Communication Faculty Publications   Department of Communication

2015

The World as the American Frontier: Racialized Presidential War Rhetoric

Zoë Hess Carney

Mary Stuckey
Georgia State University, mstuckey@gsu.edu

Recommended Citation

The World as the American Frontier:
Racialized War Rhetoric

Following the attacks of September 11, 2001, President George W. Bush labeled the U.S.

response a "War on Terror," asserting "Americans have known wars—but for the past 136 years

they have been wars on foreign soil, except for one Sunday in 1941."[1] This rather curious

statement went unremarked in the media, although its specificity testifies to its importance. The

reference, of course, is to the Civil War, which for Bush, and with the exception of the attack on

Pearl Harbor and other American territories in 1941, constituted the last time troops engaged on

American soil. It is a routine observation; it is also patently false. Following the Civil War,

American settlers and the military that supported them sped west, pushing indigenous nations out

of their own lands and into the territories held by other Indian peoples, turning a centuries' old

set of relationships based on trade, cultural adaptation, and intermittent conflict into an

unrelentingly violent war of cultural and physical annihilation.[2] From 1865 to 1890, the U.S.

military fought Indian nations from the Central Plains and the upper Midwest to the West Coast

and the borders with Mexico and Canada. From the Battle of the Little Bighorn in 1876 and the

death of Oglala Lakota Crazy Horse in 1877 to the pursuit and eventual surrender of Geronimo

in 1886 and until the Massacre at Wounded Knee in 1890 symbolized the end of the "Indian

Wars," the nation was at continual war on its western frontiers. Despite the prevalence and

significance of these on-going conflicts, contemporary presidents consistently fail to

acknowledge the Indian Wars. We argue here that while the Indian Wars go unmentioned in

contemporary presidential rhetoric in general and in regards to the War on Terror in particular, a

focus on the racial underpinnings of those wars nuances what we know about war rhetoric and

the historical relationship between race and war in the United States.

Viewing the War on Terror through the lens provided by the rhetoric in the Indian Wars draws specific attention to its racialized elements. While it can be legitimately argued, for instance, that in many ways "terrorist" has simply replaced "communist" in the national imagination, and that the pathologies we detail here can be seen throughout the Cold War and are well understood in the literature, we argue that there are racial elements in rhetoric of both the Indian Wars and the War on Terror that are absent from Cold War rhetoric and also from most studies of war rhetoric.[3] Scholars, have, of course, examined the racialized nature of the War of Terror. Dana Cloud, for example, has pointed to the ways in which the "clash of civilization" rhetoric has framed our understanding of intervention in Afghanistan.[4] Jasmine Jirwani and Gargi S. Bhattacharyya have separately examined the ways in which the rhetoric in the War on Terror has evoked specific ideologies concerning race and gender.[5] We hope to add to that conversation by drawing specific parallels between these recent wars and previous incarnations of racialized war rhetoric, noting the ways in which the past recurs in the present and language recalling that past brings with it entailments that sit uncomfortably in our contemporary understanding of ourselves. In their rhetoric on the War on Terror, both Democratic and Republican presidents, white and black, stake a claim to global power based on their ability to contain and control a racialized threat and, in the process, offer rhetorical protection to a racial hierarchy at home and abroad.

Specifically, we argue that the Indian Wars provide an important parallel for the ways presidents articulate the national mission in the War on Terror. Presidential rhetoric during the Indian Wars depended on particular understandings of the national enemy viewed through their reliance on the frontier myth.[6] Like all myths, the frontier myth appeared as colloquial common

sense and served to "validate a certain social order" and instruct the community's future decision-making, actions, and beliefs.[7] The frontier myth is shorthand for the story of American progress, expansion, and the conquering of the west.[8] This myth, Richard Slotkin argues, is "our oldest and most characteristic myth, expressed in a body of literature, folklore, ritual, historiography, and polemics produced over a period of three centuries."[9] The myth tells the story of white American settlers who valued civilization, community, and democracy, moved west, triumphed over American Indians, and tamed the frontier.[10] It explains the establishment of American colonies, and accounts for America's emergence as a nation-state, its economic growth, and its process of modernization.[11] Just as the frontier myth justified the Indian Wars, presidents draw upon the same markers of national identity implicit in that myth to justify the War on Terror. Presidents once positioned themselves as Indian fighters and the west as their frontier; they now position themselves as "terrorist" fighters and the world is their frontier.[12]

We use the frontier myth and the rhetoric of the Indian Wars as a heuristic for understanding presidential rhetoric on the War on Terror, finding four elements in this rhetoric useful to understanding contemporary presidential war rhetoric. First, just as the word "Indian" collapses the members of a number of different cultures and nations into one seemingly coherent entity, the term "terrorist" functions in much the same way.[13] The enemy named in both instances is magnified and rendered formless, amplifying the potential threat and justifying a similarly amplified reaction.[14] Second, the war zone in both instances is characterized by shifting borders and alliances. The battleground in the War on Terror is similar to the Western frontier in that no clean line moved west. Similarly, terrorists can be found in any geographic location. Like Indians, they are both inside and outside of American held territory, and pose a double threat which authorizes a broad scope of presidential action. Third, presidents favor "technology" over

"trickery." The U.S. government relies on superior weaponry while characterizing its opponent as relying on deception, setting up an understanding of the distinction between savagery and civilization such that technology and not behavior becomes the standard of judgment and authorizing the use of force. Fourth, the declared ends of both Indian Wars and the War on Terror are democratization, civilization, and assimilation. War in both instances is understood as bringing civilization to the world through violent means and violence is thus justified as democratic action. Examining the rhetoric of the War on Terror through the lens of the Indian Wars, then, focuses attention on the ways in which these conflicts are racialized. It highlights the mechanism through which this rhetoric authorizes presidential power exercised through violence with global scope, and adds to our understanding of war rhetoric in general. We make our argument by explaining how these four elements characterize the rhetoric surrounding the War on Terror and conclude with a discussion of how the centrality of racialized warrants for exercises of presidential power inflects the use of that power at home and abroad.

Authorizing Power: Presidents as Indian and Terrorist Fighters

Indian fighting long served as a source of legitimacy for American political leaders and also as a warrant for presidential leadership. George Washington became well-known as a result of his actions in the French and Indian War. Andrew Jackson, of course, was the nation's most famous Indian fighter, not only valorized for his violence toward indigenous nations during his years of service in the military but continuing it while in the executive office.[15] Other presidents also relied on their prowess as Indian fighters, including William Henry Harrison, who rode into office in 1840 on the basis of his defeat of the Tecumseh and the Shawnee alliance ("Tippecanoe and Tyler too") and Zachary Taylor, whose career included actions against Indians from Minnesota and Wisconsin through Kansas and into Florida.[16] The ability to subdue the savage

enemy was, for a time at least, a significant responsibility for American presidents, and those who did not directly engage this enemy on the battlefield continued the war through means such as treaties requiring Indian removal, trade policies that led to Indian debt repayable in land, and policies aimed at facilitating what they considered to be the inevitable demise of Indian nations in the face of advancing "American" civilization.[17]

Throughout the nation's history, presidents symbolically and materially acted as defenders of the nation against its most important constitutive threat.[18] Both enacting and reinscribing the frontier myth, U.S. presidents invoked the idea that national actions were taken in defense of "civilization," always represented by the central government. No matter how violent, no matter how destructive, action ranging from massacre and murder to allotment, presidents justified forced assimilation and cultural destruction were as necessary to further "America's" purpose in the world.[19]

As the frontier closed and the nation's territory became increasingly secure within defined borders, the need for presidents to represent the nation's military prowess did not abate. As a number of scholars have demonstrated, U.S. presidents throughout the twentieth century were expected to have served in the nation's military, and to defend that military politically.[20] Presidents once authorized their leadership as Indian fighters. More recently, they endeavored to appear "tough on communism." The circle has, since George Bush's presidency, come back around and presidential toughness is now on display against terrorists, who, like Indians, are understood as a unified and undifferentiated mass, able to move treacherously across borders. That mobility and the lack of stability it implies give terrorists-as-Indians the ability to resist the otherwise superior technology associated with civilization. That resistance, however, is depicted as temporary. The American teleology insists on its eventual victory understood as the expansion

and protection of democracy through the assimilation of the less civilized into the group of democratic peoples. War rhetoric always includes an argument that the enemy is savage. But not all war rhetoric racializes the savage enemy in the way that the rhetoric of the Indian Wars and the War on Terror do. By focusing specifically on these racial elements, we add to our understanding of war rhetoric and of the hierarchies it supports at home and abroad. There are at least four valences through which this racialization can be understood: collapsing identities, permeating borders, wielding technology, and defining the ends of conflict.

Collapsing Identities

The word "Indian" is more than simply a misnomer begun by Christopher Columbus' ignorance and misunderstanding.[21] It conflates the members of over five hundred nations, numerous cultural and language groups, and residents of a variety of geographic locations into a single, undifferentiated mass. Culturally, geographically, linguistically, and genetically, for instance, the Seminole of Florida have little in common with the Anishanaabe of Minnesota, the Onondaga of New York or the Diné of the Southwest. They do, however, share a history of invasion, genocide, and oppression, authorized by the word "Indian," for the assumption was that regardless of the manifest differences among and between them, all Indians were essentially the same—essentially enemies, who were alike in all of the fundamentals differentiating savagery from civilization. Settlers who wanted Indian land brought with them specific racial hierarchies that were adapted and applied to their new environment. Delimiting all indigenous peoples as singularly "Indian" facilitated the application of those hierarchies and authorized violence as a political tool of conquest.

This conflation accomplishes other work as well as defining "the enemy." Peaceful Indians, for instance, were always threatened by association with their more militant kin. They

could be presumed to be on the verge of war even when they were unarmed. [22] Indians who lived in settled farming communities were threatened with the loss of territory as they could be easily accused of failing to "use" their lands, since they were understood collectively as wandering nomads.[23] Indians who governed themselves through matriarchies were threatened with treaty negotiations that took as their starting point a lack of respect for their political organization, since the common assumption was that all Indian nations were governed by "chiefs" and their women were maltreated.[24]

During the Indian Wars, pioneers ignored the differences among indigenous nations, calling all of the nations and cultures "Indian." Mary Stuckey notes that this "vocabulary problem" influenced and reinforced confusion about which native nations presidents were naming as enemies and which were friends.[25] The conflation of all native peoples into one "Indian" category did more violence against American Indians than creating and reinforcing misunderstandings about which people non-American Indians should war against, though that was its most violent effect. In addition to psychological and cultural repercussions of this new identity, the naming of all natives as "Indians" contributed to the myth of white superiority, in which God's will commanded that white settlers expand west, their success at the expense of any and all American Indian lives that were in the way.[26] All American Indians, diverse peoples clumped into one linguistic identifier by white presidents and settlers, became unified into a single, undifferentiated mass threatening the lives and ambitions of white settlers. For instance, Leroy Dorsey and Rachel Harlow note that President Theodore Roosevelt's telling of world history, steeped in the myth of the frontier, "demonstrated that success could depend, at least in part, on having the right bloodline."[27] The "right bloodline," for Roosevelt, distinguished between various European immigrants. American Indians themselves were understood to be so

different from white pioneers they were rendered indistinguishable from one another. National hierarchies of race were thus established and maintained almost invisibly by conflating members of all Indian nations into one undifferentiated group through the label "Indian," and marking membership in that group through their skin color.

Like "Indian," the word "terrorist" collapses members of different cultures and nations into a single untrustworthy entity. While on the one hand, media sources and political actors agree that "terrorists" can come from any country and any racial or ethnic background, the figure of the terrorist is frequently racialized in the public mind.[28] Domestic "white" terrorists, for example, are treated as aberrant, and the assumption that "terrorists" are nonwhite is prevalent.[29] Presidents imagine the racialized enemy as a stable, clearly identifiable subject who must be conquered. While the Obama administration has been less expansive in its treatment of terrorists as an amorphous enemy than was Bush, fighting a war on "terror" is as imprecise as fighting a war on "Indians." This imprecision now allows presidents to take whatever action they deem necessary anywhere in the world, just as any action was once authorized by the necessity of controlling indigenous people.

In his 9/11 address to the nation, for example, President Bush said, "The search is underway for those who are behind these evil acts. I've directed the full resources of our intelligence and law enforcement communities to find those responsible and to bring them to justice. We will make no distinction between the terrorists who committed these acts and those who harbor them."[30] He put it more starkly in his September 20, 2001, address, saying, "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."[31] Those who harbor terrorists, like the "Indian lovers" of the frontier, risked the wrath of the national government.

Any individual or group of individuals who became too close to terrorists, like those who became too close to Indians, risked sharing their fate. If a people or even a region of people do not agree in conscience or abide in action with the U.S. position on the war, as articulated by Bush, they are implicated as being a part of this amorphous group of terrorists. "The only good Indian," for General Philip Sheridan, was "a dead Indian." Bush comes very close to articulating the same sentiment regarding those whom he defined as terrorists. In neither case was there any real effort to understand the wide variety of motives, the variance among behaviors, or the nuances that lie between motive and action. In the days of the frontier, the label "Indian" assigned motive and predicted behavior in much the same way that presidential uses of the label "terrorist" function for us today.

The Bush Administration's logic of conflating non–white bodies onto a group of people who are either terrorists or potential terrorists was an important part of his justification for U.S. intervention in Iraq. In his 2003 State of the Union address, Bush invited his audience to imagine the great danger that Iraq, under Saddam Hussein, could have on the rest of the world: "Year after year, Saddam Hussein has gone to elaborate lengths, spent enormous sums, taken great risks to build and keep weapons of mass destruction. But why? The only possible explanation, the only possible use he could have for those weapons, is to dominate, intimidate, or attack."[32] At least two important things happen in this part of Bush's speech. First, there are no possible motives other than "to dominate, to intimidate, or to attack." Like the Indians on the frontier, the idea that one might need weapons to defend oneself is not part of the calculation. Savages amass weapons in order to harm the innocent. The savagery of terrorists, like the savagery of Indians on the frontier, is inherent. Therefore, the strongest measures against these savages are not only justified, they are mandated. "Nits," after all, "make lice."[33] Certainly, this kind of rhetoric is

always applied to enemies. But when it is applied to a racialized mass, it takes on even more ominous overtones than when it is applied to, say, Europeans, whether fascist or communist. When taken with the other elements discussed here, this amalgamation authorizes racialized understandings of the world and its conflicts, cementing them in ways that are difficult to challenge, at least in part because the associations are already ubiquitous.

Second, Bush implicates the entire citizenry of Iraq as part of the War on Terror because of the potential threat its leader represented. As with Indians on the frontier, terrorists are inherently violent, wait only for the right opportunity to enact that violence, and all Indians were as culpable as their leaders. Bush and members of his administration argued that Al Qaeda is "a collection of loosely affiliated terrorist organizations," and that people and countries had only two option in the War on Terror: to be "with" the U.S., and thus, the decisions of the president, or to be "with the terrorists." [34] It has become standard for presidents to argue in times of conflict that the U.S. has no problems with a nation's citizens, only with its leaders. Presidents make conscious and clear efforts to distinguish between a mass public and an opposing nation's leadership. In the case of Indians and "the axis of evil," this tendency is much less in evidence, although efforts were made, for instance, immediately after 9/11 to create such distinctions. But because the War on Terror blurs the lines between state action and non-state action, these distinctions become equally unclear, and it is perilously easy to conflate all people, whether Shi'a, Sunni, or anyone else, as a potential threat.

This logic runs throughout Bush's rhetoric. For instance, in his 2006 State of the Union Address, Bush said, "The Shi'a and Sunni extremists are different faces of the same totalitarian threat. Whatever slogans they chant when they slaughter the innocent, they have the same wicked purposes. They want to kill Americans, kill democracy in the Middle East, and gain the

10

weapons to kill on an even more horrific scale."[35] Even given the (easy to overlook) modifier "extremists," the logical leap that connected Shi'as, Sunnis, and anyone else who "want[s] to kill Americans," is a large one indeed, and it is explicable through the same logic that allowed Americans on the frontier to understand all Indians as equally guilty: "they have the same wicked purposes." This is, in many ways, standard war rhetoric; when placed in the context of a racialized enemy, it becomes part of a logic that helps to reinforce existing racial hierarchies.

This logic was partially undermined during the Obama administration. Obama's language, while relying on similar logic, is less sweeping in its definition of who the "terrorists" are in the War on Terror. For example, Obama explained that the "just war" in which the U.S. must engage is not equivalent to what President Bush termed a "War on Terror," but is instead something more precise—a war specifically against the terrorist groups al Qaeda and Taliban. This still allowed for amalgamation, especially in that both these groups cross borders and are assumed to operate as webs or networks, but Obama offered some sense that the threat was identifiable, containable, rather than extending to the entire region and encompassing entire peoples. Obama noted the seriousness of the threat posed by "resurgent al Qaeda and a Taliban taking over large parts of Afghanistan."[36] Even in Obama's rhetoric, though, the specific enemy is unclear. In this speech alone, he implicates al Qaeda, its affiliates, and seemingly mysterious Taliban members throughout Afghanistan. When the fight is not against a nation-state's official military regime, the "enemy" is necessarily amorphous, and its presence inside the borders of any nation, including those controlled by U.S. allies, is sufficient provocation for military action.

The very vagueness of labels like "Indian" and "terrorist" do significant political work, for they appear to be merely descriptive but in certain contexts imply that certain actions regarding them are both necessary and required. Both terms collect a variety of individuals, who

may well have a variety of motives, and who may or may not be acting in any concerted fashion toward a shared end, into one large and frightening mass. Moreover, in this labeling they become other, strange, unknowable. They are not like us in any of the ways that count, for their actions are not depicted in presidential rhetoric in terms that make them knowable. These are depictions of non-white bodies, which serve both to justify violence against enemies and to reinscribe domestic racial hierarchies. Because of the ways that these depictions are naturalized within the existing national ideology, this process is at once very visible, acting as it does on non-white bodies, and, because of its consistency with prevailing ideology, also invisible.

Shifting Borders and Alliances

The battleground during the Indian Wars was unclear. It shifted both temporally and geographically, and while the frontier is often understood as a single line marching relentlessly westward, that was not actually the case. Non-Indians made incursions into Indian Country; they were accommodated and resisted; settlements were formed in an uneven line, sometimes advancing, sometimes retreating. There was no clear demarcation along of the frontier of safe zones and unsafe zones. The entire frontier was often unsafe. Borders were unenforceable and territorial boundaries were fluid.[37]

Political relations on the frontier were complicated. Indigenous nations engaged in artful blends of negotiation, stalling, war, trade, and intermarriage as they tried to accommodate the incursion of settlers, trappers, and members of other, often displaced nations into their territories.[38] The artistry of these negotiations were often lost on non-Indians, who were committed to a singularized view of Indians as "savages" and who therefore often misunderstood, misinterpreted, and abused the Indians. When alliances shifted, as they often did in on the fluid western frontier, what looked to Indians as strategic maneuvering in the face of

unprecedented threat looked to American political leaders like untrustworthy actions by undependable adversaries.[39]

A minor threat anywhere along the frontier was often therefore understood as posing a threat to the nation's capacity to ensure order anywhere on the frontier.[40] The Indian Wars were amorphous in part because defeating one indigenous nation did not mean an end to the struggle. It meant that the struggle moved to a different frontier and became ever more complicated as Indian nations encroached on one another's territory as they were encroached upon themselves. Nations that had histories of enmity might form lasting and temporary alliances or antagonisms might intensify under this new pressure. In either case, initial victories on the frontier often complicated rather than simplifying matters for the prosecutors of the Indian Wars.[41] Wars are always tricky, but especially so when they are inflicted upon an "enemy" that is not limited to a particular geographic nation-state. When borders shifted in the Indian Wars and as they continue to shift in the War on Terror, they become wars without borders.[42]

These borderless wars, however, are fought in specific kinds of territory. In the case of the Indian Wars, Euroamerican settlers encroached on land previously controlled by indigenous peoples, understood to be organized "tribally." The same logic is frequently applied to the Middle East, where, especially in Afghanistan, tribal "war lords" prevent the development of stable government. The use of words like "tribal" and phrases like "war lord" denotes primitive forms of political organization inside of underdeveloped territories only sporadically controlled—areas that are therefore ripe for development after coming under more civilized control. These terms also denote a racialized political hierarchy in which stable and civilized governments associated with nation-states face off against unstable and disorganized racially territories controlled by non-white tribal leaders.

The prime goal in the Indian Wars was to extend governmental control over unorganized tribal territory. In the War on Terror, the goal is control over "terrorist" territory. Bush, for instance, said "Our War on Terror begins with al Qaeda, but it does not end there. It will not end until every terrorist group of global reach has been found, stopped and defeated."[43] Thus, "any nation that continues to harbor or support terrorism" would be "regarded by the United States as a hostile regime."[44] This frame remained in effect throughout the Bush presidency and continues into the Obama administration. In Obama's first major speech on drone policy, for instance, Obama said that the world had seen "an emergence of various al Qaeda affiliates" and noted that they are located "from Yemen to Iraq and from Somalia to North Africa."[45] In fact, according to Obama, the terrorist threat is now even more diffuse than it was when the war began, "with Al Qaeda's affiliates in the Arabian Peninsula—AQAP—the most active in plotting against our homeland."[46] Obama argued here that the threat to the U.S. is no longer only from terrorists in other regions. The warzone shifted into the United States, which holds its own terrorists. The wider the area of conflict, the more dangerous the world becomes, and the more imperative it is that the nation authorizes a strong president, able to protect the nation on every part of its vast frontier.[47] Racialized understandings of the problem become translated through the authorization of presidential power into a globalized version of domestic hierarchies.

Obama's claims enlarge the battlefield, declaring a war upon individuals in the U.S. who may have been "inspired by larger notions of violent jihad."[48] As with Indians, the threat posed by terrorists is simultaneously internal and external. Obama said that "deranged and alienated individuals," residing in the U.S., citizens or non-citizens alike, pose the "current threat."[49] These "homegrown terrorists" are the ones for which U.S. citizens should be concerned. It is one thing to fight a nation-state that has clear and identifiable borders—measuring the success of

such a campaign can be accomplished by territorial markers on maps. In many ways, the "Indian Wars" were understood in such ways, although the territory in question was in constant flux, requiring a mobile force with flexile mandates. The inchoate nature of the Indian Wars also justified the most extreme violence against Indians, including assaults upon entire villages, full of the elderly, the weak, and the young. Such violence was justified through the logic that they all Indians, because they were Indians, were equally guilty. In the War on Terror, territorial boundaries are also of doubtful relevance. The Obama administration is as likely to send drones into the territory of our allies such as Pakistan as into that of our declared enemies, such as that controlled by the Taliban. And the innocent, the weak, and the young are also likely to become collateral damage of those drone attacks. These measures are justified by the same imperatives that justified the flexible tactics and the violence of the U.S. military on the frontier: the enemy is fluid and dynamic, and if the nation fails to respond, its existence is threatened. With the security of the homeland at stake in an undefined way, extreme measures become not only reasonable, but imperative.

Technology over Trickery

During the Indian Wars, the U.S. military could depend upon superior force, both in numbers and in technology. Presidents continue to favor technology while attributing trickery to the enemy in the War on Terror. Unlike moments such as World War II or the Cold War, when the enemy's presumptive technological prowess increased the nature of the threat posed, in the Indian Wars and the War on Terror, the threat comes from a reliance on underhanded means from primitive others. In both instances, and in keeping with the national reliance on the myth of inherent progress as a marker of national superiority, presidents valorize advanced weaponry while characterizing opponents as relying on trickery. Presidents describe this superior

technology as being more moral and humane than that of Indians and terrorists. The morality of the weaponry then transfers to that of those who wield the weapons, making U.S. soldiers more humane than their enemies.

Certainly, the idea of Indians as perpetrators of conflict runs throughout the corpus of presidential rhetoric, and is consistent with the overall genre of war rhetoric in which the enemy is portrayed as a primitive, violent savage.[50] In his first annual message, George Washington, for instance, found "reason to hope that the pacific measures adopted with regard to certain hostile tribes of Indians would have relieved the inhabitants of our southern and western frontiers from their depredations, but you will perceive from the information contained in the papers which I shall direct to be laid before you (comprehending a communication from the Commonwealth of Virginia) that we ought to be prepared to afford protection to those parts of the Union, and, if necessary, to punish aggressors."[51] Note that U.S. action was understood as "pacific," while that of the Indians was variously seen as "hostile," as "depredations," and the Indians themselves were "aggressors." Whites required "protection" against them.

Luckily for whites, such protection against Indians could be afforded by the government. Because of their inherent volatility and their lack of civilization, Indian victories were consistently attributed to some kind of trickery. Madison, for instance, depicted Indian weapons of choice as limited to the tomahawk, the hatchet, and the knife as well as the bow and arrow.[52] Whites were understood by Grant to be in need of protection from Indian "depredations," launched without warning.[53] These characterizations complemented the depictions of Indians as inherently savage, because if they were civilized, they would carry civilized weapons and conduct themselves, in war and peace, in a civilized and manner. The absence of any one of these elements indicated the absence of civilization.[54]

Similarly, in contemporary warfare, some weapons are widely considered to be less "civilized" than others, a formulation that conflates "civilization" with "morality," and is codified as international law in the 1925 Geneva Protocol, which outlawed biological and chemical warfare.[55] In the case of the War on Terror, U.S. presidents characterize enemy weapons are immoral in ways that vilify the enemy and garner support for U.S. military action. For instance, in 2006, Bush spoke at length of the horrors of improvised explosive devices (IEDs). Among the IED's traits that Bush claims make them "weapons of fear" instead of, as Bush implies, legitimate weapons is their ability to "be hidden and detonated remotely."[56] Instead of confronting the U.S. military face-to-face—the more civilized approach to warfare— terrorists instead "turned to IEDs," weapons that allow enemies to "attack from a safe distance without having to face [U.S.] forces in battle."[57] Attacking others from a position of safety is deemed here something akin to cowardice. It is certainly bereft of the honor traditionally associated with and highly valued by, members of the U.S. military.[58] Like the attack on Pearl Harbor, to which the 9/11 attacks are frequently compared, a racial other used trickery to assail its civilized enemy.

Both the Indian Wars and the War on Terror were depicted in binary terms in which the U.S. national government was understood as unequivocally moral, representing civilization in its highest form and the inchoate enemy was depicted as immoral and uncivilized. Unlike the rhetoric employed in some conflicts, in both the Indian Wars and in the War on Terror, technology became the marker for both morality and civilization. Ideologically, this does more than simply present the world as divided into "friends" and "enemies," although it does do that. But this rhetoric also lays out the terms of judgment: those racial others who lack technology are placed in a different hierarchy through the vehicle of technology. [59]

Violence on the part of the U.S., therefore, is both justified and reasonable. But because the U.S. represents the forces of civilization and humanity, that violence is not just preventative, it is also creative—through the violence of war, the U.S. can bring civilization and humanity to those who lack them. Through this hierarchy of terms implicit in the language of the Indian Wars and the War on Terror, American war-making generates civilization as it also generates and maintains the idea of Americans as inherently civilized.

Democratization and Civilization as the Consequence of War

Presidents in both the Indian Wars and the War on Terror label the point of the wars to be democratization, civilization, and assimilation. Presidents in both contexts justify war through the presumption and rhetorical construction of a savage other.[60] These racialized savages, who attack their own people, are in need of democracy and civilization, which can only come from U.S. intervention.

Presidents long argued that the "savage" Indians needed the benefits of civilization, sometimes speaking at length on the subject, as did Thomas Jefferson,[61] and sometimes confining themselves to encapsulating long held cultural beliefs in simple sentences, as Ulysses S. Grant did in his inaugural: "The proper treatment of the original occupants of this land—the Indians—is one deserving of careful study. I will favor any course toward them which tends to their civilization and ultimate citizenship."[62] The cultural assumptions here were clear: Indians lacked the civilization that was a prerequisite for citizenship. It was up to the national government to train them in the ways of civilized nations. This summary was possible because of the long history of this version of American relations with indigenous peoples. John Quincy Adams laid out that history as clearly as any president:

The attention of Congress is particularly invited to that part of the report of the Secretary of War which concerns the existing system of our relations with the Indian tribes. At the principle was adopted of considering them as foreign and independent powers and also as proprietors of lands. They were, moreover, considered as savages, whom it was our policy and our duty to use our influence in converting to Christianity and in bringing within the pale of civilization. . . . We have been far more successful in the acquisition of their lands than in imparting to them the principles or inspiring them with the spirit of civilization.[63]

American national policy, as articulated here by Adams and as understood by every president at least into to the late twentieth century, rests on a complicated understanding of Indians as sovereign and childlike and savage. As sovereigns, they could reassign their land to the U.S. government. As children, they could be directed toward the path of civilization.[64] As savages, that direction must sometimes require force. Because they were presumed to be ignorant, they did not always understand the benefits the U.S. was bringing to them and were thus sometimes hostile to American actions. The mature response was to understand that this hostility was the result of ignorance on the part of most, and malice on the part of their leadership and to act accordingly—teaching where possible, making war when necessary. Rutherford B. Hayes, for instance, noted in his first annual message to Congress that,

After a series of most deplorable conflicts—the successful termination of which, while reflecting honor upon the brave soldiers who accomplished it, can not (sic) lessen our regret at their occurrence—we are now at peace with all the Indian tribes within our borders. . . Whatever may be said of their character and savage propensities, of the difficulties of introducing among them the habits of civilized life, and of the obstacles

19

they have offered to the progress of settlement and enterprise in certain parts of the country, the Indians are certainly entitled to our sympathy and to a conscientious respect on our part for their claims upon our sense of justice. . . . We cannot expect them to improve and to follow our guidance unless we keep faith with them in respecting the rights they possess, and unless, instead of depriving them of their opportunities, we lend them a helping hand.[65]

Conflict with the Indians, now, in Hayes's view, successfully concluded, could be understood as "deplorable," a cause for "regret." But that conflict had paved the way, despite the Indians' "savage propensities" for the introduction of civilization to these savages, provided Americans were there to offer "a helping hand." First, the nation had to pacify the savages. That accomplished, they could then be trained and educated in the ways of civilization, leading to a successful conclusion for all parties—the Indians may have lost their land, but they gained civilization. Denizens of the U.S. gained territory and fulfilled their responsibility toward those whose "guardians" they had become.

Similarly, the U.S was forced to combat terrorists, who, willfully or not, misunderstood American beneficence. Presidential rhetoric justifying the War on Terror, for example, rests heavily in the claim that terrorists are ignorant or venal. They hate the U.S. because of its freedom. Bush said that the U.S. was targeted on 9/11 because "we're the brightest beacon for freedom and opportunity in the world."[66] Terrorists attack and plot against the U.S. because of its "democratically elected government," its "freedom of religion," its "freedom of speech," its "freedom to vote and assemble and disagree with each other."[67] It was the very goodness and civilization of the United States that lured terrorists to attack.[68]

Wartime presidents in general argue that this inherent goodness of the U.S. and the way it governs should be exported to the savage enemy, for the sake of both the enemy and the U.S.[69] Because terrorists live in societies in which they are not free, according to Bush and Obama, they act out violently. As in the Indian Wars, contemporary presidents argue "terrorists'" imperfect understanding is a product of their lack of civilization, and that they must be subdued so they can be educated and brought into the civilized world. This process involves force. Like Indians, terrorists are willing to fight to defend an inappropriate way of life. Indians sought to protect their wild, nomadic existence; terrorists "seek to impose and expand an empire of oppression in which a tiny group of brutal, self-appointed rulers control every aspect of every life."[70] The battlefield, in Bush's articulation, is comprised of savage aggressors opposed to civilization.

Free people, on the other hand, "are not drawn to violent and malignant ideologies," and they "choose a better way when they're given a chance."[71] Thus, it is in the interest of both the terrorists and the U.S. for the U.S. to invade countries and spread democracy. The U.S. brings democracy in order to save itself from being harmed by terrorists as well as to save the terrorists from themselves. Bush offered one of his common sentiments in his 2002 State of the Union when he said that because of terrorists, "freedom is at risk," and the U.S. "will not allow it."[72] To work toward freedom in other countries advances "our own security interests by helping moderates and reformers and brave voices for democracy."[73] While terrorists try to build fascist empires, according to Bush and Obama, the U.S. does something completely different in its promotion of democracy. Bush said that the main difference between the U.S. and its enemies is that "the United States has no right, no desire, and no intention to impose our form of government on anyone else… because democracies respect their own people and their neighbors, the advance of freedom will lead to peace."[74] American violence was a civilizing force.

Moreover, as in the Indian Wars, eventual democratization and/or civilization is a part of God's divine will, which is inherently inevitable, pure, and good. Bush argues that democratization is indeed taking place: women are voting in Afghanistan, Palestinians are "choosing a new direction," and the Ukraine has elected a president. [75] The coming years, Bush said, would only "add to that story" of democratization. [76] God Himself has "planted in every human heart the desire to live in freedom," and that desire will win out in the end. [77] "Human dignity," Obama said in 2012, "cannot be denied." [78] That dignity can only come from freedom and democracy.

Interestingly, neither president was willing to negotiate with terrorists; civilization and democracy cannot be brought to them peacefully. Terrorists must be eliminated, violently of necessary. By killing the terrorists, however, the people under their control are free to reap the benefits of civilization. The rhetoric of civilization is also a rhetoric that justifies armed conflict, for savages must be subdued in order to be brought into the circle of democratic nations. They rebel against this process either out of ignorance or malice. The cause ultimately does not matter, for the process is the same: render the needy enemy physically powerless so that they can be subject to the dictates of a democratic education. For Indians, that process meant forced relocation and incarceration on reservations and in boarding schools where the object was, in school superintendent Richard Pratt's famous phrase, to "destroy the Indian and save the man."[79] In the case of terrorists, it has meant war as the means for "democracy promotion." In both cases, war has been justified as the appropriate response to an amorphous and threatening enemy, who makes shifting alliances along diffuse borders, requiring massive force and the leadership of a strong executive who has both the morality implicit in claims to civilization and explicit in its superior technology to command. War is not the preferred means of action, but when necessary it

is authorized as generative of a democratic civilization, the instantiation of God's will in the world.

Racialized War

We know a great deal about how war rhetoric operates in general, and, as numbers of scholarly studies have ably demonstrated, the rhetoric in the War on Terror can be usefully understood through the lens of genre. But that genre may work a bit differently when it is used in reference to non-white enemies, and it thus also useful to isolate the specifically racialized versions of war rhetoric. Such isolation allows us to focus on the ways in which racial hierarchies are confirmed at home and promulgated abroad.

War is a blunt instrument. It is made more so by rhetoric so steeped in ideology that its consequences are both pervasive and hidden. In the Indian Wars and in the War on Terror, presidential rhetoric purveys a specific sense of the national self so ingrained in the national culture that it works almost invisibly, making its assumptions difficult to contest. In both cases, that rhetoric wields generality instead of specificity, rendering images of the enemy in ways that both magnifies the threat and conceals differences in motivation as well as behavior. By presenting enemies as an inchoate mass operating along a shifting and perilous border, deftly able to form and reform allegiances, continued force is justified as the only appropriate response. In both sets of wars, inchoate and massively threatening enemies are characterized by their primitiveness and represented by their lack of technology, which operates as a metonym for civilization. The enemy in each case is depicted as deficient of basic elements of honor; they lack a commitment to the rules of war and cannot be trusted. As an inevitable consequence of these depictions, war itself is justified as a civilizing force, bringing the benefits of the American version of democracy to those whose savagery threatens that system. Americans are happy to

offer democracy to all: the nation is, after all, understood by itself as a "city on a hill," an example to the world. But if the world is not ready to accept that example, violent means can help them learn by it.

This essay brings to the fore specific ways a national understanding of race reveals itself in presidential war rhetoric, and the implications of the racial ordering within the rhetoric of the current global, amorphous War on Terror.[80] Just as early mercantilism linked the "New World" and the "Old World" in a "common project of defining modern subjectivity in racial terms," the designation of the term "tribe" to American Indians, along with Pacific Islanders, and Africans, positioned non-whites as lower on the evolutionary scale than nations and citizens"[81] Deborah Thomas and M. Kamari Clarke note that the "construction of security as racialized discourse has been particularly evident in the post 9/11 period," as a race-ing of Muslims, in the U.S. and abroad, constitutes criminalization."[82] The disciplining of Muslims as raced threats follows the path set by the U.S. in the American Indian Wars. Local constructions and disciplining of race affects and reflects global understanding of race. Use of race as a mechanism for discipline, such as in the War on Terror, likewise affects the treatment of racialized subjects in the U.S.[83]

Focusing on these sets of prolonged wars highlights the ways this rhetoric is focused on maintaining national racial hierarchies by disciplining non-white bodies. Historically, the U.S. has a vastly different way of responding to white "enemies" than it does to non-whites, or those who have white privilege and those who do not. White actors are considered individuals who committed crimes, and as exceptions to the "rule," while non-white persons are understood to have an all-assuming identity that makes them inherent threats. The prevailing version of U.S. civic republicanism excludes non-whites from those fit to self-govern, thus energizing and validating paternalistic U.S. foreign policy.[84] Non-whites are consistently amalgamated and

connected to an ideology that is different than the pervasive and hidden ideology of whiteness, which marks the U.S., and which justifies systematic surveillance, war, and other forms of discipline against those who are not white.[85] We think of foreign and domestic policies as parts of different domains of politics, but the rationales that characterize one domain can and do affect the ways we perceive the other domain. The U.S. has always exerted rhetorical means of policing the borders of citizenship; the rhetoric used to justify extended wars becomes part of the ways in which those borders are protected at home.

[1] George W. Bush, "Address Before a Joint Session of the Congress on the United States Response to the Terrorist Attacks of September 11," September 20, 2001. Online by Gerhard Peters and John T. Woolley, *The American Presidency Project*. http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=64731.

[2] On the Indian Wars in general, see, among numerous others, Dee Brown, *Bury My Heart at Wounded Knee: An Indian History of the American West* (New York: Bantam, 1972); Robert Utley, Wilcomb E. Washburn, *Indian Wars* (Glendale, CA:" American Heritage Library, 2002); Bill Yenne, *Indian Wars: The Campaign for the American West* (Yardley, PA: Westholme Publishing, 2008).

[3] See, among many others, Denise M. Bostdorff, *The Presidency and the Rhetoric of Foreign Crisis* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1994); Stephen John Hartnett and Laura Ann Stengrim, *Globalization and Empire: The US Invasion of Iraq, Free Markets, and the Twilight of Democracy* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2006); Robert L. Ivie, "Presidential Motives for War," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 60 (1974): 337–345; Robert L.

Ivie, *Democracy and America's War on Terror* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2005); John M. Murphy, "'Our Mission and Our Moment': George W. Bush and September 11th," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 6, no. 4 (2003): 607–632; Karlyn Kohrs Campbell, *Presidents Creating the Presidency: Deeds Done in Words* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008); Carol Winkler, "Parallels in Preemptive War Rhetoric: Reagan on Libya; Bush 43 on Iraq," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 10 (2007): 303–334.

[4] Dana L. Cloud, ""To Veil the Threat of Terror": Afghan Women and the ⟨Clash of Civilizations⟩ in the Imagery of the US War on Terrorism." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 90 (2004): 285-306.

[5] Gargi S. Bhattacharyya, *Dangerous Brown Men: Exploiting Sex, Violence and Feminism in the 'War on Terror'* (Zed, 2008); Jasmine Jiwani, "Trapped in the Carceral Net: Race, Gender, and the "War on Terror." http://www.gmj.uottawa.ca/1102/v4i2_jiwani.pdf

[6] Richard Slotkin, *Gunfighter Nation: The Myth of the Frontier in Twentieth Century America* (New York: Athenium, 1992), 5-6.

[7] Leroy Dorsey, "'Sailing into the 'Wondrous Now': The Myth of the American Navy's World Cruise.'' *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 83 (1997): 453.

[8] See Frederick Jackson Turner, "The Significance of the Frontier in American History," in *The Eloquence of Frederick Jackson Turner*, ed. Ronald H. Carpenter (San Marino, CA: The Huntington Library, 1983; Janice Hocker Rushing, "The Rhetoric of the American Western Myth." *Communication Monographs* 50 (1983): 14–3; Mary E. Stuckey, "The Donner Party and the Rhetoric of Westward Expansion," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 14 (2011): 229–260; Leroy G. Dorsey and Rachel M. Harlow, "'We Want Americans Pure and Simple': Theodore Roosevelt and the Myth of Americanism," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 6, no. 1 (2003): 55–78; M.J. Heale,

"The Role of the Frontier in Jacksonian Politics: David Crockett and the Myth of the Self-Made Man," *The Western Historical Quarterly* 4 (1973): 405–423.

[9] Richard Slotkin, *Gunfighter Nation: The Myth of the Frontier in Twentieth Century America* (New York: Athenium, 1992), 10.

[10] See Stuckey, "The Donner Party and the Rhetoric of Western Expansion" and Slotkin, *Gunfighter Nation,* 10.

[11] Slotkin, *Gunfighter Nation,* 10.

[12] The use of the frontier myth and the Indian Wars as s source of invention justifying war is not new; our argument is not that presidents have never used such warrants before, but that it has been largely ignored by rhetorical scholars and that in justifying the War on Terror, it has been startlingly consistent. The most prominent example of scholarship connecting the Indian Wars to American justifications for war can be found in Richard Drinnon, *Facing West: The Metaphysics of Indian-Hating and Empire-Building* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1997).

[13] See Mary E. Stuckey and John M. Murphy, "By Any Other Name: Rhetorical Colonialism in North America," *American Indian Culture and Research Journal*. 25(2001): 73-98.

[14] On amplification, see Chaim Perleman and Lucie Olbrechts-Tyteca, *The New Rhetoric* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1991), 175-176.

[15] On Andrew Jackson, see most famously, Michael Paul Rogin, *Fathers and Children: Andrew Jackson and the Subjugation of the American Indian* (Piscatawy, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 1991).

[16] Other politicians, including Daniel Boone and Davy Crockett also first became prominent as Indian fighters. For an extended discussion of this connection, see Thomas G. Mitchell, *Indian*

Fighters Turned American Politicians: From Military Service to Public Office (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2003).

[17] There is a vast literature on this topic. See, among many others, Stuart Banner, *How the Indians Lost their Land: Law and Power on the Frontier* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 2007); Lindsay G. Robinson, *Conquest by Law: How the Discovery of America Dispossessed Indigenous Peoples of their Lands* (NY: Oxford University Press, 2007).

[18] See Philip Deloria, *Playing Indian* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1999).

[19] The literature here is immense, and often the most useful literature is tribally specific. For overviews of the arc of indigenous history in the U.S., see Vine Deloria, Jr., *Custer Died for Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1988); Peter Iverson, *"We are Still here": American Indians in the Twentieth Century* (Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell, 1997); Jake Page, *In the Hands of the Great Spirit: The 20,000 Year History of Native Americans* (NY: Free Press, 2004); David E. Stannard, *American Holocaust: The Conquest of the New World* (NY: Oxford University Press, 1993).

[20] See, for example, Richard Maxwell Brown, *No Duty to Retreat: Violence and Values in American History* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1994); Patricia Nelson Limerick, *The Legacy of Conquest: The Unbroken Past of the American West* (NY: WW Norton, 1987); John Orman, *Comparing Presidential Behavior: Carter, Reagan, and the Macho Presidential Style* (NY: Praeger, 1987).

[21] Tzevtan Todorov, *The Conquest of America* (NY: Harper Perennial, 1996).

[22] This was largely the experience of the California Indians. See, for example, Jerry Stanley, *Digger: The Tragic Fate of the California Indians from the Missions to the Gold Rush* (NY: Knopf, 1997).

[23] See. For example, the history of the Chickasaw nation, in James R. Atkinson, *Splendid Land, Splendid People: The Chickasaw Indians to Removal* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2003).

[24] Most work on the political role of women in indigenous nations is tribally specific. See for example, Barbara Alice Mann and Paula Gunn Allen, *Iroquoian Women: The Gantowisas* (NY: Peter Lang, 2006).

[25] Mary E. Stuckey, *Defining Americans: The Presidency and National Identity* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2004), 87. See also, Mary E. Stuckey and John M. Murphy, "By Any Other Name: Rhetorical Colonialism in North America," *American Indian Culture and Research Journal*. 25(2001): 73-98

[26] Stuckey, *Defining Americans*, 237.

[27] Dorsey and Harlow, "'We Want Americans Pure and Simple' 69.

[28] David Domke, Philip Garland, Andre Billeaudeaux, and John Hutcheson. "Insights into US Racial Hierarchy: Racial Profiling, News Sources, and September 11." *Journal of Communication* 53: (2003): 606-623.

[29] Ambalavaner Sivanandan, "Race, Terror and Civil Society," *Race & Class* 47: (2006): 1-8; Elahe Izadi, "Boston Bombing Case Upends Assumptions About Racial Profiling," *National Journal*, April 19, 2013, http://www.nationaljournal.com/politics/boston-bombing-case-upends-assumptions-about-racial-profiling-20130419.

[30] George W. Bush: "Address to the Nation on the Terrorist Attacks," September 11, 2001. Online by Gerhard Peters and John T. Woolley, *The American Presidency Project*. http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=58057.

[31] George W. Bush, "Address Before a Joint Session of the Congress on the United States Response to the Terrorist Attacks of September 11."

[32] George W. Bush, "Address Before a Joint Session of the Congress on the State of the Union," January 28, 2003. Online by Gerhard Peters and John T. Woolley, *The American Presidency Project*. http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=29645.

[33] This phrase, of course, was used by General John Chivington as a justification for the Sand Creek Massacre. For a history of the massacre and the continuing controversy it created, see Ari Kelman, *A Misplaced Massacre: Struggling Over the Memory of Sand Creek* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2013).

[34] See also David Zarefsky, "Making the Case for War: Colin Powell at the United Nations," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 10: (2007): 275–302.

[35] George W. Bush, "Address Before a Joint Session of the Congress on the State of the Union," January 31, 2006. Online by Gerhard Peters and John T. Woolley, *The American Presidency Project*. http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=65090.

[36] Barack Obama, "President Obama's speech on Afghanistan," *The New York Times* (June 22, 2011), http://www.nytimes.com/2011/06/23/world/asia/23obama-afghanistan-speech-text.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0

[37] This dynamic is very clear in many narratives of the frontier. See, for example, S.C. Gwynne, *Empire of the Summer Moon: Quanah Parker and the Rise and Fall of the Comanches, the Most Powerful Indian Tribe in American History* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2010)

[38] These negotiations played out differently in every nation.

[39] On the politics of Indians and the American government, see among many others, Daniel K. Richter, *Facing East from Indian Country: A Native History of Early America* (Cambridge, MA:

Harvard University Press, 2003); David E. Wilkins and Heidi Kiiwetinepinesiik Stark, *American Indian Politics and the American Political System* (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2010).

[40] This was the logic governing much of the state-sponsored violence on the frontier. See, for example, Scott W. Berg, *38 Nooses: Lincoln, Little Crow, and the Beginning of the Frontier's End* (NY: Vintage, 2012).

[41] See Gregory F. Michno, *The Encyclopedia of Indian Wars: Western Battles and Skirmishes 1850-1890* (Missoula, MT: Mountain Press, 2003).

[42] For more on amorphous borders in war, see Stephen J. Heidt, "The Mobile Savage: Presidential Peace Rhetoric and the Perpetuation of Enemies" (PhD Dissertation, Georgia State University, 2014), 225-277 and Joshua Reeves and Matthew S. May, "The Peace Rhetoric of a War President: Barack Obama and the Just War Legacy," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* (2013): 639.

[43] George W. Bush, "Address Before a Joint Session of the Congress on the United States Response to the Terrorist Attacks of September 11."

[44] George W. Bush, "Address Before a Joint Session of the Congress on the United States Response to the Terrorist Attacks of September 11."

[45] Barack Obama, "Obama's Speech on Drone Policy," *The New York Times* (May 23, 2013), http://www.nytimes.com/2013/05/24/us/politics/transcript-of-obamas-speech-on-drone-policy.html?_r=0.

[46] Barack Obama, "Obama's Speech on Drone Policy."

[47] For further discussion of the mobility of enemies, see Heidt, "The Mobile Savage."

[48] Barack Obama, "Obama's Speech on Drone Policy."

[49] Barack Obama, "Obama's Speech on Drone Policy."

[50] See Robert L. Ivie, "Images of Savagery in American Justifications for War," *Communication Monographs* 47 (1980), 279-291 and Robert L. Ivie, "Savagery in Democracy's Empire," *Third World Quarterly* 26:1 (2005), 55-65.

[51] George Washington, "First Annual Message to Congress on the State of the Union," January 8, 1790. Online by Gerhard Peters and John T. Woolley, *The American Presidency Project*. http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=29431.

[52] James Madison: "Inaugural Address," March 4, 1813. Online by Gerhard Peters and John T. Woolley, *The American Presidency Project*. http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=25806.

[53] See, for example, Ulysses S. Grant: "Sixth Annual Message," December 7, 1874. Online by Gerhard Peters and John T. Woolley, *The American Presidency Project*. http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=29515.

[54] This is a complicated phenomenon, of course, as Indians were depicted both as lacking civilization and thus savage, and as being above civilization, and thus "noble." In both halves of the "noble savage" depiction though, their inevitable doom is implicit. See, among many others, Robert F. Berkhofer, *The White Man's Indian: Images of the American Indian from Columbus to the Present* (NY: Vintage, 1979); S. Elizabeth Bird, ed. *Dressing in Feathers: The Construction of the American Indian in Popular Culture* (Boulder, CO: Westview, 1996); Ter Ellingson, *The Myth of the Noble Savage* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001); Shari M. Huhndorf, *Going Native: Indians in the American Cultural Imagination* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2001).

[55] "1925 Geneva Protocol," *United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs, http*://www.un.org/disarmament/WMD/Bio/1925GenevaProtocol.shtml

[56] George W. Bush, "President Bush's Speech on Iraq" *The Washington Post,* (March 13, 2006), http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/03/13/AR2006031300813.html.

[57] George W. Bush, "President Bush's Speech on Iraq."

[58] This too is complicated, as American patriots in the Revolutionary War adapted just such tactics (learned from the Indians) in defense of their freedom.

[59] For more on hierarchical relationships, see Kenneth Burke, *A Rhetoric of Motives* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969),187.

[60] For extensive work on the democratization of the savage enemy, see Ivie, "Images of Savagery in American Justifications for War,"; Ivie, "Rhetorical Deliberation and Democratic Politics in the Here and Now,"; Ivie, "Savagery in Democracy's Empire,"; Robert L. Ivie, *Democracy and America's War on Terror* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2005).

[61] Stuckey, *Defining Americans,* 37

[62] Ulysses S. Grant: "Inaugural Address," March 4, 1869. Online by Gerhard Peters and John T. Woolley, *The American Presidency Project*. http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=25820.

[63] John Quincy Adams: "Fourth Annual Message," December 2, 1828. Online by Gerhard Peters and John T. Woolley, *The American Presidency Project*. http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=29470.

[64] A similar argument to this was made on behalf of slavery. Just as American Indians were seen as children, slaves were argued to be child-like. See Stuckey, *Defining Americans*, 89; See also, Anne Norton, *A Reading of Antebellum Political Culture* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986).

[65] Rutherford B. Hayes: "First Annual Message," December 3, 1877. Online by Gerhard Peters and John T. Woolley, *The American Presidency Project*. http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=29518.

[66] George W. Bush: "Address to the Nation on the Terrorist Attacks," September 11, 2001. Online by Gerhard Peters and John T. Woolley, *The American Presidency Project*. http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=58057.

[67] George W. Bush, "Address Before a Joint Session of the Congress on the United States Response to the Terrorist Attacks of September 11."

[68] For an explanation of how this rhetoric echoed that of Puritan rhetoric of "covenant renewal," see Denise M. Bostdorff, "The Evolution of a Diplomatic Surprise: Richard M. Nixon's Rhetoric on China, 1952-July 15, 1971," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 5 (2002): 31–56.

[69] For more on presidents' use of "just war" and "just peace," see Joshua Reeves and Matthew S. May, "The Peace Rhetoric of a War President: Barack Obama and the Just War Legacy," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 16 (2013): 623-650.

[70] George W. Bush: "Address Before a Joint Session of the Congress on the State of the Union," February 2, 2005. Online by Gerhard Peters and John T. Woolley, *The American Presidency Project*. http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=58746.

[71] George W. Bush: "Address Before a Joint Session of the Congress on the State of the Union," January 31, 2006.

[72] George W. Bush: "Address Before a Joint Session of the Congress on the State of the Union," January 29, 2002. Online by Gerhard Peters and John T. Woolley, *The American Presidency Project*. http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=29644.

[73] George W. Bush: "Address Before a Joint Session of the Congress on the State of the Union," January 23, 2007. Online by Gerhard Peters and John T. Woolley, *The American Presidency Project*. http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=24446. In the same address, Bush likewise says, "The great question of our day is whether America will help men and women in the Middle East to build free societies and share in the rights of all humanity. And I say, for the sake of our own security, we must."

[74] George W. Bush: "Address Before a Joint Session of the Congress on the State of the Union," February 2, 2005.

[75] George W. Bush: "Address Before a Joint Session of the Congress on the State of the Union," February 2, 2005.

[76] George W. Bush: "Address Before a Joint Session of the Congress on the State of the Union," February 2, 2005.

[77] George W. Bush: "Address Before a Joint Session of the Congress on the State of the Union," January 20, 2004. Online by Gerhard Peters and John T. Woolley, *The American Presidency Project*. http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=29646.

[78] Barack Obama, "State of the Union: Obama Speech Transcript," *Washington Post* (January 24, 2012), http://articles.washingtonpost.com/2012-01-24/politics/35440939_1_fair-share-hard-work-world-war-ii/8

[79] See David Wallace Adams, *Education for Extinction: American Indians and the Boarding School Experience, 1875-1928* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1995).

[80] For more on globalization and race, see *Globalization and Race: Transformations in the Cultural Reproduction of Blackness*, ed. Kamari Maxine Clarke and Deborah A. Thomas (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2006).

[81] Deborah A. Thomas and M. Kamari Clarke, "Globalization and Race: Structures of Inequality, New Sovereignties, and Citizenship in a Neoliberal Era," *The Annual Review of Anthropology* (2013): 308.

[82] Thomas and Clarke, "Globalization and Race: Structures of Inequality, New Sovereignties, and Citizenship in a Neoliberal Era": 313.

[83] See John L. Jackson Jr. "Gentrification, Globalization, and Georaciality," in *Globalization and Race*, ed. Clarke and Thomas, 193. Jackson notes that though the War on Terror gives insight into local experiences of race as well as a global understanding of race, there is no "coherent organizing principle for planetary inequality mappable along a selfsame epidermal ladder from light to dark bodies."

[84] Matthew Frye Jacobson, *Whiteness of a Different Color: European Immigrants and the Alchemy of Race* (Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 1998), 17.

[85] See David Sirota, "Let's Hope the Boston Marathon Bomber is a White American," *Salon* (April 16, 2013), http://www.salon.com/2013/04/16/lets_hope_the_boston_marathon_bomber_is_a_white_americ an/; on whiteness, see Charles W. Mills, *The Racial Contract*, (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1997). Note also, that there is a distinction between consequences of government policy as the disciplining of non-white bodies in U.S. war-making and the motivation of individual actors.