

[Redacted] = rhetorical strategies

[Redacted] = supporting claims

The following opinion essay was published in the *Washington Post* on September 8, 2011.



## THE 9/11 "OVERREACTION"? NONSENSE.

CHARLES KRAUTHAMMER

metaphor

The new conventional wisdom on 9/11: We have created a decade of fear. We overreacted to 9/11—al-Qaeda turned out to be a paper tiger; there never was a second attack—thereby bankrupting the country, destroying our morale and sending us into national decline.

rhetorical question

The secretary of defense says that al-Qaeda is on the verge of strategic defeat. True. But why? Al-Qaeda did not spontaneously combust. Yet, in a decade Osama bin Laden went from the emir of radical Islam, jihadi hero after whom babies were named all over the Muslim world—to pathetic old recluse, almost incommunicado, watching shades of himself on a cheap TV in a bare room.

metaphor

What turned the strong horse into the weak horse? Precisely the massive and unrelenting American war on terror, a systematic worldwide campaign carried out with increasing sophistication, efficiency and lethality—now so cheaply denigrated as an “overreaction.”

claim

First came the Afghan campaign, once so universally supported that Democrats for years complained that President Bush was not investing enough blood and treasure there. Now, it is reduced to a talking point as one of “the two wars” that bankrupted us. Yet Afghanistan was utterly indispensable in defeating the jihadis then and now. (We think of Pakistan as the terrorist sanctuary. We fail to see that Afghanistan is our sanctuary, the base from which (we) have freedom of action to strike Jihad Central in Pakistan and the border regions.

identification

Iraq, too, was decisive, though not in the way we intended. (We) no more chose it to be the central campaign in the crushing of al-Qaeda than Eisenhower chose the Battle of the Bulge as the locus for the final destruction of the German war machine.

Comparison (Simile)

Al-Qaeda, uninvited, came out to fight us in Iraq, and it was not just defeated but humiliated. The local population—Arab, Muslim, Sunni, under the supposed heel of the invader—joined the infidel and rose up against the jihadi in its midst. It was a singular defeat from which al-Qaeda never recovered.

counter-argument

True, in both wars there was much trial, error and tragic loss. In Afghanistan, too much emphasis on nation-building. In Iraq, the bloody middle years before we found our general and our strategy. (But cannot the same be said of, for example, the Civil War, the terrible years before Lincoln found his general? Or the Pacific campaign of World War II, with its myriad miscalculations, its often questionable island-hopping, that cost infinitely more American lives?

opposing claim

his refutation

rhetorical questions

In the end: 10 years, no second attack (which everyone assumed would come within months). That testifies to the other great achievement of the decade: the defensive anti-terror apparatus hastily constructed from scratch after 9/11 by President Bush, and then continued by President Obama. (Continued why? Because it worked. It kept us safe—the warrantless wiretaps, the Patriot Act, extraordinary rendition, preventive detention and, yes, Guantanamo.

the opposing claim

counter-argument

Perhaps, says the new conventional wisdom, (but) these exertions have bankrupted the country and led to our current mood of despair and decline.

exemplification

(Rubbish.) The total cost of “the two wars” is \$1.3 trillion. That’s less than 1/11th of the national debt, less than one year of Obama deficit spending. During the golden Eisenhower 1950s of robust economic growth averaging 5 percent annually, defense spending was 11 percent of GDP and 60 percent of the federal budget. Today, defense spending is 5 percent of GDP and 20 percent of the budget. So much for imperial overstretch.

opposing claim and his concession

counter-argument

(Yes, we are approaching bankruptcy.) (But) this has as much to do with the war on terror as do sunspots. Looming insolvency comes not from our shrinking defense budget but from the explosion of entitlements. They devour nearly half the federal budget.

his response

As for the Great Recession and financial collapse, you can attribute it to misguided federal policy pushing homeownership through risky subprime lending. To Fannie and Freddie. To greedy bankers, unscrupulous lenders,

metaphor  
and claim

naive (and greedy) home buyers. To computer-enabled derivatives so complicated and interwoven as to elude control. But to the war on terror? Nonsense.

13  
 “9/11 was our Pearl Harbor.”  
 9/11 was our Pearl Harbor. This time, however, the enemy had no home address. No Tokyo. Which is why today’s war could not be wrapped up in a mere four years. It was unconventional war by an unconventional enemy embedded within a worldwide religious community. Yet in a decade, we largely disarmed and defeated it, and developed the means to continue to pursue its remnants at rapidly decreasing cost. That is a historic achievement.

14  
 Our current difficulties and gloom are almost entirely economic in origin, the bitter fruit of misguided fiscal, regulatory and monetary policies that had nothing to do with 9/11. America’s current demoralization is not a result of the war on terror. On the contrary. The denigration of the war on terror is the result of our current demoralization, of retroactively reading today’s malaise into the real—and successful—history of our 9/11 response.

### READING ARGUMENTS

1. What is Krauthammer’s thesis? Restate it in your own words.
2. Where does Krauthammer anticipate and refute possible objections to his argument?
3. How does Krauthammer support the claims he makes in paragraph 3? What evidence does he use? Do you find this evidence persuasive? Why or why not?
4. Does Krauthammer appeal primarily to *ethos*, *pathos*, or *logos*? Why do you think he chose the appeal he did?