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ABSTRACT

Hegemonically masculine concepts are frequently employed by decision-makers during times of crisis and war. Language used by leaders is powerful in securing domestic support for US foreign policy decisions, and hegemonic masculinity shapes the ways in which leaders conceive of conflicts and in what ways those conflicts should be addressed. Notions of hegemonic masculinity exert a powerful, structural influence on US Presidential foreign policy decisionmaking.

The attacks of September 11th, 2001 changed United States foreign policy in fundamental ways. This research examines the role of hegemonic masculinity in President George W. Bush’s policy speeches, both how hegemonic masculinity may have shaped his language and how that language gave Bush the support he needed for unilateral intervention in Afghanistan.

The research begins from a standpoint feminist perspective, and examines President George W. Bush’s language in public speeches and statements released to the public on September 11, 2001 and in the six weeks following the attacks. The research includes a narrative examination of Bush and how he understood international politics with regard to hegemonic masculinity, and a narrative of how Bush employed gendered language when speaking about the US intervention in Afghanistan. The language used by President Bush is examined in detail, regarding his references to power, rescuer, and
warrior in his speeches and statements before and after the 9/11 attacks. Both quantitative and qualitative approaches were utilized to uncover how these three concepts were employed by President Bush before and after the terrorist attacks.

President Bush relied heavily on conceptions of hegemonic masculinity in his language after September 11, 2001. In particular, he used gendered ideologies and narratives to bolster the case for unilateral intervention in Afghanistan, employing notions of power, rescuer, and warrior. Bush’s use of the concepts of rescuer and warrior increased significantly after the terrorist attacks. Bush, in effect, remasculinized the United States through a hypermasculine response. These three concepts, power, rescuer, and warrior, were embraced by many Americans, and support for the US intervention in Afghanistan was overwhelming. Language is powerful, and Bush’s use of specific language which referenced hegemonic masculinity was an essential component in his arguments for US military intervention in Afghanistan.
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Chapter One

Introduction

The world changed when terrorists attacked the United States on September 11, 2001. Nineteen terrorists hijacked four American airplanes early that morning, using them as bombs, flying two directly into the Twin Towers of the World Trade Center in New York City, and one into the Pentagon in Washington, D.C. The fourth plane, probably intended to hit the White House or the Capitol building, went down in a Pennsylvania field, allegedly after the passengers tried to overcome the hijackers. These attacks claimed thousands of lives, incurred costs in billions of dollars in damages, and devastated American financial and political symbols. The terrorist attacks on 9/11 were the first time since Pearl Harbor that the United States was attacked on its own soil, reshaping American foreign policy in profound and long-lasting ways.

President George W. Bush, less than a year into his first term of office, was initially in shock. He spoke to the American people that day, and addressed the nation that evening, promising to find the alleged terrorists who had helped the hijackers and bring them to justice. The next two days, as the nation focused on the attacks and the recovery effort, Bush, with few public addresses, scrambled to put together a strategy to deal with the Islamic radicals who had perpetrated the attacks. The third day after the attack, Bush went on the offensive, speaking frequently about his intentions to find all who were involved in the attacks and to bring them to justice in the United States. During the week following the attack, Bush asserted American strength, proclaimed a
commitment to rescue the survivors and others hurt by Islamic radicals, and characterized the United States as a warrior state which would seek retribution using American military force.

Beyond his initial shock, Bush’s immediate reaction demonstrates his default to a classic masculinist response, his words resonating with important components of hegemonic masculinity in the United States. For example, Bush repeatedly emphasized American power and strength as he asserted that he himself, and the United States, would become a rescuer of those who had been hurt by Islamic radicals, using military might to seek-out and punish the perpetrators. Bush’s masculinity was threatened by the attacks, he was emasculated. It was important for Bush to restore his masculinity, because without being a “man” Bush could neither lead the country nor deal with its enemies.

The central research question addressed in this research is how did American hegemonic masculinity shape the US intervention in Afghanistan? Hegemonic masculinity is the predominant form of masculinity in any culture, and masculine traits are valued most. Hegemonic masculinity in the United States is defined by strength and power, anti-femininity, rescuing women, and aggressiveness. Hegemonic masculinity dictates which behaviors are considered “masculine” and which behaviors are not. Hegemonic masculinity is complex and relatively slow to change. Hegemonic masculinity limits the options individual men have in many areas of their lives, and prescribes certain “masculine” behaviors. Individual men must display masculinity on a

---

1 “Hegemonic masculinity” is a particular form of masculinity defined by the cultural gender ideology as to be the most highly valued.
daily basis, proving they are men by the way they talk, walk, laugh, joke, interact with women, and interact with other men.

The United States as a nation-state also displays the characteristics of hegemonic masculinity. The United States projects strength and power around the world. It valorizes masculine traits and de-values feminine ones. The United States cannot be perceived as weak, and women are “weak” by the definitions of hegemonic masculinity. The United States, through the use of its international military and economic power, rescues other countries, weak countries which are feminized. The means through which the United States projects power and the other components of hegemonic masculinity is primarily through US military power, and through its economic power as well. The United States spends more than any other country on national defense, and projects power around the world. Hegemonic masculinity, then, does more than dictate the acceptable behavior of men, it also dictates what actions are taken by the United States in interacting with other actors in international politics, shaping foreign and domestic policy via individual political leaders, their decisions, and how they present those decisions. It also defines the parameters of acceptable international actions, underscoring what actions are not acceptable because they would present the United States as weak, or feminine. Masculinist rhetoric is common in domestic politics, and is used frequently in foreign policy.

On 9/11, the United States became a victim. Victims, by the definitions of hegemonic masculinity, are feminine; therefore, it was imperative that Bush move quickly to regain his own masculinity and that of the United States. In order to
remasculinize the Unite States and its people, and to fulfill the emotional needs of the President and the country, the United States identified the attackers as Al Qaeda members and quickly initiated the Afghan intervention, which was designed to capture and/or kill those responsible for the attacks. Bush soon declared a “War on Terror.”

The Bush administration’s success regarding the war on terror is mixed. Many people argue his policies did indeed prevented further Al-Qaeda attacks on US soil. It is a compelling argument. The United States has in custody, and is working to convict, many alleged terrorists, including some directly involved in the 9/11 attacks. The Bush administration claimed to have made significant progress in dismantling Al-Qaeda, arresting members, and exposing terrorist plots; however, with few exceptions, no military judicial commission or other courts have convicted, or even tried, these detainees. Those captured were detained primarily at the US military base at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, but for many the whereabouts of incarceration were classified. The administration, due to national security concerns, was unwilling to provide access to materials usually allowed to criminal defense attorneys, but the Supreme Court insisted on fair trials. Consequently the detainees remained “detainees” and are slowly being prepared for fair hearings. As for Bush’s promise to “get Bin Laden,” his whereabouts, evidently, are unknown. Bush did not turn out to be the knight-in-shining-armor who rescued Afghanistan and the American people. The masculine image (the armor) of the United States had been tarnished. Moreover, America – the mightiest country in the world – had been emasculated.
After the 9/11 attacks, President Bush vowed to find the “evil-doers” responsible, “dead or alive,” and to punish any and all who had been involved in the terrible act of terrorism. Bush further said that every state in the world was “either with us or against us” in this new global war. The United States invaded Afghanistan to find Bin Laden, bring him to justice, and overthrow the Taliban.

The intervention in Afghanistan was overwhelmingly supported by the US Congress and the American people. Why did Congress and the American people support the US intervention in Afghanistan? How did the Bush administration, and President Bush himself, view the intervention? What frames of meaning did the Bush administration exploit to create support for the invasion? More precisely, and as stated above, the central research question asked here, is how did American hegemonic masculinity shape the US intervention in Afghanistan? Masculine traits which are valorized in the United States include strength, independence, rationality, inexpresiveness, achievement, aggression, and violence. How did constructions of hegemonic masculinity shape the overall US response to the 9/11 terrorist attacks? Why did the Bush Administration, specifically, rely explicitly on American cultural ideas about masculinity, including its hegemonic and other formulations?²

How did gender ideologies help to create the conditions for the Afghan intervention? The construction of hegemonic masculinity in the United States created those conditions, framed the questions, and provided the response. To explore further, first, how did the terrorist attacks affect the constructs of hegemonic masculinity and the

² Femininities are plural as well; however those hegemonic and other formulations will not be the research focus here.
masculine image of the United States? What was gendered about the American response (and President Bush’s personal response) to Al-Qaeda’s attacks? Second, how did the Bush administration present the Afghan intervention to the American people through US media using the meanings associated with hegemonic masculinity? How was the debate framed in both the US Congress and with the public at large? Finally, how did these messages resonate with the American people to create nearly unanimous support for the invasion?

On 9/11, the images of Americans as victims – and therefore America as a victim – humiliated American men, in particular its political leaders, because perceived gender ideologies define “victims” as feminine. America itself had been “feminized” by the emasculating attacks and had to regain its masculinity. The immediate response—to invade Afghanistan to punish those responsible—was, among other things, an effort to “remasculinize” the United States.³

This need to remasculinize America’s image after the attacks required the United States to regain power and control by using the classic masculine response of aggression. The Afghan intervention especially remasculinized American men. To American political leaders, including President Bush, Bin Laden and his supporters could not be allowed to go on thinking the United States was weak and could be preyed upon or be

---

considered vulnerable to attack. The United States had to “give ‘em hell.” Moreover, the personal confrontation between Bush and Bin Laden escalated—aggression was matched with aggression. Bush would “stand up and fight.”

The terrorist attacks on 9/11 created the conditions for a redevelopment of the meaning of masculinity among Americans, specifically the form hegemonic masculinity. Bush used the attacks to justify military intervention in Afghanistan, used gendered language, and invoked gender ideologies to ensure support from the Congress and the American people. Americans, who had been beginning to accept a “tough but tender” strand of masculinity in the hegemonic form after the end of the Cold War, instead developed a more robust form of hegemonic masculinity, with more emphasis on power, aggression, and control. Since 9/11, changes probably have occurred in hegemonic masculinity, and those changes may have helped to frame arguments in favor of military intervention in Afghanistan. The approach here is broadly interpretive, and while the research will employ mixed methods to explore hegemonic masculinity and its influence on US policy of intervention in Afghanistan, I will not attempt to establish a causal connection or be able to account for variance.

In this study, Chapter Two, “A Gender Approach to Foreign Policy”, explores the meta-theoretical approach to interpret constructions of hegemonic masculinity and gendered rhetoric used by the Bush administration. It explains standpoint theory and presents the standpoint approached as used in this research. In Chapter Three, “Masculinity Concepts in Foreign Policy”, the literature on the power of hegemonic

---

masculinity is addressed. Hegemonic masculinity is a complex topic, and is examined in detail. Masculinity shaped Bush’s personal response to the 9/11 attacks, and his administration’s foreign policy. Chapter Four, “President George W. Bush as a Masculine Leader”, analyzes President Bush, his understanding of masculinity as it related to leadership during this crisis, his personality and masculine persona, and his projection of masculinity. The masculine nature of the Bush administration was a combination of Bush’s own perspective in conjunction with other policymakers. The way the Bush administration shaped the argument of intervention in Afghanistan was gendered, and blatantly masculinist. Chapter Five, “Intervention in Afghanistan as Masculine Foreign Policy”, examines the case of the US military intervention in Afghanistan as an example of masculine foreign policy. The chapter additionally explores Afghanistan as the “damsel in distress,” and Bush’s characterization of the enemy as “evil.” Chapter Six, “Masculinity Concepts in President George W. Bush’s Foreign Policy Speeches”, offers a content analysis of foreign policy speeches, before and after 9/11, using mixed methods. Three gendered concepts are examined (power, rescuer, and warrior), first in a quantitative approach to observe and record the differences in frequency of the use of these gendered concepts. Conceptual analysis follows. Chapter Seven, “Conclusion,” summarizes the study with an analysis of how the 9/11 attacks affected constructions of hegemonic masculinity and the masculine image of the United States. The question as to whether a different president would have spoken or acted differently under the same conditions is addressed as well.
Chapter Two

A Gender Approach to Foreign Policy

The main issues for this research include how the policy of military intervention in Afghanistan was shaped by ideals of hegemonic masculinity, how the rhetoric of the intervention conformed to the requirements of hegemonic masculinity, and the way in which ideas about masculinity were used to justify military intervention in Afghanistan while persuading the American people that it was a just cause. The language used by the Bush administration demonstrates how important hegemonic ideas of masculinity were to the intervention. What did the President emphasize regarding this intervention? What language did he use to accomplish the intervention? What were the political effects of language used by President Bush?

In International Relations theory, feminism as an analytic tool is an intellectual descendant of Hegel, Gramsci, Weber, and many others.  This research fits broadly within the Constructivist school of thought within International Relations. Ted Hopf wrote:

Constructivism argues that both material and discursive power are necessary for any understanding of world affairs.
I emphasize both because often constructivists are

dismissed as unrealistic for believing in the power of knowledge, ideas, culture, ideology, and language, that is, discourse. The notion that ideas are a form of power, that power is more than brute forces, and that material and discursive power are related is not new. Michel Foucault’s articulation of the power/knowledge nexus, Antonio Gramsci’s theory of ideological hegemony, and Max Weber’s differentiation of coercion from authority are all precursors to constructivism’s position on power in political life.  

Gender has become one lens through which to interpret state-to-state interactions.

Standpoint epistemology is an informative tool to investigate the power of discourse in international politics. Given standpoint’s commitment to the construction of identity, standpoint epistemology is clearly constructivist. In addition, standpoint is committed to cultural transformation and the elimination of systems of domination. Hopf’s conception of the standpoint approach is similar to Robert Cox’s discussion of “emancipatory” international relations.

Standpoint feminism is focused not only on the socially constructed identity of the writer, but also the socially contingent and constructed nature of the “subjects” of inquiry. Gender is the social construction of sex difference, it is the social meaning of the categories of “man” and “woman,” “masculinity” and “femininity.” The traits associated with these categories of identity are likewise socially and historically contingent, created intersubjectively within the culture. Norms of masculinity and femininity prescribe behaviors and attitudes associated with “man” and “woman.” As Catharine MacKinnon

---

writes, “I analyze women and men as socially and politically constituted throughout, an approach that neither reveals nor presupposes ‘authentic’ or ‘arbitrary’ beings but rather exposes thoroughly socially contingent ones.” Everyone involved, the writer and everyone else—political elites, average US citizens, victims and survivors of human and political offenses, is socially and politically constituted. In this study, the particular social and political constitution of President George W. Bush is analyzed in order to produce an understanding of how gender was employed to promote his foreign policy and to interpret President Bush’s own personal reaction that helped to create these policies.

Standpoint Feminist Epistemology

I approach the questions on the relationship between the construction of gendered social relations and US military intervention using feminist standpoint epistemology. Standpoint epistemology can be understood as situated knowledge. Standpoint theorists argue that they manage a position between the traditional, masculinist, and what they consider flawed “scientific method” and semiotics, postmodernism, and relativism. Standpoint theorists start thinking from women’s lives. In Sandra Harding’s words, “The activities of those at the bottom of...social hierarchies can provide starting points for thought—for everyone’s research and scholarship—from which humans with each other and the natural world can become visible.” This process can produce better questions and better results for understanding humanity.

Standpoint feminism comes from the idea that both “knowers” are not interchangeable, and subjects of knowledge are likewise situated. Social identity matters because experience and perception matter for the possibility of knowledge. No individual is capable of knowing from every experiential location, and in our present culture, our social identities are in some cases relevant to our experiential locations, though certainly not the most or only relevant feature. The accounts of perception given either in much of contemporary phenomenology or in analyses of the relation between perception and discourse (or theory)…show that perception is a kind of social practice: learned, interpretive, and an index of culture. But the fact that our culture is far from homogeneous must suggest that basic-level perception of events and of people, perception that surmises identity, credibility, salient evidence, probable causal relations, plausible explanations, and other important epistemic judgments, can vary across social identities. This variability pertains not only to factual description but also to evaluation and moral assessment.11

The variability in experiential location informs all aspects of the process of scientific inquiry. From a standpoint perspective, however, this is not “bias” to be eliminated, but heterogeneity that produces different pictures of the natural and social world, all of which are partial because of the standpoint of the researcher. These differences, instead of presenting a threat to the traditional process of scientific method, are instead an improvement because no scientific research can be absolutely objective. By making the standpoint clear, instead of hidden, better science results. The masculinist bias in traditional science should be eliminated as much as possible so that we who study the social world can better understand it. The goal of feminist epistemology is not just to deconstruct but to build knowledge. The goal is to produce better theories and better

science. Feminist standpoint theory is one avenue of approach to the study of societies, and therefore, politics.

_The feminist standpoint_ originates in Hegel’s thinking about the relationship between the master and the slave and in the elaboration of this analysis in the writings of Marx, Engels, and the Hungarian Marxist theorist, G. Lukacs. Briefly, this proposal argues that men’s dominating position in social life results in partial and perverse understandings, whereas women’s subjugated position provides the possibility of more complete and less perverse understandings. Feminism and the women’s movement provide the theory and motivation for inquiry and political struggle that can transform the perspective of women into a “standpoint” – a morally and scientifically preferable grounding for our interpretations and explanations of nature and social life. The feminist critiques of social and natural science, whether expressed by women or by men, are grounded in the universal features of women’s experience as understood from the perspective of feminism.\[12\]

The standpoint from which interpretations and explanations emerge is important. An individual’s standpoint is socio-economic, racial, ethnic, geographical, gendered, and other varieties of locations. For example, an individual’s standpoint also encompasses the “knower’s” sexual identity and sexual preference. Alcoff argues that the social location of the knower is very important to determine the value of the conclusions made. For standpoint epistemology, the focus is on what situated knowers can contribute overall. Marginalized social groups can “give rise to new questions concerning dominant points of view that members of dominant groups are not likely to consider otherwise.”\[13\]

The masculinist perspective is challenged and better science is produced by situated knowledge; however, social location can also lead to blindness. Satya Mohanty argues

\[13\] Alcoff, 69. In discussing Dorothy Smith’s and Sandra Harding’s work on social position.
that “Social locations facilitate or inhibit knowledge by predisposing us to register and interpret information in certain ways. Our relation to social power produces forms of blindness just as it enables degrees of lucidity.” Use of the standpoint approach must acknowledge and address how social power, or the lack of social power, shapes the ways in which questions are asked and how conclusions are reached.

Western scientific inquiry has never been gender neutral. “[Standpoint] epistemology appear[s] to assert that objectivity never has been and could not be increased by value-neutrality. Instead, it is commitments to antiauthoritarian, antielitist, participatory, and emancipatory values and projects that increase the objectivity of science.” The solution to the problem of the traditional scientific method is not to attempt to be more neutral, as neutrality is not neutral. Science is a social activity, and all those who seek knowledge, and the people and structures they study, are situated within societies. Much of standpoint contends that women are thereby uniquely situated to produce knowledge claims.

[Hillary] Rose goes on to analyze the relationship of the conditions of women’s activities within science with those in domestic life, and the possibilities created by these kinds of activities for women to occupy an advantaged standpoint as producers of less distorted and more comprehensive scientific claims.

Whether women are actually advantaged by their social location can be questioned; nevertheless, women can make a unique contribution to knowledge because of their social location.

---

15 Harding, 1986, 27.
16 Ibid., 143.
Michel Foucault offers one of the theoretical origins of the standpoint approach in international relations theory. According to Harding:

The origins of an epistemology which holds that appeals to the subjective are legitimate, that intellectual and emotional domains must be united, that the domination of reductionism and linearity must be replaced by the harmony of holism and complexity, can be detected in what Foucault would call “subjugated knowledges” – submerged understandings within the history of science.¹⁷

Feminist standpoint theory emerges from these “subjugated knowledges,” a standpoint which, because it comes from women, is not replicating the established social order, and comes from those who have access to knowledge beyond it.

Harding further states:

Thus Rose proposes that the grounds for a distinctive feminist science and epistemology are to be found in the social practices and conceptual schemes of feminists (or women inquirers) in craft-organized areas of inquiry. There women’s socially created conceptions of nature and social relations can produce new understandings that carry emancipatory possibilities for the species. These conceptions are not necessarily original to women scientists: hints of them can be detected in the “subjugated knowledges” in the history of science.¹⁸

Subjugated positions of scientists, therefore, can produce new understandings and emancipatory possibilities. Women scientists, in particular, can contribute to knowledge about how gender is important. Because of the masculinist bias in the scientific enterprise, this is particularly important.

Feminist standpoint theorists contend the approach will move beyond traditional science to a new way to explore important social and political questions.

¹⁷ Ibid., 144.
¹⁸ Ibid., 145.
By starting from the lived realities of women’s lives, we can identify the grounding for a theory of knowledge that should be the successor to both Enlightenment and Marxist epistemologies. For Hartsock as for Rose, it is in the gendered division of labor that one can discover both the reason for the greater adequacy of feminist knowledge claims, and the root from which a full-fledged successor to Enlightenment science can grow.  

Standpoint theory goes further to contend some people are in a better situation to understand the social and political conditions of life, including governmental and intergovernmental structures.

A feminist epistemological standpoint is an interested social location (“interested” in the sense of “engaged,” not “biased”), the conditions for which bestow upon its occupants scientific and epistemic advantage. The subjugation of women’s sensuous, concrete, relational activity permits women to grasp aspects of nature and social life that are not accessible to inquiries grounded in men’s characteristic activities.

Characteristically, due to gender socialization practices, men are not raised or expected to be like women. Feminist epistemological standpoint posits that women think differently from men to bring an epistemic advantage. “For men more than women, the self remains frozen in a defensive, infantile need to dominate and/or repress others in order to retain its individual identity.” As the self develops in men, because of their relationships to women and separation from them, men are created to be “independent.”

Men who are relieved of the need to maintain their own bodies and the local places where they exist can now see as real only what corresponds to their abstracted mental world. Like Hegel’s master, to whom the slave’s labor appears merely as an extension of his own being and will,

---

19 Ibid., 146.
20 Ibid., 148.
21 Ibid., 156.
men see women’s work not as real activity – self-chosen and consciously willed – but only as a “natural” activity, as instinctual or emotional labors of love….Women’s actual experience of their own labor is incomprehensible and inexpressible within the distorted abstractions of men’s conceptual schemes.  

Women are socialized differently from men, which is what brings epistemic advantage, according to this theory.

Standpoint epistemology is grounded in women’s experiences.

A feminist inquiry that starts from the categories and valuations of women’s subsistence and domestic labor and is interested (again in the sense of engaged) in the struggle for feminist goals provides the grounding for a distinctive epistemology of a successor to Enlightenment science.

Feminist standpoint is explicitly focused on feminist social goals. However, standpoint theorists also acknowledge that each researcher thinks differently. As Flax argues

Any feminist standpoint will necessarily be partial. Each person who tries to think from the standpoint of women may illuminate some aspects of the social totality which have been previously suppressed with the dominant view. But none of us can speak for ‘woman’ because no such person exists except within a specific set of (already gendered) relations – to “man” and to many concrete and different women.

Each contribution is unique and adds in different ways to the accumulation of knowledge.

For example, Cynthia Enloe’s research into gender and militarization has produced astonishing questions about how we think about gender and international relations. In *Bananas, Beaches and Bases* Enloe argues “gender makes the world go round.”

---

22 Ibid.
23 Ibid., 150.
24 Ibid., 154.
analysis of sexism and tourism, base women, diplomatic wives, factory workers, and domestic servants, she concludes that the lives of ordinary women around the world support, and are necessary to, the global patriarchal, capitalist, and imperialist international domination.

Male domination in science, and in international relations, is virtually ubiquitous. The ways in which international scholars think about the relations between states, as informed by the traditional scientific method, is necessarily incomplete. Feminist standpoint theorists connect masculinity to both domestic and international politics. For example, one theorist claims that “[T]he escalation in international hostilities, reveal[s] the clear overlap between masculine psychic needs for domination and nationalist domination rhetoric and politics.”26 Masculinity dominates not only the practice of science, but also the analysis of politics and international relations.

The Political Mind

George Lakoff’s recent book, The Political Mind, explores many of the issues discussed here. Lakoff focuses on metaphors and cognitive structures to explain political behavior. His approach differs from most feminist international relations scholars in that most feminists emphasize the socialization process in creation of gender; however, Lakoff’s research emphasizes how cognitive structures create metaphors, some of which are gendered. He argues, “A great deal of the political strife in America and elsewhere

---

26 Ibid., 156.
stems from the cognitive unconscious of individual citizens.” He contends cognitive science can explain a lot about politics because it can show how individual citizens’ brains manage information. “We will need to embrace a deep rationality that can take account of, and advantage of, a mind that is largely unconscious, embodied, emotional, empathetic, metaphorical, and only partly universal.” Lakoff does not reject rationality (which has been the standard of science since the Enlightenment), but instead seeks to understand how brains function to examine the processes through which people’s brains organize information. He says that a symptom of eighteenth-century rationalism assumes everyone is rational, and that rationality means seeking self-interest. Lakoff contends that rationality does not work the way scholars have assumed. He stresses, as have others, the importance of language.

Since language is used for communicating thought, our view of language must also reflect our new understanding of the nature of thought. Language is at once a surface phenomenon and a source of power. It is a means of expressing, communicating, accessing, and even shaping thought. Words are defined relative to frames and conceptual metaphors.

In other words, the way in which human brains function is shaped by language and effects the way the human brain interprets and categorizes information.

Language gets its power because it is defined relative to frames, prototypes, metaphors, narratives, images, and emotions. Part of its power comes from its unconscious aspects: we are not consciously aware of all that it evokes in us, but it is there, hidden, always at work.

---

28 Ibid., 13.
29 Ibid., 14-15.
30 Ibid., 15.
Language is particularly powerful because of its symbolic nature. “Language uses symbols. Language is a tool, and instrument – but it is the surface, not the soul, of the brain.” From Lakoff’s perspective, language is extremely important but it is not everything. Understanding the way language shapes and is shaped by brain structures is important, because the brain structures understanding, and as a consequence, politics.

This research is concerned with the language used by President Bush in the first weeks and months following the 9/11 attacks, which is also compared to the language Bush used in foreign policy speeches before 9/11. The way in which Bush understood the nature of the attack, and the way he understood the attackers, was reflected in the language he used in speeches afterward.

Lakoff describes the importance of narratives shaped in the brain that lead to political decision-making. For the purposes here, one, in particular, is extremely powerful and affects both political decision-making and political interpretation by people.

A lot of the narratives look similar. Here is a general Rescue narrative. It has a number of “semantic roles,” that is, main characters, actions, and instruments. The characters are: the Hero, the Victim, the Villain, the Helpers. The Hero is inherently good; the Villain is inherently bad. The main actions form a scenario, usually in this order: the Villainy, committed by the Villain against the Victim; the Difficulties undergone by the Hero; the Battle of Hero against Villain; the Victory of Hero over Villain; the Rescue of the Victim by the Hero; the Punishment of the Villain; the Reward for the Hero. The Villainy upsets the moral balance. The Victory, Rescue, Punishment, and Reward restore the moral balance. There

\[31\text{Ibid.}\]
is also a variant in which the Hero is the Victim. This is a Self-defense narrative: the Hero rescues himself.  

Simple narratives are combined in the brain to larger, more complex ones. Lakoff asserts that “neural binding” is the process by which this occurs. He says

Parts of the brain neurally closer to the muscles and sensory organs are called “downstream”; those farther away in the brain are called “upstream.” Neural signals go from downstream to upstream and back. Neural pathways from downstream regions “converge” on their way upstream at what are called “convergence zones.” Information from downstream and upstream is “integrated” at convergence zones via neural binding. The most prominent theory is that binding is “timelocking” – neurons firing simultaneously in different parts of the brain along connecting pathways. When they do, we experience simultaneous firing as characterizing the same entity.

Another current theory is based on the coordination of so-called neural signatures – small collections of individual neurons together forming distinct firing patterns. But however it occurs, and whatever theory turns out to be correct, binding is one of the most important and most commonplace of all brain mechanisms.

Neural bindings are long-term, and narratives have a structure that is activated over time, called an “event structure.”

Dramatic event structures are carried out by brain circuitry. The same event structure circuitry can be used to live out an action or a narrative, or to understand the actions of others or the structure of a story.

Importantly for this research, neural binding also creates emotional experiences.

Emotional content may be bound to a narrative.
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The circuitry characterizing winning for your hero is neurally bound to dopaminergic circuitry, which produces positive feelings when activated. Narratives and frames are not just brain structures with intellectual content, but rather with integrated intellectual-emotional content. Neural binding circuitry provides this integration.\(^{36}\)

Through neural binding, minds connect emotion to narratives. Lakoff says that “narratives are fixed in the neural circuits of our brains,”\(^{37}\) and he seeks to make the processes of the brain clear so that we can understand more completely how human minds work. “My goal as a scientist and a citizen is to make the cognitive unconscious as conscious as possible, to make reflexive decisions reflective.”\(^{38}\)

Lakoff contends that narratives are reflected in the way humans live their lives. In politics, “A President may see himself as a Hero rescuing a Victim-nation from a Villain-dictator. Or as leading a Battle of Good Against Evil.”\(^{39}\) When he addresses narrative and war, Lakoff contends that the “rescue narrative” has been quite powerful.

In the first Gulf War, the first President Bush first tried a self defense narrative: Saddam Hussein was threatening the United States. He was choking off our oil lifeline… A poll taken three months before the war showed that Americans would not go to war for oil. But they would go to war for a rescue. Immediately after the poll, the president’s narrative changed to the Rape of Kuwait, a Rescue Narrative.\(^{40}\)

The rescue narrative in that war was this story: Saddam was the Villain (inherently evil, beyond reason), Kuwait was the Victim (innocent, too weak to defend herself), the
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United States was the Hero (the rescuer), and the coalition members were the Helpers.\textsuperscript{41}

Lakoff argues the same narrative shift was used by the second President Bush in the Iraq War, but does not specifically address what narratives were important in the intervention in Afghanistan.

Lakoff contends that conservative thought is different from liberal thought, not just in ideology but in regards to conservativism’s understanding of authority.

Conservative thought has a very different moral basis than progressive thought. It begins with the notion that morality is obedience to an authority – assumed to be a legitimate authority who is inherently good, knows right from wrong, functions to protect us from evil in the world, and has the right and duty to use force to command obedience and fight evil. He is “the Decider.” Obedience to legitimate authority requires both personal responsibility and discipline, which are prime conservative virtues. Obedience is enforced through punishment. In large institutions, there will be a hierarchy of authority, used, among other things, to maintain order. Loyalty is required to maintain the hierarchy. Freedom is seen as functioning within such an order.\textsuperscript{42}

According to Lakoff, in conservative thought morality means compliance with authority. Personal responsibility, obedience, and discipline are highly valued.

With regard to policymaking, Lakoff argues that the cognitive structures of the brain lead people to morally frame prior to decision-making about policy.

Many people get policy and framing backward. Policy is about fitting frames – moral frames. The mistake is when people think framing is about selling policy….Moral framing precedes policy.\textsuperscript{43}

\textsuperscript{41} Ibid., 37.
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According to Lakoff, Bush would have been pre-conditioned to see the world with a “conservative” brain, and he would have framed the events of 9/11 before making any policy decisions.

Conclusion

This research explores masculinity and its relationship with foreign policy decision-making. The broader theoretical approach is standpoint feminism, as I explore how the decisions made by President George W. Bush to intervene in Afghanistan were reflected in his language. I also explore how Bush used American gender ideologies to create domestic support for the military intervention in Afghanistan, a mere two months after the terrorists there were suspected of attacking the United States in New York, Washington D.C., and Pennsylvania. Public sentiment at the time was wildly in favor of military intervention. Bush did not need additional arguments to sell the American people on the intervention. Why, then, did Bush use gendered language and metaphors in his public addresses and interviews?
Chapter Three
Masculinity Concepts in Foreign Policy

Introduction

This study is concerned with the effects of masculinity on foreign policy decision-making through internalized assumptions and gender ideologies, and masculinity’s effect on how decision-makers present arguments to constituents. A detailed examination of masculinity and its importance to American politics and American decision-makers is therefore necessary. This chapter is a literature review of masculinity studies and gender studies in international relations, and it explores a variety of theories about masculinity and the effects of the construction of masculinity on individuals, society, government, and international politics. The specific objective is to review the literature to develop ideas about which components of hegemonic masculinity are emphasized most frequently in order to distill the components of hegemonic masculinity into concepts which are then analyzed regarding the effects of masculinity on President George W. Bush’s perspective on the relations between states, and how Bush drew upon American hegemonic masculinity and gender ideologies to bolster the case for US intervention in Afghanistan in 2001.

It is the assertion here that the debates surrounding military interventions are shaped by, and contribute to, the construction of the hegemonic masculinity in the United States. The specific parameters of the hegemonic masculinity are relatively constant, but some changes in emphasis do occur. At least some of these characteristics can be traced
and changes over time can be evaluated. As Steve Smith argues it should be, the attention is on “the international processes that help construct what it means to be a male or female, as well as pointing to the dependence of the practices of international relations on other gendered structures and processes.”

Hegemonic Masculinity

Gendered ideologies in the United States are shared widely, and the images used by Presidents “engender” support for military intervention. Political leaders are blatant and unapologetic in their use of gendered imagery and symbolism. Gender ideologies are those belief systems regarding the proper roles, characteristics, behaviors, values, etc., of men and women. Social learning theory assumes “gendered behavior is produced by differential treatment, the systematic, although sometimes unintentional, provision of sex-specific environmental influences.” Certain traits and behaviors are associated with masculinity in the United States, and there are plural formulations of masculinities. One form of masculinity is dominant, however, and that form is hegemonic, in that other forms of masculinity are considered inferior and subordinate to it. Hegemonic masculinity is composed of various strands of beliefs about what a man is and how men should behave.

Gender belief systems, gender ideologies, prescribe behaviors for genders. “The dominant gender ideology in the United States fuses gender stereotypes with...”
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masculinist/heterosexist beliefs about families, sexuality, divisions of labor, and constructions of power and authority." Masculinist belief systems and stereotypes are transmitted from adults to children.

Many researchers have focused on the sex-specific application of reward and punishment by various socializing agents: parents, schools, and peer groups. Certain behaviors are typically rewarded or punished in males, and this gender-typed socialization process creates dispositions toward masculine behaviors and away from feminine ones. 

Gender socialization begins at birth (or before, with ultrasound technology), and continues throughout one’s lifetime. Socialization is “how individuals are taught, and how they internalize, culturally appropriate attitudes and behaviors. Families, schools, religious institutions, and media are important sources of this socialization." People are socialized into culturally constructed gender roles. Gender ideologies have a purpose. As V. Spike Peterson and Anne Sisson Runyan put it, these gender beliefs “distort reality while they maintain it by justifying status quo social, economic, and political arrangements. Ideas emanating from gender ideologies operate as social control, by defining the status quo as the proper state of affairs.” Gender ideologies are not benign, but control the boundaries of acceptable behaviors.

Individuals construct their own masculinities, within the parameters defined by the broader culture.
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The internalization of gender relations is a building block of our personalities – that is, it is the individual elaboration of gender and our own subsequent contributions to replenishing and adapting institutions and social structures in a way that wittingly or unwittingly preserves patriarchal systems.  

As masculinities are plural, and change over time, in American culture we see various components of masculinity, some that are hegemonic, and others that are subordinate to that hegemonic version. Masculinities also vary with other social locations: class, race, sexual preference, etc.

The historical context, the economic, political, and cultural/social factors at play at any given time, clearly have profound implications for the way manhood and masculinities are understood and maintained.

Moreover, there are gendered contests over meaning and power. Men do not universally accept hegemonic masculinity, through the socialization process they absorb American gender ideologies, and individually draw upon social understandings of masculinity to construct their own identities. Another important part of socialization, however, is how men contest the masculine role as well, and negotiate the parameters of hegemonic and subordinate forms of masculinity.

Differing interpretations suggest that non-hegemonic groups of men are more often than not caught up in a contradictory and complex process of simultaneously participating in and resisting their oppression and the constructions of masculinity that are thrust upon them, so
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that subordinate and oppositional styles of masculinity are neither wholly regressive nor wholly progressive.\textsuperscript{52}

Finally, hegemonic forms of masculinity are defined and practiced by those in positions of power and influence in society. “Not surprisingly, hegemonic males and their visions of masculinity predominant in the world of international affairs.”\textsuperscript{53} Because the hegemonic version(s) of masculinity predominate in international affairs, knowledge of them is crucial to understanding international politics more generally.

R. W. Connell argued in \textit{Gender and Power} that masculinities are constructed within American culture in plural forms, but that one type of masculinity is hegemonic.

The concept of “hegemony”, deriving from Antonio Gramsci’s analysis of class relations, refers to the cultural dynamic in which a group claims and sustains a leading position in social life. At any given time, one form of masculinity rather than others is culturally exalted. Hegemonic masculinity can be defined as the configuration of gender practice which embodies the currently accepted answer to the problem of the legitimacy of patriarchy, which guarantees (or is taken to guarantee) the dominant position of men and the subordination of women.\textsuperscript{54}

Both masculinity and femininity are culturally constructed, and there are plural manifestations of both, however “masculine” traits are more valued than “feminine” traits. At all times, there are different versions of “maleness” and “femaleness” in operation. These gendered social relations intersect with other hierarchies in society: hierarchies of race, socioeconomic class, sexual orientation, and others. Individuals negotiate these prescribed roles to construct their own identities, and as part of the

\textsuperscript{52} Charlotte Hooper, \textit{Manly States: Masculinities, International Relations, and Gender Politics} (New York: Columbia University Press, 2001), 73.
\textsuperscript{53} Parpart, 204.
process they respond to, remake, and recreate discourses regarding meanings of masculinities and femininities. The social control which operates through gender ideologies is manifested not only in binary oppositional categories of male and female such as aggressive/passive or strong/weak, because masculinities vary by the degree to which female behaviors are acceptable. The hegemonic version of masculinity defines the ideal type of masculinity, and other masculinities are subordinate to the dominate construction in that they incorporate behaviors (or other characteristics) that are socially defined as female.

What does hegemonic masculinity look like in the United States? Hegemonic masculinity is not a fixed set of traits, “but . . . a constantly negotiated construct that draws on a pool of available characteristics.” What kinds of traits construct hegemonic masculinity? Scholars have presented a variety of ways to examine hegemonic masculinity. Charlotte Hooper argues there have been four ideal types of dominant masculinities in Western history.

Attempts to trace the history of hegemonic masculinity in the West reveal at least four ideal types, or social categories, of dominant masculinities. These are inherited from different periods of European cultural history. The ideal types consist of the Greek citizen-warrior model; the patriarchal Judeo-Christian model; the honor/patronage model; and a Protestant, bourgeois-rationalist model. Hooper maintains that these are heuristic devices, and they are not completely distinct. Hooper states that the parameters of hegemonic masculinity in the United States have developed over time, and have been consistent since the 19th century.
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Stearns, Segal, Weeks and Connell all agree that by the end of the 19th century a clear and distinct, definitively heterosexual, Anglo-American model of manhood had crystallized, emerging thorough industrialization, bureaucratization, medical classification, British “public schools” . . . and their US counterparts, and imperialism, and that this model has survived, with modifications, as the manly ideal throughout most of the 20th century. 57

Another typology of hegemonic masculinity is described by Robert Brannon and discussed by Christopher T. Kilmartin. Kilmartin contends that “traditional” masculinity in the United States consist of four elements: anti-femininity (“No Sissy Stuff), status and achievement (“The Big Wheel”), inexpressiveness and independence (“The Sturdy Oak” or “The Male Machine”), and adventurousness and aggressiveness (“Give ‘Em Hell”). 58 These elements of masculinity are not static, but change over time. Simultaneously, on an individual level, men negotiate masculinity while constructing identity. Kilmartin, in The Masculine Self, lists the structure of traditional masculinity as including anti-femininity, achievement, self-reliance, and aggression. 59

Cross-cultural gender comparisons performed by cultural anthropologists have indicated that there are some characteristics associated with masculinity that can be found across a variety of cultures. “In the majority of the cultures Gilmore studied [in Manhood in the Making (1990)], masculinity was characterized by strength, risk taking, avoidance of femininity, aggression, and sexual initiative.” 60

57 Ibid., 67.
58 Kilmartin, 7-8.
59 Ibid.
60 Ibid., 109.
Michael Kimmel’s *Manhood in America* makes a variety of remarkable claims about masculinity and its development in the United States. Kimmel argues that “Manhood is less about the drive for domination and more about the fear of others dominating us, having power and control over us.” He furthermore asserts that masculinity is a homosocial enactment. Men perform masculinity for other men. Proving manhood in the United States since the early 19th century has had a core element of homosociality.

Sometimes “crisis points” emerge in the meaning of manhood—when masculinity was seen as threatened and people work hard to try and salvage, revitalize, and resurrect it. A number of wars have been examined regarding the phenomena of remasculinization. In the analysis which follows, the 9/11 attacks constitute the assumed “crisis point” to explore how American masculinity was threatened, and how America was remasculinized. The response to the terrorist attacks—military intervention in Afghanistan—was the way in which Americans (men in particular) remasculinized the country and themselves. The process of remasculinization through foreign policy is examined as well. In later chapters the remasculinization strategies employed by the President, his words to the American people and to the world, are analyzed.

Kimmel argues that there are specific types of masculinity found in the United States including: “Genteel Patriarch,” “Heroic Artisan,” and “Self-Made Man.” To meet the criterion of the current dominant model of masculinity, from Kimmel’s perspective,
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success must be earned, and manhood must be proven—on a constant basis. Success in the market, individual achievement, mobility, and wealth are all important components.  

“Self-Made Man” has not always been the predominant formation. Before the industrial revolution, “Genteel Patriarch” and “Heroic Artisan” models were more important. Furthermore, although it has been one of the primary roles for men in the United States, “Genteel Patriarch” also has been associated with femininity. Kimmel contends that in politics, manhood is used as political currency. For example, Kimmel argues that President Andrew Jackson embodied virulent hypermasculinity and vengeful, punitive political maneuvers. In Jackson’s policies, masculinist rhetoric (also seen on the opposing side) and campaign tactics were employed. Kimmel asserts that the year 1840 marked the “most gendered rhetorical barrage.”

Since 1840 the president’s manhood has always been a question, his manly resolve, firmness, courage and power equated with the capacity for violence, military virtues, and a plain-living style that avoided cultivated refinement and civility.

These elements of a masculine President still resonate with Americans today.

The relationship between the boundaries of “masculinity” and “femininity” are unclear. Some scholars, such as Eve Kosofsky and Gail Rubin, argue that patriarchal heterosexuality “can best be discussed in terms of one or another form of the traffic in women: it is the use of women as exchangeable, perhaps symbolic, property for the
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primary purpose of cementing the bonds of men with men." Sedgwick discusses patriarchy as masculine supremacy, but also as an organization of male sexuality in both hetero and homosexual dimensions. From this perspective, the male "homosocial continuum" structures patriarchal organization, and heterosexuality is for the assignment of economic roles. The most important point is that there are significant differences among men, and they vary along dimensions of class, race, and sexual preferences. Rubin and Sedgwick’s analysis extends the idea that if there is a continuum that could "conceptualize masculinity across a range of bodies, identities and practices,” then women can be placed within the masculine continuum. Masculinity can be disconnected from the male body, which allows consideration of the relationship between gender variance and homosexuality. Judith Halberstam theorizes gender variance and homosexuality in Female Masculinity.

Not all models of masculinity are equal, and as butches and transsexuals begin to lay claims to the kinds of masculinities they have produced in the past and are generating in the present, it is crucial that we also pay careful attention to the function of homophobia and sexism in particular within the new masculinities . . . Gender variance, like sexual variance, cannot be relied on to produce a radical and oppositional politics simply by virtue of representing difference . . . I suggest we think carefully, butches and FTMs [Female-to-Male transsexuals] alike, about the kinds of men or masculine beings that we become and lay claim to: alternative masculinities, ultimately, will fail to change existing gender hierarchies to the extent to which they fail to be feminist, antiracist, and queer.
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Halberstam’s discussion of masculinity without men points out that masculinities are variable, contingent, intersubjectively constructed, and plural. Judith Butler discusses the arguments made above as well, regarding the fact that masculinity must be demonstrated when she uses gay male drag as an example of the “constitutive performativity of gender,” and how heterosexual regulatory strategies normatively align sex, gender, and sexuality.73 She concludes

Gender ought not be construed as a stable identity or locus of agency from which various acts follow; rather, gender is an identity tenuously constituted in time, instituted in an exterior space through a stylized repetition of acts . . . This formulation moves the conception of gender off the ground of a substantial model of identity to one that requires a conception of gender as a constituted social temporality.74

Masculinity is then constituted through intersubjective meanings attached to it, and is variable across groups, time, and place.

Different theorists have developed a variety of components which are important to hegemonic masculinity. Three components stand out to this author: to be masculine a person (or state) should be powerful, should protect and rescue the weak, and should be aggressive, even violent.

Masculinity and American Politics

After the onset of the industrial revolution, men were not judged as manly in the same ways. Previously, a man’s masculinity was more stable, but “in the marketplace American men’s economic, political and social identity was no longer fixed . . . his sense
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of himself as a man was in constant need of demonstration.” Masculinity was demonstrated, performed, and achieved. American men kept the public worlds of work, education, and politics as the homosocial preserves of native-born white men. The solution to civilization has included, variously: self-control, exclusion, and escape. These have provided some of the important themes in the history of American masculinity.

Abolitionist men proposed a manhood based on inclusion and self-expression, opposed to self-control, exclusion, and escape. Support for women’s rights and opposition to slavery brought abolitionists’ manhood into question. In the North, the upper classes intended to reclaim manhood. Black men were making a claim for manhood, for example Frederick Douglass. The US Civil War can be viewed as a conflict between Confederate chivalry and Self-made Yankees. Its conclusion reflected the triumph of urban industrial entrepreneurs over the genteel southern patricians. Southerners were a “doomed aristocracy,” and represented the last stand of the Genteel Patriarch. The South’s loss meant vilification of Southern manhood as feminized. The Union triumph meant manhood rested with the marketplace. The losers experienced gendered humiliation. Southern manhood has since continually attempted to reclaim itself, through an emphasis on independence, self-reliance, and “manly” activities such as hunting and through military service.

Self-control has often meant self-control of sexuality (the so-called “spermatic economy”). Masturbation was considered harmful. Alcohol presented another challenge,
it had become a way of life, in particular binge drinking between 1790 and 1830. Drinking became an expression of masculine protest against feminization at the same time as it was an artisanal protest against proletarianization.\textsuperscript{80}

Women were confined to the domestic sphere, a male creation which was later embraced as domesticity by some women. Men used scientific, religious, and “medical” evidence to “prove” women were not capable in the public sphere. The “Cult of True Womanhood” was invented.\textsuperscript{81} Men relied upon women to meet all of their emotional needs, because all other men were competitors.\textsuperscript{82} Furthermore, because men did not occupy the private sphere, they were separated from their children. They were exiled from home, and could not return because of fears of feminization.

Women constrained manhood, and so men wanted to escape.\textsuperscript{83} “Thus did a portion of the definitions of American manhood become the repudiation of the feminine, a resistance to mothers’ and wives’ efforts to civilize men.”\textsuperscript{84} The Western United States became a safety valve, and promised a free life and “manly hardihood.”\textsuperscript{85} This reflected a change in earlier ideas that man could “lose” civilization in that way. The gold rush was a homosocial preserve, and “man” degenerated into savagery.\textsuperscript{86}

Thoreau argued that men need liberation, the “tonic of the wilderness,” perhaps in some ways to preserve masculinity. Middle class men could escape through fiction about the wilderness, with characters like Carson, Boone, and Crockett. “Equally distinctive
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was the creation of the American myth of mobility, and especially the link between geographic mobility, social mobility, and self re-creation as men.” The “frontier fable” was a dominant theme in American culture in this period. Historical figures were transformed into mythic heroes.

The new American male hero typically had a bond with another male (Tonto, etc.) across races. This reflected white refuge from society and association with the dark-skinned primitive, but the relationship between the hero and his side-kick was not equal. James Fenimore Cooper created a prototype of masculinist flight.

In contemporary politics, as during the Civil War, hegemonic masculinity has been important to the ways in which political leaders have presented themselves and been perceived by others. For example, President John F. Kennedy was cast in a heroic mold, which helped American men feel masculine, but which also contributed to the shock over his assassination.

In the 1960s the masculine mystique, an “impossible synthesis of responsible breadwinner, imperviously stoic master of his mate, and swashbuckling hero—was finally exposed as a fraud.” One of the most important developments was that “One of the most reliable refuges for beleaguered masculinity, the soldier/protector fell into disrepute.” As stated above, aggression and even violence has been a key component to hegemonic masculinity in the United States. Soldiers returning from Vietnam were not celebrated as heroes, they were reviled as “baby-killers.” The United States, and

---

87 Ibid., 64.
88 Ibid., 66.
89 Ibid., 67.
90 Ibid., 262.
91 Ibid., 263.
American men, for a period of time were unable to claim this important part of hegemonic masculinity. The alienation of men was well underway by the 1960s. The breadwinner role, part of hegemonic masculinity through its connection to masculine power, brought few anticipated rewards. Men were categorized as having either “Type A” or “Type B” personalities. “Type A” personalities were the ideal for American manhood: they were men who focused on achievement; however, the relentless striving for success and power also brought isolation. For some, the rewards of American economic growth were a temporary salve, and consumption could not fill the isolation. The antiwar movement then became a central expression of the growing crisis of masculinity.92

Crises have been seen as tests of masculinity. American political leaders who successfully wielded power, protected and rescued people, and used military force have been seen as successful and appropriately masculine to the American people.

[President Lyndon] Johnson appears to have been so deeply insecure that his political rhetoric dripped with metaphors of aggressive masculinity; affairs of state seem to have been conducted as much with the genitals as with political genius.93

Johnson was once reported to have pulled out his penis during a foreign-policy discussion to emphasize his point about American strength. The Johnson administration, with its survival linked to positive outcomes in Vietnam, ultimately failed to prove its masculine credentials. Johnson’s refusal to run for re-election was indicative that he felt people
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believed he had lost his masculinity and could therefore no longer be President of the United States.

President Richard Nixon did not want to appear “soft on communism,” and his approach has been labeled “compulsive manhood.” Nixon’s plan for Vietnam, “Peace with Honor,” provided the United States a way out of the war, or at least a rhetorical ability to say the United States did not “lose” the war. Nixon preserved his masculine credentials. Nevertheless, the “new man” created in the Carter administration was evidently too soon after the trauma of the military loss in Vietnam to be taken seriously. President Carter’s concern for international human rights, and his willingness to engage in international negotiation (particularly with the Soviet Union), in many ways created a persona for him which was considered “feminine.” In contrast, President Ronald Reagan was considered very masculine—strong, protective, and aggressive. Susan Jeffords contends that the 1980s were a period of remasculinization in the US, which she illustrates by exploring popular movies in *The Remasculinization of America: Gender and the Vietnam War*. Jeffords’ analysis of this period is of importance, as she explicitly linked how the loss in Vietnam emasculated America, and how America regained its masculinity afterward. She focused on movies, for example *Rambo* and other violent films, but the Reagan administration was central to remasculinization as well.
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As a country, “The manhood regained under President Reagan and Bush was the compulsive masculinity of the schoolyard bully…”\(^{97}\) and served to remasculinize the United States and American men. The “wimp” became a negative model to attack. President Reagan was overtly masculine. During his first term he challenged the Soviets, labeling the USSR “The Evil Empire” in an effort to combat worldwide communism. Reagan’s continual support for anti-Soviet forces around the globe showed him to be a masculine leader, who could and would demonstrate aggression and violence. Late in his administration Reagan’s negotiations with Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher and Soviet Premier Mikhail Gorbachev did help to bring the Cold War to an end; however, Reagan continued to emphasize he that he negotiated from a position of strength, not weakness.

President George H. W. Bush feared being seen as a wimp, even as he advocated “kinder, gentler” policies of “traditionally aristocratic noblesse oblige.”\(^{98}\) Genteel Patriarchs were considered indolent wimps; however, President G. H. W. Bush did “demonstrate” his own personal masculinity and American manhood while in office by authorizing the US invasion of Panama.\(^{99}\) Later, his struggle to overcome the “wimp factor” was successful after the United States, with the cooperation of the United Nations, ousted the Iraqis from Kuwait.

President Bill Clinton also used the “tough but tender” strain of masculinity in his military interventions in Bosnia. Clinton was unwilling to put troops on the ground, given the memory of Vietnam, but pushed for NATO intervention in the wars in Bosnia.

\(^{97}\) Kimmel, 292.
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He emphasized rescuing the innocents who had been trapped by warring parties, and rescuing the weak.

The social movements in the 1960s and 1970s critiqued traditional masculinity; the marketplace and the political arena were no longer exclusive to heterosexual white men.\textsuperscript{100} The Civil Rights movement challenged racial supremacy. The Civil Rights movement was also gendered—black men asserted their masculinity, whether moderate and radical. The Second Wave of the Women’s Movement in the 1970s challenged male dominance. Feminism directly criticized patriarchy, and the Women’s Movement affected men personally and politically.\textsuperscript{101} The Stonewall Riots in 1969 began the vibrant (and quite successful) gay rights movement, which continues to contest traditional norms about sexuality and gender. Traditional masculinity includes a fear of homosexuality. Gay liberation challenged the idea that gay men were failed men – in fact, many were hypermasculine.

After the feminist movement in the 1970s, many more women emerged in higher education and the workplace. Women were empowered, and they demanded governmental protection from men. Because of the Civil Rights Acts, women could make choices in many areas of life which had not been available before. Furthermore, they demanded that men change. Many men resisted, and their resistance was reflected in academics and in popular culture. For example, men harassed women in the workplace, and began to talk about men as the “last minority” group. Many men advocated a return to the breadwinner role for males and to the domestic sphere for
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females. One effect of the social changes in the United States was that the position of “other” began to erode. The “other”—women, blacks, gays, etc.—were those who had been excluded previously. The “other” helped men define themselves as “real men.” Once the “other” was gone it became increasingly difficult to define “real men.”

The emergence of the “Men’s Liberation” movement, using feminist ideals, also challenged traditional manhood in American. Men’s liberation participants questioned why, if men are so powerful, did they live lives of “quiet desperation”? Men’s liberation theorists began to understand traditional masculinity as a burden, a form of oppression. They attacked the male sex role, and the expectations placed by society on men.102

Men’s confusion emerged because the structural foundations of traditional manhood—economic independence, geographic mobility, domestic dominance—had all been eroding.103 Men experienced downward mobility. Men felt beleaguered and besieged. What to do? One option was to revive Self-Made Manhood—angry white males purposively returning to traditional, hegemonic masculinity. Susan Faludi argues that American men reacted with a “backlash,” and pushed back against the forces eroding traditional masculinity. The nuclear family in the United States has traditionally been seen by conservatives, and others, as the foundation of a free society. Men are the real victims in society, they argue. “Contemporary masculinists believe that men are still wimps; they need to be rescued from the clutches of overprotective mothers, absent fathers, and an enervating workplace and need to rediscover themselves through a manly
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quest against a pitiless environment.”¹⁰⁴ Ways to accomplish this include the workplace, fitness, travel, and development of military masculinity. Critics argue that “The quest for manliness is essentially right-wing, puritanical, cowardly, neurotic, and fueled largely by a fear of women.”¹⁰⁵

This research explores which elements of masculinity appeared to be hegemonic both before and after 9/11, and how the United States constructed its international identity in gendered terms after the emasculation of the terrorist attacks. Some elements of American hegemonic masculinity were emphasized and used to remasculinize the image of the United States and of American men, while other strands of hegemonic masculinity were reduced in importance. The research examines which elements of American masculinity were most heavily emphasized by President Bush at that time, and attempts to discern why, and how.

Masculinity and International Relations

According to feminist international relations scholars, international relations are steeped in images of masculinity, as is much social science research. “Feminist work on epistemology has made it abundantly clear that the knowing mind of traditional epistemology is axiomatically a male mind.”¹⁰⁶ Traditional approaches in international relations replicate cultural ideologies of gender. To more clearly understand processes of international relations, including military intervention, masculinity and gender ideologies must be exposed and purposefully analyzed. Traditional approaches in international

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., 309.
¹⁰⁵ Ibid., 295, quoting novelist Paul Theroux.
¹⁰⁶ Smith, 47.
relations all rely upon gender ideologies: all approaches are gendered. Thus, realist, neo-conservative or other approaches to explaining foreign policy outcomes are not helpful when analyzing the effects of gender on foreign policy. Traditional approaches do not scrutinize gender and the important role of masculinity.

The international arena is a place where competing hegemonic interpretations of male power and manliness struggle for predominance. For example, some have argued the US military confrontations in Panama (1989) and the Persian Gulf (1990-1) were struggles over contending versions of masculinity as well as battles over land. As Luke Ashworth and Larry Swatuk point out, competition between realist and neorealist theories of international relations has often been couched in masculinist terms, each side arguing that it represents “real” masculine values and practices. Thus international politics, war, and peacemaking are particularly revealing sites for understanding the construction of, and competition among, different hegemonic masculinities.107

US foreign policy decision-makers (both men and women) are socialized within a masculinist milieu; they are the elite and therefore conform to dominant masculine roles. Decision-makers’ perceptions are shaped by a masculinist belief system, and it is precisely that gender ideology which is of interest here. American decision-makers are socialized to think of the world in competitive, winner-take-all scenarios—a product of masculinism’s effect on how men are socialized. Realism’s ubiquitous presence within

---

the foreign policy discourse reinforces pre-existing “male-as-competitor” ideas gathered from the notions of masculinity pervasive in society.\(^{108}\)

Although states, in English, are frequently referred to as “her,” or with the pronoun “she,” feminist international relations theorists have established that states are generally considered to be masculine in nature. Feminist international relations theorists have illustrated that international relations discourse is masculine, and the state is reified as a single entity, which frequently is considered male. The “rational actor” is also male, and decision-makers are theoretically “rational” in traditional international relations theory (particularly in realist and neo-realist versions). As Hoganson has argued in *Fighting for American Manhood*, often the United States is portrayed as male, and frequently opponents and/or countries in need of help are portrayed as exhibiting feminine characteristics.\(^{109}\) Furthermore, in a Presidential system, the President, as Head-of-State, often personifies the nation. Presidents personify the United States, and their gender ideologies inform and shape both decision-making and the way in which they explain the nature of conflicts to the American people. Presidents’ conceptions of masculinity, how those relate to foreign policy decisions, and how they affect the way a president presents those decisions to the American public are crucial points of exploration for scholars to better understand the role masculinity plays in foreign policy.

Military intervention is frequently described in gendered terms and often is justified as necessary to protect or rescue innocent victims. One important component of the discourse on humanitarian rights violations is the suffering of *innocents*. J. Ann


\(^{109}\) Hoganson and Jeffords.
Tickner writes, “When women fight for their rights, they generally get less support than when they are perceived as victims.”110 The emphasis that victims are *innocent*, frequently coupled with the familiar phrase, used so frequently it is now virtually a word, *women and children*, makes those particular deaths mysteriously more meaningful because of the construction of gendered social relations and the special, protected nature of *women and children*.111

Post 9/11 Feminist Analysis

Scholars, citizens, and policymakers continue to debate the effects of the 9/11 attacks on American society and on the balance between liberty and security in the United States. Questions persist regarding the global war on terror and how successful the United States has been in taking the war from American soil to the enemy. The Bush Administration’s decision to fight the war by invading Iraq made these issues much more complex. The effects of the 9/11 attacks on constructions of American masculinity and on the makeup of hegemonic masculinity is the focus of this study, specifically how it may have shaped the way the President advocated US intervention in Afghanistan. Now that some time has passed since the attacks, the question of whether “remasculinization” has occurred can be addressed. It is also now possible to examine whether or not political leaders have continued to be engaged in maintaining an image of the United States with a more masculine international posture than was the case before the 9/11 attacks.

111 Carpenter, Brownmiller, and Enloe.
Since the focus here is on the intervention in Afghanistan, at least a brief discussion of the conventional explanation for the post 9/11 US military intervention in Afghanistan, and the way in which it was approached and debated in the media, and between the administration and American citizens, is in order. The primary explanation by the Bush Administration is that the United States took national defense to a new level by going after terrorists and the countries that harbored them. Bush declared war on terrorism and on Bin Laden. For some, this was a new “neo-conservative” approach for foreign policy: pre-emption. As this research contends, however, the reactions of President Bush and his administration to the terrorist attacks were essentially an emotional response, one with connotations of revenge and payback (or, more mildly, justice) for the victims of 9/11. Explanations without an explicit examination of the gendered ideologies upon which Bush’s arguments rested are incomplete. How and why did President Bush and his administration specifically make reference to American gender norms while arguing in favor of military intervention in Afghanistan? What gendered language was used by the administration? Upon which American gender ideologies was the response based? We cannot fully understand the intervention in Afghanistan without examining the Bush administration and its reliance on ideas, norms and behaviors associated with hegemonic masculinity in the United States.

Many feminist writers have examined the effects of the attacks on gender ideologies in the United States, with much of the analysis published relatively soon after the terrorist attacks occurred. Some feminist writers focused on how the media and the Bush Administration defined the “heroes” of 9/11, and the subsequent increased attention
the American media placed on firefighters as a cultural icon of heroism. For example, Judith Lorber has said that the “heroes” of 9/11 were working class men, and both firefighters and terrorists displayed heroism, “and so, as in most wars, we were presented with two very different types of masculinity – the ‘good-doers’ and the ‘evildoers.’”112

Obviously “our guys” were the good-doers. Al-Qaeda terrorists displayed masculinity, but not heroic masculinity (for Americans). Janice Haaken writes that “In the political choreographing of the war on terrorism, Muslim men are cast in the role of the ‘bad’ patriarchs and the United States in the role of the ‘good’ protectors, the guardians of women’s freedom.”113 Lydia Potts and Silke Wenk contend

As visual media and political discourse suggest daily, it is necessary to reestablish masculinity and male virtues—in order to defend the interests of the “civilized world.” Masculinity thereby performs itself once more as representing “humanity” and “civilization”—at the same time denying and de-naming gender.114

Although masculinity was emphasized, it was not specifically addressed. Few people overtly linked masculinity and the response to the terrorist attacks. Masculinity was resurgent after the 9/11 attacks, but subtly and in ways that were not explicit to everyone. Susan J. Brison, in “Gender, Terrorism and War,” writes

Back home in the United States, masculinity, having been sorely tested, emerged newly secure and celebrated. What women really wanted, we were told, is brawny firefighters

and police officers—strong men to protect them (against whom? Other strong men?).\textsuperscript{115}

She focuses, as others do, on how people responding to the attacks in New York, Washington, D.C., and on airplanes, became culture icons to be valorized. Not only were these men heroes, says the cultural message, but these offer examples of real men.

Moreover, firefighters were not the only men who were valorized after the terrorist attacks. Marita Sturken writes

> The image of courage has fixated on the firefighters, but it has also included the traders who called home and spoke in loving terms to family members when they knew they were trapped, and the airplane passengers who decided to fight rather than passively meet their deaths. The men of Flight 93 are now legendary for their physical brawn and for their can-do, take-care-of-it spirit. Those who died in the World Trade Center were from the scrappy, eager, work-your-way-up-the-ladder segment of Wall Street.\textsuperscript{116}

The masculine qualities of these men were emphasized and celebrated, their strength, their assertiveness, and their aggression.

Criticism of those who died in the World Trade Center was poorly received. Dr. Ward Churchill, a former University of Colorado at Boulder Professor of Ethnic Studies, learned this after then-Colorado Governor Bill Owens called for his termination. Churchill eventually lost his position because of alleged plagiarism, due to an investigation that some have argued was prompted by his remarks that the people who died at the World Trade Center were “Little Eichmans.”


J. Ann Ticker, as well, in her article “Feminist Perspectives on 9/11,” contended that gendered images changed after 9/11. She says

Carol Gilligan notes that men’s rising star all but eclipsed that of the many heroic women who rose to the occasion. If we did see women they were likely to be faceless Afghan women in the now familiar burqa. Their shadowy and passive presence seemed only to reinforce these gendered images.

Heroic deeds performed by women in New York, the Pentagon, and onboard the hijacked airplanes were not the images of women Americans saw after the terrorist attacks. Instead, when women were the focus, it was the image of an Afghan woman who needed to be rescued by a hero.

Diana Taylor argued that there was an instant feminization of the loss on 9/11, and a masculinist rush to save the day.

The attacks immediately triggered the same old scenario: evil barbarians, threatened damsels, and heroic males drawn from repertoire of frontier lore. “Evil” wrongdoers attack the righteous defenders of manifest destiny or, in Bush’s words, “the brightest beacon for freedom and opportunity in the world.” His claim that the peace-loving, virtuous United States will “go forward to defend freedom and all that is good and just in our world” sounds prophetic. But it points backward as much as it points forward. It’s the language that justified the “race of hardy pioneers” (Anglo-Saxons) fighting off “barbarians” and “savages” (racially degraded), that justified expropriating “unused” lands held by Native Americans and Mexicans, and that justified killing these populations based on claims that evildoers had abducted white women. In 1898, images of Uncle Sam and Lady Liberty continued to justify the US colonial domination of Puerto Rico, Cuba, and the Philippines. These scenarios of gendered and racial domination are so predictable that we could write the script. The fetishized male in uniform saves the lady from the dark.

---
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menacing other, though we all know it’s about territorial control and oil wells.  

By sending American troops to Afghanistan, the United States became the hero in uniform, saving “the lady” (Afghanistan) from the “dark menacing other” (Al Qaeda and the Taliban).

Afghan women themselves, previously hidden victims of Al Qaeda, became extremely important symbols in the gendered ideological justification for the intervention in Afghanistan. Afghanistan became, symbolically, the “damsel in distress,” and the United States could reclaim its masculinity—its honor—by “rescuing” Afghanistan from the “evildoers.” At the same time, more importantly, the United States reclaimed its own masculinity by becoming “the hero,” and in turn reclaimed the masculinity of American men. One of the gender images supporting hegemonic masculinity is that of man as rescuer, protector, the “knight-in-shining-armor.” The United States could not be a victim, because victims are weak (feminine). It had to transfer its own “victimhood” to the women in Afghanistan, and instead become the “hero,” simultaneously rescuing Afghanistan from the evildoers, and regaining power over the situation, regaining control through aggression. The US military became the arm of remasculinization—the army used guns, missiles, and bombs to hurt the enemy, and remasculinize the United States, transforming it from victim to hero. America “rescued itself.”

After the terrorist attacks on 9/11, remasculinization could be observed in many areas of American life. The United States became a hero, and inside the country, men who acted bravely were valorized. Tickner has argued that remasculinization occurred at

---

the cultural level in the aftermath of the terrorist attacks. “Masculinity is back in vogue in the United States. Since 9/11, the male hero has been a predominant cultural image, presenting a beefy front of strength to a nation seeking steadiness and emotional grounding.”119 This subject will be of particular focus in the chapter on Afghanistan, how the intervention there was informed by masculine ideals and how the intervention represented an attempt at the remasculinization of American society through American use of force.

Hollywood has produced its own versions of those events. “World Trade Center,” directed by Oliver Stone and starring Hollywood tough-guy Nicolas Cage, poignantly detailed the heroism of police officers and firefighters who entered the burning towers. It was a “memorial of heroism and courage.”120 The rescue of two Port Authority police officers depicted the officers as valiant, brave, and stoic while buried beneath the rubble. They were also shown as dedicated family men, working class guys who struggled with marriage and family but kept it together. “World Trade Center” does not put the attacks on 9/11 into a political context, although some of the characters vow to “get the bastards” responsible. It was not only the heroic actions of the two main characters that the film emphasized, but the risk that many firefighters, police officers, medics and others took to rescue these two men. Notably, all of the rescuers were men.

Another film about 9/11 is “United 93,” which valorized the courage of ordinary men in challenging the airplane high-jackers. The narrative of this heroic story is now familiar to Americans. Ordinary men on that flight willingly sacrificed their lives to foil

119 Tickner, 4.
120 Internet Movie Database Inc., User Comments, (accessed 8/11/06).
the terrorists’ plot. Bush repeated their words he argued for intervention in Afghanistan:
“Let’s roll.”

Masculinity and Power

“Hegemonic” masculinity, in any culture, is that form of masculinity that is privileged, meaning those traits which are associated with hegemonic masculinity are most valued in the culture.\textsuperscript{121} Charlotte Hooper argues “hegemonic masculinity gets transformed, through constant challenges and struggles, to resemble whatever traits happen to be most strategically useful for the getting and keeping of power.”\textsuperscript{122} Hooper focuses on the material relationships between men and women, and the importance of power, aggression, and control. The material relations of masculinity mean that men dominate women’s material reality.

Men here refers to that gender class of people who so benefit from particular material relations around reproduction, housework, sexuality, violence, or emotional/care work beyond early child work. Thus men may be seen as simply the class that benefits from particular material relations over women.\textsuperscript{123}

Gender ideologies are founded upon these material relations. Other scholars concur with the emphasis on power, including Michael Kimmel and Michael Kaufman, two leading theorists in masculinity studies.

\textsuperscript{121} Conner
\textsuperscript{122} Hooper, 61.
Michael Kimmel states: “The hegemonic definition of manhood is a man in power, a man with power, and a man of power.”\(^{124}\) Michael Kaufman agrees, and writes that “The common feature of the dominant forms of contemporary masculinity is that manhood is equated with having some sort of power.”\(^{125}\) Power is an essential element to the contemporary configuration of hegemonic masculinity. Hegemonic masculinity in the United States has a variety of elements, from different sources, but one form of masculinity is hegemonic. It is a masculinity that is powerful, and other “non-powerful” masculine constructions are subordinate to it.

Brannon, Kilmartin, and others, argue masculinity is anti-femininity. Masculinity is expressly constructed as a rejection of the feminine. Men are strong, women are weak, according to this theory. For example, the expression “No Sissy Stuff” means “males are encouraged from an early age to avoid behaviors, interests, and personality traits that are considered ‘feminine.’”\(^{126}\) Male dominance is a related element: men must not only reject femininity, but they must dominate and control women to be men.

One naturalizes male dominance in social practice and discourse, claiming orthodoxy for its known rules, and rarely if ever reaches the underlying doxa of male insecurity and fear of returning to the original embrace of the mother and the feminine.\(^{127}\)

Constructing masculinity occurs in opposition, both to women and non-hegemonic men.

“Through American history, various groups have represented the sissy, the non-men


\(^{126}\) Kilmartin, 7.

against whom American men played out their definitions of manhood, often with vicious results.”

Masculinity does not emerge naturally, and the construction of masculinity involves the rejection of those traits associated with femininity. Masculinity is not granted with a Y chromosome, it is created and maintained. An anthropologist, Gilmore, contends this is a cross-cultural phenomenon. As Kaufman states, “Gilmore also noted that, in most of the world, masculinity is regarded as an achievement—something that the culture must build into males through various socialization processes.”

Masculinity is a reaction against passivity and powerlessness, and with it comes a repression of a vast range of human desires and possibilities: those that are associated with femininity.

Men are powerful, not passive, and men’s power must be continually witnessed for them to be considered masculine.

Masculinity is a homosocial enactment, in homosocial environments. “Manhood is demonstrated for other men’s approval.”

Men also fear one another, fear powerlessness (even though when they are powerful), and fear humiliation, primarily because powerlessness is associated with femininity. “Male dominance is real, with very real effect, yet it is built on insecurity and fear of loss of masculinity through the (subversive) action of women or other men.” As Kimmel puts it, “The fear of emasculation by other men, of being humiliated, is the leitmotif in my reading of the
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history of American manhood.‖ Furthermore, men must suppress that fear. Men should be brave, not afraid. Hegemonic masculinity usually, but not always, requires that all emotions except anger be suppressed; therefore, constructing masculinity is a process of suppressing emotions, needs, and possibilities, including fear, pain, and many more, including all emotions associated with femininity.

In more concrete terms the acquisition of hegemonic (and most subordinate) masculinities is a process through which men come to suppress a range of emotions, needs, and possibilities, such as nurturing, receptivity, empathy, and compassion, which are experienced as inconsistent with the power of manhood.

Men are required not only to “perform” masculinity, but also to reject and suppress any actions or emotions which have been culturally defined as feminine.

Masculinity and Man as Rescuer

One cultural icon of masculinity, from a fairy tale, is Prince Charming. In A Knight in Shining Armor: Understanding Men’s Romantic Illusions, Dr. Harvey A. Hornstein discusses Prince Charming.

Prince Charming is a fairy-tale character, but he can’t be written off as simply make-believe. Fairy tales are more than meaningless fiction. They are to a society what furniture is to a well designed room: It blends in, both reflecting and supporting the motif of the room. Fairy tales, too, express, reflect, and support society’s motif in the advice that they give about fundamental human concerns: the importance and meaning of truth, beauty, courage, cowardice, greed, envy, loyalty, and love.

---
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Hornstein argues the Prince Charming-type is seen in many Man-Rescues-Woman fairy tales.

Prince Charming and other male-rescuers are not your everyday Joes. These men kill, outwit, imprison, and otherwise immobilize fantastic adversaries. They defeat witches, ogres, ogresses, sorcerers (the evil kind), and various monsters. Oceans, dark woods, deserts, mountains, valleys, pits, raging rivers, caves, and caverns are mastered by these heroes.  

Prince Charming is strong, rescues women in distress, and is also a warrior. This cultural image is potent when examining the remasculinization that took place after the attacks on 9/11 humiliated—and feminized—Bush and the United States. One could interpret Bush as a Prince-Charming-type, a hero who was stronger and better than other men, a rescuer who battled a terrifying adversary. Bush represented America, so American men re-claimed masculinity by challenging an enemy that committed unspeakable acts, acts which humiliated the United States, and by rescuing the damsel in distress—Afghanistan.

Masculinity, Violence, and the Warrior Image

In *The Masculine Self*, Christopher T. Kilmartin, using evidence from Brannon, lists the structure of traditional masculinity as including: antifemininity, achievement, self-reliance, and aggression.  

Because he is using a sociological perspective, however, Kilmartin argues that these traits are not innate. He asserts that American culture has both violence-encouraging and violence-inhibiting factors. He lists as violence-encouraging factors the following: separation, objectification, externalizing defensive

---
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style, over-attention to task, reinforcement, violent models and vicarious reinforcement, drug use, social expectations, low masculine self-esteem, and peer support. As Kilmartin asserts, the construction of a “masculine self” is very much affected by social expectations, models, peer reinforcement, and peer support. Whether masculinity is based on “innate” characteristics or is socially constructed is a key question for a vast number of people who research human behavior, but it is a question that remains unanswered. Theorists vary widely in the attention they focus on culture versus biological masculine traits. In this study, it is assumed that both biological and cultural traits contribute to the cultural definition of masculinity, and that since the meaning of masculinity is subject to change, culture plays an extraordinarily important role.

Not only are ideal men “knights in-shining-armor,” meaning rescuers and honorable gentleman, they are warriors as well. Masculine violence is institutionalized in the military, and the military plays a crucial role in creating and reinforcing hegemonic masculinity in the United States. One of the essential hegemonic images of the male is the warrior.

The warrior still seems to be a key symbol of masculinity….The stance, the facial expressions, and the weapons clearly connote aggression, courage, a capacity for violence, and, sometimes, willingness for sacrifice. The warrior symbolizes aggression, courage, violence, and sacrifice, all valorized traits of masculinity.

---
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A social constructionist explanation of cross-cultural similarities in masculinities is that many cultures have found it necessary to defend land and compete for scarce resources in order to survive, and that the gender ideology of men as risk-taking, aggressive, powerful, and dominant provided a cultural context for men as hunters and warriors.\(^\text{140}\)

The state’s identity has been affected as well. “The image of the warrior will come to personify the society, and individual soldiers will be called on to identify their occupation with the core values of the nation.”\(^\text{141}\) These phenomena can be observed regarding the United States. Around the world, America is associated with, and represented by, American troops in combat. Furthermore, “The changes in the military and the changes in the gender order are mutually dependent. Changes in the military and the conduct of war have an effect on dominant images of embodied masculinities.”\(^\text{142}\)

“Men” achieve that status not only by violence toward self, other men, and women, but also through their participation in institutionalized violence. According to Robyn Weigman

Because the so-called theater of war functions in modern technological cultures as the primary scene of masculinity’s hegemonic performance, Jefford’s investigation [of the remasculinization of America after the Vietnam War] simultaneously situated the homosocial prominently within the national imaginary and detailed the ways in which popular culture by the end of the twentieth century functioned as the symptomatic domain for the production of masculinity as spectacle. In the proliferation of this spectacle, which is to say in its incessant visuality, Jeffords culled a vocabulary for thinking not only about crucial
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distinctions between patriarchy and masculinity but about
the historically specific structural relationships between
gendered discourses and social differences among men. 143

One of the ways masculinities are produced is through spectacle in the popular culture,
primarily focused on militarized masculinity. Jefford’s focus on the remasculinization of
America through popular culture spectacle after the Vietnam War (Rambo films and the
like) illustrates how much masculinity is constructed through the experience of war.
Frameworks of meaning are constructed within the masculinist culture that exists in the
United States.

Masculinity and militarization are entwined, as many theorists have acknowledged and discussed.

Feminists from India, Zimbabwe, and Japan to Britain, the United States, Serbia, Chile, South Korea, Palestine, Israel, and Algeria all have found that when they have followed
the bread crumbs of privileged masculinity, they have been led time and again not just to the doorstep of the military, but to the threshold of all those social institutions that
promote militarization. 144

Given discourses on the “innate” aggressive nature of masculinity, and the warrior ideal
type, it is not surprising that the institution of the military is constitutive of our society.
There are many examples in American history of masculinism’s impact on the private
decisions of politicians, and in the public discourse. During the era of the Spanish-
American War,

To win political authority, men had to appear manly. The partisan press thus went to great lengths to portray its

favored politicians as magnificent specimens of manhood and their opponents as manly . . . They reinforced the conviction that electoral politics rested not just on men, but on a specific kind of manly character.\textsuperscript{145}

Another example is President George H. W. Bush concerns about being considered weak, and the efforts put forward to combat the “wimp factor.”

Relationships between men are mutually hostile yet sometimes emotionally close—an active/passive equilibrium which must be maintained. “Within the masculine psychology of surplus aggression, expressions of affection and of the need for other boys had to be balanced by an active assault.”\textsuperscript{146} Militaries take advantage of both the “buddy” and the “opponent” relationships. State militaries manage and exploit gender ideologies regarding masculinity to create soldiers. Soldiers are culturally defined as exclusively male. As both Cynthia Enloe and Carol Cohn discuss, militaries promulgate a masculine stereotype which is aggressive, and distinctively non-feminine.

One of the ways the masculine nature of the US military can be understood is through analysis of public debate on gays in the military.

The congressional hearings sparked by Clinton’s order and the public discussions that surrounded them suggest a different concern—not about gays in the military per se but about the cultural meaning of the military as an institution. What is so upsetting and unacceptable is not homosexuals in the military but having people who are openly gay in the military—having the military appear as anything other than a strictly heterosexual institution.\textsuperscript{147}

\textsuperscript{146} Kaufman, 19.
The military is a guarantor and producer of masculinity. It cannot include homosexuals, because masculinity in the United States is defined as heterosexual. “The traditional definition of masculinity is not only surplus aggression. It is also exclusive heterosexuality, for the maintenance of masculinity requires the repression of homosexuality.”

Masculinity in the United States is challenged by the possibility of openly gay men serving in the armed forces.

The rape of enemy women has typically been understood as soldiers’ personal, sexual spoils of war. Not only are victorious soldiers frequently allowed to rape enemy women, armies have used systematic rape as a tool of war. Raping the enemy’s women is a weapon because it attacks the masculinity of the enemy who is vanquished: they are no longer men because they failed in their jobs to protect their women and children. For example, the rape of Muslim women in the wars in Bosnia was designed to demoralize and effectively “ethnically cleanse” areas so that other groups could take land.

Male aggressiveness frequently has been related to the role of the military in society, and how states should socialize men to become soldiers. Kaufman argues that violence is integral to the constitution of masculinity. One of most important ways masculinities perform is through the demonstration of violence.

On a psychological level the pervasiveness of violence is the result of what Herbert Marcuse called the “surplus repression” of our sexual and emotional desires. The substitution of violence for desire (more precisely, the transmutation of violence into a form of emotionally gratifying activity) happens unequally in men and women.

---
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The construction of masculinity involves the construction of “surplus aggressiveness.” The social context of this triad of violence is the institutionalization of violence in the operation of most aspects of social, economic, and political life.\textsuperscript{150}

Men, according to Kaufman, are violent toward themselves, toward women, and toward other men. They are conditioned to do so through identity construction.

There are also socio-biological (also called “evolutionary biology”) notions of “innate” male aggressive behavior and its links to testosterone. These can be observed within the masculinist discourse regarding male competition. For example, one familiar gendered conception is of the “alpha male” defeating other male opponents to be rewarded with females. This is a cruder version of the Prince Charming metaphor, discussed above. The naturalization of so-called “innate” male aggressive behavior and the idea of an “alpha male” emerge from comparisons between human behavior and the behavior of animals.

As discussed above, sometimes innate aggressiveness is tied to rape. “Rape is a crime that not only demonstrates physical power, but that does so in the language of male-female sex-gender relations.”\textsuperscript{151} Rape is a violent crime, an act of violence against women and is an expression of male rage. Many cultures have condoned or ignored rape because cultural stereotypes reinforce myths, that men cannot control their aggressive sexual appetites, and that some women seek rape, or tease men, or cry rape when they regret the sexual incident later.

\textsuperscript{151} Kaufman, p. 17.
Christianity and American Masculinity

Tickner has argued that since the terrorist attacks, religious fundamentalists, both Christian and Islamic, have used the 9/11 crisis to criticize women’s advances. This tendency reflects a much more general phenomenon. As many feminists have pointed out, all fundamentalist religions are, to varying degrees, bad for women. “There is no major religion in which the inferiority of women, and God’s wish to place them and their dangerous polluting sexuality under male control, has not been a central theme.” The connection between religious fanaticism, be it Christian, Judaic, or Islamic, and the suppression of women is almost universal. The patriarchal family, with its control of women, is usually central to fundamentalist movements and often seen as the panacea for social ills.¹⁵²

Tickner does not differentiate between a fundamentalist and a fanatic; clearly a religious person can be a fundamentalist without being a fanatic. Nevertheless, the important point is that fundamentalism, at least in Christianity (and in other religions, as noted above), emphasizes the inferiority of women.

What is the version of masculinity advocated by fundamentalist Christianity? Kimmel argues “Christian life essentially contains a warlike aspect [and] the military virtues are essential to it.”¹⁵³ Warlike societies give war toys their male children, to develop boys’ masculinity. Playing war is a socialization tool to train boys to become fighting men.

The evangelical movement’s political involvement emerged in the late 1970s as a reaction to the Civil Rights Movement, the Women’s Movement, and the elimination of prayer in public schools. The gay rights movement also became an extremely important

¹⁵² Hornstein, 20.
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issue for American Christian conservatives. Carol Flake contends that the revival of evangelism brought with it a revival of muscular Christianity. Contemporary televangelist, the Reverend Jerry Falwell, has asserted “Christ was a he-man.”

As Hooper points out, the patriarchal Judeo-Christian model emphasizes the role of the father and subordinates women. Fundamentalist Christianity in the United States emphasizes that the proper roles for women are as mother and wife. Politically, fundamentalist Christians in the United States have opposed the Equal Rights Amendment, abortion, no-fault divorce laws, and the movement of women into the paid workforce. Overall, Christian fundamentalists believe women are subordinate to men, and that women’s subordination is ordained by God.

Some versions of Christianity emphasize that men are the heads of the household and the decision-makers. James C. Dobson, Director of Focus on the Family, writes

It is important to understand some of the other ways men and women are unique if we hope to live together in harmony. Genesis tells us that the Creator made two sexes, not one, and that He designed each gender for a specific purpose. Take a good look at the male and female anatomy and it becomes obvious that we were crafted to “fit” together. This is not only true in a sexual context but psychologically as well . . . How unfortunate has been the recent effort to deny this uniqueness and homogenate the human family! It simply won’t square with the facts.

Dr. Dobson argues for these among the differences between the genders: men and women differ in every cell because of the difference in chromosome combinations; woman has “greater constitutional vitality” (women live longer, on average); basal

154 Kimmel, 312.
155 Focus on the Family, Moral Majority, Stop-ERA.
metabolic differences; differences in skeletal structures; internal organ differences; 

women menstruate, can be pregnant, and lactate; differences in blood content; men are 
physically stronger; women’s hearts beat more rapidly and have lower tendency toward 
high blood pressure; and women can stand higher temperatures than men.\textsuperscript{157} Dobson 
goes on to discuss additional differences beyond the physiological.

Love is linked to self-esteem in women. For a man, 
romantic experiences with his wife are warm and enjoyable 
and memorable—but not necessary. For a woman, they are 
her lifeblood. Her confidence, her sexual response and her 
zest for living are often directly related to those tender 
moments when she feels deeply loved and appreciated by 
her man.\textsuperscript{158}

Regarding the role of women as homemakers, Dr. Dobson argues

One masculine need comes to mind that wives should not 
fail to heed. It reflects what men want most in their homes 
... Competition is so fierce in the workplace today, and the 
stresses of pleasing a boss and surviving professionally are 
so severe, that the home needs to be a haven to which a 
man can return.\textsuperscript{159}

Dobson contends that women’s roles are different than men’s roles, and those differences 
are of particular importance to men. Men need a safe place, a refuge, from the demands 
and competition in the paid workforce.

\textsuperscript{157} Ibid. 
\textsuperscript{158} Ibid. 
\textsuperscript{159} Ibid.
Conclusion

Gender ideologies in the United States valorize hegemonic masculinity, and men—particularly political leaders—are widely expected to conform to the norms of hegemonic masculinity. A political leader’s masculinity, whether he (or she) conforms to the dominant view of how men act and what they do, is extremely important to policy success. This is particularly true of the US President. The President must display masculine traits, and respond in masculine ways to foreign policy challenges, lest he (or she) be derided for being “soft” or “weak,” like a woman. Women leaders around the world must struggle with this issue daily. For example, during Hillary Rodham Clinton’s run for the Democratic Nomination in 2008, she had to project strength, and was criticized for appearing weak. American Presidents must emphasize American power and strength, its nature as masculine, and reinforce that with American military strength to demonstrate aggression. Presidents also employ masculine notions such as the man/nation as rescuer when the foreign policy situation is suitable. Although masculinity is changeable, in its hegemonic form, change comes slowly and many of the components of American hegemonic masculinity existed long before the United States did.
Chapter 4

President George W. Bush as a Masculine Leader

Introduction

As the “rational decision-maker” is male, and in the United States the primary foreign policy decision-maker is the President, research into the decision-making processes of military intervention must address the President’s personality and other character traits. The analysis of President Bush as a masculine leader is a narrative approach to exploring how his actions seem to demonstrate his decision-making processes as affected by his understanding of masculinity and his own role as president. This is one way to investigate how hegemonic masculinity shapes presidential decision-making.

Generally, in international relations, research into foreign policy decision-making occurs at three different “levels of analysis”: the individual-level, the state-level, and the systems-level. This project’s research, because of its genesis from the standpoint approach, will examine decision-making incorporating all of these levels. How Bush’s foreign policy decision-making has been affected by his own personality, upbringing, faith, the ways in which his ideas about himself as a masculine leader and his understanding of hegemonic masculinity, and the way in which he viewed himself as president and leader of the United States will all be discussed to examine the ways in which those factors have shaped his decision-making. The ways in which Bush’s foreign
policy decisions were made within the institutions of government (dominated by masculinity, masculine-derived metaphors, and an androcentric workplace) are also of importance. American culture’s gender ideologies have not only shaped the ways in which Bush, as the President, conducted himself, but also the ways in which his advisors discussed international issues with him.

Another important component is how the Bush administration, due to potential concerns of loyalty, security, and idiosyncratic rationales, insulated itself from opposing views. This kind of situation involving a small, highly prestigious group of decision-makers, under overwhelming pressure after the terrorist attacks, demonstrates clear elements of crisis decision-making. The nature of the decision-making after the terrorist attacks, made it vulnerable to groupthink.\(^{160}\) The “masculine” nature of the response was in many ways shaped by groupthink, and the gender ideologies common to those decision-makers. As far as the systems-level approach, this research, by its very nature, cannot factor out individual differences between decision-makers or states; however, gender ideologies are prevalent at the systemic level as well.

The chapter begins with an exploration of Bush’s gender ideologies (especially with regard to masculinity), and how he conceptualized international politics in gendered ways, ergo as evidenced by his actions and the rhetoric with which he effected policies. This research examines how Bush himself understands hegemonic masculinity in particular, what he thinks it is to be manly, and how it is that a man should act. How did Bush’s conceptions about masculinity affect his decision-making, regarding both content

\(^{160}\) Group think is a well-developed subfield in international politics scholarship, which has examined how small groups of decisionmakers in prestigious positions can make poor policy decisions.
and message? Bush’s psychological makeup, his religious convictions, his upbringing, family dynamics and other factors were all relevant to Bush’s decision-making.

There is also, however, the necessary point that the role of the Presidency in the United States superimposes additional pressures shaping decision-making (not to mention other sources of pressure), in some or many ways overruling the individual personality of the person who assumes the office. The research explores how Bush’s gender ideologies shaped his initial response in the days after 9/11, which in a later chapter is compared to his use of masculinist language before 9/11. The decision to invade Afghanistan (or its justification), and how Bush himself (perhaps directed by his advisors or by directing his advisors) set about convincing the American public that invasion of Afghanistan was absolutely necessary is also explored. With regard to the impact of Bush’s advisors, less emphasis is given to their possible influence on Bush’s language than what Bush himself said to the American people. We do not have access of what was said to him, but we do know what he said publicly.

Bush’s masculinity, family background, and psychological profile were analyzed with regard to the three most important components of masculinity in Presidential foreign policy decision-making: man/nation as powerful, man/nation as rescuer, and man/nation as warrior; integral components of hegemonic masculinity in the United States. These components exerted influence over Bush’s decision-making, the ways in which he spoke to the American people about how he felt about the terrorist attacks, and how he urged Americans to support his foreign policy initiatives.
The Masculinity of President George W. Bush

President George W. Bush’s masculinity, which influenced his decision-making, was used to create domestic support for his decisions and is foundational to his moral code. It was different from the “tough but tender” displays of masculinity seen in the Gulf War, under President George H. W. Bush. Although in his run for President in 2000 Bush characterized himself as a “compassionate conservative,” during his presidency President Bush was not “tough but tender,” he was just tough. Obviously Bush, like all men and all male Presidents, was affected by the gender ideologies common to most Americans, and also by those of his religion, his service in the US military, and his elite and wealthy socio-economic class. Bush’s own personal interpretation of hegemonic masculinity is important, however his own self-reflection about masculinity may or may not be as informative, given his general dislike of introspection (as will be discussed below). Yet the ways in which Bush acted demonstrated his self-conception and his understanding of masculinity. Bush’s words and actions also illustrated the way in which he interpreted his role as President, his understanding of the nature of the international politics, and how hegemonic masculinity was an integral part of those conceptualizations.

The public debate surrounding foreign policy after 9/11 and the decision for military intervention were therefore profoundly influenced by the construction of hegemonic masculinity in the United States. As previously noted, the specific parameters of hegemonic masculinity are not completely fixed. Their main components endure over time, yet at different historical periods and due to specific circumstances, some strands of hegemonic masculinity are emphasized more strongly than in other periods. This
research will examine the most important characteristics of modern hegemonic masculinity, and evaluate whether changes have occurred, or which different aspects of hegemonic masculinity have been emphasized, since the terrorist attacks in 2001. Foreign policy speeches and decision-making influenced how women and men felt about their gender. Bush’s quick responses, his rhetoric to discuss the tragic events of 9/11, and his decisions as commander-in-chief for military intervention in Afghanistan were influenced by gendered structures—hegemonic masculinity, and processes—an androcentric political environment, and a patriarchal society.

Gender ideologies and the constructions of gendered social relations do not influence decision-makers alone, as discussed above. Foreign policy decision-making in the United States occurs within democratic processes. Decision-makers engage in an ongoing dialogue with the public. An important component here is how foreign policy decision-makers in the United States define what is in the “national interest.” David Campbell argues that “The claim is not that Foreign Policy constitutes state identity de novo; rather, it is that Foreign Policy is concerned with the reproduction of an unstable identity at the level of the state, and the containment of challenges to that identity.”

How did Bush use foreign policy to contain challenges to the identity of the United States as masculine, to remasculinize the US after 9/11? The research indicates that Bush spoke in hypermasculine terms when discussing the US military intervention in Afghanistan. In addition, although the United States is reified as a male protector (or as “Prince Charming,” a rescuer) intervention decisions are not made unilaterally but in dialogue.

with the American people, through elected representatives and through the media. Hypermasculinity by the American public was reflective of Bush’s hypermasculine response to the 9/11 attacks, and hypermasculinity within the culture, self-generating, reinforced the administration’s perspective. Evidence of Bush’s hypermasculine response and the hypermasculine response of many Americans will be addressed below.

Which gender ideologies emphasized by decision-makers and opinion leaders affect public perceptions and support for intervention? How are gender ideologies and cultural ideas about America combined? The gendered nature of the construction of the American identity cannot be ignored, it is constitutive and shapes the way decision-makers and the public frame problems and discuss solutions. Ultimately, it is not only the gender ideologies of decision-makers which are important, but also the gender ideologies shared by men and women throughout the United States.

Family Background, Military Service, and Education

President George W. Bush is the son of former President George Herbert Walker Bush. The Bush and Walker families have a prestigious and wealthy background, in the financial and energy sectors of the US economy, and elite connections forged at America’s top universities and international corporations. George W. Bush was raised Episcopalian, but was converted to an evangelical form of Christianity, and subsequently attended the Methodist church, his wife Laura’s denomination. He was “born again” at age 40, when he gave up drinking, and dedicated himself to his faith, his family, and his

---

country. To what degree did Bush’s elite education shape his ideas as about masculinity and his gender ideology? Did his being “born again” alter or reinforce his gender ideologies? What, specifically, were the effects of Bush’s religious beliefs on decision-making? How did those beliefs affect the way that he conceived of enemies, of what men should do, and what their proper role in society should be? How did Bush’s religious views shape his views about foreign policy, and the use of military force?

Bush was a member of the US armed forces, like his father before him, but without the distinguished service record. Bush was criticized for his lack of commitment to the military, including using connections to have himself assigned to the Texas Air National Guard instead of serving in Vietnam, and for essentially deserting to assist on his father’s friend’s Senate campaign. How much of military culture and values did Bush absorb? What do we know about how serving in the military affected Bush’s concepts of masculinity, and violence? These questions can not be fully answered or understood, but Bush’s perspectives on the US military, foreign policy, and the use of force at least can be explored by what he said and the specific words that he used. Bush’s language is discussed in detail later in the research.

Psychological Profile

In “The Political Personality of U.S. President George W. Bush,” Aubrey Immelman uses a psychodiagnostic approach to study Bush’s political personality. She concludes: “in terms of MIDC scale gradation criteria, George W. Bush was classified as an amalgam of the Outgoing/gregarious and Dominant/controlling patterns, with
subsidiary features of the Dauntless/venturesome pattern.” She suggests the following composite personality portrait:

- Characteristically engaging, energetic, and optimistic; driven by a need for excitement and stimulations and willing to take risks; full of ideas, though tending to be a superficial thinker; likely to start many projects but inconsistent in following through, compensating with a natural salesperson’s ability to persuade others to join in getting things done.

- Assertive, realistic, and competitive; enjoys the power to direct others and to evoke respect, often asserting control under the guise of good-natured fun and teasing; authoritative without being authoritarian, tending to use position power for the greater good; creates rules and expects subordinates to follow them, though within reasonable limits.

- Disarmingly affable and charming, making a good first impression; possessing a keen ability to read others’ motives and desires, and willing to scheme in calculated fashion to realize personal ambitions.

- Congenial, cordial, and agreeable; generally benevolent and approval-seeking, preferring to avoid conflict without being conflict averse; anti-introspective and unwilling to acknowledge disturbing emotions, denying personal difficulties or covering inner conflicts with self-distraction.

Clearly many of the components of Bush’s personality profile placed him in good stead as President. One point is of particular note: Immelman created this psychological profile before the terrorist attacks in 2001. Bush’s intention to conduct a “humble” foreign policy, his understanding of international politics and his assumption that he would be president in a time of peace changed the day of the attacks. Bush’s sense of himself as the masculine leader of the US charged with its protection changed fundamentally on the day of the terrorist attacks. The framing of the “war on terror”

---

164 Ibid., 98-99.
followed a devastating psychological blow to Bush and to the American people. The Bush administration, and Bush himself, began making decisions regarding our enemies under what any foreign policy decision-making analyst would clearly determine to be crisis conditions.

Immelman’s analysis of Bush’s personality profile points out both positive and negative aspects of his personality which may have affected his decision-making. She writes

George W. Bush’s major personality-based leadership strengths are the important political skills of charisma and interpersonality—a personable, confident, socially responsive, outgoing tendency that will enable him to connect with critical constituencies, mobilize popular support, and retain a following and his self-confidence in the face of adversity. Outgoing leaders characteristically are confident in their social abilities, skilled in the art of social influence, and have a charming, engaging personal style that tends to make people like them and overlook their gaffes and foibles. Bush’s major personality-based limitations include the propensity for a superficial grasp of complex issues, a predisposition to be easily bored by routine (with the attendant risk of failing to keep himself adequately informed), an inclination to act impulsively without fully appreciating the implications of his decisions or the long-term consequences of his policy initiatives, and a predilection to favor personal connections, friendship, and loyalty over competence in his staffing decisions and appointments—all of which could render a Bush administration relatively vulnerable to errors of judgment.\footnote{Immelman, 101-102.}

In my opinion, many of Immelman’s conclusions seem accurate, and were supported by the way Bush acted as President throughout his term. “Assertive, realistic, and competitive,” major traits of Bush’s personality, emerged much more strongly after
the terrorist attacks. The attacks evoked a classical masculine response as discussed in the chapter on masculinity, mainly Bush needed to “Give “Em Hell,” to stand strong against Islamic terrorists, and namely, to “bring the fight to them.” Not only was Bush’s own masculinity challenged—because he was the President he embodied the nation’s masculinity. Men everywhere, from schoolyard bullies and football players, to soldiers and political decision-makers, know that to restore masculinity the response to aggression must be to hit back, harder, and punish the opponent. Perhaps this affected Bush in a very personal way because he was the sitting President, although Immelman’s characterization of Bush as “anti-introspective and unwilling to acknowledge disturbing emotions, denying personal difficulties or covering inner conflicts with self-distraction” would lead us to believe that he did not spend much time focusing on how the attacks affected his own personal beliefs. Regardless, his actions spoke loudly, and his words following the attacks were clearly aggressive. Bush’s statements after 9/11 are analyzed in more detail in subsequent chapters, in terms of their reliance on gender ideologies proscriptions for remasculinization, and how they shaped US policies directly after the terrorist attacks.

Immelman’s characterization of Bush’s personality as having a “propensity for a superficial grasp of complex issues” is another important issue regarding Bush’s decision-making and the way he conducted himself immediately following the terrorist attacks. The attacks triggered an automatic black-or-white interpretation of “enemies” and “friends,” and his simplification of complex issues into a slogan: “You are either with us or against us.” Did Bush have a superficial grasp of complex issues? Was he
prepared on September 10, 2001 for what happened the next day? In all likelihood, he was completely caught off guard. In fact, documentary film shows Bush’s initial reaction—he was reading to a classroom of elementary schoolchildren the morning of 9/11 and, instead of terminating the event, he continued to read to the children until he was informed a second time as to the likelihood that a terrorist attack on US soil was underway. To many observers, Bush did not seem to automatically go into crisis mode. Initially he seemed disbelieving and unsure of what to do.\textsuperscript{166} His security personnel and staffers took charge and put him on Air Force One, to protect him from any additional attacks. What was Bush thinking? How was he processing the most devastating attacks to the United States since Pearl Harbor? He had expected a post-Cold War world of relatively few threats and American global hegemony. That was over within a few hours. He must have been asking himself, “What do I do now?”

An additional important point is that at his ranch in Crawford, Texas, in August of 2001, Bush had been previously briefed that there had been marked increase in intelligence regarding the threats from Al Qaeda, and was warned again that August as to the intentions of Osama bin Laden to attack the United States. Why did Bush discount this information? Perhaps partly the reason that Bush did not focus on the Al Qaeda threat was due to his personality characteristics, namely his “predisposition to be easily bored by routine (with the attendant risk of failing to keep himself adequately informed), or perhaps he preferred to avoid conflict.”\textsuperscript{167} To be fair, his national security advisor at the time, Condoleezza Rice, had been trained as a Soviet scholar, and she was most likely

\textsuperscript{166} See Michael Moore’s \textit{Farenheight 9/11}.
\textsuperscript{167} Immelman, 101-102.
focused on “traditional” threats to US security—other states. Other advisors may have
taken these threats more seriously, at least a few. It is possible, however, that Bush may
not have been informed adequately regarding the threat from Osama bin Laden.

The description of Bush’s personality including “an inclination to act impulsively
without fully appreciating the implications of his decisions or the long-term
consequences of his policy initiatives” is of particular interest here. Because of the crisis
nature of his decisionmaking after the 9/11 attacks, Bush evidently acted emotionally and
automatically, and his personality did not predispose him to fully explore the implications
of his decisions, nor to explore the long-term consequences of the decisions he made and
the way he described the “new war.” Under the crisis conditions, it would have been
nearly impossible for any political leader not to act impulsively.

Did Bush fully appreciate the implications of his decisions made in the weeks
after 9/11, regarding both domestic policies involving homeland security and police
work, and the ramifications of a unilateral foreign policy? Probably not. It is also
unknown what he was able to consider regarding a shift in US foreign policy and the
formation of the “Bush Doctrine.” Perhaps Bush considered these things in a way based
on the “rational actor model.” Perhaps not. Clearly Bush did not have the ability to
predict the future, but in some ways his policies have been considered short-sighted and
inappropriate in other ways. Although this is a partisan issue as well, some “mistakes
were made,” in Bush’s words.

Finally, did Bush fully understand the long-term consequences of his policy
initiatives? The United States moved extremely quickly to begin the intervention in
Afghanistan. Many other nations have invaded Afghanistan, yet none has (of yet) been able to fully occupy or control that country. In the very early phases of the campaign, mainly to route the Taliban and Al Qaeda, it seems that the United States did well; however, another aspect of Bush’s idea of a “war on terror” quickly took precedence over Afghanistan: the US invasion of Iraq in early 2003. Today, Afghanistan continues to be occupied by American and NATO forces, only the capital city is somewhat functional under the new “elected” government of Hamid Karzai. Large parts of Afghanistan continue to be controlled by Taliban and Al Qaeda forces. The US military intervention does not appear to be ending in the near future—any set time for the withdraw of American troops will be necessarily dependent on the security situation in Afghanistan.

It appears that Bush did not fully appreciate the long-term consequences of the intervention in Afghanistan, perhaps, if he had, he would not have committed the United States to a war in Iraq. The war in Iraq is outside the discussion in this research; however, because the US quickly got involved in a full-scale invasion of Iraq while the intervention in Afghanistan was ongoing, it seems likely that either Bush did not explore possible long-term consequences well enough, or focused only on the short term. In the long term, it is agreed that the conflict between Islamic terrorists and the United States is a global one. On the other hand, the shift in focus from Afghanistan to Iraq could demonstrate an unwillingness to think long-term. Perhaps Bush felt that expanding the “war on terror” was focusing on long-term consequences.
Bush and Masculinity as Power

“Assertive, realistic, and competitive,” are traits Immelman highlighted in Bush’s psychological profile, which are traits of hegemonic masculinity. Masculinity shapes politics. “Anxious masculinity and its discourse, along with the resulting gender gap, were powerfully manifested in the campaign for the 2000 presidential election, and seemed to shape the outcome as well. Once the primaries were over, George W. Bush had an unprecedented twenty-one point advantage among men, whereas women favored Al Gore by six points, according to a national poll.”

It is not only in the ballot box that masculinity shapes politics. Because the dominant configuration of masculinity is hegemonic, it shapes everything from the way that parents hold their infants to the definitions of what it is to “be a man.” As one might expect, hegemonic masculinity pervades foreign policy decision-making as well.

Bush was careful not to repeat the mistakes of his father, who had been branded a “wimp.” Bush used aggressive language when he talked about what actions the United States would take regarding the attacks on 9/11. Inexpressiveness and independence are additional traits masculinity studies have associated with hegemonic masculinity. Although Bush consoled victims and discussed the events of 9/11 as a national tragedy, he did not act or speak in a way that would be considered “feminine” or “womanish.” For example, Bush expressed his emotions about the attacks in a way that reinforced his own masculinity: he was essentially inexpressive except when offering condolences.

When he addressed his own emotions, Bush said: “I am angry.” Anger is an acceptable

---

emotion for men, weeping is an acceptable expression of sorrow for women. Bush said that he felt sorrow, but he did not show sorrow. Instead, he showed anger. Bush channeled his anger into aggressive language, followed by aggressive action.

Gilmore’s components of hegemonic masculinity, strength, risk-taking, avoidance of femininity, and aggression, can all be seen in Bush’s actions and speech as a masculine leader. Bush repeatedly emphasized the strength of himself, the American people, and the US military. He took risks in his orchestration of the intervention in Afghanistan. American forces were helping the Northern Alliance within hours of the terrorist attacks. He made a case to the American people, and explicitly employed gendered language, even though the support for a military response was overwhelming.

Bush, consciously or not, was driven to appear strong and manly regarding foreign policy.

The virile bombast that emanated from the White House in the buildup to the recent war [in Iraq] . . . was of such magnitude that it alarmed even conservative allies of the Bush administration. In a radio interview, American Enterprise Institute fellow Radek Sikorski said, “There is sometimes a little bit too much testosterone in the air in these trans-Atlantic exchanges . . . The underlying metaphorical continuum implied here, with seduction at one end and rape at the other, reflects two distinctive modes of hypermasculinity—those, respectively, of the ‘Ladies’ Man’ and the ‘Man’s Man.’”

Not only was the military intervention in Afghanistan infused with masculinist rhetoric but the US war in Iraq was, too. According to Ducat

The hypermasculine posturing and triumphalism chest beating on the part of Republicans toward the end of the war—what New York Times columnist Maureen Dowd

---
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referred to as “red meat moments” (witness George W. Bush’s infamous aircraft carrier victory strut)—have certainly made evident the importance of affirming manhood on the part of the most ardent advocates for, and the greatest political beneficiaries of, the Iraq invasion. Dowd captured well the underlying urge for phallic domination that drove Bush foreign policy when she said that a better title for the American bombing campaign might have been “Operation Who’s Your Dad?” As a British official who worked closely with Bush administration hawks in planning for the war said, “Everyone wants to go to Baghdad. Real men want to go to Tehran.”

Ducat argues that masculinity was a crucial component in the argument to go to war with Iraq “and its most profound sequel—the phallic unilateralism that has come to characterize American global military, economic, and environmental policy.” Unlike the way international relations scholars traditionally interpret foreign policy, as being internationalist or unilateralist, Ducat contends they omit a very important component—the masculine nature of President George W. Bush’s unilateralism. Ducat argues

Until the gender subtext of contemporary politics is understood as an unconscious as well as a conscious phenomenon, and debated openly and widely, men’s fear of the feminine will continue to be central among the various motives that drive electoral campaigns. If femiphobia goes unexamined, it will also remain an invisible force guiding both the tone and content of U.S. foreign policy objectives, and ultimately impair our capacity to combat such real threats as the incendiary nihilism of fundamentalist terror. For men to be inoculated against appeals to their gender insecurities, we as a society will need to challenge the notion that masculinity must be based on domination, whether over women or over other men.

170 Ibid., 22.
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Failing to analyze the underlying gendered ideologies, in particular the effects of masculinity on decision-making, leaves analysts with an incomplete picture. To make foreign policy decision-making more understandable, masculinity and its requirements for individual men are an important contributing factor to both identifying international threats, and deciding how to deal with them.

In his discussion of what he describes as one of the two predominant motifs of hypermasculinity (a “Man’s Man” and a “Ladies’ Man”), Ducat explains

A Man’s Man is the prototypical cowboy or jock – the Marlboro Man—who presents as rugged, strong, reliable, and rigidly moralistic. He seeks primarily the company and admiration of other men, but has a consuming hatred of male homosexuals. His motto is “I am unlike women,” and thus his central impairment in heterosexual relationships is an inability to empathize with partners. In fact, he wears his cluelessness about what women want or how they think as a badge of honor, as a confirmation of his dissimilarity to them. His unconscious stance toward women is a kind of revulsion at their “castrated” condition.  

President George W. Bush displayed aspects of a “Man’s Man.” He emphasized his toughness (and strength) as much as he could. For example, recall the “Mission Accomplished” banner on an aircraft carrier to which Bush arrived in a fighter jet and dressed in military gear. Some have even commented on his “package,” which was accentuated by the flight suit and harness, referring to Bush as a “stud.” This display has been called patently phallic. Bush also attempted to present himself as rugged—emphasizing his Texas roots, where Texans believe “Real Men” live. His reliability was highlighted, by emphasis on his strict adherence to following his own beliefs about decision-making. He repeatedly indicated that he did not take polls into account when

\footnote{Ibid., 49-50.}
making decisions. Even as the war in Iraq became increasingly difficult, Bush said he would stay the course, and would not go against his own beliefs that Saddam Hussein was an imminent threat to the United States. Whatever else his flaws may have been, Bush seemed sure of his decision-making and was unwilling to be swayed by what the American people thought. In masculinist terms, this is an indication of Bush’s strength.

In his chapter titled “Gender in a Time of Holy War” in *The Wimp Factor*, Ducat contends that gender was an integral part of Bush’s war on terror.

An appreciation of the phallic aspects of the attacks can add to our understanding of the terrorists’ psychology, and may give us insights into our own responses to this trauma. The buildings *were* phallic, not just in the crude sense of being towering monoliths that penetrated the sky, but because they, along with the Pentagon, represented (for America as well as its enemies) fantasies and attitudes associated with U.S. global economic, political, and cultural hegemony. The phallic frame of mind held by America’s ruling elite did include the fantasy of absolute self-sufficiency, a contemptuous abrogation of international agreements (and the refusal to negotiate others), a thoughtless indifference to the suffering of people in other nations (especially marked in the Bush II regime), a sense of invulnerability, and an unshakable conviction that our wealth could make our arrogance affordable.174

The attack on America catastrophically challenged this phallic understanding of American hegemony. The attacks feminized the United States, the President himself, the Bush administration, and the American people. According to the requirements of masculinity, the President had to respond to remasculinize the country and every American.

174 Ibid., 225.
There were other, more profound, ways in which the terrorist attacks provided America with an opportunity for cultural remasculinization. First, it facilitated the revivification of “heroic” manhood, by turning altruistic New York firemen, policemen, and assorted male volunteers into iconic rescue-worker hunks, signposts of a new era of defeminized men . . . A month and a half after the attacks, a *New York Times* headline announced, “Heavy Lifting Required: The Return of Manly Men.” The article is flanked by a photo of a group of burly male rescue workers and soldiers, studly and uniformed. The caption emphasized the performative aspects of the phenomenon these men supposedly represented: “The attacks of Sept. 11 have brought more than a few good men back into the cultural limelight.”

Conservative pundit James P. Pinkerton proclaimed, “Real Men Back in Style.” After discussing an anecdote about coal miners whose first request after rescue was chew, he gives a Cornball homage to post-9/11 revitalized machismo: “Chewing tobacco? That’s men for you, fraternal enough to save lives, macho enough to be jaunty in the face of death, manly enough to be politically incorrect. Male virtues and values have never really changed, but after decades of disdain, Americans are seeing the natural ways of men in a new and more positive light.”

Ducat discusses how recovered masculinity was celebrated in fashion as well. “This celebration of recovered masculinity reached all the way to the fashion runways of Milan and Paris, where hulking male models sported the latest in commando chic, camouflage muscle shirts, combat fatigues festooned with cartridge belts, and cowboy clothes.” Manliness was “back in style,” literally.

---

175 Ibid., 227.
176 Ibid., 228.
177 Ibid.
Ducat also discusses the nostalgia for the World War II generation, and the idealization of WWII as a “good war.”

One place where a link was established between the sanitized vision of the past and the present cultural moment was in the variety of soft-focus analyses of George W. Bush’s putative transformation from a callow frat boy to a mature leader whose commanding presence now approached the manly gravitas of the “greatest generation.”

Ducat points out that the prize for the “most gushing, over-the-top encomium to post 9/11 revivified manhood has to go the special issue of The American Enterprise, entitled ‘Real Men: They’re Back.’”

To remasculinize the country, Bush had to regain the American position of dominance. “Domination, for contemporary politicians, no less than for those in ancient Greece, remains the defining criterion for masculinity.” Domination has been foundational to masculinity.

This cultural and psychological link between masculinity and domination has been expressed in a multitude of ways across the centuries. This may be why rape has not only been used as a metaphor for military conquest but has often been employed literally as a strategy of physical, psychological, and genetic invasion.

As discussed previously, the examples of rape used as a tool of war are numerous, throughout human history and across the globe.

As researchers have long established, rape is not a crime of passion, but a sadistic assertion of male dominance. It will continue to be a strategic atrocity of military conquest and a
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private horror of personal life as long as masculinity is defined in terms of domination, and men are able to dissociate from any feeling of empathy toward women.¹⁸²

Ducat also addressed the differences between the two major American political parties, and presented a study which measured and compared the manliness of Republican and Democratic male members of Congress.

Endeavoring to be as scientific as possible, the authors developed objective criteria, such as whether the congressman in question had ever been a hunter (“successfully bagged an animal more than once”), a mechanic (“performed extensive mechanical work on a motor vehicle”), a spy (“operative in any intelligence service”), or an Eagle Scout.¹⁸³

Ducat maintains that masculinity had to be revived, that the United States had somehow “lost” its masculinity along the way.

It might be instructive to point out an obvious, but never discussed, logical implication of all this talk about a recovered masculinity: where there is a sense of something having been refound, there must have been a prior experience of loss. The search for a feeling of manliness that can never be securely possessed has been a repeating theme throughout this book. As I have argued in various places, male identity will always be an unstable psychological achievement, as long as it is based on repression—on the disavowal of whatever is construed as feminine . . . Thus, the discourse of the “new” post 9/11 machismo can be read as an indication of something that has felt absent, or at least imperiled, as much as it is about something temporarily recovered.¹⁸⁴

As asserted above, the loss of masculinity was directly caused by the attacks, and to remasculinize the US, masculine power had to be employed. Recalling Ducat’s argument
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that “domination remains the defining criterion for masculinity,” Bush had to return the United States to a position of dominance, which meant he had to retaliate, “get justice,” get revenge—dominate the “enemies” to remasculinize the United States and Americans themselves.

Some theorists have associated American political parties with gender. The Democratic Party has been considered the “Mommy Party;” the Republican Party, the “Daddy Party.” Ducat argues that

The celebration of the newfound “manly man” (a redundancy that seems to have survived at least three centuries of American public life) has had one particularly curious manifestation. It has enabled certain cold-war dinosaurs, namely Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld and Vice President Dick Cheney, to morph into studly septuagenarian paternomatriarchs, rugged paternal protectors who will keep the barbarians at bay. In one interview, Ann Coulter practically swooned at the thought of Mr. Cheney’s reassuring gerontocratic musk, describing him as her “ideal man” and “extremely sexy.”

Not only Bush himself, but members of his administration, were reasserting their own, personal masculinity. Ducat argues that the terrorist attacks ushered in (or again ushered) the “Daddy State.”

The war on terror, along with its associated domestic security apparatus, has enabled the federal government, at least temporarily, to cast off its Democratic-era image as an engulfing, infantilizing, and ultimately castrating maternal caretaker, and refashion itself as a stern paternal protector and avenger of the nation’s shared trauma. Within three weeks after the September 11 attacks, the New York Times was heralding the “muscular new role for government.”

The media assisted with the remasculinization of America as well.
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Ducat elaborated on the differences in American parties in gendered terms.

Presaging this change in the gendered view of the federal
government was a metaphorical distinction drawn ten years
earlier by political economist Jude Wanniski. He referred
to the Republicans as the ‘Daddy Party,’ whereas
Democrats belonged to the ‘Mommy Party’.  

George Lakoff has also distinguished the gendered natures associated with American
political parties.

In Lakoff’s framework, the conservative world-view is
based on a “Strict Father Morality,” whereas liberalism is
founded on a “Nurturant Parent Morality” that is implicitly
maternal. Lakoff examined the key phrases and metaphors
of conservative and liberal thinkers, which are claimed to
be derived from two very different models of parenting, to
show how each world-view is internally consistent. He
revealed the sometimes hidden coherence within each
perspective that renders seemingly contradictory positions
understandable—for example how conservatives could
simultaneously be ‘pro-life’ (oppose abortion) and favor
capital punishment.  

Ducat continues by arguing “By tuning our ears to the metaphors embedded in political
rhetoric . . . it is easy to see that contemporary Republicans, when out of power, view the
government as a malevolent maternal entity.”  

However,

Once their party is in power, the federal government,
especially when enacting policies that stress vengeance,
punishment, discipline, and the with-holding of provisions
and entitlements, is viewed and interpreted by Republicans
as a strong, omniscient, and unaccountable phallic body—a
daddy state.  
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In fact, Republicans often emphasize the paternal role. Ducat argues that Jerry Reiger, who under President G.H.W. Bush ran the National Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, embodies in a single individual the co-occurrence of certain passionately held beliefs and attitudes—authoritarian parenting, political conservatism, the subordination of women, and a fundamentalist phallic sadism that associates manliness with harsh punishment.191

Just one Republican who represents this kind of masculinity does not mean every man in the Republican Party believes the same thing; however, the overall point that Lakoff and Ducat make is that Republicans tend to emphasize strong masculine leadership, law and order, and a foreign policy that reflects those values.

Bush and Masculinity as Rescuer

Much of the rhetoric after the 9/11 attacks presented Bush and the US as rescuers. Bush was ready to not only use the power of the US to regain masculinity, he also employed a rescuer/protector theme. This is examined more closely in the content analysis, but some discussion here is necessary. Bush emphasized, again and again, that the United States would rescue those who had been hurt by the terrorists, in particular the Afghan people.

Some sense of Bush’s masculinity can be gleaned from his relationship to his wife, and how she perceived her role as the wife of the President.

Laura Bush, eschewing any claim to selfhood, and doubtless reassuring George W.’s male constituency, announced, “My life really began when I married my
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husband . . . I give my husband some counsel, but I actually think counsel or advice from a spouse ends up being nagging.” A year later, under pressure to drum up support for the war in Afghanistan and to close the gender gap in her husband’s popularity, the first lady was briefly unmuzzled and allowed to step out from under her political-wife burqa. Taking the president’s place during one of his weekly radio addresses [a first for an American First Lady], Mrs. Bush, in reborn feminist drag, shed the administration’s crocodile tears over the plight of women under the Taliban. This too-little-too-late lacrimation was a response to a condition that only a few months earlier had evoked no discernible outrage on the part of Republicans, who were showering the Taliban with drug-war money for their tepid campaign to curtail opium production. At that time, Mr. Bush and his allies could scarcely summon a yawn when women’s organizations lobbied for sanctions against the misogynist Afghan regime.\footnote{Ibid., 19-20.}

Mrs. Bush highlighted the plight of Afghan women to increase support for the administration’s intention to intervene militarily. Mrs. Bush, following her husband’s lead, emphasized the rescuing nature of the United States; however, her true social and religious conservative nature was apparent as critiqued in the following discussion.

Interestingly, among the horrors the first lady admonished the Taliban for perpetrating, she drew particular attention to the Draconian punishments inflicted on women who wore nail polish. It seems that, even while co-opting a feminist critique, Mrs. Bush could not hide her June Cleaver soul. Meanwhile, there remains from the Bush administration a deafening silence about Kuwaiti women, who can’t initiate divorce proceedings or vote; Saudi women, who must sit in the back seats of the cars they are forbidden to drive; and Pakistani women, who are punished for being raped by men.\footnote{Ibid., 20.}
Both the First Lady and President Bush made a point to call attention to the fact that the United States was not only involving itself in Afghanistan to track down and punish the perpetrators of the 9/11 attacks, but also to rescue Afghan women.

In his speeches just after the attacks, Bush used the rescuer theme in an additional way when he discussed the recovery efforts in New York (“Ground Zero”), and at the Pentagon. He specifically praised the efforts of those involved in the rescue and recovery efforts, and valorized the emergency personnel. Bush underscored the heroism of first responders, and promised that the US Federal Government would do everything in its power to assist in those efforts. America was a rescuer.

Bush and Masculinity as Warrior

Was George W. Bush affected by his father’s public humiliation at being labeled a “wimp?” While that question does not lend itself to a completely accurate answer, some have considered the issue.

Unlike his father, President George W. Bush has had vigilant handlers who have very tightly managed their boss’s actions and utterances. One can only speculate about whether he inherited Bush Sr.’s concerns regarding masculinity, along with his name and job. We don’t know the psychological consequences of having a paternal role model who was publicly humiliated for his perceived effeminacy. We do know that Bush was preoccupied with rectifying what many fellow conservatives viewed as Bush Sr.’s greatest failure of manly determination—leaving Saddam Hussein in power, and worse, doing so at the behest of that decidedly unphallic, collaborative institution, the United Nations.\footnote{Ibid., 21.}
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The fact that Bush had “vigilant handlers who . . . tightly managed . . . utterances” is important information, as it affects the researcher’s ability to confidently examine Bush’s words as in this study. As will be shown, however, Bush’s speeches did reflect a desire to remasculinize the US, and to strike back at the enemy because of the humiliation of the 9/11 attacks. Furthermore, Bush demonstrated “manly determination” in Afghanistan, and later, in Iraq.

President Bush emphasized the military might and warrior strength of the United States in the days and weeks after 9/11, and later in his administration as well. However, Ducat argues

The fantasy that repudiating interdependence and multilateralism would make America stronger should have exploded along with the buildings on 9/11 . . . The behavior of the present Republican regime, however, suggests that nothing but spin and the choreography of photo opportunities have been affected by recent events. In sympathy with the manic triumphalism of the Bush administration after the initial military victory in Iraq, country singer Toby Keith recorded a song, “Courtesy of the Red, White, and Blue,” that quickly went to number one, and became a virtual anthem for the White House architects of permanent war. A few lines say it all: “You’ll be sorry that you messed with the U.S. of A. ’Cuz we’ll put a boot in your ass—It’s the American way.”

Keith’s lyrics were blatantly militaristic, and resonated with the American people, who had been hearing Bush’s aggressive and militant language since the day of the terrorist attacks. The song was in concert with the militant language emanating from Bush himself. Ducat contends Keith’s song was the perfect theme for the “famous Top Gun
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landing on the USS Abraham Lincoln." Ducat considered the appearance by Bush, proclaiming “Mission Accomplished,” impressive. “Rarely in the history of political stagecraft has there been a more coherent spectacle, by which I mean a unity of phallic form with phallic content.” Bush’s own military record is not precisely a heroic one.

Although the president’s military drag performance was in obvious contrast to his history, Bush’s photo opportunity became a phallic event primarily because it signified the boot-end of an unstoppable hypermasculine empire. He became, at least for a while, the principal iconic figure of resurrected American manhood.

Ducat contends that this “unilateralist swagger was interpreted in specifically phallic terms by the larger American public.” The American public recognized, whether consciously or not, that the United States had remasculinized itself, because the President declared military victory in Iraq. Ducat cites G. Gordon Liddy’s interview with Christopher Matthews’ Hardball.

Liddy said: “And here comes George Bush. You know, he’s in his flight suit, he’s striding across the deck, and he’s wearing his parachute harness, you know. And I’ve worn those because I parachute—and it makes the best of his manly characteristic . . . You know, all those women who say size doesn’t matter—they’re all liars. Check that out…What a stud…” Liddy was literally saying the President had a big “manly characteristic,” and that women appreciated the size of his penis! The size of Bush’s penis was discussed by others as well.

196 Ibid.
197 Ibid.
198 Ibid.
199 Ibid., 245.
200 Ibid.
Both Salon.com’s conservative commentator Andrew Sullivan and leftist culture critic for the *Village Voice* Richard Goldstein wrote articles regarding the authenticity of “Bush’s basket.” Unlike Sullivan, Goldstein was convinced the Commander in Chief had done a “sock job.”

Ducat argues “By far the most compelling confirmation of the phallic meaning of the president’s aircraft-carrier cakewalk was found on the hot-selling ‘George W. Bush Top Gun Action Figure.’” Bush was such a manly man, he became an action figure, to teach American children about a “man’s man.”

How did the attacks on 9/11 affect Bush spiritually? Whatever shades of grey Bush had seen in the world seemed to change to a very black-and-white perspective, particularly when it came to his need to “hunt down the evildoers;” in his stated assumption, if countries harbored terrorists they were just as guilty. It was a “with us or against us” approach, and countries could choose to be on the side of the terrorists or the side of freedom. (“They hate us for our freedoms.”) For Bush, the war against the enemy became a zero-sum game, reminiscent of US Cold War policy toward the erstwhile Soviet Union. As was frequently claimed during the Cold War, Bush characterized the United States as “good,” and the non-Christian enemy as “evil.”

Bush has appeared to invoke a divine mandate as he promises to “rid the world of evil-doers.” But at the same time, he explicitly rejects the notion that he is waging a holy war. “This is not a clash of religions,” he said . . . This was not the first time Bush had trod carefully to avoid a tone of Christian triumphalism.
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Bush avoided this theme, but the core notion remained: the United States (which Bush saw as essentially Christian) vs. Islam, or at least, radical Islam. Bush intended to use every resource at his disposal—American military global hegemony—to defeat the enemy.

Some observers argued that Bush’s faith after 9/11 became about America as unique and strong, noting that he would act according to his understanding of God’s plan.

As in so many other aspects of his presidency, Bush’s faith played different roles before and after 9/11… Administration critics see a religious agenda that extends beyond compassionate-conservative outreach in the judges Bush has appointed and in his decisions to limit federal funding of stem-cell research, promote abstinence education over condom distribution and deny funds to international family-planning groups. But many of these were disputes that any Republican President could have had with his Democratic opponents. It was only after Sept. 11, when Bush found himself leading a shaken country through a dark valley, that the old left-right debates gave way to something altogether different. Now the debate was less about personal faith changing lives. It was about America’s destiny and Bush’s view of God’s plan for him and for the U.S.²⁰⁴

Bush’s Christian faith became more important than ever. Bush, while taking care not to characterize the conflict as Christianity versus Islam, did in fact use many references to a Christian God, and emphasized that the United States was supported by God. In characterizing the enemy, Bush did not accept them as religious people whatsoever.

Bush can’t allow the possibility that the enemy is motivated by its understanding of God’s will lest his critics note that he believes the same of himself. So he portrays the terrorists as heirs of the Nazis and communists: totalitarian in vision, cynical by nature, manipulative in their appeal, certainly not devout. They “couch their language in
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religious terms. But that doesn’t make them religious people . . . I think they conveniently use religion to kill.”

Bush consistently reaffirmed his commitment to Christ and identified the Christian God as aligned with America. He was determined to act in ways that he saw as befitting his faith.

Conclusion

Masculinity theorists have posited a number of characteristics they understand to be components of hegemonic masculinity, of particular focus here man/nation as powerful, man/nation as rescuer, and man/nation as warrior. Bush’s upbringing, religion, and personality all served to create a man, a leader, who valued hegemonic masculine traits and displayed these traits both personally and as a political leader. Many masculinity theorists emphasize anti-femininity as a fundamental element of hegemonic masculinity. Bush, as a leader, was careful to emphasize his “manly” characteristics, including the most subtle one—antifemininity. It is not as if Bush made statements in which he degraded women, but his emphasis on masculinity and masculine power included an implicit rejection of the feminine.

Bush displayed his masculinity regularly after the terrorist attacks. He also emphasized the masculine traits of the United States. Bush’s personality and the way he acted as President, including foreign policy decisions, were profoundly affected by his masculinity and how he felt a man should act. He was aggressive, inexpressive, strong, risk-taking, and anti-feminine. His family background and psychological profile illustrate
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that “being a man” was very important to him. Bush’s personal faith was important as well, he was “manly” in the way that Christian fundamentalists understood. Bush was careful to avoid any behavior that might assign the “wimp” label, and he (intentionally or not) displayed himself as masculine, actually “hegemonically masculine.” For example, he regularly emphasized his own strength and power, and that of the United States in general. Regaining masculinity was important for him personally, and he believed it was crucial for the country as well. Bush himself may not have been consciously aware of this however, he feel the importance of demonstrating his manliness, to prove he was a strong leader, and to prove to the United States was strong as well. Other important components of hegemonic masculinity were also regularly displayed and referenced. Bush, as a decision-maker and as a leader, clearly acted out hegemonic masculinity. How Bush used speech to emphasize and display hegemonic masculinity is analyzed in the next two chapters.
Chapter Five
Intervention in Afghanistan as Masculine Foreign Policy

Introduction

This chapter examines the case of the US military intervention in Afghanistan, in particular the rhetoric of Bush about the intervention when he made reference to the components of hegemonic masculinity. This is a narrative approach to understanding the masculine nature of the response to the terrorist attacks. The intervention in Afghanistan was markedly masculine regarding the language used to convince the American people that the United States had no choice but to intervene militarily in Afghanistan.

Hours after the terrorists struck the United States, American forces were on the ground in Afghanistan, supporting the Northern Alliance, the last remnants of the opposition to the Taliban. After the Soviet invasion and subsequent withdrawal due to an inability to gain victory (1979-1989), Afghanistan was virtually lawless. Tribal warfare broke out around the country, until the Taliban, the most radical Islamic fundamentalist regime to ever control a state apparatus, consolidated control in 1994. Many Afghans were relieved, because although the Taliban regime was draconian in its policies and punishments, it did manage to bring order to society. In 1996 Al Qaeda was driven from the Sudan, and Al Qaeda, under the leadership of Osama bin Laden, relocated its training camps to a friendlier place, Afghanistan under the rule of the Taliban. After the terrorist attacks on 9/11, the United States quickly concluded that Al Qaeda had been responsible
and Bush promised to hunt down the “evildoers” responsible for the attacks and bring them back “dead or alive.” US military intervention was fully underway by October, 2001, mere weeks after the Al Qaeda attacks. Bush used gendered language and American gender ideologies to buttress his case for military intervention, despite near-universal support from the America people. The main purpose of this research is to determine the effects of gender ideologies on the decision to intervene in Afghanistan and how it was addressed by the President to the American people. Specifically, the research explores the language used by Bush and his administration to gain support from the American people regarding the intervention, and how the American public responded to that language.

The focus in this chapter is on a few areas in which use of gender ideologies and the reliance upon hegemonic masculinity were highlighted by the Bush Administration, within the concepts of “power,” “rescuer,” and “warrior.” This chapter specifically examines the rescue narrative and the Prince Charming metaphor, the use of the word “evildoers,” and “good versus evil,” the use of “cowboy masculinity” and other statements with gendered meanings embedded within them. Additionally, a hard, hyper-masculine response was evident: the need for retaliation, punishment, and revenge—an “eye for an eye.”
The Intervention in Afghanistan and Man/Nation as Masculine Power

Rescue Narrative and the Prince Charming Metaphor

To at least begin to answer some of the questions posed, this study examined some of Bush’s statements regarding the intervention in Afghanistan, as well as the messages he was sending to Bin Laden, to the American people, and to the international community at large. In one telling statement, Bush said, “But you know what? The whole world is watching. And we cannot waver now or show any doubt.” As discussed in the masculinity chapter, in confrontation between men “backing down” establishes a subordinate position. When Bush emphasized that “the world is watching,” he showed his belief that his own responses to Bin Laden carried over into international opinion about the masculine strength of the United States. Wavering and/or showing doubt are female/feminine characteristics. Women are widely expected to be indecisive, whereas men are expected to be decisive, to show strength. Showing doubt is considered weak and feminine. Bush clearly acted to avoid this.

Bush had previously said, “Al-Qaeda underestimated us, see. [Bin Laden] thought we’re soft. He made a huge miscalculation, huge. And I’m sure he’s now cowering in some cave, wondering, you know, what went wrong.” Bush’s highlighting what he thinks is Bin Laden’s perception of Bush as a leader and the United States as a country is of note. Bush contended that Bin Laden believed the United States was “soft.” “Soft” is associated with femininity, “hard” or “strong” is associated with masculinity.
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Bush was reiterating the point that the United States is a masculine country—strong, decisive, and willing to make tough sacrifices.

Bush had the following to say about his role as president: “A President has got to be the calcium in the backbone . . . If I weaken, the whole team weakens. If I am doubtful, I can assure you there will be a lot of doubt.” In this statement, Bush reveals how his own beliefs about personal masculinity connect to international perceptions of US foreign policy—placing himself at the crucial center. Bush definitely did not want to be perceived as “weak.” In fact, his preoccupation with appearing not to be weak shows his rejection of “feminine” traits and values and his willingness to embrace hegemonic masculinity. After the attacks on 9/11 the Bush administration accentuated Bush as both strong and decisive—integral traits of hegemonic masculinity.

Vice President Cheney crudely emphasized Bush’s masculinity in this way: “Bush is who he is: bold, tough, faith based, unyielding. He’s got the biggest balls of anyone you’ve ever seen.” The administration worked tirelessly to ensure that the public viewed Bush as masculine. Cheney’s emphasis of Bush as “faith based” reinforces the notion that fundamentalist Christianity’s perception of manhood was important to Bush. While it is obvious that Cheney’s indelicate reference to Bush’s “balls” is merely figurative, physiologically, testicles are male attributes; although women are never mentioned, this omission serves to emphasize Bush’s antifemininity. The fact that Cheney claims that they are “the biggest balls of anyone you’ve ever seen” indicates Cheney’s belief in Bush’s masculine strength.

---
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Bush emphasized how much more terrible these attacks were because Americans are freedom-loving and brave. “. . . The employee who is getting ready to serve the country is an essential part of winning the—of defeating terrorism, evil-doers so emboldened that they feel like they could attack the great bastion of freedom.”

Bush also said, “Nobody can threaten this country. Oh, they may be able to bomb buildings and obviously disrupt lives. But we’re too great a nation to allow the evil-doers to affect our soul and our spirit.” The American spirit—a spirit of goodness—would not be defeated by evil powers. Bush then characterized the United States as “a great nation.” He emphasized the strength and resilience of the United States and the American people—the power of the country. “We are on a mission to make sure that freedom is enduring. We’re on a mission to say to the rest of the world, come with us—come with us, stand by our side to defeat the evil-doers who would like to rid the world of freedom as we know it.”

America’s goodness was based on its freedoms as well. “The attacks on America were intended to break our spirit, but the evildoers failed. It’s a fabulous land, we’re lucky to live in it.” Bush also maintained that “The evildoers struck, but they may have hurt our buildings, and they are obviously affecting some family lives in such a profound and sad way. But they will not touch the soul of America. They cannot
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dim our spirit.” Moreover, the power of the United States was based on the unique American spirit. “Now is the time—now is the time to root out evil so that our children and grandchildren can live with freedom as the beacon all around the world.” He asserted that, “[W]e’ll be tough and resolute as we unite, to make sure freedom stands, to root out evil, to say to our children and grandchildren, we were bold enough to act, without tiring, so that you can live in a great land and in a peaceful world.” As Bush’s rhetoric demonstrates, he asserted America was a survivor, and would become stronger as a result of the terrorist attacks.

Cowboy Diplomacy

In “The End of Cowboy Diplomacy: Why George W. Bush’s Grand Strategy for Remaking the World Had to Change,” Mike Allen and Romesh Ratnesar characterize President Bush’s temperament and reputation as “no-nonsense, alpha-male decisiveness.” They argue that late in his administration, Bush’s attitudes changed (he was more relaxed, perhaps) and the Bush Administration shifted its foreign policy, away from unilateralism and toward multilateralism. This may have indeed been the case, however the focus in this study is on his temperament and other factors involved in the decision to intervene in Afghanistan. What happened later lies beyond the parameters of this study, but significant here, their words indicate that soon after 9/11 Bush acted unilaterally, and in masculine ways.
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The shift under way in Bush’s foreign policy is bigger and more seismic than a change of wardrobe or a modulation of tone. Bush came to office pledging to focus on domestic issues and pursue a “humble” foreign policy that would avoid the entanglements of the Bill Clinton years. After Sept. 11, however, the Bush team embarked on a different path, outlining a muscular, idealistic and unilateralist vision of American power and how to use it. [Bush] aimed to lay the foundation for a grand strategy to fight Islamic terrorists and rogue states by spreading democracy around the world and pre-empting gathering threats before they materialized. And the Bush Administration was not willing to wait for others to help. The approach fit with Bush’s personal style and his self-professed proclivity to dispense with the nuances of geopolitics and to go with his gut. “The Bush Doctrine is actually being defined by action, as opposed to by words,” Bush told Tom Brokaw aboard Air Force One in 2003.218

These analysts characterize Bush’s foreign policy after 9/11 as “muscular, idealistic and unilateralist.” This marks a distinct shift in policy.

Allen and Ratnesar also commented on the changes over time in the language used by the Bush Administration. “At a press conference with British Prime Minister Tony Blair in May (2006), Bush swore off the Wild West rhetoric of getting enemies ‘dead or alive,’ conceding that ‘in certain parts of the world, it was misinterpreted.’”219 This allowed Allen and Ratnesar to declare President George W. Bush’s “cowboy diplomacy” dead. “Put it another way: cowboy diplomacy, RIP.”220 Previously, however, during the first few weeks after the terrorist attacks, Bush and his administration apparently had no qualms about using such bellicose language, and invoking notions of retaliation and revenge.
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If Bush was pursuing “Cowboy Diplomacy,” what does that mean? The cowboy is a lonesome, fiercely independent figure with an archetypal masculine persona. He is strong, yet caring and protective of women and children. Brannon’s typology of hegemonic masculinity is instructive here. The four components, “No Sissy Stuff,” “The Big Wheel,” “The Sturdy Oak,” and “Give ‘Em Hell” are all components of hegemonic masculinity and related to the “cowboy ideal.” Examining Bush’s foreign policy and his invocation of these components of hegemonic masculinity produces an interesting understanding of how gender shaped foreign policy—most importantly, the decision to intervene in Afghanistan—especially regarding the way the intervention was publicly discussed and how it was presented to the American people.

“No Sissy Stuff” refers to antifemininity. Men are defined in opposition to women. A man cannot act “like a woman” in front of other men, or his masculinity will be compromised. When the United States was attacked by Al Qaeda, it became a “victim.” We might even say “she” became a victim. Women are victims, men are not. The country had to regain its masculinity because it had been feminized. The primary way to remasculinize is to “Give ‘Em Hell.” From this perspective, America had the right to fight back, to take the fight to the terrorists’ home countries (which was actually counterfactual, as the 9/11 terrorists involved were primarily Saudi). Once America became the aggressor, it reasserted itself as hegemonically masculine and regained its international position as “The Big Wheel,” the most powerful country. From rescuing Americans in the immediate aftermath of the attacks, to rescuing the Afghan people during the intervention, the United States displayed the component of “The Sturdy Oak.”
Bush’s repetitive contention that the United States is strong proved important to the remasculinization of America.

President Bush steered foreign policy in an aggressive direction, first toward military intervention and then to war. What part of “The Bush Doctrine” was Bush’s attempt to reject the role of victim and become an aggressor? The cowboy metaphor is no mistake here either, since the Wild West employed “rough justice.” Translation: no due process, only execution. One man, the man, metes out justice. Aggression restored Bush’s own masculinity.

Cowboy diplomacy can also be understood as a visible metaphor, fraught with all kinds of predetermined meanings, which emphasized the policy of unilateralism. Traditionally many people in the Republican Party have not been fans of the United Nations nor multilateralism. Republican Presidents Ronald Reagan and George H. W. Bush intervened unilaterally militarily more than once (i.e. Granada, Panama). However, both these presidents had multilateral moments: President Reagan’s work with Premier Mikail Gorbachev and Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher was the beginning of the end of the Cold War, and President G. H. W. Bush was successful in creating a United Nations force to expel Saddam Hussein and his military from Kuwait. President G. H. W. Bush was a particularly skilled diplomat. Bush’s language which evoked Cowboy Justice strengthened his ability to act unilaterally.
“Good” versus “Evil”

One of the ways Bush asserted masculine power was in his use of the concepts of “good” and “evil.” Bush essentially maintained that the United States was “good,” and that the terrorists were “evil.” This concept appeared frequently after the attacks. On September 13, 2001, President Bush proclaimed September 14 a “National Day of Remembrance for Victims,” and in the written proclamation made three references to “evil.” He said

Civilized people around the world denounce the evildoers who devised and executed these terrible attacks. Justice demands that those who helped or harbored the terrorists be punished—and punished severely. The enormity of their evil demands it. We will use all the resources of the United States and our cooperating friends and allies to pursue those responsible for this evil, until justice is done.221

First, by pointing out that “civilized” people condemn terrorism, Bush effectively labels any who do not agree with or join this condemnation “uncivilized.” Second, notice in particular that the magnitude of the evil demands harsh justice. To effect this, Bush then summons all the force at his disposal—both at home and abroad. His proclamation also states, “We will persevere through this national tragedy and personal loss. In time, we will find healing and recovery; and, in the face of all this evil, we remain strong and united, ‘one Nation under God.’”222 He contrasted the hopeless, destructive malevolence of terrorism with a hopeful, resilient America that, unified, would prevail. The age-old rhetoric of good triumphing over evil is obvious here.
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On September 16, 2001—five days after the terrorist attacks, President Bush made a number of important statements in a speech on the White House lawn, mentioning “evildoers” five times, and “evil” once. Bush’s language was very emotional, and he asserted American power. He emphasized that the United States was strong and would remain strong in the face of evil. For example, he said, “We’re a nation that can’t be cowed by evil-doers.” Bush reiterated the theme of civilized people in a war against barbarians. “. . . We need to be alert to the fact that these evil-doers still exist. We haven’t seen this kind of barbarism in a long period of time.” Bush expressed surprise at the method of attack by the terrorists. “Never in anybody’s thought process about how to protect America did we ever think that the evil-doers would fly not one, but four commercial aircraft into precious U.S. targets—never.” One of the most devastating results of the attacks was the end of American’s belief that the country could not be attacked by a foreign enemy on native soil. It also proved that the United States had not focused on domestic security regarding attacks from a foreign enemy successfully. It is clear now that, as every political leader may say in retrospect: “mistakes were made.” Conviently, the passive voice absolves the speaker of mentioning by whom the mistakes were made.

Bush emphasized both the “exceptional” nature of the terrorist attacks, and the fact that Americans had never faced an evil of like magnitude. “That’s why I say to the American people we’ve never seen this kind of evil before. But the evil-doers have never
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seen the American people in action before, either—and they’re about to find out.”

Here Bush refers to the daunting power and strength of the United States. There are a few problems, however, with Bush’s characterization of this “evil” threat. During World War II, the Japanese were considered by Americans to be particularly evil. Nazis were, and continue to be, considered evil. Communists were evil. Ronald Reagan called the Soviet Union “The Evil Empire.” Incidentally, the US decision to bomb Hiroshima and Nagasaki in WWII has also been condemned as evil—couched by supporters in the rhetoric of it being a “necessary” evil. Were the terrorists who attacked the United States on 9/11 worse than any of these groups or nations? Obviously degrees of evil would be difficult to measure; however, some of these “evil” groups familiar to Americans in the 20th century—ergo the Japanese, the Germans, and communists—were responsible for significantly more deaths than exacted by the 9/11 attacks. Perhaps the difference in magnitude or attitude lies in the fact that not all of them killed Americans, as with the Soviets, save via proxy wars; or, when they did kill Americans it was primarily in foreign theaters, Pearl Harbor excepted. Evidently, the 9/11 terrorists were uniquely evil because they killed Americans inside the continental United States. One possible additional factor to consider is that they killed non-combatants. In speeches and press releases, media coverage and published articles, the emphasis was on the loss of innocent Americans, including women and children. Bush repeatedly emphasized “evil” and “evildoers” in the days, weeks, and months after the terrorist attacks. Notions of “evil” and “evildoers” are firmly rooted in Christianity, and other major religions as well. Because of Bush’s
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personal beliefs, he likely understood evil in biblical terms—the age-old struggle noted above.

The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia defines “evildoers” in this way:

“EVIL-DOERS (e-v’-l-doo’-erz), mere`im; from ra`-a`; kakopoios, always plural:
Malefactors or offenders of God’s law. Used generally of the ungodly, as, ‘Fret not thyself because of evil-doers.’” (Psalms 37:1) From a Christian perspective, evildoers are offenders of God’s law. God rescuers his followers from evil-doers. “He hath delivered the soul of the needy from the hand of evil-doers.” (Jeremiah 20:13) In the New Testament there are additional references.

The New Testament Hyper-concordance defines “evil doer” by referencing the following New Testament verses:
“And then will I declare to them, ‘I never knew you; depart from me, you evildoers.’” (Matthew 7.23); “The Son of man will send his angels, and they will gather out of his kingdom all causes of sin and all evildoers.” (Matthew 13.41); “They answered him, ‘If this man were not an evildoer, we would not have handed him over.’” (John 18.30); “Let the evildoer still do evil, and the filthy still be filthy, and the righteous still do right, and the holy still be holy.” (Revelations 22.11).

Evildoers cause and commit sins, and they are ungodly. They should be punished, made to depart from God and others.

Bush said the United States would find and punish all evildoers, and anyone who had assisted the evildoers. He was asserting American power and he promised to hold everyone involved “accountable” for their actions.

All I can tell you is that Osama bin Laden is a prime suspect, and the people who house him, encourage him, provide food, comfort or money are on notice. Last Tuesday—last week, I spoke clearly about our nation’s policy. And that is, we’re going to find those who—those evil-doers, those barbaric people who attacked our country and we’re going to hold them accountable, and we’re going to hold the people who house them accountable; the people who think they can provide them safe havens will be held accountable; the people who feed them will be held accountable.228

Bush’s description of the terrorists as “barbaric” is telling because he describes a conflict between “civilized people” and “barbarians.” Barbarians are people without morals, without religion, who are less-than-human. Bush’s characterization of the 9/11 attackers as barbarians invokes millennia of meaning about who is “civilized,” and therefore human, and who “barbaric,” or sub-human.

Bush’s focus on evil and the “evildoers” was striking.

No threat, no threat will prevent freedom-loving people from defending freedom. And make no mistake about it: This is good versus evil. These are evildoers. They have no justification for their actions. There’s no religious justification, there’s no political justification. The only motivation is evil.229

Bush’s unequivocal good-versus-evil dichotomy discounted any possible rationale, further magnifying the depravity of the attackers. Although not everyone agrees with Osama bin Laden’s interpretation of the Qu’ran, Al Qaeda feel justified in attacking US civilians, and participants feel they, also, are on the side the good. Bush, however, remained unwilling to give any credence to their motives, instead simply understanding

Al Qaeda as evil. Al Qaeda is equally steadfast in its position and unwillingness to give credence to the motives of the US.

Bush also said

I’ve got a job to do, and that’s to explain to the American people the truth. And the truth is that we’re now facing a new threat for freedom; that on September 11th, war was declared on the United States, not by a religious group, not by one country versus another, but by people motivated by evil. And I’m going to make it clear to the world what I made clear to America, that this great country will not let evil stand. 230

Although he did not use the word “Satan,” given Bush’s fundamentalist Christian interpretation, we can infer that he understands evil to be caused by Satan. In effect, it is the good people of America battling Satan. Part of his plan to thwart evil involved economic sanctions: “We’ve got nations around the world willing to join us in cutting off the money of the evil ones. Our attitude is, if they can’t fund evil deeds, they’re not going to be able to affect freedom." 231

To clarify his position, in order to avoid describing the conflict as a religious one between Christianity and Islam, Bush spoke about Islam and sent a message to the American people that Islam was not “evil,” but Al Qaeda and Bin Laden had perverted Islam to their own evil purposes.

Because we’ve made it clear, this is not a war between Christianity or Judaism and Islam. As a matter of fact, the teachings of Islam make it clear that peace is important, that compassion is a part of life. This is a war between good and evil . . . This is not a war between our world and their world. It is a war to save the world. . . But in order to
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overcome evil, the great goodness of America must come forth and shine forth.  

Bush also discussed how in the face of evil, Americans would become better and stronger, united and able to endure sacrifice. Bush portrayed America as powerful.

I see out of this evil will come good, not only here at home, as youngsters all of a sudden understand the definition of sacrifice, the sacrifice of those brave souls on Flight 93 who, after the 23rd Psalm said, let’s roll to save America.  

This rhetoric is heart-rending, a story of Americans on a plane who prayed together and then acted to “save America.” Most Americans consider those on Flight 93 as ordinary Americans who became extraordinary under the circumstances. That they probably saved lives seems beyond question. Bush’s connection of these “good” people versus the “evil” terrorists reassured America, and portrayed the the United States as powerful, and benevolent—a brave and self-sacrificing people.

On October 10, 2001, President Bush unveiled his “Most Wanted Terrorist List.” Thirty days after the attacks, Bush had fine-tuned his message. Nevertheless, he continued to emphasize the nature of the evil men who were the enemy.

The men on the wall here have put themselves on the list because of great acts of evil. They plan, promote and commit murder. They fill the minds of others with hate and lies. And by their cruelty and violence, they betray whatever faith they espouse.
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Not only do they commit atrocities, but, here, Bush also argues that their actions undermine their religious principles. This fits within the biblical dichotomy even more explicitly than some of his previous comments.

Singling out the men on the “Most Wanted” list and framing his comments in terms of a kind of mission and ultimatum, Bush says

I say “the first 22” because our war is not just against 22 individuals. Our war is against networks and groups, people who coddle them, people who try to hide them, people who fund them. This is our calling. This is the calling of the United States of America, the most free nation in the world.

A nation built on fundamental values that rejects hate, rejects violence, rejects murderers, rejects evil. And we will not tire. We will not relent. It is not only important for the homeland security of America that we succeed, it is equally as important for generations of Americans who have yet to be born . . . Now is the time to draw the line in the sand against the evil ones. 235

Bush proclaimed America strong enough to defeat these new enemies. He also echoed his father’s line-in-the-sand rhetoric, which may have made sense in the first Gulf War, but seemed ill-suited to the 9/11 terrorist attacks.

Bush continued his theme of evil and continued to label Al Qaeda and the Taliban evildoers.

I also want to remind my fellow Americans as we round up the evildoers, as we look for those who might harm our fellow Americans, we must remember not to violate the rights of the innocent . . . Our war is not against a religion. Our war is against evil. 236

These comments also strive to underscore the protector or rescuer status of the United States as they purport to reject holy war distinctions. Bush further states

Evil knows no borders, no boundaries . . . we must take a stand; that those of us who have been given the responsibility of high office must not shirk from our duty; that now is the time to claim freedom for future generations.\textsuperscript{237}

This particular kind of evil, viewed as both ubiquitous and inisidious, was extremely difficult to combat, but Bush maintained that political leaders would remain strong, and defeat the enemies.

The rhetoric continued when parents were encouraged to tell their children that there is love in the world, and that there is evil in the world. Bush illustrated a Christian understanding of evil; although, this understanding is not exclusive to Christianity. But, not all Americans believe in evil, nor do all Americans define it in the same way.

We learned a good lesson on September the 11\textsuperscript{th}, that there is evil in this world. I know there’s a lot of children in America wondering what took place. I think it’s essential that all moms and dads and citizens tell their children we love them and there is love in the world, but also remind them there are evil people.\textsuperscript{238}

Bush’s conceptualization of good versus evil extended to the point that he encouraged American children be told about good and evil. Bush’s rhetoric was so pervasive that it even targeted children.

In his attempt to avoid the appearance of a holy war, Bush said, “We don’t hold any religion accountable. We’re fighting evil. And these murderers have hijacked a great religion in order to justify their evil deeds. And we cannot let it stand.”\textsuperscript{239} Bush’s
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It is interesting that Bush used the word “hijack,” because he cleverly turned the tables on the hijackers, and made Muslims the victims of an evil variant of their religion. His words that “We cannot let it stand,” asserted American power and strength to deal with the enemies of the United States.

Evildoer becomes synonymous with terrorist. Who was the enemy? Bush argued it was not Islam, in fact he took pains to do so. But his rhetoric was so extreme that his attempts to categorize narrowly the enemy proved unsuccessful. The only “surity” was “terrorism”: “First of all, it is important to know that this is not a campaign against Islam; this is not a campaign against Arab people. This is a campaign against terrorists. This is a campaign against evil-doers who hate freedom.”

The perpetrators were simply evil, their religious reasons for attacking the United States were deemed irrelevant or non-existant. As noted above, those who hijack a faith cannot use it to defend themselves.

Besides accountability, Bush made some attempts at unity

First of all, it is so important for my fellow Americans, as well as everybody in the world to understand that America will hold those evil-doers accountable. We don’t view this as a war of religion, in any way, shape or form. As a matter of fact, Islam preaches peace. The Muslim faith is a peaceful faith. And there are millions of good Americans who practice the Muslim faith who love their country as much as I love the country, who salute the flag as strongly as I salute the flag.
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In discussing the diversity of religious beliefs within the United States, Bush seems to aim for unifying Americans, but because he elsewhere characterized “God” as “An Almighty God” this tactic may not have been as successful as he had intended. In three of the five major religions this is true, but certainly not for all the religions, nor for atheists, in the United States. This did not stop him, however, from pursuing such a line.

There are many Americans on bended knee from all different religions, praying to an almighty God. We’re a nation united in our conviction that we must find those evildoers and bring them to justice. We seek not revenge in America, we seek justice.  

Rhetorically, he also attempts to qualify and lessen any negative reactions to his foreign policy by making a distinction between the more pejorative “revenge” and the ostensibly positive “justice.”

Furthermore, Bush did not claim that the United States would fight this new war to seek “justice” alone as he tried to warn others of similar attacks.

We built a vast coalition of nations from all around the world to join us—nations which understand that what happened in New York and Washington could happen to them, as well. They understand it’s now time to unite to defeat evil. Each nation comes with a different set of capabilities and a different set of—a different willingness to help. America says, we don’t care how you help, just help. Either you’re for us, or you’re against us.

This can be viewed as either praise and enticement or censure and threat, depending which side one takes. It also illustrates the complete black and white nature of Bush’s interpretation of the 9/11 attacks.
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Bush repeated his theme about evildoers again and again. His comments underscore upheaval. He noted that “The evildoers cost America a lot of lives,” and that “they’ve also changed a lot of lives, these evil actions.” Economically, he asserted, “We need to counter the shock wave of the evildoer by having individual rate cuts accelerated and by thinking about tax rebates.” Bush even linked tax policy to the evildoers, and argued America would become stronger if the government cut taxes.

Bush contrasted the evildoers with the goodness of Americans.

We are engaged in a noble cause. And that is to say loud and clear to the evildoers that we reject you, that we will stand firm against terror, and that this great nation, along with many other nations, will defend freedom.

Bush described the actions taken against terrorists as “a noble cause.” He illustrated the greatness and goodness of America, and characterized the American nation as one which defends freedom.

Regarding economic sanctions, Bush said

Truth of the matter is, the first shot we fired in this war against evildoers was when the Secretary and I and the Secretary of Treasury said we’re going to find their money, and we’re going to starve them of their money. . . We’re going to talk to banks all around the world, and make it clear that if they are on our side, if they join the folks who are fighting evil, that they’ve got to do everything they can to cut off their funds.
Bush and his administration promised to stand up to evil, to use American strength, in part, by cutting off Al Qaeda’s funding. The “first shot” against the terrorists was to employ the economic strength of the US to fight evil.

On October 11, 2001, during President Bush’s first formal White House press conference of his administration, he said

Today, the Justice Department did issue a blanket alert. It was in recognition of a general threat we received. This is not the first time the Justice Department has acted like this. I hope it’s the last. But, given the attitude of the evildoers, it may not be.

The possible on-going nature of the threat is highlighted here. Moreover, he introduced the Office of Homeland Security:

We’ve got a Homeland Security Office now running, as I mentioned, headed by Tom Ridge. We’re sharing intelligence with our friends in countries from overseas. We follow every lead. And information-sharing between the CIA and the FBI is seamless, so that the reaction to any threat is real-time. And—but the truth of the matter is, in order to fully defend America, we must defeat the evildoers where they hide. We must round them up, and we must bring them to justice. And that’s exactly what we’re doing in Afghanistan—the first battle in the war of the 21st century.\(^{250}\)

Here, at the onset of a new millennium, the epochal nature of this battle of good and evil is highlighted with accountability at its core.

Intervention in Afghanistan and Man/Nation as Masculine Rescuer

Afghan women became an archetypal symbol of the damsel in distress. They were portrayed that way by the Bush Administration and the mainstream American
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media. The image of a damsel in distress is powerful, and the hegemonic masculine response is to save the damsel—Prince Charming to the rescue! The rescue narrative, as discussed by Lakoff, is evident here as well. As discussed in Chapter 3, Lakoff describes the rescue narrative thus:

The characters are: the Hero, the Victim, the Villain, the Helpers. The Hero is inherently good; the Villain is inherently bad. The main actions form a scenario, usually in this order: the Villainy, committed by the Villain against the Victim; the Difficulties undergone by the Hero; the Battle of Hero against Villain; the Victory of Hero over Villain; the Rescue of the Victim by the Hero; the Punishment of the Villain; the Reward for the Hero. The Villainy upsets the moral balance. The Victory, Rescue, Punishment, and Reward restore the moral balance. There is also a variant in which the Hero is the Victim. This is a Self-defense narrative: the Hero rescues himself.\(^{251}\)

In the military response to the attacks on 9/11, the United States was “victimized” and therefore feminized. According to Lakoff’s narrative, the United States was both Hero and Victim, and the terrorists were Villains. The military intervention in Afghanistan became the “difficulties” to be overcome by the Hero. The US military was rescuing the other victims as well: the women in Afghanistan who had been oppressed by the Taliban. Capturing Al Qaeda and Taliban members was the “punishment;” however, very few men captured in Afghanistan and elsewhere during the “War on Terror” have been tried in courts of law for offenses for which they have been accused. They have, however, been punished by detainment at Guantanamo Bay and by the torture used by the US military and the CIA. The villainy of the terrorist attacks was rectified (or began to be rectified) by the US military intervention. The victims were “rescued,” at least
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theoretically. The Bush administration celebrated the changes it imposed on Afghanistan after the Taliban was overthrown: women could participate in public life, girls could be educated, and in effect women and girls were rescued by the American intervention. While the actual conditions of life for most women in Afghanistan have not exactly met the ideal of a rescue, the rhetoric alleged that Americans rescued Afghanistan, and in particular, Afghan women. This liberation was part of the “reward.” Another component of the reward was the remasculinization of the US, part of what Lakoff refers to as the “Self-Defense Narrative.” The United States rescued itself, by using military force to capture and punish the “evildoers,” and, in doing so, regained its masculinity.

Good From Evil

Not only did Bush invoke the “rescue narrative,” he also spoke about how the United States would “rescue” itself, and from evil create good. He commented on how America, a unique country with limitless capabilities, could turn things around and create good from evil. As the months passed after 9/11, Bush emphasized these ideas more, in addition to the on-going emphasis on evil and evildoers.

I want to thank those of you who have worked extra long hours to help forge this fantastic coalition that we’re building, a coalition of people all around the world who understand that the evil acts could have happened to them, just like they happened to us. . . People understand that now is the time to take a stand, to seize this moment, to say that out of this evil act will come good.252

America would rise, phoenix-like, from the ashes to reclaim freedom and goodness for the world.
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So America is sacrificing. America—I think the interesting thing that has happened, and this is so sad an incident, but there are some positive things developed—that are developing. One is, I believe that many people are reassessing what’s important in life. Moms and dads are not only reassessing their marriage and the importance of their marriage, but of the necessity of loving their children like never before. I think that’s one of the positives that have come from the evildoers. . . The evil ones have sparked an interesting change in America, I think—a compassion in our country that is overflowing.  

This underscores the way Bush perceived America’s goodness increasing after the evildoers attacked. On October 17, 2001, Bush said “The evildoers have struck our nation, but out of evil comes good. We are a good, kind-hearted, decent people, and we’re showing the world just that in our compassion and our resolve.” Through Americans’ compassion the United States would rescue itself, and rescue others as well.

By winter of 2001 and into Spring of 2002, Bush’s emphasis on evil and evildoers was less pronounced than just after the terrorist attacks. Emphasis on how good can come of evil became a more prominent message. On January 5, 2002, Bush said

One of the most heartening things for me is to know that thousands of Americans are reassessing their values. Moms and dads are asking what they can do to be better parents. That as a result of the evil-doer, not only are we responding militarily and not only have we put this broad coalition together that says we’ll rid the world of terror, but here at home people are saying, gosh, let me reassess my life. It’s so important for moms and dads to know that the most important job they will ever have is to love their children with all their heart and all their soul.”
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Americans—specifically “moms and dads”—illustrated the goodness of America.

Americans were becoming better people, and creating better families, by recovering from the attacks. Bush seemed to be saying that the evil of the attacks would only make Americans stronger, more loving, and more united. Bush’s words evoke the positive effects of the terrorist attacks, that Americans would become more aware of their freedoms, more supportive of their government, and more generous with one another. On April 9, 2002 Bush said

> It’s small acts of kindness and decency that define the true face of America for the world. If you want to fight evil, do some good. And it’s that gathering momentum of millions of acts of kindness which will have the American people stand squarely in the face of the evil doers. And that’s happening in America. It is.  

Bush emphasized not chaos, desperation, and unrest as a result of the crisis of 9/11, but a wholly different reaction; perhaps not the one his “evildoers” or the global audience expected. Once again, on March 18, 2002, Bush praised the rescuers saying, “And by helping, you stand squarely in the face of the evil doers that hate America.”  

Ironically, when President Bush addressed the Joint Session of Congress and the American people on September 20, 2001 he made no mention of evil-doers. Why this language was not included in the address to the Congress is not clear, perhaps his rhetoric was not fully formed by September 20, 2001, whereas by March 18, 2002 he was more clearly using the dichotomy of good and evil.
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What Bush made clear, is that the remasculinized United States, under the president’s own remasculinized leadership, would see to it that good came from evil, and part of this was related to Afghan women. Sadly, the truth about the salvation of women and girls in Afghanistan still is not quite up to international human rights standards. Bush’s rhetoric about the goodness of America, and the rescue of Afghan women, was not followed by actual results in terms of improving the lives of Afghan women.

Lived Realities of Afghan Women’s Lives Today

The Bush Administration, when arguing for US military intervention in Afghanistan, made a point to argue that Americans were, in part, going there to rescue Afghan women from the terrorists. The Bush Administration, in conjunction with President Hamid Karzai, did encourage suffrage for women and the election of women to political office. The legal rights to franchise and political representation were extended to women. Nevertheless, legal rights, and being able to exercise one’s legal rights, are two completely different things. This phenomenon is not uncommon, in the United States slaves were freed, only much later were African Americans able to exercise rights, and racism and discrimination continue to exist. Afghan woman have yet to realize and enjoy these new “rights” in their own country.

The Bush Administration also emphasized providing opportunities for girls and women in Afghanistan to be educated. Under the Taliban it was illegal for women and girls to be educated, and this was perceived by Americans and the world community to be a particularly egregious offense. Support within Afghanistan for the education of girls
has been mixed, primarily because girls’ schools have been targets for bombings and other attacks, by insurgents, Taliban and/or Al Qaeda. Because of the deeply-held traditional beliefs regarding the education of women by some Afghan men, not all of whom are terrorists, many girls are unable to attend school. Girls also have considerable domestic duties which interfere with their time for education, particularly in rural areas. Finally, the job prospects for women who become educated remain dismal. Furthermore, the traditional belief that a woman’s primary duty is to care for her husband, family, and the household, remains powerful in Afghanistan. Women who work outside the home are frequent targets of harassment and violence. Women politicians have been murdered.

Additional rights are also of serious concern to women in Afghanistan, and around the world. Those rights include the right to choose freely one’s own spouse after reaching an age a decision can be made maturely, or not to choose one at all; the right to be free from physical abuse by one’s husband and other male relatives; and the right not to be used in property exchanges.

How are women faring in Afghanistan? The Associated Press has reported

Desperate to escape domestic violence, forced marriage and hardship, scores of women across Afghanistan each year are committing suicide by fire. While some gains have been made since the fall of the Taliban . . . life remains bleak for many Afghan women in the conservative and violence-plagued country, and suicide is a common escape. . . . Five years after the fall of the repressive Taliban regime, domestic violence affects “an overwhelming majority” of Afghan women and girls, according to a report from Womankind, an international women’s rights group. An estimated 60 to 80 percent of Afghan marriages are forced, the report said. More than half the Afghan women are married before they turn 16 and many young girls are married to men who are several decades older, the report
sai. The exchange of women and girls to resolve a crime, debt or household dispute is also common.\footnote{Associated Press, “Afghan Women Turn to Suicide for Escape,” \textit{The Greeley Tribune}, Nov. 19, 2006.}

Clearly, even though the rhetoric used by Bush emphasized “rescuing” Afghan women, the realities of life for women in Afghanistan during the intervention have improved only slightly. The United States, therefore, did not actually “rescue” Afghan women, even while some advances have been made.

Regarding legal rights under the Karzai regime, Afghan women have been restored some of the rights they had under previous governments.

Under the hard-line Taliban regime, women were unable to vote, receive education or be employed. In recent years [since the fall of the Taliban], women have gained the right to cast ballots and female candidates have run for parliament, but women are often still regarded as second-class citizens.\footnote{Ibid.}

Legal equality has not been followed by actual equality.

Clearly the liberation of Afghan women was not the real reason the Bush Administration committed troops to a military intervention. Although the Bush Administration and the US Congress did provide financial assistance to educate Afghan girls, the commitment to improving the lives of women in Afghanistan was not a priority for the Bush Administration. In the rhetoric of the Bush administration, however, women in Afghanistan were victims who needed to be rescued.

Contrary to the fairy tale and Lakoff’s rescue narrative, women in Afghanistan did resist the Taliban. They did so subversively, by having clandestine “makeup parties” and other social gatherings, and by secretly continuing to educate their girls. Many
Afghan women joined a secret anti-Taliban political organization, RAWA, and this non-governmental organization worked at the global level to expose the atrocious treatment of women and girls in Afghanistan, and what the Taliban had essentially established: gender apartheid. The film *Beneath the Veil* is a documentary about the secret social and political organization of women under the Taliban regime. It explores how women fought against the Taliban it exposes the punishment by the Ministry of Virtue and Vice for even mild infractions—execution.  

Women also fled Afghanistan in large numbers to escape the Taliban. These women refugees, living across the border in Pakistan, organized themselves and worked with women within Afghanistan to rescue women in trouble, smuggling them out whenever possible. Internationally, these women’s groups in Pakistan made connections with feminists around the world. They produced goods that were marketed by international feminist groups, and solicited donations, not only to continue resistance against the Taliban and rescue more women, but also for their own survival in the refugee camps. These camps were frequent targets of harassment and violence. They even used the *burqua*, as symbol of the Taliban’s oppression, to generate necessary funds. For a small donation, people around the world could receive a small swatch of the mesh through which all women in Afghanistan, and elsewhere, viewed the world when in public.

Regarding the research questions addressed here, the depiction of Afghan women as “victims” who needed to be “rescued” by the US military (rescued by men) fits clearly within the rescue narrative. Yet Bush did not need to use this metaphor to gain support.
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with the American people. Opinion polls showed overwhelming American support for the US military intervention in Afghanistan, because Americans felt justified in going after the perpetrators of the terrorist attacks. It seems that the Bush administration, and Bush himself, defaulted to a hypermasculine response and justified intervention, in part, through the rescue narrative and the idea of the United States as “Prince Charming.” As the above facts demonstrate, however, the outcome of Prince Charming’s rescue paled in comparison to what the Afghan “damsel-in-distress” could do for herself. She was not quite the helpless victim the Bush administration portrayed to the American public or the world.

Intervention in Afghanistan and Man/Nation as Masculine Warrior

“Dead or Alive”

Bush asserted strength and power when he said, “We’re a nation that can’t be cowed by evil-doers.”262 And, he promised to eliminate the enemy: “We will rid the world of the evil-doers.”263 It was a promise to capture and execute the “evildoers.” This is the extreme masculine response: kill.

On September 18, 2001, in New York Times article titled: “A NATION CHALLENGED: THE PRESIDENT; Bin Laden Is Wanted in Attacks, ‘Dead or Alive,’ President Says,” David E. Sanger summarized what the President had been saying since the terrorist attacks on September 11. Just seven days after the attack, President Bush had definitely gone on the offensive, and relied upon hypermasculine rhetoric. Sanger

\footnote{262 http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010916-2.html}
\footnote{263 Ibid.}
wrote, “President Bush declared at the Pentagon this morning that he wanted Osama bin Laden, the prime suspect in last week’s terrorist strikes, brought to justice, and he pointedly recalled the frontier posters urging the capture of criminals ‘dead or alive.’”264 Bush projected not only power, but also aggressiveness when he promised to exact justice for the terrorist attacks.

Within days of the attacks, Bush was completing plans to call up 35,000 military reservists to patrol American harbors and airspace. Already, Bush was broaching the idea that the war against Islamic extremism would be a long one. “The president also seemed to be preparing the country today for the likelihood of casualties in what he said would be a long war, one likely to be fought by unconventional means.”265 He also predicted that the United States would win the war. “We will win the war, and there will be costs” Bush said.266 Bush prepared the American people for war, argued why it was necessary, and made note that casualties would certainly occur. A warrior, however, does not worry about the physical damage and/or psychological damages to himself or to others. A warrior is focused on defeating the enemy.

Bush made another interesting argument. “He warned that even if Mr. bin Laden were found, ‘there are other terrorists in the world,’ and, turning on his Texas twang, promised to ‘get them running and to find them, and to hunt them down.’”267 Bush, relying on the ideology of cowboy masculinity, and frontier justice, emphasized a hyper-
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masculine response to the attacks. No terrorist would be safe from the long arm of the law.

Bush began to describe the nature of the conflict and reshape his image as President. Sanger writes,

His trip [to the Pentagon], and then to the Islamic Center of Washington, on Embassy Row less than two miles from the White House, seemed part of an emerging White House strategy of trying to portray Mr. Bush as a resolute wartime leader, a compassionate father figure, and an economic strategist. After the White House was criticized for how little Mr. Bush was in evidence on the day of the attack, it may now be “overcompensating,” said one Republican figure close to the White House.268

Notice Sanger’s interpretation that Bush was presenting himself as a “resolute wartime leader” and a “compassionate father figure.” The term “resolute” evokes classic masculine characteristics, such as “Sturdy Oak.” He also invoked the masculinity of “Give ‘Em Hell,” while stating his determination to “get them running and to find them, and to hunt them down.” In a sense, Bush presented himself as the “Sheriff” who would round up a posse and hunt down the criminals. While Bush projected an image of himself as a warrior, he simultaneously presented himself as the classic father—a tough man who does what he needs to do to protect his family. Bush invoked both the rescue narrative and the image of himself and the United States as aggressive.

Bush’s reliance on a hyper-masculine and aggressive perspective were clearly evident. Sanger wrote,

Bush’s comments about Mr. bin Laden, the Saudi millionaire believed to be in hiding in Afghanistan, came when he was asked if he wanted the suspected terrorist
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dead. “I want him—I want justice,” the president said. “And there’s an old poster out West, as I recall, that said: ‘Wanted: Dead or Alive.’”

It is patently obvious that this hypermasculine statement was designed to highlight the position of Bush as the “Sheriff” and remind people of the rough justice found in the Old West. Bush’s use of his Texas accent was either deliberate or accidental, but either way he was characterizing this new war as a man hunting down criminals. To further emphasize his point, “[Bush] spokesman, Ari Fleischer, made it clear that Mr. Bush was not simply reminiscing about late-night Westerns, and would be happy to have Mr. bin Laden served up either way.” The idea of “Dead or Alive” is reminiscent of bounty hunters and posses of the Old West. This statement shows that Bush was not interested in capturing Bin Laden so that he could be tried for murder, or even crimes against humanity. In fact, one way to interpret that statement is that Bush would have preferred Bin Laden dead—that way he would not have to comply with international or national standards regarding due process or penalty. Furthermore,

Mr. Fleischer said that the executive order prohibiting United States officials from engaging in assassinations remained in effect. But he quickly added that the rule “does not limit the United States’ ability to act in self-defense.” He did not say whether the battle against Mr. bin Laden and his organization fit that definition, but he left the strong impression that it did.

In effect, Fleischer implied that should the United States have the opportunity to kill Bin Laden without having to use a judicial system to try him for crimes, the United States (its
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military or intelligence services) would act as judge, jury, and executioner. Wild West rhetoric was employed to illustrate Bush and the nation as warriors.

In describing his war goals in broad terms, Mr. Bush also talked about destroying the al-Qaeda network of terrorists, a goal Secretary of State Colin L. Powell began discussing over the weekend. Senior White House officials said that the remarks were intended to underscore that Mr. bin Laden’s arrest or death would mark only the beginning of the war. Over the weekend Mr. Powell described al-Qaeda as a “holding company” for a variety of terrorist groups.272

Although Bush wanted Bin Laden “Dead or Alive,” he also wanted to capture and/or kill anyone who was involved with Al Qaeda and anyone who had assisted the terrorists or who protected them, specifically the Taliban.

Hypermasculine Response

Bush’s “humble” foreign policy was quickly swept away, and he embarked on a unilateralist strategy that was consciously masculine. After the attacks, the United States intended to punish the evildoers, whether others in the international community were supportive or not. Sanger wrote, “Mr. Bush will spend much of the week trying to build an international coalition to wage war on terrorism, but he and other officials acknowledged today it will be unlike any coalition ever before assembled.”273 The coalition was clearly assembled with the tacit acknowledgement that the United States would be in charge of the intervention in Afghanistan, and other countries could help if they were willing to accept that. Bush also emphasized that countries were “either with us or against us,” presenting a zero-sum game definition of the war on terror.
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A senior administration official today described it as essentially three concentric circles: Longtime allies like Britain that may provide troops and equipment, states near Afghanistan and other terrorist hot spots that could provide landing locations, intelligence or overflight rights, and finally smaller states and organizations that “have small capabilities but add an important voice.”

Initially, secrecy surrounded the decision-making regarding the response to the attacks. Sanger wrote

The administration said nothing today about its military plans, and Mr. Bush stressed again the need for secrecy, saying he would never discuss his options. But Treasury Secretary Paul O’Neill, speaking about the crisis for the first time, said he expected the United States would also be “waging a financial war.”

As would become evident later, Bush wanted to find and punish those responsible, and he would use both military and financial means to do so. Treasury Secretary O’Neill said “What you’re going to see now is an all-out attack” on terrorists and suspected terrorists, “and then systematically going after their financial assets.”

The comments made by Bush just after the attacks illustrated a clear hyper-masculine response.

In talking about the hijackers, however, Mr. Bush kept up his bellicose language. He once again called them ‘barbarians,’ and graphically described the terror they wrought on the airplane that ultimately crashed in Pennsylvania—a plane administration officials say they
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believe was on a kamikaze mission toward the White House or Capitol. 277

Bush emphasized the “evil” nature of the attackers, and in his characterization of the terrorists as “barbarians” he put them within a well-known framework of meaning which dates back millennia in Western culture. As previously discussed, “Barbarians” are the “other,” and sub-human. Bush graphically illustrated the barbaric nature of the terrorists when he said, “They slit throats of women on airplanes in order to achieve an objective that is beyond comprehension . . . And they like to hit, and then they like to hide out.” 278

Not only were the terrorists “barbarians,” they were also cowards who killed women instead of protecting them as men should. The terrorists were also characterized as cowards when Bush discussed how “they like to hide out.” Hiding out is weak and cowardly, not manly and brave. Bush also said that beating the terrorists would require new rules of warfare. “Beating such a foe, he said, is ‘going to require a new thought process.’” Later he added: ‘It’s going to take a long time to win this war.’” 279

Nevertheless, Bush maintained that Americans, and he himself, were capable of meeting this new challenge. America was a warrior.

In many ways, the US military intervention in Afghanistan went beyond asserting American power and the rescue narrative—it echoed the classic masculine response to humiliation: retaliation and revenge. Retaliation and revenge can also be connected to a simplistic, literal reading of the Old Testament’s advocacy of “an eye for an eye.” The United States had to punish Al Qaeda, to take revenge, and to regain American
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masculinity. It was this hypermasculine reflexive response which led Bush to emphasize the evil nature of the terrorists, and to think of them and talk about them as if they were pure evil. Clearly, the concept of evil, in a biblical context, is important to a nation in which 70% claim to be Christian, and this characterization resonated with a lot of Americans. This resonance proved particularly effective given the grief and fear many Americans experienced after 9/11.

In the research regarding President Bush’s language on the Afghan intervention, some words and phrases were used infrequently but were very powerful, for example, “dead or alive.” Other words and phrases, however, were used extensively by President Bush. As noted, Bush repeatedly used the terms “evil” and “evildoers” to describe the terrorists who attacked the United States on 9/11. These words helped to reinforce the idea, for himself and the American people, that Al Qaeda members were not just enemies, but that they were evil and needed to be destroyed at nearly any cost. The United States would use all means at its disposal to get justice and revenge against the attackers.

The terms “evil” and “evildoers” convey a wealth of meaning. First, Bush clearly used these words in the Judeo-Christian context, as expected given his fundamentalist Christian understanding of the world. Evildoers cannot be engaged diplomatically, for example, because they are inherently malevolent. No one can negotiate with evil, and there is no compromise with evil. Everything is black-and-white. Evildoers cannot be brought into the international community because they cannot be reasoned with. They can only be destroyed. The Biblical foundations of this perspective are very clear. The
United States can negotiate with countries that are different from us and that have
different goals, and perhaps even with countries with whom, historically, we have not
been particularly friendly. Evildoers, however, are in a completely different category.
The only way to get rid of them is to kill them.

Has Operation Enduring Freedom Succeeded?

Osama bin Laden has not been brought to justice. He continues to evade the
American and NATO forces in Afghanistan and the Pakistani forces in Pakistan as well.
Initially, Bush focused a great deal of attention on “getting” Bin Laden, to the point of
emphasizing that he wanted him “dead or alive.” Why has the United States been
unsuccessful in catching Bin Laden? Myriad reasons have been discussed by analysts,
including poor rules of engagement, the resistance by the Pakistani government to
intervene, and the extremely difficult terrain in which the United States believes he is
hiding. Over time, Bush shifted the emphasis away from Bin Laden, and after the initial
phase of the campaign in Afghanistan, rarely discussed catching him as the United States’
primary objective. Why the shift? Did the administration downplay Bin Laden’s
importance because the United States was unsuccessful in capturing or killing him? The
American public continues to believe that Osama bin Laden’s capture should be a
priority. The Bush administration, however, focused on other things: the war in Iraq,
fighting and capturing members of the Taliban and Al Qaeda, improving the overall
security situation in Afghanistan, and spreading democracy to both Afghanistan and Iraq.
There was very little discussion of whether Afghanistan and Iraq were places in which democracy is possible, or even prudent. Democratic outcomes can be surprising, e.g. the democratic election of Hamas in the Gaza Strip. In some cases, the United States actually has prevented elections from taking place so as to avoid the election of leaders it dislikes, for example in post-WWII Vietnam. In other cases, democratic elections have brought undemocratic regimes to power. The point, however, is that Bush’s initial rhetoric about getting the evil-doers, and getting Bin Laden, ebbed over time and he emphasized other objectives over the capture of Bin Laden.

Conclusion
For President Bush, the people who attacked the US on 9/11 were pure evil, and given Bush’s moral code, the response was obvious to all: kill the people who did this, punish those who helped them, and require all people and countries to choose sides. Bush repeatedly invoked narratives which resonated with Americans in the weeks after the attacks, weeks of shock and horror and mourning. Bush maintained constant emotional reactions as evident in his statements: he automatically fell back upon cowboy lingo, images of rescue, good old-fashioned violence, right versus wrong, and good versus evil.
Chapter Six
Masculinity Concepts in President Bush’s Foreign Policy Speeches

The approach employed here is a qualitative content analysis to examine how hegemonic masculinity affected Bush and the nation after the terrorist attacks on 9/11, and how it thereby directly affected foreign policy decision-making. This chapter employs a different approach than the narratives in Chapters Four and Five. This chapter is a content analysis of Bush’s speeches. I focused much of the analysis on Bush’s communication in the aftermath of 9/11, and compared the rhetoric used before the attacks to that used after. Blatant gender references were not much in evidence before the attacks. There was a noticeable shift toward gendered language, with a subtext of hegemonic masculinity, just after the terrorist attacks. I explored Bush’s public commentary (spoken and written) for evidence of the components of hegemonic masculinity I have distilled from masculinity studies, gender studies, women’s studies, and feminist international relations literature.\(^{280}\)

According to John W. Creswell, qualitative research “is a form of interpretive inquiry in which researchers make an interpretation of what they see, hear, and understand. Their interpretations cannot be separated from their own backgrounds, history, contexts, and prior understandings.”\(^{281}\) Creswell’s description of qualitative content analysis is in keeping with my broader, meta-theoretical ontological approach of

\(^{280}\) A list of the speeches analyzed can be found in Appendix A.

\(^{281}\) John W. Creswell, Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches, 3\(^{rd}\) ed. (Los Angeles: Sage, 2009), 176.
standpoint feminism. As I have noted, standpoint feminism posits that the standpoint—the situational location of the researcher—is of importance in producing quality research. Although the standard scientific method presents the researchers as without bias, and encourages researchers to eliminate bias as much as possible, standpoint feminism argues that this is neither possible nor desirable. Obviously this raises the question of reliability and validity; however, from a standpoint feminist perspective, we cannot eliminate researcher bias because that very bias is what prompts us to ask interesting questions. I approached this research from a particular situated location, but proceeded with research and analysis commonly used in the social sciences.

Validity and Reliability

Creswell says “Qualitative validity means that the researcher checks for the accuracy of the findings by employing certain procedures, while qualitative reliability indicates that the researcher’s approach is consistent across different researchers and different projects.” Standpoint feminism objects to the description of qualitative reliability, as standpoint theory posits a researcher’s approach never can be consistent across different researches and different projects. It is difficult to reconcile the standpoint approach and reliability in the sense Creswell describes. For example, a level of reliability regarding how any given researcher would code concepts—that is, whether they would be coded exactly as I code them here—was not possible for this project. Nevertheless, regarding definition of terms and usage, I define the concepts clearly and explain why speeches were considered to contain references to these concepts.

282 Ibid., 190.
The validity of any research is extremely important as well, defined by Creswell as “whether the findings are accurate.” Reliability can be addressed here as well. A researcher who duplicated the research regarding the difference in the number of times masculine concepts were invoked before and after 9/11, coding speeches according to the concepts operationalized here, would likely come to the same conclusion: the number of times these concepts were invoked increased substantially after 9/11. Determining what this means and why these concepts were employed so frequently, are of course much more complicated questions, and different researchers might likely come to different conclusions. Other suggestions given by Creswell regarding reliability and validity include the use of procedures, some of which were employed. For example, every effort was made to ensure that there was not a “drift” in the “definitions of the codes,” here the recording and analysis of three gendered concepts. In addition, to increase validity, thick description was employed to convey the findings. One final question to consider is whether or not the findings can be generalized. Some qualitative researchers contend qualitative case study results can be generalized to some “broader theory.” Others argue particularly that this is “the hallmark of qualitative research.” This research generates questions as well as some answers. The questions generated are important for a better understanding of foreign policy decision-making and the way American foreign policy is portrayed to US citizens. The research shows that President Bush increased his use of gendered language after the 9/11 attacks. Does that mean every military intervention includes the use of gendered rhetoric to evoke gendered ideologies? That question
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cannot be answered here, but it highlights the importance of masculine rhetoric to Presidential decision-making in the United States and what the President says about it. Others could apply this approach to different countries, and decision-making within those countries, to determine how much hegemonic masculinity might direct foreign policy globally.

Regarding qualitative research Creswell also makes the point that researchers often use a lens to view their study. In this research, the lens is gender. All of the data is analyzed through the lens of gendered ideologies and ideas of masculinity in the contemporary United States. I have focused not just on what President George W. Bush said, but the embedded gendered meanings which reflect hegemonic masculinity, and the ways in which he evoked gendered ideologies and beliefs.

The speeches were first initially reviewed with attention to whether masculine concepts were invoked, both the set of speeches before 9/11, and speeches on 9/11 and for a short period of time afterward (approximately six weeks). The set of speeches chosen before 9/11 were selected to cover the time between Bush’s inauguration as President to just weeks before 9/11. The selected speeches also had to be sufficiently lengthy for analysis. They also addressed (in some form) US foreign policy and illustrated Bush’s views on the global role of the United States, the President’s role, and his own interpretation of both. The set of speeches analyzed after 9/11 included every major speech in the first week after the attacks, and important speeches made in the five or so weeks following. The gendered rhetoric after 9/11 was analyzed and three conceptual indicators of hegemonic masculinity emerged: power, rescuer, and warrior.
After the concepts were clearly defined, with reference to masculinity studies, gender studies, and international feminist scholarship, the speeches were reviewed again and references to each of the three concepts were recorded. This was performed for both sets of speeches. Each speech was then analyzed as to the three concepts, and results of the qualitative analysis were drafted. The data was rechecked as it was reviewed three times for each indicator, and then again when data was recorded and analyzed for each individual speech. The hypothesis of whether the number of references to these three concepts increased after 9/11 was tested statistically with a t-test, with results that showed a significant statistical increase for two of the concepts: rescuer and warrior. The differences—whether these gendered concepts were employed more frequently after 9/11 and speculation as to why—were then analyzed as well. Conclusions reached relied on both the qualitative analysis and the statistical differences evident from the t-test.

The development of the concepts for qualitative content analysis is a process, and the repeated examination of speeches facilitated a refinement of the concepts through the course of the research. How concepts are operationalized frequently evolves in qualitative research in this way. An initial review of the language (the data) is followed by a return to the concepts to make them more precise, and to operationalize them as clearly as possible. Then, during additional reviews of the data, with double-checking as to the accuracy of the coding of each concept in each speech, references to the gendered concepts were recorded. After the data recording, statistical methods were employed to determine if there was a change in the frequency of the concepts, and how frequently these concepts were evoked in each speech.
Concepts

I have explored the gendered nature of Bush’s rhetoric through three main concepts: 1. Man/nation as powerful; 2. Man/nation as warrior; 3. Man/nation as rescuer. The traditional view of power in international relations is that of “control over,” or “influence over,” something that makes people or states do things they would not ordinarily do. From Bush’s perspective, as a Realist and a powerful man, this is the most appropriate way to conceptualize power. Indeed it is the way he conceptualizes power. In this research, to operationalize power for the purposes here, power has a number of gendered concepts and components.

Power

First, in theory, power refers to the idea that men (and the nation) are powerful over others. This implies the ability of men and states to impose their will on other people and other states. Regarding the analysis of Bush’s rhetoric pursuant to US military intervention, Bush was exercising his power by persuading the American people and the US Congress to support US military intervention in Afghanistan. Bush was also exerting power (his own and US power) when he authorized the use of force to intervene in Afghanistan in order to capture Osama bin Laden and destroy both Al Qaeda and the Taliban. For Bush, the use of his (and US) power was not contingent on the agreement of other states. Bush evidently felt that the United States had the right to unilaterally
intervene in Afghanistan, although that action was arguably a violation of the United Nations Charter.

Bush frequently used words in his speeches during this period to invoke the power of the United States and of himself. He emphasized the strength of the United States and of its people and soldiers (also firefighters, police officers, emergency responders, etc.). In particular, his emphasis on the masculine strength of the US is of extreme importance in this analysis.

The assertion that the United States was able to “get the evildoers” was an assertion of American strength. (It also set up the dichotomy of the Americans as “good” doers and the enemy as “evildoers.”) “Getting” the evildoers meant capturing and killing those allegedly responsible for the terrorist attacks on 9/11. It also evoked the male-as-competitor view of power. In other words, it was about men versus men, in a masculine battle, ostensibly, to establish the United States was the stronger.

Another component of American strength was the assertion of the superiority of America and Americans. Bush emphasized again and again that America must win in this particular competition, because if America did not win against the terrorists the US would always be threatened by their existence. He also emphasized that Americans must be strong to do so. In truth, it was more than a competition, which seems like a sporting event. In Bush’s view it was nothing less than a battle between good and evil for the survival of the United States and American values worldwide. A number of particular words were used to emphasize American strength including: strong, steadfast, heroes, bravery, “blink,” evildoers, punish, execute, kill, “make no mistake,” “Muslim
fundamentalists” and other phrases for the enemy, heroes, brave men and women in our armed forces, and others which will be discussed below in the content analysis.

Another concept which will be addressed is man/nation as warrior, and there is some overlap in the concepts of power and warrior. Nevertheless, to explore the gendered meanings of Bush’s assertions I have separated these concepts. America as strong is related to, but not the same as, the concept of America as warrior. When discussing America’s strength, Bush included elements such as increased faith, helpfulness, hope, etc. Warrior is a concept which includes having and exercising power, but in a way that explicitly refers to the use of military force.

An additional component of the idea that America is powerful is the implicit rejection of the feminine. The United States and Bush are male, masculine, not weak victims or effeminate. Bush’s emphasis on strength and power is an implicit rejection of the feminization of the United States which resulted from the terrorist attacks, rejection of the feminization of American men, and of Bush himself. This was an important part of the remasculinization of the United States post 9/11.

The other concept of interest here, rescuer, contains elements of power as well. A rescuer has empathy and compassion, which are not necessarily essential components of power. A rescuer is strong of course, but focuses on protecting innocents, preserving life, and taking care of the weak. Power and rescuer were separated into two different concepts which were then explored in Bush’s language.
The concept of the man and the nation as rescuer pervades Bush’s language regarding the response to the terrorist attacks. As previously discussed, this is part of the “rescue narrative” and the “knight-in-shining armor” concept. Masculinity emphasizes not only men (and nations) as strong, but also as rescuer. Men/nations rescue and protect women/feminine nations. Bush again and again referred to the United States as a rescuer. He first focused attention on the rescuers—the heroes of 9/11, the firefighters and emergency personnel reacting quickly to rescue victims, the political leaders and ordinary Americans who were all in some way involved in the rescue effort. For example, Bush personally called on every American citizen to do whatever they could to help the rescue effort, either personally or through donations to such organizations as the Red Cross, or directly to the government rescue effort by asking all American schoolchildren to donate a dollar toward the rescue and recovery efforts. The government, in Bush’s words, was doing everything in its power to rescue actual injured victims; going beyond that, it was rescuing its own self image. Conceptually, this is the American people, in particular its men, performing a traditional masculine role: rescue. Recall the discussion of the knight-in-shining-armor. Bush then began to discuss rescuing those people in Afghanistan who did not support the Taliban. This took the concept of rescue to another level, the international level. Bush began to speak about rescuing the innocent victims of the terrible Taliban regime in Afghanistan and victims of Al Qaeda there. Rescuing the women in Afghanistan from the fundamentalist Muslim control over women also crept into this rhetoric. Words used frequently included, but
were not limited to: heroes, bravery, innocent women and children, help, protect, stand by, and emergency.

Warrior

The concept of man/nation as warrior was a constant theme in Bush’s rhetoric. As discussed above, warrior and power are conceptually connected. Power comes through being victorious in battle, through violence, and maybe force in general, which could include economic force. Bush also continually made reference to not only the strength of the United States and its citizens, but America as militaristic (although he did not explicitly use this term). He also praised Americans as superior warriors who would use strength not only to rescue the innocent, but also to punish the evildoers. The concept of man/nation as warrior includes references to violence, aggression, threats, etc. Hooper, Brannon, Kilmartin, Gilmore and Kimmel all include aggression as a part of the construction of masculinity. Bush, in an attempt to re-masculinize the United States and himself after the feminizing 9/11 attacks, used this warrior imagery and rhetoric. From the masculinist perspective of Bush (and of Realists generally) men and nations are violent, and settle disputes through violence. Realism accepts that men are innately selfish and violent, and neo-Realists posit that nations can only survive if they perpetrate violence to survive in the anarchic international environment. Thus, men and nations are warriors. In addition, the United States was portrayed not only as militaristic, but also a nation of warriors. In Bush’s speeches he described the United States using explicit warrior imagery including such words as: enemies, fight, kill/execute, terrorists,
murderers, heroes, brave *men* and *women* of our armed forces, evildoer(s), punish, homeland, soldier, “wanted dead or alive,” and “smoke ’em out.”

While some of these indicators are slippery and not easily quantified, the analysis illustrates the frequency of Bush’s use of these gendered concepts. A key question is: Was there a difference in the number of times Bush use these gendered concepts before 9/11 as compared to after 9/11? Obviously after the 9/11 attacks the President was responding to a crisis. Changes in Bush’s language were to be expected. In a time of relative peace, there would be no reason to employ such language. Therefore, the answer to that question is yes, for two of the concepts—rescuer and warrior. However, there was no significant escalation in his references to power. To understand why there was such escalation for rescuer and warrior, in the qualitative analysis I focus on why and how these concepts were used in Bush’s speeches. I am not only interested in the frequency of the invocation of these masculine notions, but also in the way they were used to argue for US military intervention in Afghanistan and how they were a mechanism to remasculinize America and to remasculinize Bush himself.

Data Analysis: Pre-9/11 Speeches

In order to fully explore the use of gendered language during this period, six random speeches from before the 9/11 attacks were examined as to the number of the three concepts evoked. There were some in which Bush asserted American *power* before the terrorist attacks. There were very few in which Bush used language with subtexts of warrior and rescuer. That changed significantly after 9/11. Pre-9/11 speeches were
compared to post 9/11 speeches, according to coding based on three indicators: power, warrior, and rescuer. The data in each speech was counted, and the speeches were summarized by date. The following analysis will examine each speech, individually, for gendered themes, intended audience, and patterns of the three concepts.

“Inaugural Address,” George W. Bush, January 20, 2001

In his inaugural address, at his specific location in Washington, D.C., President Bush spoke in person to citizens, elected officials, other governmental employees, and people around the world. He was, in addition, speaking to the Republican Party throughout the country as the Republican Party leader, and to the minority party, the Democratic Party. Presidential inaugural addresses are frequently analyzed for information about Presidential styles, decision-making characteristics, policies, and numerous other variables. Because of this scrutiny, Presidential inaugural addresses are carefully prepared and carefully delivered. Nevertheless, they are still worthy of examination. Bush’s theme in this address was about American exceptionalism and America ideals. “It is the American story—a story of flawed and fallible people, united across the generations by grand and enduring ideals.”

Would Bush have characterized Americans as flawed and fallible after 9/11? Obviously he did not. He emphasized Americans as strong and capable. In his Inaugural Address, Bush may have also been invoking Biblical ideas of “fallen” man, appealing to a certain part of the population and asserting his position as an evangelical Christian. In this speech Bush made reference to

the concepts examined here as well. There were ten (10) references to power, one (1) reference to rescuer, and three (3) references to warrior. For example, Bush spoke of America as a leader, as strong, when he said: “If our country does not lead the cause of freedom, it will not be led.”\footnote{Ibid.} Bush implied that the United States was the only country in the world capable of leading the cause of freedom, that the United States demonstrates hegemonic power in the world regarding freedom and democracy. Bush did not evoke the themes of rescuer nor warrior much. This speech was not focused on drawing attention to the US as anyone’s rescuer, and Bush did not need to portray the US as a warrior because, as he said in the speech, the United States was “in a time of peace.”\footnote{Ibid.}


The news conference held on February 22, 2001 was held in the White House Press Room, and its audience was the media in the room, and beyond that, the American people as a whole. It was a question-and-answer session and a number of topics were addressed by Bush. There is no overall theme, precisely, as the news conference is guided by the media. There does emerge a theme, regarding international politics, of relatively passive foreign policy and multilateralism.

We’re reviewing all policy in all regions of the world, and one of the areas we’ve been spending a lot of time on is the Persian Gulf and the Middle East. The Secretary of State is going to listen to our allies as to how best to effect a policy, the primary goal of which will be to say to Saddam Hussein, we won’t tolerate you developing weapons of

\footnote{Ibid.} \footnote{Ibid.}
mass destruction, and we expect you to leave your neighbors alone. 288

The key phrase here is: *listen to our allies*. Bush’s initial foreign policy approach can be classified here as at least somewhat multilateral and passive in nature. He also emphasized the importance of having a coalition of allies, “a coalition of countries that agree with the policy set out by the United States.” 289 Bush’s language here is passive, unlike the language used after the terrorist attacks. However, it also indicated that Bush considered the US to be in a leadership position, and directing its allies. Bush proposed multilateralism, but under the global leadership of the United States. Although somewhat passive, a coalition led by the United States asserts some power in that the other countries would have to agree to be led by the United States. *Power* was referenced three (3) times in this speech, *warrior* twice, and *rescuer* not at all. Bush’s focus was simply not on issues that propelled him toward gendered language encompassing the concepts examined here.

The President’s News Conference, March 29, 2001

In Bush’s news conference on the March 29, 2001, he again spoke to the same audience he addressed on February 22, 2001. The focus in this news conference was not on foreign policy but on Bush’s domestic policy initiatives—most importantly for Bush, his tax cut plans. In response to a foreign policy question on the peace process in the Middle East, however, Bush’s position seemed unchanged.

289 Ibid.
I have said all along that this Nation will not try to force a peace settlement in the Middle East, that we will facilitate a peace settlement. It requires two willing parties to come to the table to enact a peace treaty that will last. And this administration won’t try to force peace on the parties. That’s what the U.N. tried to do the other day. They tried to force a situation in the Middle East to which both parties did not agree. That’s why I vetoed their suggestion. We have been fully engaged in the Middle East. We’re on the phone all the time to the leaders. I’m welcoming leaders to come. In order for there to be a peace, this country must develop a—what I call a broad foundation for peace. That means we’ve got to have good, strong relations with the Egyptians and the Jordanians and the Saudis.\footnote{Presidential News Conference, March 29, 2001, http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/print.php?pid=45705. (accessed 9/7/2009).}

Again, Bush emphasized the importance of allies to resolving international disputes, and seemed to be taking an essentially passive approach. Talking with leaders is not the same as leading the world for freedom and democracy. Bush mentions force as incompatible with peace, and says willing cooperation is necessary, which is much different than what he asserted after the terrorist attacks.

Interestingly, Bush did touch on the subject of terrorism that day; however, his attention focused on conventional warfare.

On missile defense, for example, I’ve assured our allies that we will consult with them. But we’re moving forward to develop systems that reflect the threats of today. I mean, who knows where the next terrorist attack is going to come from, but we’d better be ready for it. And I believe that I’ve got the opportunity to convince our friends and allies that our vision makes sense.\footnote{Ibid.}

Although Bush touched on the subject of terrorism, he did so in a way that emphasized multilateralism and cooperation with allies.
In this address, Bush made reference to power just once:

> People are beginning to learn what my administration is like. And they’re going to find we’re steadfast friends. But a friend is somebody who’s willing to tell the truth, and if there’s a disagreement, to be able to state it clearly, to make it clear where we disagree.  

In this speech Bush alludes to power, when he uses the word “steadfast,” indicating strength of character and keeping true to one’s friends. Rescuer and warrior concepts were not invoked in this speech. This could be attributed to the way that Bush saw the world before 9/11. The US was portrayed as powerful in the speeches before 9/11, but rarely were the other concepts employed. Those conceptual frameworks were not necessary at that time.

The President’s News Conference with Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi of Italy in Rome, Italy, July 23, 2001

This joint address in Italy was chosen because of its international location and its focus on international politics. The theme was partnership between the United States and Italy regarding European politics, the European Union and NATO, and other international institutions (such as the G-8 conference first reference to by Berlusconi). The immediate audience was selected by the Italian government, but the audience was truly international. Bush was speaking to everyone, in particular to other governments, and to the American people. Bush discussed bi-lateral and multilateral relations, and how he felt about meeting with the Roman Catholic Pope. His multilateral theme continued:

“I will tell you this: The spirit of collaboration and cooperation should indicate to our

---

292 Ibid.
friends and Allies that we’re more than willing to cooperate.” Nevertheless, Bush also invoked American *power* while simultaneously discussing multilateralism. Bush discussed what he understood to be the most important threats, rogue states with weapons of mass destruction (WMD), and that the creation of a missile defense system was one of his top priorities. This was an indication of American *power*, but he was careful to emphasize the involvement of Russia in going forward with missile defense in Europe, and emphasized his discussions with Putin and that the Cold War was over. Similar to statements made previously, Bush emphasized *power* through multilateralism and bilateral relations, through the cooperation of allies, and through dialogue and international agreement. Except for his references to *power*, albeit *power* defined differently from how he uses it after the terrorist attacks, the other two concepts examined here were not evident in this address.

The President’s News Conference in Crawford, Texas, August 24, 2001

This news conference was of particular interest for two reasons: its proximity in time to the terrorist attacks, and because it was a conference regarding Bush’s nominations for Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Some references to the concepts examined here were expected. In addition, it is interesting to compare Bush’s remarks approximately two weeks before the attacks to remarks made on 9/11 and beyond. The audience was composed primarily of the press, again, but the broader audience was the American people as well. The theme of this speech was Bush’s

---

understanding of the nature of international threats and optimism with his newly created national security team. Bush referred to power fourteen (14) times in this speech, the highest number of any speech analyzed in this time period. This is related to the focus of the press conference: national security. The tone of these remarks is different in emphasis, although bi-lateral and multi-lateral approaches to international challenges were still included. Bush argued for a strong military, to be brought about through an increase in military spending, and emphasized that the strength of the United States would be enhanced by his plans. He spoke of transforming the military

It’s not easy, because it requires balancing two sometimes conflicting priorities: the need to train and maintain our forces to meet all our security responsibilities in the world right now, with the need to research, develop, plan, and deploy new systems and strategies that will allow us to meet our responsibilities in a much different world in years to come.  

Bush’s focus was on military spending for security responsibilities as well as investment in research and development. He discussed balancing, which implies compromise, and that security is a global responsibility, which does evoke the concept of power but in a multi-lateral sense.

Bush’s approach to questions about Israel reflected the continued multi-lateral, cooperative approach to international relations, but with an absolute commitment to Israel. “We will not participate in a conference that tries to isolate Israel and denigrates Israel.” Bush sounded somewhat passive when addressing the Palestinians.

295 Ibid.
If Mr. Arafat is interested in having a dialogue that could conceivably lead to the Mitchell process, then I strongly urge him to urge the terrorists, the Palestinian terrorists, to stop the suicide bombings, to stop the incursions, to stop the threats. At the same time, we have worked very closely with [Israeli] Prime Minister Sharon to urge him to show restraint. Terrorism is prevalent now in the Middle East, and the first thing that all parties who are concerned about peace in the Middle East must do is work to stop the terrorist activities.²⁹⁶

He made this statement, followed by “I would hope the Israelis would show restraint on all fronts.”²⁹⁷ Some of these words invoke American power but overall were not aggressive in nature. He did discuss and condemn terrorism, but his tone was relatively muted on the subject. Bush’s attitude toward terrorism here was much different than his post-9/11 attitude. This indicates a shift in Bush’s worldview, and his understanding of international politics and foreign policy. Bush said here that Israel needed to show restraint, but after 9/11 Bush himself showed none. In fact, he went after “evildoers” with a marked lack of restraint and said that he would do anything to catch those responsible for the 9/11 attacks.

Bush continued with his theme of a strong, fully funded military. He specifically addressed what he evidently considered to be a primary threat to the United States, WMDs.

One of the threats that faces America is the threat of blackmail as a result of some rogue nation having a weapon mass destruction. And that not only is a threat to our own land; it’s also a threat to our forward-thinking foreign policy . . . the ability to have a weapon of mass destruction not only affects our people living in America, because some of these weapons have now got longer ranges than

²⁹⁶ Ibid.
²⁹⁷ Ibid.
ever anticipated, but also affects our foreign policy. It could be used as an attempt to isolate America, and we’re not going to let that happen.  

Bush’s discussion of the probability of a rogue nation with a weapon of mass destruction was part of his pre-9/11 perception of threats to the United States. He did assert that America would not allow that to happen, reflecting his focus at that time on a foreign policy which was directed at states.

Bush also commented on the strength of the American economy, and the strength of the American people, but briefly and with little emphasis. He did not reference the concepts of rescuer or warrior. Why warrior was not invoked, despite the theme of a fully-funded and powerful American military, is an interesting question. It is preventative instead of reactionary. There was no crisis yet. Bush’s comments about national security were well-planned and delivered smoothly. His emotional tone was serious, but not angry. He discussed the American military in technical ways, and did not invoke warrior imagery in any direct way. This was a status-quo speech about US national security.

Pre-9/11 Data Analysis Conclusion

The speeches analyzed before 9/11 showed gendered language involving all of the gendered concepts, but only power was frequently referenced. The existence of this gendered rhetoric likely reflects the Realist approach to international politics, which is patriarchal by nature and explicitly masculinist. It is also part of hegemonic masculinity.

\footnote{Ibid.}
which makes it part of hegemonic international power, specifically American hegemony, at least according to Bush.

The almost complete omission of references to *rescuer* is also of interest, because this concept was much more frequently employed after 9/11. It was not Bush’s focus before the terrorist attacks, even though he did at times discuss humanitarian and international aid. Americans were not encouraged to rescue themselves, however, and Bush did not discuss the United States rescuing others or itself.

*Warrior* was a gendered concept Bush apparently did not need before 9/11. His discussions of the military were focused more on funding and technical discussions of weaponry and reorganization. In international politics, Bush used measured admonitions and emphasized international communication, bi-lateral and multilateral relations, international institutions, and the importance of allies. Overall, his was a more cooperative, passive approach to international politics at this time. Although Bush did unilaterally withdraw from treaties he disliked, and emphasized American independence at times, he also presented what he had argued for during the Presidential elections: a “humble” foreign policy.

Everything about Bush’s language regarding these three concepts changed on September 11, 2001. The comparison between this period and the post-9/11 period will follow the analysis of those speeches, individually and collectively.
Data Analysis: Post-9/11 Speeches

Remarks by the President After Two Planes Crash Into World Trade Center, Emma Booker Elementary School, Sarasota, Florida, 9/11 (1)

After Bush was informed about the planes crashing into the World Trade Center, he spoke almost immediately to the American people, while he was still in Florida. His remarks were quite brief, but he labeled the events a “tragedy,” promised to help victims, and vowed to hunt down the perpetrators. Bush asserted: “terrorism against our nation will not stand.” Bush reassured the American people, and promised a response. Obviously there were significant time constraints, but the immediate theme of Bush’s remarks was that America was strong, would use force, would help victims, and would exact justice. The three main concepts examined here are clearly present. Bush’s location was at the Emma Booker Elementary School in Sarasota, Florida, but he was speaking to the American people directly, and to people around the world. He used power twice, warrior twice, and rescuer once. These three concepts, which had appeared before 9/11, but infrequently, were employed immediately.

Remarks by the President Upon Arrival at Barksdale Air Force Base, Barksdale Air Force Base, Louisiana, 9/11(2)

Bush spoke again later in Louisiana directly to the American people. He invoked power twice, warrior three times, and rescuer twice, in very brief remarks. Again, his emphasis was on all three concepts, and the theme was the same as his first speech that morning.
President Bush’s Address to the Nation on Sept. 11, 2001, 9/11(3)

Bush’s address to the American people on the evening of September 11, 2001 was his first statement of any significant length. It was broadcast from the Oval Office, and was simply Bush addressing the American people during a time of national crisis; however, he very clearly also had an international audience. The themes Bush emphasized were that the US had been the victim of an evil terrorist act, and that Americans were angry. He vowed to use the powerful American military to defend and protect America, and to find those responsible for the attacks. He also promised that justice would be brought to not only the perpetrators but also any who assisted or harbored them. Bush further emphasized the heroism of rescuers, and promised that the US Federal Government would assist with recovery and help the victims of the attacks. One example that illustrates the theme of this speech is when Bush asserted, “American and our friends and allies join with all those who want peace and security in the world, and we stand together to win the war against terrorism.” In this speech Bush referred to power six (6) times, warrior seven (7) times, and rescuer four (4) times. The continued focus on these three concepts, on the day of the attack, shows Bush was using gendered rhetoric immediately and often in his speeches. There was now an immediate reason to use these words since the “time of peace” was seen to be a thing of the past.

Remarks by the President in Photo Opportunity with the National Security Team, The Cabinet Room, 9/12 (1)

In this speech in the Cabinet Room Bush spoke to the media, his national security team standing with him. His immediate audience was only those individuals present,
however, since his speech was broadcast world-wide Bush also addressed a global audience. The country, and indeed the entire world, was still shocked and confused, and Bush spoke to reassure Americans and to promise them justice. In his brief remarks Bush referred to *power* four (4) times, *warrior* three (3), and *rescuer* two (2).

Remarks by the President While Touring Damage at the Pentagon, The Pentagon, 9/12(2)

While touring damage at the Pentagon, Bush made very brief remarks, essentially thanking soldiers and others for their service, and expressing his sadness and anger. His immediate audience was the media and personnel working at the site of the attack, and these remarks, too, were broadcast to a global audience. He referred to *power* twice, and *warrior* once.

Presidential Memo to Executive Departments and Agencies, 9/12(3)

This is a document, a Presidential Memo, not a speech. In it is a directive to Federal Employees to excuse absences for any employees affected by the attacks. The memo went out to all Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies, all US governmental employees were the most immediate audience. Bush said

\[ I \text{ am deeply saddened and outraged by the loss of life and suffering caused by the attacks . . . I convey my deepest sympathy and heartfelt sorrow to our fellow Americans and their families who have been affected by these senseless acts of violence. Many parts of the Federal Government have been mobilized to respond to this tragedy.} \]
In this memorandum, Bush referenced *rescuer* three (3) times. Bush’s theme in this memo was to express sorrow and to promise assistance to federal employees. This seems less angry and emphasized warrior less than in other examples.

Honoring the Victims of the Incidents on Tuesday, September 11, 2001, By the President of the United States of America, A Proclamation, 9/12(4)

In Bush’s Proclamation to honor the victims of the attacks were called “Incidents” in the title of the address. This seems to be significant, because it is euphemistic. Later, the events of 9/11 were almost always labeled as attacks. Bush announced American flags would be flown at half-staff “As a mark of respect for those killed by the heinous acts of violence perpetrated by faceless cowards upon the people and the freedom of the United States.” Bush’s audience was the entire American nation, and his intent was to honor the victims of the attacks while condemning those who perpetrated them. The theme was of national mourning, he also wished to denigrate the attackers (and their supporters) as cowards. Bush referred to *power* once, *warrior* once, and *rescuer* once in this proclamation.

National Day of Prayer and Remembrance for the Victims of the Terrorist Attacks on September 11, 2001, By the President of the United States of America, A Proclamation, 9/13(1)

Another proclamation announced a National Day of Prayer and Remembrance for the victims of the attacks. This time, the events of 9/11 were labeled “attacks” instead of incidents. The audience was again the entire country. Bush’s theme in this proclamation was to condemn the attacks, promise justice, and to call for a day of prayer and remembrance.
I call on every American family and the family of America to observe a National Day of Prayer and Remembrance, honoring the memory of the thousands of victims of these brutal attacks and comforting those who lost loved ones. We will persevere through this national tragedy and personal loss. In time, we will find healing and recovery; and, in the face of all this evil, we remain strong and united, “one Nation under God.”

Bush referred to *power* twice, *warrior* once, and *rescuer* four (4) times. The number of times he invoked the concept of *rescuer* is of note, as compared to most of the other speeches and written communications during this period: *rescuer* appears more frequently.

President Pledges Assistance for New York in Phone Call with Pataki, Giuliani, Remarks by the President in Telephone Conversation with New York Mayor Giuliani and New York Governor Pataki, 9/13(2)

Bush spoke to New York Governor Pataki and New York Mayor Giuliani in a public, broadcast telephone conversation, and then took questions from the press. The audience was not only the media, but, ultimately, everyone in the United States and the global community as it was covered by the media and then released by the Office of the Press Secretary. The theme was of assistance for the city of New York, but more than that was discussed in these conversations. In particular, *warrior* and *power* were invoked more frequently than *rescuer*, which, ironically, was the apparent purpose of these remarks, at least according to the title used by the Office of the Press Secretary. Bush referred to *power* seven (7) times, *warrior* ten (10), and *rescuer* five (5). The drift in focus from *rescuer* could have been purposeful, as Bush had national and international audiences, but it could also have been affected by the shift in focus due to questions from
the media. When Bush spoke with Giuliani he focused more on power and rescuer, but while speaking to the media, Bush emphasized warrior more frequently. He spoke about the nature of the enemy, and promised to “hunt” them down, because of his belief that “this enemy likes to hide.” He also maintained that “an act of war” had been declared against the United States, but that “[America] would lead the world to victory, to victory.”

Remarks by the President to the Travel Pool After Visiting Washington Hospital Center, Washington Hospital Center, 9/13(3)

After Bush and the First Lady visited some of the survivors of the attacks in the hospital, he talked about their courage and strength, and told them that the “the nation prays for those who have been injured by this unbelievable act of terror.” He spoke at the hospital, with media coverage. Bush referred to both power and rescuer twice. He did not make reference to warrior, most likely because that was not the purpose of his visit to the hospital, nor was it appropriate for remarks after the visit.

Text of a Letter from the President to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, September 12, 2001, 9/13(4) (Document sent to Speaker 9/12, released by Office of the Press Secretary 9/13)

In a written document, Bush asked the US Congress for “emergency appropriations to provide resources to address the terrorist attacks . . .” The theme was that there had been an evil attack on freedom, and the United States needed to respond “swiftly and surely.” Bush asked for $20,000,000,000 in emergency funds for the response to the attacks and assistance for the victims. The audience was the US House of
Representatives, and the media reported on this appropriations request. Bush referred to *power* twice, *warrior* once, and *rescuer* twice in this letter.

To the Congress of the United States, 9/14 (1)

In a formal written document to the United States, Bush declared a national emergency and authorized deployment of US forces “to conduct operational missions in connection with the World Trade Center and Pentagon attacks . . .” This was a short and simple statement to the US Congress that the United States had been attacked, future attacks were a “continuing and immediate threat,” and the President intended to deploy military troops to fight this threat. The tone is detached, but the theme is similar to previous oral and written statements: America is under attack and we must use force. In this brief statement Bush referred to both *power* and *warrior* once, and to *rescuer* not at all.

Statement by the President, 9/14, (2)

In two sentences, addressing the media, Bush thanked and praised the US Congress for its strength. “I am gratified that the Congress has united so powerfully by taking this action. It sends a clear message—our people are together, and we will prevail.” In these few words Bush invoked *power* twice; however, he did not refer to either *warrior* or *rescuer*. Despite the brevity of his remarks, Bush was clear in his message: America is strong and *will* defeat the enemy.
President Extends Order for Flags at Half-Staff, Amending Proclamation 7461, Display of the Flag at Half-Staff as a Mark of Respect for the Victims of the Incidents on Tuesday, September 11, 2001, By the President of the United States of America, A Proclamation, 9/14 (3)

As a mark of respect for the victims of the terrorist attacks, Bush extended the length of time the American flag would be flown at half-staff. Again, the language of the title is significant, in that the events of 9/11 were again labeled “Incidents.” Perhaps because this Proclamation was an extension of the first, the same language was used. This Proclamation was addressed to the American people as a whole, and referred to rescuer only once. Bush did not employ the other concepts.

President Orders Ready Reserves of Armed Forces to Active Duty, Executive Order, 9/14 (4)

Due to the national emergency “by reason of the terrorist attacks . . . and the continuing and immediate threat of further attacks,” Bush ordered the Ready Reserves of the US military to active duty, for not more than twenty-four consecutive months. Given Bush’s belief that the United States was vulnerable to further attacks, in addition to his determination to locate, prosecute, and punish any person involved in the attacks, Bush’s order was to be expected. He was moving quickly toward using force to target Al Qaeda, and was putting his plans into motion. The document is very clinical, but Bush did reference both power and warrior once, in keeping with the overall message of this Executive Order.
On the street in New York, the President made remarks to rescue personnel. His overall theme was that America was strong, although it had been victimized, and the people and the government were committed to the rescue efforts and the mission for justice. Bush referred to power four (4) times, warrior once, and rescuer twice in his brief address to the crowd. Because he was speaking to a live and responsive audience, Bush was energized. He was interrupted by chants of “USA! USA!” Still, Bush maintained his focus on the three concepts analyzed here, in a reassuring and encouraging speech. For example, referring to power and warrior, he said “I can hear you. (Applause) I can hear you. The rest of the world hears you. (Applause) And the people who knocked these buildings down will hear all of us soon. (Applause).” He was then interrupted again by chants of “USA! USA!”

At the National Cathedral in Washington D.C., a more somber Bush spoke to the people at the church, there to remember the victims of the terrorist attacks. Bush’s theme included both grief and mourning (as expected due to the nature and location of the speech), as well as asserting the strength of the United States and of Americans in general. Because his remarks were reported by the media, his audience also included all Americans and everyone around the world. Again, Bush referred to all three concepts, but emphasized power and rescuer the most. He referred to power eight (8) times,
warrior three (3), and rescuer four (4). Rescuer is the concept that is referred to the least by Bush in all of his speeches and other communications after 9/11, but appears in this address in a comparatively high number of times.

Radio Address of the President to the Nation, 9/15 (1)

The President’s radio address had both a national and international audience. He was speaking directly to the American people and to the rest of the world as well. This address was to assert that the United States had a new, and unique, enemy, and that Bush, as president, would respond with appropriate use of force to ensure justice (and perhaps revenge).

President Urges Readiness and Patience, Remarks by the President, Secretary of State Colin Powell and Attorney General John Ashcroft, Camp David, Thurmont, Maryland, 9/15 (2)

In his remarks at Camp David, the President made a statement along with the Secretary of State and the Attorney General. The audience was the media, who were allowed to ask questions. Because of the media, the theme was in part affected by their questions; however, Bush was ready to make bold statements, and to make his case for the use of force. This is a speech in which Bush used some of his strongest and most colorful language, for example when he said

This act will not stand; we will find those who did it; we will smoke them out of their holes, we will get them running and we’ll bring them to justice. We will not only deal with those who dare attack America, we will deal with those who harbor them and feed them and house them.
This quote is reflective of the overall theme of his remarks. Bush referred to power five (5) times, warrior eleven (11) times, and rescuer five (5) times during his address. There were a relatively higher number of references to warrior in this speech.

Remarks by the President Upon Arrival, The South Lawn, 9/16 (1)

The message Bush sent to the American people in this speech was that the nation had mourned, but that “tomorrow we go back to work.” He talked about America’s resilience and his faith in the American military. His speech was firm yet also aggressive. He said, “We will rid the world of the evildoers,” and noted further that “People have declared war on America, and they have made a terrible mistake.” Bush was speaking to the media, and to the American people, yet again, the audience was also global. He did take questions from the press, and so the theme could have been affected, but he maintained his focus on the message very well. Using biblical language, he called this new war on terrorism a crusade, and promised to win the first war of the 21st century decisively. In these remarks, Bush referred to power fourteen (14) times, warrior twenty (20), and rescuer just twice. Bush was clearly making his case for the use of force against Al Qaeda, and by extension, the Taliban. He used the first two gendered concepts repetitively in this speech to help accomplish that objective.

“We’ve All Got a Job to Do,” Remarks by the President to Employees in the Eisenhower Executive Office Building, Dwight D. Eisenhower Executive Office Building, 9/17 (1)

Covered by the media, Bush’s extremely brief statement to the Employees in the Eisenhower Executive Office Building was intended to bolster their spirits, the spirits of
all Americans, and a shocked global audience. Bush invoked power twice. He said: “I’m here to remind people that the best way to fight terrorism is to not let terrorism intimidate America.” He added “I want to thank the [employees] . . . and remind them we’ve all got a job to do…”

Guard and Reserves “Define Spirit of America,” Remarks by the President to Employees at the Pentagon, The Pentagon, 9/17 (2)

In a much longer address, Bush spoke to employees at the Pentagon, and the remarks were covered by the media. The media were also allowed to ask questions. The overall theme was that the United States was going to use its military to get those who had attacked it. He again emphasized the strength of the country. Bush repeated his interpretation of the events of 9/11: “I believe, I know that an act of war was declared against America.” Bush heavily referred to power and warrior. Part of this may be attributed to his audience: Department of Defense employees, who were at that moment just going back to the damaged Pentagon, to go back to work. In this speech Bush referred to rescuer just once. His overwhelming focus involved power and warrior with twenty (20) and twenty-two (22) references, respectively.

“Islam is Peace” Says President, Remarks by the President at Islamic Center of Washington, D.C., Washington, D.C., 9/17 (3)

In remarks intended to differentiate between the enemy and Muslims, Bush spoke at the Islamic Center of Washington, D.C. Bush quoted the Qu’ran to condemn evil, and praised Muslim Americans. He said:

This is a great country. It’s a great country because we share the same values of respect and dignity and human
worth. And it is my honor to be meeting with leaders who feel just the same way I do. They’re outraged, they’re sad. They love America just as much as I do.

The remarks were covered by the media, and the overall message was that “Islam is Peace,” which is the title in the press release. In his speech, Bush referred to power three (3) times, and warrior twice, but rescuer not at all.

President Launches Online American Relief and Response Effort, Remarks by the President Supporting Charities, The Rose Garden, 9/18 (1)

When Bush announced the Online American Relief and Response Effort, he focused on how Americans could help one another, as well as how the government would help those in need. This speech was given in the Rose Garden, and it was intended to encourage people to support charities. Bush praised the American people for their generosity and compassion. He said

Tens of millions of dollars and thousands of hours and tons of food and clothing have all been donated to help rebuild shattered lives. Americans’ love for America was channeled through our nation’s great charities. And as President of this great land, nothing made me more proud.

In addition, he thanked political leaders, Mayor Giuliani for example, and he thanked their public efforts. He thanked the National Guard for its assistance with rescue of victims in New York and Virginia. “I was honored to be able to stand amidst the rescue workers and looked into their eyes and saw the determination that would make all Americans proud.” Bush referred to power four times in this speech, warrior just once, and rescuer twenty-three times. This was obviously a speech dedicated to the concept of American altruism. Bush underscored the role of police and emergency personnel, the
armed forces, and government employees as rescuers. Bush’s praise was intended to encourage further charitable aid. Much of the speech was dedicated to his discussion of philanthropy, what organizations had done and would do, and the need for Americans’ continued charitable support.

President Tries to Give Americans Some Answers, Excerpts of President Bush’s address Sept. 20, 2001 to a joint session of Congress, 9/20 (1)

To a Joint Session of the US Congress Bush made his case for the military intervention in Afghanistan. He began with praise for Americans who had become rescuers. Through most of the address, Bush used aggressive and confrontational language, albeit with only a slightly angry tone. The themes of this address were that Al Qaeda and the Taliban were to blame for the attacks and should all be brought to justice. This is the speech in which Bush demanded the Taliban surrender Osama bin Laden and Al Qaeda, or suffer the consequences. Bush said, “These demands are not open to negotiation or discussion. The Taliban must act and act immediately. They will hand over the terrorists, or they will share in their fate.” Bush made statements emphasizing that every resource would be dedicated to destroy the global terror network. Combined with these aggressive statements was a message that the Taliban was repressive and the Afghan people needed to be rescued. The audience included the US Congress, both the Senate and the US House of Representatives, the American people, because it was covered by the media, and the greater global community. In this address Bush referred to power seven (7) times, warrior thirteen (13) times, and rescuer seven (7) times. In this
important address, Bush again relied upon the gendered concepts examined here to communicate his message to the American people.

Bush Announces Military Strikes on Afghanistan, President Bush’s Address to the Nation Announcing Military Action Against Strategic Targets Within Afghanistan, 10/7 (1)

When Bush announced the American military strikes against Afghanistan, he outlined the policy that had been developed very soon after the 9/11 attacks. As noted above, Bush had demanded the Taliban surrender Osama bin Laden and all Al Qaeda members, but, not surprisingly, the Taliban did not comply. As a result, in this speech, Bush announced to the American people that the United States was strong enough to fight this battle, that the United States would use its military to achieve its objectives, and the United States would rescue the Afghan people. “The oppressed people of Afghanistan will know the generosity of America and our allies. As we strike military targets, we will also drop food, medicine and supplies to the starving and suffering men and women and children of Afghanistan.” While Bush had previously emphasized the rescue of Americans at the attack sites, it is significant that in this speech he transferred that idea to the rescue of the Afghan people. The overall focus, however, was on the strength of America and the abilities of its military. Bush referred to power five (5) times, warrior twelve (12) times, and rescuer twice. Obviously warrior was the most important concept employed in this address.
At his tribute at the Pentagon Memorial, Bush spoke to pay respects to those who had died at the Pentagon. His audience was made up of Pentagon employees, and political leaders. It was covered by the media, so he had a national and global audience as well. Perhaps in part because of the audience he addressed, Bush heavily referred to *warrior* in this speech. The overall theme was that the United States had suffered, but that it remained strong, was committed to using force against the enemy, and would rescue the Afghan people who had been oppressed by the Taliban. In this address Bush referred to *power* ten (10) times, *warrior* twenty-one (21) times, and *rescuer* three (3) times. As evident by the numbers, Bush continued to invoke all three concepts examined here, but in this speech he again heavily emphasized the aspect of *warrior*.

The news conference on October 11, 2001 was a basic outline and justification of Bush’s intervention plan. It was a lengthy news conference held in the East Room of the White House, and questions were allowed from the media. The theme, however, was again about the intervention and its necessity. Bush repeatedly emphasized all three of the concepts examined here. He referred to *power* forty (40) times, *warrior* fifty-three (53) times, and *rescuer* forty-five times. These are very high numbers compared to the other speeches and news conferences. Bush’s tone was stern, but he appeared optimistic that the United States would achieve its objectives regarding the terrorists.
“My Fellow Americans, Let’s Roll,” Text of President George W. Bush’s Address to American Before Representatives of Firemen, Law Enforcement Officers, and Postal Workers in Atlanta, GA, 11/8 (1)

Bush spoke to representatives of firemen, law enforcement officers, and postal workers in Atlanta, Georgia on November 8. The title of the address was “My Fellow Americans, Let’s Roll.” Bush used the language that the passengers allegedly used on board Flight 93, the fourth plane which had been taken by the terrorists but was supposedly prevented from achieving its target by the heroic actions of the passengers. Obvious from the title, the intention of the President was to energize his audience, the people they represented, and the American people as a whole. The speech was covered by the media and reached the world. Bush reiterated statements that referred to the concepts under examination here. He invoked power most frequently, an astounding sixty-two (62) times. In fact, that was the essential theme of this address: America is strong. He referred to warrior and rescuer as well, and frequently, but not as frequently as power; about half as often for both: twenty-seven (27) and twenty-eight (28) times, respectively. Overall, the theme really was that America had the strength and resiliency, and the force, to catch enemies and bring them to justice while rescuing other victims of terrorism.

Text of President George W. Bush’s First Address to the General Assembly of the United Nations in New York City, New York, 11/10 (1)

The last speech examined here is Bush’s first address to the United Nations General Assembly on November 10. At that time, Bush was attempting to get a UN
Security Council Resolution to approve the use of force against Al Qaeda and the Taliban. In his audience were representatives from virtually every country in the world, as he was addressing the UN General Assembly. His remarks were also covered by the media, so he had a national and international audience. The theme of these remarks was similar to others he had given—the US is strong, it will remain strong, it will find justice for the perpetrators of the 9/11 terrorist attacks, and it will rescue those in need of help.

Bush referred to power forty-three (43) times in this speech, warrior eighteen (18) times, and rescuer twenty-one (21) times. This address summarized his major arguments for the intervention in Afghanistan, and he emphasized to the entire world that America was capable and remained strong.

Post-9/11 Data Analysis Conclusion

By examining each speech by theme, audience, and use of each of the three concepts, power, warrior, and rescuer, some conclusions can be reached. First, it is apparent that on the day of the attack, and the next few days after, the Bush administration was operating in crisis mode. The remarks made on 9/11 itself reflected Bush’s personal and gut-level reaction to the terrorist attacks. There was a lull in which Bush did not communicate much to the American people in speeches and addresses in the first three days after the attacks, perhaps this allowed Bush and his advisors to consult and come to some decisions about what to say to the American people.

Secondly, Bush continued to employ all three concepts in virtually every speech. Sometimes speeches were focused primarily on one concept, for example when Bush
addressed the nation to announce the Online American Relief and Response Effort, Remarks in the The Rose Garden (9/18/2001). Other speeches referred to the three concepts relatively equally. Because Bush addressed different audiences at different times, his audience may have affected his emphasis on some concepts rather than others; however, every address did have a national and international audience as well. There is a pattern which emerged: Bush employed these three concepts more and more frequently over the time period under examination. This culminated in the last four speeches analyzed, in which he referred to these concepts repeatedly and frequently.

*Power* was invoked most frequently, followed by *warrior*, and then by *rescuer*. This may illustrate the importance Bush himself placed on these three concepts and how useful they were to him in communicating his message. In the last four speeches analyzed, Bush employed these three concepts in very high numbers, which could reflect that by the time he gave these addresses, he personally had come to understand the attacks in a certain way, and communicated about them according to his views. It could also reflect, perhaps, that his national security team, indeed his entire administration, had developed a narrative, a story, that explained what happened and why, and encompassed justification for military intervention in Afghanistan.

Additional conclusions will be generated by the analysis which follows, in both the data comparison section, and the conceptual analysis section, in which each concept was examined separately, in chronological order by speech and date.
Data Comparison

The speeches after 9/11 are what yielded varying but significantly numerous references to the three concepts analyzed here. Table 1 shows the numbers of references for each concept in each speech examined before 9/11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPEECH</th>
<th>POWER</th>
<th>WARRIOR</th>
<th>RESCUER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/20 (1)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/22 (1)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/29 (1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/11 (1)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/23 (1)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/24 (1)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the table clearly illustrates, Bush referenced the concept of *power* in relatively high numbers in speeches before 9/11, however the concepts of *warrior* and *rescuer* were rarely used.

Table 2 shows the number of times, in the speeches after 9/11, Bush referred to the concepts of *power*, *warrior*, and *rescuer*. Bush not only continued to refer to *power*, but he did so more frequently than before 9/11. In addition, what is most interesting, is that the two concepts to which he paid very little attention before 9/11 were much more frequently used after the terrorist attacks, beginning the day of the attacks. Although frequency varied by speech (or memorandum or proclamation), all three concepts were used with regularity after the attacks, in many different ways and in speeches with different audiences, in a variety of locations, sometimes in response to questions from the
media. Other sources included Presidential memoranda, proclamations, and other statements.
### TABLE TWO
**POST 9/11 SPEECHES AND WRITTEN MEMORANDUM, DIRECTIVES, AND STATEMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPEECH</th>
<th>POWER</th>
<th>WARRIOR</th>
<th>RESCUER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/11 (1)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/11(2)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/11 (3)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/12(1)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/12 (2)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/12 (3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/12(4)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/13 (1)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/13 (2)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/13 (3)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/13 (4)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/14(1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/14 (2)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/14 (3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/14 (4)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/14 (5)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/14 (6)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/15 (1)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/15 (2)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/16 (1)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/17 (1)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/17 (2)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/17 (3)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/18 (1)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/20 (1)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/7 (2)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/11(1)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/11(2)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/8 (1)</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/10(1)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
T-Test Results

Where the differences in the number of references before and after 9/11 statistically significant? The t-test is a way to examine two samples, assuming unequal variances. The t-test was used to test for a significant difference between the number of references for power, warrior, and rescuer, before 9/11 and after 9/11. Power showed a notable difference, but it was not statistically significant. The difference in means for the concepts of warrior and rescuer were statistically significant. The two groups were tested at a .05 significance level. Figure 1 illustrates this graphically.

FIGURE 1
References per Speech of Power, Rescuer, and Warrior
References to *warrior* and *rescuer* were almost non-existent before the attacks, but frequently used in the speeches given after 9/11. In two speeches before 9/11 Bush used the concepts. After 9/11, he referred to *power* the most. He emphasized the *power* on every day in which speeches were analyzed. In his speeches after 9/11, Bush also referred to *warrior*, in almost every speech, on almost every day in the data set. The same pattern held for *rescuer*.

Conceptual Analysis

In this section the concepts analyzed will be re-examined by focusing on one concept at a time, separate analysis of *power*, *warrior*, and *rescuer*. In this way the research can examine not only the numerical differences between the speeches before and after 9/11, but also how these three concepts were employed after 9/11 by Bush.

Under examination are the ways in which Bush identified the United States as having been victimized by the attacks, how the United States went about remasculinization, and how Bush re-asserted US power and presented the United States as a warrior and a rescuer in his speeches. Through the use of qualitative content analysis we can understand more fully which narratives were invoked, which ideas about America and American men and women were important to Bush while he argued for US military intervention, and how gender was used as a way to buttress those arguments.

Realistically, Bush did not have to use gendered metaphors, narratives, or language to gain the American people’s support for US military intervention. In fact, support was
overwhelmingly strong for a swift and aggressive military response to the attacks. Being wounded, feeling victimized, the vast majority of Americans clearly believed a military response was the best course of action. The question then arises: why did Bush use masculinist rhetoric as an additional means to gain support for intervention? From a feminist perspective, however, the question is really: Why not? Gendered language pervades public and private political discussions. It was natural (in a socialized sense, not a biological one) for Bush to fall back on masculine rhetoric. It was natural for him to desire remasculinization. In fact, it was imperative to his own sense of himself that he do so, imperative that the US regain its masculinity, and imperative that American men reverse the feminization which occurred with the 9/11 attacks.

An extremely important component of the need to remasculinize, and how and why Bush used gendered rhetoric, has to do with the nature of the problem he faced. This was, by any interpretation, a period of crisis decision-making. International relations scholarship on decision-making has shown that it proceeds differently in a crisis as compared to status quo decision-making. I will argue here, however, that the urgency felt by Bush, and by many Americans, meant that Bush was even more likely to fall back on gendered language, gendered metaphors, and gendered narratives. I contend it was a default reaction. Not only do political leaders use gender normally, under crisis conditions it is an obvious, perhaps even subconscious, way to characterize the crisis and the response.
Power

In the analysis of Bush’s comments regarding power, virtually every speech contains components which emphasize the American nation (and the state) as powerful, American armed forces and citizens as powerful, and the President as powerful. These assertions began immediately on September 11, and a number of press conferences indicated American strength and American power.

At 9:30 EDT, Bush at Emma Booker Elementary School in Sarasota Florida, the location at which Bush first heard the news of airplanes crashing into the World Trade Center Towers, Bush said:

Today we’ve had a national tragedy. Two airplanes have crashed into the World Trade Center in an apparent terrorist attack on our country. I have . . . ordered that the full resources of the federal government go to help the victims and their families, and to conduct a full-scale investigation to hunt down and find those folks who committed this act.

Terrorism against our nation will not stand.299

Bush clearly implies that the US Federal Government’s resources are extensive and that the US Government (the state) is powerful. Further, in rejecting terrorism, he asserted the US Government’s strength as more than capable of helping victims, conducting investigations, and bringing perpetrators to justice. This is an unequivocal assertion of American power.

Later that same day, Bush said, “Make no mistake: The United States will hunt down and punish those responsible for these cowardly acts. The resolve of our great

nation is being tested . . . We will show the world that we will pass this test.”

In one of his first formal statements regarding the terrorist attacks, Bush asserted the power of both the federal government and the US military. When Bush announced a manhunt and threatened justice he asserted American power capabilities. In the last portion of this speech, Bush emphasized that our great nation would pass the test. Our great nation blatantly describes the US as strong and powerful. The idea that our great nation would be able to pass this test means that the US is strong enough, tough enough, to vanquish fear and remain strong. Bush overtly referred to power twice, when he said “Make no mistake: The United States will hunt down and punish those responsible for these cowardly acts,” and “The resolve of our great nation is being tested. But make no mistake: We will show the world that we will pass this test.” What meaning was Bush trying to convey with the repeated phrase “make no mistake”? Here the repetition seems to be assertive, perhaps to the point of aggressiveness. It may have also been an assertion of power directed toward Al Qaeda and any regime harboring the terrorists responsible for the 9/11 attacks.

The evening of September 11, Bush insisted on giving an address from the Oval Office in Washington, D.C. In terms of his security, at that point it may have not been the wisest choice. The country had undergone attacks mere hours before. Washington, D.C. itself had been targeted. Bush evidently felt that an address from Washington, D.C. would indicate strength. In President Bush’s evening address, a number of points are of interest. He said: “These acts of mass murder were intended to frighten our nation into

---

chaos and retreat. But they have failed. Our country is strong. A great people has been moved to defend a great nation.”

Bush again referred to American strength. “Terrorist attacks can shake the foundations of our biggest buildings, but they cannot touch the foundation of America. These acts shatter steel, but they cannot dent the steel of American resolve.”

The assertion of the strength of the American people, comparing it to steel, is obvious. Bush again reiterated the strength of the US military. “Our military is powerful, and it’s prepared.”

Furthermore, he asserted “Our financial institutions remain strong, and the American economy will be open for business as well.”

He again mentioned strength through unity. “We stand together to win the war against terrorism.”

He added “All Americans . . . unite in our resolve for justice and peace. America has stood down enemies before, and we will do so this time.”

To conclude, Bush said: “None of us will ever forget this day, yet we go forward to defend freedom and all that is good and just in our world.”

In his evening address to the nation, President Bush referred to American power six times, as discussed by the quotes above.

The day after the terrorist attacks, September 12, the President again spoke directly to the American people. He said, “The deliberate and deadly attacks which were carried out yesterday against our country were more than acts of terror. They were acts of war. This will require our country to unite in steadfast determination and resolve.

---
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306 Ibid.
307 Ibid.
Freedom and democracy are under attack. In emphasizing that the attacks were *acts of war* the President implied that the United States had been a *victim* (and had been feminized). In the next sentence the President asserted that Americans would need to be *strong*, to *unite in steadfast determination and resolve*. Bush also began to elaborate on his contention that the American way of life was under attack, in a way that differed from other wars. This theme, that freedom and democracy had been attacked, continued throughout Bush’s term as President. It illustrates that Bush believed that freedom and democracy make America *strong*. In these remarks, Bush also feminized the enemy, to remasculinize the United States.

The American people need to know that we’re facing a different enemy than we have ever faced. This enemy hides in shadows, and has no regard for human life. This is an enemy who preys on innocent and unsuspecting people, runs for cover. But it won’t be able to run for cover forever. This is an enemy that tries to hide. But it won’t be able to hide forever. This is an enemy that thinks its harbors are safe. But they won’t be safe forever.

A number of concepts were invoked by the President in this statement. First, he characterized the *enemy* as cowardly, and essentially evil. Secondly, he asserted *American power* by declaring that although the *enemy* thinks it is safe, it is not, and *American strength* and *power* will mean that *they won’t be safe forever.*

Bush continued with this theme when he said

---


309 However, arguably the attack by Imperial Japan and the declaration of war by Hitler’s Germany were also attacks against the American way of life—freedom and democracy were challenged and/or attacked by fascism. But Bush emphasized the uniqueness of these particular attacks.

310 Ibid.
This enemy attacked not just our people, but all freedom-loving people everywhere in the world. The United States of America will use all our resources to conquer this enemy. We will rally the world. We will be patient, we will be focused, and we will be steadfast in our determination.311

Again, he asserted that the attacks were an attack on the American way of life and American values worldwide (freedom and democracy). He asserted American strength and power when he outlined his approach to responding to the attacks: patient, focused, steadfast in our determination.

Bush’s next sentence also emphasized these themes. He said, “This battle will take time and resolve. But make no mistake about it: we will win.”312 He asserted that the US and the American people were strong enough to commit to a long-term conflict, and would rely on their resolve. Again the phrase “make no mistake” was used to emphasize American resolve. The second part of this statement also invoked strength and power. Make no mistake about it indicated to the American people—and probably addressed the enemy—that American strength and American power meant that the US would prevail in any upcoming conflict. We will win, the second part of the statement, asserted that Bush was absolutely convinced (or wanted to appear that way) that the US was strong and powerful and was no match for whatever enemy it faced.

In this same brief speech, Bush asserted American strength again when he said, “But we will not allow this enemy to win the war by changing our way of life or
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restricting our freedoms.” As discussed above, Bush seemed to believe that not only are Americans strong, but it is American freedoms that make Americans strong.

Bush went on to discuss that the United States would “do whatever it takes . . . to respond to this tragedy, and to protect our national security.” The message of power is undeniable.

Finally, Bush concluded with this statement:

I want to thank the members of Congress for their unity and support. America is united. The freedom-loving nations of the world stand by our side. This will be a monumental struggle of good versus evil. But good will prevail.

All of this emphasizes strength and power. In the “Remarks by the President In Photo Opportunity with the National Security Team,” Bush invoked power four times.

Later, on September 12, Bush made comments again referencing these concepts. In his remarks while touring the Pentagon Bush said,

Coming here makes me sad, on the one hand; it also makes me angry. Our country will, however, not be cowed by terrorists, by people who don’t share the same values we share, by people who are willing to destroy people’s lives because we embrace freedom. The nation mourns, but our government will go on, the country will function.

Bush’s revelation that he was angry is interesting to note because those words evoke a wealth of meaning. He felt personally attacked and was determined to punish the perpetrators. Bush himself had been emasculated by the terrorist attacks. Not only was the country feminized, Bush himself was feminized. He had to regain masculinity,
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personally and for the US in general. His political decision-making subsequent to the attacks were classic masculine responses, just as were his emotions on that day when an admission of sorrow quickly gave way to wrath: I am angry. According to much of the research on masculinity, anger is an appropriate masculine emotion and an appropriate masculine reaction to being attacked and/or emasculated. Men are socialized in the US to suppress much emotion, but anger is an emotion that men can publicly show and it is considered “natural” that men can and do express anger. All of the language here reaffirms the theme of strength.

While touring the damage at the Pentagon, Bush also said,

Coming here confirms what the Secretary and I both know, that this is a great nation. People here working hard prove it; people out here working their hearts out to answer families’ questions, to remove the rubble and debris from this office. I want to thank everybody not only on this site, but all across America, for responding so generously, so kindly, in their prayers, in their contributions of love and their willingness to help in any way they can.\textsuperscript{316}

Here Bush affirmed the United States’ status as a great nation. Amidst the praise and thanks, Bush highlights the strength of a unified nation marked by compassion and faith, a nation that can come together in a crisis, to cooperate by donating time and money.

The following day, September 13, in remarks titled “National Day of Prayer and Remembrance for the Victims of the Terrorist Attacks on September 11, 2001,” Bush further developed his themes of power. He stated “The fourth plane crashed in the Pennsylvania countryside, killing all on board but falling well short of its intended target

\textsuperscript{316} Ibid.
apparently because of the heroic efforts of passengers on board.” Bush’s emphasis on heroism portrayed Americans as *strong*. He continued by saying later in the speech, “In time, we will find healing and recovery; and, in the face of all this evil, we remain strong and united, ‘one Nation under God.’” In this very short speech Bush invoked strength twice.

Bush made four speeches on the September 13. In addition to the Proclamation about a National Day of Prayer and Remembrance, the President made remarks in a telephone conversation with New York Mayor Giuliani and New York Governor Pataki. When commenting on the situation in New York, Bush said:

I look forward to joining with both of you in thanking the police and fire, the construction trade workers, the restaurant owners, the volunteers—all of whom have really made a huge display for the world to see of the compassion of America, and the bravery of America and the strength of America.”

Note the phrase, *the bravery and strength of America*.

Later in the same speech, Bush repeated his assertive words.

But make no mistake about it, my resolve is steady and strong about winning this war that has been declared on America. It’s a new kind of war. And I understand it’s a new kind of war. And this government will adjust. And this government will call others to join us, to make sure this act, these acts, the people who conducted these acts and those who harbor them are held accountable for their action. Make no mistake.”
Again, Bush used the phrase *make no mistake*, twice in this particular quote. Why this particular phrase continues to appear is not clear, but it is obviously a warning and asserts the *power* and *strength* of both the American people and their President. The appeal to allies and the necessity of understanding the supposed novelty of the enemy and its war is further emphasized. Bush asserted *strength* through global unity and the need for accountability. In the last part of this conversation, Bush repeated the concept of *strength* through unity saying, “I’m most appreciative, again, [to the US Congress] for really showing solidarity again and uniting the nation. Now is the time for the country to be united.”

Bush also linked the grief of Americans to the creation of resolve and determination.

> You know, through the tears of sadness I see an opportunity. Make no mistake about it, this nation is sad. But we’re also tough and resolute. And now is an opportunity to do generations a favor, by coming together and whipping terrorism; hunting it down, finding it and holding them accountable . . . But now that war has been declared on us, we will lead the world to victory, to victory.

The previously discussed “good from evil” theme is evident here, asserting a different kind of *strength*.

In the final words of his conversation Bush said: “But this country will not relent until we have saved ourselves and others from the terrible tragedy that came upon America.” The attacks had already occurred, how could the United States save itself
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and others? I interpret this statement as one of an intention of remasculinization. The American people would “save [themselves] and others” not by changing the past, but reasserting American power and strength, and regaining the masculinity of Bush and the American people.

In “Remarks by the President to the Travel Pool After Visiting Washington Hospital Center,” although it was a just a few comments, Bush again asserted American’s strength. He described the survivors as extraordinarily strong, primarily because of their ability to withstand adversity and to maintain valor in the face of unspeakable danger and loss.

We have just seen some really brave men and women . . . Some of the folks could talk, and they described the horror of the incident, the moment. They talked about escaping, going through fire, crawling through debris. It was clear that they were fighting for their survival then, and like every patient up there, they’re still fighting for survival.\(^{324}\)

Finally, on September 13 the White House released a letter from the President to the Speaker of the House dated September 12. In it Bush asserted

Yesterday, evil and despicable acts of terror were perpetrated against our fellow citizens. Our way of life, indeed our very freedom, came under attack. Our first priority is to respond swiftly and surely. We need to do so in a way that will make Americans proud, especially those heroes who are struggling so valiantly to deal with yesterday’s tragedy.\(^{325}\)

The immediacy of the response demonstrated US strength. Bush reiterated his belief in strength through a united American public when he made reference to funding, “Passing


this supplemental appropriations bill without delay will send a powerful signal of unity to our fellow Americans and to the world.\textsuperscript{326}

Between September 13\textsuperscript{th} and September 18\textsuperscript{th} Bush asserted American power and strength in virtually every speech, press release, statement, Executive Order and other remarks. As will be discussed below, this is also the period of time when the other gendered language examined here emerged most significantly. Because of the number of times Bush invoked American masculine/hegemonic power, on a personal, national, and international scale, the discussion will be somewhat abbreviated so as not to overwhelm the reader with detail.

On the September 14 President Bush, in a release to the Congress, “exercised [his] authority to declare a national emergency by reason of the terrorist attacks at the World Trade Center, New York, New York and the Pentagon, and the continuing and immediate threat of further attacks on the United States.”\textsuperscript{327} The official proclamation of a national emergency was expected, and brief. It made official what everyone already knew: the United States had been a victim and was under immediate threat of it happening again. The crisis shaped the way Bush and many others decided to respond—manfully, forcefully, and quickly. The United States and its president had to be remasculinized itself through a classic masculine response: hit back, harder!

Bush again asserted American unity as an indicator of strength on September 14 when he said, “I am gratified that the Congress has united so powerfully by taking this
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action. It sends a clear message—our people are together, and we will prevail.”

That same day, Bush asserted American power in other remarks, to salute heroes in New York, once again emphasizing unity. “This Nation stands with the good people of New York City, and New Jersey and Connecticut, as we mourn the loss of thousands of our citizens.”

In this speech, amidst the crowd’s applause, Bush said, “I can hear you. I can hear you. The rest of the world hears you. And the people who knocked these buildings down will hear all of us soon.”

He also said, “The nation sends its love and compassion to everybody who is here. Thank you for your hard work. Thank you for making the nation proud.”

The invocation of power is subtle but evident. The strong “heroes” were thanked, for hard work and for making the nation proud. Although, on the surface, these statements seem less overtly about power, nevertheless a weak nation would not be heard by anyone, let alone the world. In being heard, especially by the attackers, this pointed audibility represents strength. The crowd’s response, “USA! USA!,” was a patriotic and powerful message that the United States of America was strong and powerful.

Later at the National Cathedral, the President again emphasized American’s strength. Bush, while referring to the casualties of the attack, brought attention to the heroism and strength of Americans, and in particular the passengers on the plane that crashed in a Pennsylvania field.
Now come the names, the list of casualties we are only beginning to read. They are the names of men and women who began their day at a desk or in an airport, busy with life. They are the names of people who faced death, and in their last moments called home to say, be brave, and I love you. They are the names of passengers who defied their murderers, and prevented the murder of others on the ground. They are the names of men and women who wore the uniform of the United States, and died at their posts.333

Bush poignantly described the victims of the attacks as ordinary, but brave, Americans who had been unjustly murdered by the terrorists. They were strong, even in the face of death.

Bush emphasized American power when he said: “War has been waged against us by stealth and deceit and murder. This nation is peaceful, but fierce when stirred to anger. This conflict was begun on the timing and terms of others. It will end in a way, and at an hour of our choosing.”334 He continued by saying, “Our purpose as a nation is firm.”335 Bush emphasizes the underhandedness of the attacks—especially against what he classifies as peaceable innocents—but also warns the enemy that once roused this normally peace-loving people will respond with appropriate ferocity. Further, the shift in control is emphasized from being in their hands to ours. Only a strong nation can respond in such a way.

In the same speech Bush again and again reiterated American strength,

It is said that adversity introduces us to ourselves. This is true of a nation as well. In this trial, we have been reminded, and the world has seen, that our fellow Americans are generous and kind, resourceful and brave. We see our national character in rescuers working past

334 Ibid.
335 Ibid.
exhaustion; in long lines of blood donors; in thousands of citizens who have asked to work and serve in any way possible.  

Yet, here, the strength is reaffirmed through a self-reflection born of hardship. By being tested, American values are glorified.

Bush continued by saying “We have seen our national character in eloquent acts of sacrifice.” Bush was arguing that Americans are strong.

In these acts, and in many others, Americans showed a deep commitment to one another, and an abiding love for our country. Today, we feel what Franklin Roosevelt called the warm courage of national unity. This is a unity of every faith, and every background. It has joined together political parties in both houses of Congress. It is evident in services of prayer and candlelight vigils, and American flags, which are displayed in pride, and wave in defiance.

Commitment, faith, national unity, and defiance all emphasize American strength. Bush continued to assert American strength by saying “Our unity is a kinship of grief, and a steadfast resolve to prevail against our enemies. And this unity against terror is now extending across the world.” In Bush’s opinion, which is most probably accurate given the nature of the crisis, unity equals strength and has the ability to affect others. American strength is an example for the world.

In his radio address to the American people on September 15, Bush heavily referred to power, his worlds emphasizing American strength and resilience. He said, “We are planning a broad and sustained campaign to secure our country and eradicate the
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The US was determined to combat evil. “Yesterday I visited the site of the destruction in New York City and saw an amazing spirit of sacrifice and patriotism and defiance. I met with rescuers who have worked past exhaustion, who cheered for our country and the great cause we have entered.”

He continued with his theme of unity as well. “In Washington, D.C., the political parties and both Houses of Congress have shown a remarkable unity, and I’m deeply grateful. A terrorist attack designed to tear us apart has instead bound us together as a nation.”

He also emphasized courage:

> Over the past few days, we have learned much about American courage—the courage of firefighters and police officers who suffered so great a loss, the courage of passengers aboard United 93 who may well have fought with the highjackers and saved many lives on the ground.

With those victims of the attacks as role models, Bush asked the American people specifically to be strong. “You will be asked for your patience; for, the conflict will not be short. You will be asked for resolve; for, the conflict will not be easy. You will be asked for your strength, because the course to victory may be long.”

Having noted the importance of fortitude, he also made an appeal for mutual aid, “In the past week, we have seen the American people at their very best everywhere in America. Citizens have come together to pray, to give blood, to fly our country’s flag. Americans are coming
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together to share their grief and gain strength from one another.”

At the end of this address, Bush again invoked the strength of the US.

Great tragedy has come to us, and we are meeting it with the best that is in our country, with courage and concern for others. Because this is America. This is who we are. This is what our enemies hate and have attacked. And this is why we will prevail.

Throughout this relatively short radio address, Bush again and again asserted American strength, through unity, sacrifice, courage, resolve, and patriotism.

In remarks with Secretary of State Colin Powell and Attorney General John Ashcroft on September 15, while also asserting the other concepts discussed below, Bush continued his emphasis on strength. He said: “Make no mistake about it: underneath our tears is the strong determination of America to win this war. And we will win it.”

Later in the remarks Bush said:

The message is for everybody who wears the uniform: get ready. The United States will do what it takes to win this war. And I ask patience of the American people. There is no question in my mind we’ll have the resolve—I witnessed it yesterday on the construction site. Behind the sadness and the exhaustion, there is a desire by the American people to not seek only revenge, but to win a war against barbaric behavior, people that hate freedom and hate what we stand for.

Besides encouragement, Bush also referred to “revenge” as retribution for the attacks.

Also of note is his use of the term “barbaric behavior.” In this way Bush continued his argument that the 9/11 attackers were not civilized, not members of the world.
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community, and different from “civilized” people. In this sentence Bush also (now famously) asserted that we would win a war against people who “hate freedom and hate what we stand for.” There has been much debate since the 9/11 attacks about the motives of Al Qaeda, and Bush contended more than once that Americans were hated for their freedoms. In my opinion this is probably inaccurate. Al Qaeda’s issues with the US had to do more with American foreign policy decisions and their implementation. I do not believe that these extremists “hate us for our freedoms.” These extremists see US foreign policy as a war against Islam. Nevertheless, Bush used the rhetoric of freedom to rally support against the terrorists.

Finally, in the last portion of this address, Bush said: “It is important for America to get on about its life. But our government will be on full alert and we’ll be tracing every lead, every potential to make sure that the American people are safe.” He wanted the American people to continue to be strong, and asserted that the government would be as well. Bush’s last words, in response to the question that began, “How long do you envision . . . ?” offered this: “The definition is whatever it takes.” This is clearly an assertion of American power and of American strength.

On September 16, Bush made extensive remarks upon his arrival back at the White House. In the beginning of his speech, Bush twice said that “Tomorrow we go back to work.” He was emphasizing the strength through resilience of the American people. He invoked power three times when he said
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Our nation was horrified, but it’s not going to be terrorized. We’re a great nation. We’re a nation of resolve. We’re a nation that can’t be cowed by evil-doers. I’ve got great faith in the American people. If the American people had seen what I had seen in New York City, you’d have great faith, too. You’d have faith in the hard work of the rescuers; you’d have great faith because of the desire for people to do what’s right for America; you’d have great faith because of the compassion and love that our fellow Americans are showing each other in times of need.\(^{352}\)

This all emphasizes themes of *power* and of *strength* for the people and the government.

“But we’ve been warned. We’ve been warned there are evil people in this world. We’ve been warned so vividly—and we’ll be alert. Your government is alert. The governors and mayors are alert that evil folks still lurk out there.”\(^{353}\) He also said, “On this day of faith, I’ve never had more faith in America than I have right now.”\(^{354}\) Bush’s emphasis on his faith in the American people is again a statement of *strength*. In response to a question about the economy, Bush said:

> People will be amazed at how quickly we rebuild New York; how quickly people come together to really wipe away the rubble and show the world that we’re still the strongest nation in the world. But I have great faith in the resiliency of the economy. And no question about it, this incident affected our economy, but the markets open tomorrow, people go back to work and we’ll show the world.\(^{355}\)

His faith in the *strength* of the American people and in the American economy was unwavering.
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In the same speech on September 16, Bush again emphasized American power.

“We have to be on alert in America. We’re a nation of law, a nation of civil rights.”

He was asserting how the US would remain strong. As for Bush himself, he said,

I can assure the American people I am determined, I’m not going to be distracted. I will keep my focus to make sure that not only are these brought to justice, but anybody who’s been associated will be brought to justice. Those who harbor terrorists will be brought to justice. It is time for us to win the first war of the 21st century decisively, so that our children and grandchildren can live peacefully into the 21st century.

In these words he invoked the concept of warrior as well as power. The continual use of man/nation as warrior will be discussed below. Again emphasizing the strength of Americans, Bush said: “They have roused a mighty giant. And make no mistake about it: we’re determined.” The image of the United States as a “mighty giant” obviously emphasized how powerful Bush believed the US was.

On the 17th of September, in remarks to government employees, Bush again referred to the power of the United States and its government.

I’m here to remind people that the best way to fight terrorism is not to let terrorism intimidate America... There are a lot of courageous people here and they’re coming back to work. And I want to thank them for that and remind them we’ve all got a job to do; people digging out the rubble in New York have got a job to do; those of us in government have a job to do.

By definition, terrorism seeks to create disruptive fear, so it was crucial that Bush emphasized the lack of fear with which the United States would respond. Returning to
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work and the necessary jobs in response to the attacks was one way to demonstrate a resistance to fear, which in turn reaffirms strength and power.

It was in Bush’s September 17 remarks to the employees at the Pentagon that he most heavily invoked the concept of individual and American power. He referred to power twenty (20) times in this single speech. Bush began by offering his gratitude to the members of the Pentagon press. “I want to congratulate you and thank you. Many of your members of the Pentagon press went out to help in the evacuation and the aide of the people who work here in the Pentagon and the country appreciates that very much.”360 The willingness of the media to help in the time of crisis affirms strength.

Bush went on in this speech to emphasize American resolution and power. “Today, we’re talking about the mobilization of Reserve and Guard troops. Such a mobilization is a strong symbol of this nation’s resolve.”361 In discussing the mobilization he admitted it would affect thousands of Americans, and said, “But the world will see that the strength of this nation is found in the character and dedication and courage of everyday citizens.”362 He added, “I know this means a lot of sacrifice for those who will be called up, and their families. But you understand—the troops who will be called up understand better than most that freedom has a cost, and that we’re willing to bear that cost.”363 Bush asserted that American troops were willing to pay the price of “new war”:

An act of war has been committed on this country, and the dedication of our Guardsmen and Reservists will serve not
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only as a strong symbol to all that we’re prepared to take the necessary actions, but will be a part of helping define the spirit and courage of America.\textsuperscript{364}

The words all invoke American \textit{power}. Referring to businesses, Bush asserted American \textit{strength} as well.

I want to thank the employers who understand that there is more to corporate life than just profit and loss, that the employee who is getting ready to serve the country is an essential part of winning the—of defeating terrorism, evil-doers so emboldened that they feel like they could attack the great bastion of freedom.\textsuperscript{365}

Bush again seemed surprised that anyone would dare attack the United States and linked it to freedom. He also characterized the attackers as “evil-doers,” a term he would use frequently in his public addresses. Before he moved on to answering questions, Bush wished the American Jewish community and Jews around the world a happy new year, “As the high holy days begin, I know you’ll find strength and determination during this time of reflection.”\textsuperscript{366} Here, he even attributes strength to allies.

In response to a question about future casualties and a possible recession, Bush responded, “There’s no question in my mind that the resolve of our military has never been stronger.”\textsuperscript{367} He also said

In terms of our economy, I’ve got great faith in the economy. I understand it’s tough right now . . . but the underpinnings for growth are there. We’re the greatest entrepreneurial society in the world. We’ve got the best farmers and ranchers. We’ve got a strong manufacturing base. But there’s a challenge ahead of us, and I’m
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confident that our business community will rise to the challenge.\textsuperscript{368}

With these words Bush asserted the \textit{strength} of all aspects of the economy. He also said “the government’s going to act, too”\textsuperscript{369} thus committing all resources to the cause.

In response to specific questions about the US military response to the 9/11 attacks Bush said, “I want to make it clear to the American people that this administration will not talk about any plans we may or may not have. We will not jeopardize in any way, shape or form, anybody who wears the uniform of the United States.”\textsuperscript{370} Although this is not as clear an invocation of American \textit{power} as some of his other statements, by vowing to keep plans confidential, Bush is able to ensure the ability of the US military to do its duty, and thus act with the necessary decisive power, uncompromised by security leaks, to realize their mission.

Bush talked extensively about Osama bin Laden and Al Qaeda in this speech as well, asserting the concept of \textit{warrior}, which will be discussed below. He also asserted the American ability to capture Bin Laden and conquer Al Qaeda. In terms of international support for this, Bush said, “People from all kinds of nationalities lost—that’s why the world is rallying to our call to defeat terrorism.”\textsuperscript{371} International aid would only serve to further \textit{empower} the cause.

Regarding what this new war would be about, Bush invoked power when he said “There are people who hate freedom. This is a fight for freedom. This is a fight to say to the freedom-loving people of the world: we will not allow ourselves to be terrorized by
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somebody who thinks they can hit and hide in some cave somewhere.”372 This again affirms that the United States, and other such would-be targets, is stronger than those who can only attack and then retreat. Retreat is cowardly and this rhetoric clearly aimed to show the cowardice of the attackers and, by contrast, the strength of the United States and its allies.

Bush reiterated his faith in the American people’s fortitude to support him in this new war against cowards with brave allies assisting: “The American people are going to have to be more patient than ever with the efforts of—our combined efforts, not just ourselves, but the efforts of our allies, to get them running and find them and to hunt them down.”373 Freedom was a common rallying cry for, “As the Vice President said, you know, Osama bin Laden is just one person. He is representative of networks of people who absolutely have made their cause to defeat the freedoms that we take—that we understand. And we will not allow them to do so.”374 He discussed participation with other countries to defeat the terrorists saying, “We are putting together a coalition that is a coalition dedicated to declaring to the world we will do what it takes to find the terrorists, to rout them out and to hold them accountable. And the United States is proud to lead the coalition.”375 While the United States remains unilaterally committed to the cause, it finds even greater strength in numbers.

Also on September 17, Bush spoke in a speech titled “Islam is Peace,” in a pointed move to convince the American people that all Muslims were not enemies, just
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Islamic fundamentalists who used terrorist tactics. “America counts millions of Muslims amongst our citizens, and Muslims make an incredibly valuable contribution to our country . . . And they need to be treated with respect. In our anger and emotion, our fellow Americans must treat each other with respect.” Many Americans had come to blame Islam itself for the terrorist attacks, and Bush wished to temper American emotions. Most of all, in the same theme, the Muslim presence in America made the United States stronger, not weaker. Bush appealed to the American sense of freedom even here

> Women who cover their heads in this country must feel comfortable going outside their homes. Moms who wear cover must not be intimidated in America. That’s not the America I know. That’s not the America I value. I’ve been told that some fear to leave; some don’t want to go about their ordinary daily routines because, by wearing cover, they’re afraid they’ll be intimidated. That should not and that will not stand in America.

Bush was arguing for the diverse nature of the United States and highlights the fact that unlike terrorists, Americas do not strive to frighten citizens. This is another source of strength. Americans are represented as empathetic to others:

> This is a great country. It’s a great country because we share the same values of respect and dignity and human worth. And it is my honor to be meeting with leaders who feel just the same way I do. They’re outraged, they’re sad. They love America as much as I do.

Despite Bush’s words of caution and reassurance, many Muslim Americans were targets for hate crimes in the aftermath of the attacks on 9/11.

---
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The speeches on September 18 emphasized *rescuer* much more than *power*, however, some statements by Bush are of note. In remarks Bush made to encourage charitable giving, Bush primarily emphasized how Americans could help others who had suffered even while he asserted that, “Nobody can threaten this country.”\(^{379}\) This was an overt assertion of American *power*. He added, “Oh, they may be able to bomb buildings and obviously disrupt lives. But we’re too great a nation to allow the evil-doers to affect our soul and our spirit.”\(^{380}\) Using rhetoric that asserts a country that possesses a greatness of a magnitude capable of making it impervious to spiritual injury does *empower* America. Continuing this thread at the end of his speech Bush said, “Today I herald the soul and spirit of America with live examples of people who have made a huge difference, and those who suffer and those who hurt. This is a great land. It’s a great land, because our people are so decent and strong and compassionate.”\(^{381}\) Bush again underscores American empathy as a source of *strength*.

On September 20, Bush addressed a joint session of the US Congress. In that speech he invoked the three concepts discussed in this study numerous times, in order to formally request support from the US Congress for his planned military response to the terrorist attacks. He began by saying, “In the normal course of events, presidents come to this chamber to report on the state of the union. Tonight, no such report is needed. It has already been delivered by the American people. We have seen it in the courage of passengers who rushed terrorists to save others on the ground.”\(^{382}\) Bush began this
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important speech asserting American strength by emphasizing American courage. He continued, “My fellow citizens, for the last nine days, the entire world has seen for itself the state of union, and it is strong.”

Regarding the planned response to the terrorist attacks Bush asserted

The United States respects the people of Afghanistan—after all, we are currently its largest source of humanitarian aid—but we condemn the Taliban regime. It is not only repressing its own people, it is threatening people everywhere by sponsoring and sheltering and supplying terrorists. By aiding and abetting murder, the Taliban regime is committing murder. And tonight the United States of America makes the following demands on the Taliban.

Obviously the Taliban did not comply, but making demands was an indication of American power. Only someone in a position of power is capable of making demands of another. Later in the speech Bush argued, “They hate what they see right here in this chamber: a democratically elected government. Their leaders are self-appointed. They hate our freedoms: our freedom of religion, our freedom of speech, our freedom to vote and assemble and disagree with each other.” It seems that what Bush described as “our freedoms” are in his opinion, and many others, the parts of American government that makes the United States powerful. But “our freedoms” are not the only things that make the United States strong. Bush said, “We will direct every resource at our command—every means of diplomacy, every tool of intelligence, every instrument of law enforcement, every financial influence and every necessary weapon of war—to the
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destruction and to the defeat of the global terror network.” All of the entities named, while they exist within and because of American freedoms, also make the America strong. Bush vowed to use all means at his disposal—the tangible outward shows of American strength—to defeat terrorism.

On October 7, Bush spoke to the American people directly to announce the US military intervention in Afghanistan. In his speech, Bush referred to power a number of times. He began by thanking American allies. “We are joined in this operation by our staunch friend, Great Britain. Other close friends, including Canada, Australia, Germany and France, have pledged forces as the operation unfolds.” In this statement Bush asserted American power by describing an international coalition of “friends” who cooperated with the US in its intervention in Afghanistan. The US was depicted as strong because it had other countries’ participation and support for the intervention. He again asserted American strength when he said

Given the nature and reach of our enemies, we will win this conflict by the patient accumulation of successes, by meeting a series of challenges with determination and will and purpose. Today we focus on Afghanistan, but the battle is broader. Every nation has a choice to make. In this conflict, there is no neutral ground. If any government sponsors the outlaws and killers of innocence, they have become outlaws and murderers themselves. And they will take that lonely path at their own peril.

Not only did Bush assert American power through a plan for victory, but also described what had then become known as the “Global War on Terror” as a zero-sum game. In this
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model, every country in the world could choose to side either with the United States or with the terrorists. Bush continued by saying,

At my request, many governors have activated the National Guard to strengthen airport security. We have called up reserves to reinforce our military capability and strengthen the protection of our homeland. In the months ahead, our patience will be one of our strengths—patience with the long waits that will result from tighter security, patience and understanding that it will take time to achieve our goals, patience in all the sacrifices that may come.\textsuperscript{389}

These sentences speak for themselves in terms of the invocation of American \textit{strength}, especially as a facet and product of fortitude. At the end of his speech, Bush reiterated American \textit{power}. "We will not waiver, we will not tire, we will not falter, and we will not fail. Peace and freedom will prevail."\textsuperscript{390} Using very descriptive language throughout Bush encouraged Americans and invoked American \textit{strength}.

At a tribute at the Pentagon Memorial on October 11 Bush asserted American \textit{power} beginning with this statement, "On September 11,\textsuperscript{th} great sorrow came to our country. And from that sorrow has come great resolve. Today we are a nation awakened to the evil of terrorism, and determined to destroy it. That work began the moment we were attacked; and it will continue until justice is delivered."\textsuperscript{391} In describing the terrorist attacks Bush said, "In New York, the terrorists chose as their target a symbol of America’s freedom and confidence. Here, they struck a symbol of our strength in the
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Because a symbol of American power had been destroyed, the United States, effectively, had been emasculated. Bush needed to strike back to regain his own masculinity and the masculine nature of the United States.

Regarding the Taliban, Bush described it as a terrible regime. “The Taliban has allied itself with murderers and gave them shelter. But today, for Al Qaeda and the Taliban, there is no shelter. As Americans did 60 years ago, we have entered a struggle of uncertain duration. But now, as then, we can be certain of the outcome, because we have a number of decisive assets.” Bush was asserting emphatically that the United States would be successful against Al Qaeda and the Taliban because of its strength. He continued to emphasize this

We have a unified country. We have the patience to fight and win on many fronts: Blocking terrorist plans, seizing their funds, arresting their networks, disrupting their communications, opposing their sponsors. And we have one more great asset in this cause: The brave men and women of the United States military.

These words reassured the American people that the war could be won. Bush described the military as having a “strong spirit” that offered this assurance.

You’ve responded to a great emergency with calm and courage. And for that, your country honors you. A Commander-in-Chief must know, must know that he can count on the skill and readiness of servicemen and women at every point in the chain of command. You have given me that confidence.

Bush also made promises to the American people.
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And I give you these commitments. The wound to this building will not be forgotten, but it will be repaired. Brick by brick, we will quickly rebuild the Pentagon. In the missions ahead for the military, you will have everything you need, every resource, every weapon—every means to assure full victory for the United States and the cause of freedom.\textsuperscript{397}

Although damaged, the injury would heal and freedom would triumph because of the fortified front.

And I pledge to you that America will never relent on this war against terror. There will be times of swift, dramatic action. There will be times of steady, quiet progress. Over time, with patience, and precision, the terrorists will be pursued. They will be isolated, surrounded, cornered, until there is no place to run, or hide, or rest.\textsuperscript{398}

The President’s promise of a relentless pursuit invoked the strength of the United States and that of the American people. At the end of his remarks, he said, “Our cause is just, and worthy of sacrifice. Our nation is strong of heart, firm of purpose. Inspired by all the courage that has come before, we will meet our moment and we will prevail.”\textsuperscript{399} The rhetoric is clear on the point of strength for victory.

In the last three speeches analyzed here, Bush invoked power more than in any other speeches. In the news conference on October 11, 2001, Bush, using many of the same words he had used before, referenced power forty (40) times.\textsuperscript{400} In a speech on November 8, “An Address to America Before Representatives of Firemen, Law Enforcement Officers, and Postal Workers in Atlanta, Georgia,” Bush referred to power sixty-two (62) times. Finally, on November 10, in his address to the General Assembly
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\textsuperscript{400} Text of President Bush’s news conference, 10/11/2001.
of the United Nations, Bush invoked the concept of *power* forty-three (43) times. Clearly this had become an extremely important part of Bush’s overall message to Americans and to the world.

Rescuer

As soon as the United States was attacked, Bush began to refer to the United States, the American people, and himself as “rescuer.” References to the Americans rescuing one another; the United States rescuing the “damsel in distress,” Afghanistan; and portrayals of the US and Bush as “Knight-Shining-Armor” were frequently employed.

On September 11, Bush started to assert this concept frequently. He began that day by saying, “I have . . . ordered that the full resources of the federal government go to help the victims and their families . . .” 401 Later that day he said, “I want to reassure the American people that the full resources of the federal government are working to assist local authorities to save lives and to help the victims of these attacks.” 402 He continued “We have taken all appropriate security precautions to protect the American people . . . We have been in touch with the leaders of Congress and with world leaders to assure them that we will do whatever is necessary to protect America and Americans.” 403 In his address on the evening of September 11, Bush strongly invoked the concept of *rescuer.*

“Today, our nation saw evil, the very worst of human nature, and we responded with the best of America, with the daring of our rescue workings, with the caring for strangers and
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neighbors who came to give blood and help in any way they could.”404 He continued to
discuss the “heroic” efforts of first responders. “Our emergency teams are working in
New York City and Washington, D.C., to help with local rescue efforts. Our first priority
is to get help to those who have been injured and to take every precaution to protect our
citizens at home and around the world from further attacks.”405

On the September 12, Bush again referred to rescuer when he said

The federal government and all our agencies are conducting business. But it is not business as usual. We are operating
on a heightened security alert. America is going forward, and as we do so, we must remain keenly aware of the
threats to our country. Those in authority should take appropriate precautions to protect our citizens . . . This
morning, I am sending to Congress a request for emergency funding authority, so that we are prepared to spend
whatever it takes to rescue victims, to help the citizens of New York City and Washington, D.C. respond to this
tragedy, and to protect our national security.406

That same day, the “Presidential Memo to Executive Departments and Agencies” in

particular employed the theme of rescuer with affirmation of aid:

I am deeply saddened and outraged by the loss of life and suffering caused by the attacks at the World Trade Center
in New York City and the Pentagon in Arlington, Virginia. I convey my deepest sympathy and heartfelt sorrow to our
fellow Americans and their families who have been affected by these senseless acts of violence. Many parts of
the Federal Government have been mobilized to respond to this tragedy.407

Bush also ordered that all Federal civilian employees in affected areas to be excused from
duty, including those involved in emergency law enforcement, relief and recovery efforts,

404 President Bush’s address to the nation on Sept. 11, 2001.
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and authorized the transfer of paid emergency leave for Federal employees.\footnote{Ibid.} In the speech “Honoring the Victims,” Bush, in essence, announced a national day of mourning and ordered the American flag be flown at half-staff.\footnote{http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010912-1.html. (accessed 12/2/2008).} In a proclamation of a “National Day of Prayer and Remembrance for the Victims of the Terrorist Attacks on September 11, 2001” on September 13, Bush referred to the concept of rescue a number of times, as he developed themes that he would emphasize even more in the coming the days. Bush not only emphasized that the United States had been hurt, but that it would rebuild itself – rescue itself. “We mourn with those who have suffered great and disastrous loss. All our hearts have been seared by the sudden and senseless taking of innocent lives. We pray for healing and for the strength to serve and encourage one another in hope and faith.”\footnote{http://www/whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010913-7.html. (accessed 12/2/2008).}

Bush, as a Christian man, apparently relied on his faith to help him through these challenging days, and he offered this as well to the American people.

Scripture says: “Blessed are those who mourn for they shall be comforted.” I call on every American family and the family of America to observe a National Day of Prayer and Remembrance, honoring the memory to the thousands of victims of these brutal attacks and comforting those who lost loved ones. We will persevere through this national tragedy and personal loss. In time, we will find healing and recovery.\footnote{http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010913-7.html. (accessed 12/2/2008).}

After announcing a National Day of Prayer and Remembrance, Bush said

I ask that the people of the United States and places of worship mark this . . . [day] . . . with noontime memorial services, the ringing of bells at that hour, and evening candlelight remembrance vigils. I encourage employers to permit their workers time off during the lunch hour to
attend the noontime services to pray for our land. I invite the people of the world who share our grief to join us in these solemn observances.\[^{412}\]

In his phone call with Pataki and Giuliani on September 13, Bush again emphasized how hurt the United States had been. Bush framed the United States as a victim, and portrayed himself as damaged as well. He also emphasized that he would comfort and *rescue* those who had been so affected. “Let me make it clear to you all as my close friends that my mind set is this: one, I weep and mourn with America. I’m going to a hospital right after this to comfort families. I wish I could comfort every single family whose lives have been affected.”\[^{413}\] Bush empathized with Pataki and Giuliani, as well as with everyone who had been hurt. “I thank you so much for your leadership on the ground. I wish I was visiting under better circumstances. But it will be a chance for all three of us to thank and hug and cry with the citizens of your good area.”\[^{414}\] Later in the call Bush promised *rescue*.

In discussing the Federal response, Bush said, “Any sources and methods of intelligence will remain guarded and secret. My administration will not talk about how we gather intelligence, if we gather intelligence and what the intelligence says. That’s for the protection of the American people.”\[^{415}\] Answering a question about how he was personally dealing with the crisis, Bush responded, “Well, I don’t think about myself right now. I think about the families, the children. I am a loving guy, and I am also someone, however, who has got a job to do—and I intend to do it. And this is a terrible
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moment.”\(^{416}\) So, although Bush was himself profoundly emotionally affected, it was important to him to maintain a focus on asserting American *power* and portraying himself and the nation as *warrior* as well as *rescuing* the American people. As hegemonic masculinity prescribes, Bush could not be weak at this moment. He would need to contain his emotions in order to exact justice (and revenge). Although he had been emasculated, indeed the United States had been emasculated, to regain masculinity projecting *power* and *strength* was extraordinarily important.

At a hospital that same day, Bush repeated these ideas. He remarked

This is a great hospital. The doctors and nurses are not only accomplished, they’re loving people. There’s a wonderful spirit up on the floor that we went to. We told them that our country is praying for each and every one there, praying for their families . . . And it was just a sobering moment for Laura and me. But we again thank the hospital, the docs, the nurses and, of course, again tell the families that the nation prays for those who have been injured by this unbelievable act of terror.\(^{417}\)

Bush praised the *rescuers* who were treating survivors of the terrorist attacks, and promised that he and others would ask God to protect and heal them.

In his letter to the Speaker of the House, Bush invoked the concept of *rescuer* again. “Immediate steps are being taken to protect our citizens at home and around the world.”\(^{418}\) In this letter Bush asked as well for funding for his *rescue*. “For additional expenses, $20,000,000,000 [$20 billion] to remain available until expended, to respond to the terrorist attacks . . . to provide assistance to the victims of those attacks . . .”\(^{419}\)
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Bush amended his previous proclamation regarding flying the American flag at half-staff on September 14. He extended the time by one week “as a mark of respect for the victims . . .”

When saluting heroes in New York Bush said

I want you all to know that America today—that America today is on bended knee in prayer for the people whose lives were lost here, for the workers who work here, for the families who mourn. This nation stands with the good people of New York City, and New Jersey and Connecticut, as we mourn the loss of thousands of our citizens.

He also said, “The nation sends its love and compassion to everybody who is here. Thank you for your hard work. Thank you for making the nation proud. And may God bless America.” Bush was again emphasizing that the United States had been victimized, and that it would recover through rescuing itself. At the National Cathedral, Bush spoke movingly about the tragedy. In referring to the casualties he said they include

the names of rescuers, the ones whom death found running up the stairs and into the fires to help others. We will read all these names. We will linger over them, and learn their stories, and many Americans will weep. To the children and parents and spouses and families and friends of the lost, we offer the deepest sympathy of the nation. And I assure you, you are not alone.

His expression of sympathy for the victims reasserted that Americans had become victims. He also emphasized that rescuers had been killed as well. In the last part of this speech Bush asserted Americans’ unique nature, that although Americans had been victimized (emasculated), they would get through it and the United States would regain its international position.

America is a nation full of good fortune, with so much to be grateful for. But we are not spared from suffering. In every generation, the world has produced enemies of human freedom. They have attacked America, because we are freedom’s home and defender. And the commitment of our fathers is now the calling of our time.”

America now had a commitment to rescuing, at the individual level, at the state level, and at the international level.

On September 15, Bush spoke to the American people in a radio address, using the rescuer theme in this speech as well. He further asserted, “We are planning a broad and sustained campaign to secure our country and eradicate the evil of terrorism. And we are determined to see this conflict through. Americans of every faith and background are committed to this goal.” In remarks at Camp David, Bush emphasized victimization again as well.

I’ve asked the highest levels of our government to come to discuss the current tragedy that has so deeply affected our nation. Our country mourns for the loss of life and for those whose lives have been so deeply affected by this despicable act of terror.

He again asserted the uniqueness of the United States, “Listen, this is a great nation. We’re a kind people. None of us could have envisioned the barbaric acts of these terrorists . . .” While speaking about the US response, Bush said

I appreciate very much the American people understanding that [we’re at war]. As we plan, as we put our strategy into action, we will let you know when we think it’s appropriate—not only to protect the lives of our servicemen
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and women, but to make sure our coalition has had proper
time to be noticed as well. But we’re going to act.”

Protecting, or rescuing, the American people was a very high priority. “Our borders are
tighter than they’ve ever been before. We’re [sic] taken a variety of measure to make
sure that the American people are safe.” Promising safety, Bush promised rescue. For
the American people to be able to resume their daily lives was important for their rescue
as well. “Our hope, of course, is that [the American people] make no sacrifice
whatsoever. We would like to see life return to normal in America.”

In the best case scenario, the people would be rescued from any concessions.

In his remarks upon arriving at the South Lawn on September 16, Bush’s rhetoric
and his use of these conceptual narratives focused almost exclusively on power and
warrior. His focus on that day was about a strong warrior response to the emasculation
of the terrorist attacks. He only mentioned the concept of rescuer twice, the first when he
began by talking about mourning and praying the day before (but today getting back to
work). The second time was about his emotional response.

And so, obviously, when I was told what was taking place,
when I was informed than an unidentified aircraft was
headed to the heart of the capital, I wasn’t concerned about
[an order to shoot down any civilian airliner that
approached the Capitol] . . . I was more concerned about
the lives of innocent Americans. I had realized there on the
ground in Florida we were under attack. But never did I
dream we would have been under attack this way.

Again on September 17, when Bush extensively referred to power and warrior, he
only referred to rescuer once, in “We’ve All Got a Job to Do,” “Guard and Reserves

427 Ibid.
428 Ibid.
‘Define Spirit of America’ and “Islam is Peace.” He said, “And, by the way, it’s important for the world to understand that we know in America that more than just Americans suffered loss of life in the World Trade Center. People from all kinds of nationalities lost—that’s why the world is rallying to our call to defeat terrorism.” The other conceptual frameworks were the focus on September 17.

That changed on September 18, when Bush spoke in remarks supporting charities, “President Launches Online American Relief and Response Effort.” In an empathetic address, Bush referred to the concept of rescuer throughout. For example, he focused on the good qualities of the American people that were rescuing in nature. “Last week, America suffered greatly. Thousands of our citizens lost lives. Thousands were hurt. But thousands of our citizens rose to the occasion to help.” In another he talked more about how he believed in the greatness of America. “The world watches the great country called America, and they say: What will they do? What will Americans do? And what they’ve seen is the best of America. They’ve seen leadership, they’ve seen courage, and as importantly, they’ve seen compassion.” However, the references to power and warrior were few in number.

In his speech to the joint session of Congress on September 20, Bush used all three concepts. He talked about the Americans who showed compassion and bravery. In addition to discussing ordinary Americans as rescuers a shift occurred and Bush began to talk about the United States as rescuer.
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The United States respects the people of Afghanistan—after all, we are currently its largest source of humanitarian aid—but we condemn the Taliban regime. It is not only repressing its own people, it is threatening people everywhere by sponsoring and sheltering and supplying terrorists.\textsuperscript{433}

In both his speech to the American people on October 7, and the “Tribute at the Pentagon Memorial” on October 11, Bush made few references to rescuer. The last three speeches analyzed here, however, a news conference on October 11, 2001, titled “My Fellow Americans, Let’s Roll,” and Bush’s speech to the UN General Assembly all contained extensive references to the concept of the American people as wounded but united in rescuing. Importantly, in these last three speeches, Bush portrayed the United States as rescuing people in Afghanistan. In this way, Bush could remasculinize American men, he could remasculinize the United States, and remasculinize himself in the process.

The shift in the use of the concept of rescuer is very interesting. Not only in the last three speeches did Bush reiterate, again and again, the United States (and himself) as powerful and invoke the concept of warrior, Bush shifted the concept of rescuer to characterize the United States as rescuing the people of Afghanistan from the Taliban. In the first week of the attacks, Bush repeatedly invoked the concept of American men (and women, at times) having become victims and, importantly, rescuing victims. He depicted Americans helping others, coming together to mourn, and doing whatever they could to rescue themselves and others. He also depicted the US government as rescuer by talking about how federal resources would be used in the rescue efforts and how the US
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government was committed to helping all victims of the terrorist attacks. In these last three speeches analyzed, Bush added another component to Americans as *rescuers*. He first discussed how American children could *rescue* Afghan children. Later, he moved on to asserting that the United States would *rescue* the Afghan people, as a whole, and, in particular, Afghan women. Therefore, at the personal level people were *rescuers*, at the governmental/state level Bush and the federal/state government(s) were *rescuers*, and finally at the international level the United States became a *rescuer*.

On October 11 as Bush discussed the plight of children in Afghanistan, he reached out to American children for help in *rescuing* them.

I want to make a special request to the children of America. I ask you to join in a special effort to help the children of Afghanistan. Their country has been through a great deal of war and suffering. Many children there are starving and are severely malnourished. One in three Afghan children is an orphan. Almost half suffer chronic malnutrition. And we can and must help them. We’ve created a special relief effort that will be supervised by the Red Cross. We’re asking every child in America to earn or give a dollar that will be used to provide food and medical help for the children of Afghanistan. You can send your dollar in an envelope marked America’s Fund for Afghan Children right here to the White House . . . This is an opportunity to help others while teaching our own children a valuable lesson about service and character. I hope school classes, or Boys and Girl Scout troops, other youth organizations will participate in any way to raise the money to send to the children. Wash your car. Do a yard for a neighbor. And I hope that adults will help them as well. Ultimately, one of the best weapons, one of the truest weapons that we have against terrorism is to show the world the true strength of character and kindness of the American people. Americans are united in this fight against terrorism. We’re also united in our concern for the innocent people of Afghanistan.
Winter is coming, and by acting today, we can help the children survive.\textsuperscript{334} This excerpt is very telling, it addresses \textit{rescue} at the personal, familial, national, and international levels. At this news conference, Bush invoked \textit{rescue} forty-five times (as well as referring to \textit{power} forty times and \textit{warrior} fifty-three times).

In a very important speech regarding the intervention in Afghanistan, “My Fellow American’s, Let’s Roll,” Bush again used the three concepts analyzed here extensively. He referred to \textit{power} sixty-two (62) times, \textit{rescuer} twenty-eight (28) times, and \textit{warrior} twenty-seven (27) times. Although much of this speech was about asserting American \textit{strength}, Bush’s use of the concept of \textit{rescuer} is a very important component, because he continued to use the concept regarding the US \textit{rescue} of innocent Afghans who had been treated badly by the Taliban. Bush, in describing the “new enemy,” noted how different their values were from American values. “This new enemy seeks to destroy our freedom and impose its views. We value life; the terrorists ruthlessly destroy it. We value education; the terrorists do not believe women should be educated, or should have health care, or should leave their homes.”\textsuperscript{335} Bush specifically singled out women as victims of the Taliban and of Al Qaeda. This is a common theme in the \textit{rescue narrative}: men \textit{rescue} women; men are “knights-in-shining armor,” who \textit{rescue} damsels in distress. The women in Afghanistan were “damsels-in-distress” who needed \textit{rescuing}. Later, Bush added

Throughout this battle, we adhere to our values. Unlike our enemy, we respect life. We do not target innocent civilians. We care for the innocent people of Afghanistan,

\textsuperscript{334} Text of President Bush’s news conference, October 11, 2001.
so we continue to provide humanitarian aid, even while their government tries to steal the food we send. When the terrorists and their supporters are gone, the people of Afghanistan will say with the rest of the world, “Good riddance.”

In the last speech analyzed here, the address to the UN General Assembly, Bush employed the concept of \textit{rescuer} frequently, but the address primarily emphasized the concept of the United States as \textit{powerful}. It was a speech in which \textit{power} was referred to forty-three (43) times and \textit{warrior} eighteen (18) times. Again, however, Bush portrayed Americans, the US government, and himself as \textit{rescuer}. He essentially labeled the United States as a \textit{rescuer} of innocent Afghan people. In this speech, he focused on a number of points. “[The Taliban and Al Qaeda] promote terror abroad and impose a reign of terror on the Afghan people. Women are executed in Kabul’s soccer stadium. They can be beaten for wearing socks that are too thin. Men are jailed for missing prayer meetings.” Further description of the plight of victims in Afghanistan followed.

My country grieves for all the suffering the Taliban have brought upon Afghanistan, including the terrible burden of war. The Afghan people do not deserve their present rulers. Years of Taliban misrule have brought nothing but misery and starvation. Even before this current crisis, 4 million Afghans depended on food from the United States and other nations, and millions of Afghans were refugees from Taliban oppression. I make this promise to all the victims of that regime: The Taliban’s days of harboring terrorists and dealing in heroin and brutalizing women are drawing to a close.

Bush expressed sadness and empathy for Afghans, and directly blamed the Taliban and Al Qaeda for all the problems in that country. Bush essentially promised he and the
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American people would become the “Knight in Shining Armor,” by rescuing the “damsel in distress” (the innocent people in Afghanistan) from “the enemy,” their terrible and murderous oppressors.439

Warrior

The concepts and narratives regarding warrior are multiple and complex. Individual men (and sometimes women) are warriors, and warriors compose all state militaries. Fighting capability is a strongly valued masculine trait. Individual men who cannot fight, or will not fight, are demeaned by men who do. Aggression is generally encouraged in American men, and other men (and women) judge men regarding this psychological trait. If an individual man is physically beaten, in a fight for example, to remasculinize himself he must show he is stronger, either by more physical violence or in other ways. Bush, and American men, had been emasculated by the attacks. To remasculinize the country and the president, Bush and American men (and women) wanted to punish those responsible. Bush promised to do this.

Bush used language immediately after the attacks which was aggressive, warrior-like in nature. Before he left Florida on 9/11, Bush said he had ordered “the full resources of the federal government . . . to conduct a full-scale investigation to hunt down and to find those folks who committed this act. Terrorism against our nation will not stand.”440 Arriving at Barksdale Air Force Base, Louisiana, Bush announced: “Make no mistake: The United States will hunt down and punish those responsible for these

439 Bush himself did not highlight in particular the “plight of Afghan women,” that message was conveyed through a radio address by the First Lady. However, the analysis here is confined to George W. Bush.
The evening of 9/11, Bush described his interpretation of the events of that day saying, “Thousands of lives were suddenly ended by evil, despicable acts of terror. The pictures of airplanes flying into buildings, fires burning, huge structures collapsing have filled us with disbelief, terrible sadness and a quiet, unyielding anger.” Bush had decided that he and the American people would deal with this anger in one way:

Our military is powerful, and it’s prepared . . . The search is under way for those who are behind these evil acts. I’ve directed the full resources for our intelligence and law enforcement communities to find those responsible and bring them to justice. We will make no distinction between the terrorists who committed these acts and those who harbor them.

It is evident Bush wanted immediate use of American military forces to capture and punish the suspects. At the end of his speech, Bush asserted: “we stand together to win the war against terrorism” Bush already considered the US at war. He said, “America has stood down enemies before, and we will do so this time. None of us will ever forget this day, yet we go forward to defend freedom and all that is good and just in our world.” The precedent supported Bush’s plan to retaliate.

Bush began remarks in the Cabinet Room on September 12 by saying, “The deliberate and deadly attacks which were carried out yesterday against our country were
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more than acts of terror. They were acts of war . . . Freedom and democracy are under attack.” He also described “the enemy”:

The American people need to know that we’re facing a different enemy than we have ever faced. This enemy hides in shadows, and has no regard for human life. This is an enemy who preys on innocent and unsuspecting people, runs for cover. This is an enemy that thinks its harbors are safe. But they won’t be safe forever.

The President promised to conquer this enemy, and said “this will be a monumental struggle of good versus evil. But good will prevail.”

At the National Day of Prayer and Remembrance on September 13, Bush again referred to warrior concepts, especially in the battle of good versus evil.

Civilized people around the world denounced the evildoers who devised and executed these terrible attacks. Justice demands that those who helped or harbored the terrorists be punished – and punished severely. The enormity of their evil demands it. We will use all the resources of the United States and our cooperating friends and allies to pursue those responsible for this evil, until justice is done.

In Bush’s phone call with New York Mayor Giuliani and New York Governor Pataki, Bush repeated similar statements that referred to the concept of warrior. He began by talking about anger, which he had mentioned before. “I want to let you know there is a quiet anger in America that really is real.” He reiterated this was a new kind of war, and to “make no mistake” the perpetrators and their supporters would be held
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accountable. He talked about “battling the enemy” as well. Bush went into detail about the new war: Leaders around the world “fully understand that an act of war was declared on the United States of America. They understand . . . these people can’t stand freedom; they hate our values; they hate what America stands for.” He continued

They understand that, unlike previous war, this enemy likes to hide. They heard my call loud and clear, to those who feel like they can provide safe harbor for the terrorists, that we will hold them responsible, as well . . . [they understand] not only the concept of the enemy, but that the enemy is a different type of enemy.

Regarding Pakistan, Bush said, “We will give the Pakistani government a chance to cooperate and to participate, as we hunt down those people who committed this unbelievable despicable act on America.”

Regarding this new war that had been declared on the United States, Bush asserted, “We will lead the world to victory, to victory.”

In his letter to the Speaker of the House published September 13, Bush began with very similar words, emphasizing the evil nature of the attacks. He also asserted, “Our first priority is to respond swiftly and surely.”

On September 14, Bush declared a national emergency “by reason of the terrorist attacks at the World Trade Center, New York, New York, and the Pentagon, and the continuing and immediate threat of further attacks on the United States.”
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Bush considered the United States under continuing and immediate threat, a *warrior* response was required. He also ordered the deployment of US forces to conduct operational missions.\(^{459}\) Also on September 14, Bush spoke to people in New York, and responding to applause he said, “I can hear you. The rest of the world hears you. And the people who knocked these buildings down will hear all of us soon.”\(^{460}\) Bush was preparing the country for war, and, arguably, responding to the country’s need for war. The *warrior* nation would be heard. In remarks at the National Day of Prayer and Remembrance, Bush also invoked the concept of *warrior*. “[The list of names] are the names of passengers who defied their murderers, and prevented the murder of others on the ground. They are the names of men and women who wore the uniform of the United States, and died at their posts.”\(^{461}\) Bush described the bravery and heroism of these individuals, praising their valor, which is a further reference to *warrior*. He added, “Just three days removed from these events, Americans do not yet have the distance of history. But our responsibility to history is already clear: to answer these attacks and rid the world of evil.”\(^{462}\) The “answer” was clear even at this point: the *warrior* nation would use the military to exact justice (and revenge). Near the end of these remarks Bush asserted, “In every generation, the world has produced enemies of human freedom. They have attacked America, because we are freedom’s home and defender. And the commitment
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of our fathers is now the calling of our time.” The commitment the United States had made historically was to fight those who had become “enemies of freedom.”

In his radio address to the nation on September 15, Bush continued to invoke the concept of warrior. He began with aggressive language, “This weekend I am engaged in extensive sessions with members of my National Security Council, as we plan a comprehensive assault on terrorism. This will be a different kind of conflict against a different kind of enemy.” Planning such an assault is a clear reference to warrior. He continued,

This is a conflict without battlefields or beachheads, a conflict with opponents who believe they are invisible. Yet, they are mistaken. They will be exposed, and they will discover what others in the past have learned: Those who make war against the United States have chosen their own destruction.

This was clearly intended not only to threaten the enemy, but also to assert the superiority of American military power. Describing the American response Bush said, “We are planning a broad and sustained campaign to secure our country and eradicate the evil of terrorism . . . in New York City . . . [I saw] an amazing spirit of sacrifice and patriotism and defiance.” Americans, and the United States (including the military), would show their resolve through a warrior response. Bush said he would not “settle for a token act. Our response must be sweeping, sustained and effective.” He also asked for a kind of warrior response from the American people, when he said, “You will be asked for your
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patience; for, the conflict will not be short. You will be asked for resolve; for, the conflict will not be easy. You will be asked for your strength, because the course to victory may be long.\textsuperscript{468} He was asking for domestic support for the intervention in Afghanistan.

In the “President Urges Readiness and Patience,” at Camp David, Bush continued to use language that invoked \textit{warrior}.

I am going to describe to our leadership what I saw: the wreckage of New York City, the signs of the first battle of war. We’re going to meet and deliberate and discuss—but there’s no question about it, this act will not stand; we will find those who did it; we will smoke them out of their holes; we will get them running and we’ll bring them to justice. We will not only deal with those who dare attack America, we will deal with those who harbor them and feed them and house them. Make no mistake about it: underneath our tears is the strong determination of America to win this war. And we will win it.\textsuperscript{469}

By September 15 Bush had effectively declared war on the suspected perpetrators of the 9/11 attacks. A swift and overwhelming show of military force was a necessary, masculine response. He continued, “They will try to hide, they will try to avoid the United States and our allies—but we’re not going to let them. They run to the hills; they find holes to get in. And we will do whatever it takes to smoke them out and get them running, and we’ll get them.”\textsuperscript{470} Bush not only promised war against “them” (all terrorists and their supporters) but unequivocal victory. He labeled the acts “barbaric” in this speech, and said, “They have stirred up the might of the American people, and we’re
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going to get them, no matter what it takes.’’471 Answering a question about how long the conflict might last, Bush responded, “As long as it takes. And it’s not just one person. We’re talking about those who fed them, those who house them, those who harbor terrorists will be held accountable for this action.”472 Responding to a question about Osama bin Laden, Bush said, “There is no question he was what we would call a prime suspect. And if he thinks he can hide and run from the United States and our allies, he will be sorely mistaken.”473 In one of the most telling parts of this address, Bush said

The message is for everybody who wears the uniform: get ready. The United States will do what it takes to win this war. And I ask patience of the American people. There is no question in my mind we’ll have the resolve—I witnessed it yesterday on the construction site. Behind the sadness and the exhaustion, there is a desire by the American people to not seek only revenge, but to win a war against barbaric behavior, people that hate freedom and hate what we stand for.474

Bush felt the American people wanted war and wanted revenge, on Bin Laden, Al Qaeda, and the Taliban. Bush’s position was that the attacks on 9/11 were an act of war, so the United States was already at war. “We’re at war. There has been an act of war declared upon America by terrorists, and we will respond accordingly.”475 That war, against an enemy never before envisioned, was characterized this way: “[The American people] go about their business on Monday, but with a heightened sense of awareness that a group of
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barbarians have declared war on the American people." 476 The enemies were “barbarians.” 477

When President Bush announced that the flag of the United States would be flown at half-staff though September 16, he began by saying, “As a mark of respect for those killed by the heinous acts of violence perpetrated by faceless cowards upon the people and the freedom of the United States.” 478 This rhetoric helped to shape the American people’s understanding of the events on 9/11. On September 16, Bush made a number of additional references to warrior. Many of his words were the same, but a few remarks are of particular note. “We’re facing a new kind of enemy, somebody so barbaric that they would fly airplanes into buildings full of innocent people. And, therefore, we have to be on alert in America . . . We’re a nation under attack.” 479 He added

We need to be alert to the fact that these evil-doers still exist. We haven’t seen this kind of barbarism in a long period of time. No one could have conceivably imagined suicide bombers burrowing into our society and then emerging all in the same day to fly their aircraft—fly US aircraft into buildings full of innocent people—and show no remorse. This is a new kind of—a new kind of evil. And we understand. And the American people are beginning to understand. This crusade, this war on terrorism is going to take a while. 480

Bush appealed to the grief and anger in the United States, and labeled the enemy “evil.” He also labeled the American response a “crusade.” Although he again said that the war

---
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against terrorism might be long and sustained, he also declared “it is time for us to win the first war of the 21st century.” Most of the language in the speech repeats, verbatim in some cases, earlier statements which reflected the concept of warrior. The total number of times Bush used this concept in this speech alone was twenty (20). He concluded with, “That’s why I say to the American people we’ve never seen this kind of evil before. But the evil-doers have never seen the American people in action before, either—and they’re about to find out.”

In Bush’s remarks to the employees at the Pentagon he again frequently invoked the concept of warrior. Of course, this is to be expected given his audience. Bush was rallying the troops, using militaristic language and invoking the warrior. He referred to this concept twenty-two (22) times in his address at the Pentagon. Many of the words are the same as he used before, “we will win the war,” “Osama bin Laden is a prime suspect,” “those evil-doers, those barbaric people [will be held] accountable.” He again, as in the previous speech, talked about hunting them down, finding their “holes,” “smoking them out,” etc. He repeated his assertion that the United States was dealing with “barbarians.” “There are no rules. It’s barbaric behavior. They slit the throats of women on airplanes in order to achieve an objective that is beyond comprehension.” He again repeated, which he had continued to contend, that the United States was facing a “new enemy” and facing an enemy that hates freedom. In famous words, which gave this dissertation its title, Bush said: “I want justice. There’s an old poster out west, as I
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recall, that said, ‘Wanted: Dead or Alive’. When questioned about his statement, Bush repeated,

I just remember, all I’m doing is remembering when I was a kid I remember that they used to put out there in the old west, a wanted poster. It said: ‘Wanted, Dead or Alive.’ All I want and America wants him brought to justice [sic].

Bush referred to warrior on September 17 even when he made remarks titled “Islam is Peace.” He was arguing that the people who were responsible for the 9/11 attacks were not ordinary Muslims, but a small percentage of Muslims who were radicals.

These acts of violence against innocents violate the fundamental tenets of the Islamic faith. And it’s important for my fellow Americans to understand that. The English translation is not as eloquent as the original Arabic, but let me quote from the Koran, itself: In the long run, evil in the extreme will be the end of those who do evil. For that they rejected the signs of Allah and held them up to ridicule. The face of terror is not the true faith of Islam. That’s not what Islam is all about. Islam is peace. These terrorists don’t represent peace. They represent evil and war.

On September 18, when the online American Relief and Response Effort was launched, Bush emphasized rescuer, but the other two concepts examined here, power and warrior, not as much. However, on September 20, in an address to a joint session of Congress, Bush focused on the concept of warrior. Of particular note are the formal demands made to the Taliban in this address.

By aiding and abetting murder, the Taliban regime is committing murder. And tonight the United States of America makes the following demands on the Taliban.
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Deliver to United States authorities all of the leaders of al-Qaeda who hide in your land. Release all foreign nationals, including American citizens you have unjustly imprisoned. Close immediately and permanently every terrorist training camp in Afghanistan. And hand over every terrorist and every person and their support structure to appropriate authorities. These demands are not open to negotiation or discussion. The Taliban must act and act immediately. They will hand over the terrorists, or they will share in their fate.  

Bush promised that if the Taliban did not do as demanded, the war that Bush already saw as declared on America would include among its enemies the Taliban regime. Bush also emphasized to the American public that this war was not going to be like other recent wars.

Our response involves far more than instant retaliation and isolated strikes. Americans should not expect one battle, but a lengthy campaign unlike any other we have ever seen. It may include dramatic strikes visible on TV and covert operations secret even in success. We will starve terrorists of funding, turn them one against another, drive them from place to place until there is no refuge or no rest. And we will pursue nations that provide aid or safe haven to terrorism. Every nation in every region now has a decision to make: Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists.  

Bush announced not only an elaborate description of how the United States was to defeat the terrorists, but also a global zero-sum game in the war between the US and Al Qaeda, that would soon involve Afghanistan as well.

That time came on October 7, when Bush announced strikes in Afghanistan against Al Qaeda training camps and military installations of the Taliban regime.

Because his demands had not been met, Bush said, “Now, the Taliban will pay a

---
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That price was a US military intervention to capture or kill any and all persons suspected of being members of either Al-Qaeda or the Taliban. Bush also praised the US military.

We ask a lot of those who wear our uniform. We ask them to leave their loved ones, to travel great distances, to risk injury, even to be prepared to make the ultimate sacrifice of their lives. They are dedicated. They are honorable. They represent the best of our country, and we are grateful. To all the men and women in our military... I say this: Your mission is defined. The objectives are clear. Your goal is just. You have my full confidence, and you will have every tool you need to carry out your duty.

Bush ended with these words, “The battle is now joined on many fronts. We will not waiver, we will not tire, we will not falter, and we will not fail. Peace and freedom will prevail.”

At the President’s tribute at the Pentagon Memorial Bush on October 11, Bush again used aggressive language and used the concept of warrior. For example, he characterized the enemy by saying:

The hijackers were instruments of evil who died in vain. Behind them is a cult of evil which seeks to harm the innocent and thrives on human suffering. Theirs is the worst kind of cruelty, the cruelty that is fed, not weakened by tears. Theirs is the worst kind of violence, pure malice, while daring to claim the authority of God. We cannot fully understand the designs and power of evil. It is enough to know that evil, like goodness, exists. And in the terrorists, evil has found a willing servant.

---
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Bush continued to describe the enemy as evil. Much of the speech repeated earlier statements as well, promising to find the enemy, promising to target any regime that did not surrender terrorists, praising the bravery and strength of the US military, and emphasizing the *warrior* nature of the United States evident in its response to victimization.

> I pledge to you that America will never relent on this war against terror. There will be times of swift, dramatic action. There will be times of steady, quiet progress. Over time, with patience, and precision, the terrorists will be pursued. They will be isolated, surrounded, cornered, until there is no place to run, or hide, or rest.\textsuperscript{494}

In this short speech, Bush invoked *warrior* twenty-one times.

In his news conference on October 11, Bush repeated most of the same themes he had discussed before. In the month since the attacks, Bush’s message had become more clear, more defined, and he outlined his intentions toward those responsible for the 9/11 attacks. It was apparent in the other speech given that day, at the Pentagon Memorial, and it was evident in the evening of his news conference. For example he said he was reporting to the American people on the “state of our war against terror.” Bush had begun using the phrase “War on Terror,” instead of “war on terrorism,” as he had referred to this “new war” just after the attacks. October 11 was exactly one month since the attacks, and Bush’s message was well refined. No longer was Bush in the same “crisis mode” as he had been in the days immediately following the attacks. By the time a month had passed, the damage had been assessed, clean-up work continued, and a plan had been formed and its execution begun in Afghanistan. Bush said
The men and women of the United States military are doing their duty with skill and success. We have ruined terrorist training camps, disrupted their communications, weakened the Taliban military and destroyed most of their air defenses. We’re mounting a sustained campaign to drive the terrorists out of their hidden caves and to bring them to justice. All missions are being executed according to plan on the military front . . . On the law enforcement front, terrorists are being swept up in an international dragnet. Several hundred have been arrested. Thousands of FBI agents are on the trail of other suspects here and abroad . . . We’re aggressively pursuing the agents of terror around the world, and we are aggressively strengthening our protections here at home.‖

Bush repeated his zero-sum game understanding of the situation. “I made it very clear to [the Taliban] in no uncertain terms, that in order to avoid punishment, they should turn over the parasites that hide in their country. They obviously refused to do so and now they’re paying a price.” He talked about “routing out terrorism” around the world, “tightening the net on terrorists,” and bringing them to justice. Discussing people as hiding in caves, as parasites, and catching them in nets implies they are sub-human, even barbarians. This sort of language was discussed earlier. These statements also repeated themes he had made previously; his message was simply more finely tuned. He did respond to some questions regarding the military specifically, by talking about some of the adjustments that had been and were being made to fight the terrorists.

All of us in government are having to adjust our way of thinking about the new war. The military is going to have to adjust . . . we need to rethink how we configure our military . . . so that we can more effectively respond to
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asymmetrical responses from—from terrorist organizations.498

My interpretation of this statement is that the military, the national security apparatus, and the new “homeland security” apparatus was figuring out how to fight in an such irregular tactics and enemies. In this news conference, Bush referred to warrior fifty-three (53) times.

At his November 8 address, Bush primarily asserted the power of the United States, but frequently invoked rescuer, and warrior as well. In this speech, to firemen, law enforcement officers, and postal workers, Bush referred to warrior twenty-seven (27) times. One notable phrase was: “We wage a war to save civilization itself.”499 In Bush’s opinion, this was no mere military intervention or conflict, it was essentially a battle between good (the United States) and evil (the terrorists). He also maintained that the “war on terror” would not end in Afghanistan.

We are at the beginning of our efforts in Afghanistan, and Afghanistan is only the beginning of our efforts in the world. No group or nation should mistake Americans’ intentions. Where terrorist groups exist of global reach, the United States and our friends and allies will seek it out, and we will destroy it.500

He concluded with this statement: “We cannot know every turn this battle will take, yet we know our cause is just and our ultimate victory is assured. We will no doubt face new challenges, but we have our marching orders. My fellow Americans, let’s roll.”501
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In the last speech analyzed here, the address to the UN General Assembly on November 10, Bush emphasized all three concepts again. His words and phrases were familiar; by this time, Bush had developed a well-rehearsed narrative. He referred to *warrior* eighteen (18) times in this speech.

Why does Bush’s use of the concept *warrior* matter? It matters because there are explicitly male components of this concept. “Warriors” are men. These components were used and reflected by the words Bush used. Bush first promised swift justice, demanded revenge, and encouraged Americans to support a military intervention. The US military was asked to obtain justice for the events of 9/11, and the American people were told that justice was assured. Bush promised to do everything in his power to punish the offenders. Bush was promising revenge, in a physical sense (through the use of the military). In this way the American people would be remasculinized. If a bully hits a boy or a man, the manly response is to fight back. Bush did the same, only he used the US armed forces. He effectively remasculinized the country and its citizens by promising to punish the bullies.

Conceptual Analysis Conclusion

The qualitative content analysis presented here clearly illustrates how important the three concepts (*power*, *rescuer*, and *warrior*) were to Bush, as he initially dealt with the crisis, explained it to the American people, and formulated a response. By the time Bush spoke to the UN General Assembly, his message had been refined, developed from the many times he had spoken about the terrorist attacks and the US response.
The “counting,” the part of this analysis in which speeches before 9/11 were compared to those afterward, obviously shows that except for statements about American power, Bush rarely used the concepts of rescuer or warrior before the terrorist attacks; however, they were frequently employed afterward.

The interpretive analysis, with its detailed examination of each speech, shows how Bush used these concepts, to develop his own understanding of the events and to project a particular message to the American people. The gendered nature of these concepts is not unimportant, it is crucial to understanding how and why Bush invoked these concepts.

To be manly, to be a man, in the US (and many places around the globe), a person displays masculinity. Some national leaders feel it is necessary for the nation to project masculinity. Bush, to be a viable political leader and maintain US global hegemony, had to project a masculine response to the attacks. He did this by talking about American power, by promising to rescue Americans (and other victims of terrorism, like the Afghan people, especially females), and by promising revenge by using the US military (warriors) to punish the people he held responsible.
Chapter Seven

Conclusion

The conclusions in this chapter summarize how the analysis of gender as an analytic category, specifically hegemonic masculinity, can help provide understanding of Presidential foreign policy decision-making under crisis conditions. The President’s language is powerful. When analyzing that powerful language, gendered ideologies are evident, at least in the case of President Bush after the crisis of 9/11.

The gender epistemology employed in this research made gender, specifically hegemonic masculinity, visible. Foreign policy decision-making, particularly crisis decision-making, can be understood better by explicitly examining the gendered ideologies referred to by the President in his public addresses. Standpoint feminism, as an epistemological approach, provides an avenue through which foreign policy decision-making and communication can be analyzed. Theorists allege both neurological and socialization influences on decision-making in general. These can obviously be applied to Presidential decision-making and communication. Gender schema, ideologies, frames, metaphors, and displays of masculinity are ubiquitous for individuals and for political leaders as well.

In the gender analysis of President Bush, it was evident that Bush reacted in ways that were shaped by hegemonic masculinity. Bush initially was in shock, he seemed to be overwhelmed and unsure of what to do; however, in his speeches on September 11, 2001 he promised the American people that he would do everything in his power to
protect them, rescue the victims, and prevent another attack. He maintained an image of strength and reassured the American people that the United States was strong. His insistence on speaking from the Oval Office the evening of the terrorist attacks was likely intended to reassure the American people and to emphasize that Bush was not afraid. Bush emphasized his own masculinity—that he was tough and strong, yet rescuing after the attacks on 9/11. He stressed, again and again, the strength of the United States, the strength of its people, and the power of the US military. Within days of the attacks Bush presented a strategic response to the public, and he asserted American military power. Bush promised justice for the victims and further promised to protect and rescue the American people.

Bush’s personal faith emerged swiftly, and he presented the attacks as biblically evil and barbaric. It was a reflexive response. Bush, as an individual man, had to deal with one of the most devastating and surprising attacks in American history. He was not particularly prepared to do so. He had intended, in fact, to approach foreign policy in a more “humble” way as evidenced by his pre-9/11 discussions of foreign policy. The terrorist attacks changed his approach and they affected him personally. Bush, whether he consciously realized it or not, had been emasculated by the attacks and needed to remasculinize himself and the United States. He seemed to sense this in some way, and his words on the day of the attacks and afterward reflected integral components of hegemonic masculinity via powerful, rescuing, warrior images.

Research on Bush’s psychological makeup indicates that he was both willing to take risks and assertive. These are valorized traits of hegemonic masculinity.
Nevertheless, the research also shows that he tended to be a superficial thinker, could be inconsistent in following through, and thought in black-and-white terms. Thinking in black-and-white seemed to emerge much more strongly after the terrorist attacks, especially in terms of the good versus evil dichotomy. On September 11, 2001 and in the days that followed, Bush acted emotionally and automatically. He said he was angry, but projected an image of strength and restrained emotion. The foreign policy which developed was phallic in nature, a masculinist foreign policy some people have characterized as muscular. His objective was to remasculinize the United States, and to do so he needed to return the United States to a position of dominance. He was also reassuring and promised rescue—of the American people, and later, the Afghan people as well.

In times of crisis, masculine leaders, leaders who are considered strong, are necessary to restore national and individual feelings of security. It is the way that gender works in America. Men are strong, they are protectors, and they are warriors if they need to be to be protectors or rescuers. Individual American men and women needed the President to display masculine traits and to act decisively (components of hegemonic masculinity). The trauma of the events of 9/11 shaped the way the President was required to respond in order to unite the country and keep it strong.

The chapter on Afghanistan, and how the intervention was masculinist in nature, illustrated some additional concepts which became important to Bush’s remasculinization of America and himself. Bush characterized the attackers as evildoers and barbarians. He also described the conflict between the US and Al Qaeda as between good and evil.
with an unequivocal emphasis on Americans as *good* and Al Qaeda as *evil*. Because of his individual personality, Bush used rhetoric that was comfortable for him. He frequently used Christian concepts to describe the conflict, and he employed phrases which referred to cowboy masculinity. His response was hypermasculine. He used very strong language to indicate that the United States would punish anyone and everyone involved, further highlighting that any country or individual not on the side of the United States could only be on the side of the terrorists. There was no neutral position. Bush also used the rescue narrative—the United States would rescue its own people and go on to rescue the Afghan people, with particular emphasis on the rescue of Afghan women. What resulted was a muscular, idealist, and unilateralist foreign policy.

These components of hegemonic masculinity measured by the content analysis, power, rescuer, and warrior, were frequently referred to by Bush after the terrorist attacks. Bush repeatedly used words and phrases that evoked these concepts. He was reassuring the American people that the United States would regain its position of dominance in the world. In resmasculinizing himself and the United States, he argued that Americans would be shown to be even more masculine. After the terrorist attacks, masculine displays were valorized and Bush projected a very masculine image personally. When Bush indicated what the immediate US response would be—to capture and/or kill anyone who had been involved in the attacks in any way—he indicated his own strength and the strength of the US military. Indeed, the rhetoric about the planned response to the terrorists’ attacks went beyond the average masculine ideology evident in Presidential communication; in fact, it was a hypermasculine response. Bush did not just
reassure the American people, he promised revenge. Immediately after the attacks, Bush promised retaliation and he directed the US military to intervene in Afghanistan to get justice for the entire country. Bush used blatantly masculinist rhetoric and was obviously aggressive. He also emphasized independence, the right of the United States to intervene to capture accomplices in order to exact revenge. Furthermore, Bush used a gender narrative by promising to rescue Americans and to rescue the Afghan people who had been controlled by this evil regime.

Obviously in the first moments and hours after the attacks Bush was in crisis mode; however, within a few days, he had refined his message. He continued to hit on the concepts of man/nation as powerful, man/nation as rescuer, and man/nation as warrior. Sometimes in his speeches all three concepts were employed, at other times one concept was the focus. There was an increase in the frequency of the references between September 11 and November 10. Of the concepts examined here, power was most frequently invoked, followed by warrior, and then rescuer. It was natural for Bush to use these concepts to remasculinize the United States and himself.

The measurements of how frequently Bush employed the concepts of power, warrior, and rescuer before and after the 9/11 attacks are of particular note: the concepts of rescuer and warrior were evoked significantly more frequently after 9/11 than they had been before the attacks. The concept of power, an integral component of hegemonic masculinity, was not evoked significantly more frequently. The answer as to why lies with the responsibility of the President to continually emphasize the power of the United States.
How did Bush’s responses different from any other man who could have been sitting President on the day of the 9/11 attacks? Bush’s adherence to hegemonic masculinity was to be expected, given his gender and his political office. This is speculative, nevertheless, two areas are of interest may illustrate some possible differences between Bush and a hypothetical President. The first was the influence of evangelical Christianity, particularly given that the conflict was between Western culture and Radical Islam—which led him to claim that the terrorists attacked the United States because of its values and its policies. Bush’s belief in an Almighty God who was on the side of America may not have been true for a different man. A different President may not have labeled the terrorists “evildoers,” for example. Someone else might not have continued, in speech after speech, to talk about good versus evil, and the innate goodness of America.

In speaking with the press, Bush also used terminology unique to his personal background, when he employed cowboy metaphors to describe the conflict, his response, and how he intended for the United States to obtain justice. Phrases like “Smoke ‘Em Out,” and “Wanted: Dead or Alive,” may not have been used by a different President. Bush, as is any other person, was shaped by his family and religious background, and those influences were reflected in his speeches after the terrorist attacks.

It is evident from this research that the constructivists are correct in their contention that language is power and that gender is a part of foreign policy decision-making and the communication used to present those decisions. Decision-making cannot be understood fully, nor can the ways in which decisions are conveyed to the American
people, without an explicit examination of language, and an explicit examination of gender. It is also evident that in times of crisis, even more than in status quo decision-making, gendered rhetoric is more likely to be employed.

Finally, we can conclude that state-level, society-level, and individual-level analysis of decision-making are all important to increase understanding of foreign policy decision-making and how those decisions are conveyed to the American people in order to generate support. Individual-level and state-level analyses cannot be eliminated to focus only on the international level of analysis.

Some limitations of this research include the methodological problem of a small data set, particularly before 9/11. Stronger conclusions could be reached with more data, however given the nature of the study that was not possible. Another limitation of this research is that the analysis only included one case: the intervention in Afghanistan. With additional cases perhaps different or stronger conclusions could have been reached. It is difficult, however, to conceive of another case which is similar enough to the terrorist attacks on 9/11 to provide a comparative analysis.

A number of objections to this analysis and these conclusions could be raised. There are possible objections to the meta-theoretical approach of standpoint feminism. The traditional scientific method continues to be accepted widely in the social sciences and many academics do not accept the challenges standpoint feminism raises against the standard scientific method. This objection would focus on validity and reliability concerns, for example, regarding how the concepts were operationalized and measured. Another possible objection could be that the small data set, even if the concepts were
operationalized well, would not be able to produce valid and reliable conclusions. The focus on just one case study is a similar objection. A comparative study would generate more data for analysis, perhaps generating different conclusions.

Additional objections could possibly be raised that the analysis of Bush’s decision-making is incomplete given that only his public speeches and written documents released to the public were analyzed. The internal decision-making processes within the Bush administration were not analyzed, nor were interviews conducted regarding how decisions were made after 9/11. An objection could be raised that more than Bush’s communication should have been examined.

Bias could be alleged in terms of the researcher’s approach. Because the research was searching for gendered meanings, an objection could be raised that the research discovered what it was looking for, instead of a more objective approach which examined communication for other concepts and variables as well. The research also posited that remasculinization was necessary after the terrorist attacks. Objections could be raised as to that assumption. Perhaps states are not gendered and states should not be assumed to have masculine characteristics.

Further research regarding gender and Presidential decision-making could include comparative studies of gendered language used by Presidents under non-crisis conditions, for routine foreign policy decisions. Additionally, comparative studies of similar cases using the same methodology could produce additional results or new results. Another possible avenue for further research would be to compare military intervention rhetoric, with a much larger number of cases, to discover if the rhetoric also illustrated gender
ideologies, which elements of hegemonic masculinity may or may not have been displayed, and whether that changed based on the President or perhaps the nature of the intervention.

Future research using a gendered approach could be employed to examine other actors in international politics. Gender as a variable could be used to illuminate interaction between states or between individuals at the international level. A gendered approach to examine foreign policy decision-making at the level of the state could be employed to understand more fully how governmental structures are gendered and how that affects foreign policy decisions. Gendered approaches also could focus on the individual level of analysis to examine how specific individuals vary as to whether or not individuals routinely or automatically act in gendered ways or are constrained by dominant constructions of masculinity and femininity.

Research about masculinity could be approached differently and decision-makers could be measured as to determine which components of masculinity are important, or whether masculinity is important at all. There are many different theories about masculinities. Perhaps hegemonic masculinity exerts more power, or less power, in certain decision-making situations or varies between individuals. Perhaps masculinity does not have a hegemonic form and is more variable and contingent than we think.

Analysis of President Bush possibly could be strengthened with an examination of all of his communications. Another approach could be to interview Bush administration personnel to determine how decisions were made and who made them. Perhaps there were changes over time, given the changes in the Bush administration over time. Bush
may not have been the most important actor. Another approach could be to examine whether Bush himself changed during his administration and how those personal changes affected his Presidency.

Despite further areas of research and critiques of the methods used here, this research shows that notions of hegemonic masculinity exert a powerful, structural influence on Presidential foreign policy decisionmaking.
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APPENDIX A

Post-9/11 Speeches

1. Remarks by the President After Two Planes Crash Into World Trade Center, Emma Booker Elementary School, Sarasota, Florida (9/11/2001)
2. Remarks by the President Upon Arrival at Barksdale Air Force Base, Barksdale Air Force Base, Louisiana (9/11/2001)
3. President Bush’s Address to the Nation on Sept. 11, 2001 (9/11/2001)
4. Remarks by the President In Photo Opportunity with the National Security Team, The Cabinet Room (9/12/2001)
5. Remarks by the President While Touring Damage at the Pentagon, The Pentagon (9/12/2001)
6. Presidential Memo to Executive Departments and Agencies (9/12/2001)
7. Honoring the Victims of the Incidents on Tuesday, September 11, 2001, By the President of the United States of America, A Proclamation (9/12/2001)
8. National Day of Prayer and Remembrance for the Victims of the Terrorist Attacks on September 11, 2001, By the President of the United States of America, A Proclamation (9/13/2001)
9. President Pledges Assistance for New York in Phone Call with Pataki, Giuliani, Remarks by the President in Telephone Conversation with New York Mayor Giuliani and New York Governor Pataki (9/13/2001)
10. Remarks by the President to the Travel Pool After Visiting Washington Hospital Center, Washington Hospital Center (9/13/2001)
11. Text of a Letter from the President to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, September 12, 2001 (9/13/2001)
12. To the Congress of the United States (9/14/2001)
13. Statement by the President (9/14/2001)
14. President Extends Order for Flags at Half-Staff, Amending Proclamation 7461, Display of the Flag at Half-Staff as a Mark of Respect for the Victims of the Incidents on Tuesday, September 11, 2001, By the President of the United States of America, A Proclamation (9/14/2001)
15. President Orders Ready Reserves of Armed Forces to Active Duty, Executive Order (9/14/2001)
16. President Bush Salutes Heroes in New York, Remarks by the President to Police, Firemen and Rescue Workers, Murray and West Streets, New York, New York (9/14/2001)
17. President’s Remarks at National Day of Prayer and Remembrance, The National Cathedral, Washington, D.C. (9/14/2001)
18. Radio Address of the President to the Nation (9/15/2001)
19. President Urges Readiness and Patience, Remarks by the President, Secretary of State Colin Powell and Attorney General John Ashcroft, Camp David, Thurmont, Maryland (9/15/2001)
20. Remarks by the President Upon Arrival, The South Lawn (9/16/2001)
21. “We’ve All Got a Job to Do,” Remarks by the President to Employees in the Eisenhower Executive Office Building, Dwight D. Eisenhower Executive Office Building (9/17/2001)
22. Guard and Reserves “Define Spirit of America,” Remarks by the President to Employees at the Pentagon, The Pentagon (9/17/2001)
23. “Islam is Peace” Says President, Remarks by the President at Islamic Center of Washington, D.C., Washington, D.C. (9/17/2001)
24. President Launches Online American Relief and Response Effort, Remarks by the President Supporting Charities, The Rose Garden (9/18/2001)
25. President Tries to Give Americans Some Answers, Excerpts of President Bush’s address Sept. 20, 2001 to a joint session of Congress (9/20/2001)
26. Bush Announces Military Strikes on Afghanistan, President Bush’s Address to the Nation Announcing Military Action Against Strategic Targets Within Afghanistan (10/7/2001)
27. President Pays Tribute at Pentagon Memorial, Remarks by the President at the Department of Defense Service of Remembrance, The Pentagon (10/11/2001)
Appendix B

This tests for a significant difference between the mean number of references for Power, Warrior, and Rescuer during pre/9-11 speeches and post 9-11 speeches. The means for the categories Warrior and Rescuer are larger for post 9-11 speeches than for pre 9-11 speeches. This is not the case for the Power category.

t-Test: Two-Sample Assuming Unequal Variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre 9-11</th>
<th>Post 9-11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>8.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>206.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesized Mean Difference</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t Stat</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P(T&lt;=t) one-tail</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t Critical one-tail</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P(T&lt;=t) two-tail</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t Critical two-tail</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-11</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3333333</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6666667</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>134.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>369</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t Stat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.325989481</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P(T&lt;=t) one-tail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1110372</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t Critical one-tail</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3888703</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P(T&lt;=t) two-tail</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2220744</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t Critical two-tail</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6933334</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* t-Test: Two-Sample Assuming Unequal Variances
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesized Mean Difference</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t Stat</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.729909494</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P(T&lt;=t) one-tail</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5175257</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t Critical one-tail</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5518742</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P(T&lt;=t) two-tail</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0350514</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t Critical two-tail</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9513438</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>