliferated later. Hegghammer suggests that the foreign fighters are a discrete actor category distinct from insurgents and terrorists and analyze the data set of foreign fighters based on the mobilization. Foreign fighters

add to the terrorist groups because they make mobilization easier. Because they have much more knowledge about the country they came from, so they can add to the terrorist group much expertise. The focus of foreign fighters is about movement formation more than the mechanism.

In conclusion, the tactics that were used to fight Al-Qaeda will not work again in the war with ISIS. The reason that the same tactics will not work with ISIS is because they established their state for a while. In contrast, Al-Qaeda does not have territory, army, nor stable income, which made them very vulnerable. Unlike Al-Qaeda, simply killing ISIS leaders would not cripple the organization. According to Cronin, the pursuit of a full-fledged military campaign with ISIS would exhaust US resources, so it is not an effective way. However, the full-fledged war campaign will not be an effective tactic for any country to adapt against ISIS, not only the US. However, the most effective way would be combining a limited military campaign with significant diplomatic and economic effort. This tactic will weaken ISIS and align the interests of the many countries that are threatened by the group. Also, for the countries that are sponsoring ISIS by purchasing the oil, ISIS sells on the black market, so they stop having a stable economy. “The end of ISIS, however, is a more complex task that requires political and social strategies that deny the group the oxygen that sustains it.” (Gerges p. 289). Overall, although ISIS and Al-Qaeda claim that their main enemy are non-believers or non-Muslims, yet Muslim majority countries are the one most attacked by these terrorist groups. ISIS and Al-Qaeda have a lot of similarities, yet they are significantly different. All the international community rejects terrorism in all its forms. However, indirect and direct support of terrorism occurred in many countries, which made terrorism more dangerous than ever.

Saudi's Responses to the Takfiri movements since the 1980s: A domestic terrorism challenge

Takfiri is the term used when referring to a Muslim who accuses another Muslim of abandoning Islam. The term is derived from the word *kafir*, meaning unbeliever. The takfiri movements that appeared after the Afghan resistance against the Soviet invasion presented a unique challenge to Saudi Arabia that rules over two holiest sites in Islam, Mecca and Medina. Among other things, these movements were critical of Saudi Monarchy's continued association with the West, and the United States. In response to this challenge, the Saudi regime has developed various strategies since the 1980s. The Takfiri movements sprung in Saudi Arabia because of the increased association of the kingdom with the West, especially after Saddam Hussein's invasion of Kuwait and his threat to the Saudi monarchy. Al-Qaeda and its founder Bin Laden were critical of the Saudi invitation of Western soldiers to help protect the country from Saddam and liberate Kuwait. For Al-Qaeda, violence was rationalized primarily as a struggle to defend their oil-rich country from non-Muslim aggression. Some of the religious citations that they referred to included Sura 48:29, which states that "*followers of Muhammad are merciful to one another but harsh towards unbelievers.*" As a result, the movement called for Muslim unity with the main goal being to face out non-Muslim soldiers who, according to them, were making the kingdom impure.

Under the leadership of Osama Bin Laden, Al-Qaeda argued that no infidel force should occupy Muslim land regardless of what the local leadership would say to justify their actions. In other words, it meant that there should be no exception even for Saudi Arabia, which allowed a

military presence in their country in response to Saddam's invasion of Kuwait (Hegghammer, p.103). Bin Laden argued that this policy amounted to an occupation of the heartland of Islam. The Saudi administration knew the seriousness of the matter and put in place different measures to respond to the rise of Takfiri movements. For example, some Saudi clerics argued that an exception to the doctrine was justified if the benefits to Muslims outweighed the harm. In this case, the continued presence of non-Muslims in the region meant increased oil exploration and more income to the kingdom. Additionally, considering the relationship between Saudi Arabia and Iraq, the presence of the American military in the region provided additional security to the citizens, thus legitimizing the presence of such troops as a defense against Saddam Hussein, Iraq's leader (Maher, p. 292).

Additionally, being governed by the Holy Quran as the country's constitution, Saudi rulers and clerics argued that they still protect the sanctity of holy lands and minimize the influence of non-Muslims on the country. For example, Non-Muslims are not allowed to visit Medina and Mecca because it is a place for Muslim worship. Nonetheless, Saudi Arabia saw various violent attacks by takfiri movements and developed counterterrorism policies during the 1990s.

In conclusion, Saudi Arabia is unique among the Muslim states. The kingdom is governed by the Sharia law, which is based on the Quran. Its rich oil deposit made it a good destination for western world powers. However, the kingdom's engagement with the West has not been well received by Al Qaeda and other takfiri movements, and this resulted in the rise of violent attacks within Saudi Arabia. The takfiri groups' thought leads them to declare society as a whole an infidel society. To counter being branded a kafir administration, the administration put in place

different measures such as arguing that the presence of western companies and military powers was to their advantage, and not against the religion in any way. Additionally, the kingdom practices religion apartheid to minimize the influence of non-Islam ideologies on Muslim places of worship. Finally, it developed various counterterrorism policies, including repression and more accommodative practices aiming to rehabilitate members of the takfiri movements. Given this historical background, the rise of ISIS after 2013 presented a serious but not unprecedented challenge to Saudi Arabia.

In the following section, I will discuss the differences between the Arab and Western political leaders in the way they approach the question of terrorism. ISIS and Al Qaeda originate from an Arabic background, which makes it interesting how the Arab leaders differ in the way they define terrorism and whether it is similar to the Western world. Additionally, how the counterterrorism speeches shape a giving country's view on terrorism and what is the real intentions behind them. This section will also state general findings from political speeches made by both Arab and western leaders domestically and internationally.

CHAPTER TWO: EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS

Analyzing Middle Eastern versus Western Political Speeches on Terrorism

After terrorism has spread around the globe, one of the political leaders leading methods in counterterrorism is to give a persuasive political speech. Political speech is the expression that comments on government action rather than the private conduct of an individual. It aims at convincing the listeners by arguments to persuade them on an emotional level or even manipulate them. Often there is a mixture of these. This counterterrorism method is very significant because it tends to have a powerful impact on public opinion, domestic, and international world. The political speeches help to achieve either political, ethical, or both goals. For the political goals, it underscores the advantages of the giving speech, including identifying what countries are the allies, and enabling countries to understand terrorism better, among other different opportunities. Ethically, however, the counterterrorism speeches raise serious questions about the morality/honesty of politicians. To handle both the political opportunities and ethical dilemmas posed by the counterterrorism speeches, politicians need to develop a clear set of principles for how to analyze political speeches based on the country and to educate the public about them.

Political speeches are a hazardous tool to control public opinion, or sometimes manipulate other institutions into believing the wrong facts. Among political leaders, counterterrorism speeches tend to be similar in content, yet different in their meanings. The sample of the analyzed counterterrorism speeches was chosen on a limitation based on these reasons. First, the speeches

were mainly chosen based on the nature of their domestic and international audiences. Second, all chosen speeches were given after the year 2001 because this year was a turning point in realizing the threat of terrorism. Third, the speeches were chosen based on their forum, so all the speeches were given in a public forum. Lastly, all the speeches had to be videotaped, not audio, nor typed. Moreover, after analyzing the political speeches of Arab and Western leaders, it was concluded that speeches could be very dangerous because it may have ambiguous motives or even indirect support for terrorism.

Arab and Western politics are significantly different, and countries differ in the way it defines terrorism and how to deal with it. Moreover, political speeches, especially the ones related to terrorism, are very critical because leaders may use it to pursue a personal goal such as reaching a new political, economic, or social status. After analyzing many speeches, the findings were that a leader's counterterrorism speeches might differ, depending on the specific audience whose listening. Furthermore, the language of the speech can be a factor to differentiate if the speech is supposed to be for the domestic or international audience.

The study of political speeches received profound academic attention throughout the centuries, and many linguistic, rhetorical, semiotic, and psychological methodologies have been developed to approach its various aspects. However, there is a gap in analyzing whether leader speech differs domestically and internationally. Moreover, if the actions of the speaking institution aligned with the speeches they give. The empirical focus of this thesis is on five of the Western and Arab leaders' political speeches on terrorism, specifically about ISIS. Moreover, what goals

the speech is trying to achieve, the methodology used, and whether the actions of the country
aliens

The first case is the leaders of Saudi Arabia since it is the leading country in the sense of religion in the Islamic world. The kingdom has always been a vital country in the counterterrorism world. Because of the efforts the country does in fighting terrorism, and it has a strong knowledge of the ideologies that these terrorist groups use since many Saudis joined ISIS, and that is a serious concern for the Saudi government. Moreover, analyzing Saudi Arabia's political speeches revealed that they have a very straight forward language and condemns with the most potent words terrorism in all its forms. However, their political speeches on terrorism have a tendency towards defensiveness. The other country the thesis focuses on is Egypt. When it comes to Egypt, the speeches on terrorism tends to have a different tone between the International and domestic audience. The president of Egypt, Abdelfattah Al Sisi, address terrorism as if it was all caused by Egyptian when they made the revolution against the previous president of Egypt. Moreover, he mentions that terrorism was created in Egypt right after the revolution happened because the economy and government were weak. While domestically Al Sisi seeks to frighten his citizens from expressing their political opinion, he speaks on terrorism with different terms saying that all countries should come together to fight this threat and never mentioning that it is caused by the Egyptian revolution when speaking to an international audience.

The third country to analyze is Jordan. Abdullah II (king of Jordan), has two ways in his political speeches related to terrorism. The first is being very critiqued of the efforts that have been made to fight terrorism, and the other way is being neutral. In the critique way, he critiques the idea

that terrorist groups are called Muslims when they do not represent Islam. The neutral way is when he mentions that Muslims have to decide which part of the war they are with. Moreover, this way is implying that other Muslim countries are funding terrorism. The fourth country is Turkey. Recep Tayyip Erdogan's political speeches significantly differ when he addresses terrorism, domestically, and internationally. When he gives a political speech to a domestic audience, he accuses the media of indirect support for terrorism and stresses that turkey doesn't seek to interfere in other country's relations. However, when Erdogan gives a speech to an international audience, he tends to be very critical of his political rivals in the region like Saudi Arabia and its allies.

The fifth country would be the United States of America. The U.S has always been one of the essential superpower countries in the counterterrorism field. The political speeches on terrorism in the U.S differs on the leader. For Barack Obama, domestically, he uses a lot of emotional words to describe the damages that have been done by terrorism and mention that Americans needs to understand that terrorism does not represent Islam. However, he expresses that the U.S needs to make Muslims their allies rather than pushing them away, which implies in a way that he might like to keep them close because he thinks they might be involved. On the other hand, Donald Trump's political speeches on terrorism domestically tend to be all about blaming the previous administration for terrorism. Trump also tends to have a tone that implies that Muslims need to put more effort into counterterrorism. Also, he expresses that the United States is not responsible for counterterrorism, but the Middle Eastern countries are.

The Comparative Analysis of the Speeches

A. US leaders' speeches: President Obama and Trump

There are several similarities and differences between Donald Trump and Barack Obama's speeches on counterterrorism. For the similarities, both leaders speak about terrorist attacks that happened in the West in front of both domestic and international audiences. Second, both leaders tend to speak about the United States efforts in counterterrorism when they talk to an international audience. Third, both leaders promote their political agenda, advocate and pursue their own domestic goals through counterterrorism speeches. Obama put pressure on Congress to accept his policies by calling the congress out in his counterterrorism speeches; Trump accuses Obama's administration for the rise of terrorism in his counterterrorism speeches in order to get elected. They blame their domestic rivals, the US Congress in Obama's case, and the Obama administration in Trump's case, for not preventing terror attacks. Moreover, both leaders tend to have different content of the speech depending on the audience. In the domestic audience level, both leaders tend to promote their administrations' political goals. For example, in order to get the public opinion on board with his administration policies, Obama advocated for gun control by addressing that Congress must do something in order to strict gun ownerships when he spoke to the Americans after a terrorist attack. Donald Trump advocated himself as a candidate for the presidency by blaming Obama and Hillary Clinton, which in his case the democratic party for the rise of terrorism in his anti-terrorism speech in Ohio Campaign. Additionally, he stressed that before Obama's administration, the Middle East did not have wars nor terrorism and goes on by

promising that by becoming president, his main focus will be revitalizing the United States. “if I become president, the era of nation-building will be brought to a very swift and decisive end.” Although Barack Obama and Donald Trump have these similarities in their counterterrorism speeches, they differ in the consistency of the speeches’ content between domestic and international audiences. Furthermore, when Obama addresses terrorism on both international and domestic levels, he makes sure to clarify that terrorists do not represent Islam, and Muslims are not terrorists “ISIS does not speak for Islam, they are thugs and killers’ part of a cult of death” Additionally, Obama has a consistent theme regardless of whether he speaks in front of a domestic or an international audience. He emphasizes that Muslims should be treated as essential allies in counterterrorism rather than blaming Islam for terror attacks. In sharp contrast, Trump addresses terrorism in his speeches significantly differently depends on whether he is speaking to a domestic or an international audience. When Trump speaks to a domestic audience, he tends to associate Islam as a religion with terrorism: “we cannot let this evil continue (referring to ISIS), nor we cannot let the radical ideology of hateful Islam, its oppression of women, gays, children, and non-believers be allowed to reside or spread within our countries” Additionally, he gives an example of the terrorist attacks that happened only in the western world by saying the exact number of Christians or Americans killed and injured “This July in the south of France, an Islamic terrorist turns his truck into an instrument of mass murder plowing down, and killing 85 men, women, and children and wounding 308 people, among the dead were 2 Americans, a Texas father and his 11-year-old son”. While Donald Trump stresses the idea of the west being attacked by terrorists when he approaches a domestic audience, he speaks about terrorist attacks significantly different when he approaches an international audience. Trump, in international

summits, stresses the idea that victims are children of God despite their ethnicity and faith.

Additionally, he says that Muslims are the most affected by terrorism since in sheer numbers, the deadliest attacks were on Arab and Muslims, with 95% of the victims are Muslims and Middle Eastern nations.

In conclusion, both American leaders tend to pursue their own political goals, whether it was promoting political policies, blaming an opposition entity, or advocating for a political candidate when they approach a domestic audience. Furthermore, they tend to change their speeches globally to focus on speaking about global peace and international common interests. Barack Obama and Donald Trump differ significantly in the way they speak about terrorism. Obama tends to define Islam as a peaceful religion in both international and domestic speeches. Moreover, Obama put pressure on Congress to pass laws about gun control and blames the Congress of failing to act against terrorism. In contrast, Trump tends to define Islam as a radical religion with a hateful ideology when speaking to a domestic audience, while he defines it as a great and peaceful religion when he is speaking to an international audience. Additionally, he blames Obama's administration for the rise of terrorism during his campaigning before the 2016 presidential elections.

B. Egyptian speeches: President Sisi

The Egyptian president Abdelfattah Al Sisi counterterrorism speeches are characterized by vast differences depending on his targeted audience, domestic or international. Furthermore, Al Sisi tends to portray himself as the savior of the nation when speaking to a domestic audience by

using counterterrorism speeches as a tool to promote himself as a president. When speaking to a domestic audience, Al Sisi's identifies political upheaval and instability as the main cause of terrorism. The main goal of Al Sisi domestic speeches is to convince Egyptian people that if the country is stable, there would be less terrorism. However, he is stressing that in order to get the country stable is reachable only by keeping him as president and not pursuing revolutionary activities.

Moreover, he characterizes the Egyptian revolution (Thawra) against President Hosni Mubarak in 2011 for leading to terrorism in Egypt: "terrorism reached Syria when? In 2011-2014, and when did it come to Egypt? After 2011 because the immunity of Egypt was overcome. It is right that it was a people's movement, but terrorism was its result."

Al Sisi talks in his domestic audience speeches about how Egypt was saved from the danger of terrorism because he became president. Additionally, he implies that he is the savior of the Egyptian nation after the revolution. Al Sisi, on January 18, 2019, specifically said in his domestic speech at the Tale of Land conference in Egypt that "Egyptians helped saving the country from terrorism because they authorized me when everyone thought Egypt would not survive. Domestically, Al Sisi advocates that in order to achieve political stability, Egyptians must not make any new revolution implying that if citizens were to make any revolution against him as a president, they would lose Egypt to terrorism forever.

While Abdelfattah Al Sisi promotes himself as a president by drawing a heroic picture of himself as the savior of the nation, he has very different rhetoric when he talks to an international audience. Moreover, he promotes Egyptian efforts in counterterrorism and talks about how

democratic Egypt is. Abdelfattah Al Sisi stresses that Egyptians are smart, and they have the right to say enough is enough whenever they want to remove any leader from office.

Additionally, he tells the international audience that he supports Egyptians even if they choose that they do not want him as a president, which is completely different from what he advocates in his domestic speeches. When speaking to an international audience, Abdelfattah Al Sisi stresses the idea that Egyptians have all their democratic rights, including the right of free speech, and the right to protest. Besides, if the Egyptians want to remove him as a president, as they did before, it is their democratic right to choose whomever they want for the presidency: “people have a right to express their opinion and demonstrate, they have the right to decide whether I stay in power.” Internationally, Abdelfattah Al Sisi says that the five years of revolution (Thawra) destabilized the country. However, that does not mean he will put stability by forcing and suppressing the Egyptian people. When a British TV anchor challenged Al Sisi and questioned him about the reason for the arrest of Egyptians who wear a revolutionary scarf despite Al Sisi’s claims that Egyptians have the freedom of speech, he tried to justify this practice by referring to the exceptional circumstances of the country [post-2011 period] which is the sensitive time of forming the government after the revolution. Abdelfattah Al Sisi advocates internationally for the need for unification to counterterrorism efficiently.

In conclusion, Abdelfattah Al Sisi's speeches exhibit significant changes depending on whether he is speaking to a domestic or international audience. While Al Sisi uses counterterrorism speeches as a tool to pursue his own political goals and self-interest domestically, he tends to promote the country’s efforts in counterterrorism and democracy globally. Al Sisi’s main

counterterrorism message domestically is political stability from revolutions. Moreover, Al Sisi advocates for not making any other revolution in order to keep the country safe and secure from terrorism. In sharp contrast, he speaks about revolutions as a part of democracy and promotes that Egypt respects the people's choices in politics even if it was revolutions.

C. Turkish Speeches: President Erdogan

Recep Erdogan has similarities and differences between his speeches, depending on whether he is speaking domestically and internationally. The leading tone of his domestic speeches is defensive. Erdogan accused the media of manipulation and indirect support of terrorism. He claimed that the media does not show the government efforts and gives the impression that the government is vulnerable and gave up to terrorism: "whoever accuses turkey of giving up to the terrorist organizations is an evil that must be involved in terrorism himself." Erdogan gives the message to the Turkish people to know that his government is working hard on fighting terrorism and portrays the war against terrorism as the independence war.

"The Turkish government is doing its best in counterterrorism, and its fighting even beyond the borders to ensure the safety and security of this land and people." Domestically, Erdogan stresses that his government does not aim to occupy other countries or to interfere in their affairs and argues that whoever makes such claims is lying.

While Erdogan's domestic speeches tend to have a defensive tone, his international speeches have an attacking tone. He is highly critical of the foreign policies of Saudi Arabia and its allies in the region. First, when Erdogan speaks to a domestic audience, he stresses that Turkey does

not have any intention of interfering in other country's issues, nor occupying foreign lands. However, when he speaks to an international audience, his tone is aggressive towards the policies of Middle Eastern countries he perceives to be Turkey's rivals. Moreover, Erdogan stressed that by resolving the issues of other countries in the region, the region will live in justice and will no longer blame Iran as a terrorism supporter. An example of his criticism of foreign policies of other regional countries would be when he talked in the United Nations assembly in New York, he spoke about the Saudi Arabia and Qatar conflict, then the Saudi interference in Yemen, describing the interference as being responsible for a severe humanitarian and economic crisis. Afterward, he goes on by talking about the murder of the journalist Jamal Khashoggi, and he accuses the Saudi justice system of not arriving to a fair decision and stresses that the Turkish government will follow this issue closely. Erdogan goes further when he criticizes Egypt. He laments the death of the former Egyptian president in prison and accuses the regime of not allowing his family to bury him. Second, while Erdogan describes ISIS and Jabhat al-Tahrir al Yasari (previously known as Al-Nusra front affiliated with Al-Qaeda) as the primary actors of violence and terrorism, he does not refer to Kurdish militant organizations by name in his domestic speech. In comparison, when speaking to an international audience, he labels Kurdish organizations as terrorists like ISIS and claims that Turkish occupation of parts of northern Syria resulted in safe areas for refugees: "Not one of the refugees went back to the places controlled by terrorists like PKK, YPG, and ISIS, but they return to the places that are secured by Turkey in Syria." Internationally, Erdogan says that PKK/YPG needs to be destroyed first in order to end ISIS. "The PKK, the YPG terrorist organization, must be destroyed in East Euphrates, and if we did not talk about it so we will not find a solution for Syria." In this regard, he directly links the

Turkish fight against PKK, YPG, to the global fight against ISIS and argues the former is as important as the latter.

In conclusion, Recep Erdogan keeps consistency in showing the Turkish efforts in counterterrorism to both domestic and international audiences. However, he tends to have several differences depending on his audience. While Erdogan argues that Turkey does not seek to interfere in other countries' issues in his domestic speech, he is highly critical of foreign policies of Turkey's regional rivals when he speaks to an international audience. Moreover, domestically Erdogan describes ISIS and Jabhat al-Tahrir al Yasari as the primary actors of violence and terrorism; he internationally describes PKK, YPG Kurdish organizations as terrorist groups that must be destroyed in order to end ISIS.

D. Jordanian Speeches: King Abdullah II

King Abdullah II counterterrorism speeches do not exhibit major differences, whether he is speaking to a domestic or an international audience. Moreover, when he talks to an international and domestic audience, he tends to stress the necessity of separating Islam from terrorists who claim to be Muslims. Abdullah II refuses the connection between ISIS and Islam because he says that Islam is not the violent religion which terrorists claim it is. "it is shocking and horrendous that ISIS is speaking in the name of Islam."

Abdullah II tends to promote the Jordanian government's efforts in counterterrorism by talking about the success in keeping Jordan's borders safe, whether he is speaking to an international or a

domestic audience. Additionally, he emphasizes how the safety of the borders did not allow ISIS to get into Jordan. Domestically, King Abdullah II tends to speak about terrorism danger. Moreover, he stresses that Jordanians need to unify and stand together to fight this extremist ideology, which seeks to ruin the country's future. Moreover, he calls for unification against terrorism among Jordanians from different religions and ethnicity: "You need to defend your country either if you were Christians or Muslims from extremism and violence, which is against our religion and values."

Although King Abdullah II tends to be consistent in his speeches when speaking about the need for unification and the real Islamic image, he only tends to address the challenges of terrorism when speaking to an international audience. Moreover, he always speaks specifically about refugees, which is a significant issue in his country when speaking to an international audience. He specifically mentions how the Jordanian government is overwhelmed by the Syrian refugees, who made 20% of Jordan's population and resulted in a shortage of resources and greater economic difficulties. Abdullah II tends to blame the international community for not reacting to terrorism as fast as they should have done. Moreover, he implies that countries need to decide whether they want to be good and fight terrorism or be evil and fund it. "Countries must unify despite their religions, differences, and make their minds in this good against the evil fight." Furthermore, he says ISIS could have been prevented if the international community worked harder together to cut ISIS funding support to the original group in Syria. "The reaction to ISIS should have been quick, and the international community was not quick about it."

In conclusion, Abdullah II's speeches mostly have the same theme, whether he is speaking domestically or internationally. Moreover, this consistent approach in his speeches is only about the true image of the Islamic religion, promoting the government efforts in keeping Jordan safe, and the need for unification to counterterrorism as efficiently as possible despite religion or ethnicity. However, Abdullah II speaks about the refugee problem in Jordan only when he is addressing the international audience. Additionally, he tends to blame the international community for not reacting as fast as it should in counterterrorism.

E. Saudi Speeches

Counterterrorism speeches given by Saudi leaders do not exhibit differences between domestic and international audiences. Domestically, the Saudi leaders aim to show the government's efforts in counterterrorism and how such efforts have evolved and developed to fight a dangerous capable terrorist organization such as Al Qaeda and ISIS. Moreover, Saudi leaders do not only focus on military strategies but also fight the extremist's ideology with the use of education, religious figures, media, and cultural initiatives. When speaking to a domestic audience, Saudi Arabia tends to call for unification among citizens, and stresses the importance of unifying together in order to end terrorism and radicalism from the country and region. Moreover, The Kingdom leaders and police officials stress that unification is required against the radical ideology distorting the image of Islam. Saudi Arabia defines the extremist ideology as a terrorist act and describes its danger and threat when speaking to a domestic audience. Moreover, the Saudi leaders stress that the most dangerous threat proposed by terrorist organizations is the way they manipulate the religion's image and show Islam in a violent wrongful way. Saudi leaders

address how this ideology got so deep in the community under the name of Islam as the real threat of terrorism. Additionally, how the most dangerous of all is how these terrorists gave a chance to the haters of Islam to talk about the religion in a hateful way and spread the wrongful image of Islam around the world. Saudi Arabia's political leaders promote the government's efforts in counterterrorism in all the governmental sectors, either Intellectual or practical ways. They mention how the police officers sacrificed their lives in the fight against terrorism, and the air force participates in the international fight against terrorism. Moreover, they narrate how the religious figures in the country came out and addressed the terrorist's threat to Islam, how the Saudi scholars researched terrorism and its causes, and how the media exposed terrorism, its goals and methods. At the regional, Arab, and Islamic levels, they discussed how the Saudi government allied with other countries to fight terrorism phenomenon and initiated a dialogue conference. Additionally, the Kingdom's political leaders address how terrorism is being defeated in the Islamic countries through all aspects of the intellectual and military, more than any other place in the world. Domestically, the crown prince in (2001, 2003), Abdullah bin Abdelaziz said that Al Qaeda is an enemy to Islam, to the Kingdom, and humanity, and stressed that all Saudi's must fight this ideology, and who does not express public refusal for terrorism and extremism is considered a supporter of terrorism. "All the people and tribe leaders have to tell all the citizens to stand against terrorism, and whoever stays silent is considered a part of the terrorist group." When speaking to an international audience, Saudi Arabia's focus on showing the Saudi government efforts in counterterrorism and criticize the Iranian regime for supporting extremism and terrorism. In the words of Said Khaled bin Salman, "Iran and Saudi Arabia significantly differ politically because there are extremists in Saudi. However, they are the

minority, and, on the run, there are minority extremists in Iran, but they are running the country.” Saudi political leaders do not put Iran and ISIS in the same category but argue that Iran as a country supports extremism and terrorism. Said Khaled bin Salman said, “Iran and terrorism not necessarily have the same ideology, but both believe in the same concept, which is not believing the sovereignty of nations, and they both believe in the transitional ideological state, and they both do not believe in international law. Sometimes they compete and fight each other, but when it comes to Saudi Arabia, we are the common enemy to them, and they cooperate in fighting us.”

Internationally, Saudi Arabia calls on the world to isolate and put pressure on Iran to change its policy, which does not abide by international laws and support terrorism. The Saudi claims on Iranian support for terrorism are based on several incidents. Moreover, they mention the previous attacks that happened by Iran, like attacking the American embassy in Beirut and attacking the US marines in Beirut. Also, the Iranian terrorist attacks in Europe and how they trained and managed terrorist cells to attack in Saudi Arabia. Additionally, harboring and sheltering terrorists like Osama bin Laden’s son when they fled to Iran, and they lived there ever since, and they use Al Houthis in Yemen to attack Saudi Arabia. “Osama bin Laden himself in his document that was found by the United States said clearly that Iran funds their activity, and it helped them logistically,” said Khaled bin Salman.

Saudi political leaders speak about the necessity for the regional countries to engage more in counterterrorism and stress that Saudi Arabia is willing to cooperate with any country in the war against terrorism. The Kingdom’s political leaders refuse to associate ISIS with Islam or accept

that they are related. Furthermore, Adel Al Jubair refused the claims of Islam being related to terrorism by giving an example of the KKK (Ku Klux Klan) terrorist organization. “The KKK terrorist group does not represent Christianity and calls for the killing of African Americans, and they do all these acts under the name of Christianity and the cross, which in reality does not represent Christianity. Political leaders of Saudi Arabia tend to promote the positive changes that are taking place in Saudi Arabia with the country’s 2030 vision which seeks to diversify the economy away from oil and open new investments, empowering the youth and women, and to transform the country into a dynamic, innovative, transparent, accountable society. Moreover, they advocate that these changes will make Saudi Arabia stronger, wealthier, and ready to face the challenges around it and will overcome them.

In conclusion, the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia does not exhibit major differences in its counterterrorism speeches. Furthermore, they tend to have a consistent theme, whether they are speaking to a domestic or international audience. The Saudi political leaders tend to promote the Saudi government's efforts in counterterrorism at military and intellectual levels. Moreover, Saudi leaders call for a unified stance among people and the international community to fight against the extremist’s ideology, whether they are speaking to a domestic or an international audience. While Saudi Arabia’s leaders focus on exposing the extremist ideology when speaking to a domestic audience, they tend to focus on explaining the danger and criticizing the Iranian regime on its support for extremism when speaking to an international audience.

F. Comparative Analysis

Middle Eastern and Western political leaders tend to have similarities and differences in their recent counterterrorism speeches, depending on whether they target domestic or international audiences.

There are some interesting similarities and differences between Donald Trump and Barack Obama's speeches on counterterrorism. For the similarities, both leaders tend to emphasize the US efforts in counterterrorism, promote their political agenda, and pursue their own domestic goals through counterterrorism speeches. Moreover, both western leaders blame their domestic rivals, the US Congress in Obama's case, and the Obama administration in Trump's case, for not taking the right actions to prevent terror attacks. Although Barack Obama and Donald Trump have these similarities in their counterterrorism speeches, they differ in the consistency of the speeches' content between domestic and international audiences. Regardless of the audience, Obama defines Islam as a peaceful religion and emphasize that Muslims should be treated as essential allies in counterterrorism rather than blaming Islam for terror attacks. In sharp contrast, the way in which Trump addresses terrorism significantly differently depends on whether he is speaking to a domestic or an international audience. When Trump speaks to a domestic audience, he tends to associate Islam as a religion with terrorism. However, Trump no longer associated terrorism directly with the Islamic religion after becoming president. For instance, in his domestic speech that was a reaction to the Manchester terrorist attack, which occurred in the UK in 2017, he didn't mention the Islamic religion. Instead, he called the terrorists "evil losers."

¹Also, after becoming president, Trump focused on the impacts of terrorism on society overall without referring to the victims by ethnicity or religion, and he referred to them as children and families instead. While Trump associated terrorism with Islam before becoming a president in his domestic speeches, he referred to Islam as a great and peaceful religion when he is speaking to an international audience. Both American leaders tend to pursue their own political goals, whether it was promoting political policies, blaming the opposition, or advocating for a political candidate when they approach a domestic audience. Furthermore, they tend to change their speeches globally to focus on speaking about global peace and international common interests.

Middle Eastern political leaders tend to have similarities and differences in their counterterrorism speeches depending on their audiences. All middle Eastern leaders tend to promote their governments efforts in counterterrorism and call for international unity to fight terrorism. Globally, Middle Eastern political leaders tend to change the content of their political speeches to focus on international common interests. However, each country's domestic speeches differ in the content depending on the country's political goals. In particular, the Egyptian president Abdelfattah Al Sisi counterterrorism speeches are characterized by vast differences depending on his targeted audience, domestic or international. He tends to portray himself as the savior of the nation when speaking to a domestic audience by using counterterrorism speeches as a tool to legitimize his presidency. Al Sisi identifies political upheaval and instability as the main cause of terrorism domestically, and his main goal is to convince Egyptians that in order to get the country stable is reachable only by keeping him as

¹ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jv95vmaYtBw>

president and not pursuing revolutionary activities. He implies domestically that if citizens were to make any revolution against him as a president, they would lose Egypt to terrorism forever. In sharp contrast, when Al Sisi speaks to an international audience, he stresses how democratic Egypt is. Additionally, he tells the international audience that he supports Egyptians even if they chose to remove him from the presidency by revolution. When speaking to an international audience, Abdelfattah Al Sisi stresses the idea that Egyptians have all their democratic rights, including the right of free speech, and the right to protest. Furthermore, he speaks about revolutions as a part of democracy and promotes that Egypt respects the people's choices in politics even if it was revolutions.

In a similar vein, the Turkish leader Recep Erdogan has similarities and differences between his speeches depending on whether he is speaking domestically and internationally. Erdogan accuses that the international media indirectly support terrorism by claiming that it does not show the government efforts and gives the impression of the government being vulnerable and giving up to terrorism. While Erdogan argues that Turkey does not seek to interfere in other countries' issues in his domestic speech, he is highly critical of the policies of Turkey's regional rivals when he speaks to an international audience. He is highly critical of the foreign policies of Saudi Arabia and its allies in the region. Moreover, Erdogan stressed that by resolving the region issues which he is highly critical of like Saudi foreign policies and its allies, the region will live in justice, prosperity, and will no longer blame Iran for being a terrorism supporter which would reflect on the region of making counterterrorism more efficient. An example of his criticism of foreign policies of other regional countries would be when he talked in the United Nations

assembly in New York, he spoke about the Saudi Arabia and Qatar conflict, then the Saudi interference in Yemen, describing the interference as being responsible for a severe humanitarian and economic crisis. Afterward, he goes on by talking about the murder of the journalist Jamal Khashoggi, and he accuses the Saudi justice system of not arriving to a fair decision. While Erdogan describes ISIS and Jabhat al-Tahrir al Yasari as the primary actors of violence and terrorism, he does not refer to Kurdish militant organizations by name in his domestic speech. In comparison, when speaking to an international audience, he labels Kurdish organizations as terrorists like ISIS and claims that Turkish occupation of parts of northern Syria resulted in safe areas for refugees. Erdogan directly links the Turkish fight against PKK, YPG, to fight against ISIS.

In contrast to both al-Sisi and Erdogan, the Jordanian King Abdullah II counterterrorism speeches do not exhibit major differences, whether he is speaking to a domestic or an international audience. Moreover, this consistent approach in his speeches is only about the true image of the Islamic religion, promoting the government efforts in keeping Jordan safe, and the need for unification to counterterrorism as efficiently as possible despite religion or ethnicity. However, Abdullah II speaks about the refugee problem in Jordan only when he is addressing the international audience. Additionally, he tends to blame the international community for not reacting as fast as it should in counterterrorism. Domestically, King Abdullah II tries to expose terrorism by addressing its danger and calls Jordanians to unify and stand together to fight this extremist ideology. Globally, he always focuses on speaking about how the Jordanian government is overwhelmed by the Syrian refugees, who made 20% of Jordan's population and

resulted in a shortage of resources and greater economic difficulties. Abdullah II tends to blame the international community for not reacting to terrorism as fast as they should have done.

Abdullah II's speeches mostly have the same theme, which is exposing terrorism domestically, and focus on the refugee's crisis internationally.

In a similar vein, the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia does not exhibit major differences in its counterterrorism speeches. Furthermore, they tend to have a consistent theme, whether they are speaking to a domestic or international audience. This consistent approach is about promoting the Saudi government's efforts in counterterrorism at military and intellectual levels, calling for a unified stance among people and the international community to fight against the extremist's ideology, and promoting the positive changes in Saudi Arabia. The Saudi leaders aim to show the government's efforts in counterterrorism and how such efforts have evolved and developed to fight a dangerous capable terrorist organization such as Al-Qaeda and ISIS. Moreover, Saudi leaders do not only focus on military strategies but also fight the extremist's ideology with the use of education, religious figures, media, and cultural initiatives. Additionally, they stress that the most dangerous threat proposed by terrorist organizations is the way they manipulate the religion's image and show Islam in a violent wrongful way. Saudi officials do not mention the term takfiri in specific; however, they explicitly criticize the meaning and practices of the term by saying that the great danger of terrorism is when terrorists use their ignorance and manipulate the Quran and its verses to exploit the religion in favor of their violent and divisive agendas. When speaking to an international audience, Saudi Arabia's focus on showing the Saudi government efforts in counterterrorism and criticize the Iranian regime for supporting extremism

and terrorism. Moreover, The Saudi claims on Iranian support for terrorism are based on several incidents. They mention the previous attacks in the Middle East that were sponsored by Iran, and how the regime is harboring and sheltering terrorists like Osama bin Laden's son. Saudi political leaders speak about the necessity for the regional countries to engage more in counterterrorism and stress that Saudi Arabia is willing to cooperate with any country in the war against terrorism. They tend to promote the positive changes that are taking place in Saudi Arabia with the country's 2030 vision which seeks to diversify the economy away from oil and open new investments, empowering the youth and women, and to transform the country into a dynamic, innovative, transparent, accountable society. While Saudi Arabia's leaders focus on exposing the extremist ideology when speaking to a domestic audience, they tend to focus on explaining the danger and criticizing the Iranian regime on its support for extremism when speaking to an international audience.

CHAPTER THREE: CONCLUSION

This thesis found that Middle Eastern and Western political leaders tend to exhibit differences in their counterterrorism speeches along two dimensions. First, the nature of their domestic and international audiences. Second, the motivations behind the speech. Even if all leaders oppose terrorism, they clearly have their own personal political agenda, which makes it really difficult to come out with a unified counterterrorism strategy. After analyzing speeches and other visual material from Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Jordan, Turkey, and the United States. The findings were that most countries tend to exhibit differences in their counterterrorism speeches, depending on their audience to reach a particular political goal. The thesis found that the political goal in the international speeches for all leaders is to pursue the global interest and to call for unification in counterterrorism among countries. However, political leaders mostly tend to use counterterrorism speeches as a tool to pursue their own political goals domestically. Countries that live in monarchical regimes like Saudi Arabia and Jordan tends to be more consistent in their counterterrorism strategy because they are seeking stability more than people's approval. Meanwhile, electoral regimes like the US, Turkey, and Egypt tend to not have a consistent theme in counterterrorism because they are seeking people's approval in the domestic competition of power related to the electoral regime. The US leaders domestically tend to use counterterrorism speeches to blame their political rivals for the rise of terrorism, or to promote their administration's policies. Egyptian leader, Al Sisi, uses counterterrorism speeches domestically as a tool mainly to advocate for himself as a president. For Turkey, Erdogan's goal in his counterterrorism speeches domestically is to promote his government efforts in counterterrorism

and accuses the media of supporting terrorism because it is not showing a great picture of the government in media. Jordan and Saudi Arabia domestically tend to focus on exposing terrorism and extremism danger to the public while focusing on pursuing their political interests internationally, exposing Iran support for terrorism in Saudi Arabia's case, addressing the refugee crisis in Jordan's case.

Since Saudi Arabia and Jordan are among the most affected countries in the Middle East by terrorism, their consistent messages in counterterrorism are expected. Moreover, Jordan's economy is affected negatively by the refugees who are resulted by terrorism, and Saudi Arabia is affected by terrorist attacks and the widespread of extremist ideology by terrorists, which was reflected negatively on the Saudi community. Furthermore, these reasons made them consistent in their fight against terrorism on both domestic and international levels. The consistency in their fight against terrorism was effective because both Saudi and Jordan are monarchical systems with no contest for electoral support, which led to a more consistent political orientation unlike political leaders vying for popular voters in countries such as Egypt, the US, and Turkey.

Directions for Future Research

This thesis suggests that the political speeches analysis field should consider areas of differences in each leader's speeches to analyze more effectively. Crucial areas of research for future scholars pertain to the differences politicians tend to exhibit between their speeches, and what are the motives behind them. Moreover, this thesis analyzed speeches to reveal thematic and

audience-oriented differences between some Middle Eastern and Western leaders, but further analysis of more political leaders and even terrorist groups leaders will be more informative. Future research can also focus on how speeches may change compared to previous years, so counterterrorism speeches used to address Al-Qaeda when the terrorist group was more powerful. However, after the killing of Osama Bin Laden in 2011, counterterrorism speeches shifted to focus more on ISIS. Also, analyzing the previous battle of ideas between the religious authority on takfir would be very beneficial. Further counterterrorism speech analysis may lead to significant results that can make significant contributions to the political speeches analysis field. Additionally, it can identify some patterns between speeches, on the one hand, and the counterterrorism efforts, specific political agendas, and connections with some terrorist organizations, on the other hand. Also, furthermore research on comparing between monarchy and other different political regimes such as electoral democracies in counterterrorism will be very relevant to explore the questions of how and why regime differences matter in counterterrorism.

REFERENCES

- Byman, Daniel. *Al Qaeda, the Islamic State, and the Global Jihadist Movement What Everyone Needs to Know*. Oxford University Press, 2015.
- Chenoweth, Erica, and Pauline L. Moore. *The Politics of Terror*. Oxford University Press, 2018.
- Cronin A. K. *ISIS Is Not a Terrorist Group*. Council on Foreign Relations, 2015.
- Gerges, Fawaz A. *ISIS: A History*. Princeton University Press, 2017.
- Hegghammer T. The rise of Muslim foreign fighters: Islam and the globalization of Jihad. *International Security*. 2010 Dec;35(3):53-94.
- Hegghammer, Thomas. "Jihad in Saudi Arabia. Violence and Pan-Islamism since 1979." *Politique étrangère* (2011): 198-201.
- Kepel, Gilles. *Jihad the Trail of Political Islam*. I.B. Tauris, 2016.
- Jacoby, T. (2019). *Islam and the Islamic State's Magazine, Dabiq. Politics and Religion*
- Maher, Shiraz. *Salafi-Jihadism: The history of an idea*. Oxford University Press, 2016.
- Wood, Graeme. "The Atlantic." *The Atlantic*, March 2015.
- Zelin, Aaron Y. "The War between ISIS and Al-Qaeda for Supremacy of the Global Jihadist Movement." Research Notes, 2014.

APPENDIX
DESCRIPTIONS AND SUMMARIES OF THE SPEECHES ANALYZED

Table A.1 Descriptions of the Speeches

Leader	date	Occasion	Description	Language	Key Words
Khaled Alfaisal	Feb 22, 2015	World Conference on Islam and the fight against terrorism	Al Faisal Condemned terrorism and called for unification among the Islamic world in counterterrorism	Arabic	Threatening, Mastering the image of Islam in disgrace and injustice, Hostile schemes
Barack Obama	Dec 6, 2015	Reaction on terrorist attack after a shooting in San Bernardino, Calif	Renewed the fight against ISIS and spoke on USA efforts in counterterrorism	English	They are thugs and killers; we must enlist Muslims our strongest allies rather than push them away
Abdelfattah Al Sisi	Jan 19, 2018	Foreign Policy and Counter-Terrorism Session at the Tale of a Homeland conference	Described terrorism in Egypt as the result of the revolution that happened in the Arab Spring	Arabic	keep your eyes on your country because if you lose it, it won't return to you again.
Abdelfattah Al Sisi	Sep14 2019	Session to assess the experience of combating terrorism locally and regionally	Implied that if people have an opposite opinion and made revolution or a movement against his authority, they will lose their country to terrorism	Arabic	the popular movements result in weakening of the national state power
Donald Trump	Aug 15, 2016	terrorism speech in Ohio while campaigning	Trump is accusing the previous administrations for the rise of terrorism in the region and the Middle East.	English	The rise of ISIS is direct result of the policies of President Obama and Secretary of State Clinton

Donald Trump	May 21, 2017	In Saudi Arabia's at the Arab Islamic American summit	Spoke positively about Saudi Arabia's efforts in Counterterrorism and then discussed ways to improve counterterrorism and cut extremism/radicalization around the globe	English	Terrorism has spread all across the world, but the path to peace starts right here (KSA)
Mohammed bin Salman	Nov 26, 2017	Islamic military counter terrorism coalition	Discussed how terrorism was active in the countries, and this coalition will end terrorism and unifies powers to counter terrorism	Arabic	Terrorism biggest danger is not only killing innocent people and civilians but also defaming the reputation of our peaceful religion and belief
Khaled bin Salman	January 24, 2020	Tv show interview	Discussed current security issues with a focus on Iran's growing threat in the region	English	Iran and Saudi Arabia significantly differ politically because there are extremists in Saudi. However, they are the minority and, on the run,, and there are minority extremists in Iran, but they are running the country.
Adel al-Jubair	Jan 20, 2017	Davos 2017 - Middle East Security in world economic forum	Talked about the Iranian support of terrorism and their nuclear weapons danger.	English	I find it interesting that virtually every country in the world attacked by ISIS or Al Qaeda except Iran, why? -he said-
Adel al-Jubair	Feb 19, 2018	the Munich Security Conference.	Responded to the Iranian foreign minister by saying Khomeini revolution started the problems in the region	English	We captured one of the terrorist leaders in Lebanon with Iranian passport isn't that harboring and sheltering terrorists?
Adel al-Jubair	Feb 13, 2016	the Munich Security Conference.	Responded to a reporter who said ISIS is Islamic extremist group	English	It's not Islamic group, it's a terrorist group, is the KKK group representing Christianity? Each religion has psychopath who tries to do violence under the religion name
Recep Erdoğan	September 24, 2019	United Nations summit	Discussed the reasons for not reaching a solution for terrorism in the region	Turkish	Interfering in Yemen and Qatar has resulted in many human rights issues, if resolving these main issues, the region will live in justice and solve the blames towards Iran

Multiple Saudi officials + VIP's	Dec 2, 2015	Documentary	Saudi officials discussing the threat and explained how they faced the danger and fight it	Arabic	The real footage is really interesting, especially when there is one footage where one of Al Qaeda members were screaming " why you are shooting at us we are Muslims just like you"
Part 2	Dec 2, 2015	Documentary	Part 2	Arabic	
Part 3	Dec 2, 2015	Documentary	Part 3	Arabic	
Abdullah II	March 3, 2015	Speech	Spoke to the Jordanian's about terrorism	Arabic	Jordanians are courageous; you have to fight extremist ideology
Recep Erdoğan	Jan 4, 2017	presidential conference in Ankrah	Reaction to terrorist attacks on Turkey	Turkish but translated to Arabic	The fight with terrorism is like we are going through war of independence; we don't interfere in other countries and we don't want someone else's land !!
Barack Obama	Sep 24, 2015	United Nations	Discussed security issues of terrorism	English	The brutality of terrorists in Syria and Iraq forces us to look into the heart of darkness. The failure of our international system to keep base in a connected world
Abdullah II	Sep 3, 2014	TV show interview	Expressed his opinion on terrorism	English	The worst thing is that they call themselves Muslims which is shocking, reaction to ISIS should be quick, and we have not been quick

Summaries of the Speeches

- **Barack Obama, December 6, 2015, Washington, D.C.**

The goal of the talk is to show Americans the government's efforts in counterterrorism in response of a terrorist attack. The occasion of the talk is the tragedy of a terrorist act that happened after a shooting in San Bernardino, Calif in 2015. The target audience of the speech is the American people. The overall theme of the speech is terrorism in general; however, there is a direct focus on ISIS and Al Qaeda. Moreover, talking about terrorist attacks that happened in the past from these organizations. Obama addresses ISIS and Al Qaeda threat and terrorism on the west, and how it has evolved. Furthermore, he describes them as strong by their growing efforts. Obama, in his speech, said that they do not have any evidence that the attack was from ISIS, yet he renewed the war against ISIS.

At the international level, Barack Obama started his speech by talking about the efforts of the U.S military and counterterrorism professionals in counterterrorism. Later on, in his speech, he made sure to show the United States' efforts in counterterrorism by stressing that the military will continue the war against terrorism in any country where it is necessary. Moreover, Obama mentioned the efforts of working with allies to stop ISIS finance and recruitment. Obama stressed the importance of cooperating with Muslims majority countries in destroying ISIS. On the domestic level, Obama said that Congress needs to step up in counterterrorism by taking several steps from congress right away.

Furthermore, he said that Congress needs to stop allowing guns for people who are on No-Flight list because what could be possibly the argument for allowing terrorist suspects to have a semi-automatic weapon. Moreover, he promoted the stopping of guns because he argues that intelligence won't be able to identify every mass shooter suspect whether they belong to ISIL or any other hateful group. Obama promoted the need for stronger screening for immigrants and whether they traveled to war zones before. Finally, he said that Congress needs to vote on continuing the use of military force against terrorism.

Barack Obama stresses that Americans cannot turn against Islam in counterterrorism. Moreover, there is a must to enlist Muslims as The United States' strongest allies rather than push them away through hate and suspicion.

- **Barack Obama, September 24, 2014, New York**

The occasion of the talk is the United Nations General Assembly. The targeted audience is the international community, and the goal of the talk is to discuss current global issues. The overall theme of the subject is Terrorism with a focus on Al Qaeda and ISIS. Obama said that as we look to the future, one issue risks a cycle of conflict that could derail so much progress, and that is the cancer of violent extremism, which is in so many parts in the Muslim world. Terrorist is not new, in 20th-century terror was used by multiple groups who failed to come to power through public support, but in this century we face a more lethal and ideological brand of the terrorist who has perverted one of the world great religions with the access of technology allowed small groups to do great harm. Obama said that terrorists embraced a nightmarish vision that divided the world

into adherents and infidels, killing as many innocent civilians as possible, employing the most brutal methods. He goes on by saying ISIS group has terrorized all whom they come across Iraq and Syria, mothers, sisters, and daughters have been subjected to rape as a weapon of war, innocent children have been gone down, and religious minorities have been starved to death, and most terrific crimes imaginable like innocent human beings beheaded on videotape. Obama said that there is no god condones this terror and no reasoning nor negotiation with this brand of evil. The only language understood by them is force. Obama stresses that he made it clear that America will not base its entire foreign policy on reacting to Terrorism, instead we waged a focused campaign on Al Qaeda and its associated forces, taking out their leaders and safe havens they rely on. The United States is not and never will be in war with Islam; Islam teaches us peace Muslims all over the world aspire to live dignity and sense justice. When it comes to America and Islam, there is no them and us because millions of Muslim Americans are part of the fabric of our country, so we reject any suggestion of a clash of civilizations. Obama said the U.S would not act alone, nor it intends to send troops to occupy foreign lands; instead, it will support Iraqis and Syrians fighting to reclaim their communities, and will use its military airstrikes to roll back ISIS, and will train and equip forces fighting against them in the ground, and work to cut off their financing.

Obama says that belief and permanent religious war are a misguided refuge of extremists who cannot build or create anything but hate. Moreover, it is no exaggeration when we say that humanity future depends on us uniting against those who want to divide us along the fall lines of tripe, set, race, or religion but this does not simply matter of words, but we must take concrete

steps to address the danger by religiously motivated fanatics and the trends that fuel their recruitment. Moreover, this campaign goes beyond our security challenge for what we have degraded methodically core al Qaeda and supported the transition into the sovereign Afghan government. Extremist ideology has shifted other places, particularly in the middle east and north Africa where a quarter of young people have no job, and corruption is ramping, which is increasingly hard to contain.

Obama stresses that in order to counterterrorism efficiently as an international community. There is a must to meet this challenge with a focus on four areas. First, the terrorist group known as ISL, must be degraded and ultimately destroyed. Second, it is time for the world, especially the Muslim community to forcefully, and constantly reject the ideology of Al Qaeda and ISIS. It is a task of all great religions to accommodate the devout faith of the modern multicultural world. Third, we must address the cycle of conflict, especially the sectarian conflict that creates conditions that terrorist crampsons. Fourth, the country of Arab and Muslim world needs to focus on their youth education, which is a tradition, and women involvements in politics and economy.

- **Donald Trump, August 15, 2016, Ohio rally USA**

The occasion of the talk is an election campaign that focuses on Donald's Trump plan on counterterrorism. Trump's targeted audience in the speech is the Americans. Moreover, the goal of his talk is to convince Americans that Muslim radicals are the only terrorists, and Obama's administration is the main reason that these Muslim radicals in ISIS are spreading around the

world. The overall theme of the subject is Muslim radical's terrorism and ISIS. Furthermore, Obama's wrong decisions that led to more terrorism. , and it all began in 2009 with president Obama's apology tour, in a series of speeches Obama described America as arrogant, dismissive and colonial power, and he informed other countries about America's past errors and making America look weak in front of our enemies. Moreover, perhaps no speech was more misguided like Obama's speech to the Muslim world delivered in Cairo 2009 instead of condemning the oppression of women and gays in many Muslim nations and the violations of human rights and financing of global terrorism, his naive words and actions like the failure to establish a new status force agreement in Iraq, and the election driven timetable for withdrawal surrendered our gains in that country and led directly to the rise of ISIS. Trump goes on by saying Obama's failure was followed by the Clinton disaster invasion in Libya and mentions that Obama said he considers Libya his worst mistake.

Trump's focus was on mentioning many examples of terrorism that happened only in the west and saying the number of Christians and Americans killed and injured, and he continues by saying that when a magazine only published a cartoon of Prophet Mohammed (Charlie Hebdo shooting in January 2015), they-referring to terrorists-attacked the magazine and killed many who was responsible for the cartoon. He indirectly describes ISIS as if they represent all Muslims because he said that Obama is not fit for presidency because he did not clarify who is the main enemy of the USA referring to Muslims. Trump describes ISIS's recruitment method on the internet as dangerous, and when he becomes president, he will not allow that to happen.

Trump's main point in talking about the United States policies and actions is blaming everything in the world related to terrorism to the previous administration, which was Barack Obama's administration. Furthermore, he goes on by saying that before Obama's administration, the middle east did not have wars nor terrorism. Trump says that he predicted everything went on and warned the public, but no one listened to him. He promises that by becoming president, his era would be the era of nation-building. Trump goes on by saying that he will make allies with countries that only want to end terrorism and describe Israel as the greatest ally of the United States. He says that NATO failed to deal with terrorism, and after his comments to them they made a division in their government that focus on counterterrorism. Donald Trump says that counterterrorism is essential, and it will not happen effectively, unlike Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton, according to him. Additionally, he says that Americans need to work together in counterterrorism.

- **Donald Trump, May 21, 2017, Saudi Arabia's summit**

The occasion of the talk is the summit in Saudi Arabia on global terrorism. The targeted audience is the Arab and Muslim leaders. The goal of the talk is to urge the Muslim world to take a stand against global terrorism and to share the burden of eradicating extremism in the region.

The overall theme of the subject is radicalization and terrorism with a focus on ISIS

Donald Trump talks about the danger of ISIS and how countries need to stop funding ISIS because this is the only way to defeat it. Moreover, he refers to IRAN as the number one country that supports ISIS and terrorism because the government of Iran gives them a safe harbor, financial backing, and social standing for recruitment. Trump mentioned how his administration

is thriving in America by talking about the current economy of the USA. Moreover, he says his administration created almost a million new jobs, added over three trillion in new value, lifted the burdens on American industry, and made record investments in our military that will protect the safety of American people and enhance the security of the United States friends and allies. Trump stressed the need for Islamic countries to stand for terrorism them self's and not to wait for Americans to vanish the evil for them. He says that Saudi Arabia's 2030 vision is very optimistic, yet this optimism cannot coexist with violence. Moreover, Islamic countries cannot tolerate, accept, nor excuse and ignore terrorism. Trump gave examples of terrorist attacks that happened in the west and stressed that in sheer numbers, the deadliest attacks were on Arab and Muslims with 95% percent of the victims being Muslims and middle eastern nations. He goes on by saying that counterterrorism is not a battle between religions or ethnicity, but it is a battle between good and evil criminals. Additionally, when he sees the terror attacks, he does not think of them as Christian, Shia, Jewish, or Sunnies, but he thinks of them as children of God.

A significant difference between Trump's speech domestically and internationally is the way he refers to terrorists. Domestically, when he mentions terrorism, he always mentions the word Islam, and make sure to give an example of the terrorist attacks on the western world by saying the number of Christians or Americans killed. On the other hand, when he speaks internationally, he stresses the idea that victims are children of God despite their ethnicity and faith.

Additionally, he says that most of the terrorism victims are Muslims.

- **Al Sisi-Tale of a homeland conference, Jan 19, 2018, Egypt**

The occasion of the speech is a political counterterrorism conference which included Egyptian academics and officials called a tale of a homeland in Egypt. Moreover, the target audience that Al Sisi wants to address is the Egyptian people. The goal of his talk is convincing Egyptian people that if the country is stable, there would be less terrorism. However, he is stressing that in order to get the country stable is reachable only by keeping him as president and not doing any revolution to take his administration out. In his speech, Abdelfattah Al Sisi also stated that Egyptians helped to save the country from terrorism by choosing him as president.

The overall theme of the subject is on terrorism in general, and revolutionists. Abdelfattah Al Sisi domestically is convincing his citizens that revolutions (Thawra) against the Egyptian presidency are what lead to terrorism in general. Additionally, by warning from revolutions he is referring to the uprising against the previous president Mubarak in 2011. He describes revolutionists and people who wanted the change in the past presidency and his presidency now as terrorists who want the country to fall. Moreover, revolutionists will lead the country to fall by letting the westerners seize the country when it is vulnerable. Al Sisi describes his administration and way of governing as the best way to counterterrorism because he can keep the country safe and stable. "keep your eyes on your country because if you lose it, it will not return to you again." Furthermore, he says that on both national and international levels, Egypt was very weak in the past revolution, and it would be weak again in case of another revolution. He promotes the idea of anti-revolution and argues that his presidency is the best way to counterterrorism for the current time.

- **Abdelfattah Al Sisi, November 6, 2015, International audience**

The occasion of the talk is a tv show interview with the Egyptian president Abdelfattah al Sisi. Moreover, the targeted audience is the international community and British people specifically. The goal of the talk is to discuss his administration and presidency. The overall theme of the subject is Egypt's security and terrorism. Abdelfattah Al Sisi said that in Egypt, there is a free speech right, and the people can express their opinion and can express it if they do not want me as a president because the right of option for our citizens is what we hope for. About the counterterrorism law in Egypt that was described by the international human rights community as a permanent state of emergency, Al Sisi said that the five years of revolution (Thawra) made the country in need of stability. However, that does not mean he will put stability by forcing and suppressing the Egyptian people. The Egyptian government is trying to organize the situation in a way or another. However, the vast population of Egypt has many problems that need to be solved. Al Sisi stressed that Egyptian have the right to free speech and the right to protest, and he says that Egyptian have the right to decide whether they want him as a president or not. He goes on by saying Egypt was in a state of emergency for the last 40 years, but that did not happen now. Al Sisi says that if people met ordinary Egyptian people, they would find that Egyptians are scared to end up as a refuge.

When asked about why to prison Egyptians who wear a revolutionary scarf, Al Sisi answered it is because of the exceptional circumstances of the country. Al Sisi says that if people brought the map of extremist countries, it would find that extremism is expanding like in book haram. However, In Egypt, it is not expanding; they are making massive efforts in counterterrorism. Islamic militancy is a threat to the entire region and the world. Moreover, Al Sisi said that he

warned the world from the foreign fighters in Syria, and after only one year of his warning ISIS came to Iraq and Syria. The danger of ISIS is very big, even though the international coalition is fighting it. The international coalition is not winning because we need to unify more, and this will take time.

- **Abdelfattah Al Sisi Video #9, September 14, 2019, Egypt**

The occasion of the talk is a session to assess the experience of combating Terrorism locally and regionally in Egypt in the 8th national conference for youth. The targeted audience is Egyptian people, and the goal of the talk is defining Terrorism and its goals. The overall theme of the subject is Terrorism and its origins. Al SISI said that Terrorism would not succeed unless they had support from other countries, and the media supported Terrorism at the beginning when it showed terrorists as Nobel jihadists. Al SISI says terrorists manipulated the scripture for their benefits, and in any religion like Christianity or Judaism, if manipulated, a person can reach to an order to kill. Terrorism's primary goals are to destroy all religions in the world, not only Islam, because they made the idea of being religious between the youth is not the right image now. Al Sisi mentions that whenever Terrorism gets into a country, it will destroy it. Moreover, it goes into a country when it is not stable like Syria. In Egypt, when the revolution happened by its people, the country got weakened, and it was threatened to be a terrifying place. About the Egyptian government, Al Sisi says that Egypt did not fight Terrorism mentally as it should do.

He describes the Egyptian military as the most critical power in the entire region, and some enemies want to destroy Egypt by destroying its military, and the citizens need to make a conscious choice not to lose their country. He says that counterterrorism is expensive, and while fighting Terrorism, a country is weak in the process, and fighting Terrorism stops the country from advancement because it is so busy fighting Terrorism, and he says this is one of the terrorism goals which is to keep the countries far from advancement.

Al Sisi says that religious figures have to realize the importance of showing the actual image of religion, which is peace and advancement.

There are major differences between the President Abdelfattah Al Sisi speeches domestically and internationally. When he talks to a domestic audience, his main counterterrorism message is identifying political upheaval and instability as the main cause of terrorism. Moreover, he advocates that in order to achieve political stability Egyptians need to not do any revolution, and implies that if citizens were to do revolution, they will lose Egypt to terrorism forever. However, when he talks to an international audience, he stresses the idea that Egyptians have all their democratic rights. Additionally, if the Egyptian wants to remove him as a president, he won't have a problem because it is their democratic right to do revolution and choose whoever they want for presidency.

- **Recep Erdogan, January 4, 2017, Turkey**

The occasion of the speech was a reaction to recent terrorist attacks that happened in Turkey. The target audience in the speech is the Turkish people. The goal of the talk is to ensure the Turkish

people that the government is working hard on fighting terrorism. The overall theme of the subject is terrorism in general and specifically ISIS, Jabhat al-Tahrir Al Yasari, and the media that supports terrorism indirectly.

He stressed that his government is working hard in the war against terrorism and mentions the number of victims that were lost are prominent in this war. Turkish people are gone through hard times because of terrorism. He reflects on the war against terrorism as the independence war, and all citizens must realize their responsibility in this war. Erdogan says that whoever accuses turkey of giving up to the terrorist organizations is an evil that must be involved in terrorism himself. The Turkish government is doing its best in counterterrorism, and its fighting even behind the borders to ensure the safety and security of this land and people. He says that his government does not want to occupy other countries nor to interfere in their affairs, and whoever says that is lying. Erdogan says he worked 10th of years in politics, and I know the Kurdish case in turkey very well, and whoever is trying to manipulate the case to achieve personal goals, they lie for 10th of years and now the truth is here and they are so far from finding a solution to the Kurdish case, and the same thing goes to Gulen terrorist organization and who support this organization will get will pay for it either if they were journalists or whoever they are. Turkish people know what happened in the Gaziantep terrorist attack which resulted in dozens of victims and we know how they wrote articles in the media and now the media is suddenly silent after the terrorist attack which happened in Ortakoy, Istanbul. There are some things that we cannot control our hands so we should use our tongue and if we can't, then we use our heart. The terrorist organizations that are using violence in this country are ISIS and Jabhat al-Tahrir Al Yasari.

- **Recep Erdogan, September 24, 2019, New York**

The occasion of the talk is the United Nations general assembly. The targeted audience is the international community. The goal of the talk is to convince the international community of his views on how to solve the issues in the region. The overall theme of the subject is on the region's current issues and ISIS. Erdogan says that since 2011, terrorist organizations became a crisis, almost one million were killed, and half million are injured, and half of the population were forced to live elsewhere, and the Syrian crisis has to end once and for all. Erdogan said that Turkey is the first and most affected country as a result of ISIS being in Syria. on ISIS, Erdogan said that this terrorist organization had crossed our borders, and suicide bombed in our cities which injured hundreds of Turkish citizens. “We have neutralized approximately 3500 ISIS terrorists, and we worked to the collapse of the ISIS organization in Syria. We are also in the front in international efforts in fighting ISIS and foreign fighters who come from all over the world to join ISIS with our bans and deportation system in our country. Turkey is the most generous country in humanitarian aid. Turkey is hosting 5 million refugees who escaped from starvation. Furthermore, we are hosting more than 29 states in the United States, and we are almost like half of the population of NYC, which is 365000 000 000. We spent nearly eight years nearly more than 40 million \$, and we did not get any financial help until now except international organizations, and all of the money goes to the refugees, not our country's budget. The Syrian, who was born in Turkey is almost 500,000. In eight months, we saved 32 000 refugees from drowning, and death, and we returned 58,000 refugees to their countries because they were illegal. Unfortunately, we are always left alone in these efforts to do it on our own. No one of the refugees went back to the places controlled by terrorists like PKK, YPG, and ISIS, but

they returned to the places that are secured by Turkey in Syria. Turkey cannot host any new refugees.”

In order to counterterrorism efficiently, Erdogan says there is a must to continue unifying the Syrian lands. Erdogan said that he met Russia and Iran, and they made an important decision in Ankara's summit, which is an important step that will result in stabilizing Syria. The PKK, the YPG terrorist organization, must be destroyed in east Furat, and if we did not talk about it so we will not find a solution for Syria. The international counterterrorism coalition, with Russia and Iran, can together host all of these refugees permanently and free them from the camps because Turkey cannot do it alone.

We see that the interference in Yemen and Qatar has resulted in severe humanitarian and economic issues, and the journalist Jamal Khashoggi, who was murdered badly, and we did not find the justice system arrives to a fair decision so that we will follow this issue closely in our country. Also, the death of the Egyptian president in the courts and not allowing his family to bury him is wound in our hearts. If resolving these main issues, the region will live in justice and solve the blames towards Iran. Erdogan says that what threatens global peace is the hate towards Muslims and Islam. Moreover, the politicians who imply the hate for Muslims in their speeches.

- **Abdullah II, September 3, 2014, United States of America**

The occasion of the talk is a tv interview about terrorism and its danger. The target audience is the international community since the interview was on an American TV show.

The overall theme of the subject is ISIS. Moreover, the spreading of the organization around the world. King Abdullah II refuse the connection between ISIS and Islam because he says that Islam is not the violent religion terrorists claim it is. Abdullah II talks about how it is non-sense to use the word Islam at the same sentence with the head of ISIS, who is claiming to lead all Muslims. Furthermore, he says it is shocking and horrendous that ISIS is speaking in the name of Islam. Abdullah II says that ISIS is different because they are self-financing, which makes them able to buy weapons and recruit more foreign fighters.

King Abdullah II describes how his government is overwhelmed by the Syrian refugees, which is taking 20% of Jordan's population and how the country is suffering from a shortage in resources and facing economic difficulties because of that. Nevertheless, he says it is the right thing to do because where the Syrians would go. He says that Jordan has a very secure border for not allowing ISIS to get in. He says counterterrorism will not happen effectively except if all countries unified despite their religions, differences, and to make their minds in this good against the evil fight. Furthermore, he says the war against ISIS could have been prevented if the international community worked harder together to cut ISIS funding support to the original

group in Syria. The reaction to ISIS should have been quick, and the international community was not quick about it.

- **Abdullah II, March 3, 2015, Jordan**

The occasion of the speech is King Abdullah's message to all of his citizens. The targeted audience is domestic, and the goal of the talk is to address terrorism and its danger. The overall theme of the subject is ISIS.

King Abdullah says that the Arabic region is going through unprecedented events. Moreover, the people should stand today for the future they are aiming to have, deserve, and the future that they choose and work for Jordan. Moreover, not the future which seeks to achieve it the dark criminals who claim Islam. Who practices terrorism, and claims faith? Abdullah says that Islam is not skin colors or kind of doctrine, nor radicals versus modern, but Islam is the religion of truth and peace. Furthermore, whoever kills is an enemy for Islam.

The region is going through a hard test, and you the Jordanians need to protect your children from this kind of ideology, you need to defend your country either if you were Christians or Muslims from extremism and violence which is against our religion and values. Jordan is stronger and more significant than all these challenges. Today we are stronger than ever because we are unified, and you Jordanians are the purest and strongest.

- **Khaled Al Faisal, World conference on counterterrorism-February 22, 2015, Riyadh**

The goal of the speech is defining the extremist ideology as a terrorist act by describing their danger and threat. Moreover, Khaled Al Faisal addressed how this ideology got so deep in the community under the name of Islam as the real threat of terrorism. Additionally, he said the most dangerous of all is how these terrorists gave a chance to the haters of Islam to talk about the religion in a hateful way and spread the wrongful image of Islam around the world. Al Faisal's main goal out of the speech is calling out to unify the Islamic countries in the fight against terrorism. The occasion of the speech is the world conference of Islam and counterterrorism. Al Faisal targeted the domestic, and Muslim audience in his speech to unify them into the war of counterterrorism. The overall theme of the subject was on religious terrorism in general, and whatever advocates for extreme ideology and violence. Khaled Al Faisal didn't specify a terrorist group in his speech, but he talked about the terrorists in general as the most threat and danger that is facing the Islamic world.

Khaled Al Faisal made sure to mention the Saudi government's efforts in counterterrorism in all the government sectors in the Intellectual and practice ways. At the national level, he mentioned how the police officers did everything and sacrificed their lives into the fight of terrorism, and the air force participates in the International fight against terrorism. Furthermore, he talked about how the religious figures in the country came out and addressed the terrorist's threat on Islam, and how the terrorists try to convince people of the extremist ideology which leads to go out against the governors, and the religious figures promoted the true image of Islam which is peace and moderation. Educational wise, he talked about how the Saudi scholars made specialized

researches on terrorism and its causes. Furthermore, how the media exposed terrorism and its goals and methods. In the regional, Arab, and Islamic levels, Al Faisal said that the Saudi government allied with other countries to fight terrorism phenomenon. Intellectually, security, and legal wise by gathering world countries into a dialogue conference. Al Faisal stressed that all these efforts are still not enough since terrorism still spreading, especially in the middle east. Khaled Al Faisal stressed that counterterrorism is a war that needs the Islamic countries to unify together in counterterrorism. Furthermore, Islamic countries need to maximize their efforts in counterterrorism.

- **Mohammed bin Salman, Nov 26, 2017, Saudi Arabia**

The occasion of the talk is the inaugural meeting of the Islamic Military Coalition's ministers of defense which include 41 Islamic countries. The targeted audience is the Islamic coalition countries. Moreover, the goal of the conference is to establish a unified Islamic power to counterterrorism. The overall theme of the subject is Extremism and terrorism

Terrorism and extremism most danger of all is not only killing innocent people and spreading hate but showing the wrongful image of the peaceful religion. He says that terrorism is being defeated in the Islamic countries through all aspects of the intellectual and military more than any other place in the world, and we will continue chasing terrorism until we remove it from this world. Counterterrorism is essential. In the past, terrorists were able to work in all our countries because we did not unify our powers. Moreover, after today's meeting, we will weaken terrorism.

- **Adel Al Jubair, February 19, 2018, Germany**

The occasion of the talk is The Munich Security Conference in Germany. The goal of the talk is to discuss the current challenges and convince the world that Iran needs to be isolated and put pressure on it to change its policy and terrorist behavior. The targeted audience of the talk is the international community. The overall theme of the subject is security and how Iran is the first supporter of terrorism. He did not put them in the same category but said that Iran as a country supports extremism and terrorism.

Adel Jubair responded to the Iranian foreign minister about the Iranian support for terrorism and how the revolution of Iran led to the establishment of Hezbollah, which he described as the current most dangerous terrorist organization. Moreover, he gave an example of terrorist attacks that happened by Iran, like attacking the American embassy in Beirut and attacking the US marines in Beirut. Additionally, the Iranian terrorist attacks in Europe, and they trained and managed terrorist cells to attack in Saudi Arabia. Additionally, harboring and sheltering terrorists like Osama bin Laden's son when they fled to IRAN, and they lived there ever since, and they use Al Houthis in Yemen to attack Saudi Arabia. He said that IRAN must to change its behavior and support of terrorism. To counter terrorism efficiently, Al Jubair stresses the idea that Iran needs to stop supplying weapons to Hezbollah and terrorist organizations.

Adel Jubair mentioned the positive changes that are taking place in Saudi Arabia with the country's 2030 vision which seeks to diversify the economy away from oil and open new investments, empowering the youth and women, and to transform the country into a dynamic, innovative, transparent, accountable society. Al Jubair stressed the idea that most Saudi's are under the age of 30, which reflects ambition and hope. He mentions initiatives for Saudi Arabia

on technology and red sea projects. Moreover, he says that these changes will make Saudi Arabia stronger, wealthier, and ready to face the challenges around it and will overcome it. He goes on by talking about the support of the legitimate government in Yemen.

- **Adel Al Jubair, video #12, 2016,2017 (International audience)**

The occasion of the talk is Davos 2017 - Middle East Security in world economic forum, and the Munich conference in 2016. The targeted audience is the international community. The goal of the talk is to discuss the current security matters in the region.

The overall theme of the subject is on the middle east security, and terrorism.

Adel Al Jubair mentions the necessity for the regional countries to engage more in counterterrorism. He mentions that Saudi Arabia is willing to cooperate with any country in the war against terrorism. Al Jubair when he was asked about the ISIS and Islam, he refused that the name of Islam gets in the same sentence with ISIS by giving an example of the KKK (Ku Klux Klan) terrorist organization and saying that this group doesn't represent Christianity and calls for the killing of African Americans, and they do all these acts under the name of Christianity and the cross which in reality doesn't represent Christianity.

About the American new presidency of Trump, Al Jubair wished that with this administration, the world can see more American engagement in the world and region and rebuilding relationships with allies. Serious effort in fighting ISIS, and serious effort in containing Iran. The deal of Iran nuclear weapon is that Iran is not trustworthy of having nuclear weapons due to its support for terrorism and disengagement in the region which is a big concern, and the fact that it

got away with its action and violating ballistic missiles arrangements and interfering in the affairs of other countries is an issue of a significant concern. About Iran, if it can be as an ally in fighting ISIS, Al Jubair said that it is not an issue of cooperating or not cooperating because Saudi Arabia is looking forward to cooperating with Iranians and others in fighting terrorism. However, the fact of the matter is that Iran has been single-handed the most supporter of terrorism in the region. Al Jubair goes on by giving an examples like how Iran created and supported Hezbollah, harbored and sheltered terrorists the directors of Al Qaeda settled in Iran after the American invasion of Afghanistan; they ordered to blow up three housing compounds in Riyadh in 2003 was made of Saif Al Adel (the chief operation of Al Qaeda) while he was in Iran in a phone call Saudi have on tape. When we captured a terrorist in Lebanon, we found him with an Iranian passport even though he was a Saudi citizen. Al Jubair continues by saying that he finds it interesting that Al Qaeda and ISIS have attacked almost every country in the world, except Iran, and is never attacked by these terrorist's organization.

- **Saudi Officials and Police Officers, Three Videos (Saudi documentary on counterterrorism), Saudi Arabia.**

The occasion of the talks is a documentary which was made by Saudi officials to show the public their efforts in the war against Al Qaeda. The targeted audience is Saudi citizens, and the goal of the documentary is showing the process of military and police force development in the war against Al Qaeda. The overall theme of the subject is the kingdom of Saudi Arabia's efforts in the war against Al Qaeda.

Officials said that Al Qaeda was the biggest threat to the kingdom from 2003 until 2006. Al Qaeda started with a secret recruiting program, and they filmed short films to use it for promoting the group, and it did not occur to them that we will find some of the unedited scenes they filmed someday. A previous member of Al Qaeda said that they kidnap the Saudi youth with wrongful fatwas of Al Jihad, and when they arrived, Al Qaeda recruited them and made them do stuff that is not even religious nor mentioned in Al Quran. They killed civilians and police officers, and we found ourselves in a war that does not have mercy. Al Qaeda's capabilities were unmeasurable, and they were seeking for any chance to spread more violence and chaos.

The crown prince at the time Abdullah bin Abdelaziz said that Al Qaeda is an enemy to Islam, to the kingdom, and humanity. Moreover, a police officer said that he could not understand how Al Qaeda claims they are Muslims when their actions do not represent religion nor values. Police officers said that they must secure the kingdom and its people. Police officers had only two choices. Either to spread law or chaos. We declared the war against terrorism after the 9/11 attack that happened in the United States. A police officer said that in the beginning, he did not expect that this terrorist group would be a source of danger for the kingdom. However, Al Qaeda appeared to be dangerous and threatening to our national security after adopting this extremist ideology against the country and succeeding in their 9/11 attack. They take the youth and manipulate their minds to create radicals then throw them in these terrorist attacks. It is very sad that they use Islam as a justification for violence. Al Qaeda's language is blood and killing, so the kingdom had to respond to them in the same language.

A police officer said that it is easy to kill a terrorist, but it was hard to kill the ideology. A Saudi police officer said that at the beginning of Al Qaeda, people did not understand the ideology, so there was an empathy when Al Qaeda called themselves mujahideen. However, it was apparent afterward that they want to manipulate the entire mean of Islam, and they wanted to kill us in and take us out of our land. Terrorist youth encourage each other by describing themselves as heroes, which is wrong. It is very unfortunate that our youth were used as a dangerous tool. They created different secret cells around the kingdom and used it as storage that included vast amounts of weapons and bombs. After each mission, we evaluate ourselves as a police force, and what we can improve in the war against them. The kingdom had successfully stopped many of their operations in the kingdom. In the war against Al Qaeda, the kingdom was in real need of all the citizens to unify and participate in the war against this terrorist organization. The crown prince ordered all the religious figures, and tribe leaders in the kingdom to unify and clarify their point of view on terrorism to all the people. The crown prince at the time Abdullah bin Abdelaziz said to all the people and tribe leaders that they have to tell all the citizens to stand against terrorism, and whoever stays silent is considered in the terrorist group. The documentary goes on to show real footage of many counterterrorism missions that were successfully done by the police officers.

- **Khaled bin Salman, Jan 24, 2020, International audience (English Channel)**

Saudi deputy minister of defense Khaled bin Salman talks in a Tv Interview. The targeted audience is the international community, and the goal of the talk is to explain and discuss the danger of Iran. The overall theme of the subject is current security issues in the region with a

focus on Iran's threat. Khaled bin Salman said that the current most significant threat to the region and international community is Iran, the Iranian regime and its proxies on one side, and ISIS, Al Qaeda, and terrorist organizations on the other side. Moreover, Iran and terrorism not necessarily have the same ideology, but both believe in the same concept, which is not believing the sovereignty of nations, and they both believe in the transitional ideological state, and they both do not believe in international law. Sometimes they compete and fight each other, but when it comes to Saudi Arabia, we are a common enemy to them, and they cooperate in fighting us. They think of us as a common enemy because we are a force of civility and force of peace and prosperity in the region. Khaled bin Salman said that Saudi Arabia's grand vision of 2030 which will reform the economy to basically un tap the potential in Saudi Arabia and move the country forward and in order to achieve that we need stability and secure region and cooperation with our neighbors, and Iran wants to export the revolution and has an expansionist ideology and Iran seeks to make the neighboring countries to be under its expansionist project. He says this is a big difference since we want to move Saudi Arabia forward with vision 2030, and Iran wants to move the entire region backward with its vision of 1979. Four years after the Iranian revolution, we see Iran start to build this sectarian terrorist militia in Lebanon, and they are trying to do the same in Syria, Iraq, and Yemen, and they are getting away with it. Moreover, Khaled bin Salman said that we should remember that Hezbollah is not a domestic threat, but it is a transnational threat because we see Hezbollah money laundry and drug activity throughout the world. Khaled bin Salman says that if the supreme leader in Iran is just about religion then why do we always see (Al Wally Al Fakeeh) the supreme leader comes from Iran, why don't we see him as Iraqi or Lebanese supreme leader and the Iranian Mulla follow him we will never see that because Iran is

using Iraq and Lebanon as a tools to their expansionist policies. Khaled bin Salman goes on by saying Osama bin Laden himself in his document that was found by the United States said clearly that Iran funds their activity, and it helped them logistically, and he mentioned Iran as a partner against Saudi Arabia and the United States. Khaled bin Salman says that Iranian people are great people and they want to build their country and move it forward, but Iran and Saudi Arabia significantly differ politically because there are extremists in Saudi. However, they are the minority and, on the run, and there are minority extremists in Iran, but they are running the country. Khaled bin Salman mentioned how president trump visit to Saudi Arabia was a very important visit and was very encouraging to the Muslim people especially when spoke about counterterrorism and he said that ISIS and terrorist group's victims are mostly Muslims and its very important to hear this from the president of the United States. When Khaled bin Salman was asked about Yemen, he said that Saudi Arabia did not sport the Yemeni government to start a war in Yemen. However, Saudi Arabia supported them to end the war against Iranian militias (Houthis) when they killed and slaughtered Yemeni people, and if the Yemeni government falls, we will have more terrorism and instability. Saudi Arabia is trying to fix the economy, and humanitarian issues in Yemen and Saudi Arabia and the UAE donated to the UN the highest donation in the UN history for humanitarian aid. Saudi Arabia wants partners and stability, which is different than what Iran wants. Counterterrorism was high on the agenda of Trump's visit, and we spoke about increasing our security side and defense, and most importantly, the economic side. Khaled bin Salman said that Saudi Arabia is an important customer to the American companies and created many jobs because of the cooperation in the defense procurement to build Saudi's arm force, which we use to counterterrorism.