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Chapter One: Deconstructing Constructions

On September 11, 2001, two planes flew into The World Trade Center, killing an estimated 2,800-3,025 global citizens. Prominent leaders, the press, and the public discourse surrounding the event all played a significant role in shaping how people know and understand it today. The following terms came to be associated with this horrific day in history: “terror,” “terrorism,” “terrorist(s),” “terrorist attacks,” “Islamic martyrdom,” “Islamic jihad,” “attacks on American soil,” simply, “9/11,” and of course, “war.” Since this watershed moment, a significant amount of research has focused on political leaders’ war rhetoric, drawing parallels between the rhetoric of America’s most recent War on Terror to the war rhetorics of former political leaders, most notably Hitler. Many studies exclusively deconstruct the strategies that leaders employ to create an enemy by means of Othering (Merskin, 2004; Graham, Keenan & Dowd, 2004). While such deconstructions elucidate certain aspects of war rhetoric, they are characteristically limited in scope, focusing on a single facet such as binary constructs, including an “us” versus “them” mentality. However insightful, Othering does not account for political leaders’ motives or the scenes in which leaders act or react, nor does Othering individually siphon out all of the “terms” leaders employ to make war appear well intentioned, purposeful, and good. Furthermore, studies that construct the enemy as Other often only draw comparisons with past war rhetorics, excluding discussions about the current Other’s actions and reactions to war (Merskin, 2004; Graham, Keenan & Dowd, 2004). Finally, also omitted from the discussions of this war’s rhetorics are alternative and silenced rhetorics.

In an attempt to bring further understanding to rhetorics of war, in this paper, I utilize Kenneth Burke’s dramatistic approach to examine the “terror[ism] rhetoric” in the speeches
of three leaders: George W. Bush, Osama bin Laden, and Benazir Bhutto. I find the first two
speakers important to analyze because of their leadership positions in “different worlds.”
Furthermore, the speakers’ similar yet different ideologies as well as their opposite positions
in the “War on Terror” make them interesting figures to include in my analysis. The speeches
themselves are pertinent to my analysis because of the timeliness in which they were
delivered after 9/11, because of the topic of war, and ultimately, because these two speeches
had a profound effect on shaping the present reality, situation, and discourse surrounding the
War on Terror.

On October 7, 2001, [then] U.S. President George W. Bush addressed the nation to
announce the beginning of military strikes on Afghanistan, thus declaring the War on Terror.
Besides the American people, Bush undoubtedly had other secondary audiences as well as
another target audience in mind in particular: Osama bin Laden, leader of the anti-Saudi
establishment known as al Qaeda. Bin Laden, speaker of the second speech I examine, was
thought to be responsible for the 9/11 attacks. Only hours after Bush’s speech, al-Jazeera, an
Arabic language network, broadcast a videotaped address given by bin Laden. The actual
date and time of the recording is still unknown today, but audiences suspected the video was
recorded in direct response to Bush’s address (Tuman, 2003, p. 137). And, in the years of
war that followed, these two leaders remained in direct conflict with one another, battling
back and forth through weapons and words. Although many other leaders have openly
addressed the 9/11 attacks, few have received the same public notice and response as Bush
and bin Laden. While these two speeches reveal the intricate details of how a War on Terror
reality was created through two performances, they only expose one reality. The speakers
may have divergent views, but they operate under the same terms, that is, through a
patriarchal, masculine, dominant ideology. This one dominant perspective on reality allows little room for other ideologies to be seen or heard, much less accepted.

Benazir Bhutto’s speech, the third speech, highlights the similarity of the terms—by offering an alternative reality—one that is more consciously gendered. Bhutto delivered this speech in the United States on December 16, 2002 under the auspices of the Pakistan People’s Party (PPP) (specific location of the speech is unknown). A feminist woman from a wealthy family with a long history of political activism, Bhutto was educated at Harvard and Oxford and became the first female leader of the modern Islamic nation of Pakistan. Bhutto was the Prime Minister of Pakistan from November 1988 to August 1990 and October 1993 to November 1996, but both times her government was overthrown. As a leader, Bhutto was devoted to peace, human rights, and democracy. Several times throughout her career, she was imprisoned and exiled for speaking out on behalf of others’ rights and also for speaking against the military dictatorships that ruled Pakistan for many years, including before, during, and after 9/11. Before her assassination on December 27, 2007, Bhutto served as chairperson of the Pakistan People’s Party.

I include Bhutto’s speech in my analysis for a number of reasons. First, in her “Victims of Terrorism” address, Bhutto focuses on the same topic as Bush and bin Laden: terrorism. Second, she delivers the speech in 2002, only a year after the declaration of the War on Terror. Third, Bhutto’s position is unique because she moves beyond the barriers of “worlds”—East/West, feminine/masculine—almost effortlessly. At the time of this speech, Bhutto was an Islamic woman and political leader in a male dominated world. She was a powerful leader who spoke publicly, struggling to make her voice heard. Bhutto sought a democratic government, understood by many as the government of the West, but she did so
in an Islamic nation, situated in the East. The speech itself is unique because although she addresses the same topic as Bush and bin Laden, she highlights different aspects of the situation and the style in which she delivers the speech shows how she negotiates all of her roles: woman, Islamic, political leader, activist, and human rights and democracy advocate. In my analysis, I will show that due to Bhutto’s constant negotiation of these roles, she shapes a different reality of 9/11 and the ensuing events.

Because of the drama inherent in 9/11 and the successive attacks, and also because of the backlash the war received including protests and the 9/11 Commission Report, I find it imperative to retrospectively examine the Bush, bin Laden, and Bhutto speeches. All three speeches have unique characteristics and present audiences with a particular way of seeing. Additionally interesting to my analysis, is the fact that two of the speeches were “heard” round the world (Bush, bin Laden), while one was kept relatively silent (Bhutto). In this thesis, I dissect the speeches to question the reality many people accept, which was shaped by leaders after 9/11. I also introduce alternative realities that Others attempted to produce but that exist “somewhere out there.” I employ both feminist rhetorical criticism and Burke’s pentad to the three speeches. While the pentad can help ascertain that there are alternative realities, feminist rhetorical criticism assists in fleshing out the details of these realities, and it also explains why these realities so frequently go unnoticed.

**Methods of Deconstruction**

Kenneth Burke’s dramatistic approach serves as a powerful tool for deconstructing political rhetoric because the framework exposes rhetors’ motives beyond those explicitly stated within a text (Bizzell & Herzberg, 2001; Hart & Daughton, 2005). Burke contends that
all of life is essentially drama. People are all actors on a stage without being completely conscious of it. And in order to create or take part in that drama—which comes to be known as reality—people use language. Leaders, then, who have access to public and often televised forums, play a primary role in shaping the drama known as reality. Through an examination of political leaders’ language, Burke’s framework reveals the reality in which a particular leader operates. Burke writes, “In brief, much that we take as observations about ‘reality’ may be but the spinning out of possibilities implicit in our particular choice of terms” (1966, p. 46). In other words, language is not directly connected to reality; language merely constructs, produces, and reproduces observations that come to be known as reality. When rhetors speak, their primary goal is to persuade the audience to accept their “drama” or particular perspective as reality. Burke claims that by pulling terms or clusters of terms out of their initial context and viewing them through what he calls “terministic screens” and by using his dramatistic pentad, people can begin to deconstruct rhetoric, revealing the rhetor’s reasons for constructing reality in a particular way.

Burke’s dramatistic pentad supplies five terms for analyzing rhetors’ motives: Scene, Act, Agent, Agency, and Purpose (1945, p. xv). The act consists of the rhetorical situation; the agent performs the act; how the agent performs the act is the agency; and the reason the act is performed is the purpose; scene contains all of these elements just as it would in a theatre drama. Burke also divides these terms further into ten “ratios,” pairing each term with each of the others, in order to show overlaps. For example, because scene encompasses all of the other elements, Burke refers to it as a “container” for the others. To explain the scene as a container for act and agent, Burke states, “Using ‘scene’ in the sense of setting, or background, and ‘act’ in the sense of action, one could say that ‘the scene contains the act.’
And using ‘agents’ in the sense of actors, or acters, one could say that ‘the scene contains the agents’” (1945, p. 3). Acts and agents must be consistent with the scene or audiences will not accept the drama—in this case, the leader’s message—as reality. The scene and act—what Burke calls the scene-act ratio—work in conjunction so that hearers willingly accept and trust the speech (agency) and speaker (agent). Because scene stands as the container for agents and acts, the scene becomes of primary importance because it paints an initial portrait even before the rhetor begins to speak. Then, on a second level, as the rhetor speaks, he/she articulates the scene, highlighting the important scenic elements he/she wishes audiences to focus on and remember.

Although audiences of rhetorics always play a part in the human drama, the dramatistic pentad allows audiences to play a less enmeshed role, to see acts, scenes, agents, agencies, and purposes in a different way, from a critical position. Once audiences begin to question the language that agents use, they will perceive the drama in a new light. They will see inconsistencies and absences from one scene to the next and come to see the motives behind these absences. And finally, they will begin to see the human drama in its entirety, instead of scene-by-scene. Burke’s framework also reveals *deflections* (1966, p. 45)—omissions, silences, secrets, and absences—in rhetorics. Acknowledging deflections in another way, Burke (1945) implores audiences to dissect rhetors’ words: “We are admonished to dwell upon the word, considering its embarrassments and its potentialities of transformation, so that we may detect its covert influence even in cases where it is overtly absent” (p. 21).

While Burke’s pentad helps audiences recognize that there are omissions and inconsistencies in the human drama, feminist rhetorical criticism offers an additional method
for fleshing out what these absences are and which agents have been silenced. The rhetoric of terrorism presents not just one, but many silences. Feminist rhetorical criticism calls into question the current dominant discourse used to construct reality. Furthermore, this branch of critical studies brings attention to multiplicities—many Others—in language, culture, race, gender, class, religion, and more. Feminist rhetorical criticism helps tease out these differences and find meaning and value beyond the dominant discourse within which many leaders operate. In her book, *Against Empire* (2004), Zillah Eisenstein refers to feminism as feminisms. She writes, “Feminisms are humanist theories of inclusivity that attempt to name women in their cacophonous voices. This variety expresses the standard of polyversality—a shared-ness expressed through uniqueness” (p. 219). Not all feminists share the same approach, not all are focused on democracy or share the same nationality or ethnicity. But, she says, a “polyversality” exists among these feminisms. This feminist approach presents audience members with alternative realities.

Feminists and women in general, are no strangers to being silenced, pushed to the background, or absent from scenes in the human drama. For centuries women were and still are denied education; they were and still are excluded from the realm of rhetoric. And women’s history was and still is erased from memory. To address women’s absence from politics, prominent feminist scholar, Karlyn Kohrs Campbell (1998) states, “That Western women, among others, have been excluded from political participation has meant that rhetorical genres have traditionally been coded as masculine, that is, there have been no protocols, no precedents, to guide a woman who sought to be heard by the community. Only male models existed” (p. 117). Historically, women who sought protagonist or “agent” roles in the human drama often did not receive the part because they did not strictly adhere to the
masculine coded script or because the script did not provide them with roles. Masculinity and patriarchy still remain the dominant ideology and within that construct, Western ideology has an ever-increasing influence over others. Although other ideologies and women may be contained within the scene, both are often spoken for, over, or silenced completely.

Women have struggled to overcome being silenced, and in doing so, Campbell (1998) asserts, “Women were compelled to invent the spaces and roles in which and the sites from which women’s voices could be heard and heeded. Women had to invent themselves as speakers, as rhetors” (p. 112). As women invented themselves in the public sphere, they adopted a “feminine style,” which allowed them to “synthesize gender expectations” (Dow and Tonn, 1993, p. 288). They adhered to “socially approved rhetorical strategies” associated with masculinity such as “formal evidence, deductive structure, and linear modes of reasoning,” but they also formed a unique style of their own by “incorporating concerns and qualities typically considered ‘feminine,’ such as family values or feminine personae” (Dow and Tonn, 1993, p. 288). This synthesis of masculine and feminine styles has not permitted mass entry into leading character roles though. Women and other marginalized groups outside the dominant masculine ideology still face the challenge of being heard. The disparities between gender and what Carol Cohn (1993) calls “gendered discourses” become even more apparent in times of war. By Cohn's definition, gender refers to “a symbolic system, a central organizing discourse of culture, one that not only shapes how we experience and understand ourselves as men and women, but that also interweaves with other discourses and shapes them—and therefore shapes other aspects of our world—such as how nuclear weapons are thought about and deployed” (p. 228). War is, in many ways, associated with the masculine form, and thus, the feminine form is devalued and often silenced. But women’s
enduring struggles over the years and subtle victories have begun to pave the way for acceptance of multiple Others gaining leading roles and being heard.

**Viewing War Rhetorics through Screens**

For viewing the ideological standpoint that Bush, bin Laden, and Bhutto endeavor to protect and/or advocate in their rhetorics, I have derived a set of screens as an extension of Burke’s framework. Through additional research (discussed below), I identified common themes contained in the language of war rhetorics, which allowed me to compose the following “terministic screens” for evaluating the three addresses: (1) The Othering Screen; (2) The Religious Screen; (3) The Gendered Screen; and (4) The Historical Analogy Screen. As suggested in their titles, each screen draws attention to certain terms or underlying themes while excluding others, but all screens are inextricably linked. For example, The Gendered Screen exposes gendered language, but in some cases, gendered language might also work as an Othering strategy by constructing the binary of masculinity versus femininity. These overlaps show how the screens work together and why leaders’ rhetorical strategies are so powerful in times of war; words that are visible through multiple screens resonate with audiences because these terms function to reinforce not just one cultural narrative, but many. The successive chapters include explanations of each of the screens followed by my analyses of the Bush, bin Laden, and Bhutto speeches, treated separately (see Appendices A, B, and C respectively for transcripts of the three speeches; all citations correspond to numbered passages in the respective addresses). Finally, I compare and contrast the three speeches and discuss implications.
One screen to view rhetorics of war is the Othering Screen, which reveals that, when threatened, groups such as governments find it absolutely essential to unify their people while at the same time placing a division between allies and the unified, Othered enemy. Burke (1973) explains, “It is a part of the genius of a great leader to make adversaries of different fields appear as always belonging to one category only” and “Men who can unite on nothing else can unite on the basis of a foe shared by all” (p. 193). Through the construction of a singular enemy, people are able to combine and direct their efforts toward defeating one common enemy. Necessarily, this enemy holds beliefs, values, ideologies, and other characteristics (race, class, gender, ethnicity, religion, nationality) that are portrayed as standing in direct opposition to the rhetor. In these situations, there is no middle ground, no grey area. Tuman (2003) adds that Othering is also “a powerful tool for galvanizing the masses and keeping one’s own people from questioning or second-guessing a leader” (p. 41). When leaders successfully create the Othered enemy, they gain consent of the masses to take action.

Beyond narrowly defining the Other as “them” with beliefs, values, and characteristics that oppose “ours,” “they” are also constructed through the use of positively/negatively-charged terms that audiences associate with loves/desires or hates/fears (Heath & O’Hair, 2008, p. 21). Through these signifying terms, the Other is identified as an enemy, while “we” remain allies. Terms identifying “us” often include “civilization,” “freedom,” “justice,” and “counterterrorism.” Similarly, negative terms associated with “them” include “barbarism,” “war,” “injustice,” and “fear/terror” (Llorente, 2002, p. 39; Jackson, 2005, p. 61). Another way to view this rhetorical strategy is in terms of “good guys”
and “bad guys.” These constructions make the War on Terror “understandable to the wider public” (Jackson, 2005, p. 59) because “Such a rendering functions to create an enemy so heinous and so inhuman that large-scale violence against them seems perfectly normal and reasonable” (Jackson, 2005, p. 61). If people regard the enemy as less than human, they lose empathy for the Other, removing any guilt they would otherwise feel for inflicting violence.

Another way of understanding the Othering Screen is through a schema called Intensify/Downplay (Rank, 1977). In this sense, Othering occurs when leaders create polarization between groups by intensifying “our” good and the Other’s bad, while downplaying “our” bad and the Other’s good. These rhetorical strategies demonstrate the power of words because “intensive political violence is actually very difficult to sustain otherwise; there are powerful in-built social and individual inhibitors to killing other human beings, like empathy” (Jackson, 2005, pp. 59-60). Anti-war protesters might be an example of this kind of empathy. However, through the Othering process, all groups reduce to only two. As a result, grey areas become non-existent, disallowing neutral stances that do not fall into the black and white categories of the two political agendas.

The Religious Screen

Related to Othering because it often functions as a source for vilifying the Other, the Religious Screen can also be used to analyze the religious language that leaders employ in war rhetorics. The Religious Screen draws out culturally embedded religious terminology, such as “evil” or “demon,” linking these terms to the Othered enemy, which evokes a certain fear and manipulates people’s attitudes and behaviors (Rediehs, 2002, p. 65). In times of war

---

1 In Rank’s Intensify/Downplay schema, he explains that rhetors intensify through the use of repetition, association (to images/objects/words that have resonant connotations), and composition (position or placement in relation to other things). Reversing these techniques, Rank adds that rhetors downplay through the principles of diversion, omission, and confusion.
and political unrest, “demons are ready-made cultural signifiers, handy *topoi* for restoring speech” (Gunn, 2004, p. 4). Accordingly, religious terminology and references provide people with a ready-made lexicon, enabling them to participate in the dramatic events and discourses surrounding war.

In addition to demonization, war rhetorics also reference specific religions (in the case of the War on Terror, the monotheistic religions of Islam and Christianity), religious books (the Bible and the Qur’an) and leaders/prophets (God/Allah, Jesus Christ/Muhammad). These appeals to morality and a higher power portray each group’s position as just, for they are only carrying out the will of God or defending justice in His name (Heath & O’Hair, 2008, p. 36; Jackson, 2005, p. 125). Again, this manipulation of language shows the strength that words have in mobilizing people to fight for a cause, in this case, God’s or Muhammad’s cause. Leaders utilize this covert strategy, so audiences will not question war. Through this strategy, leaders teach people how to act and react as members of society: “…the use of evil in demon-making sets a civil pedagogy—a subtle form of discipline—into motion. By using a charged, yet vague label, a speaker can demonize entire peoples and justify violence as a necessity” (Gunn, 2004, p. 19). The assumption, then, is that evil cannot be fought with more evil, which establishes all actions taken against evil as good.

*The Gendered Screen*

While Othering and religious language reproduce the dominant ideology through the use of emotionally charged terms, gendered language aids in the construction of war rhetorics because the terms reinforce the enduring cultural narrative of patriarchy. The Gendered Screen uncovers the patriarchal language in war rhetorics, strengthening traditional masculine/feminine roles to legitimize certain thoughts and actions over others. As Richard
Jackson (2005) points out, the rhetoric of the War on Terror is “actually an overwhelmingly masculine narrative full of stereotypical masculine heroes (firefighters, and police officers, soldiers/warriors, the courageous president), equally stereotypical female victims (the oppressed women of Afghanistan, Private Jessica Lynch, the ‘Homeland’) and an accompanying set to traditional masculine behaviours and images” (p. 157, emphasis in original).

In many rhetorics of war, men are portrayed as heroes while women appear victims, but there is also another dimension to the use of gender stereotypes in the War on Terror. Stereotypical feminine characteristics are often associated with the enemy. For example, while positive masculine traits ascribed in war rhetorics include “strong, rational, aggressive, and brave,” typical feminine traits within the narratives include “weak, irrational, passive, and cowardly” (Egan, 2002, p. 54). By overlapping the Religious Screen with the Gendered Screen, R. Danielle Egan (2002) adds that “One need look no farther than biblical references to Eve and her tasting of the forbidden fruit to recognize the historical connections of femininity to evil” (p. 55). In the rhetoric of the War on Terror, women are often portrayed in one of two ways, neither respectable; leaders depict women as either the evil villain or the feeble maiden.

Many scholars point specifically to the usage of “coward” to demonstrate gendered language at work in rhetorics of war. Immediately after the 9/11 attacks, many addressed the suicide bombings as “cowardice” (Egan, 2002, p. 53). This term constructs a particular way of understanding the War on Terror (and also gender):

Using cowardice as a metaphor for the attacks of 9/11 constructs a gendered discourse that foregrounds masculinity as a way to help understand 9/11 and as a
justification for the bombing in Afghanistan. In this discourse, a coward is less than a man, one who does things underhandedly and either refuses to fight or plays dirty when he engages in a fight. The coward is not man enough to say it to your face and instead chooses to say it behind your back. In essence the coward is the antithesis of the dominant ideology of masculinity in a patriarchal culture. (Egan, 2002, p. 54)

While cowardice may not necessarily denote femininity, by invoking binaries, it clearly signifies a lesser form of masculinity. Although this covert method causes gendered language to be frequently overlooked in war rhetorics, it remains a prominent rhetorical strategy that leaders employ—by reinforcing dominant ideologies—to construct a specific perception of war.

The gendered screen also exposes emotions as associated with femininity. Instead of discussing human lives, which might lead to empathy for the enemy Other, leaders and the media speak of “collateral damage,” a phrase familiar to most yet devoid of feeling. This gendered discourse informs and shapes nuclear and national security discourse, and in so doing creates silences and absences. It keeps things out of the room, unsaid, and keeps them ignored if they manage to get in. As such, it degrades our ability to think well and fully about nuclear weapons and national security, and shapes and limits the possible outcomes of our deliberations. (Cohn, 1993, p. 232, emphasis in original)

In discussions of war, the only emotions deemed acceptable are those associated with masculinity such as aggression. If people begin to feel for or empathize with the enemy, then war appears more and more unfavorable and less and less just.
The Historical Analogy Screen

The three previous screens provide a substantial amount of support and context for the Historical Analogy Screen because they show that “Words have histories,” connotations that they carry due to prior usage (Collins & Glover, 2002, p. 9). The idea of reproducing ideological constructions, like those created through Othering, religion, or gender implies that such constructions were always and already present to some extent. The Historical Analogy Screen highlights words or phrases that reuse language or recreate cultural narratives to remind audiences of the past and its consequences by making associations to the present. Thus, these “word histories” ensure that audiences decode messages in the way that rhetors intend. Hart and Daughton (2005) note that Burke was aware of historical references and the history of terms that leaders employ to evoke certain emotions, thereby producing actions within their hearers. They claim, “[He] knew that political systems come and go as a nation’s economy, sociology, and demography evolve. But a galvanizing drama can be repeated endlessly, Burke warned, because people’s deepest fears and anxieties never change” (p. 261). Leaders and speechwriters may even go so far as to recycle former rhetorics in order to call up specific images and emotions in the audience (Gunn, 2004, p. 11). Thus, history repeats itself in actions and in words.

The discourse of historical analogies is “reflexive; that is, it has to continuously reconstruct and reinvent earlier discursive formations in order to maintain coherence in the face of internal and external contradiction and challenges” (Jackson, 2005, p. 156, emphasis in original). More specifically, the rhetoric of 9/11 may revolve around four meta-narratives: (1) World War II and the attack on Pearl Harbor; (2) Communism during the Cold War; (3) the battle between civilization and barbarism; and (4) the threats to/of globalization (Jackson,
2005, p. 41). Myths also work as “narratives which give meaning and purpose to experience…leaders create and re-create myths, especially in times of crisis, as a means of reinforcing unity” (Jackson, 2005, p. 35). So, here too, there are links to unifying one group against the Other. As historically established discourses, myths and narratives serve to heighten people’s fears in times of war; they construct a reality where war appears the only viable option because many of the historical references resulted in war. Additionally, it is imperative that leaders mention wars that are often viewed as “good,” wars in which the rhetor’s side claimed victory. Such historical references serve to dispel any doubts about winning the war at hand.

Common among many rhetorics of war is the absence of alternatives to war-based methods (Jackson, 2005, p. 158). Instantly, other options are erased from the discourse, but there are several alternatives to the War on Terror: “Instead of acknowledging that there are a great many models and paradigms for dealing with terrorism—legal and policing-based approaches, diplomatic and political approaches, conciliatory approaches, long-term structural approaches—it is axiomatically assumed that military and repressive approaches are the only rational and realistic options” (Jackson, 2005, p. 158). Leaders intentionally exclude these histories and alternatives from the discourse, so people will not question or challenge the dominant narrative. Therefore, spaces for discourse, along with perceptions of reality, were limited before the War on Terror even began (Jackson, 2005, p. 178; Tuman, 2003, p. 111).

In spite of the many historical analogies and, allusions to previous wars, by its very nature, history presents breaches in perspectives; people cannot completely understand experiences they have not personally had. If people are not knowledgeable of historical
accounts and the foreign policies of various nations, many of the allusions do not serve their purposes; they elude, rather than allude.

All of the screens discussed up to this point illustrate that historically, war remains a dominant mode of discourse and action. Countries, cultures, religions, genders, individuals, and their respective Others have always been at war, wishing to claim themselves rulers of the world; battle remains a perpetual state of affairs. But, people wouldn’t fight if they doubted victory. Therefore, leaders often allude to past wars that they have won. Rhetors employ terms in their texts to display conviction in order to gain the consent of the people. “At its most basic level, the language used by officials is an attempt to convince the public that ‘war’ against all forms of terrorism is necessary, reasonable, inherently good and winnable” (Jackson, 2005, p. 177). However, leaders of any war and on any side, employ this strategy, which shows that when people gain confidence in a leader, they offer their consent. In turn, leaders address war as “winnable” without a doubt, which serves to justify actions of war not only in the past, but in the present and future as well. By stating victory as an inevitable fact, war appears a favorable option because as the cultural narratives in the Historical Analogy Screen suggest, people who win gain power and respect. Historical analogies and historical events serve to shape leaders’ scenes prior to their speech acts. Turning now to Bush, I will show how he shaped his address through explicit references to history and through various terms that saturated the public discourse surrounding and following 9/11.
Chapter Two: Deconstructing the Scene and Rhetoric of George W. Bush’s October 7, 2001 Speech

After the September 11 attacks, many Americans found a renewed sense of patriotism; they waved the American flag proudly from their homes and businesses. However, they were still experiencing a state of shock, fear, sadness, and despair. In weeks after the attacks the U.S. media and public discourse aided in the construction of Bush's scene. They repeatedly displayed images of the planes crashing into the World Trade Center towers, the towers tumbling to the ground, and people scrambling to save lives. Osama bin Laden, the Taliban, and al Qaeda were immediately targeted as the culprits, referred to time and time again as “terrorists.” In response to these acts and media constructions, Americans were devastated, and they wanted answers. Bush addressed the nation several times after the attacks, but it was not until October 7, 2001 that he delivered a response of action.

President George W. Bush spoke to the people of the United States in a televised address. Ironically, although his purpose was to announce military strikes on Afghanistan, Bush spoke from the Treaty Room in the White House, which, even he admits, is “a place where American presidents have worked for peace” (para. 9). As the sole actor contained within the scene, Bush appeared refined, professional and confident in a dark business suit, white button-down shirt, red tie, and an adorning American flag lapel pin. The camera remained in close for most of Bush's speech, but when the cameraperson zoomed out, viewers could see family photographs on each of his sides. Bush’s masculinity was shaped by his role as a loving father and husband—to his family and the nation. Donning patriotism and presidential power, the American and U.S. Presidential flags appeared in close frames,
on Bush's left and right, respectively. Bush sat in front of a window, thus, behind him viewers could see trees, cars driving by on the streets of Washington D.C., and birds flying about in the distance seeming to symbolize that despite the recent attacks, by some force or strength, life in the U.S. continued. The President peered directly into the camera with insistence as he announced the War on Terror. In order to respond to 9/11 and also to provide some answers to Americans, Bush created his speech-scene with a calm, yet determined voice and through the use of powerful language. Viewing his speech through each of the four screens (Othering, Religious, Gendered, and Historical Analogy), it becomes apparent how Bush used terms that permeated public discourse to trigger a favorable and justified response to the war.

**Bush’s “Othering Screen”**

Bush begins his address by immediately identifying the Other as al Qaeda and the Taliban. He most commonly employs the negatively charged term “terrorists” to define the enemy. In fact, Bush reiterates the point to the extent that some form of the word “terror” occurs nine times throughout his brief address. He also utilizes the inclusive/exclusive language of “us/we/our” and “them/they/their”—which appear scattered throughout his address—to simultaneously unify and divide. For example, Bush states, “Our military action is also designed to clear the way for sustained, comprehensive and relentless operations to drive them out and bring them to justice” (para. 6, emphasis added). The culmination of Bush’s Othering rhetoric emerges in passage 12 where the display of binary opposites seems most apparent. He states, “Every nation has a choice to make. In this conflict there is no neutral ground. If any government sponsors the outlaws and killers of innocents, they have
become *outlaws* and *murderers* themselves” (emphasis added). In statements such as this one, Bush draws a line between two groups, therefore eliminating any chance for nations or individuals to hold a neutral position on the war. Noteworthy, though, are Bush’s concessions to the Afghan people. In passage six, Bush attempts to break down or at least problematize the binary by setting the people of Afghanistan apart from the terrorists. However, he continues to Other them in statements, such as “the *oppressed* people of Afghanistan will know the *generosity* of America and our allies” (emphasis added). He assumes that all Afghans are oppressed and thus will be overjoyed when Americans swoop in to save them. Ultimately, Bush undermines his attempt to dismantle the binary because he easily picks it up again later in the speech, as shown in paragraph twelve (discussed above). His rhetoric depends on the binary construction because without it he would complicate the image of the enemy. Bush cannot afford to risk allowing his audience(s) to reason to a non-binary conclusion, perhaps deeming the war unnecessary. Instead, he fulfills the binary construction, likely quieting some protesters and maintaining the favor of the American public, which later led to his 2004 election victory.

Bush frequently employs language with negative and positive connotations to intensify the division between the “good, civilized, and just American” and the “bad, barbaric, and destructive Other” while downplaying “bad American” and downplaying the “good Other.” For instance, Bush condemns the terrorists for plotting “evil plans” (para. 6). He also classifies the terrorists as “barbaric criminals” who commit “murder” (para. 9). In these constructions, Bush strips people of their humanity by calling them “barbarians.” Thus, the construction leads to the belief that terrorists are not human and therefore, they deserve to die horrible deaths and not be subject to international law. He continues this construction
when he states, “Initially the terrorists may burrow deeper into caves and other entrenched hiding places” (para. 6). Bush paints the image that the terrorists are more like animals than they are humans. They “burrow” like moles, living in caves, not houses. Adding to this construction as the war developed, the American military began detaining captured terrorists in places like Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. Because the terrorists are not human, they are not fit to be imprisoned within the U.S. They do not deserve the same legal justice as other criminals. But another of America's longstanding enemies, Cuba, can be exposed to these animalistic criminals, for over the years, they have been portrayed as less than human too.

In complete contrast to his dehumanization of the Other, Bush describes the actions of the U.S. and its allies through the use of positive language such as “friends,” “justice,” and “freedom.” For example, he states that the American military’s goal is to “bring [the terrorists] to justice” (para. 6). Bush also stresses that the U.S. “is a friend to the Afghan people” and to those who “practice the Islamic faith” (para. 8, emphasis added). Such positive connotations represent the U.S.’s actions as “good and just,” further distinguishing them from the Othered enemy.

Moreover, Bush utilizes the value-laden words of “peace” and “freedom” to construct America’s war efforts in a more favorable light and also to comply with Congressional Mandate. Despite the sudden declaration of war, Bush states, “We’re a peaceful nation” (para. 13), and names the operation “Enduring Freedom” (para. 14) (note the use of “operation,” a neutral term, as opposed to the more negative term “war”). He justifies his actions, arguing “there can be no peace in a world of sudden terror. In the face of today’s new threat the only way to pursue peace is to pursue those who threaten it” (para. 13, emphasis added). Thus, Bush depicts the threat as “real” by identifying it with terrorists and
tells the American people that war is the only way to bring the terrorists down. Finally, in the closing passage he asserts, “Peace and freedom will prevail,” (para. 23) implying that despite U.S. involvement in the War on Terror, and striking back before identifying a certain enemy, the U.S. remains on the side of justice.

**Bush’s “Religious Screen”**

Bush repeatedly references God in his rhetoric, claiming God sides with America. Because the U.S. is a “believing” nation, he could likely assume that invoking the religious narrative would lead to a favorable response from his American audience. Bush also responds to bin Laden’s use of religious rhetoric in order to discount it. Possibly to appease U.S. Muslims, Bush says that the terrorists “profane a great religion by committing murder in its name” (para. 9). Yet, Bush turns around and repeats a similar action. For example, he declares the War on Terror through religious appeals, stating, “A commander in chief sends America’s sons and daughters into battle in a foreign land only after the greatest care and a lot of prayer” (para. 18, emphasis added). Unaware of the hypocrisy and contradictions within these statements, Bush constructs the War on Terror as a battle between religious ideologies and also reinforces his fatherly, patriarchal role as president. Through a distorted version of religion, he justifies and promotes violence, asking his audience to play along and do the same. Bush closes his address with one final appeal to God, saying, “May God continue to bless America” (para. 23), leaving his audience and his allies with a sense of reassurance that their efforts are just; God will protect them because He is on their side. Through the use of religious terminology, Bush rationalizes war, for all attacks are only a defense in the name of the Almighty God.
Bush’s “Gendered Screen”

Aside from the obvious gendered terminology—use of the generic “he”—in Bush's address, the Gendered Screen also exposes some suppressed gendered narratives. Bush does make several attempts to be inclusive in his language. For example, he refers to both “America’s sons and daughters” (para. 18) and the “men and women in our military” (para. 19). In the following passages, Bush utilizes an enduring cultural narrative to talk about the bravery of men who go to war, thus reinforcing the stereotype that men go to battle while young, innocent, weak women stay home:

I recently received a touching letter that says a lot about the state of America in these difficult times. A letter from a fourth-grade girl with a father in the military. 'As much as I don't want my dad to fight,' she wrote, 'I'm willing to give him to you.' This is a precious gift, the greatest she could give. This young girl knows what America is all about. Since Sept. 11 an entire generation of young Americans has gained new understanding of the value of freedom and its cost in duty and in sacrifice. (paras. 21-22)

These passages function as strong pathetic appeals that are successful because of the entrenched patriarchal cultural narrative. Here again, Bush picks up the patriarchal construct with a man as the head of the household juxtaposed by a female child seemingly lower in the hierarchy. Jean Bethke Elshtain (1987) provides an explanation for this enduring cultural narrative, which she calls the “Just Warriors/Beautiful Souls” construct, and which captures the essence of Bush's use of this narrative in his address to the American people. She claims, We in the West are the heirs of a tradition that assumes an affinity between women and peace, between men and war, a tradition that consists of culturally constructed
and transmitted myths and memories. Thus, in time of war, real men and women...take on, in cultural memory and narrative, the personas of Just Warriors and Beautiful Souls. Man construed as violent, whether eagerly and inevitably or reluctantly and tragically; woman as nonviolent, offering succor and compassion: these tropes on the social identities of men and women, past and present, do not denote what men and women really are in time of war, but function instead to re-create and secure women's location as noncombatants and men's as warriors. These paradigmatic linkages dangerously overshadow other voices, other stories. (p. 4, emphasis in original)

Although the American military has progressed, this gendered narrative—especially in accounts of the U.S. military—remains deeply entrenched in American culture. Even when women are allowed to go to war, they are often stripped of any signs of femininity. Thus, this dominant narrative lacks space for Other voices and Other stories.

The American soldiers along with the “vanguard Muslims” carry the connotation of masculine bravery, for prior to World War II in the United States and even still today in some countries, women were/are not allowed to fight in wars. Bush’s masculine reference is more covert as shown in the following statement where he begins with inclusive language, but easily slips into gendered language: “To all the men and women in our military--every sailor, every soldier, every airman, every coast guardsman, every marine” (para. 18, emphasis added). Bush employs the generic—known to some as “universal”—“he” to refer to men and women; he could have attempted to alter the institutionalized masculine code by addressing the same groups of people as “every airman and airwoman” and “every coast guard.” Instead, Bush reinforces the dominant code.
For no apparent reason except to call up the masculine bravery of American leaders, Bush inserts a reference to former “American presidents.” He asserts, “I’m speaking to you today from the Treaty Room of the White House, a place where American presidents have worked for peace” (para. 13). This association can only be made to masculinity since the U.S. has yet to elect a female president. Thus, through this statement and those mentioned previously, Bush reinforces patriarchal constructions by calling attention to women’s public service—or rather perceived lack thereof—in the military and public office. These powerful positions appear reserved for men, and men only.

**Bush’s “Historical Analogy Screen”**

Bush seemingly denies that the War on Terror is part of an ongoing communication process, masking his historical analogies with countless references to “today” and a “new threat.” However, he cannot ignore actions and rhetorics of history. For example, Bush relies heavily on previous American war victories to gain the consent of the American people, mobilizing them to fight the War on Terror. When he states, “We’re a peaceful nation” (para. 13) and references the Treaty Room, he suggests the U.S. has only ever gone to war when absolutely necessary. Additionally, Bush states, “We are joined in this operation by our staunch friend, Great Britain” (para. 3), again calling to mind past wars that the U.S. fought alongside Great Britain, namely WWII, which Americans view as a good and just war on their part (Jackson, 2005, p. 44). Bush’s reference to former presidents “who have worked for peace” (para. 13) also serves to remind American citizens of the previous wars fought and won, all for the sake of peace. Thus, Bush utilizes the familiar contradiction that people wage wars to achieve peace.
Moreover, by labeling the Taliban and al Qaeda as “terrorists” and “barbaric criminals” (para. 9), Bush calls up images of the Ancients—barbarians—from which Americans consider themselves far removed now, being a “civilized nation.” And, as a civilized nation, war is never initiated without just cause and only as a last resort. The reference to barbarians and uncivilized societies also calls to mind “savagery” of the American-Indian War (Jackson, 2005, p. 48), which furthermore can be linked to Bush’s use of the term “outlaws”: “If any government sponsors the outlaws and killers of innocents, they have become outlaws and murderers themselves. And they will take that lonely path at their own peril” (para. 12). At first, it might appear out of place, but it too carries cultural significance in American history. A meta-narrative perhaps overlooked by non-American scholars, such as Jackson (British), appears to be that of the “Old West.” In the “Old West” a brave and noble hero tracks down and fights gun-slinging outlaws. Therefore, Bush’s use of the word “outlaws” in the rhetoric of the War on Terror makes America’s war efforts appear noble and heroic, fighting against those who commit murder without cause.

Throughout Bush’s address, he makes many strong pledges to gain American citizens’ consent. For example, after listing the names of the countries joining in America’s efforts, Bush says, “More than 40 countries in the Middle East, Africa, Europe and across Asia have granted air transit or landing rights. Many more have shared intelligence. We are supported by the collective will of the world” (para. 4). Thus, he communicates that with practically all nations on America’s side, “the collective will of the world” cannot lose. Furthermore, Bush explicitly states, “we will win this conflict” (para. 11), showing sheer confidence in America’s military as well as its allies’. He adds to this level of confidence when he assures people in the U.S. military that they possess everything they need to win the
war: “Your mission is defined, your objectives are clear, your goal just. You have my full confidence. And you will have every tool you need to carry out your duty” (paras. 19-20). Even with such a grand statement, Bush’s greatest display of certainty in winning the War on Terror comes at the end of his address, in the final paragraph when he claims, “We will not waver, we will not tire, we will not falter, and we will not fail” (para. 23). Bush mobilizes the “masses” to take action in what the U.S. declared the War on Terror. Through grand displays of confidence due to previous war victories and from supposed positions of justice, he tells Americans and their allies that victory is certain.

**Conclusion**

Pulling all of these terms out of Bush’s address shows his astuteness in choosing terms to achieve a particular outcome—namely, getting the public to agree with his course of action. Using the context leading up to and shortly after 9/11, Bush was able to construct the War on Terror as just. The scene had already been constructed a considerable amount; Bush merely reinforced and solidified the points. The media contributed by speculating on where and when the next terrorist attack would occur, building upon the already present fear of the public. In response, Bush described the state of the world as one of “sudden terror” (para. 13), thereby preying upon Americans’ heightened fear. The terrorists’ “evil plans” (para. 6) necessitated a response that would eliminate terrorism and eliminate Americans’ fears. Thus, in his address, Bush constructed a scene that made desperate actions such as war appear justifiable, even in the hands of the civilized world. The terrorists had agency in the 9/11 attacks; they were able to plan and execute their act of terrorism, an act that likely had many purposes. For this reason, Bush pressed that it was the American military’s responsibility to
go to battle and reclaim the agency they lost on 9/11. Since war is the only way that these barbaric, inhuman, uncivilized terrorists knew how to respond, the U.S. would have to resort to their [lower] level of response in order to eliminate the barbarians.

Bush also painted the act of war as one of defense: “We defend not only our precious freedoms but also the freedom of people everywhere to live and raise their children free from fear” (para. 14). In this context, Bush suggested that war was not only just but also a selfless act on behalf of all humanity. American soldiers were not murderers but rather world heroes and freedom fighters. Through all of his terms, Bush reinforced the dominant ideology that glorifies the West, Christianity, and masculinity and erases opposing voices and alternative ideologies from the scene.
Chapter Three: Deconstructing the Scene and Rhetoric of Osama bin Laden’s October 7, 2001 Speech

As the presumed instigator of the 9/11 attacks, bin Laden's videotaped address, broadcast on al-Jazeera shortly after Bush’s address, came as no surprise to some. Many media outlets speculated he was aware of Bush's declaration of war and was thus responding. Amateurs seemingly recorded the tape as it showed no signs of sophisticated film editing. However, the placement and positioning of the camera seemed careful and intentional. Additionally, the shots did not lack proper lighting or other modern technologies. For example, bin Laden spoke into a microphone—held in his right hand—to his audience(s) in his native Arabic language. And, despite the fact that some viewers did not understand or speak the language, bin Laden's scene expressed his purpose without words. Standing in front of a rock slab—presumably a cave in the mountains as constructed in the U.S. media—he wore an iconic military camouflage fatigue jacket with a green robe underneath that covered his legs as he sat on the bare ground. Signifying his strong Islamic religious beliefs, bin Laden wore a white turban on his head. His long, graying beard looked unkempt [reinforcing Bush’s “barbarian” construction]. Other men sat to bin Laden's right and left, and beside him, on his left, was a rifle. Through these elements, bin Laden constructed his scene and his masculinity as one centering on war. Even without taking his language into account, bin Laden's scene strongly suggests he was indeed ready for war. Turning now to the Screens, I will show how bin Laden constructed a scene that justified 9/11 and acts of war.
**Bin Laden’s “Othering Screen”**

In his speech, bin Laden frames America (and its allies) as “hypocrites”—a negatively charged term—a number of times throughout his address as a means of Othering Americans. Through this repetition, bin Laden makes no mistake in identifying one common enemy (the West). Here again, residue of the deeply rooted binary of East versus West persists in the rhetoric of the War on Terror. Likewise, bin Laden opens his videotaped address with “America,” which he identifies as the enemy Other, repeating it six more times in the address. Like Bush, bin Laden utilizes the inclusive/exclusive language of “us/we/our” and “them/they/their”—which appears scattered throughout his address—to simultaneously unify and divide. He states, “I seek refuge in God against them and ask him to let us see them in what they deserve” (para. 5, emphasis added). Bin Laden divides “us” and “them” into “camps.” In passage nine, he explicitly enforces the binary: “Tell them that these events have divided the world into two camps, the camp of the faithful and the camp of the infidels” (emphasis added). Bin Laden makes no efforts to concede in his address to any individual American groups or subcultures, categorizing all Americans as the enemy Other. Individuals do not exist; Americans are a singular evil entity.

Bin Laden also employs positive/negative language to further divide the two groups or “camps,” intensifying and downplaying respectively. He calls Americans “killers who toyed with the blood, honor and sanctities of Muslims” (para. 4, emphasis added). Strong descriptive language with vivid imagery also arises in the following passage where he asserts that Americans are “apostates who followed the wrong path. They backed the butcher against the victim, the oppressor against the innocent child” (para. 5, emphasis added). In this particular statement, bin Laden utilizes the binary, placing terms and, therefore, groups
associated with each, in direct opposition to one another. With images of bloody slaughter, he paints the picture that Americans are the heartless enemy. Therefore, al Qaeda and the Taliban must fight against and resist Americans and American ideology.

Furthermore, as a seeming direct response to Bush’s address, bin Laden attempts to invalidate Bush’s use of the label “terrorist”: “they have been telling the world falsehoods that they are fighting terrorism” (para. 7). To bin Laden, the U.S. has been terrorizing the Middle East and Islamic religions for far too long. Therefore, he might actually argue that Americans are the terrorists. Bin Laden also appears to react to Bush’s statements about peace, communicating that the U.S. will not achieve peace in this war because Americans do not stand on the side of justice. He asserts, “As to America, I say to it and its people a few words: I swear to God that America will not live in peace before peace reigns in Palestine, and before all the army of infidels depart the land of Muhammed, peace be upon him (para. 11). Throughout this Othering process, like Bush, bin Laden not only communicates to his allies and enemies, but also directly to Bush. The Othering screen shows precisely how he reaches these multiple target audiences to unify and divide at the same time, claiming to defend peace and justice.

**Bin Laden’s “Religious Screen”**

In his October 7, 2001 address, bin Laden grounds his rhetoric in the Islamic faith. With an abundance of references to God and Muslims, bin Laden justifies the 9/11 attacks, which initiated the War on Terror. He explains, “God has blessed a group of vanguard Muslims, the forefront of Islam, to destroy America. May God bless them and allot them a supreme place in heaven, for he is the only one capable and entitled to do so” (para. 3). These
vanguard Muslims martyred themselves by flying into the World Trade Center towers. Thus utilizing the “will of God” strategy, bin Laden removes blame from the martyrs and himself. He shows an extreme reverence to God and places all of the actions in the war into the hands of God; God determines the wrath that shall be sent down on America just as he determines who will be judged and not allowed into heaven.

Bin Laden also invokes religion by citing America and its allies as “infidels” and “pagan/ism” (paras. 3, 8, 9, 11). He says, “But when a few more than ten were killed in Nairobi and Dar es Salaam, Afghanistan and Iraq were bombed and hypocrisy stood behind the head of international infidels: the modern world’s symbol of paganism, America and its allies” (para. 8, emphasis added). Bin Laden employs these terms to clarify the battle as one of good versus evil, and being on the side of God, the good and blessed “vanguard Muslims” will prevail. Additionally, bin Laden calls for Muslims to defend their religion and revolt against an evil America, therefore justifying subsequent attacks (para. 10). Naturally, with God on their side, it is assumed that Muslims will be protected in the war. Like Bush, bin Laden closes his address with a final appeal to God, leaving his allies with a sense of reassurance that their efforts are just; God will protect them (para. 12).

**Bin Laden’s “Gendered Screen”**

Throughout his speech, bin Laden makes several references to children and the oppressed, associating them with the traditional “victimized female” stereotype. Bin Laden employs “weak children”—when referring to Palestinians—to reinforce the traditional gender roles and draw out empathy and other emotional responses from his audience(s). He states, “When those who have stood in defense of their weak children, their brothers and
sisters in Palestine and other Muslim nations, the whole world went into an uproar, the infidels followed by the hypocrites” (para. 3). Although bin Laden does include women in this statement, he excludes women throughout the rest of his address.

Employing the generic “he” several times in his address, bin Laden proceeds with gender stereotypes when he calls for every Muslim to “defend his religion” (para. 10, emphasis added). While the use of “he” or like forms in Bush's speech are often directed at all humankind, being the generic “he,” bin Laden's use of “he” may not be employed in the same manner. He may assume that all Taliban and al Qaeda members are male. This assumption effectively excludes all of the contributions that wives, daughters, and sisters offer to the groups. Furthermore, the assumption excludes female members of the groups, which have since been reported on repeatedly. Finally, bin Laden's use of the generic “he” also excludes American female soldiers. Bin Laden states, “Bush and his staff who went on a display of vanity with their men and horses, those who turned even the countries that believe in Islam against us—the group that refuses to be subdued in its religion” (para. 6, emphasis added). Thus, not only does bin Laden remove women from their contributions in Afghanistan but also from the U.S., highlighting a strong sense of misogyny in his rhetoric. Meanwhile, the U.S. military is comprised of hundreds of thousands of women, not to mention the women who served on Bush's staff, including Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice.

While seemingly excluding women from his rhetoric, bin Laden projects cowardly femininity upon the “evil” Other. As Egan (2002) points out, “The discourse of the coward erases complexity, flattening both parties into binaries of man and not-man (thus feminine)” (p. 54). In the binary of the faithful and unfaithful (or “infidels” as bin Laden calls them),
allusions to ancient texts, such as the biblical story of Adam and Eve arise, which suggests
gender plays a significant role in the construction of terror rhetoric even though it may not be
as blatant a construction as others. Traditionally, men are not thought of as unfaithful; only
women betray their husbands. That is not to say that the former does not occur, just that only
women are accused of marital betrayal in many patriarchal narratives.

A final gendering strategy that occurs in bin Laden's address is one that many people
fail to question, in either the American or the Afghani narrative, perhaps because both are
bound by the masculine, patriarchal ideology. Bin Laden refers to God explicitly as male
when he states, “May God bless them and allot them a supreme place in heaven, for he is the
only one capable and entitled to do so” (para. 3, emphasis added). God is accepted as male in
most religions with only a few, such as Hindu and Wicca, referencing female gods or
“goddesses” as opposed to male gods.

Bin Laden’s “Historical Analogy Screen”

Bin Laden, unlike Bush, seems more overt in his historical references. For instance,
“What America is tasting now is only a copy of what we have tasted” (para. 1), is an obvious
allusion to the never-ending religious struggles in the Middle East. He continues in the next
passage reminding his listeners of the “80 years of humiliation and disgrace” of Western
influence in the region (para. 2). Bin Laden evokes the past to remind his Islamic audience of
their long suffering and to convince them that America deserves retribution. Furthermore, he
identifies America and its allies as “hypocrites” several times throughout his address, at one
point claiming, “The least that can be said about those hypocrites is that they are apostates
who followed the wrong path. They backed the butcher against the victim, the oppressor
against the innocent child” (para. 5). Here, bin Laden suggests Americans have done wrong and deserve proper punishment, such as the violence brought through war. Bin Laden’s label of “hypocrites” might also be a reference to negotiations between the U.S. and Afghanistan that began in the 1970s (Jackson, 2005, p. 158; Glover, 2002, pp. 215-216). The U.S. once funded the Mujahideen, meaning jihadists (many of whom later joined the Taliban); then through a turn of events, the U.S. halted the funding and declared war on the same group it once supported and trained.

Another meta-narrative of the War on Terror—grounded in the East versus West binary—is the threat/progress of globalization. Bin Laden appears to reference this narrative when he calls America and its allies “the modern world’s symbol of paganism,” suggesting that the modern world/America worships consumption. In response, bin Laden calls for jihad (Church, 2002, p. 121). Along with religious references such as this one, gender stereotypes also serve as historical analogies; both relate to deeply entrenched historical and cultural traditions. The Historical Analogy Screen also demonstrates Tuman’s (2003) concept of terror as a communication process. Since the rhetoric of terrorism constantly calls upon previous rhetorics, actions, and reactions through this screen, the start and finish lines of terror become more and more obscure.

In his address broadcast on October 7, 2001, some of bin Laden's other historical references come in the form of claiming victory. He clings to his stance on the war and assures his allies that they serve on the side of justice. Calling upon sacred religious beliefs to demonstrate his confidence and conviction, bin Laden declares, “I seek refuge in God against them and ask him to let us see them in what they deserve” (para. 5). He also claims that “the matter is very clear” (para. 6). Almost prophetic in his choice of terms, bin Laden shows the
war to be “winnable” by issuing the statement, “The wind of faith is blowing and the wind of change is blowing to remove evil from the Peninsula of Muhammad” (para. 10). Thus, he states although winning war may not have been certain in the past, God has chosen this time for victory. Bin Laden's language lacks any expression of doubt; winning the war is a matter of fact. In his final remarks, he also swears to God (para. 11), conveying to his opponents that he and his allies will not rest until justice is served. Therefore, his statements of victory, though fewer in number than Bush’s and with fewer historical war references, show no fewer signs of doubt in winning. Bin Laden vows, “As to America, I say to it and its people a few words: I swear to God that America will not live in peace before peace reigns in Palestine, and before all the army of infidels depart the land of Muhammad, peace be upon him” (para. 11). His message communicates to all audiences that because God is on their side, he and his allies will win the war.

Conclusion

In his address, bin Laden describes the scene as one that has been building for “more than 80 years” (para. 2). He justifies the act of 9/11 and future retaliations by seeming to claim that Americans deserve what is coming to them; they have held hostage the Muslim world’s agency for too long. They are “infidels” (para. 3) who have defied God, and after 80 years, God is finally pouring down His wrath of judgment on them. Bin Laden also acts on behalf of Palestinians, whom he refers to as “weak children,” proclaiming himself their agent. Bin Laden justifies 9/11 and other gruesome acts as part of God’s will. Similar to Bush, bin Laden constructs the act of battle as just: Muslims must defend their religion. He summons Muslims “to remove evil from the Peninsula of Muhammad, peace be upon him,”
insisting that they stand on the side of justice (para. 10, emphasis added). Thus, bin Laden lends more agency to the terrorists, justifying their military training and future attacks. However, unlike Bush’s condemnation of the terrorists, bin Laden glorifies these men—these agents—as martyrs.

Bin Laden’s construction of the scene does differ from Bush’s on at least one significant account. He identifies the dominant Western ideology as one that can no longer prevail, thus attempting to give agency to the Middle Eastern ideology. However, employing many of the same rhetorical strategies as Bush, bin Laden invokes the same patriarchal, masculine ideology to construct the scene, inviting destructive actions and reinforcing the War on Terror as a just act without alternatives.
Chapter Four: Deconstructing the Scene and Rhetoric of Benazir Bhutto's December 16, 2002 Speech

As an alternative and silenced rhetoric, the immediate scene of Bhutto’s December 16, 2002 speech in the U.S. was not well documented. The speech was not televised nor is there a recording of it posted on the Internet. In fact, little information about the speech remains except the transcript. From videos and photos of Bhutto’s other addresses, I would speculate that she wore a veil, covering most of her hair, as she almost always appeared veiled. From the contextual clues of the speech, I would also surmise that Bhutto’s purpose was to inspire her audience to lead by discussing her own accomplishments as an Islamic, democratic, and female leader. In the opening of the speech, she states, “I know you are here primarily to learn from my experiences throughout my career that you may be able to apply to your own lives, responsibilities and careers” (para. 2). However, in a kairotic move, she capitalizes on framing the speech within the current issue of terrorism.

Over a year removed from the immediate scene of 9/11 and one year into the War on Terror, Bhutto is keenly aware of the scene that leaders and the media have constructed up to this point. In an attempt to revise the present constructed scene and call for social actions, Bhutto treats the screens in a different manner than Bush and bin Laden; she transforms, expands and shifts the screens. Throughout her speech, she provides a new way of talking about and seeing what Bush and bin Laden omit from their rhetorics. She confronts these absences and dispels misconceptions within each screen. At the most basic level, Bhutto and her speech exemplify an ideal beyond the dominant, patriarchal, masculine, and Western narrative. She defied these narratives and became a leader as an Eastern, Islamic, democratic
woman. Thus, in her speech, Bhutto turns the culturally accepted scene on its head. The fact that little information on her speech remains today suggests that alternative rhetorics of the War on Terror are still being silenced.

At the time of Bhutto's speech (2002), she had been ousted from office. With military force, General Pervez Musharraf, Chief of Army Staff in Pakistan, claimed the Pakistani presidency in 2001 forcing Bhutto into exile. Up to the point of her assassination (December 27, 2007), Bhutto spoke out against Musharraf's and the Pakistani military's injustices, many of which she addresses in the “Victims of Terrorism” speech. At one particular point, Bhutto addresses an absence from Bush's rhetoric that highlights the inconsistencies and corruption of American foreign policy. In one fell swoop, she criticizes Musharraf's actions and also implicates American foreign policy for supporting his regime. Bhutto states, “Despite the Musharraf regime’s support of the international war against terrorism, this military junta, like its Martial law predecessors of the past, is attempting to use the teaching of Islam as an excuse to subjugate women, deny freedom, destroy a free press, dominate NGOs, break up political parties, decimate the Judiciary, and restore the iron hand of dictatorship to the land” (para. 110). She later adds, “A world focused on the destruction of the Al Qaeda network has neither the interest nor the knowledge to investigate the human rights abuses in a 'coalition' member” (para. 112). Musharraf was cooperating with the U.S. government and its fight against terrorism. Thus, occupied with winning the War on Terror, why would the U.S. government, or furthermore, public discourse, question Musharraf's other actions? Echoing Eisenstein (2004), who advocates tolerance and acceptance of the multiplicities inherent in a diverse world, Bhutto argues, “The goal of the international community's foreign policy agenda must always be to simultaneously promote stability and to strengthen democratic
values. Not selectively but universally. Not when it is convenient but rather because it is right” (paras. 57-59, emphasis added). From her alternative perspective, Bhutto is free from the shadows leaders cast upon acts they wish to conceal. She describes the scene, acts, agents, agency, and purpose in a thoroughly different manner than Bush and bin Laden. In the following explanations of Bhutto’s Screens, it becomes apparent that Bhutto does not ascribe to the dominant, masculine, patriarchal ideology. She understands the world differently than Bush and bin Laden. Therefore, Bhutto constructs an alternative rhetoric to initiate other ways of seeing the War on Terror scene and furthermore to expand people’s understanding of multiple scenes contained in the ongoing human drama.

**Bhutto’s “Othering Screen”**

People are familiar with the binary constructs that leaders invoke in their addresses. Therefore, in order to aid her audience in decoding her language, Bhutto stays true to this speech form, but she synthesizes it with a feminine form to covertly critique the masculine speech form. She crosses and navigates the binaries, and in many cases, confronts the grey areas between them. Additionally, Bhutto is careful in her application of god terms and devil terms; she qualifies her words, “extremists” for example, in order to avoid generalizing all Afghanis as the evil Other. Employing devil terms, she identifies the enemy as “terrorists of Al Qaeda” (para. 9), “psychopaths” (para. 4), “forces of hate” (para. 17) “criminals, including Osama bin Laden himself” (para. 11), and most frequently, “fanatics” (paras. 13, 18, 25, 44, 52, 91). In opposition, employing the god term “victim,” she refers to herself, women, children, America, and democracy. For example, Bhutto recounts that as the Prime Minister of Pakistan, she actively worked against al Qaeda’s terrorists: “I disarmed their
Madressas, their sham primary schools that do not teach children literature, science or mathematics but rather turn children into fanatics and criminals. I tried to restore law and order to our cities under incessant assault from terrorist attack” (para. 13). In this statement, innocent “children” are placed in opposition to “fanatics and criminals.” At the same time, she reveals herself as a heroine for disarming many of their efforts. But, at one time, the terrorists also threatened her. For example, she claims, “As a woman, I was their enemy. As a democrat, I was their opposite. But above all, as someone who offered hope to our people—education, jobs, communication, and modernity—I was a dangerous obstacle to the forces of hate” (paras. 16-17). Explaining who she is and what she stands for and revealing herself and her own ideology as “the enemy’s enemy,” Bhutto provides a binary, oppositional framework for her audience to understand the terrorists’ mentality.

It becomes clear in Bhutto's speech that although she utilizes opposites, there are not just two polarized extremes, but rather, multiple positions. The terrorists are not the only enemy, just as children, America and democracy are not the only victims. Women of Pakistan and across the world are victims; Islam—perverted by the terrorists—is a victim. And furthermore, the terrorists are not the only enemies. The military junta that overthrew Bhutto's government in Pakistan is also an enemy. Bhutto's speech reveals the multiple layers in Others. Exposing these Other enemies and Other victims, she describes the Pakistan military junta's support of terrorism and atrocities against women. She asserts, “I condemned and sought to reverse the unspeakable prosecution of women raped and then tried for the crime of adultery, a perversion of justice that affronts the civilized world. The military junta uses this abomination as a means to solidify support among extremists” (para. 37). In this one statement, Bhutto identifies multiple victims: the raped women, Bhutto herself, and her
government—those in the “civilized world.” At the same time, she specifies two enemies: the military junta and extremists, who, through the binary construct are portrayed as part of the “uncivilized world” as they allow these actions to be silenced. The title of Bhutto's speech, “Victims of Terrorism”—victims plural—reminds audiences to look for the multiplicities and grey areas often concealed in political rhetorics.

**Bhutto’s “Religious Screen”**

As security in the U.S. increased after 9/11, citizens paid attention to the color-coded terror alert system with orange signifying “high.” Airport security grew especially tight, and many travelers of Arabic descent going to, from, and within the U.S. experienced delays due to the common practice of racial profiling; they had to prove they were not terrorists. Stemming from the fear of Middle Eastern-appearing terrorists grew a suspicion of a foreign, unfamiliar religion: Islam. Because bin Laden claimed allegiance to Islam, many people with little or no knowledge of the religion, equated Islam with the terrorists of 9/11. Aware of this suspicion targeted at her own religion, Bhutto addresses the drama and misconceptions associated with Islam in her “Victims of Terrorism” speech. She revises many people's accepted definition of Islam.

Early in the address, Bhutto states, “There is nothing in the precepts of Islam that make it inconsistent with Judeo-Christian values. In the Holy Book, Abraham is our father, just as Moses and Jesus are our prophets” (para. 6). Thus, she attempts to appeal to her audience through identification and explain that Christianity, Judaism, and Islam are not as incongruous as some might initially believe. Continuing this identification strategy, Bhutto explains the core principles of Islam in terms that her audience understands: “Islam is
committed to tolerance and equality, and it is committed by Koranic definition to the principles of democracy. The Holy Book says that Islamic society is contingent on—and I quote—‘mutual advise [sic] through mutual discussions on an equal footing.’ Sadly, most Muslim countries are dictatorships, contrary to what Islam teaches” (paras. 45-46).

Essentially, Bhutto is saying, “we are more like you than unlike you; our religion is merely misunderstood.” Additionally, Bhutto refers to three major world religions, driving home her point that religious pluralism and tolerance are necessary in order to achieve peace.

In many successive lines of the speech, Bhutto attempts to distinguish the Islam she and many others practice from the Islam the terrorists' pervert for their own ends. She asserts, “During the Afghan-Soviet war, my country became the breeding ground for their psychopolitical religious manipulation and exploitation. Hiding under the cloak of religion, they preached a message that would enslave not liberate, teach children not to write but rather to hate, keep people hopeless and desperate, bitter, xenophobic and paranoid” (para. 12).

Admitting to problems in her homeland, Bhutto condemns these past acts. Furthermore, she simultaneously disassociates this perverted Islam with her own beliefs and exonerates “true” Islam. Towards the end of her address, Bhutto reinforces her points about Islam, pleading with her audience to rethink their views of the religion. She asserts,

Those who are ignorant of Islam, could cast aside their preconceptions about the role of women in our religion. Contrary to what many believe, Islam embraces a rich variety of political, social and cultural traditions. The fundamental ethos of Islam is tolerance, dialogue and democracy. Just as in Christianity and Judaism, we must always be on guard for those who use the Muslim Holy Book for their own narrow
political ends, who will distort the essence of pluralism and tolerance for their own extremist agendas. (paras. 98-100)

Without placing blame on her immediate audience, Bhutto explicitly states that some people are “ignorant of Islam.” Islam does not fundamentally conflict with other religions, democracy, or women's rights. She implores her listeners to spread the word to others: to question, filter, and revise the constructions that pervade the discourse about Islam in post-9/11 rhetorics.

**Bhutto’s “Gendered Screen”**

In addition to religion, a significant portion of Bhutto's speech focuses on gender. She is not only discussing the War on Terror, but also the battles for women’s, and furthermore, humans rights. For instance, keenly aware that public speaking began as a masculine form, she follows the form but expands it with her own feminine style. She also openly addresses gender issues in Pakistan and around the world, presenting her own life as an example. She proclaims, “It has not always been an easy life for me, or for my family. But this is nothing new, really. Women have always had to make difficult choices, often choices that men are [sic] not been forced to make. And we must live with the consequences, for better or worse” (para. 67). While acknowledging the hardships that women face, Bhutto also implies that women accept rather than conceal their consequences as men would.

Characteristic of many women speakers, Bhutto legitimates her position of power and authority throughout the speech. “Despite the constraints of a political system rigged against democrats, and a social system biased against women, as Prime Minister of Pakistan I used my office to reverse centuries of discrimination against women. My tenure was a textbook
affirmative action program against gender discrimination” (paras. 27-28). In these brief statements, Bhutto explains her political background to enhance her ethos. At the same time, she discusses her own efforts to reduce gender discrimination in Pakistan.

Extending her discussion to all women, Bhutto argues that they could attain leadership like her if given the opportunity and if the masculine, patriarchal ideology made room for alternative ideologies. In a long list, Bhutto explains the many actions regarding women’s rights that her government and she took to help progress in Pakistan:

We increased literacy by one-third, even more dramatically among girls...We outlawed domestic violence and established special women's police forces to protect and defend the women of Pakistan. We appointed women judges to our nation's benches for the first time in our history…I encouraged women's and girl's participation in sports, nationally and internationally by lifting the ban on women's participation in sport. I persuaded the armed forces and security services to hire women in their institutions. (paras. 29-38)

Despite her efforts, Bhutto mentions that since the military dictatorship overthrew her government, many of these attempts at reform have been dismantled. Furthermore, in reference to her condemnation of “honor of killing, by members of their own families, of women who had been raped” (para. 36), Bhutto sadly states, “The military junta is now silent to these abominations” (para. 36). As before Bhutto's time in office, murdering raped women in order to maintain family honor, is again condoned and overlooked. Underlying Bhutto's claims is the assertion that these crimes and the military junta are directly related to masculine domination and men's objectification and subjugation of women. Women are
killed for being raped; men are not killed for committing rape or for murdering their raped mothers, sisters, and daughters.

In order to combat the traditional masculine view and other gender issues, Bhutto calls for women's education, which she believes “leads to the kind of financial independence that causes women to break the shackles of being only a man's daughter or a man's wife” (para. 82). In later passages, Bhutto overtly argues against the dominant masculine tradition, something Bush and bin Laden never confront in their addresses. Bhutto urges “women all over the world not to accept the status quo...It is critical that women—whether in London or Kabul—refuse to accept traditional roles and traditional constraints. Acquiescing to a tradition dictated by men—a tradition of subjugation of mothers and daughters—can no longer be accepted” (paras. 86-87). Following Bhutto's lead, women can reshape, redefine, and revise what it means to be a woman today and furthermore, create alternative ways of seeing for future generations, ways that recognizes all traditions.

Pushing the discourse still further into the unknown, Bhutto invokes a modern feminist viewpoint that seeks justice not only for women but all of humanity. Extending feminism to “feminisms,” Bhutto encompasses all marginalized groups. She explains that she targeted rural Pakistan, calling for social actions to help the underprivileged and uneducated (para. 30). Furthermore, in her discussion of running for President of the Oxford Union, she speaks of her own experiences with being less privileged: “I had been told that as a foreigner, I could not win the Presidency and should not run. I had been told that as a woman, I could not win, and should not run” (paras. 78-79). Of course, Bhutto ran the race and won, showing that education and persistence can overcome discrimination. Delivering this speech in the U.S. where the majority of people have more privilege and opportunities to advance
themselves in society than countless other countries in the world, Bhutto calls attention to the inconsistencies in American culture. A nation that proclaims to stand for progress still does not wholly accept female leadership. The masculine, patriarchal ideology still dominates American culture and shapes reality in a way that devalues, marginalizes, and alienates those who do not meet the male standard: women, children, nonwhites, gays, and numerous Others.

**Bhutto’s “Historical Analogy Screen”**

Like Bush and bin Laden, Bhutto also references history, but her rhetoric does not fit quite as neatly into the Historical Analogy Screen. She does not allude to wars already won to invoke the past; instead she speaks of past failures, even the failures of her own country. To inspire hope, she does not look back on the past, but rather forward into the future. And unlike Bush and bin Laden's masculine tradition(s), the alternative rhetoric that Bhutto sets forth has little if any history at all. She recalls historic events in order to remind her audience of the gravity of the current scene and acts.

Speaking of her own country's failures in the past, Bhutto recounts Pakistan's support of militant, terrorist groups during the Afghan-Soviet war (1979-89) stating, “My country became the breeding ground for their psycho-political religious manipulation and exploitation” (para. 12). Bhutto does not omit or even curtail these errors because doing so would fail to acknowledge valuable lessons from which all countries can learn. Furthermore, Bhutto places blame on the U.S. for their involvement in the war, discussing how the two countries (among others) shared responsibility for what happened later by contributing to the Islamic Mujahideen Resistance forces. She contends,
The overall policy of standing against Soviet aggression in Afghanistan was right. Yet the early decisions to arm, train, supply and legitimize the most extreme fanatics sowed the seeds for the 21st century terrorism that is now swirling around us. In America and Pakistan's combined and admirable zeal to end the Soviet occupation, we failed to plan or work for a post-war Afghanistan built on democratic principles of coalition, consensus and cooperation. (paras. 52-53)

Looking back on this war, Bhutto implores her listeners to “remember the lessons of history and not repeat the mistakes of the past” (para. 48). She addresses history in terms of mistakes, not just in terms of battles but words or acts deserving retribution.

Providing a realistic perspective on war in opposition to Bush and bin Laden's certain-victory approaches, Bhutto does not tell her audience that winning wars and achieving peace will be easy. She does not tell them that blood will not be spilled. Instead, she admits that conflict resolution is a long and strenuous path: “Peace is often difficult to achieve, and even more difficult to maintain. The words on the Korean War Memorial on Washington's great mall never have rung more true—‘Freedom is not free’” (paras. 20-21). People cannot expect an easy road ahead; peace—even among allying factions—often does not last long.

Despite her references to past failures and ongoing struggles, Bhutto sheds a positive light on these situations as well. If it were not for failures with slight progress along the way, people would never commit themselves to fighting against injustices. Bhutto discusses how her own political interests and views were shaped by the battles and accomplishments of her generation. Among them, she cites students' movements in Rawalpindi and Washington, apartheid, women's rights, the Watergate crisis, and Margaret Thatcher's induction to the
British Prime Ministry (paras. 69-74). Then, taking all that she has learned and gained from the past, Bhutto inspires her audience by looking into the future. She offers hope that one day, women all over the world will be free and all people will have equal rights. She proclaims, “The new century must...be an era where honor and dignity are protected in peace, and in war, where women have economic freedom and independence, where women are not defined by their fathers or husbands, but by their own achievements, where they are equal partners in peace and development” (paras. 117-118). Even still, Bhutto qualifies her statements: “Even as we catalogue, organize and hopefully attain our goals, step by step, all of those around the world who are committed to the common causes of human rights, women’s rights and peace, must be vigilant” (para. 119, emphasis added). She does not delude her audience; there is no way she can say with absolute certainty that women will ever truly be free.

**Conclusion**

By framing her speech around the War on Terror, Bhutto calls attention to other scenes and other acts—namely, acts of terror against women. The title of her speech, “Victims of Terrorism,” implies that there are many victims of terrorism on several accounts, not just Americans and those affected by the 9/11 attacks. Like Bush, Bhutto does identify the terrorists as agents, but she also extends the understanding of terrorists to those who ascribe to the dominant masculine ideology. She describes her time in office as “a textbook affirmative action program against gender discrimination” (para. 28). Thus, during her tenure, she attempted to reverse discrimination and became an agent for women. She suggests that the dominant ideology is responsible for not allowing women to act as agents,
for erasing women from the scene. Through recollections and explanations of her own life’s accomplishments, Bhutto offers hope to women and other marginalized groups that they too can overcome and restructure the dominant code. She states, “It has not always been an easy life for me, or for my family. But this is nothing new, really. Women have always had to make difficult choices, often choices that men are not been forced to make” (para. 67). By doing so, Bhutto lends agency to many diverse Others.

In place of the masculine, militaristic form of agency, Bhutto provides the agency of voice; she discusses alternatives to war, focusing on democratic leadership that is not selective or convenient but “right” (paras. 57-59). Bhutto also counters Bush and bin Laden’s constructions of war as a justifiable act by stating, “There will only be a clash of civilizations if we allow ignorance and fanaticism to take control, to shape the agenda and to shape the debate” (para. 7). Here, she seems to imply that a clash is occurring in the form of the War on Terror because the dominant code has shaped the situation in a way that ignores alternatives to war. Bhutto explicitly states, “Short-term battlefield strategy is often myopic” (para. 55). There are many and varied historical situations that led up to 9/11, which have been ignored in the dominant discourse surrounding 9/11. Countering Bush’s view of the scene as a “sudden” state of terror, she insists, “Osama Bin Ladin did not emerge like whole cloth from a nightmare. His depravity was long in the making…” (para. 49). Bhutto recognizes bin Laden as an agent and one that the American government gave agency to during the Afghan-Soviet War (paras. 51-52). All throughout her speech, Bhutto accounts for the omissions from Bush and bin Laden’s addresses. Perhaps the most significant difference between Bhutto’s construction and the constructions of Bush and bin Laden is that she sees and allows room for not one but multiple scenes, agents, agencies, purposes, and acts. Unlike
Bush and bin Laden, Bhutto does not see the divide of East/West and masculine/feminine as rigid and static. She provides agency to people by recognizing ideologies—plural—and insisting upon change through democratic means.
Chapter Five: Revealing Absences and Silences in War Rhetorics

Victory—for the terrorists or the U.S.—in the War on Terror was never certain.

Religious references, such as the biblical story of David overcoming Goliath suggest victory is never certain. The patriarchal constructs, gender stereotypes, and sexual discrimination that persist today around the world, despite equal rights movements, suggest that victory cannot be certain even after the battle has been declared “won.” Many historical accounts including the fall of the Roman Empire would suggest that even with the most powerful army, victory is never certain. But many of these historical analogies do not appear in the Bush, bin Laden, or Bhutto addresses; these and other relevant terms are absent from or invisible within the dominant discourse. Bin Laden attempts to respond to the Western dominant narrative, but only appeals to a particular audience. Furthermore, his address only serves to enhance the influence of the male dominant ideology. In fact, only Bhutto—through her alternative construction—comes close to sharing an expanded and complex view of reality that captures more than one perspective. She breaks away from both the dominant Western narrative in Bush’s speech and the male dominated ideology found in both speeches.

Like the Gendered Screen, the view of absences and silences demystify cultural assumptions and narratives, laying bare the dominant ideology that public discourse produces and reproduces, often unquestioningly. With as much discourse as there has been about 9/11 and the War on Terror, acknowledgement of these ideological constructs and the broader historical contexts surrounding the war remain absent from the discourse. Essentially, the War on Terror has been dealt with in isolation as though the 9/11 attacks were unprovoked and disconnected from previous acts and actions. In turn, the American people have been manipulated by war rhetorics and public discourse to maintain the status quo by not
questioning political agendas. In my analysis of Bhutto's speech, I have already revealed many of the absences and silences in Bush and bin Laden's addresses. In this section, I continue that discussion and also elaborate on omitted and silenced discourses within the general context of America’s War on Terror.

Most notable among the absences in Bush’s terror rhetoric are of former U.S. and Middle East dealings and alliances over the years. For example, among other omissions are “the record of American involvement in the politics of the Middle East—it’s support for Israel, its military bases in the Arabian Peninsula, its alliances with despotic regimes, its murky dealings with the Taliban and the Mujahaddin before them, its oil politics; [and] the history and context of al Qaeda’s decade-long struggle against American policy in the region” (Jackson, 2005, p. 158). As a result of these and other omissions, the discourse about 9/11 both directs and diverts attention, thereby constructing a particular view of the war. Furthermore, the gaps and silences fail to show actions, discourses, and consequences as a series of ongoing events in the human drama.

While Bush and bin Laden discuss previous war victories and define the war as “winnable,” only Bhutto addresses the chance of failure. Bin Laden cites the 80 years of struggle that have occurred in the Middle East, but he never counts this as a failure. Bush, on the other hand, completely omits references to the U.S.’s unsuccessful wars. Americans only have to look back to the Vietnam War (1959-1975) to remember one of its greatest failures when troops returned home in shame and were ridiculed. Similarly, despite the confidence of both leaders, they silence the individual voices of people. The binary construction forces people to choose a definite stance on the war—choosing one side or the other, but war is a
highly complex issue with many grey areas. As a result, people have challenged the War on Terror for diverse reasons.

The following events preceding the War on Terror are perhaps the most significant omissions from the war’s rhetoric. Bhutto confronts one such omission in her speech, asserting, “Osama Bin Ladin did not emerge like whole cloth from a nightmare. His depravity was long in the making, and there were errors—of omission and commission—that must never be repeated” (para. 49). Still further back in history, in 1979, Soviet forces invaded Afghanistan. As the Soviet’s greatest adversary, the U.S. retaliated by forming an alliance with an Afghan resistance group known as the mujahideen. In order to gain control worldwide, the U.S. needed to supply the mujahideen (and other global forces) with training and weapons, requiring access to more funds. As a result, the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency became involved in narcotics trafficking because the U.S. government realized that one of the most effective ways to arm its imperial foot soldiers, whether those soldiers are Afghan, Iraqi, or Nicaraguan, is to use the drug trade to buy weapons. By assisting the heroin trade in the Afghanistan-Pakistan region, the CIA was able to fund silently and less expensively the arming and training of the resistance to the Soviet invasion. This, of course, was in addition to the $3 billion in aid given to the mujahideen “freedom fighters.” …In 2001, the George W. Bush Administration gave $43 million to the Taliban to reduce heroin production in Afghanistan. (Glover, 2002, pp. 215-216, emphasis in original)

Many people are likely still unaware of the U.S. government’s contributions to terrorist groups, such as the Taliban, not to mention its corrupt involvement in drug trafficking to support these terrorist groups. And without knowledge of these events,
people also remain ignorant of the U.S.’s sudden revocation of funds when the Bush Administration turned on these groups, which offers insight as to why bin Laden refers to Americans as “hypocrites” in his address. Ironically, all of these actions were carried out during another of America’s infamous wars: the War on Drugs. Absences in discourse like this one reveal some of the greater political agendas behind war rhetorics, namely money and power.

Lending a voice to the silence that other leaders ignore, Bhutto explicitly addresses Pakistan and U.S. contributions to the mujahideen. When she realized Pakistan's errors, she also “cautioned that US policy to defeat the Soviets had empowered and emboldened the most fanatical, extremist elements of the Afghan seven-faction Mujahadeen at the expense of the moderates, creating a ‘Frankenstein’ that could come back to haunt [all] in the future” (para. 51). But then too, at the end of the Soviet-Afghan war, true to the dominant ideology, leaders silenced her warning. In just a few passages after this revelation, Bhutto satirically adds that “democracies...do not sponsor international terrorism” (para. 56). However, the U.S. and other democratic nations continue to allow and contribute to worldwide gender-based terrorism.

Also absent from Bush and bin Laden’s rhetorics on October 7, 2001—but likely most apparent today—are the many costs of war: lives, money, physical health, mental health, and emotional health, among others. These discourses appear to be assumed because both the terrorists and the U.S. have faced war before, but neither Bush nor bin Laden openly discusses the aftermath and destruction of war that occurs abroad and at home. Talk about war is emotionless, cold, numb, and desensitized because it has been constructed through masculine discourse that silences the emotions attached to war. As the feminist political
scientist, Carol Cohn, points out in her analysis of military discourse, “Voicing concern about the number of casualties in the enemy’s armed forces, imagining the suffering of the killed and wounded young men, is out of bounds” (p. 232). The reason for such absences and silences is that emotion does not fit into the masculine, dominant narrative. Instead of acknowledging, as Bhutto does, that “short-term battlefield strategy is often myopic,” (para. 55) Bush and bin Laden demonstrate conviction to winning an emotionless war in order to prevent questioning and resistance. The only acceptable emotions in times of war are masculinized emotions—aggression, hate, rage, hostility, and revenge—but these are not viewed as emotions at all. As Cohn (1993) asserts, “it is only the ‘feminine’ emotions that are noticed and labeled as emotions, and thus in need of banning” (p. 242). Leaders do not speak of love, trust, empathy, sadness, or fear because in war, these emotions do not exist.

If Bush and bin Laden confronted the horror of war, they would have been viewed as “wimpish,” something incongruous with leadership, just as femininity rarely coincides with leadership. But simply balancing the masculine discourse with the feminine cannot solve this problem. All discourses—even alternative ones—operate within the same hegemonic, masculine construct. Cohn (1993) argues, “The assumption that [women] would make a difference is to some degree predicated on the idea that 'the feminine' is absent from the discourse...However, the problem is not that the 'female' position is totally absent from the discourse; parts of it, at least, albeit in a degraded and undeveloped form, are already present, named, deligitimated, and silenced, all in one fell swoop” (p. 239). Bhutto's speech represents a discourse that was not absent from the rhetoric of the War on Terror. However, she certainly was silenced as evidenced by the fact that little record of the speech still exists; and furthermore, she was silenced through murder.
While these are but a few of the omissions from Bush and bin Laden’s rhetorics, they all serve the purpose of diverting attention as Burke so aptly realized as characteristic of war rhetorics. If the two leaders had chosen different terms, thus directing their audiences’ attention to the matters I laid out in this discussion and those that Bhutto addressed in her speech, the two leaders would have constructed a very different perception of the War on Terror, likely producing significantly different results.

In their speeches, all three of the leaders—Bush, bin Laden, and Bhutto—construct their scenes in a similar fashion. They frame their rhetorics in terms of war and terrorism, which the Othering, Religious, Gendered, and Historical Analogy Screens draw attention to. While each speaker’s act is contained within the War on Terror scene, the speakers have different purposes for acting. In his declaration of war, Bush also wishes to calm Americans and build their trust in the American military’s abilities to seek out and destroy the terrorists. Bin Laden, on the other hand, acts as an agent on behalf of a faction of Muslims and the terrorists themselves. His intents are to praise the terrorists for the act of 9/11 and also to send a message to Americans that the terror will not stop; the terrorists will fight back in the War on Terror. Bhutto’s purpose differs from Bush’s and bin Laden’s because although she acknowledges acts of terrorism in her scene, she expands the terror acts to women’s and human rights violations. Like bin Laden, Bhutto acts as an agent herself. She speaks on behalf of women, Muslims, and many Others, hoping to lend them agency. Additionally, all three speakers recognize the agency of the terrorists because the terrorists’ acts succeeded. However, Bush and Bhutto attempt to revoke the terrorists’ agency—Bush by declaring war against them and Bhutto by seeking democratic alternatives to war and speaking out against other forms of terrorism.
Each speaker became an agent in the War on Terror scene, but in retrospect, it appears that Bhutto had the least agency. Her speech still exists in written form, yet unheard and unknown by many people. Although contained within the same scene as Bush and bin Laden, she played a background role in the human drama. In her attempts to turn the dominant, masculine, patriarchal narrative, she defined and used terms differently. These terms did not adequately fit the masculine form, and thus, have been overlooked. Bhutto was silenced because her act was inconsistent with the masculine scene in which the majority of people operate in times of war. Thus, it remains that the dominant narrative is a powerful construct and one so deeply entrenched that overturning it may be all but impossible.

**Implications**

In choosing terms and omitting others, Bush and bin Laden collectively shaped people’s perceptions of the War on Terror as one marked by certainty, dominance, and historical myopia. These perceptions masked ideological constructions and led to unasked questions, which caused people to justify acts that they might not otherwise. Bhutto attempted to revise the constructions, but in her efforts, she too, was silenced through murder. Beyond this devastating consequence of Bush and bin Laden’s constructions, I turn to the U.S. Department of Defense website to elucidate other ramifications. There, the government displays a day-by-day account, listing the casualties of war (5,428 deaths between Iraq and Afghanistan at the time of this writing), soldiers missing in action, and the deployment of U.S. soldiers to foreign countries such as Iraq and Afghanistan.

Although my Burkean analysis comes just shy of a decade after Bush’s declaration of the War on Terror, the battle presses forward as nations continue to reconcile the aftermath of
9/11. My analysis of war rhetorics is in no way comprehensive. With more screens available to view rhetorics of war and endless overlaps within those screens, there are many layers to this communication process. Furthermore, Bhutto was not the only individual who attempted to revise the dominant discourse and transform the perception of reality. Protesters and social activists today carry out her legacy of seeking peace and justice for all people.

With the U.S. under the new leadership of President Barack Obama, it is just as important to apply Burke’s dramatistic framework to rhetorics concerning war(s). As Obama’s plans continue to unfold in the upcoming months, there will likely be more war rhetoric to assess. If the U.S. is ever going to truly be the peaceful nation that its leaders claim it to be and have a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, U.S. citizens will need to closely examine and be critical of leaders’ rhetorics. Burke’s dramatistic framework heightens awareness of leaders’ employment of language to shape perceptions of reality; the pentad and recognition of alternative rhetorics enable seeing different perspectives. From there, it is left up to individuals to decide if, when, and how they will act. The pentad and “terministic screens” reveal cultural ironies and inconsistencies as they happen, providing people with the leverage to revise their realities and change the status quo if necessary.

People are oriented toward the world in a certain way based on how they grow up and what they are immersed in throughout their lives. Thus, they begin to construct a reality that differs from others, but when those realities are constructed by world leaders and reinforced in the media, people begin to share similar realities if they do not question rhetorics and public discourse. Furthermore, through these constructions, people are trained to respond to rhetorics and actions in a certain way. Events like 9/11 can change the world, but sometimes
people’s actions and reactions do not change accordingly. Thus, the human drama closes up on itself, perpetually reinforcing certain behaviors and expectations. Actions, words, and symbols count; the way people talk about things—especially war—makes a difference. If people fail to see those terms or acts for what they are, they run the risk of becoming trapped in the perpetual cycle of reinforcing the same ideological constructions that incited hate and war in the first place. Seeing alternative and silenced rhetorics and finding peaceful alternatives to war, then, become almost impossible.

Through the lessons learned from analyzing war rhetorics, perhaps one day leaders will utilize less provocative rhetoric to shape reality. Instead of turning to war as the only possible solution, leaders might begin to negotiate and discover alternative resolutions to global conflicts. Currently, they evade the issues by producing binary constructions that do not exist, demonizing other religions, reinforcing gender stereotypes, and calling up unrelated historical events and omitting relevant ones. Instead, leaders might begin to discuss previously silenced issues implicit in scenes, acts, and the entire human drama. This synergy of the [Western] masculine, patriarchal ideology forces constructions which illustrate the immense power war rhetorics have for mobilizing people to go to war without questioning, i.e. “What are our leaders really saying, what are they not telling us, why are they hiding it, and how can they not see alternatives to war?” Future research in the field might continue searching for answers to these questions as well as elucidating alternative and silenced rhetorics that are still difficult to “see.”
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Address to the United States delivered by George W. Bush on October 7, 2001

1. Good afternoon. On my orders the United States military has begun strikes against Al Qaeda terrorist training camps and military installations of the Taliban regime in Afghanistan.

2. These carefully targeted actions are designed to disrupt the use of Afghanistan as a terrorist base of operations and to attack the military capability of the Taliban regime.

3. We are joined in this operation by our staunch friend, Great Britain. Other close friends, including Canada, Australia, Germany and France, have pledged forces as the operation unfolds.

4. More than 40 countries in the Middle East, Africa, Europe and across Asia have granted air transit or landing rights. Many more have shared intelligence. We are supported by the collective will of the world.

5. More than two weeks ago I gave Taliban leaders a series of clear and specific demands: close terrorist training camps; hand over leaders of the Al Qaeda network; and return all foreign nationals including American citizens unjustly detained in your country. None of these demands were met. And now the Taliban will pay a price.

6. By destroying camps and disrupting communication we will make it more difficult for the terror network to train new recruits and coordinate their evil plans. Initially the terrorists may burrow deeper into caves and other entrenched hiding places. Our military action is also designed to clear the way for sustained, comprehensive and relentless operations to drive them out and bring them to justice.

7. At the same time the oppressed people of Afghanistan will know the generosity of America and our allies. As we strike military targets we will also drop food, medicine and supplies to the starving and suffering men and women and children of Afghanistan.

8. The United States of America is a friend to the Afghan people. And we are the friends of almost a billion worldwide who practice the Islamic faith.

9. The United States of America is an enemy of those who aid terrorists and of the barbaric criminals who profane a great religion by committing murder in its name.

10. This military action is a part of our campaign against terrorism, another front in a war that has already been joined through diplomacy, intelligence, the freezing of financial assets and the arrests of known terrorists by law enforcement agents in 38 countries.
11. Given the nature and reach of our enemies we will win this conflict by the patient accumulation of successes, by meeting a series of challenges with determination and will and purpose.

12. Today we focus on Afghanistan. But the battle is broader. Every nation has a choice to make. In this conflict there is no neutral ground. If any government sponsors the outlaws and killers of innocents, they have become outlaws and murderers themselves. And they will take that lonely path at their own peril.

13. I'm speaking to you today from the Treaty Room of the White House, a place where American presidents have worked for peace. We're a peaceful nation. Yet as we have learned so suddenly and so tragically, there can be no peace in a world of sudden terror. In the face of today's new threat the only way to pursue peace is to pursue those who threaten it.

14. We did not ask for this mission. But we will fulfill it. The name of today's military operation is Enduring Freedom. We defend not only our precious freedoms but also the freedom of people everywhere to live and raise their children free from fear.

15. I know many Americans feel fear today. And our government is taking strong precautions. Our law enforcement and intelligence agencies are working aggressively around America, around the world and around the clock. At my request many governors have activated the National Guard to strengthen airport security. We have called up reserves to reinforce our military capability and strengthen the protection of our homeland.

16. In the months ahead our patience will be one of our strengths: patience with the long waits that will result from tighter security; patience in understanding that it will take time to achieve our goals; patience in all the sacrifices that may come.

17. Today those sacrifices are being made by members of our armed forces, who now defend us so far from home, and by their proud and worried families.

18. A commander in chief sends America's sons and daughters into battle in a foreign land only after the greatest care and a lot of prayer: We ask a lot of those who wear our uniform. We ask them to leave their loved ones, to travel great distances, to risk injury, even to be prepared to make the ultimate sacrifice of their lives. They are dedicated. They are honorable. They represent the best of our country. And we are grateful.

19. To all the men and women in our military--every sailor, every soldier, every airman, every coast guardsman, every marine--I say this:

20. Your mission is defined, your objectives are clear, your goal is just. You have my full confidence. And you will have every tool you need to carry out your duty.
21. I recently received a touching letter that says a lot about the state of America in these difficult times. A letter from a fourth-grade girl with a father in the military. "As much as I don't want my dad to fight," she wrote, "I'm willing to give him to you." This is a precious gift, the greatest she could give. This young girl knows what America is all about.

22. Since Sept. 11 an entire generation of young Americans has gained new understanding of the value of freedom and its cost in duty and in sacrifice.

23. The battle is now joined on many fronts. We will not waver, we will not tire, we will not falter, and we will not fail. Peace and freedom will prevail. Thank you. May God continue to bless America.

Appendix B

Videotaped address by Osama bin Laden, broadcast on October 7, 2001

1. America has been filled with horror from north to south and east to west, and thanks be to God. What America is tasting now is only a copy of what we have tasted.

2. Our Islamic nation has been tasting the same for more than 80 years of humiliation and disgrace, its sons killed and their blood spilled, its sanctities desecrated.

3. God has blessed a group of vanguard Muslims, the forefront of Islam, to destroy America. May God bless them and allot them a supreme place in heaven, for he is the only one capable and entitled to do so. When those who have stood in defense of their weak children, their brothers and sisters in Palestine and other Muslim nations, the whole world went into an uproar, the infidels followed by the hypocrites.

4. A million innocent children are dying at this time as we speak, killed in Iraq without any guilt. We hear no denunciation, we hear no edict from the hereditary rulers. In these days, Israeli tanks rampage across Palestine, in Ramallah, Rafah and Beit Jala and many other parts of the land of Islam, and we do not hear anyone raising his voice or reacting. But when the sword fell upon America after 80 years, hypocrisy raised its head up high bemoaning those killers who toyed with the blood, honor and sanctities of Muslims.

5. The least that can be said about those hypocrites is that they are apostates who followed the wrong path. They backed the butcher against the victim, the oppressor against the innocent child. I seek refuge in God against them and ask him to let us see them in what they deserve.

6. I say that the matter is very clear. Every Muslim after this event, after the senior officials in the United States of America starting with the head of international infidels, Bush and his staff who went on a display of vanity with their men and horses, those who turned even the countries that believe in Islam against us—the group that refuses to be subdued in its religion.

7. They have been telling the world falsehoods that they are fighting terrorism. In a nation at the far end of the world, Japan, hundreds of thousands, young and old, were killed and this is not a world crime. To them it is not a clear issue. A million children in Iraq, to them this is not a clear issue.

8. But when a few more than ten were killed in Nairobi and Dar es Salaam, Afghanistan and Iraq were bombed and hypocrisy stood behind the head of international infidels: the modern world's symbol of paganism, America, and its allies.
9. Tell them that these events have divided the world into two camps, the camp of the faithful and the camp of infidels. May God shield us and you from them.

10. Every Muslim must rise to defend his religion. The wind of faith is blowing and the wind of change is blowing to remove evil from the Peninsula of Muhammad, peace be upon him.

11. As to America, I say to it and its people a few words: I swear to God that America will not live in peace before peace reigns in Palestine, and before all the army of infidels depart the land of Muhammad, peace be upon him.

12. God is the greatest and glory be to Islam.

Appendix C

Benazir Bhutto’s “Victims of Terrorism Speech, delivered December 16, 2002

in the United States

1. I am pleased to come before you at the season of the year when Christmas, Eid and Hanukah coincide. Maybe in this week of holidays that celebrate renewal, hope, faith and peace, we can begin to move away from the precipice of disaster that I fear the world finds itself in December of 2002.

2. I know you are here primarily to learn from my experiences throughout my career that you may be able to apply to your own lives, responsibilities and careers. I intend to address those points.

3. But these are very special times. These are very dangerous times. These are times of misperceptions and confusion. I want to take part of the time to share with you some thoughts about the extraordinary state of the world.

4. First let us address the issue of terrorism, Islam and the West. Terrorism and fanaticism will not succeed unless we fall into the psychopaths’ trap. Professor Samuel Huntington of Harvard wrote of an inevitable clash of civilization between the West and the Islamic world.

5. I argue that this clash is far from inevitable, unless we make it so.

6. There is nothing in the precepts of Islam that make it inconsistent with Judeo-Christian values. In the Holy Book, Abraham is our father, just as Moses and Jesus are our prophets.

7. There will only be a clash of civilizations if we allow ignorance and fanaticism to take control, to shape the agenda and to shape the debate.

8. Osama and his men use commercial airliners as bombs against cities and symbols to provoke the clash of cultures under which they will thrive.

9. I am not unfamiliar with the terrorists of Al Qeda.

10. I know them well; I know how they operate, how they think and I know what they want.

11. As Prime Minister of Pakistan, I stood up to them. I battled with many of these same criminals, including Osama Bin Laden himself. I took them on, and often paid a price.
During the Afghan-Soviet war, my country became the breeding ground for their psycho-political religious manipulation and exploitation. Hiding under the cloak of religion, they preached a message that would enslave not liberate, teach children not to write but rather to hate, keep people hopeless and desperate, bitter, xenophobic and paranoid.

I closed their so-called universities. I disarmed their Madrassas, their sham primary schools that do not teach children literature, science or mathematics but rather turn children into fanatics and criminals. I tried to restore law and order to our cities under incessant assault from terrorist attack.

My government tracked down and extradited the terrorists, like Ramzi Youseff, who had exported death and destruction to New York in the 1990s.

They struck back at my allies and me. They destroyed the Egyptian Embassy in Islamabad. They burned our National Assembly, hijacked school buses, gunned down diplomats and businessmen in the streets of Karachi and Lahore, and organized and financed schemes to topple my government.

As a woman, I was their enemy.

As a democrat, I was their opposite. But above all, as someone who offered hope to our people -- education, jobs, communication and modernity –I was a dangerous obstacle to the forces of hate.

I took them on with my eyes open. I knew they would strike back, just as we expect that these fanatics to try and strike again in America.

Despite the personal and political price I paid over the years, my only regret is that we were unable to destroy them completely, before they rained terror on America.

Peace is often difficult to achieve, and even more difficult to maintain. The words on the Korean War Memorial on Washington’s great mall never have rung more true --

“Freedom is not free.”

These terrorists greatest fear is the spread of information, social equality and democracy. These three principles suffocate terrorism.

These three goals guided my years as prime minister. Maybe this could explain the two assassination attempts against me by Al Queda.

My government heralded the information age by introducing fax machines, digital pagers, optic fiber communications, cellular telephones, satellite dishes, computers, Internet, e-mail and even CNN into Pakistan.
25. Under my government Pakistan integrated into the global economy that the fanatics so fear. We became one of the ten emerging capital markets of the world, attracting billions of dollars in foreign investment, particularly in power generation. We eradicated polio in our country. We dramatically reduced infant mortality.

26. WHO

27. Despite the constraints of a political system rigged against democrats, and a social system biased against women, as Prime Minister of Pakistan I used my office to reverse centuries of discrimination against women.

28. My tenure was a textbook affirmative action program against gender discrimination.

29. We increased literacy by one-third, even more dramatically among girls.

30. We built over 30,000 primary and secondary schools, targeting rural Pakistan. Our education program targeting girls and rural areas has been dismantled by the military junta.

31. We brought down the population growth rate by establishing women’s health clinics in thousands of communities across our Nation.

32. We outlawed domestic violence and established special women’s police forces to protect and defend the women of Pakistan.

33. We appointed women judges to our nation’s benches for the first time in our history.

34. We instituted a new program of hiring women police officers to investigate crimes of domestic violence against the women of Pakistan. That special police force has been dismantled.

35. I systematically appointed women judges to the courts of the land. That affirmative action program for women in the judiciary has been dismantled.

36. I condemned, as state police, the honor killing, by members of their own families, of women who had been raped. The military junta is now silent to these abominations.

37. I condemned and sought to reverse the unspeakable prosecution of women raped and then tried for the crime of adultery, a perversion of justice that affronts the civilized world. The military junta uses this abomination as a means to solidify support among extremists.

38. I encouraged women’s and girl’s participation in sports, nationally and internationally by lifting the ban on women’s participation in sport. I persuaded the armed forces and security services to hire women in their institutions.

39. PIA Pilot
40. I created a special Women’s Development Bank to guarantee small business loans to women entrepreneurs, because I firmly believed that economic justice would build political justice. It was a bank run by women for women—although men were allowed to keep their money in it.

41. Case by case, issue-by-issue, policy-by-policy, the military junta that rules Pakistan with an iron fist undermines policies aimed at ameliorating the role and rights of women in Pakistani society.

42. The women of Pakistan cannot be expected to struggle alone against the forces of discrimination, exploitation and manipulation.

43. I recall the words of Dante who reminded us that “the hottest place in Hell is reserved for those who remain neutral in times of moral crisis.”

44. To the fanatics and the extremists, we became the enemy, the threat, and the obstacle. To Islam at the crossroads, a modern Pakistan was one fork in the road, fanaticism and ignorance the other.

45. Islam is committed to tolerance and equality, and it is committed by Koranic definition to the principles of democracy. The Holy Book says that Islamic society is contingent on-- and I quote -- “mutual advise through mutual discussions on an equal footing.”

46. Sadly, most Muslim countries are dictatorships, contrary to what Islam teaches. The denial of democracy shifts opposition from the political class to the mosque. This play into hands of militants and extremists. They can canvass to a captive audience.

47. In Islam dictatorship is never condoned, nor is cruelty. Beating, torturing and humiliating women is unIslamic. Denying education to girls violates the very first word of the Holy Book: “Read.” According to our religion, those who commit cruel acts are condemned to destruction.

48. Sometimes tragedy can lead to resurrection of hope and spirit. As America and the civilized world respond to the most terrible terrorist attack in history, we must remember the lessons of history and not repeat the mistakes of the past.

49. Osama Bin Ladin did not emerge like whole cloth from a nightmare. His depravity was long in the making, and there were errors-- of omission and commission -- that must never be repeated.

50. Afghanistan is a tragic case in point of how retreating from the principles of human rights and democracy can have the most tragic unanticipated consequences.

51. In the closing days of the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan, during a State Visit to America I cautioned that US policy to defeat the Soviets had empowered and
emboldened the most fanatical, extremist elements of the Afghan seven-faction Mujahadeen at the expense of the moderates, creating a “Frankenstein” that could come back to haunt us in the future.

52. The overall policy of standing against Soviet aggression in Afghanistan was right. Yet the early decisions to arm, train, supply and legitimize the most extreme fanatics sowed the seeds for the 21st century terrorism that is now swirling around us.

53. In America and Pakistan’s combined and admirable zeal to end the Soviet occupation, we failed to plan or work for a post-war Afghanistan built on democratic principles of coalition, consensus and cooperation.

54. The fundamental mistake, which contributed to a long-term historical calamity, was that we were not consistently committed to the values of freedom, democracy, social equality and self-determination that ultimately undermine the basic tenets of terrorism.

55. Short-term battlefield strategy is often myopic, as the anarchy, civil war and Taliban terror in Afghanistan so painfully proves.

56. Just as democracies do not make war against other democracies, democracies also do not sponsor international terrorism.

57. The goal of the international community’s foreign policy agenda must always be to simultaneously promote stability and to strengthen democratic values.

58. Not selectively but universally.

59. Not when it is convenient but rather because it is right.

60. General Musharraf made the correct decision to stand with America at this moment of crisis. But the United States and the rest of the world must remember that Pakistan has an extra-constitutional military government with no democratic legitimacy.

61. Elections that took place were exercises in fraud; a sad charade.

62. This is tragic, for a democratic Pakistan is America’s best guarantee of the triumph of moderation and modernity among one billion Muslims at the crossroads of our history.

63. The alternative of a long-term nuclear-armed Pakistani dictatorship has consequences that could make September 11th look like a mere prelude to an even more horrific future for the civilized world.

64. This is not the simple world we dreamed of with the end of the Cold War. And mine is not the simple life I dreamed of growing up in Pakistan and going to school at Harvard and Oxford.
65. The gauntlet of leadership was thrown down before me. I had no choice but to pick it up. But it has often been very difficult, often very sad.

66. Leadership is not easy. It is never meant to be easy. It is born of a passion, and it is a commitment -- a commitment to an idea, to principles, to fundamental human values.

67. It has not always been an easy life for me, or for my family. But this is nothing new, really. Women have always had to make difficult choices, often choices that men are not been forced to make. And we must live with the consequences, for better or worse.

68. Those of us in positions of responsibility understand this special, unique and extraordinary moment in history. We fight for all the women who came before us who gave us this opportunity. And most of all, we do it for all woman who will come after us -- the baby girls yet unborn!

69. As a child of my age, in the late sixties, I was influenced by the social ferment around me. The worldwide students movement, from Rawalpindi, to Washington, were important factors in my youth. The fight against apartheid shaped the ferocity of my commitment to stand up for principle. The burgeoning movement for women’s rights empowered and emboldened me.

70. As an Asian at Harvard, I joined up with American students to protest a war that they thought was unjust and did not want to fight.

71. These important steps helped shape my outlook on life, helped me focus on fighting injustice, promoting freedom and safeguarding the rights of the weak and dispossessed.

72. But above all, in America during the Watergate crises I saw the awesome power of the people to change policies, change leaders, and change history.

73. From Harvard I went to Oxford, where the British Politician Enoch Powell was threatening to throw all Asians into the sea.

74. While I was at Oxford, the Conservative party chose a woman, Margaret Thatcher, as the Leader of Opposition. The idea of the first female British Prime Minister became an intense topic for student discussions.

75. At Oxford, I was the first female foreigner to be elected as President of the Oxford Union.

76. The Oxford Union reflects the British Parliament.

77. It was there that I learned to debate, slowly gaining confidence before an audience.
78. I had been told that as a foreigner, I could not win the Presidency and should not run.

79. I had been told that as a woman, I could not win, and should not run. But I did run and did win and overcame my fear of losing. I learned to overcome fear and to take risks. I learned never to give in when the task seemed formidable or impossible.

80. What has always been clear to me is that the extraordinary educational opportunities I had gave me a range of life and career options denied to most women, and certainly almost all women of the developing world.

81. My own experiences at Harvard and Oxford made it clear to me that only educational opportunity promotes empowerment for women.

82. If women are truly to be defined by themselves and their own accomplishments and abilities, they need the level of education that empowers them. Education leads to the kind of financial independence that causes women to break the shackles of being only a man’s daughter or a man’s wife.

83. Toba Tek Singh

84. As the Prime Minister of Pakistan I appeared before an historic Joint Session of the United States Congress in 1989.

85. In that address, the most meaningful line to me was my simple message to the woman of America, my message to the women of the world. Three simple, powerful words: YES YOU CAN!

86. I urge women all over the world not to accept the status quo, not to accept “no” for an answer. It is critical that women-- whether in London or Kabul -- refuse to accept traditional roles and traditional constraints.

87. Acquiescing to a tradition dictated by men -- a tradition of subjugation of mothers and daughters-- can no longer be accepted.

88. In the West and in the East we must stand up and reject the notion that leadership and femininity are contradictory.

89. I recall the words of Lady Margaret Thatcher. “When a woman is strong, she is pushy. But when a man is strong…ah…he is a great leader!”

90. We’ve made progress; we’ve smashed many glass ceilings. But there are thousands left to break, many battles left to fight.

91. The greatest obstacles to progress for women in the third millennium is the bigotry of men, and no where is that bigotry more venal than in the Taliban and the fanatics that have declared war on the civilized world.
92. We fight against terrorism, and the bigotry and intolerance that will confine and constrain and victimize in the generations ahead.

93. Victimization of significant elements of society and the concept of long-term peace are mutually exclusive.

94. The denial of human rights is a bomb that ultimately explodes.

95. These are difficult times. Freedom is under assault. Democracy is under assault. Criminal terrorists hijack my religion just as they hijack America’s planes.

96. The solutions will not be quick or simple. But if we maintain our commitment to the principles that define us-- the principles of racial, gender and religious equality, the principles of political pluralism and tolerance, and the principle of peaceful change through democracy-- we shall in the end prevail.

97. In addressing the new exigencies of the new century, we could translate dynamic religion into a living reality. Muslim societies need to learn to live by the true spirit of Islam, not only by its rituals.

98. Those who are ignorant of Islam, could cast aside their preconceptions about the role of women in our religion.

99. Contrary to what many believe, Islam embraces a rich variety of political, social and cultural traditions. The fundamental ethos of Islam is tolerance, dialogue and democracy.

100. Just as in Christianity and Judaism, we must always be on guard for those who use the Muslim Holy Book for their own narrow political ends, who will distort the essence of pluralism and tolerance for their own extremist agendas.

101. These manipulators, distorters and bigots exist all over the world, but nowhere were they more dangerous and destructive than the last years of the Taliban era in Afghanistan.

102. And most central to the Taliban perversion was its concept and treatment of women.

103. For the Taliban, and other extremists throughout the Moslem world, refute the central ethos of Islam which is equality, especially equality between the sexes. I find Islam in its writings, respectful of the role of women in society. It is this tradition of Islam that empowered me, strengthened me, and emboldened me.

104. It is this tradition of Islam that allowed me my battle for political and human rights. It strengthens me today in this hour of crisis for my family, my nation and myself.

105. Today in Pakistan, the veil of repression has descended across our people.
The cause of human rights is being set back decades.

But the cause of women’s rights, I am sad to say, is being set back a century.

My immediate successor’s attempt to turn back the clock on women’s rights, on liberal society, on pluralistic democracy focused on me, on destroying me politically at home and destroying my reputation abroad.

We have become accustomed to attempts to use the politics of personal destruction to turn back the course of democracy, human rights and women’s rights in our homeland. It didn’t work then and it will not work now.

Despite the Musharraf regime’s support of the international war against terrorism, this military junta, like its Martial law predecessors of the past, is attempting to use the teaching of Islam as an excuse to subjugate women, deny freedom, destroy a free press, dominate NGOs, break up political parties, decimate the Judiciary, and restore the iron hand of dictatorship to the land.

For me, it is particularly heartbreaking, as the military regime dismantles the array of special programs that I instituted in my two terms as Prime Minister to raise the quality of life of women in Pakistan.

Unfortunately hiding under the aura of international cooperation on terrorism, the current regime in Islamabad continues to terrorize its own women. A world focused on the destruction of the Al Qaeda network has neither the interest nor the knowledge to investigate the human rights abuses in a “coalition” member.

And thus the causes of women’s rights, human rights, press freedom and democracy fall backwards into the dark chasms of a past era.

Yet I see great progress looming as the forces that shape the new century and the new millennium come together around the world.

It is a confluence of energy committed to universal social, economic and political values-- this triad definition of comprehensive human rights for the future.

It is a confluence of ideology that must shape a world free from exploitation and maltreatment of women, a world in which women have opportunities to rise to the highest level in politics, business, diplomacy, and other spheres of life.

The new century must, for once and for all, exclude even the notion of battered women.

It must be an era where honor and dignity are protected in peace, and in war, where women have economic freedom and independence, where women are not defined by their fathers or husbands, but by their own achievements, where they are equal partners in peace and development.
119. Even as we catalogue, organize and hopefully attain our goals, step by step by step, all of those around the world who are committed to the common causes of human rights, women’s rights and peace, must be vigilant.

120. As in Pakistan today, repressive forces always stand ready to exploit the moment and push us back into the past.

121. It seems that the words of Goethe continue to resonate: “freedom has be re-made and re-earned in every generation.”

122. Dear Guests,

123. In the time it took for me to speak to you today, over one thousand children starved to death on this planet.

124. As long as these basic violations of human rights are allowed to continue, none of us—regardless of where we live, regardless of how elegant or civilized our life-styles, regardless of our own personal circumstances and comforts—are free.

125. My father, Prime Minister Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto, was toppled and ultimately murdered by the forces of dictatorship and extremism two decades ago. I recall vividly those dark and tragic days, with my father languishing in a dark prison, living in the most inhumane conditions, with the world helpless to stop his murder.

126. But he remained courageous to the end, even in the hours before his death.

127. I want to end this monograph with the words that he ended his last letter to me, quoting Robert F. Kennedy, himself a victim of assassination, commenting on the poetry of Alfred Lord Tennyson. Despite the crisis we live under today, these words set the tone for a new and brighter future.

128. In 1979, from the horror of his death cell, my father wrote:

129. “Every generation has a central concern, whether to end war, erase racial injustice, or improve the conditions of working people. The people demand a government that speaks directly and honestly to its citizens. The possibilities are too great, the stakes too high, to bequeath to the coming generation only the prophetic lament of Tennyson -- “Ah, what shall I be at fifty…if I find the world so bitter at twenty.”

130. If there is anything that I can truly share from my life that applies to yours, it is the classic quote Shakespeare’s Hamlet, “to thine own self be true.”

131. In politics and business, in art and in the academy, there will always be pressures to do what is convenient, the path of least resistance, what is safe and conservative.

132. But leadership is not rooted in safety; it rather is a product of boldness.
133. Do not be timid.
134. And do not surround yourself with those who are timid.
135. Don’t do what is necessarily popular, do what is right.
136. It is sad that modern leaders often take public opinion polls to decide on courses of policy.
137. Sixty years ago, a truly great leader, American President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, also took polls.
138. But he didn’t take polls to determine what course to follow.
139. On the contrary, he took polls to find out where the people were so that he would know how to educate them to stand with him to do what was right.
140. Leaders lead, remember that.
141. Convince, educate, bring people around to do what is moral, to do what is right, to do what is necessary.
142. Whether it is in politics or business, don’t be afraid to stand out and stand up.
143. Ladies and gentlemen, go forth and lead. Good luck and Godspeed.

Text from the United States Pakistan People's Party website.