Kurdish Studies
September 2024
Volume: 12, No: 5, pp. 1772-1779
ISSN: 2051-4883 (Print) | ISSN 2051-4891 (Online)
www.KurdishStudies.net

DOI: 10.53555/ks.v12i5.3569

National Narrative and America: Political World Making in Benazir Bhutto's *Daughter of the East*

Dr Shafaat Yar Khan[1*], Syed Abuzar Naqvi[2], Waqas Yousaf[3]

[1*]University of Central Punjab, shafaat.yar@ucp.edu.pk
[2]Minhaj University Lahore, Abuzar.eng@mul.edu.pk
[3]Minhaj University Lahore, waqas.eng@mul.edu.pk

Abstract
This paper uses contextualist-rhetorical narratology, developed by Wayne-Booth and Phelan, to explore narrative techniques in Benazir Bhutto's autobiography, "Daughter of the East". It bases its thesis on the premise that political narratives often focus on the way the world exists and relate the identity formation of the narrator to the political forces that control the affairs of the world. Therefore, personal narratives of political leaders can be used to shed light on their views of these forces, and the way they tend to side by them or oppose them. This paper studies Benazir Bhutto's view of the forces of American hegemony on world affairs vis-à-vis her own national narrative during the troubled days of General Zia's martial law, and her struggle to bring democracy to Pakistan. For this, she employs identity formation techniques to present herself as a product of education in the American intellectual atmosphere of the early 1970's. The focus of this research is on narratological strategies employed in Benazir Bhutto's world making in a globalised world. It emphasizes that her narrative techniques seem to accommodate American political projects in South East Asia. In doing so, this research sheds light on the way Benazir Bhutto disentangles herself from her father's politics who had resisted American policies using anti-imperialist stratagems, and who had accused American government to have planned his downfall. The research explores how her autobiographical narratives shows her perched between these two opposing forces in such a way as to suggest her vision of the future of democracy in her country.

Key words: political autobiography, narratology, imperialism, political world making, Benazir Bhutto

This paper employs the methodologies developed in rhetorical and contextualist narratological school of Wayne C. Booth (*The Rhetoric of Fiction*, 1961 & 1983) and James Phelan (*Narrative as Rhetoric: Technique, Audiences, Ethics, Ideology*, 1996). It triangulates these techniques with techniques of narrative analysis developed in the disciplines of psychology, sociology, and politics as highlighted by Catherine Kohler Riessman (2002, 2005, 2013, 2015). This narratological study focuses on identity construction and negotiations with readers, which have often been neglected by other researchers in political discourse analysis.

Rhetorical approaches to narratives study the use of narrative to gain political effects. They explore how storytelling creates nationalist ideas or upbraids masses. In *Understanding Nationalism: On Narrative, Cognitive Science, and Identity* (2009), Patrick Hogan pointed out how "nationalism is crucially linked with storytelling" (168). He underscores that "nationalism cannot be understood in separation from narrative, which itself cannot be understood in separation from our emotion systems" (ibid). In his study of nationalism, Hogan underscores the importance of 'affectivity' as a function of national identity. From his discussions, it is clear that narratives can have important consequences for socio-political actions. Emotional responses are achieved by 'emplotting' nationalist ideas so that they motivate to action. Commenting on the ideological uses of narratological strategies, de Fina says: "We see narrative more and more as a way of constructing "events" and giving them meaning..." (*Discourse* 161). Hogan specifically uses the rhetorical approach and lays down that "the crucial thing is not the individual intent with which a given action is performed. Rather, the crucial thing is the effect of the action (66). By affectivity, he means "the infusion of emotion into our ideas about identity" (93) so that "emotion in nationalism is crucially bound up with the narrative structures" (ibid).

Hogan's views find ample evidence in political studies of narratives. Terms like 'grand narratives' and 'national narrative' are now used to explain the nationalist purpose of achieving ideological objectives. This research takes into account the methods and conclusions of these studies to apply to the study Bhutto's travel narratives in her autobiography. Its starting point is the idea that personal narratives are purposely written to send a message or messages to the readers. It is informed by Bhabha's term "cultural construction of nationness" (Nation, 292) which involves re-writing historical events as demanded by political objectives. This comes close to what Riessman points out: "As nations and governments construct preferred narratives about history, so do social movements, organisations, scientists, other professionals, ethnic/racial groups, and individuals in stories of experience" (Riessman, "Narrative" 2005, 1). Literary studies of narratives take narratives to be the result of a communication practice in which "events are selected, organised, connected, and evaluated as meaningful for a particular audience" (Riessman, Narrative, 4). Interpretative methodologies of narratives have been greatly affected by rhetorical studies of narrative pioneered by Wayne Booth and his disciple, James Phelan. They elaborated how storytellers "engage and influence their audiences' cognition, emotions, and values" (Phelan, "Rhetoric/ethics" 203), with ideology as the most significant purpose (Phelan, *Companion*, 203). Rhetorical approach requires critics "to reason back from the effects of a work to the causes

of those effects in the elements of its construction" (Phelan, "Approaches" 502). This research paper attempts to show that rhetorical narratology provides a successful methodology for analysis of political texts like Benazir Bhutto's autobiography.

Interpretive strategies used in this paper focus on the way Bhutto situate herself vis-à-vis her audiences. It uses Booth' contention that narrators 'wipe out those selves' they don't like, or consider inappropriate ("Resurrection", 77-78) as in 'literary masking' (ibid 78) or use of dishonest by 'rhetrickery' by politicians (ibid 77). Thus, while Browning created "deliberately unreliable poetic voices", Sylvia Plath "beautifully revealed and recreated [her] self-destructive faults and miseries – as if practicing total undoctored honesty" (Resurrection 79). This phrase is important in understanding Benazir Bhutto's autobiography. While inscription of nationalist ideas is not an obligation on travel narrators, yet one must acknowledge Hogan's recommendation that "it is important that we spontaneously interpret events in nationalistic terms" (68).

Third World leaders, in their subaltern situations, must construct a worldview of global politics when they narrate their encounters with imperialist forces. The abstract ideas of 'cold war', 'New World Order' and 'war on terror' affect these leaders in material terms. When Benazir narrates travelling to America and England, and her contact with American imperial forces, she narrates, and comments on her, and her nation's position, vis-à-vis America's imperialist policies. Benazir Bhutto inherited a troubled legacy as the daughter of Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, Pakistan's foreign minister during the rule of General (R) Ayub Khan his He was known for his passionate vocalism and anti-US and pro-China policies (*Myth* 4). He brought up Benazir Bhutto to carry on her father's legacy. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto was not just a statesman and an impressive public speaker; he was an intellectual who wrote books explaining world affairs. In his books and speeches, particularly in *The Myth of Independence* (1967), he showed an intelligent perception of postcolonial political theories of Said and Fanon, as well as of the ideas like the Great Game, clash of civilisations, and encirclement of China.

Benazir Bhutto was trained by her father from her adolescence to inherit his political legacy. She was educated at Radcliff College and had participated in American activism in anti-Vietnam war. By the time she came into politics, the world had become unipolar and the US had risen as the sole imperial power with strong roots in Pakistani politics. In her autobiography, at many places, Benazir Bhutto gives her perceptions of US influence in the region, but does not own her father's Anti-US, pro-China policies. Her world view presents the global powers more in the light of American political narratives than her father's vision. In her autobiography, she used narratological techniques to distance herself from her father's ideology, to make it 'pleasing' to the US, whose imperial sway was regarded as necessary to form a successful government in Pakistan.

Benazir Bhutto's autobiography (1989) was published with two titles: *Daughter of the East* and *Daughter of Destiny*. The latter indicates the influence of fate as a mysterious force in her career which was pushing her to a certain destination. The other title, *Daughter of the East*, suggests that she is the inheritor of the legacy of the 'Poet of the East', Dr. Muhammad Iqbal, Pakistan's national poet as well as a representative of the socio-political ideology of the East. Both the titles generate subtexts through intertextuality and were obviously chosen for the messages they could convey to readers.

It is noteworthy that her narrative of her stay at Harvard does not mention 'halaal' food. This is a theme that she asserts when she narrates herself a politician in the making (221). As noted in travel narratives analysed in previous chapters, food has been a contested idea in foreign travels of people of the subcontinent. For Gandhi and Sir Syed food became the most vital question of their foreign travels. For Benazir, it is as if kosher meat was needed to be mentioned to make her eligible for politics in Pakistan after Zia's Islamisation.

The autobiography does not begin with the usual narrative of her birth, but rather of her father's death. Narrative of her life is interspersed with the experiences she had to bear as a result of her father's political career. In narrating her father's stormy career and being present at his most critical moments, she asserts how her life was determined by the events in his life. The text begins with her assertion: "I have always believed in the importance of historic record" (3). It thus assures the reader that she is writing here to go on record, and she would tell the truth and nothing but the truth. The text, however, uses rhetorical and fictional devices quite frequently. The first chapter, titled "The Assassination of My Father", starts with a rhetorical "They killed my father in the early morning hours of April 4, 1979 ...". That she uses fiction rather than the normal mode of memory recall should thus be the starting point for any discussion of her narrative.

Her father's death is the pivot on which Benazir balances the scales of her own life. On the one side is her past as her father's daughter, and on the other is her future as an emerging leader of the Pakistani people. She balances these two extremes with a dangerous balancing act. In her ambition to be honest she accuses the US to have conspired against her father. She clearly writes that the unrest against her father was due to American involvement and she relates it in clearest possible terms to "the ClA-sponsored military overthrow of President Allende and his democratically elected government" (72) in Chile . She even cites evidence for this: "Our intelligence had also noted frequent meetings between American diplomats and members of the PNA" (ibid). Yet, after this, her narrative is an attempt to distance herself from her father's policies which had caused his overthrow. Thus when she narrates her encounters with the Chinese dignitaries, she narrates her disappointment on not meeting Mao, but Chou En-lai (Zhou Enlai), who was her father's idol and whose cap he had worn as his 'lucky cap'. She particularly mentions Chen-Yi and Liu-Shao Chi, and tells the readers "who would subsequently die in jail during the Cultural Revolution" (32-33). Thus, she comments on China's cruel internal policies. This distancing herself from her father's pro-China policies holds an important narrative message for her Western readers, particularly since her "most important political battles were still to be fought" (3).

Benazir alienates herself from her father's politics when tells her inability to understand her father's views. She tells that when she was only ten, her father wrote her a "long letter elaborating on the self-interest of the superpowers in the United Nations and the resulting neglect of third world countries" (33). She tells that a nun "sat Sanam [her sister] and me down on a bench in the school garden and read the letter to us in its entirety, though we understood little of its content" (ibid). That the nun 'sat' them indicates their age and innocence, as does reading the lettering to them as if they did not know how to read it. The resulting idea that they 'understood little of its content' in a way mocks her father's intelligence to write such dense ideas to his innocent daughters.

Despite this, she offers herself as a leader in the making by stressing that she was educated in international political economy from her childhood: "Terms such as 'cold war' and 'arms embargo' had already become part of our dimly understood vocabulary as small children. We were as familiar with hearing the results of round-table conferences and summit meetings as other children were with World Cup Cricket scores" (34-35). These points were obviously motivated by her desire to impress upon her readers that she was no amateur in international politics.

Benazir's autobiography seems motivated by her desire to gather US support. She describes Soviet entry into Afghanistan as "battle between the superpowers ... on Pakistan's doorstep" (41), showing her clear understanding of Pakistan as the strategic site of new Great Game. Yet, in developing a geo-political scenario, Benazir Bhutto yields to America's strategic narrative that US was a force for democracy. She writes: "If the United States wants a country which is internally strong to meet the Soviet presence, they will move quickly to restore democracy to Pakistan. If they decide to wait and see what happens in Afghanistan, Zia's dictatorship will be strengthened" (42). As she later recaptures, American governments of Carter and Regan strengthened Zia's dictatorial regime (93, 173-74), and ignored her protests against human rights violations by Zia's military courts (185-86).

In her narrative, Bhutto stops short of commenting on the policies of strengthening General Zia. She superimposes the narrative of Russian troops entering Afghanistan on the idea of US being a bulwark against communism. This leads immediately to her stay at Radcliff where, she says: "America. I had experienced democracy for the first time in America, where I spent four of the happiest years of my life" (42). That she learnt political the dynamic in America is clearly stated: "As a student at Radcliffe, however, I had also learned firsthand the powerlessness of third world countries in the face of the self-interest of the superpowers" (ibid). She attributes this understanding to Radcliff and not her father's discourses or to his struggle that she had watched first-hand.

Benazir Bhutto's narrative of stay at Radcliff College underscores the themes of her growing up as a woman and her training as a future politician. She narrates her participating in activist rallies, becoming conscious of democracy, and coming to understand Pakistan better than before: "By studying government at Harvard I began to understand more about Pakistan than I ever had by living there" (44). She narrates anti-war movement and that she "had opposed the Vietnam War at home" (43), but she stops short at narrating her participation in "Bring the Boys Home" rallies and refraining from indicating her understanding of the war in Vietnam. She uses here the technique of criticising the imperial culture for the evils acknowledged by itself. This has the effect of showing her to be a part of US politics without being a participant in anti-US activism. Benazir, thus, establishes that her travel to America contributed to her political education.

The period of her stay at Radcliff was the period of civil war in East Pakistan. In narrating her anxiety during this period, Benazir narrates reading the "official newspapers" her parents sent her from Pakistan, but listening to the BBC; references to American media are thus elided. The conflict is consciously established. She does not favour her father's view that "attitude of the British and the American press has been, to say the least, deplorable" (*Tragedy* 41). Rather, instead of noting what she heard on the BBC, Benazir refers to her sister, Samiya, who wrote to her: "The BBC is also reporting terrible crimes committed by the army in East Pakistan. Have you heard anything about that?" (47). Thus, the narrative contrasts Pakistan's official newspapers with BBC, only to find BBC to be truthful. It is significant that she stresses BBC reports and not American media reports, thus clearing the US of any partiality in the matter.

In America, Benazir Bhutto narrates her defending Pakistan at Radcliff, but comes to the unavoidable conclusion: "I was also too young and naive at Harvard to understand that the Pakistani army was capable of committing the same atrocities as any army let loose in a civilian population. The psychology can be deadly, as it was when U.S. forces massacred innocent civilians in My Lai in 1968" (46). This seemingly Anti-US argument is not against US army but rather one against all armies. Here, she notes Mai Lai as 'one' incident not representative of US army's actions in Vietnam.

Benazir Bhutto inscribes US as Pakistan's support against its enemies in a sentence written to her by her sister: "We are waiting for help from the Americans" (47). When she records the fact that "Military help from America never arrived", she adds a justification" "Nixon eschewed military intervention for safer diplomatic man[o]euvers, ordering what came to be called America's "tilt" toward Pakistan" (ibid). She, thus, supports American policies, and, to emphasise a pro-US discourse, she chrocicles date-wise how the US helped Pakistan diplomatically (47).

Benazir then narrates how during the stormy days of 1971, she accompanied her father at the UN. She establishes American and Chinese support for Pakistan and blames Russian veto for the inconclusive discussions. Instead of focusing on America's Seventh Fleet, Benazir asserts that "Only answer [was] Chinese intervention with Americans putting screws on the Russians to prevent them from intervening" (49). Chinese support was acknowledged by her father in *The Great Tragedy* (41-43) with a clear statement: "In spite of our good record in international relations, the attitude of most countries except for China has been vacillating and ambivalent in our hour of crisis" (*Tragedy* 40, also 41 & 42). Benazir Bhutto gives a view different from her father's and subverts her father's narrative of Chinese support: "Henry Kissinger is very worried that the Chinese will intervene militarily on the side of Pakistan. My father is worried that the Chinese won't" (49).

Benazir's use of narrative techniques shows that she is playing to the American gallery in these narratives. She maintains the anonymity of the Chinese delegations her father met thus not making them individuals with names. But she narrates that the United States delegation came headed by George Bush who was friendly and patronising: " 'My son is up at Harvard too. Call me if you ever need anything' Ambassador Bush tells me, handing me his card" (49). Bush was to play an important role in American policies (1971 – 1989), especially towards Pakistan and during Benazir Bhutto's terms in office.

In trying to distance herself from her father's politics and draw up to to US policies, Benazir endorses the US views of her father. She especially mentions: "The Washington Post termed my father's performance in the Security Council 'living theater'" and endorses the view by narrating how her father instructed her to give false messages to everyone who called: "If the Soviets are here, tell me the Chinese are calling. If the Americans are here, tell me that the Russians are on the line or the Indians ... One of the fundamental lessons of diplomacy is to create doubt" (49). It is clear that Benazir's aim is to ender herself to her readers because she again disentangles herself from her father's influence: "I follow his instructions but not his lesson. I always

lay my cards on the table" (49). She tells how she learnt from his performance lessons that repudiated his actions: "As his impassioned words fill the chamber, I learn the lesson of acquiescence versus defiance" (50). In her use of 'acquiescence' Benazir unmistakably emphasises her ability to learn, and thus assures to exercise amenability and compliance, thereby declaring submission.

Benazir's narratives not only subvert the paradigms her father had set for Pakistan's place in the changing global scenarios, she showcases her liking for America and its policies everywhere in her autobiography. Thus, she points out that going to Oxford was not her choice and that she obeyed her father then because he was financially supporting her (58). Her attempt to separate herself from her father's preferences is reflected in her preference for Harvard to continue her studies while he insisted on Oxford. She sums it up simply as: "He had been far happier at Oxford than, at first, I was" (61), but the narrative shows deeper, and far reaching differences. She claims that she joined the Oxford Union to please her father. She asserts that Harvard made her aware of political realities that her experience in Pakistan never could: "By studying government at Harvard I began to understand more about Pakistan than I ever had by living there" (44), which means: under her father's care. She also rebels against her father's career as politician in asserting that she "had no intention of becoming a politician, having seen firsthand the pressures and strains of life in politics" (61). She wanted to join Pakistan's Foreign Service as against her father's career as Foreign Minister. Thus, she establishes that she was forced into politics.

Benazir Bhutto also validates her liking for America by contrasting the narratives of leaving America and entering England. The narrative of the stay in America comes to an end with a narrative recounting her flight taking off (58) as she expresses sorrow through the nostalgic memories of her life during her stay. She remembers her daily chores which she tries to preserve, Wordsworth-like, as 'food for days to come. No such narrative had recounted her flight to American, which was her first foreign travel. Leaving America is narrated with details of vacating her room, packing up, and taking a last look at the familiar scenes: "Our suite looked bare, as did Harvard Yard and the shelves at the Coop bookstore" (58). She emphasises this impression through her sadness at leaving America: "As the plane lifted off from Logan Airport, I *strained* to catch my last glimpse of the Boston skyline" (ibid). She narrates reminiscing about her small, daily chores at Harvard that she would miss: "Shopping at Filene's Basement. Eating at the communal tables at Durgin Park. Going to the Casablanca to forget our hockey loss to Boston University" (ibid). She emphasises American achievements and her pride in having witnessed it: "Man had reached the moon and I had seen the moon dust at M.I.T" (ibid). To emphasise her cultural loss, she narrates that she left with "... the lyrics to a Peter, Paul, and Mary song – 'I'm leaving on a jet plane, don't know when I'll be back again' – running through my mind, I flew home to Pakistan" (58).

Benazir contrasts England and America by showing her homely feelings in the US and English bias "When I first arrived in England the immigration officials had questioned me for forty-five minutes ..." (220). Even when she had been living in England and flying in and out so frequently that her passport had few pages left. She narrates that the attitude of the British immigration officers was so biased that she dreaded their interviews: "I was apprehensive every time I landed back in England, fearing that I would be turned away by the immigration authorities" (220). Her narrative suggests that while the US was always condescending, the British resented her political manoeuvring.

Benazir also asserts the primacy of American education by mixing up her English experiences with events in America. The narrative of her first debate in Oxford Union Debating Society brings in the Nixon affair which had ended her narrative of leaving Harvard. It is as if she had qualified for the debate by the maturity gained in America. She presents Nixon affair as a paradox of American politics: "American history is replete with paradoxes ... Americans began with a president who couldn't tell a lie and now they have one who can't tell the truth" (62). She emphasises the greatness of American democratic traditions: "The American people are removing their president through democratic, constitutional means" (57). She treats the debate as the epitome of the views of the greatest political thinkers like Locke, Rousseau, and John Stuart Mill whose views seemed sterile before the practice of democracy by the American people: "... theory was one thing. Seeing it unfold in practice was quite another" (57).

Benazir's focus remains the application of American democratic principles: "The leaders in a democracy like America's might come and go, but the U.S. Constitution remained. We would not be so fortunate in Pakistan" (57). She describes the Watergate scandal as having given her "a profound sense of the importance of nationally accepted laws, rather than whimsical or arbitrary laws imposed by individuals" (57). It is significant that Benazir does not pursue these narratives to the trial of President Regan in the Iran-Contra affair, and conviction of Col. Oliver North, which were the most explosive events during the period when her autobiography was being written (1987 - 1989). Iran-Contra Congressional Report had been released in 1987 and could seriously controvert Benazir's faith in American democracy. That she chose to elide it indicates that she chose to discuss only those aspects of American politics that glorified its democratic practices.

Benazir Bhutto's narratives include drawing a contrast between Harvard and Oxford where her father insisted she go (57-58). Although several of her friends, including Peter Galbraith, were going to Oxford, she "grew increasingly sad at the thought of leaving America. She discusses her sorrow like an amateur girl: "I knew my way around Cambridge and Boston and had finally mastered the subway routes on the MTA" (58). Then she adds: "I knew and understood the people" (ibid).

In contrasting Harvard and Oxford, Benazir complains like a teenager that whereas they had "our own suite of rooms" at Harvard, the "single room at Lady Margaret Hall was tiny with a communal bathroom down the passageway" (61). That America is more opulent is also established by complaining about "Oxford's antiquated message system, which generally took two days" (ibid). The intimacy she claims for America and its people leads to her judgment that Americans are friendly but the English are cold. She creates national stereotypes by telling that she "found the English reserved compared to my friends at Harvard, who had been instantly friendly" and tells that "[f]or weeks I sought out the company of my American classmates who had come on to Oxford" (ibid). The difference between America and England was reflected in the change of dress code and Bhutto remembers "Student speakers dressed in formal clothes with carnations in their lapels, forcing me out of my jeans and into the silks of Anna Belinda" (61).

Her father feared that: "If you stay longer in America, you will begin to put down roots there" (58). The desire to have "roots" in America seems to be the message she conveys through her various narratives. Her acquaintance with the Galbraiths, her participation in American cultural and political movements, her receiving a kind offer from George Bush, who in future was to be the Director of CIA and Vice President and then President of America during her tenures in office, all seem to suggest to the American readers that she was an ally of America and deserved their supported.

Benazir was bound to recount events in Pakistan politics and America's alleged role in causing her father's downfall. In doing this, Benazir's strategy is to avoid her own comments and resort to 'reports'. In capturing US support of Zia's regime, Benazir depends on journalistic accounts to continue her narrative without gaps. This strategy of reporting only suggests to the reader that this is her point of view and does not actually stating her view as a comment or narrating her reactions to the historical events. This sort of apocryphal history noted events reported by public. These include ideas like "People had fistfuls of American dollars and were quitting their jobs ... the flood of American currency had driven the value of the dollar in the black market down by 30 percent". This includes her suspicion that her father's government was overthrown by the CIA in a manner similar to "ClA-sponsored military overthrow of President Allende" with tactics called 'Operation Wheel Jam' (72-73). However, to strengthen 'conspiracy theories', she adds her own observation with a daring "I could see for myself", which amounts to only an observation of truckers' strike, as she was not herself on the streets to 'observe'. Knowing that this could embroil her with the US authorities, she contrast these accounts with her pleas of innocence of American involvement in Pakistani events. She stresses that she came to know of CIA's involvement in Pakistan after reading the book *Veil: The Secret Wars of the CIA* (1987) by the American journalist Bob Woodward (174).

However, her choice of what should go into her narratives actively monitors her writing and ensures that her objectives are fulfilled. In narrating her father's overthrow, she makes a daring statement about how Kissinger had tried to dissuade her father from getting the nuclear reprocessing plant from France to make what came to be called Pakistan's "Islamic bomb". She narrates that Kissinger had told her father that if he did not stop, he would take the "risk [of] being made a "horrible example". While this may seem a very bold, anti-US comment, Bhutto's narrative strategy is to offer an explanation of the mistaken view of the American government: "The U.S. government *evidently* saw the plant only as potentially producing a nuclear device …: and adds to this as her own point of view: "the 'Islamic bomb', as it came to be known, was decidedly not in the best interests of *the free world* (73, emphasis added). In writing 'free world', Benazir includes India in the free world as it was opposed to Pakistan's nuclear plans. She here completely elides her father's assertion that the myth of the White Man's Burden was being "epitomized in the creed of democracy against dictatorship" (*Myth of Independence* 9). Bhutto's reference there was obviously to US narrative of being the champion of democracy and defender of the 'free world'. Benazir Bhutto explains that the nuclear reprocessing plant would have given Pakistan energy "at a time when skyrocketing oil prices had adversely affected the economies of even the prosperous West" (73), but does not add the important fact that oil prices and the earlier 'oil embargo' were in a way caused by her father's efforts in 1973.

In narrating Kissinger's comment, Benazir Bhutto writes that "I didn't want to believe the United States was actively destabilizing the democratically elected government of Pakistan", which contradicts her own 'reported' facts (72-3). Benazir Bhutto rather puts the blame on CIA (206) asserting that "changes in the U.S. administration did not necessarily mean changes in all the U.S. centers of power" (73) thus asserting that the CIA was often autonomous and that their policies were not established overnight", which targets a visible enemy and saves the US government. She mentions a taped conversation of "between two American diplomats in Islamabad" saying that "The party's over!" (73), but does not say much beyond imagining a "CIA dossier on [her] father" (73). Rather she thinks that "Relations with the United States, too, seemed to be improving" because when shown a "fifty-page Foreign Office report containing the grounds of *our suspicion* about American involvement" (74, emphasis added), Cyrus Vance had said: "No ... we want to start a new chapter with Pakistan" (74), which could actually mean a change of government. As conclusion, Benazir Bhutto writes "Did the Americans play a role in disrupting my father's government? We will never have proof" (75). She wraps up this whole narrative exonerating the US government: "The United States was acting in its national self-interest, but we were not acting in our own. Some people take the easy way out by putting the whole blame for the events of 1977 on the United States" (75). So, she puts the blame nearer home than on the US. This also proves that her strategy is to keep avoiding any reference to the Great Game or geo-strategic factors that her father had underscored or she herself had highlighted in her monograph *Foreign Policy in Perspective* (3, 5).

When it comes to commenting on US support of Zia regime, Benazir again uses the narrative technique of quoting external sources to avoid giving personal opinion. She resorts to 'reported' facts and writes: "The United States government has made its choice ... it becomes clear that the Americans are opting for Zia's military dictatorship and not the return of democracy" (95). However, she again seeks the cause for this support in "The refugees and the Soviet troops on our doorstep" (ibid). She focuses on the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan without noting details of its geostrategic importance and terms it rather as "Brezhnev's Christmas present to Zia" (95), as if it were a personal or local affair not a part of the Great Game as her father had asserted. In suggesting her disappointment at monetary and military aid, Bhutto refers to "America's eagerness to bolster Pakistan against the Communist threat" and dilutes the bitterness by including others in the blame by telling that "Zia's position was being further strengthened by the hundreds of millions of dollars in refugee relief aid Pakistan was receiving from the United States …" (173-74). In all these, Benazir Bhutto avoids narrating her own feelings and reactions.

Benazir Bhutto's narratives of the US suggest optimism. Despite frequent mentions of failure of attempts to free her father and other political prisoners, she maintains the view that much was being done. Regarding these efforts, she writes: "I didn't know then that behind the headlines certain American politicians were quietly challenging Mr. Buckley's conclusions" (185). Bhutto's intention here is to suggest a counter-politics existed in US Houses of Representatives. She also avoids the obvious conclusion that against this minority effort, the US government pursued its plans with no regard for efforts of this minority group to raise the issue of human rights. When she mentions that after these efforts, US government approved the sale of F-16 planes to Pakistan – "the most visible symbol of American support for the Zia regime" (185) – she reports from *India Today*

rather than any American magazine. In discussing an amendment initiated by Senator Pell which stated that "in authorizing assistance to Pakistan, it is the intent of Congress to promote the expeditious restoration of full civil liberties and representative government in Pakistan", she does not mention the failure of the whole movement but rather contents the reader by saying that "While the Pell amendment had little practical effect, it was a useful shot over the bow of the Zia dictatorship" (186). Later, suggesting similarities between herself and Corazon Aquino (265-266), Bhutto resents Americans role in ousting and comments "The Reagan administration, however, was solidly behind Zia".

In bringing out the Soviet threat as the cause of US policies, Bhutto never refers to US interests in South Asia. The most that she asserts is: "I was increasingly frustrated as well to read about the twisting of the political situation in Pakistan by the Reagan administration in its congressional campaign to restore U.S. aid. Under Secretary of State James Buckley, even testified that elections were not "in the security interest of Pakistan," as if we, the democratic party, were the enemy, and not the dictator!" (185). However, she mentions how efforts to raise the issue of human rights her detention were met by Under Secretary Buckley with promise to use "efforts through 'private diplomacy', a code word for doing nothing at all" (185-186).

Benazir Bhutto's favourite technique in pointing out US protection of General Zia's army regime is to narrate her activism in pointing out human rights violation in Pakistan and then contrasting it with US support of Zia in terms of aid or military support or US concern for Pakistan's nuclear program which many supposed was the cause of her father's downfall. So, naming many well-known senators and congressmen, she writes" "For a week I talked incessantly about the need to end human rights abuses and restore democracy to Pakistan ... Pakistan was already very much on the minds of legislators in Washington. The $3.2 billion U.S. aid package voted to Pakistan in 1981 was in peril of being cut off because of Pakistan's unverifiable nuclear program" (215) and how the Senate Foreign Relations Committee reversed its stance antinuclear requirements for American aid: "Instead they passed a new amendment allowing the continuation of aid to Pakistan with certification from the president that Pakistan did not have a nuclear bomb, and (218). This gulf between US global concerns and her insistence on human rights violation made her dread speeches and interviews (216) because "The Western press was now consistently portraying Zia as a 'benign dictator' and the man who had brought 'stability' to Pakistan". She expressed her own feelings when she spoke at Carnegie Foundation: "We in Pakistan are confused and disappointed by the backing given Zia's illegitimate regime," I said to the distinguished audience. "We do appreciate your strategic concerns, but ask you not to turn your back on the people of Pakistan" (216). The only support she got was from labour leaders and organisations (222), but even Amnesty's 1985 report was unable to change US policy (231). However, when she mentions American strategic concerns, she includes Russian as well and argued with the Marxists in her party: "The Americans are supporting Zia because of their strategic considerations. The Soviets may want to support us today, but tomorrow, if their strategic concerns change, they'll ditch us. We must not get involved in these superpower rivalries, but fight for our own national interests. We can't afford to fight global politics" (223-24). Thus she took a 'neutral' stance which served to support US "strategic considerations". She had pointed out in 1977-78 how Pakistan had "found itself caught by the winds of the cold war" right after its birth (*Foreign Policy in Perspective* 3) and had defined nonalignment as "relations with the Socialist States of Eastern Europe, Soviet Union and China" (ibid). At that time she had resented that "out of fidelity to the United States", Pakistan had not developed more than formal relations with the Soviet Union and China which were its immediate neighbours. Even in discussing "colonialism and neo-colonialism with all their attendant's implications" (*Perspective* 14), she had chosen to exclude them from her analysis at a time when Afghanistan was on the brink of becoming a hotbed for Western imperialist designs. Instead of stressing the point she had made regarding her father that The United States had become accustomed to dealing with docile governments in Pakistan" (*Perspective* 16), she gave the credit to US for restoration of the democratic process in Pakistan: "Under pressure from the United States, Zia decided to hold elections by March 1985" (225). Regarding her own detention, she takes a bolder stance to point out how Reagan administration expressed 'dismay' over her detention but stressed that "Pakistan has taken encouraging steps toward the restoration of constitutional government". The view that "putting Ms. Bhutto under house arrest would appear to be inconsistent with this process" (254) is narrated simply as "a State Department spokesman was quoted as saying", which is another journalistic 'fact' which helps her avoid giving her own point of view. But she emphasises that the reaction of British parliamentarians was stronger, two of whom contacted Zia (254).

In other narratives, she completely elides strategic concerns which her father had pointed out and resisted for two decades. She includes other details to make the narrative interesting and to avoid discussing the details of how she contested US pro-Zia policy. Thus, the meeting with "the top editors of Time magazine at the Time-Life Building is narrated by emphasising not what they discussed but that they served her "cottage cheese luncheon ... a favorite meal from my years at Harvard" (217). Thus, she also uses the technique of trivialisation to destabilise the importance of the event being narrated. Elision helps her to avoid narrating what really took place. Like the authors analysed in previous chapters, Benazir avoids narrating important political conversations.

Foreign travels do not make up the later part of her autobiography which mostly relates family and party affairs. One event specially relates to her subaltern narrative policy. When narrating the death of General Zia in the plane crash, Benazir speaks of others who died in the crash, and their families. She names only one, the wife of the American Ambassador. In a manner similar to that of the Begum of Bhopal, Benazir expresses:

"My heart went out to Ambassador Raphel's wife, Nancy, who, like me, had just recently married. Now her husband, whom I had met and found very warm and committed to the idea of restoring democracy to Pakistan, was dead".

(314)

Empathising with colonial masters was discussed as an important technique of subaltern narratives. Benazir finds a similarity in the tragedy of the wife of the American Ambassador. Her reason that Nancy had recently married, like her, is a good enough reason, but narrative salience shows that this was not the only reason Benazir inserted the comment above. Nancy Rafael gets one-line sympathising comment, but her husband, the Ambassador, gets two with clear emphasis on his commitment to the idea of restoration of democracy. Politics therefore finds more prominence than sympathy.

Benazir Bhutto's narrative policy in her autobiography and her compromise with US policies can be explained by referring to an external witness to her career which oscillated between living under the shadow of her father's anti-US policies and her final bid to get US support for her government in Pakistan. In *The Duel* (2008), Tariq Ali discusses at length how Benazir had changed her policies over the decades to bring them in line with American strategic narratives. He asserts that for Benazir "The United States as the sole imperial power was too powerful to oppose" (np). He tells that when he voiced his objections to her, "all she would say was that the world had changed. She couldn't be on the 'wrong side' of history" (np). He comments that Benazir's party had started "banking its hopes on a prolonged U.S. presence in the region to get rid of its religious opponents". Tariq Ali's comments make it clear that "[Benazir] had hitched her future to the United States …" (np). They would help whitewash her past and get her back into power, after which she would still need Washington's support to deal with the army. This was necessary because "those, like her late father, who did not do its bidding had ended up dead" (np).

The narrative analysis above furnishes ample evidence of a subaltern attitude. Her life was in the real-life theatre of politics. The autobiography had a political context and she had to account for the driving forces in her life's events. These events were influenced by the historical events into which she was born. Forces which mobilise events in the lives of national leaders are the forces which shape history. Benazir had to narrate her life with the events that were shaping the history of her country. She had, therefore, to narrate the role played by the US in Pakistan politics, in her father's downfall, and through the years of her opposition to Zia's military regime. Since she wrote this autobiography at the beginning of her political career, she needed to address those sections of her readers which would play important roles in shaping her future career. Therefore, she discussed US involvement in the events recounted in the autobiography by attempting not to offend the US. Forces similar to those which acted on the colonised people were shaping her life and she was conscious of this fact. In her autobiography, therefore, she uses the same narrative techniques as did the authors who lived through colonial times.

As a narrative policy, she assumed the identity of an innocent amateurish girl who was learning to accept the realities of international political history. She narrated herself as growing up through American academia and learning to elude the lessons her father had tried to teach her – lessons which had led to his downfall. For all periods of political upheavals, involving her father, she narrated as an observer, elided her own comments, and resorted to noting news and opinions in the press so that she would avoid giving her own. She also endorsed US strategic narratives and defended American policies even when she was a victim of those policies. In this way, her narratives can be termed subaltern, and pro-US.

Works Cited

1. Bhutto, Benazir. *Daughter of Destiny: An Autobiography*. New York: Harper Perennial, 2007. Print.
2. Hamidullah. Zeb-Un-Nissa. *Sixty Days in America*. Karachi. The Mirror Publications. 1957. Print.
3. Anderson, Linda. *Autobiography*. Routledge. London. 2001
4. Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture*. New York, NY: Routledge. 2012. Print
5. Bhutto, Benazir. *Daughter of Destiny*. Place of publication not identified: HarperCollins, 2009. Internet resource. www.bhutto.org
6. Bhutto, Zulfikar A. *The Myth of Independence*. London: Oxford U.P, 1969. Print. Internet resource. www.bhutto.org www.bhutto.org
7. Booth, Wayne C. *The Rhetoric of Fiction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 2nd Edition. 1983. Print
8. Booth, Wayne C. "Resurrection of the Implied Author: Why Bother?" James Phelan, and Peter J. Rabinowitz. Eds *A Companion to Narrative Theory.*. Blackwell Publishing. 2005. Print
9. Burton, Antoinette. *Making a Spectacle of Empire: Indian Travellers in Fin-de-Siècle London.* History Workshop Journal, No. 42 (Autumn, 1996), pp. 126-146. Oxford University Press. Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/4289470 .Accessed: 08/01/2014 09:50. Print
10. Burton, Antoinette M. *At the Heart of the Empire: Indians and the Colonial Encounter in Late-Victorian Britain*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998. Print.
11. Césaire, Aimé, and Robin D. G. Kelley. *Discourse on Colonialism*. New York: Monthly Review Press, 2000. Print.
12. De Fina, Anna. *Identity in Narrative: A Study of Immigrant Discourse*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 2003
13. De Fina, Anna. Deborah Schiffrin. Michael Bamberg. Eds. *Discourse and Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2007
14. De Fina, Anna and Barbara Johnstone. "Discourse Analysis and Narrative". Tannen et al. Eds. *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. 2nd Edition. Chichester, West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons, Inc. 2015.
15. De Fina, Anna. Narratives and Identities. Anna De Fina, and Alexandra Georgakopoulou. Eds. *The Handbook of Narrative Analysis*. Malden, MA: John Wiley & Sons Inc. 2015
16. De Fina, Anna. Alexandra Georgakopoulou. "Introduction". Anna De Fina, and Alexandra Georgakopoulou. Eds. *The Handbook of Narrative Analysis*. Malden, MA: John Wiley & Sons Inc. 2015
17. Fanon, Frantz, *Black Skin, White Masks*, tr. Charles Lam Markmann. Charles Lam Markmann. London: Pluto Press. 2008. Print.
18. Fludernik, Monika. "Histories of Narrative Theory (II): From Structuralism to the Present". James Phelan & Peter J. Rabinowitz. Eds. *A Companion to Narrative Theory*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd. 2005
19. Fludernik, Monika. "Identity/alterity". David Herman. Ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Narrative*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2007.
20. Fludernik, Monika. *An Introduction to Narratology*. Tr. Patricia Häusler-Greenfield and Monika Fludernik. Abington: Routledge. 2009.
21. Fludernik, Monika. "A Narratology of the Law? Narratives in Legal Discourse."*Critical Analysis of Law* 1.1 (2014). Web. Stable URL http://cal.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/cal/article/download/21024/17173.

22. Guha, Ranajit. *Dominance Without Hegemony: History and Power in Colonial India.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard U.P., 1997.
23. Hogan, Patrick C. *Understanding Nationalism: On Narrative, Cognitive Science, and Identity*. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University Press, 2009. Print.
24. Husain, Noor A. "Pakistan-U.S. Security Relations: Arms Sales, Bases, and Nuclear Issues". Rose, Leo E. and Noor A. Husain. *United States-Pakistan Relations*. Berkeley, California: Institute of East Asian Studies. University of California. 1985. Print.
25. Loomba, Ania. *Colonialism/Postcolonialism*. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge, 2005. Print.
26. Mr. Y. *A National Strategic Narrative*. Washington, D.C.: Woodrow Wilson Center for Scholars, 2011. Internet resource.
27. Nayar, Pramod K. *Sublime Raj: English Writing and India, 1750-1820*. *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 39, No. 34 (Aug. 21-27, 2004), pp. 3811-3817.Published by: Economic and Political Weekly. Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/4415446. Accessed: 04/01/2014 03:06. Print
28. Nayar, Pramod K. *English Writing and India, 1600–1920: Colonizing Aesthetics*. New York, NY: Routledge. 2008. Print
29. Nayar, Pramod K. *Colonial Voices: The Discourses of Empire*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc. 2012. Print.
30. Nayar, Pramod K. *The Postcolonial Studies Dictionary*, Chichester: Wiley Blackwell, 2015. Print.
31. Ngũgĩ, wa T. *Decolonising the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature*. London: J. Currey, 1986. Print.
32. Phelan, James, and Peter J. Rabinowitz. *Understanding Narrative*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1994. Print.
33. Phelan, James, Foreword. *Before Reading: Narrative Conventions and the Politics of Interpretation.* Columbus: Ohio State University Press. 1998. Print
34. Phelan, James and Peter J. Rabinowitz (edit). *A Companion to Narrative Theory*. Blackwell Publishing Ltd. 2005. Print
35. Phelan, James. "Rhetoric/ethics". *The Cambridge Companion to Narrative*. David Herman. Ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2007. Print
36. Pratt, Mary L. *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*. London: Routledge, 1992.
37. Pratt, Mary L., "Travel Narration and Imperialist Vision: Understanding Narrative". Eds. James Phelan and Peter J. Rabinowitz. *Understanding Narrative*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1994. Print.
38. Rabinowitz, Peter J. *Before Reading:Narrative Conventions and the Politics of Interpretation.* Columbus: Ohio State University Press. 1987. Print
39. Riessman, Catherine Kohler (2002) "Analysis of Personal Narratives." Jaber F. Gubrium and James A. Holstein. Eds. *Handbook of Interview Research: Context and Method*. London-New Delhi: SAGE Publications.
40. Riessman, Catherine Kohler. "Narrative Analysis". Nancy Kelly, Christine Horrocks, Kate Milnes, Brian Roberts, and David Robinson. Eds. *Narrative, Memory and Everyday Life*. Huddersfield: University of Huddersfield, 2005. Print.
41. Riessman, Catherine Kohler. "Narrative Analysis". *Narrative, Memory & Everyday Life*. University of Huddersfield. 2005. http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/4920/
42. Riessman, Catherine Kohler. "Analysis of Personal Narratives". Anne E Fortune, William J. Reid, and Robert L. Miller. *Qualitative Research in Social Work*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2013. Internet resource
43. Riessman, Catherine Kohler. "Entering the Hall of Mirrors: *Reflexivity and Narrative Research".* Anna De Fina and Alexandra Georgakopoulou.Eds. *The Handbook of Narrative Analysis*. Malden, MA: John Wiley & Sons Inc. 2015. Print.
44. Rimmon-Kenan, Shlomith. *Narrative Fiction: Contemporary Poetics*. London: Routledge, 2005. Print.
45. Rizvi, Hasan-Askari. *Pakistan and the Geostrategic Environment: A Study of Foreign Policy*. New York, N.Y.: St. Martin's Press, Inc. 1993
46. Rizvi, Hasan-Askari. *Military, State and Society in Pakistan*. New York, N.Y.: St. Martin's Press, Inc. 2000.
47. Slaughter, Anne-Marie. "Preface". Mr. Y. *A National Strategic Narrative*. Washington, D.C.: Woodrow Wilson Center for Scholars, 2011. Internet resource.
48. Smith, Sidonie, 'Construing Truths in Lying Mouths Truthtelling in Women's Autobiography', *Studies in the Literary Imagination*, vol. 23, no. 2 (1990), p. 145. Qtd in Liam Harte. *The Literature of the Irish in Britain: Autobiography and Memoir, 1725–2001*. Palgrave Macmillan. New York, NY. 2009
49. Spanos, William V. *America's Shadow: An Anatomy of Empire*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2000. Internet resource.
50. Viswanathan, Gauri. *Masks of Conquest: Literary Studies and British Rule in India*. London: Faber, 1990.