

“I’M TIRED OF HATING PEOPLE”:  
The use of invitational rhetoric in speeches on  
equality

Bachelor’s thesis  
Emma Mäkinen

University of Jyväskylä  
Department of Languages  
English  
January 2016

# JYVÄSKYLÄN YLIOPISTO

Tiedekunta – Faculty Humanistinen tiedekunta	Laitos – Department Kielten laitos
Tekijä – Author Emma Mäkinen	
Työn nimi – Title ”I’m tired of hating people”: The use of invitational rhetoric in speeches on equality	
Oppiaine – Subject Englannin kieli	Työn laji – Level Kandidaatintutkielma
Aika – Month and year Tammikuu 2016	Sivumäärä – Number of pages 26 + 2 liitettä
<p>Tiivistelmä – Abstract</p> <p>Kutsuretoriikka on vuonna 1995 esitelty retoriikan muoto, jonka 20-vuotiselle tutkimushistorialle ovat olleet tunnusomaisia teoriasta esitetty kritiikki ja tutkijoiden metodologiset erimielisyydet. Kutsuretoriikka on feministisestä tutkimuksesta syntynyt tutkimuskohde, joka on harvoin sisällytetty osaksi kielitieteellistä tutkimusta. Kutsuretoriikalla tarkoitetaan puhujan tapaa kutsua yleisö näkemään maailma tai jokin tietty asia hänen näkökulmastaan. Tämä retoriikka eroaa perinteisestä suostuttelevasta retoriikasta siinä, ettei puhujan tavoitteena ole painostaa tai taivutella yleisöä yhtymään hänen mielipiteeseensä.</p> <p>Tämän kandidaatintutkielman tarkoituksena on ottaa osaa tähän yhä käynnissä olevaan keskusteluun kutsuretoriikasta. Tutkimuksen aineistoksi valittiin kaksi englanninkielistä puhetta, jotka molemmat käsittelivät puhujan valitsemalla tavalla ihmisten välistä tasa-arvoa. Yksi kutsuretoriikkaan kohdistuvista kritiikeistä koskee sen käytön rajoittumista vain naispuhujiin ja tästä syystä aineisto valittiin sisältämään yksi puhe mieheltä, amerikkalaiselta rauhanaktivisti Zak Ebrahimilta, ja yksi puhe naiselta, brittiläiseltä näyttelijältä Emma Watsonilta. Tämän tutkimusasetelman avulla haluttiin selvittää, voiko kutsuretoriikan käyttäjän identifioida tarkasti vai onko kyseinen retoriikka kaikkien käytettävissä.</p> <p>Aineisto analysoitiin erikseen ja molemmista puheista tunnistettiin kutsuretoriikan kaksi laajempaa retorista keinoa: näkökulmien tarjoaminen ja ulkoisten olosuhteiden luominen. Analyysissä selvisi, että puhujat käyttivät näkökulmia tapana kutsua yleisönsä näkemään tasa-arvo heidän näkökulmastaan. Käytettyjä näkökulmia olivat henkilökohtaiset ja muiden näkökulmasta esitetyt kertomukset sekä esimerkiksi tilastojen esiintuominen. Tämän lisäksi kutsuretoriikan mahdollistavat ulkoiset olosuhteet – osanottajien tasa-arvo, mielipiteen ilmaisemisen vapaus sekä kommunikatiivisen tilanteen turvallisuuden ylläpitäminen – esiintyivät kummassakin puheessa.</p> <p>Kutsuretoriikan analysointi kielitieteellisestä näkökulmasta kaipaa lisää tutkimusta ja toivon tämän kandidaatintutkielma toimivan sille innoittajana. Olisi myös tärkeää selvittää perusteellisemmin, minkälaisissa konteksteissa kutsuretoriikan eri muotoja käytetään ja miksi tätä puhetapaa saatetaan käyttää rinnakkain suostuttelevan retoriikan kanssa.</p>	
Asiasanat – Keywords invitational rhetoric, feminist linguistics, equality	
Säilytyspaikka – Depository JYX	

## Table of contents

1 INTRODUCTION.....	3
2 CONVENTION SPEECHES AND INVITATIONAL RHETORIC.....	4
2.1 Previous research on convention speeches.....	4
2.2 Invitational rhetoric .....	6
2.2.1 Offering perspectives .....	6
2.2.2 Creating external conditions.....	7
2.3 The debate over invitational rhetoric.....	9
3 DATA AND METHODS.....	10
4 RESEARCH AIM AND QUESTIONS .....	12
5 INVITATIONAL RHETORIC IN PRACTICE.....	12
5.1 Zak Ebrahim’s speech .....	13
5.1.1 Offering perspectives .....	13
5.1.2 Creating external conditions.....	15
5.2 Emma Watson’s speech.....	17
5.2.1 Offering perspectives .....	17
5.2.2 Creating external conditions.....	20
5.3 Comparison of the findings .....	21
6 CONCLUSION .....	22
BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	25
APPENDICES.....	27

# 1 INTRODUCTION

Argumentation is a complex skill that can be taught, learned and studied. It is utilized in informal contexts, such as negotiating a place to have lunch with one's friend, and formal settings such as political debates. Argumentation can be analyzed as a phenomenon of both oral and written communication in different areas of research, such as linguistics, rhetoric and pedagogical studies (see e.g. Hobbs et al. 2000).

First, rhetorical practice can be studied in face-to-face interaction. In her study, Schuetz (2005) examined the rhetorical practices used in the courtrooms in the United States. The analysis concentrated on legal argumentation and how emotionality was used to persuade the jurors. Schuetz (2005: 212) found that especially in criminal cases, where the death penalty was one of the considered forms of punishment, the emotional testimonies given by the victims and their families were utilized as a genre of persuasive argumentation.

Second, rhetorical practice can also be included in indirect communicative situations such as advertising. Atkin and Richardson (2005) argued that the issue of unknown audience challenges the advertiser to exclude and include people from the targeted audience. Atkin and Richardson (2005: 174-178) analyzed an advertisement in different stages and on each of them they both excluded and included more audience members. As a result, they identified rhetorical devices, such as naming, from the advertisement. To sum up, since the objective of advertising is usually the same as persuasive rhetoric, rhetorical moves can be used to inflict change in a disconnected audience.

Argumentation can be closely connected with persuasion, which is the goal of traditional rhetoric. Tindale (2004: 101) states that traditional persuasive rhetoric attempts to inflict change in the audience in a way that the rhetor acts as the instigator and the audience as the interlocutor who, as a result of a successful rhetoric event, experiences the change. However, significant lack of research comes about when discussing rhetoric that is not utilized to persuade other people. Not all rhetoric practices are argumentative and these alternative ways of interacting have been the focus point of especially feminist linguists who continuously formulate new methodology for

rhetoric analysis. As a result of this effort, the theory for invitational rhetoric was formed (Foss and Griffin 1995).

Invitational rhetoric was chosen as the topic of this Bachelor's thesis because it has worked as an incentive for scholarly debate that has currently continued for two decades. It is important to study invitational rhetoric because, as Mallin and Anderson (2000: 121) pointed out, there have not been many researchers who have tried to analyze the use of the rhetoric by taking different theories into account. Thus, the aim of my study is to contribute to this ongoing discussion between different, especially linguistic and rhetoric, scholars of invitational rhetoric. Rather than trying only to prove whether the rhetoric theory is applicable in linguistic analysis while relying on previous research, I attempt to give evidence with my own examples and analysis of speeches on equality. I believe that exploring how and why the rhetoric is used is more important and fruitful than only debating about it.

## **2 CONVENTION SPEECHES AND INVITATIONAL RHETORIC**

### **2.1 Previous research on convention speeches**

Conventions are events during which people from different backgrounds and with different motives may have the opportunity to voice their opinions to a possibly large audience. Nowadays conventions may also be videotaped or even broadcasted live on television or Internet, and, consequently, speeches from for example celebrities, politicians and ordinary people have been made available to a global audience. Many studies of convention speeches have focused on either, especially American, politicians' or their family members' speeches and the rhetoric styles they use.

Benoit, Blaney and Pier (2000) analyzed convention speeches held during the United States presidential nominations. The analysis focused on three features of what the authors described as political campaign discourse: acclaiming, attacking and defending. Each of these features was utilized in order to enhance the standing of a certain candidate or the entire political party. Benoit et al. (2000: 66-67) analyzed these three features in three different stages. First, they divided the

speech into smaller units, each of which represented either a focused idea or theme. Second, they categorized each unit according to what feature it embodied; an acclaim, an attack or a defense. Third, they identified the target of the unit, for instance whether it was directed at the audience or a rival party. In addition, from a rhetorical point of view, Benoit et al. (2000: 62) argued that campaign discourse is actually a rhetorical discourse as they both share the same objective of achieving a particular goal by persuasion. To illustrate this, in a campaign discourse the objective is usually to convince the audience to give their vote for the candidate in question. In a rhetorical discourse, this objective can be almost anything but the central idea is to achieve a change.

Some previous research of convention speeches has been done from a gendered point of view. Manning (2006) analyzed speeches held by an American politician Hillary Rodham Clinton, to determine how the rhetoric style she uses in the speeches correlates with the rhetorical style of a politician rather than that of a woman. In addition, Manning compared how Rodham Clinton's rhetorical style had changed during the decade between the speeches. As a result, Manning (2006: 118) argued that Rodham Clinton's interchange from a feminine rhetorical style to that of a politician has forced her audience to see her not only as a woman but also as a serious politician. Furthermore, Manning's study demonstrates that examining convention speeches from other points of view in addition to the rhetor's gender may prove to be fruitful and substantiate the complexity of influences on the rhetor's speech.

The objective of a convention speech, or any speech, may be to initiate a change in the opinion of the audience. Political convention speeches usually embody the goal of traditional persuasive rhetoric, which is to persuade the audience to do something the rhetor wants. In this case, the objective is to convince the audience to vote for the preferred electoral candidate. However, Petre (2007) found that convention speakers may also utilize a rhetoric style called invitational rhetoric (Foss and Griffin 1995) in their speeches. However, as the objective of invitational rhetoric, further explained below, is not to induce change, its use in convention speeches may appear unorthodox. Petre (2007: 25-33) argues that some features of invitational rhetoric are used in the speeches in order to counterbalance the otherwise politically loaded speeches and expose the audience to a less aggressive rhetoric style.

## **2.2 Invitational rhetoric**

Invitational rhetoric is a rhetoric theory first proposed by Foss and Griffin (1995) in order to formulate a new way of analyzing speech in both formal and informal situations. The objective of Foss' and Griffin's proposal was to introduce an alternative way of studying speech from a rhetorical point of view together with traditional persuasive rhetoric (Foss and Griffin 1995: 5). A rhetor with an invitational standpoint attempts to create a communicative situation where each participant's feeling of security and value as an independent human, and freedom to make own choices are maintained and respected. Bone, Griffin and Scholtz (2008: 437) define the invitational standpoint as one creating an environment of appreciation and civility. Moreover, the theory of invitational rhetoric embodies defined communicative categories by which a speech or text can be analyzed. First, Foss and Griffin (1995: 7-13) outline the rhetorical form of offering perspectives, which stands for the rhetor's communicative measure to invite the audience to see his or her view of the issue by, for example, describing a personal experience. Second, the rhetorical form of external conditions comprises three dimensions which every interlocutor must maintain in order to create a safe environment. These conditions are the safety and security of the communicative situation, the equal value of the participants and the freedom and right for independent thought. Next, it is best to discuss each of these categories more elaborately and thus demonstrate their functions and importance in the formation of invitational rhetoric.

### **2.2.1 Offering perspectives**

Foss and Griffin (1995: 7-13) define invitational rhetoric in terms of two principal structures: the offering of perspectives and the creation of external conditions. When a rhetor offers perspectives in his or her speech, the audience is provided with a view through the rhetor's eyes to the surrounding world or a more specific issue. In the same way, Bone et al. (2008: 436) confirm that the objective of offering perspectives is to enable the best possible premise for understanding the current issue. As mentioned above, the goal of invitational rhetoric is to provide the audience, and in a dialogic-oriented situation also the rhetor, with new perspectives instead of consciously attempting to inflict change. However, personal narratives are used both by speakers who exploit invitational rhetoric and those who favor traditional persuasive rhetoric. Consequently, it is

important to understand the difference between these two ways of utilizing personal narratives in one's speech.

Personal narratives are stories told by a rhetor and they may be performed either as independent units of speech or as parts of more extensive communicative events. Langellier (1989: 243) states that an important characteristic of a personal narrative is that it either summarizes or describes in its entirety one or multiple personal experiences. However, even though personal narratives are usually told by a first-person narrator, the actual described episode may have been experienced by someone else. For this reason, personal narratives can be analyzed taking into consideration whether they are self- or other-oriented and whose perspective the narrative actually represents. In addition, personal narratives can be observed as individually functioning units or as the components of wider discourse. Langellier (1989: 245) also states that the analysis of personal narratives can be narrowed down to the analysis of a narrative clause.

A personal narrative is an important aspect of invitational rhetoric. Langellier (1989) argues that a personal narrative may be a powerful and effective way for the rhetor to present the audience with his or her view. Moreover, a personal narrative offers the rhetor with an opportunity to choose a particular experience to share. In addition, a personal narrative creates equality between the interlocutors as it validates the humanity of the speaker and therefore removes the possible distance to the audience. A key concept of invitational rhetoric is that the rhetor is a person with the same value as the audience members and that he or she does not hold a superior position in the communication.

### **2.2.2 Creating external conditions**

Foss and Griffin (1995: 10) argue that the expected and desired outcome of the use of invitational rhetoric is a mutual understanding between each participant in the interaction. However, this kind of characteristic requires several communicative aspects to synchronize but not all of them are dependent on the rhetor's investment. Consequently, the audience, and more specifically their behavior, has a significant role. The three external conditions for a successful invitational interaction, mentioned above, require all the participants' efforts but especially the rhetor's



influence and importance has been highlighted. Without safety, equal value and the freedom of thought, invitational rhetoric cannot reach its objective of creating an equal communicative environment.

First, the external condition of safety stands for the safety of every interlocutor. In an invitational interaction all of the interlocutors must feel safe to express their opinions without having to expect any kind of marginalization. Even though invitational rhetoric applies for the most part to verbal interaction, all the external conditions also incorporate non-verbal behavior. That is, the participants should be able to communicate without any fear of mental or physical abuse and maintain their integrity. However, Bone et al. (2008: 436) specify that it is the rhetor's duty to create the safe environment and they further emphasize that the audience must be made aware that the rhetor will not express any kind of disparagement towards them.

Second, an invitational rhetor may face the challenge brought by an audience who do not share his or her opinion. In comparison with the traditional persuasive rhetoric, the invitational rhetor has to interpret the interaction also outside his or her point of view and thus form a comprehensive image of the situation. However, it is not only enough for the rhetor to find out others' standpoints, but he or she also has to accept those standpoints and, in other words, appreciate their value. Bone et al. (2008: 437) argue that in order to fully develop the external condition of value, the rhetor must emphasize the readiness to abandon the current standpoint and attempt to understand the audience's perspective. Bone et al. (2008: 449) further present a study where the external condition of value was analyzed in Jimmy Carter's, the former president of the United States, speeches. In the observed situations, Carter manifested his appreciation for his audience by listening to them carefully and thus making them feel like their ideas and opinions were being valued. Accordingly, as Foss and Griffin (1995: 11) argue, the rhetor must not only eschew any kind of criticizing behavior but also accept that possibly each audience member may have a differing standpoint.

Third, the audience of an invitational rhetor must be made aware of their freedom of opinion. In addition to acknowledging their value and safety, those who listen and possibly participate in the interaction with the rhetor must know that it is not compulsory for them to agree with the rhetor's

views. Foss and Griffin (1995: 12) argue that the objective of invitational rhetoric, the mutual understanding between the participants, cannot be accomplished without all of them knowing that there are no restrictions for the communication as long as the two other external conditions are also in effect. Consequently, all opinions and views can be expressed as long as they do not violate anyone's individual value, physical, social or mental safety or the freedom of thought and speech. In summary, Bone et al. (2008: 447) define invitational interaction as "an exchange of ideas from positions of mutual respect and equality".

### **2.3 The debate over invitational rhetoric**

Ever since Foss and Griffin (1995) introduced their theory of invitational rhetoric to the science community the debate over the theory's accuracy and reliability has been on display (see e.g. Condit 1997: 100). In their article, Bone et al. (2008) summarized the criticism from over ten years and argued (437) that the debate may derive from Foss' and Griffin's division to different fields of study. In the current section, I am going to briefly explain the main critique invitational rhetoric has accumulated and, in addition, what counter-arguments have been presented.

Invitational rhetoric is a rhetoric based on such as values as equality and moral rightness. Persuasion and the attempt to change other participants of the interaction are considered as invading characteristics of traditional rhetoric that trivialize others' personal right to think and form their own opinions without intrusions. According to Bone et al (2008: 438), this definition of invitational rhetoric has been interpreted by the critics in the manner that Foss and Griffin argue that any persuasive act is violent. Similarly, some critics have deduced from Foss' and Griffin's proposal that they purposefully denounce persuasive rhetoric and assert invitational rhetoric as suitable for any communicative situation. However, Bone et al. (2008: 440) attempt to revoke this argument with the counterclaim that it is futile to make such polarized restrictions about the use of the two forms of rhetoric. Invitational rhetoric is based on the free choice of the participants and therefore the choice to use it should also be made without restraint. However, by shifting from traditional to invitational rhetoric, the rhetor encounters different responsibilities (Mallin and Anderson 2000: 124).

Even though Foss and Griffin (1995: 3) admit that invitational rhetoric is based on values usually associated with the field of feminist research, they emphasize that the analysis of invitational rhetoric should not be stereotypically restricted only to women's or feminists' language use. In contrast, some critics have argued that the analysis of invitational rhetoric is restricted only to feminine language use or women's language use. They reassert this claim by pointing out that Foss and Griffin (1995: 2) themselves state that traditional persuasive rhetoric embodies a patriarchal bias, which, in turn, invitational rhetoric eschews. Nevertheless, Bone et al. (2008: 442) explicate this critique by arguing that the patriarchal bias should be considered in more general terms and not as resonating explicitly with men.

In conclusion, invitational rhetoric is a theory among other rhetoric theories and thus worth further exploration. Bone et al. (2008: 437) present a timely research gap for the invitational rhetoric by stating that despite the criticism, which was very briefly summarized above, actual applied research has been low.

### **3 DATA AND METHODS**

The data of the current study consists of two videotaped speeches, which were held at different times and in different locations though which share the same topic of equality among people. The first speech, 9 minutes and 10 seconds long, was held by the American author and peace activist Zak Ebrahim during a TED (Technology, Entertainment and Design) conference in Vancouver, Canada, on 19 March 2014. In his speech, Mr. Ebrahim tells about his childhood with his terrorist father and how he came to understand that all people are essentially similar and thus equal. The second speech, 11 minutes and 47 seconds long, was held by the British actor and United Nations Goodwill Ambassador Emma Watson at the United Nations' Headquarters in New York, the United States, on 22 September 2014, during the launch of a United Nations' Women's campaign called *HeForShe*. During the speech Ms. Watson briefly introduces the campaign and its main objectives in addition to advocating the audience with her personal appeal to promote gender equality. The data was collected from the website of TED and the Internet service YouTube, and the relevant parts of the speeches to the analysis were transcribed. Moreover, these two speeches were chosen for this analysis because they share a similar topic but differ as far as for example

the rhetors' personal qualities were considered. The analysis will therefore focus on the linguistic features of invitational rhetoric rather than what qualities of the rhetors may have acted as influences.

Both speeches will be analyzed along the same principles and the main focus will be on the different aspects of invitational rhetoric. The analysis of invitational rhetoric does not focus exclusively on a specific linguistic feature, such as grammar or the use of pronouns, but rather it takes them all into consideration at once. It is important to examine not only how the rhetor speaks but also how he or she contrives to communicate with the audience. Even though the audience may be verbally passive and do not engage actively in the communication by commenting or asking questions, they are, nonetheless, important actors. The mere presence of the audience or the rhetor's awareness of an audience for example via Internet may affect the communicative situation.

First, the analysis of offering perspectives and, in this study more specifically, personal narratives, will take into consideration who are included in the narrative: the rhetor alone or someone else alongside with him or her; personal narratives may not necessarily be about the rhetor's own personal experiences.

Second, the three external conditions of invitational rhetoric, safety, value and freedom, will be analyzed especially from the point of view of the audience. The manner in which the rhetor succeeds in creating a safe and equal environment for the communicative event can be contemplated for example in the following ways. Firstly, the rhetor must acknowledge the presence and standing of the audience directly. Secondly, the rhetor can include the audience in the interaction, despite their possible passiveness, by using pronoun *we* instead of *I* and thus creating a group in which both the rhetor and the audience belong to. It can also be analyzed how well the rhetor attempts and manages to eschew the juxtaposition of *us* and *them*. Even though the rhetor may endeavor to construct togetherness with the audience, he or she should remember that, from the point of view of invitational rhetoric, an audience member has to have the freedom to choose whether or not to agree with the rhetor. By distinguishing two groups, *us* and *them*, the rhetor indirectly forces the audience to choose a side and an opinion.

Before the analysis it is relevant to point out that it is unlikely that these two speeches will embody all presented features of invitational rhetoric, which are personal narratives and the establishment of safety, value and freedom (Foss and Griffin 1995). However, it is important to analyze why certain aspects, such as the use of personal narratives, occur in the speeches alongside the occurrences of traditional persuasive rhetoric, whereas some other aspects might have been omitted.

## **4 RESEARCH AIM AND QUESTIONS**

In the following chapter, I will analyze the use of invitational rhetoric in Zak Ebrahim's and Emma Watson's speeches on equality. The analysis will focus more specifically on the use of personal narratives as a tool for invitational rhetors. In order to gain a better understanding of the complex use of invitational rhetoric, I will focus on the following questions:

1. In what ways do the speakers use invitational rhetoric in their speeches?
2. Who do the speakers invite to share their point of view?
3. Do the speakers use personal narratives as a way of inviting the audience to share their views?

## **5 INVITATIONAL RHETORIC IN PRACTICE**

In this section, I am going to analyze how Zak Ebrahim and Emma Watson used invitational rhetoric in their speeches which were chosen as the data of this study. I am going to examine the speeches first separately and identify how the two rhetorical forms of invitational rhetoric, offering perspectives and creating external conditions, have been represented. I will then conclude the analysis by comparing the speeches and their use of the invitational rhetoric. In fact, it is important to compare the findings from the speeches because despite their similar topics, the overall communicative situation in both cases is quite different as far as, for example, the qualities of the rhetor, the targeted audience and the speaking environment are considered. The

comparison may therefore make it possible to argue whether or not the use of the rhetoric is restricted to a certain kind of interaction or speaker.

As the scope of a Bachelor's thesis is quite limited for an exhaustive analysis of the use of invitational rhetoric, it is crucial to remark that only selected parts of the two speeches were chosen for closer examination. Furthermore, the chosen sections are what I consider to best represent each rhetorical form of invitational rhetoric.

## **5.1 Zak Ebrahim's speech**

The first speech I am going to analyze was held by the American peace activist Zak Ebrahim in TED2014 conference. In his speech, Ebrahim tells a story how he became a peaceful person despite living and growing up in the same household with his father, who was a terrorist. Ebrahim begins his speech by describing how his father was involved in both the assassination of Rabbi Meir Kahane in New York in 1990 and the bomb attack of the World Trade Center in 1993. Ebrahim continues by speaking of his childhood and how he, as a small child, grew up oblivious of his father's fundamentalism. Moreover, Ebrahim discusses how his opinions began to change when he became older and met people from various backgrounds. For instance, he openly admits that *I'd been taught that homosexuality was a sin, and by extension, that all gay people were a negative influence* even though this kind of statement makes him open to possible criticism and judgement. Ebrahim ends his speech by telling the motive for it: *I do it for the victims of terrorism and their loved ones, for the terrible pain and loss that terrorism has forced upon their lives.*

Next, I will analyze the use of invitational rhetoric in this speech, first focusing on the offering of perspectives and, second, the creating of external conditions.

### **5.1.1 Offering perspectives**

One aspect of invitational rhetoric is that the rhetor does not claim his or her opinion to be the absolute truth but rather offers an alternative idea or way of thinking for the audience (Foss and

Griffin 1995: 5-6). The audience therefore has the freedom and right to decide whether or not they adopt the rhetor's perspective for themselves. In his speech, Mr. Ebrahim never directly asks the audience to choose to either agree or disagree with him. To illustrate this, here is an example of an offer of perspective in Mr. Ebrahim's speech:

- (1) It's been my experience that when people take the time to interact with one another, it doesn't take long to realize that for the most part, we all want the same things out life.

In Example 1, Mr. Ebrahim most likely summarizes the whole life experience he has obtained while interacting with other people. Instead of arguing that people should invest in interacting with each other, he simply states that this has been his personal experience. It can also be inferred that he has had possibly problematic experiences in realizing how equal people actually are and, as a continuum, he recounts in further detail how this realization has happened:

- (2) One day toward the end of the convention, I found out that one of the kids I had befriended was Jewish. Now, it had taken several days for this detail to come to light, and I realized that there was no natural animosity between the two of us. I had never had a Jewish friend before, and frankly I felt a sense of pride in having been able to overcome a barrier that for most of my life I had been led to believe was unsurmountable.

In Example 2, Mr. Ebrahim shares a specific personal experience with the audience. This realization happened when he was attending the National Youth Convention in Philadelphia, as a part of a preparation course for college. Mr. Ebrahim states how previous to the convention he had felt an unsurmountable barrier in his way of thinking. He does not directly tell what that specific barrier was but it can be deduced that he refers to his fundamentalist upbringing and how he had been taught to consider other people by varying qualities, in this case their religion, to be of different value.

In addition to these few personal narratives that I have now analyzed, in Example 3 Mr. Ebrahim offers the audience with an outside perspective, even though it is relatable to his own:

- (3) She looked at me with the weary eyes of someone who had experienced enough dogmatism to last a lifetime, and said, "I'm tired of hating people."

In this section Mr. Ebrahim tells the audience more about his mother in addition to the earlier brief mention at the beginning of his speech. During his speech, Mr. Ebrahim told several instances where he had learned to regard every person as each other's equals and, consequently, abandoning the hateful and fundamental way of thinking his father had imposed on him. Here Mr. Ebrahim presents a view of someone who likely has been similarly subordinated. By sharing someone else's perspective with the audience, Mr. Ebrahim indirectly encourages the audience to consider how other people besides himself have been negatively affected by domineering people. It is important to underline that Mr. Ebrahim's speech presents quite a different point of view to the contemporary discussion on terrorism; the victims of terrorists are often identified as either the people killed or wounded in the attacks rather than as the next of kin of the terrorist. Thus Mr. Ebrahim emphasizes in his speech that despite the level of injury or the type of suffering, mental, physical or social, the victims of terrorists are equals.

### 5.1.2 Creating external conditions

When analyzing invitational rhetoric and, more specifically, the offering of perspectives, the focus is almost entirely on the content the rhetor produces. However, the examination of the rhetoric also requires looking beyond the text and interpreting how well the rhetor respects the three external conditions formulated by Foss and Griffin (1995: 10-13): the equality, safety and freedom of the interlocutors. In the case of the current study, these aspects can be mainly analyzed based on the rhetor's behavior because the audience of both Mr. Ebrahim's and Ms. Watson's speeches is playing the role of a silent observer.

- (4) And with that simple fact, I stand here as proof that violence isn't inherent in one's religion or race, and the son does not have to follow the ways of his father.

Example 4 illustrates the external condition of equality between the interlocutors. It is from the end of Mr. Ebrahim's speech, and it indeed acts as a conclusion and summary for the journey he described to his audience. Before this, he explained how his father, a terrorist, tried to guide him to a similar path of life by teaching him, when Mr. Ebrahim was only a child, how to shoot with a rifle and how his early life was characterized by hatred and prejudice. In this statement, Mr. Ebrahim says that *violence isn't inherent in one's religion or race* and therefore reveals the



audience his standpoint on equality. He utilizes himself as an example for justifying his opinion; people should never be stereotyped by their religion or race. Mr. Ebrahim had a childhood which might have led to him becoming like his father, but he did not succumb to such a fundamentalist way of thinking. Through a long learning process, he was able to overcome the stereotypes and distorted ideas he had been taught. By stating this, if it had not become obvious at the beginning of his speech, Mr. Ebrahim wants the audience to be sure that he does not judge people by their race or religion anymore, and, as a result, that he considers everyone as equals.

- (5) On a nightly basis, Jon Stewart forced me to be intellectually honest with myself about my own bigotry and helped me to realize that a person's race, religion or sexual orientation had nothing to do with the quality of one's character.

The comparison of Examples 4 and 5 reveals that the external conditions of safety and equality are sometimes intertwined. Example 5 illustrates the same representation of equality regardless of *a person's race, religion or sexual orientation* and therefore confirms Mr. Ebrahim's standpoint for the audience. However, this statement can also be analyzed as far as the safety of the interlocutors is concerned. First, Mr. Ebrahim convinces the audience that he will not judge them by any of the above-mentioned qualities. Thus, the audience can feel safe in knowing that they will not be criticized by Mr. Ebrahim by their personal qualities. Second, when Mr. Ebrahim admits that he used to think of and evaluate people by these measures, even though he does not do it anymore, he makes himself vulnerable and open for judgement and critique from the audience. By admitting this sensitive fact from his history so openly, he must feel safe in the communicative situation and not threatened by the audience.

- (6) Zak Ebrahim is not my real name. I changed it when my family decided to end our connection with my father and start a new life. So why would I out myself and potentially put myself in danger?

Example 6 represents the external condition of freedom; the freedom of choosing one's opinion and standpoint in any issue. During the whole speech Mr. Ebrahim has had the freedom to talk about his own personal life and experiences he has had. He did not have the obligation to censor his output by for example changing people's names to protect others' anonymity until this point in the speech. By revealing that Zak Ebrahim is in fact not his real name, he both embraces his freedom of speech and the fact that he can decide what to tell the audience and what to omit. In

the example above Mr. Ebrahim also acknowledges the freedom of independent thought openly in the form of a rhetorical question: *So why would I out myself and potentially put myself in danger?* This question invites the audience to see the entire communicative situation from Mr. Ebrahim's point of view. In fact, until this point the audience might not have even thought that Mr. Ebrahim has put himself in a dangerous position but his question momentarily switches the interlocutors' roles.

## 5.2 Emma Watson's speech

The second speech I will analyze was held by British actor Emma Watson during the launch of a UN women's campaign HeForShe. In her speech, Ms. Watson expresses her concern for the constancy of gender inequality in the modern society and, as a result of the campaign she is involved in, she invites the audience to participate in the movement. Ms. Watson includes in her speech personal stories from childhood and youth to exemplify the role and effect of gender equality in her life. In addition, she adopts a more formal standpoint by giving statistics and predictions and warns the audience of the results if gender inequality is not seen as a serious problem.

Accordingly, the motive of the speech is, in Ms. Watson's words, *to galvanize as many men and boys as possible to be advocates for change*, and change cannot be accomplished without attempting to persuade the audience. However, the objective of invitational rhetoric is actually not to persuade. Thus, it is important to find out how and especially why the rhetoric is used in this speech alongside traditional rhetoric; how it contributes to the message of the speech. First, I am going to analyze how Ms. Watson uses the rhetorical form of offering perspectives and, second, the rhetorical form of external conditions.

### 5.2.1 Offering perspectives

Bone et al. (2008: 436) expand the definition of the rhetorical form of offering perspectives also to include the possible providing of ideas. This denotes that the rhetor can not only broaden the audience's possibilities of choosing the most preferable point of view but also augment the ways

of presenting his or her own opinion. In other words, by simply expressing more different ideas in the speech, the rhetor makes the offering of perspectives and, consequently the invitational rhetoric, yet more noticeable.

In her speech, Ms. Watson offers perspectives from both her own point of view and other, more detached standpoints. First, I am going to present how Ms. Watson offers her own perspectives within the limits of the current rhetorical form. Here is the first example from the speech:

- (7) I started questioning gender-based assumptions a long time ago. When I was 8, I was confused for being called bossy because I wanted to direct plays we would put on for our parents, but the boys were not. When at 14, I started to be sexualized by certain elements of the media. When at 15, my girlfriends started dropping out of their beloved sports teams because they didn't want to appear muscly. When at 18, my male friends were unable to express their feelings.

Example 7 is a first-person narrative where Ms. Watson describes events from her childhood and teenage years that she has either experienced herself or witnessed. In this part of the speech, Ms. Watson therefore offers her own personal perspective to the issue of gender equality. However, in addition to her own personal narrative, in this section she also offers the audience two other perspectives: her girlfriends' pressure of not *appearing muscly* and her male friends' inability to express their feelings when they had become older. Not only does Ms. Watson describe how her childhood, for her personally, was affected by gender stereotypes, but she also describes how she has seen those stereotypes and issues affect others around her.

Without stating any of the occurrences in this part of the speech as either right or wrong, Ms. Watson simply explains how everyone around her, despite their gender or age, have been affected by certain prevailing gender stereotypes. As a result, the use of invitational rhetoric, and, more specifically, the offering of perspectives, is noticeable in this example. Ms. Watson does not encourage or try to persuade the audience to choose a side or opinion but instead she offers the audience, in a few sentences, several different perspectives to contemplate.

- (8) My life is a sheer privilege because my parents didn't love me less because I was born a daughter. My school did not limit me because I was a girl. My mentors didn't assume that I would go less far because I might give birth to a child one day. These influences were the gender equality ambassadors that made me who I am today.

In Example 8, Ms. Watson tells the audience a personal narrative in which she explains how different people and factors have influenced her current perspective on gender equality. In this narrative, she continues the story she began in the first example and tells how she became who she is today despite facing gender inequalities and stereotyping. She invites the audience to think how fortunate those girls are who are not discriminated in their childhood because of their gender. Moreover, by sharing this personal narrative Ms. Watson also implies that not all girls and women have the same opportunities as she has had. In fact, she directly states in this part of the speech that her life is *a sheer privilege*. By offering this further personal perspective, she wants to highlight the importance of external support in the early stages of life.

In her speech, Ms. Watson also offers the audience other perspectives in addition to her own. These other perspectives differ from the ones presented above in that they do not include personal narratives even though the rhetor may in other ways present the perspective from her own point of view. However, offered perspectives can also be quite formal and neutral. Here is an example to illustrate this:

- (9) For the record, feminism by definition is the belief that men and women should have equal rights and opportunities. It is the theory of the political, economic and social equality of the sexes.

Ms. Watson presents a formal definition for feminism and at the same time she offers the audience an alternative point of view to consider. The given definition is a more academic and objective perspective and gives the audience more space to form their own opinion. In comparison with the more personal perspectives, Ms. Watson also presented in her speech, this provided idea gives the audience the opportunity to choose a more neutral point of view to gender equality. Furthermore, this can be useful in case for example Ms. Watson's personal perspective does not seem suitable.

In addition, another similar example of a more separate perspective, from the rhetor's position, can be found in the speech:

- (10) In fact, in the UK, suicide is the biggest killer of men between 20 to 49, eclipsing cancer and coronary heart disease.

Ms. Watson shares a perspective with the audience, which can still be interpreted as personal since she comes from the United Kingdom, and the statistics are from her home country. However, in comparison with her personal narratives, this statement was based more on statistics rather than her own experiences. As the purpose of the invitational rhetoric is to offer the audience with different perspectives, this statement represents a more official point of view.

### 5.2.2 Creating external conditions

The external condition of the equal value of the interlocutors may be visible in interaction through both the content and the style of speech. In Example 11, Ms. Watson accepts the equal value of herself and the audience by using herself as the actor in each of the statements.

- (11) I am from Britain, and I think it is right I am paid the same as my male counterparts. I think it is right that I should be able to make decisions about my own body. I think it is right that women be involved on my behalf in the policies and decisions that will affect my life. I think it is right that socially, I am afforded the same respect as men.

When the rhetor successfully creates this external condition in the communicative situation, he or she intentionally attempts to eschew any juxtaposition of different groups. Ms. Watson executes this rule by avoiding the usage of the traditional comparison between men and women when talking about gender equalities. Instead of arguing that *women should be afforded the same respect as men*, she replaces the noun *women* with herself as the object of the sentence. Moreover, Ms. Watson does not claim in this extract that women and men were not each other's equals. She instead confirms the aspects in question as if no inequalities between the genders existed. Thus, the equal value of the interlocutors is guaranteed as Ms. Watson does not directly claim that the two genders had unequal positions and that she places herself at the same level in the interaction as her audience.

As mentioned above, every interlocutor of the same communicative situation is involved in the realization of invitational rhetoric. However, it is often the rhetor's, or in this case the speaker's,

duty to maintain all the relevant aspects. Especially in situations similar to the ones in the current data, the audience's active verbal involvement in the interaction is not anticipated and therefore the rhetor's role is even more emphasized.

- (12) We are struggling for a uniting word, but the good news is that we have a uniting movement. It is called HeForShe. I am inviting you to step forward, to be seen and to ask yourself, "If not me, who? If not now, when?"

In Example 12, Ms. Watson takes the responsibility of maintaining the external condition of safety by encouraging her audience to take part in the discussion. However, because of the formality of the situation and the communicative environment, the UN Headquarters, she does not invite the audience *to step forward* and *to be seen* immediately. This illustrates how the use of invitational rhetoric can outreach the imminent interaction. Ms. Watson wants to make her message clear and encourage her audience to feel safe to participate in the ongoing discussion in their own way.

- (13) I decided I was a feminist, and this seemed uncomplicated to me.

Previously in her speech Ms. Watson stated that defining oneself as a feminist had become unpopular since the word has attracted so much negative attention and its formal meaning has been forgotten. In Example 13, she now identifies herself as a feminist and therefore it can be argued that she feels free to express her point of view. In connection with this section, Ms. Watson claims that there are people who do not want to be known as feminists but, as a result of her admission, she now characterizes herself as a person who does not adhere to the restriction.

### 5.3 Comparison of the findings

In communicative situations, such as holding speeches, invitational rhetoric and traditional persuasive rhetoric are often used in parallel. For this reason, instances of both rhetorics can be found in one speech; however, their use might not be equally distributed. This distribution of different rhetorical tools depends entirely on the rhetor.

Both rhetors of the analyzed speeches used invitational rhetoric together with traditional persuasive rhetoric. Invitational rhetoric was applied to present the audience the point of view of

the rhetor and his or her motive for the speech in a way that would engage the audience's focus effectively. The purpose of invitational rhetoric in these speeches is indeed to offer the audience new ideas and invite them to reflect the multi-layered issue of equality. Furthermore, both speeches featured instances of the two main rhetorical forms of invitational rhetoric, the offering of perspectives and creating external conditions. The main difference between the speeches was that Mr. Ebrahim utilized the rhetorical form of offering perspectives more in his speech than Ms. Watson. In addition, the two speeches differed as far as the type of perspectives is considered. While Mr. Ebrahim relied most on recounting personal narratives in his speech, Ms. Watson used both personal narratives and other ways of presenting perspectives. The rhetorical form of creating external conditions was used by Mr. Ebrahim and Ms. Watson relatively equally.

It is difficult to argue where these differences and similarities in the two speeches derive from. Foss and Griffin (1995:3) argued that invitational rhetoric could be used by anyone and not just by a specific group such as, for example, women or feminists. In addition, the use of invitational rhetoric cannot be restricted to a certain type of discourse.

As a result, I argue that the differences in the presence of invitational rhetoric in these two speeches cannot be limited to one or even two aspects. With the small amount of data it is impossible to argue, for example, that the gender or religious background of the rhetor affected the speech. However, it is possible to make a careful deduction that the overall communicative situation had an effect on the use of invitational rhetoric. This means that it is likely that the audience, the environment and the purpose of the speech, among others, influenced the rhetor's choice of how to approach his or her audience.

## **6 CONCLUSION**

The aim of my thesis was to enrich the regrettably small amount of research that had been conducted on the use of invitational rhetoric. Following three research questions I attempted to find out how invitational rhetoric was used in the analyzed speeches and whom the speakers invite to share their view of the world or, as in this case, their point of view towards equality. In

addition, I concentrated specifically on the speakers' use of personal narratives as a tool for extending the invitation to their audiences.

First, the analysis focused on how the rhetors provided the audience with different perspectives. These perspectives were found to include both the rhetors' own narratives and more detached viewpoints. For instance, Mr. Ebrahim included in his speech both his own and his mother's personal narratives. On the other hand, Ms. Watson also told personal narratives in her speech in addition to sharing more separate viewpoints, such as the formal definition of feminism. Furthermore, both speakers shared their own stories with the audience, which demonstrates that this aspect of invitational rhetoric can be used by different speakers regardless of, for example, their gender.

Second, I found that the chosen data represented each of the rhetorical forms that are required for the creation of safe, free and equal communication. Both Mr. Ebrahim and Ms. Watson ensured that the three external conditions (Foss and Griffin 1995: 10-13) were implemented in their speeches and both rhetors applied the rhetorical form in equal measures. However, the recordings of the speeches did not include the evidence of the audience's participation, which, in a dialogic situation, is also important. For instance, it would be interesting to examine more closely the listener response emerging in the same context as invitational rhetoric. Xudong (2009: 119) states that several researchers have come to the conclusion that listener response varies by gender, with women usually more active than men; however, this is in contradiction to the gender-neutral quality of invitational rhetoric. For future research, it would be valuable to analyze all the interlocutors because the complete realization of the external conditions depends on every participant.

Foss and Griffin (1995: 3) argued that invitational rhetoric can be used by both men and women. However, some of their critics have claimed that the theory is too restricted exclusively to a feminine style of speaking, which is often associated with women speakers. In future research, this argument could be contradicted by two research frames. First, by gathering enough data, such as speeches, everyday conversations and written text, that embody both traditional persuasive rhetoric and invitational rhetoric, it could be shown that feminine and masculine styles of



speaking can be utilized in parallel. Second, by conducting a comparative study of women's and men's speech with considerably more extensive data than in the present study, it could be revealed that the use of invitational rhetoric is not restricted to only female speakers.

Even though the data of the present study was small, I argue that even these examples of the use of invitational rhetoric indicate that the practice is not as restricted as has been claimed. In this thesis I have provided support for the claim that invitational rhetoric is at everyone's disposal regardless of the speaker's personal qualities. In addition, I have given solid evidence that direct persuasion is not always necessary to make people aware of an issue.

The restricted scope of a Bachelor's thesis did not permit the examination of both the use of invitational rhetoric and traditional persuasive rhetoric and how their use has been distributed in the data. Future research could therefore benefit from the analysis of the parallel use of the rhetoric practices and attempt to discover whether one of them is used only in a specific context. Moreover, similar studies such as the one conducted by Carey (2014), where she analyzed human rights activist Ella Baker's parallel use of different rhetorics, should be conducted.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Primary sources

- Ebrahim, Z. (2014). *I am the son of a terrorist. Here's how I chose peace*. [online]. (31 Oct, 2015)  
[https://www.ted.com/talks/zak\\_ebrahim\\_i\\_am\\_the\\_son\\_of\\_a\\_terrorist\\_here\\_s\\_how\\_i\\_chose\\_peace?language=en](https://www.ted.com/talks/zak_ebrahim_i_am_the_son_of_a_terrorist_here_s_how_i_chose_peace?language=en)
- Watson, E. (2014). *Gender equality is your issue too*. [online]. (31 Oct, 2015)  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Q0Dg226G2Z8&feature=youtu.be>

### Secondary sources

- Atkin, A. and Richardson, J. E. (2005). Constructing the (imagined) antagonist in advertising argumentation. In van Eemeren, F. H. and Houtlosser, P. (eds.) *Argumentation in Practice*, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 163-180.
- Benoit, W. L., Blaney, J. R. and Pier, P. M. (2000). Acclaiming, attacking, and defending: a functional analysis of U.S. nominating convention keynote speeches. *Political Communication*, 17 (1), 61-84.
- Bone, J. E., Griffin, C. L. and Scholz, L. (2008). Beyond traditional conceptualizations of rhetoric: invitational rhetoric and a move toward civility. *Western Journal of Communication*, 72 (4), 434-462.
- Carey, M. K. (2014). The Parallel Rhetorics of Ella Baker. *Southern Communication Journal*, 79 (1), 27-40.
- Condit, M. C. (1997). In Praise of Eloquent Diversity: Gender and Rhetoric as Public Persuasion. *Women's Studies in Communication*, 20 (2), 91-116.
- Foss, S. K. and Griffin C. L. (1995). Beyond persuasion: a proposal for an invitational rhetoric. *Communication monographs*, 62 (1), 2-18.
- Foss, S. K. and Foss, K. A. (2011). *Inviting transformation: Presentational speaking for a changing world* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.
- Hobbs, J. D., Hobbs, J., Bile, J. T., Lowrie, S., Wilkins, A., Milstead, V. and Wallace K. C. (2000). Intercollegiate Debate as Invitational Rhetoric: An Offering. *Contemporary Argumentation and Debate*, 21 (2000), 76-94.

- Langellier, K. M. (1989). Personal narratives: perspectives on theory and research. *Text and Performance Quarterly*, 9 (4), 243-276.
- Mallin, I. and Anderson, K. V. (2000). Inviting Constructive Argument. *Argumentation and Advocacy*, 36 (3), 120-133.
- Manning, M. R. (2006). The Rhetoric of Equality: Hillary Rodham Clinton's Redefinition of the Female Politician. *Texas Speech Communication Journal*, 30 (2), 109-120.
- Petre, E. A. (2007). Understanding epideictic purpose as invitational rhetoric in women's political convention speeches. *Kaleidoscope: A Graduate Journal of Qualitative Communication Research*, 6 (1), 21-37.
- Schuetz, J. (2005). Arguments of victims. A case study of the Timothy McVeigh trial. In van Eemeren, F. H. and Houtlosser, P. (eds.) *Argumentation in Practice*, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 197-214.
- Tindale, C. W. (2004). *Rhetorical argumentation: principles of theory and practice*. London: Sage.
- Xudong, D. (2009). Listener response. In S. D'hondt, J. Östman and J. Verschueren (eds.), *Pragmatics of Interaction*. John Benjamins Publishing Company, 104-124.

## APPENDICES

### Appendix 1: The transcription of Zak Ebrahim's speech

I am the son of a terrorist. Here's how I chose peace.

On November 5th, 1990, a man named El-Sayyid Nosair walked into a hotel in Manhattan and assassinated Rabbi Meir Kahane, the leader of the Jewish Defense League. Nosair was initially found not guilty of the murder, but while serving time on lesser charges, he and other men began planning attacks on a dozen New York City landmarks, including tunnels, synagogues and the United Nations headquarters. Thankfully, those plans were foiled by an FBI informant. Sadly, the 1993 bombing of the World Trade Center was not. Nosair would eventually be convicted for his involvement in the plot. El-Sayyid Nosair is my father.

I was born in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania in 1983 to him, an Egyptian engineer, and a loving American mother and grade school teacher, who together tried their best to create a happy childhood for me. It wasn't until I was seven years old that our family dynamic started to change. My father exposed me to a side of Islam that few people, including the majority of Muslims, get to see. It's been my experience that when people take the time to interact with one another, it doesn't take long to realize that for the most part, we all want the same things out of life. However, in every religion, in every population, you'll find a small percentage of people who hold so fervently to their beliefs that they feel they must use any means necessary to make others live as they do.

A few months prior to his arrest, he sat me down and explained that for the past few weekends, he and some friends had been going to a shooting range on Long Island for target practice. He told me I'd be going with him the next morning. We arrived at Calverton Shooting Range, which unbeknownst to our group was being watched by the FBI. When it was my turn to shoot, my father helped me hold the rifle to my shoulder and explained how to aim at the target about 30 yards off. That day, the last bullet I shot hit the small orange light that sat on top of the target and to everyone's surprise, especially mine, the entire target burst into flames. My uncle turned to the other men, and in Arabic said, "Ibn abuh." Like father, like son. They all seemed to get a really

big laugh out of that comment, but it wasn't until a few years later that I fully understood what they thought was so funny. They thought they saw in me the same destruction my father was capable of. Those men would eventually be convicted of placing a van filled with 1,500 pounds of explosives into the sub-level parking lot of the World Trade Center's North Tower, causing an explosion that killed six people and injured over 1,000 others. These were the men I looked up to. These were the men I called ammu, which means uncle.

By the time I turned 19, I had already moved 20 times in my life, and that instability during my childhood didn't really provide an opportunity to make many friends. Each time I would begin to feel comfortable around someone, it was time to pack up and move to the next town. Being the perpetual new face in class, I was frequently the target of bullies. I kept my identity a secret from my classmates to avoid being targeted, but as it turns out, being the quiet, chubby new kid in class was more than enough ammunition. So for the most part, I spent my time at home reading books and watching TV or playing video games. For those reasons, my social skills were lacking, to say the least, and growing up in a bigoted household, I wasn't prepared for the real world. I'd been raised to judge people based on arbitrary measurements, like a person's race or religion.

So what opened my eyes? One of my first experiences that challenged this way of thinking was during the 2000 presidential elections. Through a college prep program, I was able to take part in the National Youth Convention in Philadelphia. My particular group's focus was on youth violence, and having been the victim of bullying for most of my life, this was a subject in which I felt particularly passionate. The members of our group came from many different walks of life. One day toward the end of the convention, I found out that one of the kids I had befriended was Jewish. Now, it had taken several days for this detail to come to light, and I realized that there was no natural animosity between the two of us. I had never had a Jewish friend before, and frankly I felt a sense of pride in having been able to overcome a barrier that for most of my life I had been led to believe was insurmountable. Another major turning point came when I found a summer job at Busch Gardens, an amusement park. There, I was exposed to people from all sorts of faiths and cultures, and that experience proved to be fundamental to the development of my character. Most of my life, I'd been taught that homosexuality was a sin, and

by extension, that all gay people were a negative influence. As chance would have it, I had the opportunity to work with some of the gay performers at a show there, and soon found that many were the kindest, least judgmental people I had ever met. Being bullied as a kid created a sense of empathy in me toward the suffering of others, and it comes very unnaturally to me to treat people who are kind in any other way than how I would want to be treated. Because of that feeling, I was able to contrast the stereotypes I'd been taught as a child with real life experience and interaction. I don't know what it's like to be gay, but I'm well acquainted with being judged for something that's beyond my control.

Then there was "The Daily Show." On a nightly basis, Jon Stewart forced me to be intellectually honest with myself about my own bigotry and helped me to realize that a person's race, religion or sexual orientation had nothing to do with the quality of one's character. He was in many ways a father figure to me when I was in desperate need of one. Inspiration can often come from an unexpected place, and the fact that a Jewish comedian had done more to positively influence my worldview than my own extremist father is not lost on me.

One day, I had a conversation with my mother about how my worldview was starting to change, and she said something to me that I will hold dear to my heart for as long as I live. She looked at me with the weary eyes of someone who had experienced enough dogmatism to last a lifetime, and said, "I'm tired of hating people." In that instant, I realized how much negative energy it takes to hold that hatred inside of you.

Zak Ebrahim is not my real name. I changed it when my family decided to end our connection with my father and start a new life. So why would I out myself and potentially put myself in danger? Well, that's simple. I do it in the hopes that perhaps someone someday who is compelled to use violence may hear my story and realize that there is a better way, that although I had been subjected to this violent, intolerant ideology, that I did not become fanaticized. Instead, I choose to use my experience to fight back against terrorism, against the bigotry. I do it for the victims of terrorism and their loved ones, for the terrible pain and loss that terrorism has forced upon their lives. For the victims of terrorism, I will speak out against these senseless acts and condemn my father's actions. And with that simple fact, I stand here as proof that violence isn't inherent in

one's religion or race, and the son does not have to follow the ways of his father. I am not my father.

## **Appendix 2: The transcription of Emma Watson's speech**

Gender equality is your issue too

Your excellencies, UN secretary general, president of the general assembly, executive director of UN women and distinguished guests.

Today we are launching a campaign called for HeForShe. I am reaching out to you because we need your help. We want to end gender inequality, and to do this, we need everyone involved. This is the first campaign of its kind at the UN. We want to try to galvanize as many men and boys as possible to be advocates for change. And, we don't just want to talk about it. We want to try and make sure that it's tangible.

I was appointed as Goodwill Ambassador for UN Women six months ago. And, the more I've spoken about feminism, the more I have realized that fighting for women's rights has too often become synonymous with man-hating. If there is one thing I know for certain, it is that this has to stop.

For the record, feminism by definition is the belief that men and women should have equal rights and opportunities. It is the theory of the political, economic and social equality of the sexes.

I started questioning gender-based assumptions a long time ago. When I was 8, I was confused for being called bossy because I wanted to direct the plays that we would put on for our parents, but the boys were not. When at 14, I started to be sexualized by certain elements of the media. When at 15, my girlfriends started dropping out of their beloved sports teams because they didn't want to appear muscly. When at 18, my male friends were unable to express their feelings.

I decided that I was a feminist, and this seemed uncomplicated to me. But my recent research has shown me that feminism has become an unpopular word. Women are choosing not to identify as feminists. Apparently, I'm among the ranks of women whose expressions are seen as too strong, too aggressive, isolating, and anti-men. Unattractive, even.



Why has the word become such an uncomfortable one? I am from Britain, and I think it is right I am paid the same as my male counterparts. I think it is right that I should be able to make decisions about my own body. I think it is right that women be involved on my behalf in the policies and decisions that will affect my life. I think it is right that socially, I am afforded the same respect as men.

But sadly, I can say that there is no one country in the world where all women can expect to receive these rights. No country in the world can yet say that they have achieved gender equality. These rights, I consider to be human rights, but I am one of the lucky ones.

My life is a sheer privilege because my parents didn't love me less because I was born a daughter. My school did not limit me because I was a girl. My mentors didn't assume that I would go less far because I might give birth to a child one day. These influences were the gender equality ambassadors that made me who I am today. They may not know it, but they are the inadvertent feminists who are changing the world today. We need more of those.

And if you still hate the word, it is not the word that is important. It's the idea and the ambition behind it, because not all women have received the same rights that I have. In fact, statistically, very few have been.

In 1997, Hillary Clinton made a famous speech in Beijing about women's rights. Sadly, many of the things that she wanted to change are still true today. But what stood out for me the most was that less than thirty percent of the audience were male. How can we effect change in the world when only half of it is invited or feel welcome to participate in the conversation?

Men, I would like to take this opportunity to extend your formal invitation. Gender equality is your issue, too. Because to date, I've seen my father's role as a parent being valued less by society, despite my need of his presence as a child, as much as my mother's. I've seen young men suffering from mental illness, unable to ask for help for fear it would make them less of xxx a man. In fact, in the UK, suicide is the biggest killer of men between 20 to 49, eclipsing road

accidents, cancer and coronary heart disease. I've seen men made fragile and insecure by a distorted sense of what constitutes male success. Men don't have the benefits of equality, either.

We don't often talk about men being imprisoned by gender stereotypes, but I can see that they are, and that when they are free, things will change for women as a natural consequence. If men don't have to be aggressive in order to be accepted, women won't feel compelled to be submissive. If men don't have to control, women won't have to be controlled.

Both men and women should feel free to be sensitive. Both men and women should feel free to be strong. It is time that we all perceive gender on a spectrum, instead of two sets of opposing ideals. If we stop defining each other by what we are not, and start defining ourselves by who we are, we can all be freer, and this is what HeForShe is about. It's about freedom.

I want men to take up this mantle so that their daughters, sisters, and mothers can be free from prejudice, but also so that their sons have permission to be vulnerable and human too, reclaim those parts of themselves they abandoned, and in doing so, be a more true and complete version of themselves.

You might be thinking, "Who is this Harry Potter girl, and what is she doing speaking at the UN?" And, it's a really good question. I've been asking myself the same thing. All I know is that I care about this problem, and I want to make it better. And, having seen what I've seen, and given the chance, I feel it is my responsibility to say something.

Statesman Edmund Burke said, "All that is needed for the forces of evil to triumph is for good men and women to do nothing."

In my nervousness for this speech and in my moments of doubt, I told myself firmly, "If not me, who? If not now, when?" If you have similar doubts when opportunities are presented to you, I hope those words will be helpful. Because the reality is that if we do nothing, it will take seventy-five years, or for me to be nearly 100, before women can expect to be paid the same as men for

the same work. 15.5 million girls will be married in the next 16 years as children. And at current rates, it won't be until 2086 before all rural African girls can have a secondary education.

If you believe in equality, you might be one of those inadvertent feminists that I spoke of earlier, and for this, I applaud you. We are struggling for a uniting word, but the good news is that we have a uniting movement. It is called HeForShe. I am inviting you to step forward, to be seen and to ask yourself, "If not me, who? If not now, when?"

Thank you very, very much.