

May 2016

Working as Civic and Patriotic Duty for Consumption: A Critical Discourse Analysis of American Presidential Inaugural Speeches Since World War II

Michelle Leigh Casey
University of Nevada, Las Vegas, michellegcasey@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalscholarship.unlv.edu/thesesdissertations>



Part of the [Sociology Commons](#)

Repository Citation

Casey, Michelle Leigh, "Working as Civic and Patriotic Duty for Consumption: A Critical Discourse Analysis of American Presidential Inaugural Speeches Since World War II" (2016). *UNLV Theses, Dissertations, Professional Papers, and Capstones*. 2649.

<https://digitalscholarship.unlv.edu/thesesdissertations/2649>

This Dissertation is protected by copyright and/or related rights. It has been brought to you by Digital Scholarship@UNLV with permission from the rights-holder(s). You are free to use this Dissertation in any way that is permitted by the copyright and related rights legislation that applies to your use. For other uses you need to obtain permission from the rights-holder(s) directly, unless additional rights are indicated by a Creative Commons license in the record and/or on the work itself.

This Dissertation has been accepted for inclusion in UNLV Theses, Dissertations, Professional Papers, and Capstones by an authorized administrator of Digital Scholarship@UNLV. For more information, please contact digitalscholarship@unlv.edu.

WORKING AS CIVIC AND PATRIOTIC DUTY FOR CONSUMPTION:
A CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF AMERICAN PRESIDENTIAL
INAUGURAL SPEECHES SINCE WORLD WAR II

By

Michelle Leigh Casey

Bachelor of Arts-Sociology
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
2003

Master of Arts-Sociology
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
2008

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the

Doctor of Philosophy-Sociology

Department of Sociology
College of Liberal Arts
The Graduate College

University of Nevada, Las Vegas
May 2016

Dissertation Approval

The Graduate College
The University of Nevada, Las Vegas

April 11, 2016

This dissertation prepared by

Michelle Leigh Casey

entitled

Working As Civic and Patriotic Duty for Consumption: A Critical Discourse Analysis of
American Presidential Inaugural Speeches Since World War II

is approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy-Sociology
Department of Sociology

Barb Brents, Ph.D.
Examination Committee Chair

Kathryn Hausbeck Korgan, Ph.D.
Graduate College Interim Dean

Kate Korgan, Ph.D.
Examination Committee Member

Simon Gottschalk, Ph.D.
Examination Committee Member

Gregory Borchard, Ph.D.
Graduate College Faculty Representative

Abstract

Presidential speeches recycle and reify power to construct notions of citizenship, civic duty, and patriotism (Bostdorff 2003, Bostdorff and O'Rourke 1997, Loseke 2009, Murphy 2003). Previous research shows that Presidents use patriotism and civic duty to promote particular policies (Bostdorff and O'Rourke 1997, Coe et al. 2004) and war (Altheide 2004, Ivie 2005, Bostdorff 2003, Loseke 2009, Murphy 2003). Research also looks at how post-World War II (WWII) political culture and campaigning reflect a consumer society, either through how Presidents use consumption to promote a specific value (Altheide 2004, Bostdorff 2003) or how Presidents themselves symbolize branded commodities (Miller and Stiles 1986, Scammell 2007, Simonds 1989, Uricchio 2009 van Ham 2001, Vidich 1990, Zavattaro 2010). However, there is not much research examining how Presidential rhetoric connects consumption and economic values to civic duty and patriotism over time.

Using Critical Discourse Analysis, I reviewed twenty inaugural speeches twelve Presidents delivered while in office since WWII to examine how they connect consumption and economic values to civic duty and patriotism.

Presidential inaugural speeches from the 1930s-1950s emphasize collectivism and construct civic duty as working together to build a better America; expressing patriotism required citizens fulfill their civic duty and maintain strong work ethics. Presidential inaugural speeches from 1960s and 1970s emphasize collectivism and individualism and construct civic duty as an individual's obligation to pursue an American Dream and as working together to help stabilize America's economic system; expressing patriotism

required citizens fulfill their civic duty and maintain independence from government assistance. Presidential inaugural speeches from the 1980s-mid 2000s emphasize individualism and construct civic duty as an individual's obligation to work for the resources needed to consume and to develop community resources; expressing patriotism required citizens fulfill their civic duty by spending and serving their communities.

Acknowledgments

With the encouragement, support, and guidance from my advisory committee, I finished my Ph.D. and learned what it means to be a scholar. Dr. Barb Brents, my committee chairperson, was a constant source of inspiration. Somewhere around a few years ago, I lost count of the number of times she motivated me when I was challenged with obstacles, even ones I put in my own way. Dr. Brents has what seems to be an innate understanding of her students, including me. She always knew when I was overwhelmed and needed a little extra encouragement. Without exception, Dr. Brents was there to help me get back on track and minimize struggles I faced. She just simply knew when and how to be available. Dr. Brents guided me when I was lost, helped me carve out a pathway where one didn't exist, and took the time to help me reach my goals while she remained compassionate, grounded, and focused. I don't know if Dr. Brents intended to transfer these qualities onto me, but I am certain that because of her influence I am a more grateful, insightful, and intellectually mature person because I had the chance to work with her. Because of Dr. Brents, I know what it means to be a scholar. I finally know how to claim my voice. Because of her, I know why I should.

I'm so grateful for the contributions my advisory committee, Dr. Simon Gottschalk, Dr. Kate Korgan, and Dr. Greg Borchard, made to my education. Dr. Gottschalk's high standards coupled with his generous offering of resources motivated me to ensure the work I submitted throughout my Ph.D. program was well-developed, relevant, and articulated professionally. I'm not entirely sure if he's aware of the profound influence he had on my academic development because he's also one of the

most humble professors with whom I've worked. I am absolutely certain that watching him balance his dedication to excellence with his superior teaching abilities helped me understand that the process of learning is as valuable as what I learn.

Dr. Korgan reinforced these values. I came to Dr. Korgan's classroom fifteen years ago to discover why I was drawn to college. Her encouragement while I pursued my BA through the Honors College made the difference between finishing my degree and graduating Summa Cum Laude with Departmental Honors. Dr. Korgan's consistent support through graduate school made the difference between giving up and finding the strength to persist. Without her guidance through every step of the way, I am quite sure I wouldn't have had the confidence to finish my Ph.D. program. I wouldn't even be writing this acknowledgement trying to figure out a way to convey my sincerest gratitude for what Dr. Korgan has done for me; it's immeasurable. Her mentorship was one of the most valuable resources I had at UNLV.

Dr. Borchard's support was also invaluable. He joined my committee after not hearing from me for a few years. I can't imagine a more meaningful gesture and show of confidence. Adding Dr. Borchard as the Graduate College Representative was by far one of the best decisions I made about my committee composition. His feedback was always relevant, thought-provoking, and very useful. Dr. Borchard's perspective provided me wonderful and unique ways of looking at my research methods, findings, and overall conclusions. Although my department committee offered excellent insight into these dimensions, Dr. Borchard added an even deeper and more profound texture by suggesting another spectrum be included, another lens to understand the relationship between

scholarship and application. I cannot thank him enough for his relentless work on my project and his dedication to my academic growth. He truly is an amazing person with an incredible understanding of why interdisciplinary work is so important.

All of my professors at UNLV have been amazing. I will always be grateful for them, the Department of Sociology staff, especially Connie Dye whose administrative insight is profoundly remarkable, my classmates, and the wonderful administrators working in the Graduate College. Each, in their own way, brought me closer to reaching my goals and helped me find my place in academia. I hope I did an adequate job of thanking them along the way and I hope they know how much I truly appreciate them.

I'm particularly grateful for Dee-dee Severin's support. To say I relied on her expertise would be an understatement. Especially over the last couple of years, I called her frequently with questions, concerns, or in need of help with one thing or another. Without fail, Ms. Severin was there for me with a pleasant and thorough response, even when the answer was available online somewhere. Her patience, understanding, and personal assistance made the formal processes involved in finishing a Ph.D. seem less daunting and easy to navigate. I thank her for that and so much more.

I'm so thankful for my colleagues at Durham Technical Community College. Without their support, finishing a Ph.D. would have been nearly impossible. Dr. David Long especially went far beyond what a supervisor is required to offer. His supportive kindness often came at the precise moment I needed it; he always knew when to offer words of wisdom or a little perspective on the scope of what I was doing. Dr. Long can tap into what's most important to a person and what those struggling around him need,

and then just seems to intuitively know what to say to settle things. There were many times I struggled to make progress in my program, and without exception, Dr. Long was there to cheer me on and help me figure out a way to regain momentum. I'm so grateful for his motivation through my Ph.D. program, his professional guidance thorough my teaching career, and his friendship through it all.

I'm tremendously grateful for my family and friends. My parents, Susan and Roger, fostered the confidence in me to realize my potential. They taught me to stand up for equality and speak out for those whose voices are silenced by injustice. Because my mother has always believed in me and has stood by my side no matter what, every milestone I've reached didn't really count until I shared it with her. To this day, her being proud of me is one of the most important affirmations of my success. It was knowing how proud she would be of this accomplishment that helped motivate me through several long and tedious writing sessions. Thank you, Mom, for everything you are.

Because my father has always offered his strength, I've never worried about failing. My father prepared me to find my way and taught me to look at every opportunity as a chance to learn, regardless of the outcome. I always knew he was available for me, and that if I made a mistake, he would help me figure out a way to learn from it, with no judgement. Thanks, Daddy, for everything you do.

My step-father, Craig, gave me unconditional support over the years and showed me how to persevere. I couldn't have picked a better partner for my mother. I thank him for always taking such good care of our family, even in times of struggle. My step-mother, Betsy, showed me what a humble yet fiercely amazing woman can do. Her love

for her family shines through in everything she does and her spirit is a source of such joy for me. I thank her for sharing her life with my father and welcoming me into her heart and home.

I've been truly fortunate to have such wonderful parents and step-parents. But, my good fortune extends beyond that. My mother-in-law, Nancy, and father-in-law, Bob, since the day I met them, gave me their full support and went out of their way to make sure I knew they don't think of me as just their son's wife, but that they consider me their daughter. My grandmother-in-law, Maxine, has also shown me the same love, and her support has meant the world to me. My husband's family is amazing.

My grandmother, Beverly, was the first person to teach me that I could (and should) do anything I set my mind to, and that anything worth doing is worth doing well. She taught me to work hard, love often, and enjoy life. These lessons were sometimes the most meaningful mantras I relied on to get me through my Ph.D. program. On more occasions than I can count, her words echoed in my heart giving me the strength to not just finish, but to give it my best effort, to find the love in the world around me and draw inspiration from it, and to remember not to take it all too seriously, to simply enjoy the ride.

My aunt, Zela, and my uncle, Tom, along with my siblings' support, helped me enjoy the ride. My aunt and uncle were the first people beyond my parents who showed me that no matter what, no matter which pathway I wanted to take, they would defend my choices. The bond we share concretized the importance of carving out a journey on my terms with the confidence that no matter where I landed, they would be there with me.

Their support made the difference between sticking to traditional trajectories that limited my options and deciding for myself the best way to pursue my goals in ways that deepened and texturized my experiences. I'm incredibly grateful for their unconditional support, their limitless confidence in me, and their heartfelt commitment to my pursuits.

My sister, Jacquelyn, my womb-mate, can make me laugh, even in the most challenging moments, but it's her unshakable faith for which I'm most grateful. I've watched her grow into a beautiful woman with strong values and an unparalleled sense of community; her spirit is an inspiration and her love for humanity has helped me see the importance of using my education to make a positive impact on the world. For that, I'll always be grateful. My step-sister, Anna, has shown me what courage and resilience looks like, even in the most difficult situations. Her endless hope and optimism have been sources of inspiration for me. My step-sister, Robin, and step-brother, Ryan, have been wonderful sources of inspiration, too, and I appreciate them so much for being incredible people. I appreciate my step-brothers, Steve and James, and my sisters-in-law, Traci and Lindsey, for reinforcing the value of making positive social change. My sisters-in-law, Jenna and Lisa, have also been supportive and made pursuing my Ph.D. a wonderful journey by just being amazing women from whom I could draw inspiration. I'm also grateful for my brothers-in-law, Jared, Jacob, and Kyle. In their own unique ways, they each reinforced important lessons about resilience, perseverance, and humility; they are remarkable men.

Last, but in no way least, I'm so grateful that my S.W.O.A. were by my side all along. Their loyalty has remained fierce for over thirty years and their strength is

unmatched by anyone I know. Their energy could light the world and power a revolution. Their dedication to social equality makes it seem like it's only a matter of time before all the injustices of the world are resolved. They have shown me what community is and have inspired me to reflect that spirit with compassion and humility. Alone, their capacity to overcome obstacles with grace and eloquence is awe-inspiring. Together, they are a force to be reckoned with, a team of sisters from other misters bound by tears and laughter. They are my anchors when I need stability and my catapults when I need launching. For that, and at least sixteen million other reasons, I owe this accomplishment to my S.W.O.A., Bekah, Jana, Jennifer, and Jessica. I have become a rose because of them.

Dedication

I dedicate this dissertation to my husband, Kevin, who is my best friend, my partner in life, and my greatest love. He made finishing this and completing my Ph.D. possible.

Table of Contents

Culminating Experience Results/Approval Page.....	ii
Abstract.....	iii
Acknowledgments.....	v
Dedication.....	xii
Table of Contents.....	xiii
Chapter One: Introduction.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	1
Methods.....	5
Findings.....	5
Organization.....	9
Chapter Two: Literature Review.....	12
Consumption, Civic Duty, and Patriotism.....	13
Political Identity, Branding, Commodification, and Marketing.....	21
Chapter Three: Research Methods.....	35
Methodological Process.....	36
Sample: Inaugural Speeches.....	37
<i>Assessing Inaugural Speeches</i>	42
Micro-Level Analysis: Concepts, Messages, and Metaphors.....	43
<i>Concepts and Messages</i>	45
<i>Messages and Metaphors</i>	48
Meso-Level Analysis: Contexts.....	51

Macro-Level Analysis	55
Reliability and Validity	58
Chapter Four: The Moral Economy Working for a Better America.....	62
Franklin D. Roosevelt	62
<i>Franklin D. Roosevelt: 1937 Inaugural Speech</i>	64
<i>Franklin D. Roosevelt: 1941 Inaugural Speech</i>	71
<i>Franklin D. Roosevelt: 1945 Inaugural Speech</i>	81
Harry S. Truman.....	86
<i>Harry S. Truman: 1949 Inaugural Speech</i>	88
Dwight D. Eisenhower	94
<i>Dwight D. Eisenhower: 1953 Inaugural Speech</i>	100
<i>Dwight D. Eisenhower: 1957 Inaugural Speech</i>	105
Chapter Five: Citizens Working with Better Americans	113
John F. Kennedy.....	114
<i>John F. Kennedy: 1961 Inaugural Speech</i>	117
Lyndon B. Johnson.....	123
<i>Lyndon B. Johnson: 1965 Inaugural Speech</i>	128
Richard M. Nixon.....	130
<i>Richard M. Nixon: 1969 Inaugural Speech</i>	133
<i>Richard M. Nixon: 1973 Inaugural Speech</i>	139
James E. Carter.....	144
<i>James E. Carter: 1977 Inaugural Speech</i>	146

Chapter Six: Consumers Working to be a Better American	154
Ronald W. Reagan.....	156
<i>Ronald W. Reagan: 1981 Inaugural Speech</i>	160
<i>Ronald W. Reagan: 1985 Inaugural Speech</i>	166
George H. W. Bush	181
<i>George H. W. Bush: 1989 Inaugural Speech</i>	184
William J. Clinton	192
<i>William J. Clinton: 1993 Inaugural Speech</i>	194
<i>William J. Clinton: 1997 Inaugural Speech</i>	209
George W. Bush	215
<i>George W. Bush: 2001 Inaugural Speech</i>	219
<i>George W. Bush: 2005 Inaugural Speech</i>	223
Barack H. Obama	228
<i>Barack H. Obama: 2009 Inaugural Speech</i>	231
<i>Barack H. Obama: 2013 Inaugural Speech</i>	234
Chapter Seven: Macro-Level Findings and Conclusions.....	239
A Working America.....	242
Presidential Inaugural Speeches.....	244
Institutional Intersections	247
Top Down and Bottom Up Approaches.....	250
Limitations	252
Future Work	254

Bibliography	256
Curriculum Vitae	268

Chapter One: Introduction

In their inaugural speeches, American Presidents set agendas for upcoming terms, define ways to enact ideological priorities set up during their campaigns, and reassign meaning to values. Additionally, Presidents often offer symbolic promissory notes outlining the relationship between citizens and their government; Presidents then define what citizenry requires and how to enact their civic duty. Aligning with their campaign platforms, Presidents often develop their images to elicit emotional investment meant to anchor citizens' loyalty to their brands and anything those represent, including ideological constructs. Analyzing Presidential inaugural speeches since WWII reveals insight into what ideologies Presidents construct and how constructs change over time. Looking at Presidential images and brands contextualizes the constructs to reveal some understanding of Presidents' intentions for constructing particular messages.

Statement of the Problem

Presidential rhetoric carries along with it a certain taken-for-granted and powerful legitimacy. According to Edelman (1988), this power is significant because “[i]t is language about political events, not the events in any other sense, that people experience; even events that are close take their meaning from the language that depicts them...political language *is* political reality” (p. 104). The rhetoric matters. It defines reality, and in this process, constructs ideologies and thus carries some power in defining culture, specifically political culture where citizens may take cues from Presidential rhetoric that assigns meaning to belief systems and values.

Since WWII, Presidents have prioritized a number of ideologies in their inaugural speeches. However, those defining civic duty as the ability to consume are particularly problematic, especially when Presidents construct the value of citizens' patriotic expression to fulfilling civic duty dependent on consuming. When Presidential rhetoric constructs patriotism around the ability to enact civic duty, and directs citizens to fulfill their civic duty by consuming, those who lack the means to consume are denied the means to enact dutiful, patriotic citizenship. Those with more access to resources consumption requires are more dutiful, patriotic citizens and those who lack access to resources are less dutiful, patriotic citizens. Therefore, when Presidents prioritize ideological constructs suggesting that expressing patriotism by enacting civic duty requires consumption, they reproduce social inequality within a political culture valuing socioeconomic status over democratic representation.

Studies on politics in late capitalist consumer culture find three important ways in which Presidential rhetoric ties consumption to civic duty and patriotism. First, Presidents communicate the ties through their speeches. Research on Presidential rhetoric after 1980, especially after the September 11, 2001 (9/11) terrorist attacks, finds the connection between consumption and civic duty is clear, and further proposes Presidents link both to patriotism (Altheide 2004, Gladstone 2006, Holian 2004, McLeod 1999, Vidich 1990). Altheide (2004) provides compelling analysis revealing how constructing national and patriotic identity tied to consumption perpetuates a culture of fear, primarily a fear of terrorism. Gladstone (2006) argues using ideological constructs to perpetuate

fear are purposeful. Simonds (1989) finds that since the mid-1940s, political culture ascribes to citizens the role of consumers.

Further, additional research finds that Presidential rhetoric links patriotism to war (Bostdorff 2003, Murphy 2003), policies (Coe et al. 2004, Bostdorff and O'Rourke 1997) and fear generally (Altheide 2004, Bostdorff and O'Rourke 1997, Ivie 2005, Loseke 2009, Murphy 2003). All of these links strengthen the chain connecting consumption to civic duty; this chain anchors citizens to political rhetoric, and further enables Presidential branding to construct ideological value where citizens aligning with one social issue, or link, may also align with another sharing the same chain. When political language is political reality, these links define the ways in which citizens should enact civic duty and express patriotism. Using these links, Presidents can define civic duty, for example, as accepting justifications for war, not questioning policies, and remaining fearful of threats, such as terrorism. If all the links are part of the same chain, then accepting consumption as part of fulfilling civic duty matters when Presidents call citizens to action and express patriotism by consuming.

Finally, recent research finds that building emotional connections between a politician's image and citizens, in the same ways companies intentionally-brand products to elicit emotional connections to products, is central to political culture (Miller and Stiles 1986, Scammell 2007, Simonds 1989, van Ham 2001, Uricchio 2009, Vidich 1990, Zavattaro 2010). Loseke (2009) follows up and looks specifically at how emotional discourse may facilitate political messages by strengthening rhetorical context, including bolstering Presidential branding, commodifying, and marketing. Traditional campaigning

is no longer about clarifying party issues, but rather establishing, or at least simulating, intimacy and emotional connections with voters to maintain brand loyalty, which translates into political loyalty, or more specifically, anchors citizens' loyalty to a politician.

Despite the relevant and poignant studies examining the relationship between consumption, civic duty, and patriotism, and the ways in which Presidential branding may impact this relationship, there are no studies looking at this connection and comparing Presidential rhetoric over time. Most research relies on specific Presidential or political party campaigns or sets of speeches a few Presidents or politicians delivered within a term or decade. Exploring rhetoric from a specific President or party and/or within a specific term or decade is valuable and contributes profoundly to context-specific analysis. However, as valuable as the studies are, they cannot explain how Presidential rhetoric changes over time nor how these changes may reflect ideological constructs evolving over several decades.

Looking at the larger socio-historical picture lends insight into both the subtle and explicit ways in which Presidents tie consumption and economic values to civic duty and patriotism over time. It also helps define how Presidential rhetoric evolves generally. More specifically, it is important to look at how this evolution reflects in the different ways Presidents conceptualize how citizens should access the means to consume, such as working, as a pre-requisite to civic duty and patriotic expression. This is particularly important to understand in order to reveal how Presidential rhetoric contributes to reproducing social inequality.

Therefore, looking at Presidential rhetoric since WWII, when consumer culture started shifting, reveals what ideologies Presidents constructed and how constructs change over several decades. Exploring the relationship between consumption, economic values, civic duty, and patriotism over time also clarifies in what ways Presidents attribute this relationship to changes in social structure, including the interdependency between work and economy. Finally, understanding what Presidential rhetoric looks like over time helps identify how consumption, economic values, civic duty, and patriotism relate to social inequality.

Methods

The purpose of this research is to answer the following question: In what ways does Presidential rhetoric reveal a connection between consumption, economic values, civic duty, and patriotism? To understand this connection, I conducted a Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) on twenty inaugural speeches twelve Presidents delivered since WWII. Further, because research shows Presidential branding plays a significant role in what ideas Presidents convey, how and why they (re)construct ideologies, and how Presidents prioritize messages, to contextualize my analysis, I also reviewed Presidential branding. Finally, I consulted newspaper articles published the day after each inaugural speech to get a general understanding of the cultural climate in which Presidents delivered their inaugural speeches.

Findings

Presidential inaugural speeches since WWII parallel America's growth into a consumer-driven economic market, and in this, also follow a clear shift from collectivism

to individualism as it manifests through the years. Through the growing pains, American Presidents constructed ideologies reflecting the social and political changes occurring alongside economic uncertainty and placed a high premium on productive labor to construct citizens' role in maintaining economic stability. Presidential images follow a similar evolution where their identities grew increasingly dependent on the commercial market transforming public servants into a Presidential commodities. Overall, Presidential inaugural speeches since WWII represent three thematically different ways Presidents connected consumption and economic values to civic duty and patriotism.

First, Presidents in the first few decades since WWII proposed dutiful citizens should work for a better America; the reward for working was the ability to contribute to the economy because they argued a strong economy required a strong collective work ethic from its citizens. Fulfilling civic duty required working for a better America and expressing patriotism came from enacting civic duty. Presidents in office, therefore, between the 1930s and 1950s proposed citizens should work, not for consumption, but because it strengthened the country's collective work ethic. Similarly, Presidents' during these few decades had to manage their impressions to align with the idea that a political leader is the ideal role model for citizenry. Presidents' brands right after WWII depended on their ability to present a morally righteous character to bring about a moral economy; a moral economy was a stable economy.

Secondly, by the mid-century Presidents incorporated that sentiment and further called citizens to action by constructing patriotism around both working for individual wealth and investing in collective service; the reward for working was the ability to

secure individual financial freedom by pursuing the American Dream, and the payoff for serving other citizens and the country was the ability to take part in stabilizing America's economic independence in a globalizing market. Fulfilling civic duty required working for the country, for citizens' own pursuits, and with more socially and morally-conscious Americans, better Americans. Better Americans were those balancing individual pursuits with their collective spirit and displaying financial security was the ultimate form of patriotic expression. Presidents in office, therefore, in the 1960s and 1970s proposed citizens should work to secure individual financial freedom and to secure America's financial freedom in the increasingly globalizing economic market. Presidents emphasized both individualism and collectivism, and further urged Americans to balance the two.

Managing images for Presidents during these two decades meant managing their brands in a then new technological medium, television. Presidential branding was no longer limited mainly to radio transmission; for the first time in political history, Presidential branding relied on not just sounding Presidential, but also looking the part: confident and charismatic, compassionate and objective, competent and collected, and strong and humble, all of which represented America on a global stage.

Finally, Presidents in office since the 1980s have placed individualism over collectivism in their speeches, and connected consumption, civic duty, and patriotism to economic values by proposing dutiful citizens should work to accumulate wealth for consumption. Working and consuming reflected patriotic spirit because it strengthened America's economy benefiting each citizen. Fulfilling civic duty meant working for a

better America, with better Americans, and to be a better American themselves.

Presidents in office, therefore, between the 1980s and mid-2000s proposed citizens should work to accumulate the means to consume where those with more access to resources were better equipped to enact and fulfill civic duty, and where patriotism relied on the ability to display indicators of achieving the American Dream. Presidents during these decades convey the importance of the collective spirit, but they primarily assigned value to working together, such as doing community service, because it would help other citizens maintain independence from government assistance, not necessarily as virtue in and of itself. In this way, collectivism reflected a commodity value where Presidents advanced the idea of working together as a valuable pathway to individual freedom; service was a tool, a valuable tool to the government, and as such, citizens were responsible for using it to protect their own interests.

Presidential branding since the 1980s reflects a similar construct where politics is big business, both literally and figuratively. In the 1980s, Presidential campaigns started requiring substantially more financial support, which meant keener salesmanship skills if they wanted to serve. Additionally, Presidential agendas started reflecting more interests of big business, including encouraging citizens to work, not matter what; it was their civic duty. Taken together, managing a Presidential image has become as important to campaigns as the issues themselves because Presidential branding has become a way to represent, or at least simulate, Presidents total agenda.

Therefore, although Presidents since WWII all proposed dutiful citizens should work, Presidents in office right before and after WWII argued work was noble in and of

itself where the collective spirit should drive citizens' intentions. Presidents in office during the middle of the century, however, justified working as a means to an end where working toward a common, collective goal should drive both individual ambition and collective interest. Since the 1980s, Presidents have argued consumption was the goal where the ability to participate in economy should drive the intention to work; working meant the ability to consume. Citizens' duty was to consume, and their obligation to their country was to enact their civic duty to express their patriotism.

Organization

In Chapter Two, I review previous studies revealing the importance of Presidential rhetoric and how it constructs and connects ideologies such as consumption and patriotism to civic duty. I also review literature detailing the ways in which constructing political identities ties to Presidential branding and marketing, and further explore how commodifying Presidents informs their platforms, agendas, and overall messaging.

In Chapter Three, I outline the general process involved with using Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and discuss why I used it to analyze Presidential inaugural speeches since WWII. I further discuss my sample by summarizing which speeches I analyzed, explaining why I chose the specific speeches in my sample, and revealing where I accessed textual copies of the twenty inaugural speeches I analyzed. I also discuss specifically how I used CDA by detailing the three specific steps I followed. I review the process I used to conduct the micro-level analysis where I reveal the significance of evaluating the concepts, messages, and metaphors in the inaugural

speeches. I review the importance of conducting the meso-level analysis where I explain how and why understanding the cultural contexts the speeches were delivered in is relevant. I review the suggested process for conducting the macro-level analysis and reveal the ways in which this process lends insight into the overall sociological implications of my findings. Finally, I discuss the utility of CDA focusing on its explanatory power and accounting for its limitations regarding reliability and validity.

In Chapters Four, Five, and Six, I provide my micro-level and meso-level analysis findings. In Chapter Four, I reveal what I found in the inaugural speeches delivered by Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, and Dwight D. Eisenhower who communicated thematically similar ideologies proposing citizens should work collectively for the nobility of building a strong moral economy. In Chapter Five, I reveal what I found in the inaugural speeches delivered by John F. Kennedy, Lyndon B. Johnson, Richard M. Nixon, and James E. Carter who emphasized the importance of citizens working both for individual and collective reasons to strengthen America's domestic and globalizing economic relations respectively. In Chapter Six, I reveal what I found in the inaugural speeches delivered by Ronald W. Reagan, George H. W. Bush, William J. Clinton, George W. Bush, and Barack H. Obama who focused on individual contributions to America's globalized economy arguing citizens' civic duty was primarily to consume and then build community resources.

In Chapter Seven, I discuss my macro-level findings and conclude by reviewing the overall sociological implications revealed in all three levels of analyses. To do this, briefly review the prevailing themes I found in Presidential inaugural speeches since

WWII. I also summarize what the concepts, messages, and metaphors found in my sample mean to political culture and social structure. I further discuss how Presidents' different approaches to economy inform their speeches looking at the impact these approaches might have had to shaping their messages. I finish this chapter by revealing the limitations of my analysis overall and suggest future work to compensate for the limitations.

Chapter Two: Literature Review

In recent decades, American Presidential rhetoric has increasingly tied consumption to civic duty and constructed patriotism as the ability to enact civic duty by working for collective goals, working for individual and collective reasons, and working primarily to secure individual rewards (Bostdorff 2003, Bostdorff and O'Rourke 1997, Loseke 2009, Murphy 2003). Previous research shows that when politicians purposefully construct consumption out of fear and tie it to patriotism and nationalism, they effectively perpetuate a culture of fear (Altheide 2004 and Gladstone 2006). Presidents construct these connections in their campaigns and then summarize the totality of their agendas during their inaugural speeches.

To effectively campaign, politicians brand and market themselves to establish, or simulate, emotional connections with their voters. Marketing requires politicians simultaneously manage their impressions across several media outlets. In order to brand, market, and manage impressions over several media outlets efficiently, politicians distill their entire platforms into one salient message, which they often package as a slogan (Miller and Stiles 1986, Scammell 2007, Simonds 1989, Uricchio 2009 van Ham 2001, Vidich 1990, Zavattaro 2010). Their slogans then represent messages they distill from ideological constructs, agendas, and political platforms meant to anchor citizens' loyalty to the President and ensure they ground any calls to civic duty with credible intentions.

Presidential campaigns, and the inaugural speeches punctuating them, therefore, are increasingly a result of carefully managed impressions Presidents purposefully tie to their brands reflecting specific ideological messages. Citizens' loyalty to a President's

brand fosters emotional connections between the two where citizens can become further invested in messages to align with a President's brand. When citizens are emotionally invested in ideological constructs Presidents advance, then Presidential rhetoric is even more powerful (Loseke 2009). When Presidents construct ideologies that reproduce social inequality, the power behind political rhetoric evolves beyond simply shaping an individual's political perspective, although important, and takes on the power to transform social structure. Presidential inaugural speeches since WWII connect consumption and economic values to civic duty and patriotism using this power, and reflect significant changes in society, changes that seemingly and superficially justify increasing levels of social inequality.

Consumption, Civic Duty, and Patriotism

Two significant pieces of scholarship look at how political rhetoric following the 9/11 terrorist attacks tie consumption to civic duty. Altheide (2004) specifically looks at how elite propaganda and general media coverage post-9/11 rhetoric constructs terrorism in relation to consumption, patriotism, and national identity. Secondly, Gladstone (2006) makes similar arguments, but specifically reviews President Bush's speeches post-9/11. He offers a relevant approach as his analysis focuses on how a branded president (re)constructs patriotism to encourage citizens to stimulate the economy through consumption as part of their civic duty.

Loseke (2009) asks how political rhetoric following 9/11 (re)constructs political reality using emotion as discourse. She specifically focuses on how "emotion discourse" constructs Americans as victims rather than villains, and in doing so, constructs

patriotism around citizens' shared victimization where persevering, even in the smallest of ways, translates into American heroism. In other words, in this context, every American can be a hero because everyone overcomes something every day, and the more "heroic" the American citizen is, the more patriotism they can (and should) claim and express.

Altheide (2004) notes three major findings about political and media rhetoric after 9/11. First, media have used fear to construct terrorism where propaganda controlled by "elites and formal agents of social control" has advanced a "metaphor of 'investment'" that "promoted joining the self with the state" (pp. 295-6). This propaganda urged Americans to spend money and give blood to stimulate the economy and help victims, but it also "cast all Americans as victims," which by default, provided a common fear (Altheide 2004: 295). Therefore, citizens were to make an "investment" media framed not just as community spirit, but also as self-preservation. In this, political rhetoric called for heightened security, thus urged increasing social control, for self-preservation and humanitarianism, which together, constructed a national identity around the normalization of terrorism (Altheide 2004). In this context, Americans expected to fight terrorism to defend American values, and thus defense translated into preserving the American Dream.

Second, Altheide notes that "consumption and giving were joined symbolically with terrorism" (2004: 297). Media constructed national unity synonymous with an anti-terrorism/terrorist narrative. Altheide emphasizes this when he argues, "[t]he most important point of the communal narrative was what Americans held in common rather

than what separated them” (2004: 299). The narratives created a common ground by linking “caring” to collective identity, which then lead to “unified” giving (Altheide 2004). Media urged citizens to donate to charities, such as the American Red Cross, aimed at helping “victims,” and to commit to community service (Altheide 2004, Bostdorff 2003). All in all, “Americans contributed more than \$2 billion to a host of charities” that in one way or another helped those impacted by terrorism, and because the rhetoric reinforced the idea that terrorism impacted everyone, this meant all Americans (Altheide 2004: 299). The post-9/11 sense of community relied on a counter sense of fear and shared victimization from a common enemy: terrorism and terrorists. Shortly after 9/11, this message remained specific to just the attacks from that day. Within months, however, that changed.

Finally, Altheide argues, eventually and inevitably, this shared victimization translated into a shared patriotic experience where “[p]atriotism was connected to an expansive [and perhaps expensive] fear of terrorism and enemies of the United States. The term ‘terrorism’ was used to encompass an idea, a tactic or method, and ultimately a condition of the world” (2004: 301). The cumulative effect of elite propaganda constructed terrorism so carefully and so broadly that just about anything resembling a threat to American culture was a terror, rather than just terrible. In turn, propaganda constructed crises as equivalent to terrorism. The implications are still important because “[c]risis provides opportunities for heads of state to present themselves as leaders, to dramaturgically define the situation as tragic but hopeful, and to bring out the ‘resolve’ of national character” (Altheide 2004: 293).

Overall, Altheide (2004) finds the “use of language and the blending of symbols commensurate with a national identity contributed to consumption, giving, and compliant support for action against past, present, and future terrorists” (p. 304). Rhetoric does this by using myths as metaphors, such as constructing parallels between crime and terrorism, and building the new national identity using rhetoric that justifies the new social controls (Altheide 2004). This language reifies familiar dichotomies for which enacting civic duty means aligning with one side in direct opposition to the other as a commitment to patriotism. When the type of rhetoric is used, Americans are victims not terrorists (Altheide 2004, Loseke 2009), good not evil (Coe et al. 2004), and heroes not villains (Loseke 2009). The binaries were simple and persuasive, and arguably still are.

Gladstone (2006) analyzes persuasive speeches and reviews implications associated with audience reception. He looks at rhetorical techniques found in Presidential speeches, particularly those George W. Bush delivered from 2001-2006 during his campaign. He first situates Bush’s rhetoric in the sociocultural climate post-9/11. Gladstone (2006) argues Bush used the country’s feelings of vulnerability for political advantage. Bush was already branded a president who aligned with big business, where political and corporate success were becoming interdependent, so his calls for consumption were not shocking. What makes Bush’s message salient, however, according to Gladstone (2006), is the audience’s vulnerability. Gladstone argues the conditions for persuasive speech are important to ideological manifestations, and as such, what might be most important, beyond sociocultural events, is the audience’s susceptibility to the message (2006).

Building on Lowenthal and Guterman (1949), Hoffer (1951), Pratkanis and Aronson (1992), and Weber (1949), Gladstone's (2006) models identifies both ideal listeners (audience) and ideal speakers (politicians). This model helps explain why audiences received Bush's brand and message, and perhaps may indicate how persuasive speeches anchor brand loyalty. Gladstone argues the ideal audience and listener is a "cognitive miser" where "the theoretical audience essentially simplifies the incredibly complex spectrum of individual characteristics so as to allow generalizations to be made" (2006: 244). Audiences are cognitive misers because they are bombarded with so many messages in a given day that they have to select what information they process, internalize, and adopt. So, any communication with any chance of receipt "must adhere to the mantra of KISS: keep it simple, stupid" (Gladstone 2006: 244-5).

According to Gladstone (2006), Bush constructed his message after 9/11 purposefully simple. His presented "the issue at hand in vivid and colorful terms" such as referring to "Iraqis and terrorists as 'evil', 'despicable' and representative of the 'very worst of human nature'" (Gladstone 2006: 245). This distillation and imagery is powerful and intended to:

"grab the listeners' attention and compel them to perceive this communication and those to come as uncommon and important-as communications distinctly different than those they are exposed to each day regarding consumer goods, economics, treaties, and international business. This communication appears urgent and urgency requires no cognitive investment at all" (Gladstone 2006: 245-6).

Once Bush had the audience's attention, the call for consumption, paired with the imagery of foreign threats, was on fertile ground to grow. In this way, the call for consumption presented a solution to a larger problem of which all Americans were supposed to fear, at least as media constructed fear as part of patriotism and civic duty for which all Americans "should" align. Therefore, fear grounded the message and reinforced an emotional relationship between the President and citizens.

The relationship was not necessarily practical nor rational, as Zavattaro (2010) might describe it, but instead relies on pathos. The message was persuasive because citizens' emotional attachment to the symbolic meaning, and the sociocultural climate was full of ideal-listeners resulting from a "hybrid consequence of both traditional emotional frustrations and immersion in modern society which is message dense and persuasively rich" (Gladstone 2006: 260). The richness was even deeper because Bush stuck to the basics:

"explain and define the problem at hand through the creation of context...elaborate on why existing procedure and protocol are no longer adequate in the face of this 'new problem,' [and] offer a solution which is couched in vague language and is logically unattainable" (Gladstone 2006: 247).

The message remains clear: citizens were to consume to fulfill civic duty.

Emotional attachment to symbolic meanings is a significant part of constructing political reality. Loseke (2009) argues it is important to understand how speeches persuade audiences to think, but equally important to understand is how speeches encourage audiences to feel, as "politics increasingly is interwoven with popular culture,

which is substantially about feeling” (p. 498). Loseke also notes that “it is not possible to understand how people think or make moral evaluations without understanding how people feel” (2009: 499). Thinking, or cognition, and feeling, or emotion, are reciprocal processes. Therefore, making conscious choices about consumption and how to enact civic duty, or even what citizenship is and patriotism means, are just as much related to how Americans *feel* about those choices. Looking at how emotional connections anchor brand loyalty provides insight into how rhetoric reinforces brands, recycles brands’ message, and ultimately reifies brands’ power; a power that, in many ways, familiar binaries strengthen (Coe et al. 2009).

Loseke (2009) analyzes the “first four nationally televised addresses to the nation after the events of September 11, 2001” to evaluate how these speeches fit into the genre of melodrama, or stories meant to invoke emotion, looking for the plot, how each deployed emotion, how the language operated, and which characters were typified (p. 501). Much like what Altheide (2004) and Gladstone (2006) find, Loseke (2009) notes the rhetoric presented symbolic codes, many of which were situated in familiar binaries, and when taken together, constructed American civic duty and patriotism around a shared victimization. Altheide (2004) discusses this same issue as above, but Loseke (2009) examines it closer.

Loseke (2009) argues this victimization translated into the powerless “Good American” who needed saving. This set the stage for a melodramatic story where good fights evil, or America fights terrorism. The plot centered on victims against villains, or Americans against terrorists. The rhetoric presented fear as something to avoid and for

which freedom (constructed via patriotism) could and should replace, but the replacement was not framed as something that just happens. The rhetoric carefully constructed fear (Altheide 2004, Gladstone 2006, Loseke 2009). Out of the shared fear and perceived victimization, the justification for war was much easier to make because both threaten freedom (Loseke 2009). According to Loseke (2009), however, hatred was the emotion that sealed the deal because “[a]ppeals to fear...are not sufficient to account for citizens’ active support for war” (p. 510). Fear simply allowed the more dangerous messages to sneak in, such as hatred, but often presented as a seemingly more innocuous ideology: nationalism (Loseke 2009).

The stories speeches tell, therefore, are set on a stage where the audiences/citizens are included in the plot because they are protagonists (Americans/victims) who are fearful of antagonists (villains/terrorists), but for whom freedom can (and should) save. How does freedom save them? They are to be ideal Americans who value their nation over all others (nationalism) and who are willing to save themselves; they are to be heroes and fear not. Loseke (2009) finds this call to civic duty in political rhetoric noting the messages revealed that Americans were supposed to “save civilization from the barbaric terrorist” and somehow transform their fear (as a response to an uncontrollable situation) to anger (a response to a controllable situation), such as a threat to “our biggest buildings” compared to a threat to “the foundation of America” as Bush described in his speech following the 9/11 attacks. (Loseke 2009: 511-3).

How would Bush have Americans save civilization in this speech? By spending. He called for Americans to spend time serving their communities, and in this, align with

moral values idealized in culture such as being a Good American who “exceeds the standards of ordinary by simply being a good American” (Loseke 2009: 514). He also called for Americans to spend their money. Bush asked in a November 8, 2001 speech for Americans’ “continued participation and confidence in the American economy,” which was sandwiched between a request for Americans’ patience for heightened security and prayers for the “victims of terror and their families” (Bush 2001, Loseke 2009: 514). Bush equated American heroism with consumption; he translated acts of heroism into the ability to maintain the American economy.

Of course, Bush’s sentiments most likely did not resonate with every American, as Loseke (2009) notes, but the messages may have resonated with a political culture where emotion, cognition, and action might have seemed synonymous to Americans. The sentiments might actually construct more harm than good when politicians construct ideologies such as nationalism and patriotism as synonymous. The sentiments might be part of a larger political agenda where political culture and consumer culture are synonymous.

Political Identity, Branding, Commodification, and Marketing

Research finds additional ways in which consumer culture affects politics and political culture. Appearing emotionally connected *with* citizens has become more important to winning campaigns than “political paradigms” of the past where the focus was on “geopolitics and power” (van Ham 2001: 4). Edelman (1964) perhaps saw what political branding would become as he, several decades ago, argues that politics was becoming primarily symbolic and meaning would change, where existing social structure

and behaviors would increasingly contextualize meaning that both informs and entertains. Edelman is not suggesting that politics would become entertaining, in and of itself, but rather it was becoming somewhat of a spectacle where audiences (citizens) simply observe rather than participate.

Edelman (1977) further suggests that politics shape and define meanings about what citizens *should* believe happens, sometimes to the detriment of what *does* happen in the social world. Edelman (1977) argues rhetoric socializes citizens. The meanings embedded in it inform citizens' how to enact patriotism and civic duty. In this context, part of civic duty is to "buy the message," and in more contemporary terms, to "buy the brand." The political brand carries the message, and politicians rely on brand loyalty to anchor citizens to their platforms, which then enables them to recycle and reify power.

Edelman (1988) continues by proposing, "[i]t is language about political events and development that people experience; even events that are close take their meaning from the language used to depict them. So political language is political reality; there is no other so far as the meaning of events to actor and spectators is concerned" (p. 10). Edelman (1988) argues this does not resolve anything significant, rather it calls for more research on political language, connotative and denotative meanings in political rhetoric, the power rhetoric has in reproducing social inequality, and in more contemporary terms, the processes significant to its transmission, including political branding.

As van Ham (2001) argues, the future of politics rests in branding, and "politicians will have to train themselves in brand asset management" (p. 6). Although not explicitly called "branding," Presidents in office immediately following World War II

did manage impressions, to some extent, and presented identities that convey specific meaning, much like brands do today. It has been part of the political process and performance for some time, therefore, albeit perhaps less intentional than it is today (McDiarmid 1937). The impact might be the same, however, as ultimately, Presidents were always tasked with developing a platform, constructing messages to rest on it, and delivering those through speeches, or performances.

Because delivering Presidential speeches is almost like a hyperbolic performance, in the sense that most embody a macroscopic version of the audience and performer relationship, Goffman (1959) would likely argue the same dramaturgical opportunities and constraints apply to delivering speeches as they do in any social situation where individuals offer “idealized” impressions. Presidents idealize their impressions, and identities within, when the, “the performer,” is “engaged in a profitable form of activity that is concealed from his audience and that is incompatible with the view of his activity which he hopes they will obtain” (Goffman 1959: 43).

If offering an occasion where Presidents formally accept their positions was the sole purpose of inaugural speeches, the messages would be ceremonial, at best. The speeches seem ceremonial, as they usually follow the swearing in ceremony, but the messages are not as trite as the pomp and circumstance surrounding them; Presidents since WWII have delivered their inaugural speeches to the American people by reaffirming goals and promises made during campaigns. They have effectively been promissory notes setting up a social contract between Americans and their President. In this, arguably, inaugural speeches might also conceal a broader political agenda:

reinforcing the Presidential brand, and as such, anchoring citizens' loyalty to the political action that might follow the ideologies they constructed during their campaigns.

Anchoring loyalty may also ensure that if Presidents do not achieve goals or fulfill promises, and/or they breach the social contract, then citizens' loyalty to the President, and their ideological constructs, remains intact.

In that, the speeches (or performances) must be free from mistakes, either ideological or not, so the Presidents' "impression of infallibility, so important in many presentations [of self and identity], is maintained" (Goffman 1959: 43). The idea that Presidents should correct "errors...before the performance [or speech] takes place" is common sense, but when Presidents connect with an audience (citizens') emotions to anchor their loyalty, they must also at least appear somewhat unscripted or unprepared, to maintain some of the spontaneous, human qualities so important to emotional connections. The trick for Presidents is then to simultaneously manage impressions by balancing their human, fallible, flexible selves without forfeiting the precise rhetoric constructing ideologies requires.

While managing idealized impressions, Goffman (1959) further proposes that "where the individual presents a product to others, he will tend to show them only the end product, and they will be led into judging him on the basis of something that has been finished, polished, and packaged...[and where he] tend[s] to conceal from [the] audience all evidence of 'dirty work'... [and where] a good showing is to be made" (p. 44).

Although not explicitly calling Presidents a "brand," nor directly referring to them as

“products” making a “good showing,” and speech writing as “dirty work,” a parallel exists.

If Presidents brand themselves like products, then they need to manage their ideal impressions carefully where audiences/citizens never see the process or means and hardly see a bad “showing.” In that, citizens are not supposed to know that Presidents purposefully manage their impressions in specific ways to elicit emotional connections and anchor loyalty; seeing the “dirty work” would dilute the product or end result. Audiences/citizens, of course, are not be privy to any ideological constructs either, as what they see and hear is likely the ideological “package” they are to pick up, and much like a gift, gratefully keep without knowing exactly what went into making it, including how Presidents brand themselves or the agenda behind it.

Today, much like developing any product for the market, politicians’ tasks are “finding a brand niche for their state, engaging in competitive marketing, assuring customer satisfaction, and most of all, creating brand loyalty” (van Ham 2001: 6). Brand loyalty, in this context, is not just about commitment to the services politicians provide, but more profoundly, refers to an emotional and psychological investment into specific politicians. It means that traditional campaigning based on party issues is not enough anymore, and perhaps it never was. Political culture demands a more convenient, efficient connection between politicians with citizens where trusting the political brand defines political winners in a market consumer culture explicitly drives.

Creating this connection through branding results in several by-products, one of which is commodifying politicians because, according to Zavattaro (2010), “branding

turns a person into a commodity” (p. 123). Any commodity’s value, even politicians’, relies on how branding and marketing translates, replicates and sustains value. Branding and commodification, although subtle and somewhat covert years ago, are not new, but more recently the process and by-products have become more explicit. Tony Blair’s 2005 general election campaign (Scammell 2007) and Barak H. Obama’s 2008 (Zavattaro 2010) presidential campaign highlight the explicit and overt processes and by-products in contemporary politics. According to Scammell (2007),

“branding is now the permanent campaign...[that] focuses on the instruments of media politics; the brand concept uncovers the underlying strategic concerns of efforts to maintain voter loyalty through communication designed to provide reassurance, uniqueness (clear differentiation from rivals), consistency of values, and emotional connection with voters’ values and visions of the good life” (p. 188).

The new permanent campaign is not unidirectional. In fact, according to Scammell (2007), “branding is both a cause and effect of the shift toward a thoroughly consumerized paradigm of political communication” (p. 189). Therefore, another by-product is clear: this paradigmatic shift constructs citizens as political brand consumers where political marketing uses their commercial brand consumption patterns to direct the context and content of political communication. In short, political strategists now track what, why, when, and how citizens consume commercial products and develop political brands paralleling these trends. In this, a politician is a product and identifying with his/her brand is the process anchoring citizens’ loyalty to it (him/her).

Zavattaro (2010) argues Obama's brand was clear throughout his campaign, and although politics paralleling spectacles is nothing new, the implications for branding and commodifying a President, or any politician, are spectacular. For example, "as a commodity, the candidate goes through the traditional steps of product marketing-create identity (brand image), get party approval (company image), win primary election (test market), campaign hard (advertising and distribution), get elected (market share), and stay in office (repeat sales)" (Kotler 1975: 768 qtd. in Zavattaro 2010: 125). Given this parallel, branding a politician into a product, as with commodification generally, transforms the subject (politician) into object (product).

Branding inevitably results in commodification on which politicians' credibility and leadership ability rely. This relationship is paradoxical, however. When politicians' brands do not leave positive, lasting impressions, their political platform can lose credibility and their leadership roles may suffer because they must engage in simulated leadership (Zavattaro 2010). This spectacular simulation can eclipse the position and highlight the person where the position comes with objective status built in and the person is subjective, flawed, and lacks status that positions grant. Specifically, negative images can cast a shadow over the politician's brand and any ideologies it represents. However, consumers sometimes crave consumption and may look for ways to satiate themselves. Zavattaro notes Baudrillard's (1994) examination of this phenomena where he primarily argues simulated leadership equals simulated power. From there, simulated power placates citizens, specifically consumer citizens.

Finally, a branded and commodified President is “marketed like a product, [and] consumer drives take over for practical, rational ones,” as Zavattaro theorizes (2010: 127). Therefore, although branding matters profoundly, consumers’ desire to consume can override an ineffective brand, even when a politicians’ platform and leadership ability suffers from it. From this perspective, consumers want to engage in consumption regardless of its cost, and forfeiting leadership to take a simulated leadership role does not disrupt this process because citizens can still connect emotionally with a simulation.

Constructing the product/politician relationship for the consumer/citizen informs this process. Miller and Stiles (1986) review acceptance and inaugural presidential speeches from 1920-1981. Their “quantitative index of Familiarity,” reveals politicians’ relationships with their audiences grew more intimate between 1920 and 1981, and acceptance speeches were not as intimate as inaugural speeches. (p. 73). Because intimacy levels increased during these years, branding and commodification did, too, as levels of intimacy require emotional investment and branding and commodification use that investment to anchor brand loyalty, especially in inaugural speeches.

Miller and Stiles (1986) establish that increasing intimacy enables solidarity between politicians and their constituents. Politicians’ ability to manage their impressions, in large part, frames this ability. Politicians must give off the impression that they are just another American; they are just like any other private citizens. If consumers/citizens welcome politicians into their private lives (albeit through media, and increasingly through electronic social media), then politicians are in citizens’ private spaces and places, and thus, need to establish a less formal connection, or at least seem

accessible much like anyone citizens have into their homes. This results in what seems like a closer, better informed relationship between politician and their constituents.

For Simonds (1989), citizens' familiarity with politicians does not make the former more politically competent, nor does it bring politicians and citizens closer together in solidarity. Simonds (1989) reveals that political incompetency decreased after WWII where the reality of a citizenry washed away informed citizens' optimism as "astonishingly ill-informed, uninterested in public affairs, and disinclined to participate in any but the barest minimum of the activities requisite to the exercise of sovereign authority" (p. 183). For Simonds (1989), the most politically-competent citizen does not just "access...information but [has] access to the entire range of skills required to decode, integrate, and arrive at decisions respecting that information" (p. 198). Simonds (1986) and Zavattaro (2010) agree that contemporary citizenry does not possess the necessary skills for competent citizenship.

Under these conditions, political culture conceptualizes citizenry as a passive process where citizens receive, and perhaps even accept, any ideology the ruling class advances, and where "false consciousness is fashioned by elites, disseminated across the dominant communications networks and automatically absorbed by a passive mass" (Simonds 1989: 198). According to Simonds, consumerism has dominated political culture since the mid-1940s where specifically the liberal government "ascribes to citizens the role of consumers in a marketplace" and where "political elites endeavor to 'sell' [citizens] alternative policies, which are 'purchased' in the voting booth" (1989: 189). He further argues "the character of the political purchase is, like many other

purchases, predominantly determined by the marketing skills of the sellers (and the interest groups they represent)” (Simonds 1989:189). Evaluating the by-products of this is profoundly important as the transformation from citizen to consumer translates politicians into branded products, and as such creates an emotional, rather than practical or rational, connection to the politician/product.

Vidich (1990), in an overview of American political rhetoric of the late 20th century, finds substantiating the popular rule to accommodate all citizens may not even be possible. Vidich (1990) notes, “there would appear to be no single set of political symbols that can embrace and simultaneously appeal to the social, economic, political, ethnic, racial and religious diversity of the population” (p. 5). As such, “this ideological deficiency poses a political dilemma for contemporary American democracy; and it is the solution to this dilemma that distinguishes the political character of the late 20th century American democracy from its earlier versions” (Vidich 1990: 5). The solution is for politicians to manage impressions appealing to a seemingly generic audience. According to Vidich (1990),

“the management of rhetorics and symbols-the art of the advertising world-has reached a level of such critical importance that the outcome of elections is thought by some to be determined by it...[where] ‘Telectioneering’ has become more refined with each succeeding presidential campaign” (p. 6).

Falling back on tried and true images, and because “face-to-face visual intimacy of television lends itself to the personalization of politics,” Bush, for example, branded himself as accessible and traditional, two qualities the public needed to concretize their

political sentiments (Viddich 1990: 10). Presidents manage personal and political qualities with concise efforts to construct specific slogans from generic ideologies with which most Americans can agree. Political strategists, and Bush's were no exception, know how powerful rhetoric and slogans are, and they know aligning with the "Democratic myth requires that America's president be 'of the people'" (Vidich 1990: 22). In many ways, most political strategists likely agree perpetuating this myth grants Presidents some level of intimacy and access into citizens' private lives, at least symbolically, but it makes "citizens easy prey for political propagandists" (Vidich 1990: 27). Predatory campaigning, if it can be called that, is manipulative at worst, and ideological, at best.

McLeod (1999), after examining presidential campaign cycles in 1988, 1992, and 1996, does in fact find that "presidential campaigns provide a rhetorical and symbolic arena (Bailey 1969) in which voters and candidates participate ritually in the complexities of the presidential struggle for power" (p. 360). Presidential campaigns, in this context, are sites where candidates, through branding and commodification, construct messages, build emotional bridges between themselves and citizens, and ultimately anchor brand loyalty. They are also sites where citizens can express their political preference and competency, and by default, brand loyalty through "rituals of rebellion" (McLeod 1999: 361). This manifests "through rhetorical skills, sound bites, debates, and televised performances [in which] American voters participate ritually in the sociodrama of presidential rebellion" (McLeod 1999: 361).

Further, McLeod (1999) notes, “presidential elections are the modern political rituals that provide the mythical charters for the expression [and presentation] of economic and political relationships” (p. 361). These relationships are sites for expressing citizenship on the political playground where the “My candidate is better than your candidate” attitude establishes vicarious political competency. As any playground knows, this sort of attitude inevitably integrates some and alienates others. In this context, rhetoric and rituals of rebellion construct symbolic in-groups and out-groups, and ultimately justify ruling class behavior (McLeod 1999). Through branding and commodification, Presidents reify status symbols by creating sites where aligning with a particular candidate reflects vicarious power, and aligning with Zattavaro (2010) arguments, that simulated power informs.

According to McLeod (1999), for example, if citizens value symbols representing one candidate more than another, then by associating with a particular brand, citizens can claim the same status. By providing practical and efficient means to distill messages into an emotional appeal for votes, this makes branding even more powerful. It reinforces a President’s brand as a status symbol. Much like driving an expensive luxury car represents a more powerful status than driving an affordable family car, aligning with a particular candidate can represent more political power than aligning with another. Aligning with a candidate is not too difficult as teledemocracy parallels what the market teaches consumers to do: evaluate advertisements and brands.

Just like commercial brands represent products, the political brand represents politicians’ agendas reflecting political ideologies all of which politicians (re)construct.

Marketing a brand, therefore, includes marketing an agenda that provides, according to Holian (2004), a sort of short cut to the totality of campaigns, or as Scammell (2007) argues with respect to brands, “a shortcut to consumer choice” (p. 177). Political agendas, and the brands representing them, allow candidates to package the issues representing their platforms and claim ownership of these issues in the process/product.

As the above authors show, Presidential branding and commodification are now the standard way to manage impressions in an ever-growing telecommunications market for which campaigning is just another site to anchor brand loyalty; effective campaigning requires strong, salient political brands. Even though branding is explicit today, the authors show branding characterizes many campaigns in previous decades, although not all explicitly call platform “agenda” and impression management “branding.” Through branding, Presidents are commodified, and as such, transform from subject to object, or a product for which citizens make choices to consume or not based on brand loyalty.

Looking at how Presidents communicate messages and in what ways branding anchors citizens’ loyalty to those messages is important, but at the foundation of it all, is the profoundly important content. Therefore, exploring what messages Presidents construct is profoundly important. While the above research looks carefully at contemporary Presidential rhetoric and how branding anchors citizens’ loyalty, not much systematic studies explore how it has changed since WWII. This is important to explore because Presidential rhetoric has the power to shape political culture, especially when citizens are emotionally invested in it (Altheide 2009, Gladstone 2006, and Loseke 2009). Looking at what messages Presidents construct over time, and briefly reviewing the role

branding might have played in this context, reveals how Presidential rhetoric has changed to shape different ideological constructs within political culture. Looking at Presidential rhetoric since WWII clarifies how Presidents: constructed messages about consumption and patriotism; defined economic values within specific cultural contexts; outlined expectations they had of citizens; and provided directions for fulfilling civic duty and expectations. My research specifically examines if Presidential rhetoric has changed over time and looks at whether or not Presidents since WWII connected consumption and economic values to civic duty and patriotism.

Chapter Three: Research Methods

Using the Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) framework Fairclough suggests, I reviewed twenty inaugural speeches twelve Presidents delivered while in office since WWII looking for connections between consumption, economic values, civic duty, and patriotism. Generally, CDA provides a model to study how language constructs, maintains, and/or exercises political power (Fairclough 1989). Using Fairclough's model (1989), I analyzed the content in three stages: micro, meso, and macro-levels to understand what specific messages Presidents constructed, to explore the speeches' historical and contextual significance, and to reflect on the ways in which the speeches reflect power dynamics situated within social structure.

I merge my micro-level findings with my meso-level analysis in Chapters Four, Five, and Six where I separate Presidential inaugural speeches thematically. In all three analysis chapters, I summarize the concepts, messages, and metaphors I found in each of the twenty inaugural speeches. I also discuss the relationship between each speech and the social world, and finally review the sociological implications of the meanings and relationships.

Chapter Four reveals my analysis of Franklin D. Roosevelt's last three inaugural speeches, Harry S. Truman's only inaugural speech, and both of Dwight D. Eisenhower's inaugural speeches. These three Presidents all constructed civic duty as working for a better America. For them, working was morally righteous and the best way to secure America's economy was through collective effort.

Chapter Five reveals my analysis of John F. Kennedy's and Lyndon B. Johnson's only inaugural speeches, Richard M. Nixon's two inaugural speeches, and James E. Carter's inaugural speech. These four Presidents all constructed civic duty as working together to serve each other and government to be better Americans. They also argued working was a necessary pathway to reach the American Dream, an achievement best displayed through self-sufficiency and independence from government assistance. Therefore, Kennedy, Truman, Nixon, and Carter all constructed civic duty reflective of both collectivism and individualism.

Chapter Six reveals my analysis of Ronald W. Reagan's two inaugural speeches, George H. W. Bush's only inaugural speech, and both of William J. Clinton's, George W. Bush's, and Barak H. Obama's inaugural speeches. These five Presidents extended the ideological construct the former introduced. They constructed civic duty as working to maintain independence from government assistance and to accumulate wealth to participate in economy by consuming. In this, all of these Presidents proposed individualism was the most valuable ideology where consuming was a noble way to display patriotism; collective efforts mattered, but primarily as a symbol of an American's achievement where being a better consumer meant being a better American.

Methodological Process

To analyze the twenty Presidential inaugural speeches in my sample, I followed several processes. First, I used NVivo to calculate and record the number of words each speech contains, including how often each word appears in each speech, and the weighted percentage of the words. Then, I highlighted key words and color-coded themes using

word processing tools. From there, I noted patterns and documented formal notes revealing connections and themes from those patterns. Further, I analyzed the codes, patterns, and themes and revisited the speeches to record the formal properties. Then, I interpreted the connotative and denotative meaning of the speeches paying attention to what they convey about the connection between consumption, economic values, civic duty, and patriotism. I reflected on those meanings, and went back to the speeches to review them again and check my notes. I then considered insight gained from the New York Times newspaper articles featuring stories published the day after each inaugural address. Finally, I reflected and then reflected some more on the larger sociohistorical context to theorize what the connection between consumption, economic values, civic duty, and patriotism indicates about political culture.

Overall, I provide a sociological understanding of how Presidential rhetoric connects consumption and economic values to civic duty and demonstrate how Presidents constructed patriotism around working to fulfill civic duty. Because Presidents defined working to consume as civic duty, they constructed those with more ability to work and then consume as more dutiful citizens. Presidential rhetoric is powerful, therefore, because it reinforces, or perhaps even encourages, inequality and grants patriotism to those who can work for it and afford it, the latter of which counters the traditional hegemonic American Dream.

Sample: Inaugural Speeches

I selected inaugural speeches rather than other speeches, such as State of the Union or Nomination Acceptance speeches, for a number of reasons. Presidents deliver

inaugural speeches immediately after pledging their Presidential oath and swearing to uphold their Presidential duties. Therefore, inaugural speeches represent the first time a President, as the official President, addresses the nation. Inaugural speeches are Presidents' first chance to frame their terms, and because first impressions matter, their inaugural speeches mark their first impressions, again as official Presidents. Next, inaugural speeches are part of a ceremony; Presidents are not obligated to speak about matters of domestic crisis, social problems, or policy issues yet. American Presidents can speak freely in their inaugural speeches, therefore, the content they deliver can reflect messages free from strict party obligations where they can situate themes around myriad issues they choose. Presidents have more freedom to personalize their messages, and as such, can reinforce their brand with more intimacy, regardless of their political party's agenda. Further, inaugural speeches are, historically, very well-attended by the public, including "attending" via radio, television, and the internet. I do not focus on audience reception issues, but Presidents are likely aware of the sheer number of people who could hear/see their messages; inaugural speeches represent a diverse and large captive audience, therefore. Finally, inaugural speeches are often shorter than any other speech a President is required to deliver. Therefore, inaugural speeches represent an opportunity for Presidents to select only the most important messages they want to convey, which may help sort of filter out, for my purposes, the most salient ones.

I selected inaugural speeches President delivered since WWII because I focus on consumption, economic values, civic duty, and patriotism; consumer culture started growing exponentially after WWII ended, a war that tested the boundaries of civic duty

and patriotism. WWII started during Roosevelt's second term, and right after his fourth term began, in 1945, the war ended. In that, WWII began and ended while Roosevelt was in office, therefore, understanding the inaugural speeches he delivered during that time are important to understanding political culture and Presidential rhetoric right before consumer culture gained momentum. Roosevelt passed away in April, 1945, and Truman took office. WWII ended one month later.

Truman delivered the first televised Presidential speech just two years later in 1947, and then in 1948, became the first President to use a paid (black and white) televised advertisement in a campaign. This remains a significant moment in not just the structure of institutional-level politics, but also in political culture. By broadcasting that one advertisement, Truman began the transformation of Presidential campaigning into advertising as citizens know it today. He took politicians off the difficult-to-reach Capitol stage and placed them squarely in the living rooms of America.

Granted not every person in America owned a television yet, but the use of this medium made Presidents' speeches accessible in unparalleled ways, and of course, shifted the importance of campaigning from communicating direct messages to packaging visually appealing products. He advertised himself; he was the product, the Presidency was the brand; it represented ideal citizenry. He sold it to his collective audience, citizens collected together to work for America, to work for Truman's vision. From there, Eisenhower delivered his first inaugural speech in 1953 and his second in 1957, and by 1961, when Kennedy was sworn in, political culture had changed significantly.

In 1961, Kennedy delivered his first and only inaugural speech, the first one televised in color. Along with this technological change that profoundly impacted political culture by extending the tradition Truman started coupling politics with the commercial market, Kennedy's inaugural address foreshadowed an ideological evolution. He planted neoliberal seeds that Presidents immediately following him would cultivate by constructing civic duty as both collective and individual efforts, or collective individualism, rather than just collective. Kennedy took political culture from black and white and this *or* that, and colored it, both through televised messages and by painting shades of linguistic nuance, around political issues and motivation where civic duty was this *and* that. Kennedy constructing civic duty as both individual and collective efforts, in several ways, jumpstarted "the political technologies associated with marketization, that provided the basis for 'advanced liberal' rule" (Larner 2000: 13). Kennedy passed away just two years after he delivered his inaugural address, and Johnson who, began harvesting the neoliberal seeds Kennedy planted, took office.

Johnson delivered his first inaugural speech in 1965 after already serving for two years as President. Nixon took office in 1969 and delivered his first inaugural speech, and then in 1973, delivered his second, however, just one year later, he resigned and Gerald Ford succeeded him. Ford never delivered an inaugural speech because Carter took office in 1977 instead and delivered his first and only inaugural speech. Four years later, in 1981, Regan was sworn into office and delivered the first of two inaugural speeches.

Much like Kennedy's inaugural speech reveals a significant change in political culture where ideological constructs layer collective civic duty with individual effort,

exactly twenty years later Reagan's first inaugural address flips this nuance over. In the first few decades after WWII, Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower called for collectivism; civic duty meant all citizens working *for a better America*. In the 1960s and 1970s, prevailing ideological constructs merged collectivism with individualism; civic duty meant all citizens working together and a "particular politics of self in which we are all to encouraged to 'work on ourselves'" to work *with better Americans*. By 1981, neoliberalism outgrew the sociopolitical landscape Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon, and Carter set up. The seeds matured and the harvests' bounty was not enough anymore. Reagan explicitly called for individualism; civic duty meant citizens working *to be a better American*. Regan delivered his second inaugural address in 1985 echoing this sentiment.

In 1989, H. W. Bush delivered his first and only inaugural speech affirming individual effort, and in many ways, condemning citizens who were not self-sufficient. In 1993, Clinton took office after delivering his first inaugural speech, and just four years later, in 1997, delivered his second inaugural speech streaming live over the internet for the first time. Just as Truman had done 50 years earlier, Clinton's speech made history. Because of the increase in accessibility of televised events, more and more people living in America could watch Presidential speeches; the only real limit was accessing one of the millions of televisions in homes by the 1990s, and by the 1980s, American news was even available in select countries. However, speeches available online meant anyone with internet connection could access them, and anyone could stake their claim in political culture.

By 2001, W. Bush, former President Bush's son, delivered his first inaugural speech. Just eleven months later, terrorist attacks shook the nation, and President Bush delivered the most explicit message directly calling for Americans to consume as part of their civic duty to express patriotism. He was re-elected, and in 2005, delivered his second inaugural speech. Four years later, America elected its first African-American President and Obama delivered his first inaugural speech. In 2013, Obama delivered his second inaugural speech, and in 2017, one of the politicians campaigning right now will be the 45th President and deliver the 58th inaugural speech.

Accessing Inaugural Speeches

Several online sources archive Presidential inaugural speeches. The American Presidency Project, run by the University of California Santa Barbara, manages publically-accessible online inaugural speech archives. The American Presidency Project provides well-organized links to video and voice recordings. It is, by far, the best and easiest inaugural speech archive to use. I accessed almost all the inaugural speeches in my sample from the American Presidency Project archives. The United States National Archives and Records Administration maintains archives of Presidential inaugural speeches and documents, too. I consulted this latter source to verify the transcription accuracy of the former.

All twenty Presidential inaugural speeches are available as both voice and video recordings. I restricted my formal analysis to the textual format because my primary goals were to understand whether or not Presidential rhetoric reflects consumption, and if so, how it does in relationship to economic values, civic duty, and patriotism. Analyzing

the text alone provided that understanding, although examining how Presidents managed their physical impressions and paralanguage would be a worthy and profound endeavor in the future. For now, to establish the connection between consumption, economic values, civic duty, and patriotism, and to evaluate its significance, I looked at the concepts, messages, and metaphors in the text itself rather than how Presidents conveyed these three qualities through paralanguage.

Micro-Level Analysis: Concepts, Messages, and Metaphors

Micro-level analysis involves explaining formal properties of the text, including the concepts, messages, and metaphors. Although denoted concepts obviously matter if the sought after meaning is intact, the messages and metaphors representing them matter, too. For example, a direct call for consumption clearly tied to an economic value and linked to civic duty or patriotism is, of course, important because it shows a measurable, overt connection between the concepts. However, the messages and metaphors matter, too, because they work in more covert ways where it might not even seem like a President links consuming to civic duty, for example, and as such, a citizen might be less aware of the agenda, and therefore, less cognizant of the messages' subtle power.

For example, when Presidents employ the American Dream metaphor to convey the importance of attending college, securing a job, buying a home, raising a family, and taking family vacations, then symbolically, going to college, getting a job, buying a home, etc. represents achieving the American Dream. In this context, achieving the American Dream is an obligation disguised as civic duty when Presidents construct it as patriotic expression. Not achieving the American Dream (and lacking the displays of its

achievement, such as going to college, securing a job, buying a house, etc.) translates into failing to fulfill civic duty. In this scenario, education is really about purchasing tuition where students are increasingly consumers in educational markets and where knowledge is the commodity. Gaining employment ultimately means securing the ability to consume. Employing workers, for example, to sell something to consume (products, homes, information, a service, etc.) means increased ability to participate in economic markets by either working to produce for profit and then consuming using that profit or providing work so employees can consume, which all Presidents since WWII conceptualized as civic duty, in one way or another. Raising a family means socializing children to consume in specific ways where even literally consuming food increasingly represents a hyperbolic status. For example, consuming food has long been a sign of wealth; increasingly, however, ideological constructs tie food consumption to identities where those with the privilege of food security can identify as vegan, vegetarian, or gluten-free for reasons related to personal consumption choices, rather than medical or health-related reasons. In other words, in some ways, even consuming basic needs beyond living in an expensive home for shelter, for example, increasingly represents status.

Finally, when Presidents encourage Americans to take vacations, for example, the same conspicuous consumption manifests as part of achieving the American Dream. Using a sentiment like President Bush delivered on Sept. 27, 2001 at O'Hare International Airport, "Get on board. Do your business around the country. Fly and enjoy America's great destination spots. Get down to Disney World in Florida. Take your

families and enjoy life, the way we want it to be enjoyed” might be less about the “goals of this nation’s war...to restore public confidence in the airline industry,” which is how Bush marketed the speech, and more about distilling down a very complex issue to the simple things in life, the things Americans presumably want: the freedom to be *an* American.

Concepts and Messages

I built a concept map to understand how some of these issues manifest in the Presidential inaugural speeches since WWII. I recorded and described the concepts, messages, and metaphors used in the speeches while paying attention to the syntax. First, I looked for the words consumption, economy, civic duty, and patriotism. Second, I looked beyond the actual concepts to find similar words, such as “consuming” and “consumption” and ones indicating or representing consumption, such as spending money or accumulating material wealth for the purpose of spending it later. I also recorded concepts that represent “economy” and coded “economic values,” such as when Presidents refer to free markets, financial systems, and messages about how to feel or think about those. I also recorded any concepts and phrases, beyond “civic duty” sharing similar meanings, such as “individual responsibility to government or country,” and inaugural speeches’ direct calls to action asking citizens to do something for America, each other, and/or themselves. I coded “patriotism” with similar terms, such as “patriotic values,” but I also recorded less direct meanings of patriotism, including “the American Dream” when Presidents either denoted what patriotism means or connoted it referring to patriotic values. Finally, because micro-level analysis requires more than just recording

concepts, I also coded messages and metaphors related to the four main themes directly listed in my research question (consumption, economic values, civic duty, and patriotism). The codes overlap in the messages and metaphors. Therefore, although the categories are discrete below, the speeches themselves reflect a much less categorical imperative where “progress,” for example overlaps with “globalization” in certain metaphors given specific contexts.

After reading the twenty inaugural speeches several times and mapping thousands of words and hundreds of relevant concepts, each time looking for concepts, messages, and metaphors related to consumption, civic duty, and patriotism, specific themes emerged. Each speech contains at least ten themes related to the four concepts I sought to connect. I color-coded each speech using the following ten thematic categories:

- 1) *civic duty* indicated by concepts/messages meaning action done for civic reasons, including individual responsibility to America’s well-being, action to maintain government, and directives or suggestions from Presidents about Americans’ responsibilities, obligations, and/or specifically saying duties;
- 2) *consumption* indicated by concepts/messages addressing or similar to maintaining well-being and wealth by spending and/or investing assets to use later in both domestic and global economic markets;
- 3) *meritocracy* indicated by concepts/messages addressing or similar to self-sufficiency, individual work/labor, producing for individual and/or government benefit, and what meritocracy (or working for individual pursuits) is not (for the purpose of highlighting polemic rhetorical strategies);

- 4) *work* indicated by concepts/messages meaning collective and individual labor, securing jobs, careers, and professions, and actionable service investing in America, community, and individual prosperity;
- 5) *economy* and *economic values* indicated by concepts/messages or any textual reference to economy, financial conditions, globally and domestically, the national budget and deficit, concepts that convey the structural/institutional components of money, including macro-economic issues, references to micro-economic issues, and any calls to action or requests for commitment to feeling or thinking about these references in specific ways;
- 6) *progress* indicated by concepts/messages meaning moving toward economic, financial, and/or material improvement, scientific and technological advancements, and recovering from economic hardship or challenges posed by myriad sources for which the resolution was framed as improving individual, social, economic, and/or political conditions;
- 7) *globalization* indicated by concepts/messages relating to greater economic success because of commerce and/or competition with other countries, and messages clearly calling for Americans to cooperate with other countries, including aiding in the defense for certain ones and against others;
- 8) *faith* indicated by concepts/messages such as “God,” “higher power,” and “spirit,” messages relating to believing in God as a pre-requisite for being a dutiful citizen, and encouraging alignment with or adopting faith-based values as citizenship;

- 9) metaphors denoting key concepts (consumption, economic values, civic duty, and patriotism) in specific phrases, stories, or narratives, and/or where various rhetorical devices connote key concepts and messages; and
- 10) paradoxical relationships where conceptual markers imply a not already-coded relationship between consumption, economic values, civic duty, and patriotism.

Distinctions such as spending v. savings are important, too, where Presidents provided direct and/or indirect instructions for where and how to spend or save. Where Presidents minimized savings in speeches, they connoted, depending on the context, consumption, the opposite of saving. For example, during publicized financial crises, such as bank bailouts and chronic inflation, Presidents did not always offer citizens suggestions on how to avoid unmanageable debt, but instead suggested ways citizens could avoid further stagnating economy working to accumulate wealth to consume. Minimizing opportunities to help citizens manage financial crisis and instead focusing on working to consume, for example, deprioritizes saving and prioritizes spending.

Messages and Metaphors

To provide structure when analyzing concepts, messages, and metaphors, Fairclough (1989) suggests asking ten questions of the text to round out the micro-level of analysis. To understand the concepts, Fairclough suggests asking the following questions: “1. What experiential values do words have? 2. What relational values do words have? 3. What expressive values do words have? 4. What metaphors are used?” (1989: 110-111).

For Fairclough, “experiential value is a trace and a cue to the way in which” authors’ represent their experiences of the world (1989: 112-113). Experiential value describes the actual content, but also the knowledge, ideologies, and relationships the content reveals. Relational value describes where in the social world the text is situated, and more precisely, how it might shape social relationships (Fairclough 1989). These two descriptions are even more significant when considering expressive value. Expressive value describes the meaning Presidents assigned by using emotionally- charged words, and therefore, most likely trying to elicit an emotional response, much like brand loyalty anchors.

Unpacking the experiential, relational, and expressive meaning of the inaugural speeches clarified for me how Presidents used specific words, and to some extent, contextual cues, to identify with their audiences or construct a particular set of beliefs for audience adoption. Therefore, describing the content and then situating the speeches within a particular context was important. Building on this, I deepened the codes to reveal the extent language might have connected with audiences on an emotional and social level, a key process in branding.

Metaphors Presidents used to indirectly communicate the importance of consumption are equally important. Although I did not analyze it because it did not meet the temporal parameters of my sample, Roosevelt’s first inaugural speech he delivered on March 4th, 1933 framed a simple yet effective metaphor, therefore, represents a reliable example of this implication. Roosevelt stated, “I assume unhesitatingly the leadership of this great army of our people dedicated to a disciplined attack upon our common

problems.” The “common problems” he referred to are economic as he compared citizens to soldiers. He called for citizens to get back to work, as he elaborated elsewhere in the speech, in much the same way soldiers go to battle: with focus, dedication, and purpose. Citizens were to get back to work and participate in the economy *for* America, a common goal benefiting anyone interested in the financial security of the country, presumably everyone. Overall, looking at what metaphors represent helped me understand how Presidents attempted to identify with citizens through commonality, another key process in branding.

To understand the grammar, Fairclough suggests asking the following questions, “5. What experiential values do grammatical features have? 6. What relational values do grammatical features have? 7. What expressive values do grammatical features have? 8. How are (simple) sentences linked together?” (1989: 111). In this, “[t]he experiential aspects of grammar have to do with the ways in which the grammatical forms of language code happenings or relationships in the word... the people...involved in those happenings or relationships, and their spatial and temporal circumstances” (Fairclough 1989: 120). Words’ experiential value reveal how Presidents framed experiences, not only their own experiences, but citizens’ feelings and thoughts about their experiences of history, events, and the social world. The relational value of grammar describes the modes of sentences (declarative, grammatical question, and imperative), modality of sentences (the authority of the speaker/producer), and the pronouns (first person, second person, choice of Mr./Mrs. rather than first name, for example) Presidents used in sentences (Fairclough 1989). Finding the expressive value in grammar meant defining the

specific words Presidents used to construct or relay specific ideologies and simultaneously establish their authority. In other words, some Presidents camouflaged ideological positions by using specific words to spin, dilute, or hide their agenda (Fairclough 1989). For example, H.W. Bush (1989) referring to someone as “addicted to welfare” rather than someone requiring assistance transformed, at least symbolically, a social problem into an individual one. The former message assigns meaning to an individual’s identity (an uncontrollable addict of something undesirable, as H.W. Bush implied several times in his inaugural speech) and the latter message assumes citizens needing help is based on a situation, perhaps situational poverty or structural inequality, not an individual’s identity.

To understand the textual structure, Fairclough suggests asking, “9. What interactional conventions are used? 10. What larger-scale structures does the text have?” (1989: 111). Question nine did not apply as it requires looking at dialogues rather than monologues, the latter of which inaugural speeches are. However, question ten was important as it encouraged me to look closer at the speeches’ chronological structure and content to see how Presidents prioritized and placed issues within the text itself.

Meso-Level Analysis: Contexts

Meso-level analysis involves interpreting the textual content’s relationship with the social world. Expanding the concept map to include denotative and connotative messages provided some structure to outline this relationship. It also shed light on how Presidents constructed meaning in the messages. I focused on abstract, implied, and subtle messages, but also on what those messages mean within specific social contexts.

Fairclough (1989) suggests analyzing the situational and intertextual context, the surface and meaning of utterances, local coherence, and the texts' overall structure. Fairclough (1989) suggests a series of questions to understand each of these, but summarizes three general goals: 1) interpret situational and intertextual context; 2) summarize discourse types; and 3) thinking about textual production and reconciling interpretations and summaries.

First, I decided what interpretation(s) the audience might have of the situational and intertextual contexts. To understand the situational context of speeches, I identified what the speeches involved, who each involved, in what relations, and to some extent, language's role in shaping events Presidents highlighted in their inaugural speeches (Fairclough 1989). Further, to understand the intertextual context, Fairclough (1989) urges interpreters to remember that “[d]iscourses and the texts which occur in them have histories, they belong to historical series,” and in this, interpretation comes down to a decision about where and to whom the text belongs, which then brings into account the potential power the interpreter has in defining its value (p. 152). I was reflexive. If I failed to reflect on and account for the power I had in deciding *what* is analyzed, *who* is most important to it, *how* the speaker and audience relate, and *how* language matters, then I would have failed the project. In many ways, reflexivity was the most important exercise.

Reflexivity also played an important role in reaching the second goal: summarizing what discourse type(s) Presidents used. Identifying discourse types required evaluating the vernacular, semantics, frames, conventions, and language systems of the

time. For example, in Roosevelt's 1933 inaugural speech referenced above, he compared citizens to an army who should "attack our common problems." During that time, it likely made sense to construct citizens as "soldiers." Doing so constructed working hard as honorable as fighting in a war; both were framed as ways to defend the country and both connoted a sense of civic duty. More importantly to Roosevelt's image, both conveyed a sense of patriotism around a shared enemy: foreign threats, threats to the American way of life (where working to stabilize American economy led to a better America) and threats to American soil (where serving in the military to secure independence and freedom led to a stronger America). Both working and military service in the 1930s was honorable. When Americans could not find work, they could serve their military or country. In this way, everyone had a job to do, despite profound structural economic problems.

The Great Depression led to extreme desperation for so many Americans. Crime rates were high, only those with ample financial resources could access educational opportunities, many were food insecure, healthcare was a luxury reserved only for life-threatening illness for many, and jobs were scarce (US History 2014). Perhaps the climate was right for an extreme call to action. Using discourse that constructed collectivism (an army) rather than individualism (one citizen) most likely made sense in 1933. Americans were all in it together. Instead of competing with each other for scarce jobs, working together to "defeat" the economic crisis connotes the idea that if one person secures a job, everyone benefits. However, in today's political culture, comparing citizens to an army might result in a semantic disaster. Although serving in the "army"

continues as a profound source of patriotism for some Americans, others clearly express resentment. Today, equating citizens with soldiers might connote an offensive message for some Americans, given so many are (and have been vocal about it since mid-century) against war and what it represents, as seen in myriad anti-war protests across the nation since Roosevelt's first inaugural speech.

To take the pulse of situational and intertextual contexts and to start identifying specific types of discourse, I read the New York Time's front page newspaper coverage of each speech the day after Presidents' inaugural speeches and reviewed several commentaries on the each speech. These clues helped account for the ways Presidents structured concepts in their speeches, the concepts' denotative and connotative meanings, and the context in which Presidents delivered their speeches. Understanding the historically-specific language and its structure helped me remain somewhat reflexive.

The third and final objective of meso-level analysis is to think through how Presidents produce texts and to reconcile the above goals. Therefore, this level of analysis, "is concerned with participants' processes of text production as well as text interpretation" (Fairclough 1989: 141). To follow through with this, I double-checked my perceptions of audiences' potential reception against my understanding of how Presidents used specific types of discourse to decide if the text aligned with what audiences were accustomed to hearing and willing to accept at the time. This was by far the most subjective step of my analysis, and therefore, the least reliable, methodologically. Tapping into Presidents' intentions for producing speeches was beyond the scope of this project. That would require also analyzing the relationships Presidents had with their

speech writers, how much freedom Presidents gave their speech writers, and to what extent Presidents relied exclusively on constructing their own speeches. Although these relationships are important, I assumed from the onset Presidents aligned with the messages they delivered in their speeches. Even if each President received help from a professional speech writer, because inaugural speeches set the tone for their terms, they still signed off the overall sentiment and still chose to speak every word written knowing citizens would interpret those messages within specific contexts.

There is no way to entirely eliminate subjectivity to bring about purely objective interpretations, if the latter even exists or should prevail over subjective interpretation. Fairclough (1989) proposes researchers at least check in with their understanding to bring about some reconciliation. Fairclough argues the dialectical interplay of cues and members' resources (MR), which refers to the background knowledge and interpretation procedures of both the audience and myself, generates interpretative power, but this power has limits (1989). I reconciled some of these limits by using my sociological imagination; it was the most valuable resource to CDA. I tapped into this resource while analyzing Presidential inaugural speeches. I applied everything I know about the larger sociohistorical world to interpret the speeches and confirm the context with additional literature for every speech I analyzed. Ultimately, analyzing inaugural speeches Presidents delivered since WWII meant using every sociological tool I have.

Macro-Level Analysis

Macro-level analysis involves explaining the relationships between interpreted messages and the larger social context. The historical context and institutional issues

matter most at this level. Fairclough (1989) suggests asking a series of questions about the speeches to understand its macro-level value. First, to understand the social determinants, I asked, “What power relations at the situational, institutional, and societal levels help shape this discourse?” (Fairclough 1989: 164). Second, to understand the ideological issues at play, which then led to final inquiries about the effects, I asked “How is this discourse positioned in relation to struggles at the situational, institutional, and societal levels? Are these struggles overt or covert? Does it contribute to sustaining existing power relations, or transforming them?” (Fairclough 1989: 166). Finally, developing the sociohistorical connections contributed to the implications.

I contextualized the connections by accounting for three areas. First, I identified the cultural climates in which the Presidents produced and delivered their inaugural speeches. There were limits to this because there is no way to identify a singular cultural climate. However, acknowledging that cultural climates reflect particular ideologies, such as collectivism, individualism, patriotism, or nationalism, for example, helped highlight how speeches aligned with certain values or contributed to cultural constructs. Then, I summarized relevant historical events the speeches address. For example, analyzing speeches that address oil crises in the 1970s required some background on how those crises relate to consumption, and looking at how war impacts American economy helped establish why Presidents may or may not have justified allocating funding to defense rather than other national needs.

Finally, as mentioned, Presidential branding generally explains to what extent Presidents intentionally managed their impressions and images. Intentionality implies

messages Presidents constructed were part of the same package needed to manage, or at least convey, their impressions and images. Managing impressions and images relies on communicating something at a seemingly intimate level. Because branding requires attaching an emotionally-charged message to that communication, Presidents since WWII likely managed messages as part of impression and image management; they tied messages that communicated who they were with messages about their agenda, often ideological constructs. Generally, branding is significant because its marketing contributes to what and how Presidents conveyed messages in speeches. Brands are meant to elicit an emotional response, which when used in specific ways, can anchor brand loyalty.

I reveal the macro-level analysis in Chapter Seven by discussing the implications and conclusions of what the concepts, messages, and metaphors mean (from the micro-level analysis) and their contextual relationship in the social world (meso-level analysis) within the larger social context (macro-level analysis). I reveal the micro-level and meso-level analyses together in Chapters Four, Five, and Six where Presidential inaugural speeches are divided based on their overall messages. I summarize inaugural speeches Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower delivered in Chapter Four; all convey a strong sense of collectivism. I summarize inaugural speeches Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon, and Carter delivered in Chapter Five; all convey a sense of collective individualism. I summarize inaugural speeches delivered by Reagan, H.W. Bush, Clinton, W. Bush, and Obama in Chapter Six; all primarily convey a sense individualism.

Although there is overlap between the micro, meso, and macro levels and the inaugural speeches, analyzing the power Presidential speeches have situated within social structure is the best opportunity to articulate their impact. Therefore, understanding the concepts, messages, and metaphors, is important, but situating those within specific historical contexts deepens their meaning. The most valuable sociological implications come from understanding what meaning Presidents constructed, how they constructed meaning, and how these constructs might continue shaping political culture, impacting social structure, and reflect intersection within institutions reflective of social change.

Reliability and Validity

Fairclough suggests CDA enables researchers to interpret, describe, and explain the relationships between language, social practices, and the social world (Fairclough 1998, Fairclough and Wodak 1997, Wodak 2002). Social constructs and practices constitute situations (Fairclough and Wodak 1997). Because constructs and practices rely on subjective interpretation, CDA is not as reliable as other methods. However, according to van Dijk (2003), CDA is much like “more marginal research traditions,” but it “has to be ‘better’ than other research in order to be accepted” (p. 353). van Dijk (2003) assumes “better” research comes when analysts focus on the core tenants. CDA should focus mainly on “social problems and political issues, rather than on current paradigms and fashions” (van Dijk 2003: 353). It should reflect a multidisciplinary approach and explain, rather than just describe “properties of social interactions and especially social structure,” and ultimately, reveal “the ways discourse structures enact, confirm, legitimate, reproduce, or challenge relations of power and dominance in society” (van

Dijk 2003: 353). Although using this checklist does not ensure reliability, I used this framework to strengthen my reflexivity.

Reflexivity is the most effective way to strive for reliability (Fairclough 1998, Fairclough and Wodak 1997, Rogers 2005, Wodak 2002). Tapping into experiential knowledge allowed reflexive exploration into my relationship with research generally, and more specifically, into any biases I potentially projected onto my findings. Therefore, to minimize bias, I remained reflexive in hopes of also maximizing reliability CDA offers. Therefore, if other sociologists replicated my analysis, by definition, their reflexivity would not yield the exact same results; their experiential knowledge is different than mine. They should yield similar results, however, if they situate their data in the same context (by analyzing branding and exploring the same sociohistorical relationships, for example) and they work with the same content. Rogers et al. (2005) argues one of the leading critiques of CDA, especially with respect to its reliability and validity, is that analysis takes place outside the original context and does not account for its “production, consumption, distribution, and reproduction” (p. 378).

Although analyzing speech writers’ contributions was beyond the scope of this project, as mentioned earlier, to further maximize reliability, I acknowledged for whom (American citizens, other politicians, and global relations), by whom (Presidents, assuming they at least agreed to each sentiment constructed in their inaugural speeches), where (in a specific time period and political culture), and for what purpose speeches were produced (for ceremonial, impression and image managements, and shaping Presidential terms).

There are no existing data revealing exactly how many people heard, saw, and/or read the twenty speeches I analyzed. Therefore, I cannot determine precisely how many people “received” the speeches, so I cannot comment on audience reception beyond applause, laughter, etc. heard in voice and video recordings and those expressions captured in the newspaper articles reviewed. I, of course, cannot reproduce the exact context for which audiences heard the speeches either; instead I built a contextual framework around the speeches to bolster my interpretations. This might help establish some validity.

Rogers et al. (2005) argue triangulating data used in CDA is the best way to establish validity. This involves, according to Rogers et al., verifying analysis with participants/producers, engaging in peer reviews, and maintaining a clear paper trail of the analysis process (2005). Rogers et al. also argue, however, that this “is problematic in a [CDA] framework that rejects the view of an objective and neutral science” (2005: 381). I attempted it anyway. I consulted existing literature, incorporate significant context in my findings below, and accessed relevant secondary data. I cannot verify Presidents’ intent nor consult with them to ensure my analysis reflects that intent. I, of course, shared my analysis with my committee advisors who reviewed the results. I established and maintained clear and organized notes at every level of analysis.

I was reflexive during every step of my analysis, including when I recorded concepts and wrote about results. This required constant awareness that, although the speeches I analyzed reflect certain power structures, that I, too, had power over how I interpreted and explained the data. I am fully aware of what that power means because, as

Wodak suggests, “language is not powerful on its own- it gains power by the use powerful people make of it” (2002: 10). Although Wodak specifically refers to the “opaque [and] transparent structural relationships of dominance,” and how they manifest in the text that critical discourse analysts study, the moment I explained the levels of text, I exercised some authority over it. The moment I wrote my analysis into this project, I took authority over their speeches, at least in a particular context.

Finally, there are limits to how I can use my analysis, including its generalizability beyond context-specific theoretical applications. Explaining how Presidential inaugural speeches reveal a connection between consumption, civic duty, and patriotism, and describing branding’s significance to this, however, offers further insight into how political power manifests. My analysis helps bridge the gap between how we were once a country who “had nothing to fear but fear itself,” as Roosevelt claimed in his first inaugural speech in 1933 to a country who, in 2001, according to W. Bush, had “a decision to make...you are either with us or you are with the terrorists.”

Chapter Four: The Moral Economy Working for a Better America (Micro-Level Content and Meso-Level Context Findings)

In this chapter, I will show how Presidential rhetoric directly leading up to WWII and through the late 1950s constructed civic duty as an obligation to work for America, specifically for the sake of contributing to and stabilizing its economy. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, and Dwight D. Eisenhower's inaugural speeches exemplify this notion and explicitly equate civic duty with working as a reward in and of itself; in their speeches, working is the pathway to individual moral righteousness that defines a moral American economy. Together, Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower welded the first link connecting consumption to civic duty by setting up a foundation where a strong American economy relied on citizens' moral righteousness; the most righteous citizen was one who committed to working for America. They constructed working as the ultimate form of patriotism for which every American was duty-bound to express. Later, Presidents build on this foundation and constructed working beyond a patriotic expression of civic duty *for a better America* into the importance of working *with better Americans* and then defined working as a necessary part of accumulating wealth for consuming in order *to be a better American*.

Franklin D. Roosevelt

Prior to the ratification of Amendment 20 changing the date Presidents took office from March 2nd to January 20th, America waited a few months between elections and inaugurations for official Presidential leadership. Neither the out-going nor in-coming President could exercise power, leaving the country at a standstill. One such standstill

resulting from this Presidential interregnum impacted the country as the months between Roosevelt's first election and first Presidential inauguration left America immobilized by a collapsing economy. Congress was powerless to take action, the former President, Herbert Hoover, could not respond to the structural damage, and Roosevelt, not officially sworn in, could do nothing. By the time Roosevelt took office on March 4th, 1933, Americans, afraid their livelihoods were at serious risk, needed reassuring.

In his first inaugural speech, Roosevelt proposed to the American people that “the only thing we have to fear is fear itself” (1933). From there, Roosevelt introduced The New Deal, a series of policies that, over the next several years, drastically changed social institutions' interdependency with the Federal government and helped end The Great Depression started four years earlier. The Great Depression turned America upside down and forced many citizens into a life they never imagined. According to Van Giezen and Schwenk (2003), “The Great Depression also brought a different approach to viewing economic security. Americans became aware that individuals were not always able to provide for their own security in a modern industrial society” (p. 6).

The Great Depression shifted American's ideologies about their role in a modern economic system, stole from them the comfort of rugged individualism and replaced it with dependency on the collective spirit, and overall, perhaps started to replace unconditional patriotism with a more critical approach to civic duty. In other words, among the many ideological shifts resulting from The Great Depression, Americans were confronted with figuring out not just what it meant to be an American, but how to pursue the American Dream with hardly any resources in an economic climate dampened with

despair they had no control in overcoming. The New Deal helped overcome some of the issues, but there was still work to do.

Franklin D. Roosevelt: 1937 Inaugural Speech

In 1937, the unemployment rate was down from almost 25% in 1933 (when Roosevelt delivered his first inaugural address) to 14.3%, but the country, of course, was not fully recovered (VanGiezen and Schwenk 2003). The lingering economic issues remained at center stage, and the residual poverty hurting so many posed a continued threat to the American Dream. The President responded accordingly, and as the front page of the January 21st edition of The New York Times read in 1937, “Roosevelt Pledges Warfare Against Poverty.” Poverty was the enemy, the common threat Americans were to unify against to save their country.

In 1937, Roosevelt stood in the rain and cold to deliver a speech calling for a change in climate, the moral climate. In this speech, estimated to have been heard by millions who listened to the radio broadcast, Roosevelt asked Americans to celebrate the two-thirds of the population living well, but also urged Americans to consider the:

“millions [“one-third of the nation”] of families trying to live on incomes so meager that the pall of family disaster hangs over them day by day...whose daily lives [are] in...conditions labeled indecent...denied education, recreation, and the opportunity to better their lot...lacking the means to buy products of farm and factory and by their poverty denying work and productiveness to many other millions” (1937).

Roosevelt began his second inaugural speech with a reminder of how far “we” as the Republic came, and how much work there was needed to achieve “the fulfillment of a vision- to speed the time when there would be for all the people that security and peace essential to the pursuit of happiness” (Roosevelt 1937). Of the 1,808 words Roosevelt spoke in his second inaugural address, he said “people” eleven times, and similarly said “nation” and “nations” eleven times. He referred to “government” the most as he said this word sixteen times. However, Roosevelt focused on “progress” most. Although he only mentioned “progress” seven times, he connoted the ways in which America should progress throughout most of this speech and drew clear parallels between it, social justice, and economic welfare.

The first time he connoted progress, he revealed that in the past, without using government as a metaphorical “instrument for our united purpose...we had been unable to create those moral controls over the services of science which are necessary to make science a useful servant instead of a ruthless master of mankind” (Roosevelt 1937). Here, he promoted government intervention as a necessary means to progress. He conceptualized progress as scientific advancement in several areas of his speech, and called for “practical controls over the blind economic forces and blindly selfish men” in order to progress and recover from “dulled conscious, irresponsibility, and ruthless self-interests” that deter progress (Roosevelt 1937). He saw these blinding forces as a sign of social illness and argued its resolution was to “master economic epidemics just as, after centuries of fatalistic suffering we had found a way to master epidemics of disease” (Roosevelt 1937). He set up a call to cure, so to speak, economic and social inequalities.

After summarizing the issues associated with The Great Depression and affirming that the nation rose out of it because of “the new materials of social justice... a more enduring social structure,” Roosevelt equated morality with economic well-being, and in fact saw the best sign of progress as the “change of the moral climate” (1937). He built a metaphor around the idea that for the country to enjoy continued progress, “economic morality pays” and “heedless self-interest [and] bad morals” did not (Roosevelt 1937).

He conveyed the sentiment that bad morality was the same as bad economics. Those with “bad morals” (such as selfishness) were not good for the economy, which was not good for progress, which was not good for democracy. Roosevelt (1937) noted, “[t]he test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much; it is whether we provide enough for those who have too little,” and in this, he began connecting civic duty not to individual prosperity, but to maintaining the nation’s health, including regulating its democratic pulse. Roosevelt proposed that Americans be morally conscious to be economically successful, for America’s benefit.

Roosevelt set up an economic situation by which privilege relied on resolving oppression. He (1937) called attention to those who were well-housed, well-clad, and well-nourished asking them to realize their prosperity would not continue if those without it suffered because eventually those marginalized by economic trouble would not be able to provide the goods they needed that were produced in farms and factories, for example. He argued privilege did not require oppression, but instead depended on lifting those oppressed out of their conditions to contribute to a balanced society requiring a prosperous and progressive economy. He noted, “in our seeking for economic and

political progress as a nation, we all go up or we all go down, as one people” (1937).

According to Krock (1937) of The New York Times, Roosevelt “expressed confidence that there were enough men and women of ‘good will’ in the country to make permanent” the change he asked for in his second inaugural speech (p. 1).

The message was likely received well because it potentially connected with everyone’s emotional investment in their own lives and asked for that same investment into the country’s economic health. He asked those living with plenty to protect what they had by protecting the interests of those who were lacking. He asked those lacking wealth to be patient and wait for a shift in the economic climate, a climate capable of shifting if something as simple as morality shifted. In this, those with plenty had permission to feel good about what they had, given they followed instructions to ensure those lacking were bolstered, and of course, those lacking who were lacking were acknowledged.

Roosevelt did not blame a lack of individual meritocratic effort for social inequality, nor did he indict a culture of poverty, but instead, Roosevelt conceptualized poverty as systemic and epidemic, which potentially solidified an emotional connection with citizens because he did not use them as scapegoat; he empowered them by attributing blame for the country’s economic state to macro systems. He implied the economic system and social structure failed those living in poverty; those living in poverty were not poor people, but instead were victims of an immoral economic climate clouding the country’s health; they were victims of “master economic epidemics” (1937). Tying economic issues metaphorically to the climate and disease sets poverty up

as something beyond control, but that could be easily predicted with the right tools, and easily cleaned up with the right resources. In this context, Roosevelt constructed poverty as inevitable, much like the weather and sickness, and where the by-products were expected and manageable. Therefore, poverty was something that did not happen because of any one person, but instead was something that could happen to anyone and everyone in America, and therefore, something anyone and everyone should fight against knowing the government is on their side.

Reflecting on the vision articulated in his first inaugural speech, Roosevelt reminded Americans in his second one that the Republic, “refused to leave the problems of our common welfare to be solved by winds of chance and the hurricanes of disaster” (1937). Reinforcing the importance of government aid (perhaps to also reinforce the value of The New Deal), Roosevelt claimed individuals were not equipped to handle the “problems of a complex civilization,” including the fallout from a dampened economic climate, without government aid (1937). Framing economic epidemics as inevitable threats coming from a broken system, and situating the residual problems within the complexities of a post-depression era where government aid is required, does not grant control to individuals. Roosevelt, however, gave Americans control by constructing civic duty in a specific way; he urged citizens to enact their civic duty by being moral. Those who were more moral were more dutiful to their country. The government’s job was to handle the systemic issues, and American citizens were to improve their morality.

Roosevelt did not ask Americans to consume anything directly; instead he asked them to invest in moral righteousness, and argued what they would receive in return was

a more equitable, democratic, progressed nation because morality would cure “economic epidemics” where a nation could grow “uncorrupted by cancers of injustice and, therefore, strong among nations in its example of the will to peace” (Roosevelt 1937).

Therefore, Roosevelt argued a dutiful citizen was morally righteous, and good morality would bring about social and economic justice, which meant that Americans were civically responsible, through maintaining their morality, for their own country’s health. According to Roosevelt, Americans’ actions, beliefs, and momentum toward progress, thus curing “economic epidemics,” should not be for individual reasons, but instead for the collective benefit; for a better America. In this, Roosevelt constructed progress toward social and economic justice, including pursuing both as part of the American Dream as a collective effort; citizens were all in it together, “as a nation, we all go up, or else we all go down, as one people” (Roosevelt 1937).

Roosevelt was popular among the American people; he won four Presidential elections. His inclusive approach to governing was his brand, or the salient message used, perhaps not intentionally, to elicit emotional connectedness. So many of his policies, including those in the New Deal, made the American Dream more accessible. His Fireside Chats, connoting comfort and warmth, brought him into the homes of Americans to keep them aware of how their government worked for them. He situated himself as *an* American citizen rather than *the* American President. This is evident in the language he used in his second inaugural speech, with one important exception.

In his second inaugural speech, Roosevelt said “we” almost exclusively when revealing the benefits of progress, the need to work together, and the struggles Americans

endured. By using this first person point of view, he joined the American people in working toward a better America and shared their suffering and struggles. At the same time, the undertones reveal his attempts to persuade Americans that government was their servant, rather than their master, which in some ways, contradicts the denotation that Americans had a civic duty to serve their government through moral righteousness.

By not acknowledging this was actually a request for service, albeit a noble request, he instead echoed government's promise to serve them instead. Roosevelt declared, "I assume the solemn obligation of leading the American people forward along the road over which they have chosen to advance. While this duty rests upon me I shall do my utmost best to speak their purpose and to do their will..." (1937). This is the only time in the speech where Roosevelt denoted that he and Americans were not "we," but instead when it comes to Americans' voice and will, "they" were entitled to their own for which he would serve. Although he determined America's social and economic health based on the moral climate, and held Americans responsible for regulating that climate, the parting sentiment is that he was their servant; their only duty was to forfeit individual interest and adopt moral righteousness.

Roosevelt clearly expected all Americans to improve morality in an effort to improve economics. For Roosevelt, bad morals equaled bad economics; therefore, good morals equaled good economics because if there were too many people acting out of selfishness, for example, the whole country would suffer. To reduce selfishness, Roosevelt argued the country should increase morality. Americans' duty to their country, as Roosevelt conveyed in his second inaugural speech, was to make good choices about

how they prospered so that progress was tempered with an awareness that what one person did impacted everyone. This meant if wealth was accumulated on the backs of the oppressed, then the moral compass on which the country's economic success relied would be compromised, which meant the economy would suffer.

Roosevelt's inaugural speech highlights the most salient connection between consumption, economic values, civic duty, and patriotism by encouraging all Americans to be moral so all patriotic citizens could participate in economy by buying homes, securing "human comforts," and maintaining basic needs. However, more consistently, Roosevelt tied civic duty to maintaining morality, and then equated morality with ensuring all Americans had their basic needs met, and then equated meeting basic needs with progress. He noted, "[t]he test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much; it is whether we provide enough for those who have little" (1937). Therefore, civic duty required improving morality, citizens should work toward progress, consumption was for basic needs, and demonstrating patriotism was about serving those who need more than those who have plenty.

Franklin D. Roosevelt: 1941 Inaugural Speech

Roosevelt echoed these sentiments in his January 6th, 1941 State of the Union address, just fourteen days before delivering his third inaugural speech. This particular State of the Union address is commonly referred to as the "Four Freedoms" speech because Roosevelt (1941) proposed that all people throughout the world should have freedom to: 1) express themselves; 2) worship God as they saw fit; 3) not want for anything; and 4) avoid fear. Because this State of the Union address systematically

outlines his plan for securing democracy worldwide, it was possible he gave himself permission to take a more philosophical rather than pragmatic approach to this third inaugural speech; he had already provided the country with a practical agenda.

Kluckhohn (1941) notes that “one word describes the way the first American President to win a third term felt on the first day of his third administration-exhilaration” (p. 1). There were only a few moments throughout the day, as Kluckhohn reveals, where Roosevelt was not visibly exhilarated: “when he prayed in church, delivered his philosophical inaugural address, and alertly watched mechanized equipment” (1941: 1). His inaugural speech represents, therefore, one of only three times that day when Roosevelt suspended his celebratory expressions to convey a more serious and solemn, as Kluckhohn describes, presence. His speech addresses the feelings and thoughts that were on so many minds and hearts of Americans.

By 1941, World War II had already claimed many lives, but America did not officially become involved until the end of that year when Japan bombs Pearl Harbor. Americans likely felt the crisis, though. Although Roosevelt spoke 1,359 words in his third inaugural address, not one of them was “war.” Instead, he softened the reality pending with the sentimentality of nostalgia coupling it with a respite in spirituality. He spoke of times passed, way passed. Conjuring up America’s founding fathers and taking the focus off threats from a world war, Roosevelt began his speech reminding Americans that in George Washington’s “day the task of the people was to preserve that Nation from disruption from within...to save that Nation and its institutions from without” (1941). He went on to praise, and almost granted deity status to, democracy. Just four years earlier,

he tied democracy to progress and urged Americans to serve their country by maintaining collective moral righteousness to cure “economic epidemics” that contradicted progress, and therefore, opposed democracy. Therefore, for Roosevelt, democracy required progress.

Roosevelt used the word “nation” the most by saying it twelve times. He said “democracy,” “life,” and “spirit” each nine times. Further, he said “America” and “people” seven times, and “freedom” six times. Of all the words he spoke, along with saying “know” ten times, he said those above the most constituting over 12% of the speech. This percentage is not that valuable quantitatively; however, the ways in which Roosevelt used these words speaks volumes to their qualitative significance.

Instead of asking Americans to serve their country by investing in moral righteousness, Roosevelt used metaphor to convey the shift from a sense of morality to national affairs, democracy, humanity, and spirit. He argued, “[l]ives of the Nation are determined not by the count of years, but by the lifetime of the human spirit,” and paralleled this sentiment by noting, “[t]he life of a Nation is the fullness of the measure of its will to live” (1941). He asked that Americans value the Nation in the same way they valued their lives. He claimed, “[a] Nation, like a person, has a body...a mind...something deeper...more permanent...larger than the sum of all its parts. It has something that matters to its future” (1941). The future rested on “the spirit-the faith of America” (Roosevelt 1941).

He asked Americans to remain faithful to democracy, specifically, to the spirit of democracy; the tone of the speech connotes a sense of urgency and, paradoxically,

desperate hope. He barely mentioned tangible resources and benefits, and instead clearly relied on the promise that faithfulness in the value and spirit of democracy would bring about national health. He promised, in the closest reference to the possibility of America's involvement in the war, that "the preservation of the spirit and faith of the Nation does, and will, furnish the highest justification for every sacrifice that we may make in the cause of national defense" (1941).

In this, he did not limit national health to simply being free from disease, such as free from "economic epidemics," as he did in his second inaugural speech of 1937, but equated national health to a body ("one that must be fed, clothed and housed"), mind ("kept informed and alert, that must know itself"), and spirit ("the faith in America") balance (1941). He recognized "[w]ithout the body and the mind, as all men know, the Nation could not live," but prioritized faith in the spirit of America and democracy when he reflected on the importance of losing it noting, "if the spirit of America were killed, even if the Nation's body and mind, constricted in an alien world, lived on, the America we know would have perished" (1941).

The residual imagery is both bleak and hopeful. Roosevelt indicated this by noting, "[n]o, Democracy is not dying," implying there was a reason to believe it might be, and then later by the direct calls for Americans to preserve their faith in democracy, as mentioned above, implying that the country was dying and Americans should do their civic duty: preserve it with their faith.

The syntax reveals awareness without claiming authority. For example, Roosevelt (1941) seemed to understand that claiming "[t]he life of a Nation is the fullness of the

measure of its will to live” might not cement the bedrock of democracy in any measurable way. He immediately followed with, “[t]here are men who doubt this...who believe that democracy, as a form of government and a way of life, is limited or measured by a kind of mystical and artificial fate that, for some unexplained reason, tyranny and slavery have become the surging wave of the future-and that freedom is an ebbing tide” (Roosevelt 1941) He then offered reassurance with, “we Americans know that this is not true” (Roosevelt 1941). Roosevelt likely arranged these statements to imply that anyone who disagreed with this version of measuring national health was either tyrannical, un-American, or did not see freedom as fixed. Further, as Roosevelt did in his last inaugural speech, he joined Americans in the first person, “we,” to shed the authorial voice and instead take on a representative tone.

Roosevelt denoted a of urgency, but connoted a historical connection. Toward the middle of the speech, Roosevelt (1941) referred to Middle Ages, the Magna Charta, Mayflower Compact, the Declaration of Independence, and the Gettysburg Address where he conjured the past and paid homage to “the mostly plain people-who sought here, early and late, to find freedom more freely.” He conjured the spirits of those who made these strides toward securing democracy, and in this, reemphasized the importance that “[i]t is not enough to clothe and feed the body of this Nation, to instruct and inform its mind. For there is a spirit. And of the three, the greatest is the spirit” (1941).

Connecting the message to the past reinforced the immediate need to maintain faith in democracy because it was a reminder that Americans owed what they had to those who came before them, and the sacrifice and investment in the country he asked Americans to

offer, pledging their faith and spirit, was no more than what those in the past gave to establish the country for them. The country belonged to everyone, in this sense, and the urgency to preserve it and its democracy, was everyone's civic duty, just as it was of those who forged the important historical moments mentioned above.

He concluded with another historical reference: his and George Washington's sentiments. Roosevelt claimed, "if we let [the] scared fire of liberty and the destiny of the republic model of government," as George Washington noted in 1789 "be smothered with doubt and fear-then we shall reject the destiny which Washington strove so valiantly and so triumphantly to establish" (1941). In Roosevelt's first inaugural speech, he noted that we only need to be fearful of fear itself. By providing a reminder that fear was not the American way, he cautioned against becoming doubtful and fearful for the sake of "[t]he preservation of the spirit and faith of the Nation" (1941). The metaphor of investment is clear: tend to the roots and strengthen the branches of democracy so the winds of change did not break the American spirit.

Perhaps Roosevelt was able to connect emotionally with citizens through this excitement, and then set it aside to pay homage to the world-wide conflicts and sacrifice to which Americans at the time were sensitized. If he were jubilant during his inaugural speech, it would have certainly trivialized the message. Therefore, Roosevelt needed to express a more solemn tone to convey a sense of seriousness for the message he delivered. Roosevelt also conveyed a sense of connectedness with the "common man," and failing to address the concerns of common men would have been disastrous to his term. In some ways, Roosevelt's brand relied on this connectedness and his political

credibility to maintain this connection reliant on appearing simultaneously as *a* citizen and *the* President, a strong and preserving leader. These qualities would be required of every citizen as the country would prepare for war just a few years later, and Roosevelt already established himself as a model of that resilience.

Roosevelt contracted polio in the 1920s, and as a result, his physical and emotional demeanor suffered; he endured, however, and managed to present an impression with which citizens could identify. He constructed himself as a survivor, not a victim, a quality that would serve him well later. By the time Roosevelt's gubernatorial campaign gained momentum, several newspapers featured him, but as Houck and Kiewe (2003) note, journalists respected his request to refrain from photographing him being lifted out of cars, onto stairs, etc. However, his physical compromises were still caught on film, and therefore, the potential for those images to construct his vulnerability were likely relatively high. The potential never really played out, though.

Roosevelt used his disability to his advantage and highlighted how and to what extent the human spirit could and should overcome challenges. Houck and Kiewe claim, "Roosevelt mounted an energetic [gubernatorial] campaign that, with hindsight, would be a useful dress rehearsal for the presidential campaign of 1932. His campaign strategy in countering the health issue 'was to display himself frequently and vigorously to the electorate of New York'" (2003: 44).

Roosevelt, often in humorous ways, countered backlash and suggestions that he was somehow weakened by his challenges by making it a point to display his strengths, which in effect, minimized any weakness others might project. He overcame the stigmas

associated with physical disability, one of which was a sign of lacking virility, a socially-constructed pre-requisite for political competence. Houck and Kiewe summarize this pre-requisite by noting that “physical fitness had an important corollary-that of masculinity. The more physically fit, in other words, the more masculine. And, of course, only fully masculine men were ‘capable’ of doing politics in the public sphere” (2003: 67).

Times have changed a little bit, but Roosevelt likely used as many opportunities as he could to demonstrate his physical fitness to ensure American knew he was “in control of his own body, aggressive when needed, and capable of decisive, physical action on a moment’s notice” (Houck and Kiewe 2003: 67). Roosevelt branded himself a man of action, one who could overcome obstacles, one who could deal with whatever life threw him, and one who was strong, could persevere, and most of all, maintain resilience. He used this brand to convey action-related metaphors American citizens could bravely take on, just as he did. His bravery was found even in smaller accomplishments. For example, “Roosevelt frequently employed metaphors of the body that proved useful for his aspirations. He was the candidate who was ‘running,’ ‘standing,’ ‘going up and down,’ ‘looking ahead,’ and ‘getting a firm footing’” (Houck and Kiewe 2003: 115).

These metaphors appeared in his third inaugural speech. Roosevelt did not ask citizens to enact civic duty by improving the moral climate. Instead, he summarized the history of government highlighting important events that reflected his definition of democracy. In this, he built metaphors conveying a sense of nostalgia and constructed civic duty tied to working for a better America and patriotism. He constructed the strength of bodies equal to the strength of nations. In demonstrating his own strength,

perseverance, and reliable, he modeled for Americans how to overcome the struggles the country could see on the horizon.

Between his frequent “Fireside Chats” where he spoke to Americans in ways that metaphorically called them around as family, and sustaining the use of metaphors to highlight the importance of serving the nation no matter what, and the connectedness to the American people through these devices, he set up a brand where Americans’ loyalty could be clearly anchored as he was, of course, very popular and nominated for a third and fourth term. However, perhaps the most significant symbol his brand represented might be one in which he presented as a patriarch, rather than a politician. Americans could rely on him to take care of them in times of need, and especially in times of war.

America officially entered WWII in December, 1941, just eleven months after Roosevelt delivered his third inaugural speech; however, the war was already in full force and Americans were already involved in other ways. The Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 passed in September, just a few months before Roosevelt’s third term began. This Act required all men between 21 and 35 to register for the draft, which for WWII, started in October of 1940. Therefore, by the time the United States was formally involved in the war, Americans were already drafted into the conflicts. Within months of the Act passing, the age parameters of the draft expanded to include just about any able-bodied man at least eighteen years old through those reaching their mid-sixties. It is likely an understatement to say Americans knew it was only a matter of time before the United States would be forced to take a more active role in the war.

Instead of asking for more direct action from citizens, Roosevelt constructed patriotism in his third inaugural address to presumably both anchor national unity and justify the defense of democracy. Roosevelt constructed patriotism as the pre-requisite for civic duty; to be a dutiful citizen meant to be patriotic, and to be patriotic meant to honor and keep democracy alive, specifically the version on which America was founded. Roosevelt reviewed several historical events that together add up to at least one important message: those who came before also sacrificed for the freedoms enjoyed today; to sacrifice today means to secure freedom for the next generation, and to secure freedom means to secure democracy. Roosevelt did not, however, explicitly reveal what sacrifices Americans were to make. Instead, he focused on ways to keep democracy alive through a commitment to patriotism, which involved “enlisting the full force of men’s enlightened will” because “[t]he life of a Nation is the fullness of the measure of its will to live” (Roosevelt 1941).

There is no direct connection between consumption and civic duty in Roosevelt’s third inaugural speech. He constructed economic values briefly in the context of stabilizing American democracy reliant on citizens’ domestic comfort. However, he clearly constructed a parallel between civic duty and a commitment to patriotism through a metaphor where America was almost anthropomorphized. In this, he set up civic duty reliant on nurturing patriotism, much like a person might nurture another, and set up democracy’s livelihood reliant on patriotism. In other words, to be a dutiful citizen, an American was patriotic; patriotism was the nourishment democracy needed. Roosevelt argued,

“[a] Nation, like a person, has a body—a body that must be fed and clothed and housed...[a] Nation, like a person, has a mind—a mind that must be kept informed and alert...[a] Nation, like as person, has something deeper, something more permanent, something larger than the sum of its parts...we understand what it is—the spirit-faith of America...it is not enough to clothe and feed the body of this Nation, to instruct, and inform its mind. For there is the spirit. And of the three, the greatest is spirit” (1941).

Roosevelt held the spirit of the Nation in highest regard, and subsequently, faith in the Nation was the highest priority. Because there were no other calls to action in this speech, and because the only investment Roosevelt connoted asked Americans to give their will to the Nation, offer their faith in America, and nurture the American spirit, civic duty was not about consuming. Civic duty was about having faith in the country; it was about believing American democracy was worth fighting for; it was about understanding the value of the good life reflective of a moral economy; and it all rested upon a set of beliefs that fostered a sense of unity: patriotism.

Franklin D. Roosevelt: 1945 Inaugural Speech

By 1945, Roosevelt was very sick. His fourth and final inaugural speech was short and he delivered it in “slow measured tones,” and as just as third inaugural address was, this last one also “took a philosophical view of history, noting its ups and downs” (Crider 1945: 26 and 1). The tone of this speech was by far the most paradoxical of all his speeches: he threaded together a sense of defeatism with optimism. Surrounded by his large family on the inaugural stage, he “stressed more heavily than any other passage in

his address...[the] ‘fearful cost’ that we had learned the lessons of recent years,” and then called for “a ‘Better Life’ ...for ‘all our fellow-men’” for which this latter phrase “was given special emphasis in the unusually slow-spoken and carefully enunciated address” (Crider 1945:1). Roosevelt also made a special effort to highlight “a just a durable peace” as his “chin lifted” during this part of the speech “as he peered over the crowd...[with] complete confidence ” (Crider 1945: 26).

Crider (1945) notes that Roosevelt changed some of the language in the speech. For example, Crider (1945) reveals Roosevelt says “decency” where “democracy” was written at beginning of the speech. Roosevelt wrote, “supreme test...of courage-of our resolve-of our wisdom-of our essential democracy” (Roosevelt 1945). Perhaps it was intentional, or perhaps it is a mistake. Either way, it is clear that where democracy was inserted in the written text of the speech, Roosevelt conveyed decency. In this, he equated democracy with decency, and because this marked the first time global citizenry was mentioned in an inaugural speech, the Americans who “learned to be citizens of the world” were constructed as decent “members of the human community” (Roosevelt 1945).

America officially entered WWII a little over four years prior to Roosevelt delivering his last inauguration address. By early 1945, millions of people were wounded or killed world-wide, including an estimated over 400,000 Americans (World War II Foundation and National WWII Museum). The impact of this continues to be immeasurable, and beyond direct losses, the damage done to families cannot be quantified. In a strange parallel, the attendance at Roosevelt’s last inaugural address

reflected, in some ways, these losses. Crider (1945) notes, “about 7,000 invitations [to the address] were issued, [but] there were probably fewer than 5,000 persons inside the White House grounds, with perhaps another 3,000 of the general public standing beyond the south fence” (p. 26). Americans simply did not show up as expected to this event; they were not there to share in this momentous occasion. They were gone.

If there is any connection between consumption, economic values, civic duty, and patriotism in Roosevelt’s last inaugural speech, it is in the way he constructed globalization where the interdependency of America with other countries was essential. He noted, “[w]e have learned that we cannot live alone, at peace; that our own well-being is dependent on the well-being of other Nations, far away” (Roosevelt 1945). Clearly, Roosevelt constructed dutiful citizens as a globally sensitive ones, and in doing this, set up a pathway for citizens to embrace rather than fear other countries. This pathway might justify international commerce, too, where doing business world-wide, rather than containing it to American soil, could be framed as a peace-keeping measure. The connection was not direct. However, if patriotism was defined as aligning with “decency” and “moral principle” to foster democracy, and civic duty required welcoming instead of fearing international cooperation, then the spike in consumerism that would follow the end of WWII might be primed by the idea that to be a dutiful citizen, Americans should embrace a globalized world, for which Roosevelt clearly advocated, and perhaps a globalized economy that would soon come.

Although there are tremendous losses because of WWII, there are significant social advances. For example, many men left the workforce for the war, and women were

able to claim their rightful places in it. Roosevelt addressed another dimension of the changing landscape in a brief comment where he noted, “men, of all races and colors and creeds, could build our solid structure of democracy,” therefore, highlighting perhaps a more ethnically and racially diverse political awareness, too (1945). The war industries created new opportunities for economic development and social welfare policies started to address systemic poverty.

Roosevelt’s final inaugural speech marked a three year investment America made to World War II. He spoke 559 words. Other than George Washington’s second inaugural address in 1793, which was 135 words, Roosevelt’s final inaugural speech remains the shortest in history. In some ways, the tone paralleled Roosevelt’s life and the course America was on for a while. By Roosevelt’s fourth term, American was exhausted from the war as was he. In this last inaugural speech, Roosevelt, maintaining the first person, “we,” throughout, interpreted the struggles endured through the war as progress, and reframed moral righteousness around it.

Interestingly, Roosevelt’s last speech represents the first time globalization was conceptualized in an inaugural speech. The country was involved in a world war; American lives were impacted by the global issues for which the war was fought. Therefore, it made strategical sense to acknowledge these issues on this platform. Roosevelt addressed global affairs almost as a prophet as he summarized the lessons learned from the war that eventually justify the rationale for a globalized economy. He urged Americans to keep their heads out of the sand, and “live as men not as ostriches, nor as dogs in the manger” (1945). He revealed, “[w]e have learned that we cannot live

alone, at peace, that our own well-being is dependent on the well-being of other Nations, far away” (1945). Then, he introduced a new version of civic duty: “[w]e have learned to be citizens of the world, members of a human community” reminding Americans again, as he did in his previous inaugural speeches, that “[w]e can gain no lasting peace if we approach it with suspicion and mistrust or with fear” (1945).

Roosevelt’s did not call for consumption in his last inaugural speech, nor did he tie consumption to civic duty and patriotism. The only time Roosevelt mentioned profit was when he claimed the lessons learned came at a “fearful cost,” but “we shall profit from them” (1945). However, of all the inaugural speeches he delivered, in the one he established the clearest directive for Americans to work with, rather against, other nations, thus setting up an important economic value.

Working to enact civic duty was not just to bring about peace, although out of the few words spoken, he said “peace” six times, more than any other word, but it was to bring about a way for Americans to reflect on what peace would cost. It costed sacrifice Americans made; he asked them to continue making sacrifices. It costed an investment in the spirit of America and democracy; he asked to invest it anyway. It costed lives. Americans had to pay anyway.

Because Americans were asked to accept these realities and the ways Roosevelt justified them, in effect, he asked the, to consume an ideology. As Roosevelt (and other Presidents preceding) implied, part of civic duty required paying for freedom. The price was twofold: sacrificing for war and investing their spirit, both of which were in response

to the promise that pursuing the American Dream would always be available and valuable.

America's landscape changed during his terms. New identities formed. New roles were assigned. New norms were emerging for individuals and institutions. New hopes were finding their way into America's heart. Americans witnessed the horrifying tragedies of war, but also saw that, despite the losses and overwhelming despair, democracy survived with its values intact. The question of America's spirit was answered; their commitment to patriotism was paying off well. They were going to be safe.

Harry S. Truman

Truman inherited the Presidency from Roosevelt in April, 1945, and seven months later, WWII ended, which marked the dawning of a new consumer era. By the end of 1945, America was war torn, but rejuvenated by emerging social changes. Not everyone embraced these changes, but there is no doubt that society was evolving for better or worse. It, of course, did not happen overnight because no evolutionary processes ever do, but culture shifted dramatically during and after WWII creating a new labor pool and new opportunities for those workers. Women entered the workforce while men were at war. Therefore, WWII released many women from domestic labor, work not previously nor explicitly constructed as civic duty, or even valuable in other ways, because it did not give back to the economy directly, and offered them a slice of the public sphere. After the war, emerging consumer culture concurrently increasing with

technological innovations created new opportunities for all citizens to work in the public sphere, including women.

After WWII, the productive labor force was growing as more women took a slice of the public sphere and as innovation and technology created more markets within which to work. Women earning money of their own, along with a sense of independence and ability to fulfill civic duty not granted through previous constructs, were able to stake a claim in the changing economic landscape. For the first time in America's history, both men and women could be dutiful citizens under Roosevelt's previous constructs. As the late 1940s approached, women were more than reproductive laborers, although it is hard to imagine a duty more valuable than this. Women, particularly middle class women, by the late 1940s had a small but profound voice in the economic market. Their dollars mattered more when Truman took office than ever before; all potential consumers mattered.

With the war over and America's new consumer culture promising material prosperity tied to happiness, Truman had a tough road ahead. He had to grab hold of the ideological reigns foreshadowing materialism and direct America back to nostalgic sentiments of collective patriotism. Truman used fear to recapture this sentiment. Americans were already accustomed to thinking about world affairs and how specific governments could threaten specific parts of America. After WWII, however, politicians and media framed these threats increasingly more generally and locally, and therefore with the potential of more applicability, than before. By the late 1940s, everyone was expected to fear Communism and the Cold War, both of which threatened, not just

American soil, but the entire American way of life, the new one built around economic freedom, technological advancements, and endless possibilities.

Harry S. Truman: 1949 Inaugural Speech

According to White (1949), Truman began his first and only inaugural speech fourteen minutes late and remained solemn, “with this chin thrust forward...[delivering] his speech...without intensity or evidence of special feeling” (p. 1). This was not the first time Truman was expected to be Presidential. Truman took over the Presidency just four months after Roosevelt took his final oath in 1941. Therefore, Truman had already served almost four years as President before delivering his inaugural speech.

Truman (1949) began his 2,273 word inaugural speech requesting Americans pray for, encourage, and support him, and then work with him for “the welfare of the Nation and for the peace of the world.” He said “Nations” and “nation” thirty-six times total, the most of any concept in his speech, and “world” thirty-three times, the second most spoken word while he referenced the first person, “we,” throughout. Truman spent the first part summarizing the brutality of the previous wars and the constitutional rights, presumably, they defended. Emphasizing the role that “we believe” faith played, specifically faith in God, in securing democracy, he built an argument against Communism implying salvation from it rested in faith, among a few other duties, as he argued, “[w]ith God’s help, the future of mankind will be assured in a world of justice, harmony, and peace” (1949).

Just two years before Truman delivered his first and only inaugural speech, he foreshadowed these latter themes when he offered the Truman Doctrine (1947) to

Congress asking Greece and Turkey for financial and political support (and by implication, also requested this from other democratic nations). This doctrine later became the foundation for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) that Congress signed into effect April, 1949 representing America's clear political involvement in world affairs, both in support and defense. He knew what was coming, and knew the country's expectations of him and the political climate in which he served.

When he delivered his inaugural speech, he also knew he was not likely eligible for the next Presidential term. The twenty-second amendment, passed in 1947 and ratified in 1951, limited the number of Presidential terms to two, and Truman's almost four years preceding his first inaugural speech counted as one. Despite being ineligible for another term and despite being the first inaugural address televised (in black and white) where actually being there was not the only way to access it, Truman's speech was very well-attended in Washington DC. White's (1949) headline in the New York Times, although probably a bit hyperbolic, claims, "More than a Million Roar in Approval of Inauguration" (p. 1). Of these "million roars," White also notes, "[t]heir voices, making a hoarse medley of all the accents of the United States of America, beat strongly against the endless brass thumping of the endless brass bands" (1949: 1). The energy was high when Truman outlined his Point Four Program; it was already primed by and echoed his doctrine.

Truman saw Communism as a threat to democracy, and implied faith in God was the salvation from it along with world trade for which "we" should all be concerned. He set up a seemingly quick fix to the problem as he justified his Point Four Program,

“These differences between communism and democracy do not concern the United States alone. People everywhere are coming to realize that what is involved is material well-being, human dignity, and the right to believe in and worship God. I state these differences, not to draw issues of belief as such, but because the actions resulting from the Communist philosophy are a threat to the efforts of free nations to bring about world recovery and lasting peace” (Truman 1949).

This is key because in the next part of the speech, Truman detailed these global connections connoting strong imagery to illustrate how and why international relations were mutually beneficial, and building on Roosevelt’s sentiments about global citizenry, advanced the metaphor that citizenship was global, at least with respect to certain parts of the globe. He outlined his Point Four Program asking for: 1) the United Nations to spread democracy world-wide; 2) expanded global economic recovery plans for Europe; 3) increased defense measures for “freedom-loving” countries; and 4) shared scientific and industrial advancements with underdeveloped countries (Truman 1949). Truman asked for investors in his Point Four Program and as such, requested those with private capital spend their wealth to invest in world peace, including peace in and *for* America. With this program, Truman promised to deter Communism and defend democracy, the latter of which continues to be central to patriotism. Therefore, this request was framed as civic duty because the action was meant *for* America.

Arguing “[i]t must be a worldwide effort for the achievement of peace, plenty, and freedom,” he urged Americans to enact their civic duty and join the effort because

“[w]ith the cooperation of business, private capital, agriculture, and labor, this program [Point Four Program] can greatly increase the industrial activity in other nations and can raise substantially their standards of living” (Truman 1949). Although he specifically included three occupations, lumping all others into “labor” made it easy for anyone employed, or doing any kind of labor, to identify with this and to heed the call to action: to be dutiful citizens. It was, therefore, production and labor, not consumption that Truman tied to civic duty. In this link, he built patriotism around a sense of pride in producing and laboring for the international market and advanced economic values tied to working. Truman molded the first link connecting consumption to civic duty and patriotism with this sentiment; specifically, he shaped “cooperation of...private capital...and labor” together outlining the pattern. Truman’s outline did not take shape as a strong connection between consumption, economic values, civic duty, and patriotism, but two tandemly-related themes are clear.

Truman set up one theme where those with private capital to invest could be dutiful citizens, and those without this resource could not, not in this way. Those without private capital could invest their labor; they could demonstrate their commitment to the Point Four Program through meritocratic ways where if they worked hard, then they could be dutiful citizens and protect democracy. Truman set up a second theme where those willing to work hard could earn more than a paycheck; they could earn democratic freedom, something far more meaningful than material wealth and far more important to citizenship, at least as Truman conceptualized it.

Between these two themes, the wealthy and the laborers, albeit not mutually exclusive, could (and should, according to Truman), do something as dutiful citizens to “earn” their freedom and protect America all the while making sure the “[g]uarantees to the investor must be balanced by guarantees in the interest of the people whose resources and whose labor go into these developments” (Truman 1949).

If economic recovering relied on international trade, then American’s role in this recovery process was to embrace and invest in globalized commerce. This meant Americans were to do business with other countries; peace itself depended on it. He argued, “peace and freedom will emphasize...unfaltering support for the United Nations,” continuing contributions to “world economic recovery,” an investment in “freedom-loving nations against the dangers of aggressors,” and “a bold new program for making the benefits of scientific advances and industrial progress available for the improvement and growth of underdeveloped areas” (Truman 1949). Clearly, Truman advanced the sentimentality of globalization Roosevelt did years earlier. In this, Truman (1949) explicitly tied economic values and civic duty to world trade, by revealing, “[e]conomic recovery and peace itself depend on increased world trade.”

Truman summarized the global condition whereby “[m]ore than half the people in the world are living in conditions approaching misery. Their food is inadequate. They are victims of disease. Their economic life is primitive and stagnant. Their poverty is a handicap and a threat to both them and to more prosperous areas” (1949). In the first part, Truman established the emotional connection between himself and citizens, and in the last sentence he rationalized his calls to action.

Constructing the need to contribute to world trade as something that inevitably benefits domestic economy also conjured Roosevelt's earlier requests where improving the economic moral climate would not just benefit those immersed in it and impacted by the "primitive" conditions of it, but also those affected by the residual by-products of it. In this, Truman connected himself to Roosevelt's brand, or at least conjured the same emotional connection and approval Roosevelt anchored from Americans, and built an emotional connection between himself and citizens stemming from fear, specifically a fear of Communism.

Truman's anti-Communist focus was almost hostile in tone, and the syntax appears purposeful. He used short, simple sentences allowing the listener to slow down a bit and pay closer attention in a shorter range. Further, Truman punctuated the messages with powerful sentiments. For example, he claimed,

"Communism maintains that social wrongs can be corrected only by violence. Democracy has proved that social justice can be achieved through peaceful change. Communism holds that the world is so widely divided into opposing classes that war is inevitable. Democracy holds that free nations can settle differences justly and maintain a lasting peace" (1949).

Truman set up a clear contrast where: Communism equaled violence and inevitable war, and Democracy equaled progressive change and lasting peace. This contrast framed the punch on which faith provided a soft pillow to land. Truman, as noted above, also used it to justify his Point Four Program relying on international cooperation, and more importantly as it revealed an indirect connection between consumption, economic values,

and civic duty, through the ways in which it called for Americans cooperation in world trade.

Overall, it seems Truman considered dutiful citizens as those who could contribute to world trade, which he then tied to “[e]conomic recovery and peace itself.” Therefore, those who could engage in international commerce should contribute more to recovering both economic prosperity and world peace. Civic duty, thus, meant playing a role in advancing world peace, a significant pay off, and balancing global economy, another achievement of which to be proud. Although White (1949) remarks that “only those who were relatively the elite were able actually to see Mr. Truman,” the President called just about everyone to enact civic duty, to work.

Truman constructed civic duty as contributing to world trade and argued citizens should work to contribute. Therefore, the connection Truman made between consumption, economic values, civic duty, and patriotism was neither direct nor clearly outlined, but he did draw a line from civic duty to participation in global commerce where the currency Americans could trade in was their labor. The more Americans worked for the country, the more dutiful they could be, and therefore, those investing more of their labor were more dutiful citizens, global citizens that is, for which American patriotism relied.

Dwight D. Eisenhower

The Employment Act of 1946 requires updates on the economy from the President. On January 14, 1953, just a week before he was to hand over the Presidency to Eisenhower, Truman, delivered a twenty-seven page Economic Report to the Congress.

Along with it, Truman delivered an almost one hundred thirty page Annual Economic Review the Council of Economic Advisers prepared for him. Truman's report primarily summarized America's economic prosperity and the role the Employment Act plays in that, revealed the importance that Americans remain employed full-time for continued prosperity, and highlighted areas for improvement (1953). There is no way to know how much of this report informed Eisenhower's first inaugural speech delivered just a week later, but it is safe to assume it provided some information as the President elect was sure to have at least been briefed of its contents.

Truman reviewed evidence of Americans' prosperity specifically by detailing the growing population, increasing standard of living and incomes, rise in home ownership, acquisition of creature comforts (such as automobiles, refrigerators, etc.), and credit lines available. In this, he attributed three reasons for this prosperity to the 1946 Employment Act. Although all three of the reasons are noteworthy, but the final one is most important to this analysis.

Truman (1953) argued "there has been a strengthening in practice of the Employment Act's third great purpose, that of positive, continuing maintenance of an economy operating at maximum—which means growing—levels of employment, production, and purchasing power" (p. 13). Therefore, just a week before Eisenhower delivered his first inaugural address, Truman framed a healthy economy as one where citizens were not only employed and productive, but also had the power to spend. This one instance was likely not enough to develop a theme around. However, it does lend

insight as to why Eisenhower strongly emphasized Americans' duty to their country resting in their ability to work and produce in both of his inaugural speeches.

Truman, revealing the importance of full-time employment, contextualized the role Americans played in economy further in the report. He went on to summarize seven principles where he offered reasons full-time employment was so significant, discussed why it protected industries, workers, and ultimately, consumers, and then described ways it could be encouraged without too much government intervention or investment (1953). Truman landed on "The Promise Ahead" where he vowed that ensuring Americans remained employed full-time would lead to more growth for America overall.

Truman predicted by 1963, "a labor force of 76 to 80 million, working more effectively with better tools but somewhat fewer hours per week, could produce annually about 475-500 billion dollars' worth of goods and services—measured in today's prices" (1953:24). He further argued "[t]he consumer portion of total production could by then come to about 340-350 billion dollars...Over the next 10 years, we should be able to raise the average income of all American families correspondingly" (1953:24). Thus, the very first promise Truman made after detailing a map outlining what, why, and how Congress should focus on increasing full-time employment was that doing so would increase citizens' ability to consume.

The report from the Economic Council of Advisers attached to Truman's report focused almost exclusively on the connection between a healthy economy and consumerism, therefore. Eisenhower's (1953) first inaugural speech carried the same sentiments Truman conveyed in the report: working hard equaled valuable civic duty, the

country valued hard work, working hard meant the values of democracy were protected and preserved, working hard was a dignified way to express patriotism, working hard would help secure America's place in the global market for which citizens should value growth, and labor combined with productivity was the currency with which all working Americans should trade as is their duty to their government and globalization.

Truman concluded the report with a summary that parallels the core tenants of Keynesian, or demand-side, economics, a theory proposing that to stimulate economy, economic and political leaders should make it easier for the working and middle-classes to consume. Truman reinforced this theory by noting,

“Prosperity, like peace, is indivisible, and in our pursuit of a full employment policy at home we must never lose sight of this supremely important truth. Hence our concern with the economic development of other free countries. This is especially true of the economically less developed countries and areas of the free world, where the provision of capital equipment and managerial and labor skills is a prerequisite to speeded up economic growth and improved living standards. As the momentum of industrial and agricultural growth gathers in these less developed areas, incomes will increase, and they will buy and sell more in other markets. As the level of world trade increases, the benefits to us will involve increased supplies of many raw materials, including critically needed strategic metals. We must import to live; and we must import more if we want to export at high and rising levels” (1953: 27).

Eisenhower connected the dots offered above in his inaugural speeches by implying in his first speech and then reinforcing in his second the idea that stimulating the economy using spending power might also represent conspicuous consumption on a larger scale where buying a house, car, etc. displayed a certain wealth that made it look like America was the strongest leader of material progress, but where this progress depended on international trade. The importance of the consumer citizen also showed up in the shift from the idea that government should bear the burden of social problems (as seen in several areas of Roosevelt's inaugural speeches) to the idea that citizens should serve their government to avoid social problems (as introduced in Truman's inaugural speech).

Truman's Economic Council of Advisers summarized the importance of citizens' consumption and less intervention of government when they noted, "[i]f, as we have assumed, the level of economic activity should remain high, and if there should be no change in basic private and public policies (specifically, if taxes are reduced as provided by present law), disposable income should increase considerably" (1953: 101). Eisenhower's second inaugural speech (1957) reinforced these same sentiments, but constructed global poverty and Communism as the antagonists rather than domestic unemployment and self-serving individualism as he did in his first inaugural speech.

Eisenhower (1953, 1957) constructed Capitalism and innovation as the protagonists through both terms, and in this, highlighted sacrifice and material progress, values which pre-WWII collectivism and post-WWII consumerism embodies respectively. In both of his inaugural speeches, Eisenhower (1953, 1957) prioritized

sacrifice linking civic duty and patriotism, where valuing the economy and consumption could directly bridge the two. However, instead of clearly constructing this connection, Eisenhower disguised it behind the American Dream, or at minimum, the value of material strength and progress. In his first inaugural speech, Eisenhower (1953) urged Americans to sacrifice for their country, for the sake of maintaining a strong position in the global economy. In his second inaugural speech, Eisenhower (1957) encouraged citizens to sacrifice for the sake of democracy and humanity to preserve America's economic interdependence with other nations and to bring about world peace.

In both speeches, therefore, Eisenhower (1953, 1957) constructed sacrificing for the country's well-being, and eventually world peace, as Americans' civic duty for which "each citizen plays an indispensable role," and should be ready to "pay the full price." Those with the ability to sacrifice were more dutiful, and therefore, more patriotic because according to his first inaugural speech in 1953, "[p]atriotism means equipped forces and a prepared citizenry" where being equipped and prepared meant aligning with the nine "fixed principles" he outlined and a willingness to sacrifice *for* America and in that, "accept whatever sacrifices may be required of us." The sacrifices might simply mean to work more, however, in order to be more productive as a nation, and more specifically, to gain more consumer power for which "free people" could be virtuous by cherishing the "love of truth, pride of work, devotion to country," and to "serve...proudly and profitably for America" (Eisenhower 1953). Eisenhower constructed civic duty as working for the country where labor and productivity were one currency Americans could exchange for freedom.

In both of his inaugural speeches, Eisenhower connected consumption to civic duty indirectly by constructing the ideal consumer citizen behind a disguise resembling a hard worker. Eisenhower constructed labor and productivity done for America as civic duty, but investing labor for the country might have really been about accumulating wealth to spend on pursuing the American Dream to make the country and its politicians stronger. In this, the reality is that encouraging citizens to invest labor and to produce might have ultimately ensured they were equipped with more income or purchasing power, which effectively stimulated the economy when used, which effectively boosted America's strength in a global market, which then led to a strong political structure protecting Politics, as an institution, and politicians perhaps seeking to maintain their own power.

Dwight D. Eisenhower: 1953 Inaugural Speech

Eisenhower inherited a political paradox to balance. On the one hand, there is no denying the importance global economics was starting to play in Americans' lives, but on the other, Americans' sense of patriotism also relied on nationalistic ideologies where the domestic/international dichotomy came with mixed emotions, at best. Eisenhower used this to his advantage, though, and constructed an image that makes the paradox seem simple to reconcile. In the mid-late 1950s when Eisenhower took office, America's consumer growth was exponential, but Communism was constructed as a threat to not just economic, social, and political growth, but to Capitalism on which the American Dream relied. Eisenhower was poised to cultivate the growth and to protect the country from any threats against prosperity.

Americans liked him, and they proudly wore his campaign slogan, “I like Ike,” in support. According to millercenter.org (2016), “Eisenhower inspired confidence with his plain talk, reassuring smiles, and heroic image,” where even his slogan is “plain.” The center further remarks “[t]he slogan “I like Ike” quickly became part of the political language of America” (millercenter.org). Eisenhower advocating for innovative Capitalism put his money where his intentions were. His 1952 Presidential campaign relied on short, plain, and easy to relate to television commercials where he reached the homes of Americans and was the “living room President.” He used the innovations of the time to compete in the political market, and “got his message to the American people through 30-second television advertisements, the first time TV commercials played a major role in a presidential election” (millercenter.org).

He was a five-star general during WWII; he was tough and conveyed a no-nonsense tone, but because Americans “liked Ike,” and because his commercials and “demanding schedule, traveling to forty-five states and speaking to large crowds from the caboose of his campaign train” made him accessible, his brand conveyed a sense of strength and stoic super heroism tempered with very real human qualities. He connected with Americans, not just with metaphors and imagery, but also with their humanity. He did not communicate just messages, although profound, Eisenhower connected them to a person, someone Americans saw in real time and experienced firsthand.

Using television commercials in his campaigns, Eisenhower was the first accessible political celebrity. He set himself up in the same medium alongside any other product featured on television; he was the commercial, he was the product. Since then

with the popularization of television, Americans have lived in a cultural climate that merges politics with celebrity (Cogan and Kelso 2009, Street 2004). Politicians use many of the same media that feature celebrities. Both politicians and celebrities manage impressions in similar ways. In today's consumer economy, information sells better packaged as entertainment. Eisenhower likely knew this.

Eisenhower took office about eight years after World War II ended well after the post-war economic boom in American and the increase of commercialism that came with the consumer economy. Remini and Golway (2008) note, “[u]nemployment was below 5 percent, the nation’s gross national product [grew] from \$205 billion in 1940 to \$500 billion in 1960, and a building boom outside the nation’s cities allowed millions to buy their own homes, sometimes with government backed loans” (p. 368). This boom marked a significant shift from a producer-driven society to a consumer-dependent one.

Eisenhower clearly tied meritocracy, or working for individual reward, to civic duty. He summarized American values noting, “we know that the virtues most cherished by free people--love of truth, pride of work, devotion to country--all are treasures equally precious in the lives of the most humble and of the most exalted” (1953). Further, he praised “[t]he men who mine coal and fire furnaces, and balance ledgers, and turn lathes, and pick cotton, and heal the sick and plant corn--all serve as proudly and as profitably for America as the statesmen who draft treaties and the legislators who enact laws” (1953). In this, he built a parallel between the working class and government, and constructed the former as dignified, which because equated, implies the latter is, too. He

constructed the dignity of hard work equal to civic duty as laborers and legislators worked “profitably *for America*.”

Tempering unbridled scientific progress and highlighting the particular kind of manual labor above as a dignified virtue prioritized the working and middle class. Tying the priority to civic duty *for America* encouraged citizens to keep working to participate in economy and consume as if economy, specifically America’s ability to control global economy, would help citizens avoid being enslaved to other countries and to build a strong defense against them. America’s economic system, built from a “basic law of interdependence” with other nations, needed strong backing, and that backing would come from consumption, and to some degree, working to pay taxes (Eisenhower 1953). Consumption could not occur without working for the means to consume. Eisenhower constructed working as civic duty, and set the latter up through implication as not just the ability to produce, which he considered “the wonder of the world,” but also the obligation to consume. Eisenhower directly urged Americans to produce, and in effect, denoted one purpose and connoted another.

Following his nine “fixed principles,” of which meritocracy, freedom, cultural diversity, defense, and civic duty are dominant themes, he clearly stated that enacting civic duty among other things, would “generate and define our material strength,” where material strength translated into patriotism because he defined it the very next sentence: “[p]atriotism means equipped force and a prepared citizenry” (1953). The syntax matters here as the order of these phrases tied material strength to patriotism. To gain material strength, Eisenhower called for Americans to increase productivity as “each

citizen plays an indispensable role. The productivity of our heads, our hands and our hearts is the source of all the strength we can command, for both the enrichment of our lives and the winning of the peace” where peace equaled freedom from too much dependency on other countries (1953).

In this, he also reinforced the relationship between production and consumption. Because America was experiencing a post-war, economic boom and consumerism was quickly becoming a prevailing hegemonic ideology, encouraging Americans to consume was not necessary. It was necessary to ensure Americans would continue producing, and not get too comfortable with their material wealth so that continued economic growth benefiting the government continued. This growth depended not necessarily on Americans consuming small ticket items, although that helped stimulate the economy overall, but instead on them buying big ticket items backed by government loans, thus accruing interest owed, such as houses and education. Increasing productivity and maintaining a strong labor force ultimately meant more money in the pockets of consumers to spend on these loans. In this, Eisenhower framed civic duty by encouraging Americans to produce, which enabled more consumption; therefore, by default, civic duty equaled production, which equaled the ability to consume of which valuing American economy was a pre-requisite.

Overall, of the 2,459 words Dwight D. Eisenhower spoke in his first inaugural speech, he said “free” and “world” the most at twenty-one and sixteen times respectively. The word “faith” ranks third as he said it thirteen times. He started this speech with a prayer he wrote, which was the first time a President did this, and spent the next several

lines reflecting on the past through metaphors, a rhetorical device he used often in this speech and the next one. He clearly valued rugged individualism and pitted this against scientific progress as he cautioned that the latter “seems ready to confer upon us, as its final gift, the power to erase human life from this planet” (1953). Connoting a less bleak future, he also claimed, “the promise of this life is imperiled by the very genius that has made it possible... labor sweats to create-and turns out devices to level not only mountains but also cities” (1953). This was all to highlight the power humans take in what should be left to Divine intervention. However, Eisenhower, in no way claimed Americans should not work. In fact, as part of civic duty, he argued it was virtuous; in fact, it was civic duty. Through careful design, Eisenhower employed sentimental imagery to maximize citizens’ role in exchanging their labor and productivity for freedom, and implied without both, the country was at risk for “grinding poverty” that “nearly a billion people” were facing (1957).

Dwight D. Eisenhower: 1957 Inaugural Speech

In his second inaugural speech consisting of 1,658 words, Eisenhower echoed many of the sentiments introduced in his first speech and those conveyed by Roosevelt: work equaled freedom, including freedom from too much global dependence, and moral righteousness, specifically where “moral law prevails,” equaled a good economy, respectively (1957). He said “world” exactly the same number of times he did in his first speech, sixteen, where “may” and nations” follow at close second and third respectively at fifteen and fourteen.

Eisenhower continued to convey the importance of global interdependency where America's reliance on international trade was only as strong as the nations' wealth and resources from where it came. In this sentiment, he addressed global poverty with altruism, however, the agenda does not seem intent on alleviating global poverty for the sake of global health as much as it is for the preservation of the American economy on which is relied. He noted,

“We live in a land of plenty, but rarely has this earth known such peril as today. In our nation work and wealth abound. Our population grows. Commerce crowds our rivers and rails, our skies, harbors and highways. Our soil is fertile, our agriculture productive. The air rings with the song of our industry--rolling mills and blast furnaces, dynamos, dams and assembly lines--the chorus of America the bountiful. Now this is our home--yet this is not the whole of our world. For our world is where our full destiny lies--with men, of all peoples and all nations, who are or would be free. And for them--and so for us--this is no time of ease or of rest” (1957).

The hero in this narrative was the productive, dutiful American laborer and the villain was Communism, a threat not just to the nations of the world, but also to America as globalization, including global economic interdependence, as “[t]he economic need of all nations-in mutual dependence-makes isolation an impossibility” (1957). Coupled with the cautionary praise above, Eisenhower conveyed a sentiment anchoring Americans to global citizenry and connoted they are role models for the rest of the world.

This is an important message because, as Eisenhower claimed, “the American story of material progress has helped excite the longing of all needy people for some satisfaction of their human wants...join again the ranks of freedom” (1957). He encouraged Americans to continue pursuing material advantages because their duty as global citizens was to be good role models for the rest of the world, to set an example of what freedom could look like. He implied that American economic stability equaled international cooperation *and* that material progress was happening.

Although not explicit, the assumption might follow that if Americans were role models for a global economy, and material progress inspired that economy, and accumulating material wealth exemplified that progress, then displaying that “material progress” was essential to conveying that message. With this assumption, Eisenhower constructed a connection between global civic duty and pursuing material progress, or more sociologically, conspicuously consuming. However, Eisenhower was not referring to individual consumption; he instead implied that America, as a collective representative of Capitalism, should consume in conspicuous ways to demonstrate America’s wealth. He set up a metaphor where the process of citizens consuming represented the totality of American’s economic power to maintain and reproduce its own stability. He, however, was likely skeptical of this process and the potential price this stability might cost.

Throughout most of Eisenhower’s second inaugural address, he revealed the strengths of America and then cautioned that the continued strength might come at a high price. It is almost as if he worried that the great material progress would eventually overwhelm moral righteousness, which for many Presidents, as conveyed in their

inaugural speeches, were concerned. He prayed: “[m]ay we pursue the right--without self-righteousness. May we know unity--without conformity. May we grow in strength--without pride in self. May we, in our dealings with all peoples of the earth, ever speak truth and serve justice” (1957). This theme foreshadowed Kennedy’s inaugural speech, too. It seems both Eisenhower and Kennedy worried about the exponential growth, although necessary to preserve America via interdependent global relationships, would be too much too soon, and the residual effects would be unleashed with no government reigns. Eisenhower reached for these reigns in first inaugural speech and grabbed hold of them in his second inaugural speech by highlighting the important role service to the country played in maintaining at least a semblance of collective American spirit, a value many at the time feared individualism would replace as materialism grew, but also knew it likely could not be stopped.

By the mid-1950s, America’s departure from a producer-driven economy to a consumer-driven was speeding up quickly. America’s reliance on domestic production remained an important feature of the country’s economic stability; however, because this production generated more wealth for Americans, Eisenhower might not have valued the production in and of itself, but just as he did in 1953, might have instead valued what production represents: more spending power. Evidence of a clear call for action to encouraging peaceful global relations threads Eisenhower’s speeches together. He suggested that meritocracy equaled patriotism, which served as the catalyst to bring about a strong America, and therefore, set a good example for what civic duty was and should

be for all countries. For Eisenhower, to be a dutiful citizen, Americans should serve their country in a number of ways.

In 1953, Eisenhower urged Americans to align with the “fixed principles,” work for America’s profit, and invest in the country by sacrificing whatever was required to define the country’s “material strength.” By 1957, Eisenhower still called for Americans to “pay its [peace] full price,” pay homage to “[t]he economic need of all nations-in mutual dependence” to live the “American story of material progress” honorably without selling their freedom to other nations. Between the four years, the tone shifted from setting up a foundation requiring material strength to almost grandstanding on material progress.

The country matured in those years, and although independence usually comes with maturation, in reality America grew more dependent on the global economy. Eisenhower assured Americans their payment for peace was not in vain, though. He argued they were not really dependent on anything other than themselves, thus resurrecting the pioneer spirit. He claimed that although the country had material resources, citizens’ freedom and independence would not be traded as “we no more seek to buy their [other countries] sovereignty than we would sell our own” (1957). This was the second and last time Eisenhower was “interrupted by applause” in his second inaugural speech, titled “The Price of Peace” (Lawrence 1957: 16). It clearly struck a chord for citizens.

Citizens clearly valued, in 1957, listening to Eisenhower’s second inaugural speech and the idea that their freedom and independence would not be sold and that

democracy would be preserved. The sentiment is not much different in 1953 when Eisenhower delivered his first inaugural speech. His first inaugural speech did not receive any applause until he was half-way into it (White 1953). However, just as it was four years earlier, when Eisenhower promised Americans “there never would be any ‘trading of honor for security’” he was interrupted with applause a second time. The theme is consistent. In 1953, audiences responded very well to a promise to keep their American values intact and their country safe; it made sense that four years later, in 1957, Eisenhower reminded audiences that another value Americans cherish, freedom, would remain intact along with the security of their independence.

He had to leave lasting impressions, and manage those impressions not just for citizens from whom he wanted to secure votes, but for consumers he needed to “buy” his image. The emotional connection to these values was important to both secure votes and ensure citizens remained loyal, and in this, Eisenhower overall represented tempered patriarchy. His political brand was tied to the military conjuring a sense of discipline, strategy, and calculability, but he was also accessible, presenting a sense of vulnerability at times. He constructed his efforts as “heroic” where innovative Capitalism was the most dangerous weapon to the “villains” who advocated Communism. Eisenhower’s legacy bestowed several policies aiming at strengthening this weapon where building America’s infrastructure, dominating the global market, and securing world peace were priorities. The legacies were costly, however. Eisenhower, however, might have underestimated “The Price of Peace” he spoke about in 1957.

By 1961, Eisenhower conveyed a very different tone than ever before. Confidence coupled with vulnerability transformed into a dire warning. A man who built his Presidency on the value of military leadership aimed at destroying Communism to protect Capitalism called to order a fear of the military's power. Eisenhower passed down to Kennedy, three days before he took office, an almost desperate warning of the growing power of the military-industrial complex. Eisenhower argued the "conjunction of an immense military establishment and a large arms industry is new in the American experience" where there was the imperative need for this development," but that "we must not fail to comprehend its grave implications" because America's "toil, resources and livelihood are all involved; so is the very structure of our society" (Eisenhower 1961).

He also perhaps saw government getting too big and taking a dangerous turn with science where "the free university, historically the fountainhead of free ideas and scientific discovery, has experienced a revolution in the conduct of research. Partly because of the huge costs involved, a government contract becomes virtually a substitute for intellectual curiosity" (1961). In this, Eisenhower warned America to keep "scientific research and discovery in respect," and "be alert to the equal and opposite danger that public policy could itself become the captive of a scientific-technological elite" (1961). Finally, where he once was optimistic about world peace, he left his Presidency "with a definite sense of disappointment" and urged all people to "learn how to compose differences, not with arms, but with intellect and decent purpose" because he feared without this purpose peace would never come, and perhaps even that was a stretch

because as Eisenhower noted, “I wish I could say tonight that a lasting peace is in sight” (1961).

Overall, between the 1930s and 1950s, Presidents defined: what patriotism and collectivism were; the value of working and the ethics it requires; and their instructions of how constituents should align with a strong work ethic. Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower all constructed civic duty as an obligation to work for a better America and argued expressing patriotism required enacting that civic duty, or working. For them, however, it was not enough, to simply work to fulfill civic duty and express patriotism. Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower also, either explicitly or through implication, argued citizens should also maintain a strong work ethic to build a better America. Because of this, Truman and Eisenhower extended Roosevelt’s ideas about moral economy and also proposed that a stable economic climate required citizens do what was moral but also that they behave in moral ways, too. Therefore, Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower did not connect consumption to civic duty; instead, they connected economic values, including working hard and a strong work ethic, to civic duty and ultimately argued a good citizen was one who worked for and believed in a better America.

Chapter Five: Citizens Working with Better Americans (Micro-Level Content and Meso-Level Context Analysis)

In this chapter, I will show that Presidential rhetoric in the 1960s and 1970s constructs civic duty both as an obligation to work for individual pursuits and with other citizens to achieve collective goals of America. By 1960, Kennedy captured the importance of individual and collective morality, but moved beyond this abstract notion to also construct a significantly different type of civic duty requiring citizens work with each other to serve government for both the collective good and to achieve a promise for individual reward. Johnson picked up this construct and developed the need to balance collective duty with individual responsibility to government by highlighting a common enemy: fear. Johnson argued citizens' civic duty was more than working together to serve government; it also required collective effort in combating threats of nuclear war and the war on poverty, specifically by investing labor and cooperating to build "The Great Society." Nixon also conveyed this message where he called citizens to action by encouraging them to work together to serve the country and develop America's resources, including its labor pools, to enable less dependency on and more service to government. Carter rounded out the shift from primarily focusing on developing America's moral consciousness by advocating working together, both literally in jobs and more figuratively as an cooperative effort, encouraging citizens to pursue the American Dream for which its access was a reward in and of itself; for Carter, the process of banding together created social and economic stability, a more valuable product than any tangible commodity.

John F. Kennedy

Kennedy echoed Eisenhower's pessimism, but balanced it with rejuvenation through the following dichotomies: end of an old era and beginning of new, "renewal as well as change," humanity and spirit, "friend and foe," "tempered by war and disciplined by a hard and bitter peace, "well [and] ill," "United [and] Divided," passivity and ambition, "instruments of war...and peace," strong and weak, "quest for peace [and] powers of destruction," "oppressed" and "free," "strong are just and the weak secure," "struggle" and triumph, "shrink" and "welcome," "light" and darkness, and "history" and future. From these direct calls to action he framed as simple binaries where Americans were either with or against the country and its goals, general themes emerge. Kennedy clearly tied civic duty to specific actions Americans were to take and values they were to hold.

The cultural context was primed for these calls. Eisenhower was seventy years old when Kennedy took over the Presidency at forty-three years old. There was literally a generation between them. Symbolically, the gap represented a bridge where culture was shifting, too. Kennedy was right. By 1961, when he delivered his inaugural speech, "the world is very different." The scientific and technological advancements of the previous decades uniquely positioned industrialized countries as both saviors and destroyers of humanity. Kennedy was a cautionary optimist about this power arguing ethical progress, cooperative competition, intelligent spirit, and vulnerable strength were necessary to keep the power in check. His biggest concerns were "tyranny, poverty, disease, and war itself" (Kennedy 1961).

His speech was both a pledge to deal with these concerns and an invitation for citizens to help. He promised America he would address not just the tangential issues resulting from the generation gap, but also the gaps between the dichotomies mentioned above. He “exhorted” the nation to join him, too, as he outlined his fears (Lawrence 1961: p. 1). He was “sober” and “deliberate” as he delivered his inauguration speech to cement his win in “the closest election of modern times” (Lawrence 1961: 8). His deliberate approach might have been, however, more about presenting himself as disciplined and in control than it was about foreshadowing his term. Hellman (1990) notes, “[t]his assertion of control over one's self-presentation is fundamental to that self-presentation” (p. 750). Kennedy knew impression management was key to surviving in politics; he carefully cultivated a persona to reflect that, and branded his issues based on what was popular in opinion polls (Jacobs and Shapiro 1997). He was fairly certain what Americans were looking for in a candidate, and appealed to citizens’ concerns.

He was a politician, but his mass appeal resembled that of a celebrity. According to Hellman (1990), “Kennedy viewed his speeches as contributions to the larger media text of his public image, a text in which words were only one important part” (p. 746). The symbols he both denoted and connoted in his inaugural speech were purposefully designed to elicit a specific response: to justify his win and appeal to American audiences to connect with them. Hellman (1990) deconstructs process to account for one way the generational gap shrunk and where a new political age began constructing the political celebrity using what is known now as branding; all of this helped Kennedy commodify his platform. Hellman argues,

“[a] citizen watching Kennedy’s image on the television screen could identify with that image as narcissistic self-image. But through the visible detachment and self-conscious performing, Kennedy also bonded with viewer through his role as actor-auteur; he offered the citizen of spectacle of a subject constructing the self through the self-aware putting together of available roles and images into a unique image of his own. Thus Kennedy returned to the viewer not simply the illusory power of the narcissistic image, but also the more substantial power of an image of authoring and performing such an image. The viewer was allowed to look with Kennedy at Kennedy, experiencing a shared pleasure in the aesthetic contemplation of this ‘profile’ as well as a shared sense of the challenge it represented in the world of action” (1990: 749).

This is key in understanding Kennedy’s brand prior to his inaugural speech, and thus, some of the context underlying the speech as it reflected an important role in the history of political culture. He constructed himself as one of the citizens, and much like Eisenhower did previously, showed up in people’s living rooms via television as if he was part of their family by building on familiar ideologies and sharing in their fears, which anchored their loyalty. Kennedy’s inaugural speech aligned with this message and reflected a certain presentation of self where the

“[m]ajor discourses of the 1940s and ‘50s Hollywood came together in a powerful ‘real-life’ narrative projected upon the commanding screen of the mass-media presidency...Kennedy’s performance thrust a condensed discourse of opposition [as seen in the dichotomies above]...that discourse of opposition-residing now in

the memories of citizens-would be available for any group or individuals who, in the 1960s, found themselves in situations prompting radical action ” (Hellman 1990: 754).

Therefore, even when Kennedy’s personal life was less than moral, per the hegemonic norms at the time, citizens could possibly overlook those indiscretions as simply being human. We all make mistakes.

John F. Kennedy: 1961 Inaugural Speech

Kennedy, in a short speech of 1,366 words, called for direct action in a way no former President had. His rhetoric was balanced throughout with caution and optimism. Much like Eisenhower before him, he worried that unchecked scientific progress, and specifically, the threat of technologically advanced warfare, might “engulf all of humanity in planned or accidental self-destruction” (1961). Kennedy focused on threats coming from abroad, abstract fears rooted in lands far away where defending democracy was no longer, as Eisenhower predicted, an issue of domestic affairs, but instead about managing threats to not just America, but Americans and their way of life.

The threats, because of their invisibility and intangibility, seemed overwhelming, too much for one person or government to manage. Kennedy, in a now famous line, plead to his “fellow Americans: ask not what your country can do for you-ask what you can do for your country. My fellow citizens of the world: ask not what America will do for you, but what together we can do for the freedom of man” (1961). Kennedy clearly constructed civic duty here by cementing a priority where dutiful citizens were

responsible for America, and explicitly stated, “[i]n your hands, my fellow citizens, more than mine, will rest the final success or failure of our course” (1961).

Although Kennedy used the first person, “we,” frequently, much like other Presidents, he called citizens to action by connoting an invitation to civic duty; he used the second person, “you,” to speak directly to individuals, which up until now, was not commonly used in inaugural speeches. Using this point of view instead “we” conveyed a sense of intimacy as “we” referred to everyone; it is the first person variation of “us” set up opposite to “them.” However, “you” refers to *a* direct subject; it refers to just one person. Using this point of view established intimacy between Kennedy and Americans. The calls to action were not to everyone, but instead to one, to “you.”

The service Kennedy asked Americans to provide (do for *your* country) might have required an intimate bond; he used “Americans” and “citizens” around the same number of times, four and five respectively, which balanced the two somewhat, and coupled with using “you,” conveyed the idea that he valued the individual, both as an American and a citizen. Communicating this value and establishing this intimacy might have made it easier to ask for the specific type of service needed to preserve the country, or more specifically, the country’s values. The threats America faced were somewhat new where “the instruments of war have far outpaced the instruments of peace” (Kennedy 1961). But, war was not the only threat and peace was not the only value at stake. Other enemies, such as tyranny, poverty, and disease mentioned above, were threats. These “enemies” were not new to America at this point, but conceptualizing these as threats happening to America rather than social problems Americans could manage

was somewhat new. Denoting poverty, for example, as an enemy potentially attacking America framed poverty as not just American soil at risk; the American Dream was at risk. Protecting it, according to Kennedy, required choosing sides and remaining balanced simultaneously. Kennedy himself set up a model for this.

His inaugural speech conveyed the right mixture of tolerance and hostility toward social problems. Kennedy's calls for action could appeal to just about anyone who was either understanding that it might take a while to resolve the issues and/or anyone who was impatient with the current state of America. Kennedy constructed mass appeal. For example, Kennedy's father compared him to both "Cary Grant and Jimmy Stewart as an instructive clue," and in that Kennedy's likability was:

"derived in considerable degree from his condensation of Grant's and Stewart's opposed images. Grant's image was marked by his grace, his wit-his detached and amused sophistication-marks of a man of culture able to manipulate others in a world of manners; the dark side of that image was the constant threat of insincerity and inauthenticity. By almost exact contrast, Stewart conveyed awkwardness, honesty, innocence-marks of a man of nature whose feelings express themselves in action; the dark side of his image was the threat of naiveté and hysteria...Kennedy found a perfect medium [television] for his ability to perform sophisticated repartee and idealistic outrage" (Hellman 1990: 751).

Therefore, Kennedy most likely appealed to Americans who were either "sophisticated" (typically connoting wealth and cultural capital) or "idealistic" (typically connoting youth and vision) and where his slogans, "Get America Moving Again" and "To Seek a New

Frontier,” likely resonated with both respectively. Jacobs and Shapiro (1995) confirm this as they note, “[t]hroughout the primary and general election campaigns, Kennedy's aides carefully tracked their candidate's image and attempted to pinpoint his perceived personal characteristics that were considered unfavorable” (p. 531). When Kennedy’s aides discovered he was not aligning with the depth of character citizens demanded, they encouraged him to adjust his presentation of self and even “develop a ‘Kennedy-identified program’ that would appeal to two distinct groups of voters: ideologically oriented party activists and more moderate centrist voters” (Jacob and Shapiro 1995: 531).

Doing this set up a unique political strategy. Presidents prior to Kennedy used polls to take the country’s political temperature. Since Kennedy, however, Presidents construct messages and then poll citizens to get their pulse, and if it is not what Presidents want, they spin rhetoric to either quicken or slow the cultural pulse down. Kennedy’s campaign strategy has now become the standard because all Presidential candidates since have used public opinion polls to direct their platforms, and often even policies, instead of measuring public opinion after decisions. (Jacobs and Shapiro 1995).

Kennedy’s image was an important weight in anchoring citizens’ loyalty, and the connection between consumption, economic values, and civic duty relied on this loyalty he cultivated over his campaign. Loyalty served as a soft spot to land when Kennedy (1961) called citizens to action by considering “not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country.” In that, aligning with issues Americans cared about is where the indirect link between consumption, economic values, and civic duty emerges,

specifically for the middle-class. As Beck (1974) quotes William F. Buckley (1964), “the Kennedys' trinitarian (family, money, image) grasp on American life has proved enormously successful because it engages the gears of a middle class society that has pretty well abandoned its ideals, theological and moral” (p. 48).

Also appealing to ideals multiple demographics possibly held, having Robert Frost read a poem at the inauguration probably helped Kennedy bolster his messages in his inaugural address. Frost read a poem titled “The Gift Outright” that conveyed a sense of both individualism and collective struggle. It urged individuals to take action and recognize their power in bringing about change as he notes, “[u]ntil we found out that it was ourselves...We were withholding from our land of living” (Frost as cited in Bosmajian 1970: 95). The poem also reveals, “To the land vaguely realizing westward...But still unstoried, artless, unenhanced...Such as she was, such as she [will] become” (Frost as cited in Bosmajian 1970: 95-6). The “will” is bracketed because the original poem reads “would,” however, Frost replaced it with the more affirmative “will” for the inauguration per Kennedy’s request. The poem acknowledged the country’s struggle, as one nation, but also conveyed a chance at change, a chance that “will become.” This poem is not too difficult to understand and likely appealed to both the “sophistication” of those who value poetry’s importance as it represented cultural capital and to the “idealism” of those wanting “radical change.”

Kennedy captured both ideals, and anchoring citizens’ loyalty to his image as both a pioneer and someone who get America on track moving again, connected consumption, economic values, and civic duty by calling Americans to action where they

should “do for their country” to alleviate several fears, including those over poverty.

Although the connection between consumption and civic duty is not direct in his inaugural address, Kennedy’s Presidential campaign articulated his demand-side economic policies where creating more buying power, specifically for the middle and lower classes, would stimulate economy; therefore, it was very possible the civic duty Kennedy called for when asking Americans to “do for their country” might actually have been for them to consume to increase demand in economy. It is important to note that although Kennedy’s economic philosophy reflected small portions of supply-side economics (calling for more production/supplies for which consumers can buy to stimulate economy), it is clear his prevailing economic philosophy reflected the opposite: demand-side (as noted above: calling for ways to develop consumer spending power).

For example, in a campaign speech he delivered September 27th, 1960 in Canton, Ohio, Kennedy remarked, “I think we must develop our natural resources,” and “it [the building of the St. Lawrence Seaway] is a national asset and a rising tide lifts all boats. If Ohio moves ahead, so will Massachusetts. Good water, power, transportation, those are necessary to develop the economy of the United States in the 1960’s.” In that same speech, he further revealed, “I think we must formulate special programs which will be of assistance in those areas which are chronically hard hit by unemployment.” In this, Kennedy hinted at his plans to install additional social and economic programs to alleviate some financial burden for those occupying lower socioeconomic positions so they could participate in economy more. Kennedy conveyed the idea that aligns with Rousseas (1981-2) who argues, “[i]f factional strife and class struggle are to be avoided,

growth must accelerate” from which that same speech I note above reveals “his leitmotif... ‘*A rising tide lifts all boats*’” (p. 202-3).

Overall, Kennedy constructed civic duty as “doing for your country” with other Americans, and one of his greatest fears was poverty. His brand loyalty rested in a strong connection of ideals between him and many citizens, and because his economic philosophy was built on the idea that more spending power would alleviate economic problems (demand-side economics), the connection between consumption and civic duty exists, but it required that citizens maintain knowledge of his economic philosophy and values before hearing his inauguration speech. Outside of that and citizens’ adherence to his brand, Kennedy’s inaugural speech does not represent a strong link between consumption, civic duty, and patriotism, but does in fact reveal a clear tie between working “for your country” and civic duty where expressing patriotism seems to be about both securing individual freedom and global independence. Kennedy’s inaugural speech does foreshadow what would come when he created more spending power for those occupying lower socioeconomic status, and thus they could conceive their civic duty to “do for their country” with other Americans as an obligation to consume with that allowance.

Lyndon B. Johnson

Johnson advocated for “The Great Society” to fight the “War on Poverty,” the latter of which Kennedy initiated. Together, these agendas called for drastic social changes, ones that Kennedy started early on in his term. Johnson took over the

Presidency November 22nd, 1963 when Kennedy was assassinated. According to Lerner (1995), Johnson

“not only faced the unenviable chore of replacing the popular John Kennedy, but confronted countless potential problems, notably civil rights, the Cold War, Cuba, and the escalating conflict in Vietnam. Further complicating his ascension was the timing; having assumed office less than one year prior to the next election, Johnson had to exercise extreme care in handling these sensitive issues or face the prospect of finding himself unemployed in 1965” (p. 751).

However, according to Johnson (1999),

“Vietnam did not resonate in the American consciousness in 1964 to the degree that it would later in the decade. Opinion polls showed that two-thirds of those surveyed paid little or no attention to the war. It did matter, however, to Johnson.

The president made it very clear to his advisers that he wanted to avoid any public debate or crisis over Vietnam until after the November election” (p. 320).

Presumably, because Johnson wanted to avoid any mention of the Vietnam War, he focused on general issues and “broad terms,” and almost exclusively on domestic issues in his inaugural speech Wicker (1965).

Johnson (1965) referenced “The Great Society” and remarked that he “does not believe that [it] is ordered, changeless, and sterile battalion of the ants,” and as Wicker (1965) notes this was when he “[shows] more emotion than at any other point...[with] clenched fists several times as he defended his conception of” it (p. 16). Johnson’s conception of “The Great Society” ultimately rested on the idea that “working shoulder to

shoulder together we can increase the bounty of all” (1965). Beyond this, Johnson’s construction of construct of civic duty does not rely on any new call to action, but instead tied it to the collective pioneer spirit already marking his previous year in office where economic values called citizens to work to secure individual freedom within a globalizing market.

Johnson carried on many of the demand-side, or Keynesian, economic approaches Kennedy’s “New Frontier” momentum gained. Where some of Kennedy’s programs/initiatives improved America’s cultural richness and spending power for some citizens (e.g., Peace Corps, Space Programs, Area Redevelopment Act of 1961, reducing tax loopholes for elite, and unemployment compensation), for others, the American Dream was almost impossible to reach. Johnson installed several programs and initiatives Kennedy started, but as weapons against the “War on Poverty,” social structure was stratified, especially for women and anyone not white. By 1965 when Johnson delivered his inaugural speech, America’s socioeconomically marginalized populations started to climb out of poverty, many still remained in the economic fringes.

Perhaps because of this, Johnson did not directly ask nor imply that anyone enact their civic duty as consumers. Instead, he capitalized on economic values and argued, if America would “succeed it will not be because of what we have, but it will be because of what we are; not because of what we own, but rather because of what we believe” (1965). Because Johnson aligned with the same demand-side economic approach as Kennedy, much like the latter’s inaugural speech, the former set up a foundation where spending power was part of a larger structural issue and government, along with citizens’ hard

work, would provide for its citizens, all of them. Johnson looked for ways to increase demand for both goods and services where the super-rich might have more choice of what to consume and the not-so-rich could at least participate in the market more readily, at least some of the latter.

Identity intersectionality, although an issue since the country's founding, was not an explicit and vocalized concern of too many politicians until the mid-twentieth century. Racial tensions grew in the early 1960s, and although many Americans experienced prosperity, poverty across the nation stayed fairly stable, especially for racial minorities, until the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Revenue and Economic Opportunity Acts both passed in 1964, along with smaller initiatives all encouraging more citizens could participate in economy better and with better wages. This legislative momentum, although did not guarantee equality, was profound. It also drew controversy from those who tended to align with supply-side economics and/or less diversity in society, therefore, the policies marking so much of what contemporary society attributed lessening segregation to, did not serve Johnson's Presidency as profoundly as the issues the policies represented. In that, although legislation aimed at equalizing access to resources helped further identify Johnson as a liberal, it was his position, and more specifically, his marketing tactics against nuclear war, that cemented his election, and thus, anchored his brand loyalty.

Despite avoiding rhetoric about specific global issues, including the nuclear arms race gaining speed, Johnson's public support for his elected Presidential term was largely a result of his attitudes against nuclear war. Although he was a generally well-liked

President prior to his campaign, Presidents needed more than just popularity to win. Jacobs and Burns (2004) argue Johnson was very strategic in his 1964 Presidential campaign, and based on public opinion polls, aligned with specific issues Americans cared about, and more importantly did not care about. In this, Johnson steered away from the contention mounting from America's involvement in Vietnam and constructed his brand around two major issues: building up "The Great Society," including the liberal, demand-side policies it advocates, and tearing down any threats of nuclear war.

Prior to airing a television advertisement on September 7th, 1964 dubbed the "Daisy Ad," Johnson was behind in the polls. Babb (2014) in the online Washington Post recalls the advertisement's power and implications: "[t]he commercial opened with a little girl in a meadow, then a horrific nuclear blast filled the screen. We've been feeling the fallout ever since. It was only a minute long. The paid ad ran on national television only once, and only on one network, NBC. But that's all it took." Babb (2014) further argues it "changed politics advertising forever" because it gave permission to use scare tactics against opponents using any hyperbolic means necessary; it was a profound contribution to the culture of fear. The advertisement, and thus Johnson, indicted nuclear war for these fears, and although he never mentioned Barry Goldwater's name, his opponent, it was clear the marketing blames him for the indictment.

According to Storey (2011), the ad had little impact on Goldwater's rating; instead it increased Americans' fear about nuclear war for which Johnson calmed. Johnson won his Presidential election by a remarkable 434 point margin in the Electoral College and retained his position. He did not need to address war, therefore, in his

inaugural speech; the country was already at peace with his position. He did not need to call Americans into action, beyond what the American Dream was already calling for, nor did he need to ensure economy was stimulated via consumption. He simply asked Americans to value economy and to work hard and work together. He went back to basics.

There was one area where he hinted at a connection between consumption and civic duty, however. Near the beginning of his speech, he argued it was “this waste of resources” (wealth, food/harvests, medicine, and education) that is “our real enemy” (Johnson 1965). In this, if the country was at war with poverty, and wasting resources was the enemy, then to combat poverty, he urged those with wealth, bounty, “healing miracles,” and those who could pass down knowledge to invest more, to spend more on the country. Those with “plenty” should help those lacking. Everyone else should “believe in ourselves,” and in doing that focused on “stretching his talents, rejoicing in his work, important in the lives of his neighbors and his nation” (Johnson 1965). By the time Johnson left office, however, citizens lacked confidence in him, specifically in his ability to keep peace, the very confidence that anchored his brand. It was a long road getting to that point, though, and just a few years earlier, his inaugural speech conveyed remarkable social changes.

Lyndon B. Johnson: 1965 Inaugural Speech

Johnson was President for less than a year before he delivered his first inaugural speech of just 1,507 words. Echoing his predecessor who passed away while he was Vice President, Johnson, too, focused on threats to the American Dream. He (1965)

reflected on the “rapid and fantastic change-bearing the secrets of nature, multiplying the nations, placing in uncertain hands new weapons for mastery and destruction, shaking old values and uprooting old ways,” but was far more concerned with another enemy: “wast[ing] of our resources.” For Johnson, social inequality, seen through “hopeless poverty,” hunger, disease, and lack of quality education posed the greatest threat to America (1965).

There is also a clear shift from optimism about relationships with other countries to focusing on domestic problems; the tone is more fearful, but also conjures a pioneer spirit marked by hope of a new beginning. Johnson claimed, America “is the uncrossed desert and the unclimbed ridge. It is the star that is not reached and the harvest that is sleeping in the unplowed ground” (1965). He encouraged Americans to be cooperative to fight the enemies mentioned above and forge a new world for which “we will bend...to the hopes of man” and “[b]y working shoulder to shoulder together we can increase the bounty of all” (1965). He argued “you must look within your own hearts to the old promises and to the old dreams. They will lead you best of all” (1965). This was the civic duty Johnson requested from Americans. He invited “you,” in a similar way Kennedy did just several years prior, to serve the country *for* the country benefiting all citizens, to become better Americans.

Using nostalgia, Johnson connoted an emotional connection between this “back to basics” society (some material wealth/not poverty, food/not hunger, wellness/not suffering, and learning/not wasted educational resources) and the future of America. He quite directly asked citizens to put faith in the future and focus on the core beliefs that

were outlined by the country's forefathers, specifically urging Americans to embrace change. He provided a reminder that "[L]iberty was the second article of our covenant. It was self-government. It was our Bill of Rights. But it was more" (1965). He followed this directly with a prophetic tone that "American would be a place where each man could be proud to be himself: stretching his talents, rejoicing in his work, important in the life of his neighbors and his nation" (1965).

Johnson explicitly tied civic duty to developing resources in America. This involved ensuring all people had enough assets to support themselves, all people had food and access to healthcare, and most importantly, all children "are taught to read and write" (1965). Although he presented this sentiment early on in the speech, he reinforced it in the middle where he revealed, "[w]e have discovered that that every child who learns,, and every man who finds work, and every sick body that is made whole-like a candle added to an altar-brightens the hope of all the faithful" (1965). Clearly, this message was important, and because when reinforcing it he constructed language mimicking that heard at the pulpit, it connoted a sense of divine intervention, as if enacting this aligned the dutiful with the faithful, equating civic duty to spiritual righteousness. Johnson extended hyperbolic metaphors creating an overall resounding message and platform that presented a resolution requiring combat against a common enemy: fear.

Richard M. Nixon

During his campaign, Nixon vocalized his opposition to Johnson, for whom many citizens blamed for the continued American presence in Vietnam. While Johnson's approval rating sunk to 35% by August, 1968, Nixon announced his intentions to not just

pull American troops out of Vietnam, but to also end the war (Gallup). Nixon set himself up as a solution by aligning somewhat with “those who had ‘hawkish’ preferences—who wanted the fighting stepped up” to win and get it over with against “those who had ‘dovish’ opinions—who wanted a reduction of fighting and more effort toward withdrawal” (Verba and Brody 1970:327). Although not campaigning, Johnson cannot make anyone happy. The long run Democrats have since The New Deal, where Eisenhower interrupted briefly, drew to a close.

For the “hawks,” it was not enough to simply maintain a stagnant presence in Vietnam; they want Johnson to invest more resources to win the war, but he did not. For the “doves,” it was not enough to promise one day to pull resources out of Vietnam; they wanted Johnson to end the war immediately, but he did not. Nixon swooped in, argued no matter what, the war needed to end, and it would be a great victory for America if it was won, too. The more conservative “hawks” heard what they wanted, and the more liberal “doves” were placated with the promise of the war at least ending. Both maintained reservations, but the campaign promises Nixon made were a stark contrast to Johnson’s actions that kept the country in limbo with well over a half million American military still in Vietnam by 1969. Nixon won the Presidential election running on a platform grounded in these promises.

Nixon’s political brand and image played a part in appealing to citizens, specifically those “good people,” as Nixon called them, who participated well in economy, attended church frequently, and clung to traditional family values. Shesol (2014) argues “today’s Republicans were weaned on Nixon’s sour brand of politics: the

politics of resentment,” and “[w]hat Nixon knew in his gut, reinforced by the latest tools of gauging public opinion, was the white middle class,” once dominant and prominent, were now known as the “forgotten” and “silent majority,” who grew up under “Roosevelt’s New Deal” resented those who “were said to spurn and mock the traditional values of family, faith, and love of country” (newyorker.com). The hegemonic ideologies once dominating culture, now in the late 1960s, were feeling the threat of more diverse ways of thinking and that generation “had come to feel humiliated by college students, civil-rights activists, anti-war protestors, intellectuals, journalists, and other liberal elites” (Shesol 2014).

Nixon’s brand of resentment resonated with them. They, too, resented the “failures of liberalism” where top down approaches, including social service programs, to solve problems did not work for them; they did not need them anyway. The funding spent on those programs did not address the structural issues, but instead, as cited from Nixon’s 1968 acceptance speech, led to nothing more than “an ugly harvest of frustration, violence, and failure across the land” they “reaped from these programs” (Shesol 2014). The resentment, frustration, and longing for a time when conservative ideologies ran front and center, situated Nixon well for a platform he founded on self-reliance and individual control, or at least more localized regulation.

Nixon did not start his career holding conservative positions, which might explain how he understood both sides of partisan politics. Reichly (1981-2) notes,

“Nixon’s apparent need for self-justification and his economic situation as a struggling young lawyer might easily have contributed to the formation of a

liberal Democrat. But the combined influences of family tradition, reaction against big government during wartime, and exposure to conservative ideas in southern California and in Washington, D.C., helped guide Nixon to the conservative side of the ideological divide” (p. 547).

Nixon was not from an elite background; he knew what it was like to struggle, both in the public and private spheres. This struggle offered some humility, but eventually also sowed the seeds of discontent for those not willing, as he perceived it, to struggle, too.

Richard M. Nixon: 1969 Inaugural Speech

Nixon, using 2,128 words in his first inaugural speech, conveyed his serious concern over the spiritual deterioration of America. The speech was somewhat condescending as he reminded citizens that

“Franklin Delano Roosevelt addressed a Nation ravaged by depression and gripped with fear. He could say in surveying the Nation’s troubles: ‘They concern, thank God, only material things.’ Our crisis is the reverse. We have found ourselves rich in goods, but ragged in spirit reaching magnificent precision for the moon, but falling into raucous discord on earth” (1969).

He blamed the American people, and although used the first person, “we,” frequently, made sure to point out several duties unmet by citizens that must be met to get the country back on spiritual, and specifically moral, track. It is fair to assume that he might have equated spiritual and moral righteousness with a healthy economy and preserved democracy. That was what Roosevelt did, and clearly Nixon had some affection for Roosevelt; he conjured his sentiment from many years earlier.

Nixon conveyed a sense of hostility toward the idea that government had provided for the American people for quite some time, and yet they had not done their part as Kennedy asked just several years earlier. He summarized many benefits the government had provided over the years, but did not outline the contributions Americans made. He looked to Americans, however, to take responsibility for their country, and reminded them that the poverty, hunger, and homelessness so many experienced was in their hands to resolve (1969). He argued the “kind of nation we will be, what kind of world we live in, whether we shape the future in the image of our hopes, is ours to determine by our actions and our choices...[t]he American Dream does not come to those who fall asleep. But we are approaching the limits of what government alone can do” (1969).

Nixon set up the pursuit of the American Dream to represent something all *should* pursue. Nixon spent two paragraphs outlining the importance of “government and people working together,” otherwise “it will not get done at all...without the people we can do nothing, with the people we can do everything...we need the energies of the people,” and here, he meant “those small splendid efforts that make headlines in the neighborhood newspaper instead of the national journal” (1969). He went on to reinforce how the individual effort would benefit everyone, make everyone better Americans, and more importantly would protect freedom as its “essence is that each of us shares in the shaping of our destiny,” was to be a part of something bigger than ourselves (pursuing the American Dream) to be “truly whole” (1969).

In this, Nixon clearly tied civic duty to meritocracy and economic values. He constructed a chain of responsibility where Americans “join the high adventure” and do

the work of maintaining their futures themselves. Although Nixon connoted this sentiment in several places, there are no less than four denotations: at the beginning of the speech, “the future...is ours to determine,” again about half way through, “each of us shares in the shaping of our destinies,” and twice near the end, “for all then peoples of this earth to choose their own destiny...our destiny lies not in the stars but on Earth itself, in our own hands, in our own hearts” (1969). As far as government, Nixon promised it would listen.

Nixon’s denotations reflect both humility and discontent. Although he abandoned his campaign brand symbolizing a much tougher approach to many issues, including global and domestic affairs, in this speech, he still advanced a clear philosophical line of reasoning congruent with that same “tough love” sentiment. He scolded Americans for being too materialistic when he summoned Roosevelt’s sentiments: “troubles: They, thank God, only concern material things,” and argued “[o]ur crisis is the reverse...ragged in spirit” (Nixon 1969). Nixon wanted citizens to get in better spiritual shape, which also echoed Roosevelt’s early rhetoric where he called for citizens to strengthen morality in order to strengthen economy. Nixon wanted citizens to concern themselves and commit to working *with* government instead of government working *for* citizens. Within this sentiment, Nixon was the first President to say “The American Dream” in an inaugural speech. Many implied it. Many spoke about it. Many argued for it. But, none actually said the words and articulated a precise meaning until Nixon did; it was not just an American Dream, it was America’s Dream, *The American Dream*.

The very next line after that ideology Nixon provided a direct call to civic duty: “we are approaching the limits of what government alone can do. Our greatest need now is to reach beyond government...” (1969). Citizens were to reach. They were to work on “small, splendid efforts that make headlines in the neighborhood newspaper instead of the national journal,” the latter of which foreshadowed Nixon’s bitter contempt for high-stakes professional journalism (Nixon 1969). He called for citizens to return to the small town sentiment where “each of shares in the shaping of his own destiny” (1969). In this, it looks like Nixon called for more production, but in reality, because he advocated demand-side economy, where less government intervention and more consumer participation equaled a good economy, by default, what he implied was that citizens should work more to pursue the American Dream, because after all, it “does not come to those who fall asleep,” and in that, equip themselves with the means to buy what achieving the American Dream represents: a home, furnishings and all the creature comforts for the home, a car big enough to hold a family, financial security via stocks, etc.

Nixon framed this connection between consumption and civic duty as patriotism; he tied it to *The American Dream*. To align with the traditional values he denoted and connoted in almost every other line of his speech, Nixon (1969) called on citizens to, in one way or another, grow the American spirit (and the Godly spirit, too, where spiritual wealth equals material wealth), a spirit for which the “forgotten middle-class” were well aware of and for which they yearned. It was a spirit that represented a time when they did not fear the liberal agenda threatening their family values, for example. This call to

action, or civic duty, Nixon made was achievable by those who could afford it., therefore, as it was for only those who had “the essence of freedom” to his own destiny (1969).

Nixon implied in this that when someone has a chance to shape his [or her] own destiny, there are no structural constraints stopping them. Only those who know the true freedom of living in a society, where they are not bound by structural inequalities, can even begin to resonate with this message; only those with the resources to buy a home and furnish it, drive their family in a car they bought to the back to check on their investments, for example, can be a good citizen under Nixon’s definition. Nixon disguised this construct behind what looks like equity; his first inaugural speech was tempered, tame, and although he scolded Americans in a few places, it overall honored tradition and addresses tension.

Restons (1969) sees the parallel, too. According to Restons (1969) of the New York Times, Nixon presented an entirely different image to America during his first inaugural speech than he did during his campaign. On inaugural day, Restons interprets, “[t]he hawkish, political, combative, anti-Communist, anti-Democratic Nixon of the past was not the man on the platform today... [h]is theme was not opposition but continuity... [h]e could have followed the pugnacious and aggressive themes of his campaign... [h]e chose to go the other way” (1969: 22). Perhaps Nixon masked his political concerns with a more personal appeal. Restons (1969) notes that Nixon’s “inauguration speech followed the same traditional appeals to unity, and invoked the normal themes of patriotism, religion, and common morality of the nation, but there was more to this than the emotion and rhetoric of a great occasion” (p. 22).

Because Nixon took such a moderate, balanced approach to all policies and affairs in his first inaugural speech, “hawkish Republicans felt betrayed and the dovish Democrats were cynical” (Restons 1969: 22). As it is expected in second term inaugural speeches, Presidents have freedom to speak from a place where there is not much to lose. However, Restons argues that Nixon’s presentation, incongruent with his campaign, during his first inaugural speech was a result of “probably reacting [that day], not only to the political yearning for peace abroad and reconciliation at home, but to his own personal beliefs and yearnings, which he is now free to express for the first time...he had to deal objectively with the problems of the nation” (1969: 22). One of the biggest problems the nation faced was the country’s increasing dependence on oil.

Nixon advocated, in some ways by default, more aggressive approaches to Middle Eastern relationships and, because of his own political position, less government intervention in economic affairs; this was a departure from Johnson, too. The sentiment he conveyed in his first inaugural speech aligns with this departure, too. According to Cohen (1994), Johnson, although he made decisions and enacted strategies to keep the Soviet Union in check, protected Israel, and maintained the increasing dependency of Middle Eastern oil flowing, but generally, “left policy toward the region to the Department of State and NSC [National Security Council] staff, intervening only when a domestic political issue was involved” (p. 309). By the late 1960s, however, the stakes were higher and Nixon had no choice but to address the issues.

The Soviet Union represented a long-standing threat to Capitalism and now the Middle East represented a threat to the America’s oil supply, thus its quality of living in a

consumer culture. Between the two threats, the American Dream Nixon advocated for in his first speech was at risk. Citizens were scared. Instead of putting consumers at ease by enacting legislation to protect their rights, Nixon instead did not pass any significant consumer protection legislation in his first term. Perhaps he did not yet see the ways in which government should protect its economy spending power, or perhaps did not see how the threats to consumer dollars needed to be protected.

Richard M. Nixon: 1973 Inaugural Speech

By 1973, tensions from overseas were mounting and becoming more than any one government could handle. By Nixon's second inaugural speech, of 1,803 words, his tone shifts from condescending to hostile. He said outright, "[i]n trusting too much government, we have asked of it more than it can deliver. This leads only to inflated expectations, to reduced individual effort, and to a disappointment and frustration that erode confidence in both what government can do and in that people can do" (1973). He said "let" and "America" twenty-two and twenty-one times, respectively, which represents the two words spoken the most. This impact of "let," however, was not as it implied permission in many uses, but rather in how it connoted a release of the reins, as in letting go.

Nixon revealed several previously held notions would be let go. He noted there would be no more "mak[ing] other nation's conflict our own...or every other nation's future our responsibility, or presume to tell the people of other nations how to manage their own affairs" (1973). There would be no more government taking from the people, and instead "Government must learn to take less from people so that people can do more

for themselves” (1973). There would no more welfare for those not working as he reminded citizens “that America was built not by government, but by people--not by welfare, but by work--not by shirking responsibility, but by seeking responsibility” (1973).

Echoing Kennedy from several years prior, civic duty, for Nixon paralleled a similar sentiment: “In our own lives, let each of us ask--not just what will government do for me, but what can I do for myself? In the challenges we face together, let each of us ask--not just how can government help, but how can I help?” (1973). Nixon clearly was not willing to have government provide much more for America until citizens helped themselves. Ironically, he argued that the “Washington knows best” condescending policies of paternalism were not working, yet the speech itself paternalistically scolded Americans for not doing their part. They were not protecting their own way of life.

Although there were international threats to American’s way of life, by Nixon’s second inaugural speech, domestic economy was in relatively good shape. According to Dolfman and McSweeney (2006), from 1972-1973, “income had increased significantly [since the previous decade]...the share of total spending for food, clothing, and housing had decreased, the average U.S. family had more dollars available for discretionary expenses. The shifts identified in 1960–61—toward spending on cars, recreation, and medical and personal care—continued” (p. 35). During Nixon’s first term, things were relatively good in America; white, middle-class families fared well anyway.

In fact, Nixon was reelected a second time on this stability. What citizens seemed to resonate most with was less government intervention, so it seemed as if Nixon calling

them to do more to be better Americans made sense. Nixon provided the pillow for the infantilizing, condescending punch with this rhetoric to maintain domestic stability, however, by generally attributing social unrest not to the role government played nor to the failings of government, but more specifically to the reliance individuals had on government, he yanked the pillow out from underneath them. Nixon blamed “inflated expectations” of government on “reduced individual effort” for which combined results in “disappointment and frustration” that inevitably would “erode confidence” in both government and citizens’ ability to do what was needed of each. Government had “a vital role to play,” but so did everyone else.

Citizens’ role was to “work to preserve...peace...[and]...freedom” (Nixon 1973). Citizens’ duty to America was to, just as Nixon conveyed four years earlier, to take their destiny in their own hands. Because Nixon promised Americans less government interference, he also vowed to curtail government assistance. For the millions who relied on this assistance, and who also worked very hard, their civic duty could not be enacted as profoundly, based on Nixon’s construct, as their wealthier, more privileged neighbors. They could and would work to do their part in preserving the country’s freedom and to maintain peace, but at the end of their shift when they punched the clock, they lacked the same kind of power to participate in Capitalism (the very ideology and economic structure Nixon fought so hard for, thus clearly valued) as the ones who signed their time cards.

When Nixon connected hard work and self-reliance exclusively to civic duty, and packaged it with patriotism, to sell it as the ideal requisite of the human spirit, he

constructed the ability to enact citizenship on these terms with the ability to maintain autonomy in an economic system where any government assistance was a sign of not just weakened patriotism, but of diluted humanity. Therefore, the power behind the way Nixon tied civic duty to consumption in his second inaugural speech was not just in the idea that the inability to work hard equaled an inability to participate autonomously in Capitalism and its markets, but it was in the implication that failing to live independent of any government assistance equaled a failure to maximize the human spirit.

He delivered his second inaugural speech about 10 months before the “first shock” when the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) placed an embargo on oil. The impact was profound, and by 1974, “largely as a result of the OPEC oil embargo, which drove up energy prices by 29.6 percent and led to higher food prices— inflation increased 11 percent, the steepest gain since World War II. Unemployment followed, peaking at 9 percent in May 1975” (Dolfman and McSweeney 2006: 39).

Times were changing, but the irony marking political culture was not. Of course, the irony in Nixon’s sentiments, beyond blaming Americans for any economic troubles when clearly there were structural issues, such as the one above, impacting this, and the “pot calling the kettle black” swap he made calling government condescending, is that on August 9th, 1974, he resigned to avoid impeachment for what many describe as less than a stellar example of a model citizen.

Nixon’s recent resignation to avoid impeachment for possible criminal activity, for which Gerald Ford pardoned all wrongdoing thus forgiving his breach of duties, likely undermined many American’s trust in the political system and their politicians. As the

leader of the “free world,” Nixon’s primary social responsibility was to set an example of what ideal citizenry was; he failed to do so with the same integrity he demanded from his constituents. The resounding hypocrisy likely deafened many Americans to the virtues of democracy.

By 1975, America’s involvement in the Vietnam War was over, but the residual impact lingered throughout many levels of society. The broken promises and failure to follow through with policy initiatives aiming to protect internationalism further undermined the country’s confidence in government. Fallen soldiers, many of whom return suffering from what is now called Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (officially added to the DSM-III in 1980 by the APA), and their families were hit hard with the realization that their government simply would not provide adequate resources to fully recover from the psychological, physical, and financial stress they endured. This failure to respond quickly and responsibly to their recovery left many Vietnam veterans in the cold and their families searching for answers. Although providing some support when PTSD was added to the DSM-III, taking so long to address this issue effectively cemented a stigmatizing individual pathology to what is really a profound social problem.

By the time Ford left the Oval Office, residual effects of the Vietnam War, such as the one mentioned above, and other tangential fallout, culminate in profound issues. The economic system fell into inflation and the country sank further in debt because of the expenses war required. Inflation hit everyone, but the most economically vulnerable populations were hit the hardest in terms of material wealth. The impact to those relatively financial secure, including conservative Baby Boomers and the “hawks” who

did not explicitly oppose American's involvement in the war, was substantial, but it was their compromising trust in meritocracy that fueled their increasing cynicism of government's authority and competence.

James E. Carter

By 1976, the country was ready for a rebirth, again, symbolizing both a new era, and because of the bicentennial, also representing a segue back to the basic framework of political structure. According to Silver (1978), although some argue he was “rigid...unreasonable...private and remote...too serious,” Carter “made moral leadership and his relationship with God an important part of his self-definition. His ‘born again’ religious experience seems to be an important part of his makeup. This led to a campaign stressing honesty, decency, fairness, openness, and compassion” (p. 203). Further strengthening his credibility to lead a rebirth, and perhaps a way for the nation to be “born again,” too, “Carter’s political experience was his Southern back ground. During his early political career, he witnessed the turbulence that altered the social fabric of the region. The years when Carter rose to political prominence were marked by the decline of racial politics, and the emergence of moderate ‘New South’ politicians who wished to solve the problems of ‘all’ the people of their states” (Silver 1978: 204).

Carter was also not Gerald Ford. Silver (1978) emphasizes the importance of Carter’s separation from his predecessor noting that, “[w]hen [Gerald] Ford issued his pardon of former President Nixon, the President’s approval rating fell by the largest drop in the shortest time in the history of the Gallup Poll. This created a credibility problem

that haunted Ford throughout his tenure, and may have cost him the election” (p. 206).

Carter won using the slogan: “A Leader, For A Change.”

The pun worked in a couple of ways. First, he established himself as “A” leader, not “The” leader, which reflected his humility, a quality Americans did not see often in Nixon. Ford was humble, but because he pardoned Nixon, thus sort of forgiving him, he lost some credibility. Carter’s slogan also worked by playing on the “For A Change.” There is a comma in front of the phrase, which might mean Carter was a leader advocating change or he was simply a leader, which might have connoted a lack of leadership preceding him. It was clever but not too difficult to decipher, which further worked to connect with citizens as it allowed them a chance to feel clever, too, and claim understanding in an often confusing political climate. Finally, his slogan also suggested Carter himself favored change; he was not against it, he was for it. Carter’s campaign played on this idea of change through television advertisements where he looked very different than a President normally does; he was a change.

A popular four-minute television advertisement ran in 1976 summarized Carter’s image well; it situated Carter within clips of traditional icons representing America, Carter, wearing casual clothes, strolling through a peanut field, surrounded by his family, talking with the camera operator, exemplified an average citizen, specifically, a small town country man who valued honest, hard work. Carter did not look, talk, nor carry himself like an elite, fast-talking politician. He presented himself as humble servant. Carter’s inaugural speech reflected that same humble, quiet persona. In fact, Smith (1976) of the New York Times suggests his speech “was less rallying cry than

sermon...where Mr. Carter preached not the powers but the limitations of the Presidency and offered not the heady excitement of a new dream but the quiet satisfaction of renewing the old” (p. 1). Carter wanted to renew the American Dream, one built around the same sentiments grounding America two hundred years earlier, one that when achieved would represent a better America and better Americans.

Carter campaigned for his Presidency squarely in the middle of America’s bicentennial celebrations. In 1976, the culture industry constructed a hyperbolic tone of patriotism. From the outside, this construction likely looked like any other celebration where the values and virtues founding the country two hundred years come together to strengthen America’s core. However, a closer look clarifies the hyperbole was masking a crumbling structure and several blows to ideologies tied to the American Dream.

Carter tempered these blows. He blended together ideas reminiscent of moderation and progress, which grounded the speech in the past with an eye on the future. He asked the country to go back to the basics and move forward at the same time. The ideas were simple, the reflections were understandable, and the rhetoric clearly was neither hostile nor hopeful. It simply revealed where the country had been, where it was in 1976, and where it needed to be. He conveyed concern without being condescending, and attempted to identify with citizens’ at an emotional level.

James E. Carter: 1977 Inaugural Speech

Carter, in 1,229 words, used the most intimate rhetoric of all previous Presidents in this sample. In this, although past speeches conveyed humility, his use of 2nd, “you,” in several areas conveyed indicates he was speaking to a person rather than citizens or

Americans. This seems purposeful as he conjured the past to connote an almost down-home feel to his tone. He humbly revealed, as Smith (1977) also captures above, that he had “no new dream to set forth today, but rather urge a fresh faith in the old dream” (1977). The old dream paralleled Roosevelt’s idea to connect moral righteousness with a good (morally just) economy. Building on both the value of spirituality, as many former Presidents did, and liberty, as the founding fathers emphasized, Carter noted that America’s freedom to define itself “has given us an exceptional appeal, but it also imposes on us a special obligation, to take on those moral duties...” (1977).

Carter connoted a sense of humility in the only inaugural speech he delivered. His sentiment was not that America should be the strongest, most powerful country dominating the global market, but that Americans ought to “simply do our best” (1977). He urged, however, all citizens of the world to not “confuse our idealism with weakness,” but instead take heed in a more offensive approach where “we will maintain strength so sufficient that it need not be proven in combat—a quiet strength based not merely on the size of an arsenal, but on the nobility of ideas” (Carter 1977). Conveying an offensive approach separated Carter from his predecessor and aligned him more with liberal ideologies, such as those Kennedy revealed over a decade earlier.

For Carter, citizens doing their best meant honoring “the affirmation of our Nation's continuing moral strength,” just as Roosevelt similarly proposed (Carter 1976). It meant affirming “our belief in an undiminished, ever-expanding American dream,” just as Nixon also implied (Carter 1976). This meant building democracy as a role model for other nations, just as Eisenhower also encouraged. It meant fighting “our wars on

poverty, ignorance, and injustice...the enemies,” just as Johnson introduced (Carter 1976). Taken together, Carter used these sentiments to remind America that the ideas, plans, and process preceding him were good ones, but somewhere along the line, someone or something fell short of maintaining them. Carter introduced several propositions, most of them also renewed efforts. However, his call for the “strengthened American family, which is the basis of our society” that transformed civic duty (1977).

Carter claimed renewing the American Dream would ensure citizens “again have full faith in our country and one another” (1977). He constructed civic duty as working hard to achieve the American Dream and as maintaining faith. Citizens were to dedicate themselves to honest, hard work, and maintain faith in God, country, and each other. Carter claimed “[o]urs was the first society openly to define itself in terms of both spirituality and human liberty,” and was the first President to explicitly discuss his faith tied to an almost obligatory civic duty blurring the separation between church and state, at least in this context.

He tied civic duty, therefore, to pursuing the American Dream, which required not just honest, hard work, but securing financial stability and success, and buying the symbols of both. The long-standing tradition of conspicuous consumption is to consume to demonstrate financial stability and success where the more a person consumes, the more stable and successful s/he is, or at least appears to be. This parallels the connection Carter implied between civic duty and consumption. The harder someone works to achieve the American Dream, the better citizen s/he is. The most conspicuous way to demonstrate this achievement and fulfillment of civic duty is to buy what represents the

American Dream: a house, furnishings, car, etc. Thus, a citizens' ability to fulfill their civic duty is tied to their ability to consume what represents the achievement of the American Dream.

Carter also tied civic duty to faith, specifically in God first and then country and other citizens. To follow this aligning with Carter's version of patriotism, civic duty also required some investment in spiritual righteousness, therefore. Taking a critical approach is likely not what Carter intended with this particular call to duty, but through that lens, he might have connected civic duty to consumption, at least spending, indirectly. Morgan (2004), argues "Carter owed his narrow election as president in 1976 to the solid support of the traditional Democratic constituency of blue-collar and low-income voters who were worried about unemployment" (p. 1020). Schieman (2010) suggests that "[r]ecent evidence confirms that stratification-based differences in religious affiliation persist" (p. 26). Schieman is reflecting on the long-standing support for the hypothesis that a negative relationship between income and religiosity continues to exist.

In this, it is likely Carter's supporters concerned about unemployment and income security were also at least moderately religious. Although likely not intentionally, Carter tangentially, tied civic duty to consumption by constructing civic duty as not just honest, hard work, but also faith in God where demonstrating that faith, thus fulfilling civic duty, required attending church (Carter advocated regular attendance at church as he attended frequently), and as it has been the tradition of many Christian-based faiths, also continue to require tithing. For those unable to pursue the American Dream in conspicuous ways, and therefore, fulfill their civic duty, could instead (or even in addition to) attend church

and demonstrate their patriotism by tithing and fulfill their civic duty using those means. When those means were not available, citizens could at least serve their communities and invest time.

There is no doubt since he left office that the humanitarian work he did during his Presidency and after sent powerful and positive messages about the importance of community and service. However, Carter's success in resolving economic issues while in office was not altogether positive. His strengths were elsewhere. Morgan (2004) summarizes the implications of Carter's lack of clear economic vision,

“[w]hen he took office nearly 8 million Americans, 7-5 per cent of the labour force, were unemployed, while inflation was a relatively low 4-8 per cent. The economy was in an abnormally slow recovery from the 1974-5 recession, the worst since the 1930s, which had been triggered by fiscal and monetary restraint to curb the surge of inflation above 12 per cent in the wake of the oil price increases levied by the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC)” (p. 1020).

Carter knew the economic problems originated in unemployment, “yet he also worried that the record \$73.7 billion deficit inherited from the Ford administration and the constant escalation of federal spending were ‘root causes’ of inflation,” but Carter did not present a clear plan to address unemployment nor the deficit (Morgan 2004: 1020). His economic philosophy was “fuzzy” at best (Morgan 2004). Unfortunately, his approach to dealing with the continued oil did not yield good results either.

During Carter's Presidential term, American and Middle Eastern cultural relations were no less tumultuous than during Nixon's. Policies were put in place to somewhat stabilize their institutional interdependency and secure a steady supply of oil (e.g., the peace treaty established between the U.S. and Middle East resulting from the September 1978 "Peace Talks" at Camp David). However, America's involvement in spreading democratic ideologies to the Middle East did not fare well across the whole region.

In response to Carter's humanitarian efforts to allow Iran's leader, Mohammed Reza Shah Pahlavi, who supported and welcomed both European and American Capitalism, to enter America for medical treatment, a group of approximately five-hundred radicals captured sixty-six American hostages from the embassy in Tehran, the capital of Iran, on November 4th, 1979. With the help of the Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini, a leader of a revolutionary Islamist movement, these five-hundred students gave reason for Americans in 1979 to rally against a common enemy, just as Americans did post-9/11. Callaghan and Virtanen (1993) argue the hostage crisis spurred a national sense of patriotic unity and boosted Carter's approval ratings to even higher than were in response to the Camp David "Peace Talks." The patriotic spirit sustained through the 444 day long hostage crisis, but Carter's boost in approval ratings did not.

Within days of taking the Americans hostage, all the women and most of the men who identified as a racial minority were released. "Within a month, Carter's popularity realized a dramatic boost from a low of 32% to 58%, a quick gain of 26 percentage points" (Callaghan and Virtanen 1993: 756). Within two months, the country was at the onset of the 1980 Presidential race. Carter's approval ratings remained high in the first

few months as citizens unified in patriotic spirit around the country; the leader of the country represents the keeper of that patriotism (Callaghan and Virtanen 1993). Within another few months, however, other hostages were not released and efforts to rescue them failed. It took eight months before another hostage was released (to seek medical treatment), but by then Carter's approval ratings took a substantial dive back to the low 30s where citizens' concern for his inability to resolve economic issues, specifically job and market security, prevailed. Carter lost the 1980 Presidential office to Reagan.

Overall, Presidents in office during the 1960s and 1970s all constructed: individualism, collectivism, and patriotism; what working for individual profit and together for the country should look like; and how citizens should enact their civic duty. Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon, and Carter all defined civic duty as an obligation to work for individual pursuits and to reach goals all Americans were supposed to share. Americans were supposed to work on becoming better citizens and helping each other to ensure community support and citizens did not rely too much on government assistance. Because of this, Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon, and Carter, both directly and/or indirectly, proposed that expressing patriotism required citizens balance their obligations to their communities and governments with their duties to prosper individually. Therefore, between the 1960s and 1970s, Presidents started to outline the importance of individualism as it related to consumption and tied this to economic values requiring citizens to work for both micro-economic and macro-economic reasons. Citizens' duty was then to develop into better, more prosperous Americans and to work together to

secure America's economic stability in a globalizing market. Expressing patriotism required fulfilling civic duty, and therefore, those who did were "better" Americans.

Chapter Six: Consumers Working to be a Better American (Micro-Level Content and Meso-Level Context Findings)

In this chapter, I will show that Presidential rhetoric in the 1980s-mid 2000s constructs civic duty primarily as an obligation to pursue resources individual need to consume, and to some extent, develop community resources. By the early 1980s, Presidential rhetoric had securely fastened the notion of doing for America and serving government with other Americans into the moral consciousness of the country by building a foundation for which civic duty relied on expressing patriotism by working. Presidential inaugural speeches in the 1930s-1950s construct working as a moral obligation for which all Americans were supposed to comply to create a better America. The 1960s brought a new era where stabilizing a moral economy by working only fulfilled part of Americans' civic duty. During the 1960s and 70s, Presidents paradoxically called citizens to work collectively to pursue their own American Dreams and asked citizens to fully commit to selfless acts of service with other citizens for their government by staking their own claim in the growing global economy to establish individual prosperity and wealth. Presidents since the 1960s have constructed civic duty as collective individualism.

By the early 1980s, Ronald W. Reagan explicitly prioritized individuals working as the primary resolution to government's economic problems and solution to prosperity. Reagan's Presidency pushed the evolving connection between consumption and economic values to civic duty and patriotism into full force. He argued civic duty required working so Americans could accumulate income to participate in the economy

and to remain independent from government assistance; expressing patriotism required working and declining social services. H. W. Bush individualized economic problems and argued citizens were responsible for working together to resolve these problems, but ultimately constructed civic duty around the idea that working would secure citizens' financial freedom to pursue an American Dream. Clinton continued some of this rhetoric, but attributed the origins of economic problems to structural issues instead of individuals. He constructed civic duty and the expression of patriotism both as an obligation to work to secure the economic security needed both to consume and to free up time to invest in community service to help others who lacked this security. W. Bush swapped responsibility back out where he blamed individuals for economic problems. He constructed civic duty as an obligation to work toward achieving financial independence and proposed expressing patriotism was every working citizens' right. Obama constructed civic duty as an obligation to reach for prosperity and to serve America's civil liberties to bring about more equal access for each citizen to achieve an American Dream. Expressing patriotism involved trying to prosper and aligning with democratic values.

Ultimately each President holding office between the 1980s through the mid-2000s connected consumption to civic duty by urging Americans to develop strong economic values, and in this, by proposing Americans either work to secure income to consume or work together in various ways to take the burden off government so it may stimulate an economy fit for consuming. Working was the best way to express patriotism. Their concern was no longer just that citizens work to establish a moral economy to build

a better America, nor was it just that citizens become better Americans by working toward the American Dream with others to serve their communities and political institutions. Instead, starting in the 1980s, Presidential rhetoric asked citizens to be a better American, for the sake of their own economic prosperity and the stability of American's economic system within a globalizing market. Times were changing, in other words.

Ronald W. Reagan

The morning of Reagan's first inauguration, all the hostages in Iran were released. According to Smith (1981) of the New York Times, "it provided the perfect symbolic backdrop for Mr. Reagan's political objectives" (p. A1-B7). Reagan did not mention this news in his inaugural speech, most likely because word of this releases to the public just minutes before he took the stage. Even if he knew of their release, however, he could not mention it because it would break the trust he established during his campaign if he showed "government" knew more than they do. Reagan's platform relied on the slogans, "Let's Make America Great Again" and "Are you better off than four years ago?" where both implied the country was not in good shape and it was time for a change.

Reagan campaigned on the promise to alleviate the role "big" government played in American's lives arguing citizens would be better off without governmental restrictions so they could move within society and participate freely in the economic market. Smith (1980) argues Reagan's first inaugural speech was "a distillation of the stump speeches and the after-dinner talks that thrust him into the political limelight and catapulted him into the Presidency, determined not only to 'free all Americans from the

terror of runaway living costs' [to end inflation] but to check and 'reverse the growth of government' [where it is nation that has its government, not a government that its nation]" (p. B7). In his first inaugural speech, Reagan revealed who would benefit from reigning in economic terror, and noted "[a]ll must share in this 'new beginning,' and all must share in the bounty of a revived economy" (1980).

Reagan proposed that individuals should, as part of their civic duty, take responsibility for their government. He gave individuals permission to do just that, metaphorically, by encouraging "the people" to "share in the productive work of this 'new beginning'" so that everyone was able to "share in the bounty of a revived economy...and let us begin an era of national renewal. Let us renew our determination, our courage, and our strength" (1981). He encouraged "the people" to begin looking at themselves differently. Claiming "the people," specifically those working to "raise our food, patrol our streets, man our mines and factories, teach our children, keep our homes, and heal us when we're sick," occupy *the* most important special interest group, Reagan constructed a way for "the people" to rationalize their connectedness to the government. Further, this construct prioritized and made special their occupations, children, families, and health over government. He anchored this construction by defining "the people" as heroes, those "you can see...every day going in and out of the factory gates...you, the citizens," and along with offering to remove obstacles in the economy, justifies the momentum citizens need to consume (1981).

What Reagan really meant, though, when he offered to "propose removing roadblocks that have slowed our economy and reduced productivity," is that he would

remove tax burdens from the elite and take funding away from many social and welfare programs (1980). Reagan was really proposing America shift to “[s]upply-side economics, with its belief that incentives to work, save, and to invest are badly hurt by taxes, provided the necessary intellectual rationale for the massive tax cuts ultimately enacted” (Peterson 1985: 627). Reagan followed through with this proposal. Households earning over \$80,000 annually were able to save more than \$21,000 a year through the tax savings the Economy Recover Tax Act (ERTA) of 1981 generated, however, “households in the lowest income category, namely those with incomes of less than \$10,000, had tax savings of only \$60” (Peterson 1985: 630).

He rationalized the ERTA by arguing its simplest asset: cutting taxes was a win-win for all citizens; it meant less money they earn goes to “big” government. Building off the myth that most of the citizens receiving government assistance were dependent on it, Reagan justified reducing “income assistance” programs by 3.8% overall, but the impact this reduction had on the working poor was profound; families below the poverty level lost, on average, 7.5% of their income (Peterson 1985). The programs, other than mandatory ones such as Social Security and Medicaid/Medicare generated a small portion of spending for the country, relative to defense and healthcare, and the taxes collected from the very wealthy reduced a portion of government “income” that helped to pay for these mandatory programs. Both the programs and taxes are lost.

At the time, citizens would not have known that reducing social and welfare programs could not address poverty, thus eliminating the need for the programs. Poverty was not conceptualized as a social problem; it was constructed as an outside threat so

brutal a “War on Poverty” as needed. It was constructed as an individual problem that occurred when someone does not work enough, as Nixon implied. But, it was not constructed a social problem. The previous rhetoric confirms this latter point most clearly where civic duty equaled an individual citizen’s hard work, which equaled the ability to consume more, which equaled an ability to display patriotism better.

By the 1980s, Media and Politics, as social institutions, merge in unique ways within the culture industry. Televising Presidential campaigns institutionalized the merger between Media and Politics, and gave the culture industry tremendous power in constructing ideologies. Presidents arguing individual hard work would inevitably raise someone out of poverty was only one source of information. The argument made sense, too, almost too much sense: being employed reduces unemployment, which decreases poverty. It is an easy message to digest; it is lateral.

However, this message did not account for the institutional issues contributing to poverty, such as laws setting the minimum wage incommensurate with a living wage, high interest rates on educational loans in an increasingly global market in which post-secondary education is required to compete, increasing healthcare expenses where hourly wage workers are pushed out of preventative wellness, and agribusiness subsidies that are not always passed on to consumers, thus raising the cost of affordable, nutritious food. In other words, conveying a message that civic duty required working hard to lift the worker out of poverty so s/he could consume and contribute to economy to demonstrate patriotism simply did not apply to everyone with equity, nor did it account for the ways

in which complex social issues intersected to maintain hierarchies and limit access to jobs paying enough to consume even basic necessities.

Schram in 1991, ten years after Reagan delivers his first inaugural speech, found “there is very little support for the idea that increases in welfare spending are at the root of the persistence of poverty and are the main cause of welfare ‘dependency.’ Instead, we find evidence for the opposite proposition: decreases in welfare spending have increased poverty, including ‘dependent’ poverty. This is especially the case when one appraises welfare spending relative to need” (p. 139). American *was* in need at the start of the 1980s. The middle class, working class, working poor, and un(der)employed needed jobs earning income commensurate with living wages. They needed adequate access to affordable food, healthcare, and housing. They needed reassurance that the American Dream was still achievable.

Ronald W. Reagan: 1981 Inaugural Speech

Reagan offered them solace in his first inaugural speech where he almost talked *with* instead of *to* citizens. He reconstructed the American Dream as something within every *working* person’s reach, and attributed to labor the noblest status. Reagan constructed civic duty as individual responsibility requiring less reliance on government where he granted every *working* American hero status. He reminded citizens they determined their destiny and secured their own freedom and safety. By contrast, those not working, or even those working reliant on government programs, were vilified. They were not the ones who were “worthy of [them]selves, ready to do what must be done to ensure happiness and liberty for our...children, and our children’s children,” nor were

they “heroes every day going in and out of factory gates,” nor the ones who “create new jobs, new wealth and opportunity” (Reagan 1980). The villain was big government.

Regan clearly conveyed his desire for reducing the size of government in his first inaugural speech. A man of many words, relatively speaking to previous Presidents, he used 2,427 to explicitly outline the concept that less is more. However, even though this speech was longer than some, it was significantly more conversational, considered somewhat unconventional at the time for Presidents. His narrative style likely provided specific ways to identify with the rhetoric. Reagan’s experience as an actor might explain his comfort using conversational tones; he was well-versed in constructing language, so to speak. He built a clear and confident first person, “I,” point of view as if to take autonomous responsibility for this position, rather than including himself in “we” or “us.” This was somewhat unique to inaugural speeches at this point, too, and likely a fresh approach to a tired citizenry. He justified the length further as he conveyed more gratitude to previous Presidents, not government, than any others in this sample.

In previous speeches, government was let off the hook in various ways by holding citizens responsible, either directly or indirectly, for the country’s economic issues. When blame was not placed on citizens, Presidents attributed problems to abstract issues. Roosevelt claimed it was the country’s morality and self-awareness that needed adjusting; failure to correct morality would result in economy failing. Truman said it was citizens’ hard work that determined economic prosperity; failure to work hard meant failure to grow the economy. Eisenhower argued citizens should serve their country with honor where civic duty equaled economic productivity; failure to fulfill civic duty meant

citizens were to blame for an unproductive economy. Kennedy flat out instructed citizens to ask what they could do for their government; failure to do anything for the government meant they had nobody to blame but themselves should inequalities persist. Johnson called on the pioneer spirit where rugged individualism would conquer inequity; failure to find the frontier and work on it meant a failure to cultivate its bountiful harvest. Nixon scolded citizens for asking too much of their government and not doing enough in return; he blamed citizens outright for the failing economy. Carter constructed honorable citizenry as they bestowed the responsibility of leading them onto him; failure to lead implied citizens' choices were not wise after all.

Reagan, however, blamed government, specifically “big” government, which was a new and easy scapegoat in inaugural speeches. Shifting the blame to government simultaneously confirmed government was not acting in the best interest of its citizens, it was too big to see the trees in the forest, and implied citizens, when left to their own devices as they had not yet been, could and would do a better job managing their own lives. The problem with this rhetoric is that it was a disguise. It masked the structural problems with a linguistic spin that ultimately muddied rather clarified the source of the economic problems. Reagan accounted for the issues, acknowledged they were overwhelming and let citizens off the hook.

Reagan's solution to the country's economic problems, to the country's “big government” problems, was simple and connoted a tempered approach, but it was in reality far more polemical than it seemed. He maintained a “plain-spoken charter” to reveal his “conservative creed, less a sermon [as Carter's inaugural address is] than a

stump speech, less a rallying cry [as Kennedy's inaugural address is] than a ringing denunciation of overgrown government and a practical pledge to get down to the business of trimming it all at once" (Smith 1980: 1).

As Reagan noted, America was "suffer[ing] from the longest and one of the worst sustained inflations in our national history" (1981). He further connected this suffering to lived-experiences, and argued "[i]t distorts our economic decisions, penalizes thrift, and crushes the struggling young and the fixed-income elderly alike. It threatens to shatter the lives of millions of our people" (1981). The situation was dire, and although some were working, the promises previous Presidents made that productivity would lead to greater chances of investment went unfulfilled.

Reagan, of course, blamed the system itself, and reassured Americans that he understood their woes as he recognized that those "who do work are denied a fair return for their labor by a tax system which penalizes successful achievement and keeps us from maintaining full productivity" (1981). He argued something had to give. It was not enough to simply believe in America, according to Reagan. Moral righteousness, faith, and beliefs in the American Dream mattered. He valued action more than anything, specifically when "we, the Americans of today act worthy of ourselves" (1981). For Reagan, civic duty ultimately relied on the above, and would eventually save America from the threats of big government and make available the American Dream for all.

He punctuated his entire speech by summarizing this main points, which provided a sense of closure, of course, but also left a final reminder that there were pre-requisites to being a dutiful American: acting with a "best effort," believing in the ability to achieve

the best, motivated by ability to do good things, and believing that, “with God’s help we can and will resolve the problems which now confront us,” the problem of big government. For Reagan, government was too big when citizens relied too much on its costly programs; when the deficit grew too much because government intervened too much in what he thought citizens should handle on their own. Overall, for Reagan, big government equaled too much. It was too much interference, too much intervening, and too much citizen reliance on its programs that cost too much. Reagan instead asked that Americans work to earn their own incomes to participate in economy, or consume, on their own terms. He proposed that it is not too much to ask for, regardless of structural obstacles.

According to Peterson (1985), Reagan’s proposal led to some success because it brought down inflation, and quickly, too, however, it was “achieved at the cost of a severe recession” (p. 627). By 1982, according to pbs.org, nine million people were unemployed and Reagan’s approval rating plummeted to 35%. On top of so many Americans being out of work, available credit essentially dwindled because the Federal Reserve increased interest rates to 14%, which resulted in seventeen thousand businesses failing all the while the national deficit increased exponentially (Forbes.com). By 1983, there were no significant improvements, and Reagan needed to reconcile a humbling bottom line; his “trickledown/supply-side” plan simply did not work. On the advice of his Budget Director, fellow supply-side economist, David Stockman, who predicted an inevitable \$200 billion or more deficit, Reagan made it impossible for corporate welfare to continue; he removed corporate tax benefits (pbs.org). This effectively held big

businesses, such as those on Wall Street, accountable for their share in contributing to the “nation’s income,” and while those on “Main Street” started paying more taxes, too, relative to income, their share was nowhere near corporations’ contributions showing multi-million dollar profits. Within a year, the blow from Reagan’s “trickledown/supply side” economic experiment softened, and the economy was on a clearer path to prosperity, as Reagan promised it would be in his inaugural speech at the start of 1980.

Reagan’s popularity during his first campaign, when Baby Boomers were in their late teens to mid-thirties, rested on traditional Christian values, but more importantly he promised to develop policies reflective of these values. In this, he effectively branded himself as a conservative aiming to fuse traditional values with policies. He proposed to institutionalize a conservative political framework not just for Economy, but also to sacrifice the separation of Church and State and legislate the practice of religion in schools, specifically for those who pray. Although he advocated for equality, he installed his personal opinions into his political obligations where women were not given much credit, other than a monumental step toward closing the gender gap in the Supreme Court and appointing conservative Sandra O’Connor in his first year as President. Reichly (1981-2) argues, “from the start of 1980 campaign,” Reagan built “[t]he final ideological pillar on which the Reagan administration bases its policies...[it] is support for traditional moral attitudes on the so-called social issues, such as abortion, school prayer, and militant feminism.” (p. 543). Reagan was anti-choice when it came to abortion, anti-separation of Church and State when it came to school prayer, and anti-feminism when it came to a more aggressive way of expressing it. Although he advocated for personal liberty in

many speeches, including his first and second inaugural addresses, it seems individual freedom was really only for those who chose the path of his preconception of moral righteousness. Fortunately, for Reagan, this path was the one many Americans choose in 1984.

Ronald W. Reagan: 1985 Inaugural Speech

America loves a “Cinderella Story.” We are a nation built on comebacks, second-chances, and as every President argued to date in their inaugural speeches, fresh starts, dawning of new eras, and renewed times. America reelected Reagan in 1984. The economy, overall, was fairly good shape. American morale was up; citizens were confident that not only was the American Dream achievable, they could reach it without too much compromise. Reagan instilled this confidence in several ways. Bouncing back from a failed assassination attempt on his life in July, 1981 and recovering the economy from what amounted to his attempt to assassinate it, Reagan showed America he was resilient and humble. Although in 1984 when America reelected him, he was more aged at seventy-three years old than most Presidential incumbents, Reagan was sharp, witty, and strong in stature, all of which connoted a sense of youth and vitality. His policies, both domestic and international, were fiercely bold and risky representing a pioneer spirit valuing innovation, progress, and rugged individualism. Reagan articulated complex issues in a narrative style where he again appeared to talk with citizens instead of to them. He appealed to citizens’ broader ideals while reinforcing optimism in their abilities. He conjured up nostalgic values on which so many Baby Boomers were raised who

comprise much of the workforce and who were also starting families as they were in their early twenties and late thirties in 1984.

It is not a big surprise that Reagan built his second Presidential campaign on the economic success of his 1983 tax cuts, minimizing the reasons precipitating the cuts, and reaffirmed a strong following clinging to traditional family values for which many young Baby Boomers held. Cannon (2016), consulting editor for the Miller Center of Public Affairs, proposes it was both Reagan's ability to create a strong economic climate for Americans and his personal opinions, rather than partisan support, that won him a second term. He confirms that, "[t]raditional Republican support among white Protestants, small-town and rural Americans, college graduates, upper-class Americans, and white-collar managers and professionals remained exceedingly strong," and further recalls, "Catholics who had supported Reagan in 1980 voted for him again in 1984, as did a large number of skilled and unskilled workers, high school graduates, and persons of moderate incomes" (2016).

Additionally, much like the hyperbolic patriotic spirit built into Carter's campaign because of the country's bicentennial celebration, the 1984 summer Olympics in Los Angeles, CA were a source of the same celebratory spirit where "[t]he sum of [Reagan's] accomplishments...restored public confidence and national pride epitomized by the chants of 'USA, USA' that began at the Olympic summer games in Los Angeles and were often heard at Reagan rallies in the fall. The mood was captured by the Reagan campaign theme, expressed radiantly in feel-good television commercials: Morning Again in America" (Cannon 2016). It seems framing tax cuts that let citizens keep more

of their income, although still not entirely commensurate with living wages, with “faith, family, work, and neighborhood” constructed a picture of Reagan with which most Americans clearly resonated (Reagan 1985). A few months after the games, voters elected Reagan for another four years of Presidential service, and a couple of months after that, he delivered his second inaugural speech.

This time around, Reagan constructed a more overtly dutiful citizen. Although he relied on the normative messages combining unity, liberty, progress, renewing America, and of course, patriotism to build directives for civic duty, he introduced a bold proposal directly holding working citizens accountable for the country’s economic freedom. Instead of constructing civic duty as an abstract obligation to believe and act in ways that benefit general individual and national well-being, Reagan argued that individuals’ civic duty was to pay taxes and government’s responsibility was to freeze programs so those taxes were directed toward the national deficit to balance the budget. Reagan argued, “[a] dynamic economy, with more citizens working and paying taxes, will be our strongest tool to bring down budget deficits” and that “we” should “permanently control government’s power to tax and spend” after programs are frozen (1985).

Reagan maintained the use of “government” in his second inaugural speech as often as he did in his first, nineteen and seventeen times respectively, and continued advocating for reducing government’s size. Although this one was only slightly longer than his previous inaugural speech at 2,561 words, it packed a far greater punch. There are a few similarities, including framing citizens as heroes, but he offered one significant

difference. Reagan proposes the most dramatic version of civic duty and clearest connection of it tied to consumption seen in any other speech.

In an even bolder move, Reagan admitted he would “submit a budget to the Congress aimed at freezing government program spending for the next year...[to] begin reducing the national debt,” and “take further steps to permanently control government’s power to tax and spend...to protect future generations from government’s desire to spend its citizens’ money and tax them into servitude when the bills come due” (1985). This is a bit of a contradiction here because within a few statements, he argued tax payers were needed to relieve the national debt. Therefore, he argued within minutes that the government should not tax citizens into servitude *and* citizens must pay taxes to cover the government’s debt. Perhaps one message was the pillow and the other punch: we should reduce government’s dependency on taxes softened the blow of citizens’ duty to pay off the effects of that dependency. Perhaps it was all to minimize the fallout expected from freezing government spending.

Because, by “freezing government program spending,” what Reagan really meant was that he planned to:

“reduce dependency and upgrade the dignity of those who are infirm or disadvantaged. And here, a growing economy and support from family and community offer our best chance for a society where compassion is a way of life, where the old and infirm are cared for, the young and, yes, the unborn protected, and the unfortunate looked after and made self-sufficient” (Reagan 1985).

He framed social services as social servitude, and constructed those who paid for the services (via their taxes) as servants to a population enslaving them to this duty. He effectively individualizes poverty, and implied those citizens who require assistance did so because they were not working to be self-sufficient. Self-sufficiency, for Reagan, was the most virtuous calling.

Two important contextual indicators from Reagan's plan to freeze government spending lend insight into how and why he constructed consumption tied to civic duty and patriotism. First, in this context, his focus on self-sufficiency indicates he valued individual contributions. Reagan directly instructed Americans to work in order to pay more taxes, which he argued would help balance the budget, which would enable government to focus on the business of the country's defense, war against drugs and disease, and squashing out Communist threats; this directive had an indirect ulterior agenda, however. Reagan (1985), just as he did in his first inaugural speech, argued those who work were the real American heroes. He reiterated that his vision would allow, "every American who seeks work [to] find work, so the least among us shall have an equal chance to achieve the greatest things—to be heroes who heal our sick, feed the hungry, protect peace among nations, and leave this world a better place."

He effectively said that citizens must not only work to be dutiful, but they must also pay off the country's debt from "an almost unbroken 50 years of deficit spending has finally brought us to a time of reckoning" in order to retain a sense of patriotism for themselves (Reagan 1985). He pleaded that "[w]e must act now to protect future generations from government's desire to spend its citizens' money and tax them into

servitude when the bills come due” (1985). Reagan wanted the current generation to protect future generations’ ability to participate in a free market and labor pool. If citizens paid more in taxes than they could keep, they could not consume as much, and if citizens did not work at all to earn income to support themselves and consume, that would burden the government’s deficit with demanding welfare programs, and as such, government could not do what it needed to stimulate the economy for consumption, as Reagan implied.

In this, civic duty, for both government and those it served, was to balance their respective budgets to stimulate economy. He argued the Federal Government should exercise:

“social compassion. But our fundamental goals must be to reduce dependency and upgrade the dignity of those who are infirm or disadvantaged. And here, a growing economy and support from family and community offer our best chance for a society where compassion is a way of life, where the old and infirm are cared for, the young and, yes, the unborn protected, and the unfortunate looked after and made self-sufficient (1985).

Here, he tied consumption and civic duty with another thread: a demonstration of patriotism. The links are somewhat indirect, as expected; however, the message is clear: Americans, everyday heroes who labor in the workforce, those who he constructed in his last speech and reinforced as such in this speech, those who “raise our food, patrol our streets, man our mines and factories, teach our children, keep our homes, and heal us when we're sick—professionals, industrialists, shopkeepers, clerks, cabbies, and truck

drivers...who heal our sick, feed the hungry, protect peace among nations, and leave this world a better place,” those are the ones who would grow the economy (1981 and 1985).

For Reagan, this growth would come from citizens working, paying taxes, and pursuing the American Dream (securing a job, educating our nation, raising a family, keeping a home, etc.). Productive labor, of course, enabled the government to collect income taxes and money spent on goods and services required also contributing to sales taxes in most states. Consuming all the necessary goods and services needed to get an education, especially a post-secondary degree, an increasingly mandatory requirement to participate in a globalized economy marked with increasingly specialized division of labor, required spending money, of course, and attending college, for example, is expensive. Raising a family and maintaining a home could be reproductive-labor intensive, time-consuming, and costly.

Set aside for now the myriad ways in which conspicuous consumption can stratify perceptions of occupational, education, and familial status, the overall prevailing message in Reagan’s second inaugural speech clearly constructed an individual’s civic duty as an obligation to balance the national deficit. This set up a dynamic where those who contribute more taxes, consume more goods and services needed to earn an education and maintain a family/home, and therefore, could contribute to the economic growth, were more dutiful citizens. This connected consumption to civic duty, and defined those who could consume more as both a more dutiful and better American, a more patriotic American.

A second contextual indicator represents how and why Reagan constructed consumption tied to civic duty and patriotism. Reagan justified his plan to freeze government spending by extending self-sufficiency to the community. Already establishing a context for which he justified working and self-sufficiency equaled to civic duty and heroism, in his second inaugural speech, he also argued community resources would close the gaps freezing government assistance programs caused. As Reagan noted above, “a growing economy and support from family and community offer our best chance for a society where compassion is a way of life,” and also reveals that much of the control the federal government has over states is being handed back “to State and local governments” (1984). He called not just for self-reliance, but also for families to take care of each other and when that was not enough, look to the community for resources. This message was consistent with how Reagan individualized poverty and its by-products, for example, food insecurity/hunger. As he promised, Reagan limited the funding available to government programs serving the needs of those living in poverty, and in effort to address some of the needs indirectly, established some proactive resources.

Through the Temporary Emergency Food Assistance Program Congresses launched in March, 1983, many families who previously relied on the federally-funded programs Reagan reduced were given food via “surplus commodities” the government provided (Lipsky and Thibodeau 1988: 223). However, it simply was not enough because, much like other initiatives helping those who are poor (and hungry), it does not address poverty as a social problem. To construct poverty as an individual problem

actually works against social equality, and thus any hope to fulfill civic duty by consuming amounts to false consciousness and perpetuates a hegemonic ideology that serves meritocracy well, but does not serve much else.

Lipsky and Thibodeau (1988) argue that counting on community resources in the private sector, such as food banks, churches, homeless shelters, and community cafes/soup kitchens to alleviate food insecurity are counterproductive, and cannot work as well addressing systemic issues related to poverty or even providing institutionalized assistance to stagnate growing poverty. When it *looks* like the effects of poverty are addressed and less people are struggling with food insecurity, for example, relying on community resources appears to work and makes it seem as though poverty is addressed. What it actually means, however, is that fewer people living in poverty are going hungry from day to day. While there is a need to address poverty as a social problem, such as dismantling the origins of social inequality generally (institutional discrimination, intersectional impact from double-jeopardy, etc.), providing at least a formal way to ensure basic needs are met (food and shelter) is a start.

Lipsky and Thibodeau argue, “[i]n contrast to food stamps, WIC, and other substantial programs, it is clear that the private sector cannot possibly provide enough food to meet the vast needs of hungry Americans,” and further note the irony that, “while government policy was structured on the belief that private feeding organizations could fill the hunger gap, the private emergency feeding organizations have been central to helping discredit the view that they could fully provide hunger relief” (1988: 243-4).

Reagan cut programs meant to help those living in poverty meet most of their

needs (still not a solution to poverty, but at least takes the edge off to gain momentum), then installed a few programs that compartmentalize by-products of poverty, such as food insecurity/hunger. He, therefore, provided some relief and encouraged individuals and communities to be self-sufficient. He constructed this as a solution to poverty to make it seem like the issue was addressed and he was doing a good job. However, as Lipsky and Thibodeau (1988) continue, “The ultimate irony has been that it has led to *heightened* perceptions of the problem and greater public awareness that the problem of hunger is real,” which in effect “helped give visibility to a social problem that is otherwise easy for a more affluent public to ignore” (p. 243-4). As it turned out, by 1985, poverty levels increased, and although not by much, “the distribution of family income [goes] in the direction of greater inequality” (Peterson 1985: 634). Reagan’s “social compassion” plan did not alleviate poverty nor did dismantling welfare programs lead to more people securing better paying jobs.

Reagan’s second term ended with mixed results. Although he did not raise tax rates for citizens, he did ask them to work more to pay more taxes. Some people did pay more taxes, but some were in worse economic shape than ever. During Reagan’s eight years in office, inflation averaged 4.4%, which was lower than year before, and unemployment dropped and stayed low at 5.4% when he left office (Ritter 2013). However, “[b]etween 1985 and 1989, the federal government never ran a budget deficit smaller than \$149 billion; in 1986, the deficit was more than \$220 billion. When Reagan left office in 1989, the national debt totaled \$2.6 trillion, nearly three times larger than when he began his tenure in 1981” (Cannon 2016). Therefore, his attempt to pay off the

nation's deficit with tax payers' money did not work. Further, he failed to address the systemic roots of economic insecurity, thus he failed to address poverty. Instead, many of those living in poverty before Reagan's last term remained in poverty and end up faring worse because they no longer had access to social service programs.

Generally, for example, Whitman (1987) reveals the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act (OBRA) did more harm than good. Because of OBRA Reagan passed early in his Presidential career in 1981, he made it more difficult for families to receive assistance through Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC). Although tightening the purse strings even more made sense to "reduce dependency" Reagan called for, new restrictions he introduced in the mid-1980s impacted the working poor who relied on AFDC for brief moments of relief rather than those who received assistance for decades at a time for whom the restrictions did not apply. Therefore, Reagan's intentions were good, but because one of OBRA's restrictions was that recipients could not combine work and assistance very well, the policies ended up creating incentives to remain unemployed. The restrictions made it more affordable to not work at all because recipients were not able to earn living wage in the private sector, therefore, it made more economic sense to maintain assistance. The Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) in 1982 offset some of this, but effectively, Whitman (1987) argues was not a good use of resources because only 60% of the participants gain employment after training, which may not have been a significant difference than having no training at all.

In 1986, 3.7 million families received assistance through AFDC, which was only a couple hundred thousand less than who received assistance in 1981 (Whitman 1987).

Reagan's efforts to "reduce dependency" and get Americans working in jobs that pay living wages was not entirely successful. Because Reagan constructed Americans' civic duty as working hard to earn more to participate in the economy and pay off the national debt with their taxes, he by default constructed a whole segment of the population as unable to fulfill their civic duty; they were unable to express their patriotism.

Further Cannon (2016) argues Reagan spent more on defense than tax payers could cover, and although he proposed cutting social service programs would save the country money, the issues above resulted in more domestic spending to clean up the residual effects. This resulted in less funding available to correct infrastructural problems, and more long-term impacts, such as reliance on foreign investment and imports (Cannon 2016). Reagan attempted to cut these issues off in their path, and on October 22nd, 1986, put into effect the Tax Reform Act aiming to correct some of the corruption previous tax laws allowed. However, according to Cannon (2016), this act "did not fall equally on all industries: real estate investment, for instance, was subject to heavier taxation, which in turn contributed to the problems of the savings-and-loan industry." Impacting both of these industries became a profound issue in years to come, but Reagan's political brand was strong, so some of the impact went unnoticed by citizens.

In many ways, Reagan's Presidency aligned with the brand he established in his gubernatorial candidacy in California. His brand anchored citizens' loyalty, and as Putnam in 1992 argues, Reagan's power rested within his rhetorical strategies, not in his policies. Reagan was good on stage; his politics were second to his brand. Putnam claims, "[f]urthermore, he was the master of television, a much more powerful tool in its capacity

anesthetize the public from reality and to convert citizens into political amnesiacs” (p. 44). This might explain why Americans forgave Reagan so quickly for the economic catastrophes from the early 1980s and why citizens gave him another chance at leading them to economic prosperity in 1984. The Americans who fared pretty well likely still had confidence in their government in the mid-1990s, and the ones hit the hardest were told their failure to achieve the American Dream by remaining “dependent” on social services was a direct result of failing to work harder, a failure to enact their civic duty and express their patriotism.

Overall, Reagan tied consumption to civic duty and patriotism using two proposals. First, in his second inaugural speech, he argued Americans paying taxes would grow the economy and lift the country out of debt. He argued citizens should enact their civic duty and work to earn more money enabling them to spend more to keep the economy strong. He directly confirmed that citizens should also work more to pay more taxes. To encourage more citizens would work, Reagan dismantled social service programs in the name of “social compassion” hoping this would “reduce dependency” and force the un(der)employed to seek (better paying) jobs. Second, Reagan highlighted his economic philosophy, supply-side/trickle-down, economics, urging a top down process where producing more goods and services for consumers would result in citizens consuming more. In this, he argued a sort of “if we build it, they will come” position. However, he failed to account for the reality that some citizens could not come to the playing field. They simply did not have access to the resources needed to get there.

There were, then, so many citizens who could not even play the game because Reagan never addressed poverty at the institutional or structural level, and consistently constructed a political culture for which individual ruggedness was paramount. In that, Boris (2007) argues “[h]e became known for ‘cowboy capitalism,’ or what one ‘free-market’ proponent defined as ‘policies of low tax rates, deregulation, free trade, price stability, and massive entrepreneurship ...’” (p. 611). Americans historically resonate well with rhetoric couched in the pioneer spirit and Reagan was a fantastic storyteller (years of acting likely foster this skill). His ability to merge stories of a better time when a hard day’s work was the only goal with the importance of rugged individualism lend credibility to his brand. No matter what he said, as long as it reflected his brand, inevitably appealed to Americans who long for a better time and/or for whom self-sufficiency justified their success as heroism and enabled them to overlook social problems, such as poverty, as simply not their problem. These Americans were likely comprised of the Baby Boomers, many of whom grew up in neighborhoods made possible by consumerism, at least the middle-class ones, and the Silent Generation, many of whom who likely say poverty at its worse through the Great Depression. In both cases, they were also likely fed up with their tax dollars going to pay for programs they did not use and at an age in the 1980s when their spending power was most profound. These two groups mattered; Reagan appealed to their fundamental values: being a dutiful citizen meant being either a hard working tax payer and/or a hard working consumer. He captured both, but did not tie all the strings he needed to before leaving the Oval Office.

Between the lack of domestic revenue and America's increasing dependency on international commerce, Reagan left the White House in a bit of a crisis, at all three levels of society: individual, cultural, and institutional/structural. Americans already enjoying some economic prosperity continued to, but those struggling to make ends meet had to deal with further obstacles. Part of these obstacles were tangible, but some were ideological. Through all the shifts in policies related to social services, Reagan cherry picked scenarios and anecdotes to construct the "Welfare Queen." He used a few instances where single women with children received benefits for years at a time to amplify the dependency he claimed most families use to survive. In this, he failed to remind Americans this was not normative for social service recipients nor was it even true for most single mothers. He also failed to inform Americans that the systemic restrictions put in place by the government made it almost impossible for anyone receiving social service benefits to work a job and receive assistance, unless that job paid close to nothing.

His policy restrictions effectively translated into: either work a job paying enough to cover all expenses or receive benefits, a recipient could not have both a job and benefits. Of course, single mothers especially found themselves stuck in between this rock and hard place. Many lacked the skills to apply for jobs paying a living wage, which was likely why they required assistance in the first place. Many lacked the time to get training or education without going broke paying a daycare center. Many were trying to get by day to day and simply feed their children and themselves; many lived without the luxury of choice. This all perpetuated Reagan's construct at the cultural level; the context

was set up to villainize the “Welfare Queen,” (he constructed as any single woman with children receiving social services) and grant hero status to anyone who worked (a citizen who does not receive any benefits, but instead pays taxes). The latter was most dutiful where by the end of the 1980s, enacting civic duty and expressing patriotism through consuming left many Americans not better, nor better off, but broke in a broken system.

George H. W. Bush

Although Dowds (1989) of the New York Times claims Bush distinguished himself from President Reagan, for whom he served as Vice President the previous eight years, Bush constructed many of the same sentiments. Echoing Reagan, Bush also referred to dutiful citizens as those who work. More specifically, Bush called on Americans to not just work, but to also appreciate “the nobility of work and sacrifice” (1989). He also argued, much like Reagan did, that “to secure a more just and prosperous life for man on Earth,” freedom should be preserved, and specifically, “free markets, free speech, free elections, and the exercise of free will unhampered by the state” (1989). Where Reagan explicitly called for action and implied individuals were responsible for social problems, Bush explicitly blamed individuals for social problems and implied a call for action to lift America out of the economic uncertainty started years ago.

In the late 1970s, America experienced extreme economic trouble; markets were stagnant due to the residual effect increasing oil prices had on just about everything, and the government was unable to invest too much to jump start it back into working order because of the debt accumulated from the Vietnam War. Citizens could not keep up with the high cost of consumption, and businesses showed monumental profit loses, at least

those big enough to endure what social scientists refer to as “stagnation,” a portmanteau of stagnant and inflation.

By the early 1980s, both economic experts and politicians were at a loss because cutting taxes meant a detrimental loss of “national income” and raising interest rates meant consumers could not pursue the American Dream and buy big-ticket items that maintained economic stability. The demand-side economic philosophy lost ground. The country was ready for a new brand of economic management. Reagan introduced “trickledown” economics, which is now labeled “Reaganomics,” or supply-side economics. This, of course, involved cutting tax rates for big businesses with the assumption that alleviating economic pressure from those who supplied the economy would inevitably result in more consumer spending because the supply would be available and affordable, thus, consumers could and would participate in economy to stabilize it. This failed, and the ones who actually needed the most help were hurt the worst, and the ones who skated on the edge of economic security had no choice but to sit out waiting for some relief. Reagan back peddled, and eventually eliminated tax incentives for which he thought would “trickle down” to consumers, and some relief came.

In 1988, Bush ran on a promise to provide that relief. Bush went on the offensive. His campaign smeared his opponent, Dukakis, which worked well for Bush. He also triangulated his campaign around simple slogans: “A Kinder, Gentler Nation,” and then later, “No New Taxes” with which he couples with “A Thousand Points of Light.” The

connection between consumption, civic duty, and patriotism rests between these three mantras.

First, he constructed a message that acknowledged the harshness of previous efforts to restore the America so many were longing for: taxes flip flopping in extreme ways, social services cut off then refunded for failing to eliminate the problems for which the cuts are made in the first place, an extreme shift from inspiring the majority of laborers in America to providing incentives for the ruling class, inflation to stagnation to recession back to prosperity, and generally, the economic whiplash citizens experienced the previous decade or so.

Then, he said the magic words that have the power to dismantle citizen-level fears: no new taxes. In other words, he promised not to take additional income from Americans to pay off a national deficit many were not around to establish from the onset anyway. Riding tandem with this idea was that because Bush did not ask for more taxes, citizens were likely to assume the economy must have been in pretty good shape. Citizens were likely to trust the President promising to maintain the shape when he urged them to work and “pitch in.”

Boef and Kellstedt (2004) find that consumer sentiment: peaks in election cycles; is shaped by “objective economy...[or] economic reality...people feel more optimistic about the current and future economy when the present looks good;” Americans typically hold their Presidents responsible for the economy; and all of this shapes how citizens conceptualize the “subjective economy...[or] economic evaluations” (p. 634-8). Therefore, when Bush constructed civic duty as working hard with nobility and the

expression of patriotism as “taking part and pitching in,” he in effect gave citizens permission to feel good about consuming; their money was safe from further taxes and they did not need to worry about extreme imbalances to the system. They should pursue the American Dream because “[w]e know how to secure a more just and prosperous life for man on Earth: through free markets” (Bush 1989).

George H. W. Bush: 1989 Inaugural Speech

Bush inherited a “war on drugs” from Reagan; therefore, it was not surprising that of the 2,320 words Bush spoke in his only inaugural speech, he said “drugs” twice, which was more than any other President did in any inaugural speech at that point. Albeit, this is by no means a large number, and considering he said “new” fourteen times, and “great,” “nation,” and “world” each ten times, it almost is not relevant. However, Bush ended this speech with a scolding account of the dangers of drugs, and constructed cocaine specifically as a disease. Because he introduced this “disease” at the end, it established a sort of recency effect. Because he constructed drugs as an addiction, along with the addictions of “welfare and the demoralization that rules the slums” in the middle of his speech, he also likened those who rely on welfare and live in the “slums” as “diseased” as those addicted to drugs.

Bush appeared to invest compassion in these constructs by mentioning issues he considered threat to America, but he connoted a very different sentiment using specific words and imagery and called on morally righteous citizens to set a good example, “to make kinder the face of the Nation and gentler the face of the world” (1989). Although it is common to refer to a country as a “her,” Bush connoted the idea that America was

incomplete because “she” was morally compromised, which implied citizens were responsible for correcting the morality of “her,” or a woman. Bush likely did not intend for this metaphor to construct such patriarchal and condescending undertones, but because later in his speech he also conveyed an analogy suggesting mothers living in poverty may not have actually cared about nor loved their children, it is safe to assume, he was passing some sort of judgement on “she” who was not “engaged in high moral principle” as was traditionally defined.

This is an important metaphor because it represents a theme in Bush’s speech: shaming paternalism. He, of course, is a father, but also seemed to approach the Presidential office as one, too. He did not deliver his speech like a conversation he might have *with* citizens, much like other Presidents, but rather he spoke *to* them. In a passive-aggressive attempt at highlighting the importance of “high moral principle,” much like several Presidents previous, Bush set up a dichotomy where he constructed those marginalized in society as projects needing work and not fully able to be an American.

Beyond Bush’s expectation that citizens should work and enjoy the nobility of it, he also called to his “friends” claiming “we have work to do” involving a higher purpose. In his inaugural speech, Bush (1989) described those who need help:

“[t]here are the homeless, lost and roaming. There are the children who have nothing, no love and no normalcy. There are those who cannot free themselves of enslavement to whatever addiction—drugs, welfare, the demoralization that rules the slums. There is crime to be conquered, the rough crime of the streets. There are young women to be helped who are about to become mothers of children they

can't care for and might not love. They need our care, our guidance, and our education, though we bless them for choosing life.”

In this sentiment, he further stigmatized those who received social service benefits by equating welfare with drug addiction and poverty. He reconstructed the “Welfare Queen” persona Reagan advanced and/or the myth that women living in poverty have children for reasons other than desiring motherhood, as mentioned above, implying they may have children to maintain a drug addiction or an addiction to social service benefits afforded to children, a myth many institutions, including Media and Politics/Government, perpetuated. He implied that women who cannot afford birth control or who brought a child into an impoverished environment lacked the same control a drug addict or criminal does. Ultimately, Bush blamed individuals, without accounting for structural social issues. He further shamed single mothers for living in poverty. He effectively called those who lived in the “slums” immoral; in other words, those who lived in poverty were not as moral as those living elsewhere. Therefore, in one short narrative, Bush implied welfare was an addiction, an addict made a personal choice to be one (and drugs were like a “deadly bacteria” as he noted later in the speech), being poor was the same as being immoral, and living in poverty was an addiction, too.

Reagan already primed the country for this style of rhetoric, which seemed to be what permitted Bush to use such strong imagery. He spent very little time in his inaugural speech reviewing international issues directly, other than how other countries might perceive America and how he hoped to rebuild “a nation refreshed by freedom,” and instead constructed domestic issues as individual problems and then pathologized them to

maintain a strict binary: you're either one of them (an addict, single mother receiving social services, a criminal, or an immoral slum-dweller) or you're one of us ("loyal friend; a loving parent; a citizen who leaves his home, his neighborhood, and town better than how he found it"), and everyone had to choose a side (Bush 1989).

Bush argued it was foolish to assume "public money alone could end these problems," such as the residual effects of structural inequality, and instead proposed "[w]e will turn to the only resource we have that in times of need always grows: the goodness and the courage of the American people. And I am speaking of a new engagement in the lives of others, a new activism, hands-on and involved, that gets the job done" (1989). He directly framed civic duty as participating in those "projects needing work above," and constructed this duty as a show of patriotism when he noted, "[t]he old ideas are new again because they're not old, they are timeless: duty, sacrifice, commitment, and a patriotism that finds its expression in taking part and pitching in" (1989). However, he did not just request that those dutiful, sacrificing, committed patriots "pitch in" to help those who might suffer from "enslavement to whatever addiction—drugs, welfare, the demoralization that rules the slums," or those "young... mothers," having "children they can't care for and might not love" (1989). He argued this should all be done to make "the peaceful prosperous time...better," to preserve democracy, liberty, and especially freedom (1989).

Bush referred to "free" nine times and "freedom" six times, most of which he spoke in the first part of his speech, thus, priming the foundation. In a somewhat contradictory sentiment, he presented the way to freedom: "move toward free markets

through the door to prosperity...secure a more just and prosperous life for man on Earth: through free markets, free speech, free elections, and the exercise of free will unhampered by the state,” and then posed rhetorical questions asking why Americans were so materialistic (1989). Therefore, twice Bush instructed citizens, including those in the “[g]reat nations of the world,” to pursue prosperity, but then immediately followed with,

“we are not the sum of our possessions. They are not the measure of our lives. In our hearts we know what matters. We cannot hope only to leave our children a bigger car, a bigger bank account. We must hope to give them a sense of what it means to be a loyal friend; a loving parent; a citizen who leaves his home, his neighborhood, and town better than he found it” (1989).

By secular definition, prosperity refers to material success; being prosperous means being wealthy, accumulating material resources. The King James Version of the Bible, the one on which Bush pledges his Presidential oath, presents prosperity measured in both spiritual and material value. Bush took this oath on the same copy of the Bible George Washington did 200 years earlier; presumably, Bush knew what is in this version. Arguably, he was aware that prosperity, at minimum, connotes, material measures. Christian or not, prosperity connotes material accumulation.

If Bush were to present prosperous/prosperity in isolation, the concept might be ambiguous; however, he coupled it with participation in a “free market,” which directly connoted consumption. In this coupling, Bush maintained a theme previous Presidents conveyed: the idea that consumption was good, but too much consumption was morally

indignant, therefore, citizens should consume but with moral righteousness. Ironically, Presidents also often constructed consumption in opposition to morality where they valued giving for the sake of giving instead of consuming for the sake of consuming.

Therefore, Bush, in this inaugural speech framed civic duty as both pursuing prosperity through participating in a free market, among other tasks, and “pitching in” to help those who relied on welfare or were demoralized by poverty (“living in the slums”); this expression equaled an expression of patriotism; however, he also set up a situation in which those who were “in times of need” could not express patriotism because they were the benefactors of those “pitching in,” and those who were “in times of need” could not enact civic duty because they could not pursue prosperity as those reliant on welfare and/or “living in the slums,” or even suffering from drug addiction “cannot free themselves” (1989).

Bush aligned civic duty with “the goodness and the courage of the American people” as the “only resource we have in times of need [that] always grows” (1989). In this, he *seems* to contradict any connection between consumption, civic duty, and patriotism because he prioritized social and cultural capital over material assets for the purpose of consumption. He also questioned American’s “entrall[ment] with material things,” and during Reagan’s first campaign often referred to his supply-side/trickledown policies as “voodoo economics.” Philosophically, Bush did not generally agree with Reagan’s approach to economics and instead aligned more closely with demand-side economics. However, he also contradicted the principles of this alignment perhaps out of offensive necessity. Generally, Bush understood the economy relied on making sure

opportunities existed for the working and middle class citizens to consume, but also that there were numerous ways to approach conveying this sentiment.

Binding the connection between consumption and civic by articulating how patriotism fit into this tie, Bush referenced his “Thousand Points of Life” in his inaugural speech. He paid homage to the important work non-profit organizations, “volunteer activity,” and communities did to help those in need (Smith 2000: 68). By the time he first introduced his “Thousand Points of Life” focus on August 18th, 1988 during his nomination acceptance speech at the Republic National Convention in New Orleans, LA, the sentiment Reagan constructed in his second inaugural speech was fairly solid. Reagan certainly was not the first President to argue civic duty required giving back to our communities, nor was he the first to connect civic duty to patriotism (Kennedy was explicit about the importance), but he was the first to propose community work at this level should replace government assistance to those in need.

In the same way Reagan’s assumption that the community relying on local resources could addresses systemic issues, Bush implied that by increasing effort at the community level, the problems would subside. He argued the many people who worked in non-government social service programs, the volunteers responsible for filling in the gaps the lack of funding for the former always left, and the local community resources all would alleviate the burden straining government. He further stated that contributing to this effort was the ultimate expression of patriotism.

Thus, civic duty equaled “pitching in” and this equaled the ultimate expression of patriotism. Bush claimed he would not collect any new taxes, which connected working

to keeping more income. This implied the economy was doing well, which instilled consumer confidence (Boef and Kellstedt 2004). Bush constructed civic duty equal to “the nobility of work and sacrifice” and “pitching in,” the latter of which was where “patriotism finds its expression” (1989). Bush promised his colleagues would invest in community resources, thus modeling ideal citizenship and civic duty.

Overall, although not directly saying consumption equaled civic duty and patriotism, Bush still connected the three because he explicitly said securing prosperity was done so through the free market. The citizens who worked with nobility and gave back to their communities were those who could also participate in the free market to secure prosperity; they could consume as they had the resources to do so and were therefore also equipped to express patriotism at its finest. They were more dutiful than citizens unable to avoid being addicted to drugs and/or welfare; those who were immoral and lived in the “slums,” those who lacked the most valuable resource: “the goodness and courage of the American people” (Bush 1989).

Bush’s clear patriotic sentimentality might be authentic because he did in fact have a “deep, quite love of country” (Dowds 1989: 9). Although Bush was raised in a wealthy family and accessed his social capital to succeed, he also understood, at some level, the importance of working hard and how obstacles beyond individual control could result in further damage or inhibit progress. Bush made an effort to dismantle some discrimination when he signed the American with Disabilities Act just eighteen months after taking office. A few months after that, he made an effort to protect the environment from damage when he signed the Clean Air Act. He did not have much revenue with

which to work. It is not clear, however, if the lack of revenue was what prevented Bush from addressing an emerging crisis of another type.

William J. Clinton

By the end of 1984 when America elected Reagan for a second term, the National Cancer Institute (NCI) and Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) both publicized their findings about the AIDS epidemic. Reagan ignored calls for help. According to AIDS.gov, Reagan did not utter the acronym AIDS until September 17th, 1985 after seeing his friend, Rock Hudson, die due to AIDS-related complications in October of that year. Reagan did not address AIDS formally until he gave a speech on May 31st, 1987 for amFAR, the American Foundation for AIDS Research. At that point, over twenty thousand deaths due to AIDS-related illnesses were recorded and Reagan reduced federal funding by almost \$10 million. Two years later, in 1989, Bush did not account for the AIDS epidemic in his inaugural speech either, and gave the issue very little attention otherwise.

Almost a decade after the NCI and CDC publically affirmed data linking AIDS to blood transmission, regardless of what cultural capitalists in the 1980s implied, did a President mention it in his inaugural address or give it serious attention in Media. By 1993, in his first inaugural speech, Clinton recognized its impact to all Americans, and in doing so, started to dismantle the stigma associated with AIDS. In a statement highlighting the ambiguity dividing domestic and international affairs, Clinton noted “[t]he world economy, the world environment, the world AIDS crisis, the world arms race” arguing “they affect us all.”

In this same statement, Clinton also conveyed the importance of sharing the economic burden defining the global economy, ecosystem, and weapons of mass destruction that, of course, extended beyond our soil, and remarked on the “almost magical” qualities of technology. Clinton conjuring up new ways of communicating and dealing with globalization signified more than just a technological advancement, though. According to Friedman (1993) of the New York Times, Clinton’s first inauguration “represents not only a change in Presidents and parties but also of generations...Bush was shaped by the patriotism of World War II, sobered by the deprivations of the Great Depression and serenaded by the music of Frank Sinatra” (p. A14). In the early 1990s, the generation leading politics was “a fortysomething crowd who were born into politics during the idealistic, prosperous era of John F. Kennedy...forged their identities singing along with Bob Dylan through the troublesome seasons of Vietnam, Watergate and acid rain” (Friedman 1993: A14).

In other words, Bush’s generation maintained devotion to their government, for the most part, as a matter of duty where citizenship was earned through a devastating war perceived as obligatory. The Baby Boomers’ skepticism, to which Clinton subscribed, in many ways informed the attitude toward their government; their skepticism stemmed from protesting against a war many believed was not America’s obligation to resolve and witnessing political corruption without the backdrop of unconditional patriotism Bush’s generation enjoyed. Maximizing the symbolism of this generational shift, in his first inaugural speech, Clinton noted, “[e]ach generation of Americans must define what it means to be an American” (1993). Each American must make a change for the better.

William J. Clinton: 1993 Inaugural Speech

Much like many former Presidents, Clinton focused on “change,” which he said nine times in his first inaugural speech which was only 1,598 words long. He said “America” and “Americans” a total of twenty-three times, more than any other concept, said “world” twenty times, “must” eighteen times, “people” a dozen times, and “today” ten times. Together, these concepts constitute ten percent of this short address. This ten percent serves as the foundation for three significant messages around civic duty for which people, Americans and those in the rest of the world, today must: 1) “take more responsibility not only for ourselves and our families but for our communities and our country; 2) work together “to shape change;” and 3) serve, to “act on idealism by helping troubled children, keeping company with those in need, reconnecting our torn communities” (Clinton 1993). The latter of these messages required the most investment as it is the duty requiring direct action.

Generally, Clinton conveyed a sense of optimism when asking for this action. The Cold War had ended recently, and it made sense to appeal to the idea of renewal. He built a metaphor around this idea and, in a now familiar conversational style using the 2nd person, “you,” Clinton remarked, “[y]ou have raised your voices in an unmistakable chorus. You have cast your votes in historic numbers. And you have changed the face of Congress, the Presidency, and the political process itself. Yes, you, my fellow Americans, have forced the spring. Now we must do the work the season demands” (1993). This connoted a sense of pride and conveyed encouragement for Americans. It set up a

positive reward, or affirmation, for their good deeds, which enabled Clinton to ask for just a bit more.

Keeping the language consistent, Clinton “challenge[s] a new generation to a season of service” (1993). He emphasized giving back rather than taking. He prioritized service as more than simply volunteering time and constructs it as necessity of life. This civic duty required much more than individual effort; it required collective energy, a generation of collective energy. Clinton (1993) assured new citizens they were not alone and they were valued, “[t]here is so much to be done; enough, indeed, for millions of others who are still young in spirit to give of themselves in service, too. In serving, we recognize a simple but powerful truth: We need each other, and we must care for one another” (1993).

Clinton seemed to realize that defining a new America where civic duty equaled service to others might be difficult for some citizens to digest; it have been might be too paradoxical to appeal to everyone. To make it more palpable, Clinton did not blame citizens’ shortcomings. He emphasized sociocultural origins that, although did not usually resonate with Republicans, might have after Bush’s broken promise scratched the bottom line of many conservative Americans. The reality is that, regardless of approach, Politics/Government and Work/Economy intersect and do in fact reflect several paradoxes, which depending on the spin can appeal to a diverse population in one way or another. Clinton controlled the spin to construct a brand that anchored loyalty from those ready for a change; those who were ready to reject the status quo regarding what defined

individual civic duty, institutional stability, and political culture. Americans were ready to change it all, the whole system from the top down.

When the Savings and Loan crisis of 1989 almost devastated American economy, Bush raised taxes to bail out the banks which ended up costing citizens about \$200 billion. Because the banks had to recoup some of the losses, it was harder for Americans to buy homes, cars, and other big ticket items because of increasing interest rates and the imposition of stricter qualification criteria determining credit-worthiness. Bush did not fulfill his promise to maintain the status quo, which left many Americans distrustful of not just his political ideologies but also the political system's future. They came to learn their civic duty as tax payers, as Reagan urged, and/or as noble, hardworking Americans, as Bush called for, was not the answer to social problems. Some learn they could not fulfill their civic duty because their leaders did not hold up their end of the deal. Civic duty needed redefining to account for less idealistic opportunities and more realistic obstacles built into the social system.

In Clinton's first campaign, he promised to "fight for the forgotten middle class," by "putting people first," and building on the rhetoric and citizen-centered ideologies of Carter, vowed to "put people first, for a change." Between Reagan's supply-side economics hurting the middle-class consumer dollar and Bush's failure to uphold his promise to maintain a predictable middle-class family's budget, the timing was perfect for Clinton to prioritize the middle-class. Promising to stabilize Economy featuring the middle-class in a more compelling role made sense to metaphorically catapult this demographic back to the days when being middle-class symbolized financial security

(more secure than being working-class, anyway). Strategically, using this tactic to anchor brand loyalty from the middle-class, and those seeking the same status, worked in Clinton's favor and set up a few ways the connection between consumption, civic duty, and patriotism called for each citizen to be a better American.

First, since the late 1970s, the middle-class was shrinking, at least from its traditional stature (Strobel and Peterson 1997). When the economy was in trouble during Reagan's terms and Bush's tenure, the spending/investment power of this class decreased along with threats of the middle-class' absorption into conceptually lower statuses. In times of macroeconomic crisis, such as the nation carrying more debt than it can cover, those who classify as middle-class may grow fearful of losing what little power comes with that status, and for good reason. Because of the ebbs and flows of the previous two decades, there were literally more citizens classified in a lower socioeconomic status (when measuring income, wealth, educational level, and occupational prestige together) than before the mid-1990s (Strobel and Peterson 1997). There were simply more people who realized achieving the American Dream was not simply a matter of meritocracy.

The middle-class started absorbing some of the upper-class, the working-class started absorbing some of the middle-class, the working-poor started absorbing some of the working-class, and those previously working to maintain basic needs found themselves unemployed in a market demanding more education and training than it previously required. In short, in the two decades prior to Clinton's first term, groups who occupied positions that were "capital enhanced...with ability to generate income in the political and economic arenas" became more powerful despite decreasing in size, and the

groups who were “labor-dependent,” those relying on income directly from their labor, such as hourly wage jobs, grew in size and became less powerful (Strobel and Peterson: 1997: 435). The reciprocal inequalities were, and continue to be, profound and the usual suspects the previous two Presidents blamed were not actually guilty: those hit hardest by social inequality were not stratifying class systems further and reproducing inequality. The rich were getting richer, the middle-class was getting shifted to working-class, and the poor were getting poorer.

Secondly, by the 1990s, information was more accessible than ever and coupled with experiencing the above class shifts, new ways of looking at the origins of social problems accounts for middle-class Americans’ readiness for drastic change. Because of some of the “harsh” Reagan policies and tax increases Bush imposed to help banks, for example, many Americans learned their ability to achieve the American Dream may have largely depended on how policies were written to favor certain industries over others, specifically in counterintuitive ways. For example, Boef and Kellstedt (2004) note, “[w]hen the government spends more than it takes in, it violates a fundamental law by which most families live: You can’t spend more than you earn” (p. 639). This also applies to industries. The banking system, the industry that should know the most about money management, failed to balance their own books. Simply put: some Americans saw the banks as bad role models; if they could not work within their means, and needed citizens’ tax dollars to bail them out of a mess, then the confidence citizens had in the banking system might have started to crumble.

One of the most powerful assets the economic market has is consumer confidence; without citizens' trust in Capitalism, for example, money does not flow. The Savings and Loan crisis of 1989 was widely publicized, and this in and of itself did not lead to a loss of trust, but it did place America in a very vulnerable position. The sheer transparency of the situation and the clear gaps in decision-making were accessible via more new channels than ever before. The situation also symbolized a lack of competence in managing Capitalism, and perhaps more importantly, represented the reality that when the government had to correct mistakes made by leading industries, politicians would look to citizens first; specifically, by using their power to tax in order to collect national income. However, ironically, in the couple of years prior to Clinton's first term, the same people arguing the government should not interfere with the market, that it should be free, were the ones who authorized a tax increase to cover the bank bailouts. Citizens saw, through the lens of a divisive media commentary, what was good for the golden goose may not be good for those tending to the beanstalk.

Finally, previous events may have sensitized many to the ways laws impacted how government used their taxes. Watching the fallout from cutbacks to government programs shed light on the face of poverty where, although the outdated and inaccurate "the poor are lazy" stigma still lingered, also started to dismantle the idea that individual "failure" was not a pre-requisite of poverty; so many Americans saw their earnings become less and less valuable due to inflation, tax increases, and tighter lending practices, not because they were failing to work hard. In this, they also began to understand exactly how access to resources is often limited or expanded because of the

intersections and interdependency of not just Work/Economy and Politics/Government, but also Education and Medicine/Healthcare.

Citizens may have seen in their lives how increasingly important education is to their livelihoods. They likely saw that post-secondary credentials were becoming almost mandatory to secure a high-paying position, one that was “capital enhanced,” as Strobel and Peterson (1997) might argue. They may have seen raising tuition costs, though, and government profiting from the interest on student loans where achieving an education required taking on substantial debt for many. They saw increasing costs of healthcare, health insurance, and more power handed over to both in determining their wellness.

If they connected the dots, they could sketch out a fairly easy to understand cycle: better educated workers earn better pay; to get an education requires a substantial investment of tuition and time; taking on debt is not avoidable for most; carrying debt of that size reduces the ability to buy a home, car, etc. a worker could afford without it; the government may not have the ability to control tuition costs, but can determine the interest on the loans given to pay tuition that, after all, will make the worker a more equipped consumer in the economic system defining, in part, America’s strength.

By the 1990s, “middle” America was likely a little fed up. Clinton started to alleviate this with “the New Age political style that helped him win the highest office in the land” (Friedman 1993: A1). Clinton promised change in his first inaugural speech; change to address individual responsibility, political culture, and institutional stability. He promised change by rejecting the rhetoric of some Presidents and reinforcing that of others. For example, clearly negating Bush’s efforts and possibly even Reagan’s, Clinton

reminded Americans of being “[r]aised in unrivaled prosperity, we inherit an economy that is still the world's strongest but is weakened by business failures, stagnant wages, increasing inequality, and deep divisions among our own people” (1993). He continued by suggesting that the failures, stagnation, inequalities, and divisions did not come from “[p]rofound and powerful forces...shaking and remaking our world,” but instead of holding individuals responsible for the residual effects, connoting another outside force, he implied Reagan did not deliver the change he promised nor did Bush maintain Reagan’s status quo. Providing a pillow for the punch, Clinton revealed,

“[t]his new world has already enriched the lives of millions of Americans who are able to compete and win in it. But when most people are working harder for less; when others cannot work at all; when the cost of health care devastates families and threatens to bankrupt our enterprises, great and small; when the fear of crime robs law-abiding citizens of their freedom; and when millions of poor children cannot even imagine the lives we are calling them to lead, we have not made change our friend” (1993).

Instead, he argued it is drifting, much like Carter warned the country to avoid sixteen years earlier; it looked like change because there was movement, but essentially the “drifting has eroded our resources, fractured our economy, and shaken our confidence” (1993). He implied Reagan’s era “deadlock” and Bush’s “drift” were over and “a new season of American renewal has begun” (1993).

To start the renewal, Clinton reinforced some of the rhetoric of previous Presidents to perhaps convey a sense of understanding of what worked. He constructed

civic duty in much the same way previous Presidents did, too. However, because his first inaugural speech connoted demand-side economics so profoundly in several areas, he effectively took this construction a step further and tied it to consumption. Demand-side economics requires investment in specifically the middle and working classes to ensure they have opportunities to work to earn income to consume, which then stimulates the economy, and it requires government maintain the value of their consumer dollar. Clinton connected consumption to civic duty and patriotism using four links all of which are foundations of demand-side economics.

First, he connoted his own paternalism, much like previous leaders, noting, “[i]t [renewal] will require sacrifice, but it can be done and done fairly, not choosing sacrifice for its own sake but for our own sake. We must provide for our Nation the way a family provides for its children” (1993). In other words, the Nation needed guidance, support, and investment in the future. Clinton argued it is creating opportunities that would accomplish all of this, and proposed, “[w]e must invest more in our own people, in their jobs, and in their future, and at the same time cut our massive debt. And we must do so in a world in which we must compete for every opportunity” (1993). With new chances to succeed, however, came “more responsibility from all” (1993).

Reminiscent of all previous Presidents, especially Kennedy and Nixon, Clinton directly connected civic duty to breaking “the bad habit of expecting something for nothing from our Government or from each other. Let us all take more responsibility not only for ourselves and our families but for our communities and our country” (1993). Highlighting the reciprocity he built into this proposal, Clinton implied that the

government would invest in its citizens and would ensure they had jobs, but citizens were responsible for working those jobs to maintain income to continue participating in the economy, or consuming. The threat to jobs might have been very real to some, too. Competing for every opportunity was not the same in 1993 as it was in decades past. Competing for opportunity (jobs, for example) in a global market also meant competing against an international labor pool where jobs are outsourced and labor was imported. The competition was, and continues to be, fierce in some industries.

Secondly, civic duty required citizens invest in their democracy and, tangentially, politicians reshape the political culture. Clinton asked Americans to work together to compete in a globalizing Capitalist market, a market that silenced the voices of the people without due cause. He asked citizens to reclaim that voice and use it to anchor democracy in this market as, as he noted previously, “to compete for every opportunity.”

Theoretically, competition drives the market, and if all people have access to the opportunity to compete, as Clinton promised to provide, working together to help each other on the same team made sense. He ambiguously played on a word in this promise, too. He urged: “us [to] give this Capital back to the people to whom it belongs” (1993). Capital in this sense, when it was capitalized, referred to the physical center of government, the space housing government action. He contextualized “Capital” to mean just that, “our Government, a place for what Franklin Roosevelt called bold, persistent experimentation, a Government of our tomorrow, not our yesterdays” (1993). However, capital means money, too. In the spoken version, the only way citizens could know he capitalized the word is from the context. Directly preceding that context, though, Clinton

asked Americans to “put aside personal advantage,” which typically represents cultural and material wealth. Therefore, in denoting the importance of ensuring all citizens had a chance to participate in democracy, he also connoted the idea that all citizens should also have capital, or even more directly, a chance to participate in Capitalism. They should have this chance because their civic duty required they work together to compete in the market.

Further, Clinton connected civic duty to global consumerism by urging Americans to “continue to lead the world we did so much to make” (1993). He paid homage to “the brave Americans serving our Nation today...,” and then clarified with “[b]ut our greatest strength is the power of our ideas, which are still new in many lands” (1993). Setting the context up in this way certainly might not have sat right with anyone who favored defense, military, and traditional patriotism. He relegated the *actions* military engage in to preserve democracy to second place and instead prioritized *ideas* about democracy as primary.

By 1993, the information age valued ideas over traditional middle-class forms of labor. Manual labor was still important, as it likely always will be, but as manufacturing jobs decreased in America and labor unions weakened between the late 1970s and 1980s, the compensation for industry-specific jobs did not carry as much weight as those where knowledge and ideas were traded commodities. Therefore, working as part of valuable civic duty started to symbolize less the rugged laborer toiling away in his factory position and more like a young, well-dressed, college-educated professional whose only risk of

callous is on their hands was from shaking others' at business lunches or dialing their football-sized cell phone.

A different face defined labor by 1993, and thus citizens' responsibility to work as their civic duty, a theme several Presidents constructed, looked different. Civic duty meant working to compete and consume in a global market because as Clinton noted, "[c]ommunication and commerce are global. Investment is mobile," and [t]echnological is almost magical" (1993). And, again, if the opportunity was there, then citizens should take responsibility to use it, for the sake of democracy and ultimately, economic stability representing global strength.

Finally, Clinton called for citizens to enact their civic duty by committing to "a season of service" (1993). This was effectively the same call past Presidents made, including the explicit call to duty both Reagan and Bush made. However, Reagan charged citizens with service to alleviate government's responsibility to those who required social service and Bush echoed that sentiment by calling on the "goodness and the courage of the American people" to help those children whose mothers "can't care for [them] and might not love [them]" and those addicted to drugs, welfare, crime, and the "slums" (Bush 1989). The connotation is entirely different. Reagan and Bush were a bit condescending and Clinton, although his intent might have been the same, conveyed a much more compassionate approach. He asked citizens "to act on your idealism by helping troubled children, keeping company with those in need, reconnecting our torn communities...In serving, we recognize a simple but powerful truth: We need each other, and we must care for one another" (1993).

In this context, service was not about an obligation to help those citizens out, but instead it was about realizing everyone needs some sort of help at some point. Clinton set this up so that giving back to a citizen's community was out of respect for humanity, not obligation to the government nor moral righteousness. Because of this, Clinton constructed civic duty as service where those who could give should give out of choice. Investing time to serve required sacrificing time from somewhere else. In the everyday reality of what service looks like off the page and on the stage, so to speak, it cannot be done unless someone has access to valuable resources themselves: time, surplus labor, and cultural capital.

Having time to serve required being able to negotiate time away from productive and reproductive labor within the public and private spheres respectively. This is, of course, a luxury typically not given to those working hourly wage jobs. Time is a valuable commodity where those without extra may not be able to serve their communities. Working less means less income, which means less ability to consume, but more time to serve. In this respect, citizens must sacrifice one form of civic duty (work) to enact another (service). Similarly, surplus labor, a commodity Capitalism is bankrupt without, is not readily available for investing in service if it is taken by employers. Whatever extra non-paid labor is available could be invested in service, but that relies on the paid employment giving it up. There are some companies, such as Intuit and AT&T, that provide incentives for their employees to serve communities where they do not have to use surplus labor. However, this was not the norm in 1993.

Therefore, for a citizen, working an hourly wage job especially, to enact this form of civic duty (service), they needed to sacrifice whatever surplus labor they could give to their employer. To even know how to locate a service site and realize the value of serving requires some level of cultural capital. Granted, in this context, cultural capital would likely not be for reproducing inequalities nor kept in reserve for a limited few; however, it is still a resource serve requires and that some Americans simply might not have had because of tandem intersecting inequalities.

Overall, Clinton connected civic duty to consumption in four ways in his first inaugural speech, all of which land on rationalizing demand-side economics. First, civic duty required citizens taking responsibility for the opportunity he promised to provide to end the deadlock and drift. He, in other words, proposed a switch from supply-side economics Reagan and Bush used, and instead promised to change America back to a demand-side economy, back to a time when the consumer dollar drove the economic demand, but with a new twist. Friedman (1993) suggests Clinton's first inaugural speech marked this coming change in more symbolic ways, too, where there was a "conscious assertion of the passing of power to the post-World War II generation" (p. A1). Just as Clinton argued earlier, his generation did not inherit a healthy economy, one where consumption booms; he wanted to get that back. Second, citizens should work and work together to stabilize democracy representing a strong economy. This then idealized global relations epitomizing the third connection where America's strength, in an international market, relied on citizens being better global consumers. Finally, citizens should serve their communities. This placed citizens in a situation where the incentive to secure

higher-paying jobs resulted in potentially having more time; the byproduct of a higher-paying job was also having more income with which to consume.

Clinton reinforced these four links in during his first Presidency. Within one year of his first term, Clinton signed the Family and Medical Leave Act, which legalized the rights of employees to take up to three months unpaid time off for family or medical reasons. He established the very controversial “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” policy that granted military personal the right to omit their sexual orientation from their identity profiles and prohibited those evaluating their eligibility from asking about it. He appointed the second women to the SCOTUS, Ruth Bader Ginsberg, an important advocate of social equality. He signed the Brady Bill restricting the waiting period for buying handguns, and within a week of that, signed the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) lifting international trade restrictions.

During his first Presidency, Clinton signed numerous legislative initiatives that protect globalization, civic rights, the environment, and consumers. Most importantly, in 1996, he hesitantly signed welfare reform legislation, the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA). This act represented a compromise to welfare benefits many conservative voters found appealing, but maintained some assistance to those in need. It was truly a compromise, the first of its kind, where the intersection of Politics/Government, Work/Economy, and Family was institutionalized.

Not the first of its kind, though, Clinton was caught in numerous personal and political scandals. According to Just and Crigler (2000), however, what separated him from Nixon, as many compare his struggles to, “Clinton’s success in preserving his

public image [contrasts] with the failure of President Nixon in the Watergate crisis” (p. 180). They further remark that, “Clinton was saved in large part by low public expectations about his personal moral behavior and high approval of his economic leadership,” but “Nixon was defeated by high public expectations about his personal probity and disappointment with his management of the economy” (Just and Crigler 2000:180). Clinton ran his second campaign on this idea; he was the “Comeback Kid.” He came back from scandal, brought the economy back to where he promised, and brought back to center stage his basic principle from 1993: new opportunity.

William J. Clinton: 1997 Inaugural Speech

In his second inaugural speech, Clinton focused on advancing what he started four years earlier: new opportunity. His second inaugural speech represents a new technological opportunity, too. Clinton was first President to deliver an inaugural speech in “real time” over the internet reaching billions of people worldwide. Clinton’s pioneer internet delivery signifies more than just moving up, though. It represents moving on, specifically, “to move on with America’s mission” (Clinton 1997). Mitchell (1997) of the New York Times notes, “at these words by the President, the sea of thousands spilling down the slope of Capitol Hill and onto the Mall let loose the most enthusiastic applause of his 22-minute speech” (p. A1). This was likely the outcome he desired because Mitchell (1997) also reveals, “Mr. Clinton’s aides said that the President had wanted his address to be inspirational and that proposals for actual programs would come later, in the State of the Union Message” (p. A14). However, he did not avoid policy plans altogether. He promised to prioritize “campaign finance overhaul, the drive to balance the

Federal budget, education, environmental protection and the creation of jobs for welfare recipients who face stringent new time limits on benefits” (Mitchell 1997: A14).

All of these priorities are important, but it was within education and job growth where Clinton linked consumption, civic duty, and patriotism together. Just one year before citizens reelected Clinton for a second term, the country was one year into a four year economic growth spurt. Morgan (2004) notes, “[t]he unemployment rate fell from 5-6 per cent to 4 per cent, while inflation kept on the lowest track since the 1950s. Most encouragingly, after a prolonged period of sluggish growth averaging only 1-4 per cent annually between 1973 and 1995, labour productivity increased at an annual rate of 2-7 per cent” (p. 1035). Freeman (2006) confirms the economy “created more than 22 million new jobs, the highest level of job creation ever recorded. Unemployment fell to its lowest in over 30 years. Inflation fell to 2.5% per year compared to the 4.7% average over the prior 12 years.” He continues remarking, “overall economic growth averaged 4.0% per year compared to 2.8% average growth over the 12 years of the Reagan/Bush administrations” (Freeman 2006). Morgan (2004) claims there is no clear consensus among economists as to why or what generated so much growth, but “corporate executives and media commentators” started calling it a “new economy,” one “driven by computers, the internet, well-functioning venture capital markets, and globalization” (p. 1035).

Therefore, Clinton ensured the foundation set up in during his first term would hold the weight of promises made during the second campaign. When he claimed in his second inaugural speech that education and job growth were priorities, it strengthened the

link between consumption and civic duty specifically because it anchored the flip from Reagan and Bush's supply-side economics to the more consumption-centered demand-side economics. At the microeconomic level, Clinton ensured what Morgan (2004) calls the "working middle class" had the income to consume. He did this by encouraging "productivity, education, job training, management-labor relations," and at the macroeconomic level, protected their consumer dollar (Reich as cited in Morgan 2004: 1030). Clinton merged the importance of macro and micro economics in a metaphorical promissory note.

Clinton's second inaugural speech paralleled the same structure, style, and content that a promissory notes does, and in some ways, his speech was an "IOU" for the promises he made during his campaign. He began his second inaugural speech of 2,155 words much the same as other Presidents: recapping what worked and what did not work in the previous years. He said "new" twenty-nine times and "century" twenty times, more than any other words. Together, these words took on a futuristic tone, a "new century" would be upon America. Of course, Clinton did not speak these words together over twenty times, although they were coupled often, but the repetition of them even spoke separately connoted the dawning of a new era. The repetition conveyed a sense of that the season of years passed was changing. However, the sentiments he conveyed in his second inaugural address were much the same as ones he did in his first inaugural speech.

Clinton echoed his construction of government's role he makes in his first inaugural speech by reminding citizens in his second, and reminiscent of Reagan, "Government is not the problem, and Government is not the solution. We-the American

people—we are the solution... The preeminent mission of our new Government is to give all Americans an opportunity, not a guarantee but a real opportunity, to build better lives” (1997). For Clinton, government should serve as the contractor and citizens should be the carpenters. He claimed, “a new Government for a new century, humble enough not to try to solve all our problems for us but strong enough to give us the tools to solve our problems for ourselves, a government that is smaller, lives within its means, and does more with less” was what citizens need to enact their civic duty (1997).

Clinton echoed his construction of civic duty he offered in his first inaugural speech, too, by reminding citizens in his second address, “that the preservation of our liberty and our Union depends upon responsible citizenship,” and continued with a call to action again reminding citizens “[t]here is work to do, work that Government alone cannot do: teaching children to read, hiring people off welfare rolls, coming out from behind locked doors and shuttered windows to help reclaim our streets from drugs and gangs and crime, taking time out of our own lives to serve others” (1997). Civic duty relied on working, in other words, and using opportunity responsibly, and serving communities. The new economy, “this new land,” required education as it “will be every citizen’s most prized possession” (Clinton 1997).

By extension, therefore, getting an education was part of civic duty because in order to “compete and win” in a global market, as he noted in 1993, citizens must work and could not compete with an increasing international labor pool without the most valuable commodity of the information age: “knowledge and power” (1997). With education securing better jobs, “[p]arents and children will have more time to not only

work but to read and play together,” presumably to also serve their communities to alleviate the need for additional government assistance, and ultimately to plan for the future (Clinton 1997). Clinton argued: “the plans they make at their kitchen table will be those of a better home, a better job, the certain chance to go to college,” and then including more technical pathways, “[p]orts and airports, farms and factories will thrive with trade and innovation and ideas” (1997). Economy rested on Americans working to secure a future where they can buy a better house, dream bigger, and ultimately, the ability to invest in mandatory education to secure better jobs to participate in economy in bigger ways.

Clinton, although clearly recognizing social problems are systemic, called on individuals to address them. Just as Nixon and Reagan before him, Clinton explicitly constructed civic duty in his second inaugural speech as an opportunity and obligation citizens had to themselves. He reminded us, “[o]ur Founders taught us that the preservation of our liberty and our Union depends upon responsible citizenship” (1997).

For Clinton, responsible citizenship equaled civic duty. He reminded Americans of a sentiment George H. W. Bush conveyed several years earlier, and one he, himself, albeit in a less paternalistic way, denoted just four years earlier:

“[t]here is work to do, work that Government alone cannot do: teaching children to read, hiring people off welfare rolls, coming out from behind locked doors and shuttered windows to help reclaim our streets from drugs and gangs and crime, taking time out of our own lives to serve others. Each and every one of us, in our

own way, must assume personal responsibility not only for ourselves and our families but for our neighbors and our Nation” (1997).

In this, Clinton did not construct civic duty much differently than he did in his first inaugural speech. In his first inaugural speech, he defined civic duty as: working to earn an income to consume; consuming to stabilize American economy; competing in the global market; and committing to a “season of service.” What was different, however, were the promises that followed.

Clinton promised a “new land,” one rich with educational opportunities, safe neighborhoods, social mobility, medical advancements and healthcare, limited terror and no threats of war, thriving industries, and most importantly, a fortified and “productive economy...protect[ing] the natural bounty of our water, air, and majestic land” (1997). Clinton defined civic duty further through this promise, and connected it to productivity, just as several Presidents before him. To fulfill the promise and build a productive economy, among reaching the above-mentioned goals, Clinton reminded citizens that new policies gave a louder voice to the people, “regaining the participation and deserving trust of all Americans,” and then called for that productivity through working or laboring toward the American Dream, the dream he argued Martin Luther King embodied. He summarized by revealing, “[o]ur history has been built on such dreams and labors. And by our dreams and labors, we will redeem the promise of America in the 21st century” (1997).

Not everyone could redeem this promissory note, however. The residual social problems posed barriers for some preventing them from cashing on this promise. As a

result, “[r]eal median family income, which did not exceed its 1989 level until 1998, stagnated for most of the Clinton era” (Morgan 2004: 1038). Those without a college education did not benefit from the prosperity, women’s annual incomes were “73 percent of that of men in 1998 compared with just over 71 percent in 1992” (Morgan 2004: 1038). There were some minor increases with respect to racial equality, but “African-American female full-time workers experience a decline in their earning relative to white females from 91 percent in 1992 to 87 percent in 1998” (Morgan 2004: 1038). Therefore, as the economy boomed, some benefited and others did not. There was a disconnect between what macro-economy promised and how it played out in micro-economy.

When “Clinton left office, the government ran surpluses of almost \$140 billion per year,” but “Bush, of course, returned to the Supply Side policies of Reagan and his father. He lowered taxes on the very rich -- his ‘base’ as he calls them. His \$1.6 trillion in tax cuts give 45% of the benefits to the top 1% of the population” (Freeman 2006). After Bush was in office for just a short time, “[t]he recession of 2001 demonstrated that the so-called ‘new economy’ remained vulnerable to old-fashioned business cycles” (Morgan 2004: 1039).

George W. Bush

At the start of his Presidential terms, Bush recalled Clinton’s 1997 promise, and paid homage to it by recognizing, “[t]he grandest of these [enduring] ideals is an unfolding American promise that everyone belongs, that everyone deserves a chance, that no insignificant person was ever born. Americans are called to enact this promise in our lives and in our laws” (2001). However, he set up a foundation on which to build a new

promise, one of his own. Bush argued, “[w]hile many of our citizens prosper, others doubt the promise, even the justice, of our own country. The ambitions of some Americans were limited by failing schools and hidden prejudice and the circumstances of their birth...I will work to build a single nation of justice and opportunity” (2001).

Bush’s new promise dismantled the contention between morality and material progress that even his father about a decade earlier advanced. In this statement, Bush celebrated and honors prosperity rather than tempering it with moral righteousness. All former Presidents, albeit in different ways, argued the work ethic was the most valuable asset to develop. Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower all argued working was a reward in and of itself. Citizens could benefit from its moral righteousness and the ways in which a moral economy could provide for its citizens. In this, morality was far more important than individual prosperity because it secured economic well-being for all, and consumption was for securing what citizens needed. Citizens could not be morally righteous and conspicuously consume. Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon, and Carter all proposed working was necessary to stabilize the economy along with working together to alleviate unnecessary burdens to the government; the government was not a resource for which citizens should use if they could help it because they should rely on themselves and each other. In this, morality was still important, and citizens should not compromise it, but America’s collective prosperity was most important to highlight Americans’ collective status in a globalizing economy. Consuming for basic needs always matters, but in this, exemplifying wealth worked in America’s favor and translated into demonstrating the importance of working with Americans where citizens cooperating to secure a better

America were better Americans. Reagan, Bush's father, Clinton, and now Bush all proposed morality mattered; it perhaps always will in Presidential rhetoric. But, morality took a back seat to individual prosperity in the late twentieth century, and by the new millennium, the most important achievement was *an* American Dream, not *the* American Dream.

By 2000, working was for an income to consume in display of individual prosperity. The collective spirit mattered, but ultimately, conspicuously consuming, for the sake of showing individual wealth, represented the fulfillment of an individual's American Dream. Morality did not oppose prosperity anymore. A citizen could be both prosperous in their own right and moral. In fact, citizens should display their prosperity, whether as a worker or steward to the country's goals; it represented being a better American.

Along with cementing a new ideology, the new millennium brought a familiar name. Bush conjured this "old-fashioned" sentiment in his 2001 inaugural speech. Bruni and Sanger (2001) of the New York Times remark that Bush's inauguration represented a link to the past more so than the future as Clinton's in 1993 did; they argue it has an "old-fashioned aura" (p. 16). Bush ran his campaign to secure his first term on "Compassionate Conservatism," which echoed his father's call for "social compassion" in his inaugural speech in 1989. Bush, conjuring much of the same rhetoric Clinton used, provided the most direct and pragmatic definitions of civic duty and patriotism: work to consume.

In 2001, Bush delivered the speech from which this project was inspired. On September 27th, 2001, Bush addressed airline employees at O’Hare International Airport in Chicago, Illinois outlining plans and proposals connoting confidence and pride in the airline industry and the people who operated it. Urging them to “get on board” made sense given the context; their jobs relied on boarding planes, in one way or another ensuring passengers board (without travelers, there are no ticket sales) or boarding themselves, etc. (Bush 2001). Bush provided instructions to relay to those the airline industry served, the American public: “[d]o your business around the country. Fly and enjoy America’s great destination spots. Get down to Disney World in Florida. Take your families and enjoy life, the way we want it to be enjoyed” (Bush 2001). In other words, “get on the airlines, get about the business of America” (Bush 2001).

To win his 2004 inauguration spot, Bush ran on the promise of “A Safer World and a More Hopeful America,” also reminiscent of his father’s 1989 slogan, “Kinder, Gentler Nation.” Bush secured both elections by very narrow margins; the former reflected a win where his opponent, Al Gore, won the popular vote but lost the electoral vote by five, and the latter represented an electoral margin of thirty-five in his favor, but between him and his opponent, John Kerry, from whom he barely secured the popular vote, the race was still close. Between his two terms, America experienced the worst direct attack on its own soil since its founding. On September 11th, 2001, the country’s economic and political epicenters crumbled. This attack became the defining moment in Bush’s career, and led to his direct call for citizens to consume as part of their civic duty

in his second inaugural speech. At the start of the millennium, however, the call was a bit less direct.

George W. Bush: 2001 Inaugural Speech

Of the 1,592 words spoken, Bush used “America” and “nation” the most, both eleven times each, which was close to how often previous Presidents did. However, Bush (2001) was the first President since the start of WWII to use the term “civic duty” in an inaugural speech, although all implied it and constructed its meaning. Bush argued “public interest” directly depended on civic duty along with “private character...family bonds and basic fairness, on uncounted, unhonored, acts of decency which give direction to our freedom” (2001). He constructed civic duty involving two related actions: work and education, and personal responsibility to self, community, and nation.

First, echoing Clinton’s sentiments of a drifting economy, Bush argued, “[i]f we permit our economy to drift and decline, the vulnerable will suffer most. We must live up to the calling we share. Civility is not a tactic or a sentiment. It is the determined choice of trust over cynicism, of community over chaos. And this commitment, if we keep it, is a way to shared accomplishment” (2001). In this context, the calling was courage and civic duty equaled being courageous so that “[t]ogether, we will reclaim America’s schools, before ignorance and apathy claim more young lives,” and then “[w]e will reform Social Security and Medicare, sparing our children from struggles we have the power to prevent. And we will reduce taxes, to recover the momentum of our economy and reward the effort and enterprise of working Americans” (2001). Civic duty here was not an abstract idea; it was an opportunity to exercise a freedom to choose a better life. For Bush, it was

the choice to be a good citizen and save the weakest in society by ensuring the economy did not fail. Thus, civic duty equaled good citizenship, which equaled saving “the vulnerable” by securing the economy.

Civic duty required courage to work together; the end goal was for this to move economy and reward Americans’ efforts for that work. Economy cannot move without consumption, consumption is not possible without working, and working increasingly requires more educational qualifications. Those who were enterprising, working Americans could fulfill their civic duty, and in order to becoming enterprising, citizens should not have been ignorant nor apathetic, but instead should get an education.

Thus, before citizens could fulfill their civic duty to work in order to move economy (consume), they had to first pursue education. Bush proposed the “No Child Left Behind” (NCLB) legislation three days after delivering his first inaugural speech, and it was signed into action just six months later. He clearly put his money where his mouth was as this legislation was one of the most profound investments in education to date. It was dismantled by 2005 as it proved unsuccessful at helping children and instead institutionalized the reproduction of social inequality.

Secondly, Bush advocated personal responsibility to self, community, and nation. He argued, “where there is suffering, there is duty” (2001). He acknowledged varying explanations for poverty, but ultimately proposed that it did not matter where it originated, it was children who suffered most. He implied children are the future, and because three days later, he proposed NCLB, it is safe to assume he was sincere about his promise to protect them in some way.

He argued prisons were not a permanent solution to what presumably was the worst possible result of poverty. This was presumable because he redirected his discussion of childhood poverty to prisons almost immediately in his first inaugural speech. This redirect connoted a sense of connection, but in a way, he seemed to also objectify both poverty and prison. He claimed, “[m]any in our country do not know the pain of poverty, but we can listen to those who do,” which implied he was not speaking to those in poverty with this address (2001). If he were to say something like, “many of you live in poverty and many of you do not know that pain,” it would suggest he understood it was possible that those living in poverty were also listening to this speech, not just waiting to be heard by those fortunate enough to avoid the pain of it.

Bush arguing the “proliferation of prisons, however necessary, is no substitute for hope and order in our souls,” suggested two meanings. Primarily, he suggested the exponential increase in prisons was needed, which effectively justified the fact the America contained more prisoners than any other industrialized country. This discounted the idea that whatever crimes result in this need were not social problems, but instead individual, as if prisoners needed to be kept away from society instead of figuring out how society could help avoid incarcerating so many people, statistically of course, so many African American men.

Indirectly, Bush assumed Americans resigned their concern over prison(ers) to their souls, perhaps simply praying about it or somehow making peace with it by taking comfort in the reconciliation that “I’m not one of *them*.” In this, civic duty relied on taking responsibility for actions, criminal or not, driven out of poverty or not. It involved

serving communities to help those in need, and finally serving the nation by being “citizens, not spectators; citizens, not subjects...this purpose is achieved in our duty, and our duty is fulfilled in service to one another” (Bush 2001).

Finally, Bush asked citizens to take care of what Government could not or would not provide (any longer): the day to day needs of everyone. Bush claimed, “Government has great responsibilities for public safety and public health, for civil rights and common schools,” but not the “spirit of citizenship” because “no government program can replace it” (2001). Citizens were responsible for their own meritocratic goals to be good citizens. They should not simply watch their dreams go by, but instead actively pursue them to keep economy moving, not drifting, but moving. Citizens should work to participate in economy (consume or produce to earn money to consume) and serve (to alleviate government’s burden to those unable to work, thus not as honorable as those who do).

Overall, Bush did not directly suggest Americans consume, save, or spend to secure the economy. Instead to build a stronger America, Bush called citizens to uphold public interest, “it is a call to conscience” (2001). According to Bush, the duty to public interest was each individual’s responsibility, and it “is as important as anything government does” where he asked citizens “to seek a common good beyond your comfort; to defend needed reforms against easy attacks; to serve your nation, beginning with your neighbor” (2001).

Behind the patriotic sentiment, Bush called for citizens to either work or serve. Doing neither resigned an individual a by-stander in civic and individual responsibility. He connoted a sense of guilt by implying examples of what he was *not* looking for in an

American citizen. Echoing Clinton again to and affirm the idea that civic duty required service, Bush conjured Thomas Jefferson's (Clinton's middle name, so conjuring him, too, somewhat) imagined understanding of America's current social problems urging citizens to not disappoint Jefferson because "his purpose is achieved in our duty, and our duty is fulfilled in service to one another" (2001).

Civic duty was service; service to individual obligations to pursue the American Dream, service to communities, service to government, and service to our Founding Father(s). He banked on traditional patriotism anchoring citizens' loyalty. He campaigned for a second term on this sentiment; he capitalized on Americans' fear of losing what the Founding Fathers, and perhaps Clinton, promised. He built a campaign around a common enemy.

George W. Bush: 2005 Inaugural Speech

Although in 2005 America is a few years distant from the 9/11 attacks, the shock and devastation continued to reverberate through the country. The attacks happened on Bush's watch, if there were seemingly positive outcomes, it is that the event distracted the country away from the economic recession and Americans united in patriotism, in mourning. Unfortunately, their unity was grounded in a common enemy, and hate is not a healthy cultural emotion. It feeds fear. Bush signed the Patriot Act soon after the attacks (with controversial aims to install some sense of security), but the culture of fear continued to grow. In further legislation, movies and television shows, songs, and in every medium imaginable, constructs of fear and additional threats were almost palpable. This certainly was not the first time cultural capitalists play on citizens' fear, but it was

the first time an event served as a catalyst to boost consumption in such an explicit way.

As mentioned, Bush delivers a speech a little more than two weeks after the attacks to parts of the airline industry at O'Hare International Airport in Chicago. He did not say, "go consume, go spend money, go shop," but he did tell Americans to continue to take vacations and lead their lives, continue carrying on with the business of economy. For Bush, in other words, getting back to our normal lives meant getting back to participating in the economy; it meant getting back to work to earn incomes to consume. He confirmed that consumerism is the norm, both in practice and ideology.

Bush's second inaugural speech reflects a continuation of similar ideological positions. He did not say outright that to be a dutiful citizen and American must consume. Instead, he disguised this sentiment with the importance of protecting freedom. Civic duty, he argued, involves Americans doing what they could to "secure America...to make the choice to serve in a cause larger than your wants...you will add not just to the wealth of our country but to its character" (2005).

He spent substantial time speaking about liberty and the idea that it was not the same thing as personal freedom; liberty required collective effort, not just a personal investment in individual success. Using the term liberty conjured a sense of nostalgia as the founding fathers, too, focus on liberty more than any other concept. Liberty is the principle that sets America apart from less democratic nations. It represents America.

In a Capitalist economy, liberty also represents the power to determine the country's economic destiny, much like "every citizen" is an agent of his or her own destiny, Bush argued, "we will give our fellow Americans greater freedom from want

and fear and make our society more prosperous and just and equal” (2005). Therefore, securing liberty meant securing prosperity for the country. Freedom meant securing prosperity for individual citizens. Much like liberty’s representation in Capitalism, freedom represented a citizen’s ability to participate in their own economic destiny. In other words, freedom represented the ability to produce for sake of production, and more importantly, to consume for the sake of pursuing the American Dream.

Bush proposed that, “[i]n America’s ideal of freedom, citizens find the dignity and security of economic independence instead of laboring on the edge of subsistence,” and further proposed this ability to accumulate wealth and presumably to consume, was in large part “motivated [by] the Homestead Act, the Social Security Act, and the GI Bill of Rights” (Bush 2005). He attributed this power to legislation, therefore, and then offered to “extend this vision by reforming great institutions to serve the needs of our time. To give every American a stake in the promise and future of our country, we will bring the highest standards to our schools and build an ownership society” (Bush 2005). Finally, to seal the link between consumption, civic duty, and patriotism, Bush promised to make it easier to achieve the American Dream and consume by “widen[ing] the ownership of homes and businesses, retirement savings, and health insurance, preparing our people for the challenges of life in a free society” (2005).

Although Bush spent a significant part of his second inaugural speech, 2071 words long, detailing the importance of global relations, specifically “freedom in all the world,” he conveyed a substantial and resonating message throughout the entire speech revealing the importance of *defending* freedom in America. He said “freedom” twenty-

seven times, more than any other word, and secondly, “America” twenty times. He even prioritized and ranked the chances of peace by claiming, “[t]he best hope for peace in our world is the expansion of freedom in all the world” (2005). Connoting the immediacy and importance of this this, Bush explained, “[f]reedom, by its nature, must be chosen and defended by citizens and sustained by the rule of law” (2005). It was Americans’ civic duty to defend freedom; everyone could do it in different ways; the best way to enact civic duty was to sacrifice and do “the dangerous and necessary work of fighting our enemies,” it was to “[m]ake the choice to serve in a cause larger than your wants, larger than yourself, and in your days, you will add not just to the wealth of our country but to its character” (2005).

In this, Bush prioritized soldiers’ contributions to the defense of freedom, and asked that “our youngest citizens...believe the evidence of your eyes. You have seen duty and allegiance in the determined faces of our soldiers” (2005). He set up soldiers, the ones who paid the ultimate price for freedom as *the* role models of defense. The soldiers whose lives were devoted to civic duty built the country’s character. Bush explained in detail what an ideal citizen was; it was a soldier who sacrificed for civic duty: defending freedom. Further, he allowed some space for the “unfinished work of American freedom to be done” implying citizens were responsible for defending it (Bush 2005). Finally, he directly connected civic duty (defending freedom) to “the dignity and security of economic independence instead of laboring on the edge of subsistence” arguing it is in ideal freedom where citizens may find this (2005). Overall, according to Bush therefore, ideal freedom, defended and true, held the promise of economic security; those who

defended freedom could contribute to America's securing America's economic independence, something core to America's values and constructed as part of a patriotic mission since before Roosevelt delivered his first inaugural address.

Arguably, society is not freer since Bush's 2005 inaugural speech, not in the sense there is full autonomy for citizens to go about their days without restrictions. Bush's legacy left the country under tighter social controls and regulations. National security was amped up to effectively turn society into a modern-day Panopticon. Paradoxically, the price of freedom was, therefore, less liberty. Bush pulled this off banking on the culture of fear concretizing terrorism as the enemy from which all Americans should feel threat.

Bush's brand reinforced his tough attitude as he anchored loyalty to his cowboy persona, the rugged individual with a collective pioneer spirit. Even Bush's second inaugural ceremony represented an increase in security and this pioneer spirit. Numerous security measures at the inauguration, such as security coding tickets, pacifying protestors, and installing ten thousand law enforcement officers, ensured the ceremony was free from threat (Bumiller and Stevenson 2005). It all came at a price and the very expensive hits kept coming.

During his terms, Bush waged two wars, one in Afghanistan starting one month after 9/11 and another in Iraq two years later. These wars took a toll on the federal budget, as they often do, and resulted in profound federal deficit. To date, the wars have cost America billions of dollars. Adding to the wars, just several months after Bush took his second inaugural oath in 2005, Hurricane Katrina devastated the Louisiana coastline costing billions of dollars more from various sources. Meanwhile the banking industry

loaned more and more money to the government, and to recoup some of it, was allowed to invest in high-risk mortgages leading to predatory lending practices, among other residual effects. Slowing banks started losing money, then they started hemorrhaging profit. The government bailed them out costing even more billions of dollars just one month before America elected Barack Obama as President.

Barack H. Obama

Obama inherited quite a financial mess. His background, however, situated him well to deal with it. Unlike most Presidents, Obama came from a middle-class upbringing during a time when being of mixed racial heritage was not accepted with full inclusion. He knows diversity well and the impact structural inequality can have. He knows struggle. He knows the value of “Hope” and “Change.” His slogans were his brand and his brand resonated with many ready to get back to Democratic ideals. Obama noted that to begin “reaffirming the greatness of our nation, we understand that greatness is never a given. It must be earned” (2009). He claimed the American “journey has never been one of short-cuts or settling for less. It has not been the path for the faint-hearted-for those who prefer leisure over work, or seek only the pleasures of riches and fame” (2009). Instead, he argued “it has been the risk-takers, the doers, the makers of things-some celebrated but more often men and women obscure in their labor, who have carried us up the long, rugged path towards prosperity and freedom” (Obama 2009). Civic duty was sacrifice, both to produce and then later consume. Civic duty was to serve, specifically to communities.

Obama's inaugural speeches aligned with previous constructs, at least on one issue: civic duty was service to self and country; it was being productive and all in the name of preserving freedom. When it came to civic duties and the "price of citizenship," Obama (2009) asked "that we do not grudgingly accept but rather seize gladly, firm in the knowledge that there is nothing so satisfying to the spirit, so defining of our character, than giving our all to a difficult task." Obama equated these tasks with the everyday jobs of living, and much like Reagan denoted in his first inaugural speech in 1981, Obama connoted in his: American heroism was in the extraordinary citizenry of ordinary life. He translated American heroism into:

"the kindness to take in a stranger when the levees break, the selflessness of workers who would rather cut their hours than see a friend lose their job which sees us through our darkest hours. It is the firefighter's courage to storm a stairway filled with smoke, but also a parent's willingness to nurture a child, that finally decides our fate" (2009).

Civic duty then was what Americans did in the course of their regular days, they simply did their jobs despite obstacles to bring about a better America for everyone, to prosper both in wealth and spirit.

Obama argued to reach this level of prosperity, civic duty should be grounded in traditional values, "hard work and honesty, courage and fair play, tolerance and curiosity, loyalty and patriotism-these things are old" (2009). There is no doubt he saw the value in the same virtues most Presidents preceding him did; he built this into this rhetoric, but the

way in which he proposed to bridge the change was different. He looked to government for reconciliation. As Baker (2009) of the New York Times notes, “Mr. Obama offered a new formulation,” where he negated Reagan’s concern over government being too big and Clinton’s dismissal of government being the cause or the solution to social problems, and instead insisted it was not a question of either; it was a question over whether or not government worked (p. P3). This is a bold move because Obama effectively implied it did not work nor had it for some time, and as if he was speaking directly to his predecessors, as Baker (2009) suggests, called them out for the failings.

Obama delivered on his promise to “Change.” He made it easier for citizens to consume as part of their civic duty. He signed the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act one month after he took his first Presidential oath of office. This legislation granted \$800 billion to various entities; a third went toward cutting taxes for the middle-class, another third was for infrastructure, and the last portion was for states to avoid losing jobs (Nelson 2016). In 2010, Obama signed into effect the Affordable Care Act institutionalizing government’s role in the nation’s healthcare. Although it came with controversy, as any ground-breaking legislation does, it offered “Hope” to Americans, another one of Obama’s brands, if for nothing else because it symbolized their government’s investment in what is offered in so many industrialized nations as a human right. Finally, with respect to boosting citizens’ ability to participate in economy, in 2012, Obama signed the “Race to the Top” initiative granting \$400 million to schools for education reform, on their terms. In this he took a step toward changing the educational system to accommodate new learners, new pedagogical practices, and new technologies

to ensure American citizens were equipped for a demanding and competitive global market.

Between his two inaugural speeches, Obama called for a complete government and economic overhaul. He was tasked with figuring out how to determine what needed repairing, how to repair what was broken, what needed to be tossed aside and totally rebuilt, how to rebuild what was dismantled, when it could be done and with that resources, and who could repair what. In effect, all Presidents preceding had similar tasks, but Obama started his Presidency already imposing a change on society not all were willing to accept while others celebrated with profound. Not only was Obama facing both overt and covert racism intersecting with a divided further by socioeconomic, but he also had to balance optimism with reality. He walked into his first Presidential term onto a charged political stage with amplified by worsening social divides.

Barack H. Obama: 2009 Inaugural Speech

Obama merged optimism with reality in his first inaugural speech. He confirmed, “[w]e remain the most prosperous, powerful nation on Earth. Our workers are no less productive than when this [financial] crisis began. Our minds are no less inventive, our goods and services no less needed than they were last week or last month or last year” (2009). However, taking issue with Bush’s tenure and almost blaming him for the banking crisis, Obama claimed the time “of protecting narrow interests and putting off unpleasant decisions-that time has surely passed. Starting today, we must pick ourselves up, dust ourselves off, and begin again the work of remaking America” (2009). He suggested America’s remaking is in demand-side economics. Obama (2009) argued,

“[t]he state of the economy calls for action, bold and swift, and we will act-not only to create new jobs, but to lay a new foundation for growth. We will build the roads and bridges, the electric grids and digital lines that feed our commerce and bind us together. We will restore science to its rightful place, and wield technology's wonders to raise health care's quality and lower its cost. We will harness the sun and the winds and the soil to fuel our cars and run our factories. And we will transform our schools and colleges and universities to meet the demands of a new age.”

In short, he planned to return America's economic, environmental, scientific, technological, and health to government. Government would act boldly and swiftly to create the means for which citizens could pursue the American Dream, for which citizens could consume.

He understood government needed to reestablish citizens' trust first, perhaps to get rid of the bad example that let an industry get too big to fail and maintain government's dependency. Obama promised, “those of us who manage the public's dollars will be held to account-to spend wisely, reform bad habits, and do our business in the light of day-because only then can we restore the vital trust between a people and their government” (2009). He took the blame off the market, and said, “the question before us [is not] whether the market is a force for good or ill. Its power to generate wealth and expand freedom is unmatched, but this crisis has reminded us that without a watchful eye, the market can spin out of control-and that a nation cannot prosper long when it favors only the prosperous” (2009).

He constructed civic duty in sweeping sentiment and reminded citizens, “[t]he success of our economy has always depended not just on the size of our Gross Domestic Product, but on the reach of our prosperity; on our ability to extend opportunity to every willing heart—not out of charity, but because it is the surest route to our common good” (2009). Citizens were to simply reach for prosperity. Government would provide the opportunity, and Americans’ civic duty was to take it and be prosperous; they were to produce, participate in economy, and consume as demand-side economics requires this for economic stability, especially from the middle-class.

Obama, in 2,395 words, clearly summarized the impact of economic instability. He simply said, “[o]ur economy is badly weakened,” and acknowledged the residual effects of that “crisis,” including the homes, jobs, and businesses lost and the failing educational and healthcare system. He set the foundation for his speech by admitting the issues exist, which enabled an opportunity to provide a plan to fix the “crisis.” He justified the fix by reminding Americans of who and what was sacrificed to establish the American spirit, and in this, used powerful finite language, such as “they died,” not often heard in inaugural speeches.

With this language, he connoted a parallel where the badly weakened economy did not seem so bad compared to travelling across oceans, working in sweatshops, fighting, and dying (Obama 2009). Further, by summarizing the current state of the economy and the residual effects of it juxtaposed against the horrific condition endured of the founders of America, whatever he asked Americans to do help fix the “crisis,” would pale in comparison. In that, he asked citizens to remake America because “[t]he

state of economy calls for action-bold and swift” (2009). He proposed drastic change, and in several lines, tore apart, using drastic language, such as “stale,” previous political strategies and Presidents connoting a reference to their issues with big v. small government, and safety v. ideals, good v. evil markets (2009).

He proposed these binaries lacked significance. American was not built on these divisions. Government should provide for its citizens a safe and stable country to pursue the American Dream, but citizens were responsible for pursuing it. America did not have to forfeit their democratic values to securing a safe country in which to pursue the American Dream. Economic markets did not have the power to impose evil nor good. The free market, built on the labor of Americans, would be as strong as the bond between government and its citizens. Government would do its part, democracy would prevail, and citizens would have a strong economy to conduct their business, one day soon.

Barack H. Obama: 2013 Inaugural Speech

By 2013, delivering his second Presidential oath, Obama claimed, “[a]n economic recovery has begun” (2013). Obama attributed this in large part to “collective action” and awarded citizens some credit using “we” as he summarized “[t]ogether, we determined...” infrastructure is necessary, “[t]ogether, we discovered that a free market only thrives when there are rules to ensure competition and fair play,” and “[t]ogether, we resolved that a great nation must care for the vulnerable and protect its people from life's worst hazards and misfortune” (2013). He argued “initiative and enterprise, our insistence on hard work and personal responsibility, these are constants in our character,” these are

citizens' duties (2013). The purpose of enacting civic duty was by 2013 to reap the rewards. Obama persuaded citizens to accept,

“our country cannot succeed when a shrinking few do very well and a growing many barely make it. We believe that America's prosperity must rest upon the broad shoulders of a rising middle class. We know that America thrives when every person can find independence and pride in their work; when the wages of honest labor liberate families from the brink of hardship” (2013).

In 2,096 words of which “must” is seventeen, Obama shifted his accommodating tone, focus, and agenda from his first inaugural speech to a more declarative one in his second inaugural speech. By 2013, identity politics reached a new level. Obama himself knew a thing or two about living as a minority, so perhaps his commitment in this speech was, in part, fueled by that frustration. There certainly was enough reason to change the definition of civic duty without his personal agenda, however.

Although he presented the familiar themes of collective action and service in this speech, he constructed a few of new ways in which citizens can enact their duty and serve their country: “take the risks that make this country great; claim the promise of new technology for the sake of “economic vitality;” and most importantly, “carry on what the [civil rights] pioneers began” (2013). Although this call for action, which he did several times, is condensed into the last few paragraphs of his speech, he presented this message as if he were saving “the best for last.” Obama reminded Americans they have the power to make the country right. He reminded citizens they have the obligation to construct

productive discourse about these issues. He (2013) reminded citizens that everyone's duty is to protect the "precious light of freedom."

As he did in his first inaugural speech, he implied the very best way to enact civic duty, to protect freedom, was to reach for prosperity because "[t]hat's how we will maintain our economic vitality and our national treasure-our forests and waterways, our crop lands and snow-capped peaks" (Obama 2013). He brought the spirit full circle and claimed,

"It is now our generation's task to carry on what those pioneers began. For our journey is not complete until our wives, our mothers and daughters can earn a living equal to their efforts. Our journey is not complete until our gay brothers and sisters are treated like anyone else under the law-for if we are truly created equal, then surely the love we commit to one another must be equal as well. Our journey is not complete until no citizen is forced to wait for hours to exercise the right to vote. Our journey is not complete until we find a better way to welcome the striving, hopeful immigrants who still see America as a land of opportunity-until bright young students and engineers are enlisted in our workforce rather than expelled from our country. Our journey is not complete until all our children, from the streets of Detroit to the hills of Appalachia, to the quiet lanes of Newtown, know that they are cared for and cherished and always safe from harm... That is our generation's task-to make these words, these rights, these values of life and liberty and the pursuit of happiness real for every American" (2013).

In this long, but very revealing sentiment, he moved away from general citizenship, and instead acknowledged the identity politics defining political culture. He suggested each American may have their own journey, and each American may travel their own path. However, the paths eventually converge somewhere in between freedom, liberty, and justice for all. He argued any American could be a better American.

Overall, between the 1980s and mid-2000s, Presidents prioritized: individualism over collectivism; the value of working to secure individual financial freedom slightly over the importance of maintaining community resources; and clear directives for fulfilling civic duty over the consequences for failing this directive. Reagan, H. W. Bush, Clinton, W. Bush, and Obama all tied consumption and economic values to civic duty and patriotism. Reagan argued citizens should value hard work and then achieve economic security to express patriotism where reliance on government assistance was the ultimate representation of failing to be a better American. H. W. Bush proposed citizens should work to establish financial freedom and express patriotism by not becoming a burden to their communities and government. Clinton argued citizens should express patriotism by valuing their communities and working hard to achieve an American Dream where doing so represented a clear investment in and value for the country's economic stability. W. Bush proposed citizens maintain individual responsibility for the country's economic condition when he constructed civic duty as working to secure America's leadership in a globalized economic market. Every citizen had an obligation to express patriotism, but those who did not fulfill their civic duty were not as worthy Americans as those who did. Obama argued a clear connection between maintaining

American's economic well-being with the country's ability to provide equal access to the resources needed to prosper. In this way, he constructed civic duty as an obligation to reach for prosperity and to help others achieve it when possible, but also accounted for the structural issues underlying social inequality. Expressing patriotism was then about fulfilling civic duty and recognizing how the intersections between individuals, culture, and social institutions impact America where he encouraged citizens to their part in reconciling.

Chapter Seven: Macro-Level Findings and Conclusions

Since WWII, Presidents have conveyed political agendas several ways, however, they all articulated the same primary goal: to ensure America's economy was strong. All twelve Presidents since WWII emphasized the importance of citizens working to maintain a strong American economy in their inaugural speeches. Presidents in office during the 1930s, 1940s, and 1950s proposed ensuring a strong economy required citizens, as a collective representation of the country, work for a moral or better America; expressing patriotism through working fulfilled Americans' civic duty, which was the most noble pathway to morality and the best way to stabilize American economy.

Presidents in office during the 1960s and 1970s proposed ensuring a strong economy required citizens work and work together. In these inaugural speeches, they proposed civic duty first required citizens' self-sufficiency, which came from individuals working hard to pursue the American Dream and the material assets representing its achievement. Secondly, civic duty required citizens work collectively to serve each other and their government to secure America's economic independence in the global community; expressing patriotism relied on fulfilling civic duty through individuals to pursue the American Dream and by investing collective service. The former better equipped Americans to participate in economy by consuming, but establishing their own financial independence, and the latter helped to establish America's financial independence in a globalizing economic market where citizens helping each other meant less citizens reliant on government assistance, therefore, freeing up funding for other support, such as defense.

Presidents in office during the 1980s, 1990s, and early to mid-2000s used their inaugural speeches to propose ensuring a strong economy required citizens accumulate resources by working in order to consume and establish America's financial security. Expressing patriotism relied on citizens' independence from social services and government programs, and it required citizens actively participate in global markets to stimulate America's economy, both of which would stabilize government spending and strengthen American political power. Fulfilling civic duty, therefore, required consumption, which required working to acquire the resources to consume.

All twelve Presidents promised incentives to citizens for enacting civic duty and expressing patriotism. Each President promised to return the country in better condition at the end of their terms than it was at the inauguration. In return, citizens were responsible for expressing their patriotism by fulfilling civic duties in a number of ways, such as maintaining a strong work ethic, working with communities and serving government, and working to accumulate resources for consumption.

To return America in better condition, each President promised to fix, or at least start repairing, social problems and civic concerns. In return, citizens were responsible for doing what their government asked of them to correct previous administrations' damages. Although their specific requests changed over the years, generally, all Presidents asked citizens to keep working; citizens should keep working for the sake of working, or they should work toward a financial goal, or they should work to accumulate wealth for consumption. Therefore, to redeem this promise, mid-century Presidents proposed citizens should not grow dependent on social services so that government could

redirect funding to resolve problems posing threats to all of America, such as war, rather than those problems individuals experienced, such as joblessness.

Each President, however, promised to serve his constituents in various ways. In return, citizens were responsible for honoring this service. Presidents in the first few decades since WWII asked citizens to honor government's service by upholding democratic values, including a strong work ethic, for a "better" America. Mid-century Presidents asked citizens to honor this service by giving back to the government, or at minimum, not taking from the government, and thus working toward self-sufficiency, as a way to encourage "better" Americans working with each other. Presidents in the last few decades asked citizens to honor government's service by developing what it meant to be a better American. Extending previous agendas, these latter Presidents argued good citizenship required claiming individual merit independent from government's offerings. Therefore, for Presidents in the last few decades, the best way to honor what government offers was by not using what government offers, and instead maintaining autonomy by working so each American was "better off" than previous generations.

Determining what "better off" meant from generation to generation, Presidents often used rhetoric describing economic success ambiguous enough so every American could find a place in it and precise enough to encourage room for growth for specific vulnerable populations. Getting away with ambiguity relied on citizens' trust that Presidential promised was valuable and redeemable. Spinning ambiguity successfully relied on citizens buying into the promises and messages backing them, and investing their trust. Buying into Presidents and their messages often relied on some sort of

emotional connection because developing trust for someone, even a President, in some ways, continues to require an emotional investment.

Presidents since WWII often constructed their images as brands to anchor this emotional investment, and then used their campaigns to construct a bridge for which buying into the emotional appeal or brand was the ticket citizens needed to cross over into trusting them. In this way, branding mattered because it represented a particular reliance on citizens' emotional investment to Presidents and their messages. Presidential branding, therefore, carried with it the power to anchor citizens' loyalty not just to the President, but also to the messages the President conveyed, including ideological constructs.

A Working America

Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower constructed civic duty as a moral responsibility to economy. In their inaugural speeches, they argued a moral economy was a just economy where it provided citizens with the means to pursue what they needed. Citizens were obligated to work because work involved keeping idle hands busy, but more importantly, it resulted in a better America for everyone. With morality driving the market, nothing but good could come. Without morality, nothing but bad would come. These three Presidents contextualized consumption tangential to work. Work in and of itself was the reward and citizens were to temper any income earned with moral righteousness. In this context, consuming was for basic needs, not to display wealth. Consuming was to stabilize America's economy. It was for ensuring a better America.

Those who worked were better equipped to ensure America was better; they were morally righteous and expressing patriotism was about being moral.

Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon, and Carter all carried this theme to construct civic duty as not just working for a better America but also working with better Americans, those who honored both the collective spirit and the importance of individual pursuits. These Presidents proposed that citizens should work for the purpose of stabilizing America's economy and should also work together to serve America. Working to stabilize America's economy involved securing jobs, careers, and professions in industries the global economy valued and rewarded. This enabled citizens the power to consume, which helped to maintain economic growth for the country. Citizens were to also cooperate and work together serving America so government could focus on global relations and creating opportunities for citizens to be better Americans. Those who worked and worked together to serve the country were better equipped to consume, and were effectively better Americans, those who could express more patriotism.

Reagan, H. W. Bush, Clinton, W. Bush, and Obama extended civic duty even further. They argued working stabilized America's economy, but they did not focus on moral consciousness nor prioritize working together for the sake of just America's prosperity. These Presidents argued civic duty was more than securing a better America and more than working with Americans to be better citizens. Civic duty was all that, but primarily working and serving together was for individual prosperity. They connected consumption to civic duty by situating the latter, civic duty, in the importance of working to earn income to pursue the American Dream reliant on purchasing a home and filling it

with conspicuous displays of patriotism as it exemplified by wealth. They contextualized the former, consumption, by highlighting the significance of achieving the American Dream. The connection between consumption and civic duty was then for America to develop into better Americans and work together to claim a top spot in the global market, but primarily the connection was a link in the process of claiming an American Dream for each citizen. Those who work were better equipped to consume, and an individual who consume was a better American than one who could not or did not. The more a citizen could consume, the more dutiful s/he was. The less a citizen could consume, the less dutiful s/he was. The better a citizen enacted their civic duty, the better American citizen that is.

Presidential Inaugural Speeches

Consumer citizens, or citizens who consume, have been told since at least WWII they are effectively responsible for the economic market. Presidents talked about the market in their speeches as it was a living, breathing entity. The market responds, reacts, adjusts, etc. Because the economic market was constructed as something capable of action, defining work as civic duty then conceptualized working citizens capable of breathing life into it, or taking life from it. Consumption then became an act of life saving, metaphorically. Every President since Roosevelt focused on the economy in their inaugural speeches. They talked about so much, citizens may have believed their role in maintaining its stability was connected to their actions in a way that set up economic activity as a reaction. Because this was coupled with sentiments about rugged individualism and the collective pioneer spirit, consuming to maintain economic health

was then tied to patriotism as an obligation to the American spirit, and more specifically, the American Dream.

Each President spoke about a new time, era, age, etc. Generationally speaking, in a person's voting life, s/he could see more than a dozen presidential elections. A citizen would have several chances to grow with political culture or be oppressed by its sentiments. Presidential rhetoric has the power to shape the American spirit. Presidential rhetoric since WWII as revealed in twenty inaugural speeches shows Presidents did tie consumption to civic duty and patriotism in various ways. The prevailing theme Presidents conveyed in all of the speeches was that working hard equaled honorable civic duty. Citizens must work for themselves, their communities, their nation, but above all, for their chance at pursuing the American Dream through the economic market. When they could not work for, whatever reason, they could not fulfill their civic duty. Those with the resources to work, such as social/cultural capital, an education, or experience, were the ones who can access this honor.

Each of the twelve Presidents revealed that working and maintaining a strong work ethic was the very best way to express patriotism. They all listed several values required of patriotism, including honesty, civility, compassion, and vision, but at the end of each sentiment, failing to take on the responsibility to work in order to consume, or participate in economy, was the primary way a citizen could disqualify her/himself from achieving the American Dream. Therefore, citizens were also required to believe in the American Dream, to achieve it, and to pass on its virtues to the next generation. In this, working to enact civic duty was part of consuming for a purpose: to establish a secure

stake in the American Dream by buying a home, setting up roots in communities, and starting families. Failing to earn enough to pursue the American Dream was then equated with failed citizenship. Those who could access the resources to pursue this achievement were more dutiful citizens.

With every new inaugural speech came a renewal of vows that connoted the importance of committing to this pursuit. Presidents constructed their campaign promises revealed in their inaugural speeches as proposals where if citizens accepted their call to action, then they did so by entering a sacred contract between an American and government. The rhetoric implied the contract required everyone do their job, everyone value meritocracy, and everyone must consume. Citizens who failed to renew their vows with each new President also failed to live up to their end of the deal. Those with more capacity to participate more fully in not just economy, but also politics, was therefore, a more dutiful citizen. Those who failed to honor the contract, or those who did not pursue the American Dream with the same success as they are told was valuable, were less dutiful citizens.

The messages Presidential inaugural speeches revealed are profound, and ultimately impact the individual, cultural, and institutional levels of society in powerful ways. Understanding the connection between consumption, civic duty, and to a lesser extent, patriotism and reviewing further the role Presidential branding played in this connection requires a closer look at key speeches, such as State of the Union addresses, those speeches delivered after key historical events, and analyzing Presidential diaries, biographies, and autobiographies. For now, it is clear that civic duty's connection to

consumption rests on the idea that the role of the citizen consumer is only growing stronger, and this connection will evolve as more Presidents continue emphasizing the importance of work and working together to build a better America, Americans, and an individual American Dream. In this, Presidents, and perhaps all politicians, play a powerful role in shaping political culture, which in some ways contradicts the notion that citizens' interests shape and define democratic societies, at least American Capitalism.

Institutional Intersections

Since before Roosevelt was in office, public opinion polls informed Presidential policy. Up until Kennedy was in office, however, Presidents used opinion polls to confirm, rather than drive their political decisions. They used opinion polls to check the pulse of the public's view about them, rather than adapting their image to polls. Kennedy institutionalized public opinion polls; he conducted them frequently and deeply. He used polls to understand what citizens cared about, and then adjusted his policy decisions accordingly. He used them to figure out how his personality, persona, and image were received, and then modified each according to the public's feedback. Since then, for well over fifty years, Presidents have used public opinion polls in the same way. The issues we see on the campaign trail reflect months of polling to determine exactly what we want to see. The policies written during each term reflect action that is likely to maintain a President's popularity. This shift overall extended citizens' power in shaping political culture to well beyond consumption. This shift transformed a citizen who consumes within an economic market into a citizen consumer within a political market.

Presidential inaugural speeches convey these issues in their campaigns, use the publically endorsed issues to get reelected, and then constantly monitor the progress of the tentative public opinion. Boef and Kellstedt (2004) argue that when economic conditions are good, citizens tend to credit Presidents, and likewise, when economic conditions are not good, citizens tend to blame Presidents, all of which impacts citizens' approval of specific Presidents and either anchors or negates their trust in politics generally. If Presidents want to remain in power, and based on how many serve multiple terms and stay politically active when they leave the Oval Office, it is safe to assume, they do, then ultimately they must do what the public wants.

This is not entirely one-sided, though. Presidents use Media to spin public opinion, too. The relationship between citizens' public opinion is then a reciprocal process. Presidents construct a brand, and image for which citizens grow emotionally attached to and anchor their loyalty, and Media spins it around to shape public opinion, Presidents poll those opinions, and then direct policy and their personalities, or more specifically, their brands to accommodate those opinions. As technological capabilities grew to reach more and more audiences, Presidential branding grew more and more important and sophisticated. Johnson institutionalized political campaigning around a brand. Using the first ever television commercial in a Presidential campaign, he created the foundation for the political market. He took the role of campaigning from simply advertising policies and positions, and developed a way to tap into complex emotional appeal and draw the Presidency into a commodity. Since then, Presidents have used commercials and advertisements to launch their brands. Presidents, since this shift, have

been featured alongside other products citizens consume. Citizens have paradoxically become both desensitized and hyper-aware of their role as consumers, even as consumers of more abstract commodities, such as education.

As of the last few decades, pursuing education has also become tied to pursuing the American Dream. In this context, Education is also responsible for maintaining economic health. However, in this process where working defines civic duty, and working a high-paying job is not possible without an education, academic credentials have been commodified right along with Presidents, their rhetoric, and then work itself. An education has in fact become a very valuable commodity where going into debt to earn a degree has been institutionalized as almost part of the mandatory curriculum. In this scenario, those who control the cost of education also control the level of consumption, and even more deeply, the level of production and competition within a global market.

The future of Government/Politics, Work/Economy, Media, and Education rests in the relationship between citizens and politicians. Political culture determines, to some extent, public opinion. Media, to some extent, controls what Presidential brand is more valuable than another, and in that, has the power to shape public opinion around whichever hegemonic ideology sells the best. Work/Economy is valued by Presidential rhetoric in specific ways that outline what industries will and will not drive the market, and therefore, offer jobs. Education is much like an enormous toolbox where the key to its use is given to those who can afford it. Social inequality is then reproduced in various ways through various means, including through Presidential rhetoric.

Top Down and Bottom Up Approaches

Both sides of the supply/demand economic philosophy and practices do not reflect true Capitalism as both require some sort of government intervention. Supply-side economics appears to empower Capitalism, which might account for its massive appeal to free-market proponents. However, the intervention government makes is not obvious; it is disguised behind what citizens and politicians take for granted as government's primary role: to regulate government agencies. This takes shape when government intervenes in how industries operate, what restrictions and allowances are given to them legislatively, and how specifically banks work to set interest rates for big ticket items, such as houses. Demand-side economics relies on government intervention and takes a fairly obvious role in that capacity. What might be less obvious is the impact these philosophies and practices have on the connection between consumption and civic duty, and how sentiments about what defines the American spirit or patriotism changes Government/Politics itself.

In some way or another, Presidents since WWII all tied consumption to civic duty in their inaugural speeches, and all suggested dutiful citizens are patriotic, a value all highly regard. Eisenhower, Nixon, Reagan, and both President Bush from 1989 and 2001/2005 tended to favor supply-side economics where America's prosperity relied on ensuring the wealthiest of citizens could produce a supply of goods and services consumers would buy to maintain or stimulate economy. Roosevelt, Truman, Kennedy, Johnson, Carter Clinton, and Obama tended to favor demand-side economics where America's prosperity relied on a well-funded consumer base, specifically comprised of

the middle and working classes, who usually spend more on the types of goods and services that drive the market overall, and in doing so, generate demand for those products which in turn stimulates economic growth. All Presidents sought the same result and all argued vastly different pathways of getting there, but they all also argued that work, labor for the sake of itself, a demonstration of cooperative value, or for accumulating wealth, was the vehicle for traveling the pathways.

Presidential constructs of consumption tied to civic duty and patriotism intersect with Government/Politics, Work/Economy, Media, and Education, albeit the last one is a bit tangential. The intersection of Government/Politics, Work/Economy, and Media shows a point at which the citizen consumer is constructed. This construct reveals that citizenship requires consumption, but some Presidents framed the requirement as working to earn wages/income to participate in Economy as consumption. Each President conveyed the importance of a strong work ethic coupled with various levels of obligation to Government/Politics, and each utilized technology available in Media to convey this message. Democrats (Roosevelt, et al.) tended to frame citizens' obligation to work as a journey to, pathway on, or a discovery of the collective American spirit; working was something we all shared and should be proud to do together for ourselves and each other. Although Republicans (Eisenhower, et al.) share this general sentiment, they tended to land on the purpose of work as commitment to Government/Politics and Economy. Working in this context required some devotion to the American spirit rather than a journey, pathway, or discovery of it; they assumed citizens already possess it.

This framing reflected a general alignment with the Presidents' general economic philosophies and actions. Those favoring demand-side economic philosophy positions held citizens responsible for consuming based on earning from jobs and opportunities the government may have needed to create and programs it may have needed to provide to subsidize earnings or alleviate social problems. In this, working was a collective endeavor where citizens' duty to it was more about focusing on the means to secure economic stability rather than the ends. In this scenario, the government was responsible for taking action to secure policies benefit the middle and working classes, such as those that cut their tax rate or offer reduced interest rates to purchase homes. Supply-side economic philosophy generally situates Presidents aligning with that economic philosophy as the keepers of the wealth where the outcome of economic stability is the goal to reach, not necessarily regarding the means to reach it, and as such empowering citizens to participate on their own. This perspective results in policies that benefit the ruling and upper classes, such subsidies for industries that generate consumable products and tax relief for highest tax bracket. The idea behind this perspective is that the middle and working classes will consume when, what, and if industries determine the options.

Limitations

This analysis is limited in a few ways. Inaugural speeches lend tremendous insight into political rhetoric and reveal how it can shape political culture. However, twenty speeches cannot capture the totality of Presidential rhetoric, especially given the number of speeches Presidents deliver in the course of their campaigns and terms. They convey myriad nuances, subtleties, and constructions that change over time with their

terms. Inaugural speeches, at least the first ones they deliver, capture the messages they *intend* to advance. These speeches, unless it is the second (and in the case of Roosevelt, the third and fourth) relay information to citizens about what Presidents hope to accomplish and what they want citizens to accomplish, either by providing direct summaries and instructions, respectively, or through indirect messages sometimes requiring some cultural capital (and context) to understand. Therefore, inaugural speeches primarily capture what ought to occur, not what already has.

Similarly, without the contextual indicators that only paralinguistics can reveal, analyzing the text alone limits any discussion about deeper meaning that what is provided. Although videos of all inaugural speeches are taken into consideration, there is no logical and efficient way to include paralinguistics analysis of some Presidential verbal cues, for example, and not others in this project. Conducting a comprehensive content analysis of both the text and paralinguistics requires analyzing hours and hours of subtle verbal cues, tonal changes, facial expressions, hand gestures, and many more nuances of active, spoken words for which Presidents, well-versed in managing physical impressions, carefully construct to appeal to massive audiences. In this, analyzing paralinguistics as part of this project would require moving beyond decoding the almost one hundred pages of text, contextualizing its socioeconomic, historical, and political significance, and making connections possibly impacting society. It would also require all of this applied to several hours and several thousand frames of video footage. This analysis lacks a comprehensive paralinguistics consideration because it is beyond the scope of this project.

Finally, analyzing speeches, any speeches, without taking the pulse of what and how audiences receive the messages can only reveal half of the implications.

Understanding what Presidents convey is profound, but understanding how audiences make sense of their messages, and then take action from those messages captures a more comprehensive meaning. At this point, there is no way to fully understand how audiences from decades ago assimilated and acted on Presidential rhetoric. Tapping into the political imaginations of citizens today is more realistic, though, especially considering the ease at which, cultural pulses can be taken electronically. Because this analysis, however, lacks a proper reception consideration, it only tells half the story.

Future Work

In the future, analyzing more speeches, including both the text and paralanguage, should bring about an even better understanding of how political rhetoric *can* shape political culture. Coupling that analysis with audience reception studies will round out a discovery of *how* political rhetoric actually shapes political culture. Extending an exploration of how Presidential rhetoric connects civic duty to consumption to more speeches, beyond just inaugural addresses, might also lend insight into how Presidential terms construct, shape, and influence individual citizens' conception of their civic duty. Tracking consumption patterns before, during, and after Presidential campaigns might also uncover the impact rhetoric connecting civic duty to consumption has on spending. It might even also start to unravel the evolution of consumerism alongside debt culture, and possibly tease out the citizens' motivations behind working pursuant to the American Dream.

Overall, analyzing how political rhetoric, in its totality, constructs ideologies contributes to a profound understanding of how belief systems evolve and how discourse prioritizes citizenship. Sociology needs more and deeper critical discourse analysis of Presidential speeches, of all kinds. Further, analyzing what and how audiences receive and process the constructs and priorities in Presidential speeches can help social scientists predict to what extent political customs, traditions, norms, values, ideologies, constructs, and language, including symbols, impact citizens. Finally, analyzing more and deeper levels of Presidential speeches, alongside audience reception, might help further inform social scientists about the specific ways individuals, culture, and social institutions intersect.

Bibliography

- AIDS. gov. 2016. "A Timeline of HIV/AIDS." *US Department of Health and Human Services*. Retrieved February, 2016 (<https://www.aids.gov/hiv-aids-basics/hiv-aids-101/aids-timeline/>).
- Albala, Ken. 2015. "Food Banks." Pp. 552-558 in *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Food Issues*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Altheide, David. 2004. "Consuming Terrorism." *Symbolic Interactionism* 27(3): 289-308.
- Apple, R. W. 1973. "Self-Help Urged: President Discerns a 'Better Way' in Shift From Old Policies." *New York Times*. January 21.
- Babb, Drew. 2014 "LBJ's 1964 attack ad 'Daisy' leaves a legacy for modern campaigns." *The Washington Post*, September 5. Retrieved February 1, 2016 (https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/lbjs-1964-attack-ad-daisy-leaves-a-legacy-for-modern-campaigns/2014/09/05/d00e66b0-33b4-11e4-9e92-0899b306bbea_story.html)
- Baker, Peter. 2009. "Obama Takes Oath, and Nation in Crisis Embraces the Moment." *New York Times*. January 21.
- Barber, Benjamin R. 2007. *Consumed: How Markets Corrupt Children, Infantilize Adults, and Swallow Citizens*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton and Company, Inc.
- Beck, Kent M. 1974. "The Kennedy Image: Politics, Camelot, and Vietnam." *The Wisconsin Magazine of History* 58(1):45-55.
- Boef, Suzanna D. and Paul M. Kellstedt. 2004. "The Political (And Economic) Origins of Consumer Confidence." *American Journal of Political Science* 48(4): 633-649.
- Boris, Eileen. 2007. "On Cowboys and Welfare Queens: Independence, Dependence, and Interdependence at Home and Abroad." *Journal of American Studies* 41(3): 599-621.
- Bosmajian, Hamida. 1970. "Robert Frost's 'The Gift Outright': Wish and Reality in History and Poetry." *American Quarterly* 22(1): 95-105.
- Bostdorff, Denise M. 2003. "George W. Bush's Post-September 11 Rhetoric of Covenant Renewal: Upholding the Faith of the Greatest Generation." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 89(4): 293-319.

- Bostdorff, Denise M. and Daniel O'Rourke. 1997. "The Presidency and the Promotion of Domestic Crisis: John F. Kennedy's Management of the 1962 Steel Crisis." *Presidential Studies Quarterly*. 27(2): 342-361.
- Bruni, Frank and David E. Sanger. 2001. "Unity is a Theme: In Inaugural Speech, He Asks Citizens to Seek 'a Common Good'." *New York Times*. January 21.
- Brunk, Gregory G. and Paul A. Gough. 1983. "State Economic Conditions and the 1980 Presidential Election." *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 13(1):62-69.
- Bumiller, Elisabeth and Richard W. Stevenson. 2005. "Bush at 2nd Inaugural, Says Spread of Liberty is the 'Calling of Our Time'." *New York Times*. January 21.
- Burkholder, Donald R. 1974-5. "The Caretakers of the Presidential Image." *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 4(3/4) and 591): 35-43.
- Bush, George H.W. 1989. "Inaugural Address." Retrieved July 1, 2015 (<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=16610>)
- Bush, George W. 2001. "Inaugural Address." Retrieved July 1, 2015 (<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=25853>)
- Bush, George W. 2005. "Inaugural Address." Retrieved July 1, 2015 (<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=58745>)
- Callaghan, Karen J. and Simo Virtanen. 1993. "Revised Models of the 'Rally Phenomenon': The Case of the Carter Presidency." *The Journal of Politics* 55(3): 756--764.
- Cannon, Lou. 2016. "Ronald Reagan: Campaigns and Elections." *Miller Center of Public Affairs*. Retrieved February, 2016. (<http://millercenter.org-/president/biography/reagan-campaigns-and-elections>).
- Carter, Burnham. 1963. "President Kennedy's Inaugural Address." *College Composition and Communication* 14(1): 36-40.
- Carter, James E. 1977. "Inaugural Address." Retrieved July 1, 2015 (<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=6575>)
- Clinton, William J. 1993. "Inaugural Address." Retrieved July 1, 2015 (<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=46366>)
- Clinton, William J. 1997. "Inaugural Address." Retrieved July 1, 2015 (<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=54183>)

- Coe, Kevin and David Domke, Erica S. Graham, Sue Lockett John, Victor W. Pickard. 2004. "No Shades of Gray: The Binary Discourse of George W. Bush and an Echoing Press." *Journal of Communication* 54(2): 234-252.
- Cogan, Brian and Tony Kelso. *Encyclopedia of Politics, The Media, and Popular Culture*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, Incorporated.
- Cohen, Jeffrey E. 2001. "'The Polls': Change and Stability in Public Assessments of Personal Traits, Bill Clinton, 1993-99." *Presidential Quarterly Studies* 31(4):733-741.
- Cohen, Jeffrey E. and John A. Hamman. 2003. "'The Polls': Can Presidential Rhetoric Affect the Public's Economic Perceptions?" *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 33(2):408-422.
- Cohen, Warren I. 1994. "Balancing American Interests in the Middle East" Lyndon Baines Johnson vs. Gamal Abdul Nasser." Pp. 279-310 in *Lyndon Johnson Confronts the World: American Foreign Policy 1963-1968*. ed. by Warren I Cohen and Nancy Bernkopf Tucker. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Crider, John. H. 1945. "President Then Pledges Victory for Allies and 'a Durable Peace.'" *New York Times*. January 21.
- Davis, Joe C. and John H. Huston. 1992. "The Shrinking Middle-Income Class: A Multivariate Analysis." *Eastern Economic Journal* 18(3): 277-285.
- Dolfman, Michael L. and Denis McSweeney. 2006. "100 Years of U.S. Consumer Spending: Data for the Nation, New York City, and Boston: 1972-3." *U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics* Retrieved February 5, 2016 (<http://www.bls.gov/opub/uscs/1972-73.pdf>)
- Dowd, Maureen. 1989. "Transformation of Bush: His Own Man." *New York Times*. January 21.
- Druckman, James N. and Lawrence R. Jacobs. 2004. "Candidate Strategies to Prime Issues and Image." *The Journal of Politics* 66(4):1180-1202.
- Eckstein, Otto. 1964. "The Unmistakable Brand Of LBJ." *Challenge* 12(7):4-7.
- Edelman, Murray. 1964. *The Symbolic Uses of Politics*. Chicago, IL: University of Illinois.
- Edelman, Murray. 1977. *Political Language: Words that Succeed and Policies that Fail*. New York, NY: Academic Press.

- Edelman, Murray. 1988. "Political Language and Political Reality." *Political Science and Politics*. 18(1): 10-19.
- Eisenhower, Dwight D. 1953. "Inaugural Address." Retrieved July 1, 2015 (<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=9600>)
- Eisenhower, Dwight D. 1957. "Second Inaugural Address." Retrieved July 1, 2015 (<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=10856>)
- Eisenhower, Dwight D. 1961. "Military Industrial Complex Speech." Retrieved February 1, 2016 (<http://coursesa.matrix.msu.edu/~hst306/documents/indust.html>)
- Fairclough, Norman. 1998. *Language and Power*. New York, NY: Longman, Inc.
- Fairclough, Norman and Ruth Wodak. 1997. "Critical Discourse Analysis." Pp. 258-284 in *Discourse as Social Interaction*, ed. Teun A. Dijk. London: Sage.
- Freeman, Robert. 2006. "A Tale of Two Theories: Supply Side and Demand Side Economics." *Common Dreams*, May 14. Retrieved February, 2016 (<http://www.commondreams.org/views06/0514-20.htm>)
- Friedman, Thomas. 1993. "Amid Pageant of Diversity, Homage to Election Themes." *New York Times*. January 21.
- Gallup. "Presidential Approval Ratings." Retrieved February 5, 2016 (<http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2016/01/12/presidential-job-approval-ratings-from-ike-to-obama/>)
- Gao, George and Samantha Smith. 2016. "Presidential job approval rating from Ike to Obama." *Pew Research*, January 12. Retrieved February 5, 2016 (<http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2016/01/12/presidential-job-approval-ratings-from-ike-to-obama/>)
- Gladstone, Eric. 2006. "Nookaler Ambitions: Social-Psychological Analysis of Persuasive Speech." *Michigan Sociological Review* 20: 241-62.
- Glynis O'Garro Joseph. "Critical Discourse Analysis in Education: A Review of the Literature." *Review of Education Research*. 75(3):365-416.
- Goffman, Erving. 1959. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York, NY: Doubleday Books.

- Heclo, Hugh. 2008. "The Mixed Legacies of Ronald Reagan." *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 38(4): 555-574.
- Hellman, John. 1990. "JFK: The Author and the Text." *American Literary History* 2(4):743-755.
- Holian, David B. 2004. "He's Stealing My Issues! Clinton's Crime Rhetoric and the Dynamics of Issue Ownership." *Political Behavior* 26(2): 95-124.
- Hilton, Matthew. 2007. "Consumers and the State since the Second World War." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 611:66-81.
- Houck, David W. and Amos Kiewe. 2003. *FDR's Body Politics: The Rhetoric of Disability*. College Station, TX: Texas A & M University.
- Ivie, Robert L. "Savagery in Democracy's Empire." *Third World Quarterly* 26(1): 55-65.
- Jacobs, Ken and Ian Perry and Jenider MacGillvary. 2015. "The High Public Cost of Low Wages." *UC Berkeley Center for Labor Research and Education*. Retrieved February, 2016. (<http://laborcenter.berkeley.edu/the-high-public-cost-of-low-wages/>).
- Jacobs, Lawrence R. and Melanie Burns. 2004. "The Second Face of the Public Presidency: Presidential Polling and the Shift from Policy to Personality Polling." *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 34(3):536-556.
- Jacobs, Lawrence R. and Robert R. Shapiro. 1994. "Issues, Candidate Image, and Priming: The Use of Private Polls in Kennedy's 1960 Presidential Campaign." *The American Political Science Review* 88(3): 527-540.
- Jacobs, Lawrence R. and Robert R. Shapiro. 1995. "The Rise of Presidential Polling: The Nixon White House in Historical Perspective." *The Public Opinion Quarterly* 59(2):163-195.
- Jacobs, Lawrence R. and Robert R. Shapiro. 1999. "Lyndon Johnson, Vietnam, and Public Opinion: Rethinking Realist Theory of Leadership." *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 29(3):592-616.
- Jacoby, Jacob, Tracy R. Troutman and Tommy E. Whittler. 1986. "Viewer Miscomprehension of the 1980 Presidential Debate: A Research Note." *Political Psychology* 7(2):297-308.

- Jankowski, Thomas and Robert R. Alford, Alexander M. Hicks, and Mildred A. Schwartz. 2003. *The Handbook of Political Sociology: States, Civil Societies, and Globalization*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Johns, Andrew A. 1999. "A Voice from the Wilderness: Richard Nixon and the Vietnam War, 1964-1966." *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 29(2):317-335.
- Johnson, Lyndon B. 1965. "The President's Inaugural Address." Retrieved July 1, 2015 (<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=26985>)
- Just, Marion and Ann Crigler. 2000. "Leadership Image-Building: After Clinton and Watergate." *Political Psychology* 21(1):179-198
- Kengor, Paul. 2013. "Ronald Reagan: Same-sex marriage advocate?" *CNN*, May 1. Retrieved February, 2016 (<http://www.cnn.com/2013/05/01/opinion/kengor-reagan-same-sex-marriage/>).
- Kennedy, John F. 1960. "Remarks of Senator John F. Kennedy, Municipal Auditorium, Canton, Ohio." Online by Gerard Peters and John T. Woolley. *The American Presidency Project*. Retrieved February, 2016 (<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=74231>)
- Kennedy, John F. 1961. "Inaugural Address." Retrieved July 1, 2015 (<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=8032>)
- Keum, Heejo and Narayan Devanathan, Sameer Deshpande, Michelle R. Nelson and Dhavan V. Shah. 2004. "The Citizen-Consumer: Media Effects at the Intersection of Consumer and Civic Culture." *Political Communication* 21:369-391.
- Klein, Jill G. and Rohini Ahluwalia. 2005. "Negativity in the Evaluation of Political Candidates." *Journal of Marketing* 69(1): 131-142.
- Kneupper, Charles W. 1986. "Political Rhetoric and Public Competence: A Crisis for Democracy?." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 16(3):125-133.
- Knott, Stephan, ed. 2016. "George H. W. Bush: Campaigns and Elections." *Miller Center of Public Affairs*, Retrieved February, 2016 (<http://millercenter.org-/president/biography/bush-campaigns-and-elections>).
- Krock, Arthur. 1937. "President Speaks: Calls for Leadership of the People Along Road They Have Chosen." *New York Times*. January 21.
- Krukones, Michael G. 1980. "Predicting Presidential Performance through Political Campaigns." *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 10(4):527-543.

- Larner, Wendy. 2000. "Neoliberalism: Policy, Ideology, Governmentality." *Studies in Political Economy* 60: 5-25.
- Lawrence, W. H. 1957. "He Bars Isolation: Stresses Duty to World as Thousands Watch Oath Ceremonies." *New York Times*. January 22.
- Lawrence, W. H. 1963. "Nation Exhorted: Inaugural Says U.S. Will 'Pay Any Price' to Keep Freedom." *New York Times*. January 21.
- Lerner, Mitchell. 1995. "Vietnam and the 1964 Election: A Defense of Lyndon Johnson." *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 25(4):751-766.
- Lipsky, Michael and Marc A. Thibodeau. 1988. "Feeding the Hungry with Surplus Commodities." *Political Science Quarterly* 103(2): 223-244.
- Loeske, Donileen R. 2009. "Examining as Discourse: Emotion Codes and Presidential Speeches Justifying War." *The Sociological Quarterly* 50(3): 497-524.
- Marshall, John. 2014. "Nixon is Gone, but his Media Strategy Lives On." *The Atlantic*, August 4 (<http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2014/08/nixons-revenge-his-media-strategy-triumphs-40-years-after-resignation/375274/>)
- Mazurek, Malgorzata and Matthew Hilton. 2007. "Consumerism, Solidarity and Communism: Consumer Protection and the Consumer Movement in Poland." *Journal of Contemporary History* 42(2): 315-343.
- McDiarmid, John. 1937. "Presidential Inaugural Addresses-A Study in Verbal Symbols." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 1(3):79-82.
- McLeod, James R. 1999. "The Sociodrama of Presidential Politics: Rhetoric, Ritual, and Power in the Era of Teledemocracy." *American Anthropologist* 101(2): 359-73.
- Miller, Nancy L. and William B. Stiles. 1986. "Verbal Familiarity in American Presidential Nomination Acceptance Speeches and Inaugural Addresses (1920-1981)." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 49(1): 72-81.
- Mitchell, Alison. 1997. "Asks Racial Unity: Calls on Congress to Join in New Effort to Close 'the Breach'." *New York Times*. January 21.
- Mogull, Robert G. 1990. "Determinants of Federal Welfare Spending." *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 20(2): 355-371.
- Mogull, Robert G. 1972. "American Poverty in the 1960's." *Phylon* 33(2):161-168.

- Morgan, Iwan. 2004. "Jimmy Carter, Bill Clinton, and the New Democratic Economics." *The Historical Journal* 47(4):1015-1039.
- Murphy, John M. "'Our Mission and Our Moment:' George W. Bush and September 11th." *Rhetoric and Public Affairs* 6(4): 607-632.
- Nelson, Michael. 2016. "Barack Obama: Domestic Affairs." *Miller Center of Public Affairs*. Retrieved February, 2016 (<http://millercenter.org-/president/biography/obama-domestic-affairs>).
- Niffenegger, P.B. 1989. "Strategies for Success from the Political Marketers." *Journal of Consumer Marketing* 6(1):45-51.
- Nixon, Richard M. 1969. "Inaugural Address." Retrieved July 1, 2015 (<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=1941>)
- Nixon, Richard M. 1973. "Oath of Office and Second Inaugural Address." Retrieved July 1, 2015 (<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=4141>)
- Norpoth, Helmut. 1996. "Presidents and the Prospective Voter." *The Journal of Politics* 58(3): 776-792.
- Obama, Barack H. 2009. "Inaugural Address." Retrieved July 1, 2015 (<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=44>)
- Obama, Barack H. 2009. "Inaugural Address." Retrieved July 1, 2015 (<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=102827>)
- Pach, Chester J. ed. 2016. "Dwight D. Eisenhower: Campaigns and Elections." *Miller Center of Public Affairs*, Retrieved February 5, 2016 (<http://millercenter.org-/president/biography/eisenhower-campaigns-and-elections>).
- Parnet, Herbert S. 1990. "The Kennedy Myth and American Politics." *The History Teacher* 24(1):31-39.
- Peterson, Wallace C. 1985. "The U.S. 'Welfare State' and the Conservative Counterrevolution." *Journal of Economic Issues* 19(3): 601-641.
- Plischke, Elmer. 1985. "The President's Image as Diplomat in Chief." *The Review of Politics* 47(4):544-565.
- Public Broadcasting Service. 2016. "Domestic Politics." Retrieved February, 2016. (<http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/americanexperience/features/general-article/bush-domestic/>).

- Public Broadcasting Service. 2016. "The 1982 Recession." Retrieved February, 2016. (<http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/americanexperience/features/general-article/reagan-recession/>).
- Putnam, Jackson K. 1992. "The Pattern of Modern California Politics." *Pacific Historical Review* 61(1): 23-52.
- Reagan, Ronald W. 1981. "Inaugural Address." Retrieved July 1, 2015 (<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=43130>)
- Reagan, Ronald W. 1985. "Inaugural Address." Retrieved July 1, 2015 (<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=38688>)
- Reichley, A, James. 1981-2. "The Conservative Roots of the Nixon, Ford, and Reagan Administrations." *Political Science Quarterly* 96(4): 537-550.
- Remini, Robert V. and Terry Golway. 2008. *Fellow Citizens: The Penguin Book of U.S. Presidential Inaugural Addresses*. New York, NY: Penguin Books.
- Restons, James. 1969. "From Partisan to President of All." *New York Times*. January 21.
- Ritter, Dan. 2013. "Presidential market scoreboard: Reagan to Obama." *USA Today*. Retrieved February, 2016 (<http://www.usatoday.com/story/money/markets/2013/08/31/presidential-stock-market-scoreboard-reagan-obama/2750227/>).
- Rogers, Rebecca, Elizabeth Malancharuvil-Berkes, Melissa Mosely, Diane Hui, and
- Romer, Christina D. 1992. "What Ended the Great Depression?" *The Journal of Economic History* 52(4):757-784.
- Roosevelt, Franklin D. 1933. "Inaugural Address." Retrieved July 1. 2015 (<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=14473>)
- Roosevelt, Franklin D. 1937. "Inaugural Address." Retrieved July 1, 2015 (<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=15349>)
- Roosevelt, Franklin D. 1941. "Third Inaugural Address." Retrieved July 1, 2015 (<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=16022>)
- Roosevelt, Franklin D. 1945. "Inaugural Address." Retrieved July 1, 2015 (<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=16607>)

- Rousseas, Stephen. 1981-2. "The Poverty of Wealth." *Journal of Keynesian Economics* 4(2):192-213.
- Scammell, Margaret. 2007. "Political Brands and Consumer Citizens: The Rebranding of Tony Blair." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 611: 176-192.
- Schieman, Scott. 2010. "Socioeconomic Status and Beliefs about God's Influence in Everyday Life." *Sociology of Religion* 71(1):25-51.
- Schram, Sanford F. 1991. "Welfare Spending and Poverty: Cutting Back Produces More Poverty, Not Less." *The American Journal of Economics and Sociology* 50(2): 129-141.
- Schneider, Sandra K. and William G. Jacoby. 2005. "Elite Discourse and American Public Opinion: The Case of Welfare Spending." *Political Research Quarterly* 58(3): 367-379.
- Shesol, Jeff. 2014. "The Nixon Memorial." *The New Yorker*, August 4. Retrieved February, 2016 (<http://www.newyorker.com/news/news-desk/nixon-memorial>)
- Silver, Howard. J. 1978. "Presidential Power and the Post-Watergate Presidency." *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 8(2):199-214.
- Simonds, A. P. 1989. "Ideological Domination and the Political Information Market." *Theory and Society* 18(2): 181-211.
- Smith, Hedrick. 1977. "A Call to the American Spirit." *New York Times*. January 21.
- Smith, Hedrick. 1981. "A Hopeful Prologue, a Pledge of Action." *New York Times*. January 21.
- Smith, Mark F. 2000. "Washington Watch: The Politics of Service." *Academe* 86(4): 68.
- Stevenson, Richard W. and John M. Broder. 2013. "Obama Offers a Liberal Vision in Inaugural Address: 'We Must Act': Speech Gives Climate Goals Center Stage." *New York Times*. January 22.
- Storey, Will. 2011. "Revisiting the Daisy Ad Revolution." *The New York Times*, October 24. Retrieved February 5, 2016 (http://thecaucus.blogs.nytimes.com/2011/10/24/revisiting-the-daisy-ad-revolution/?_r=0)
- Street, John. 2004. "Celebrity Politicians: Popular Culture and Political Representation." *The British Journal of Politics & International Relations* 6(4): 435-452.

- Strobel, Fredrick R. and Wallace C. Peterson. 1997. "Class Conflict, American Style: Distract and Conquer." *Journal of Economic Issues* 31(2): 433-443.
- Tsai, Wan-Hsiu. 2010. "Patriotic Advertising and the Creation of the Citizen Consumer." *Media and Communication Studies* 2(3):76-84.
- Truman, Harry. 1949. "Inaugural Address." Retrieved July 1, 2015 (<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=13282>)
- Unger, Rick. 2014. "The Obama Economy vs. The Reagan Economy: It's Literally No Contest." *Forbes*, September 18. Retrieved February, 2016 (<http://www.forbes.com/sites/rickungar/2014/09/18/the-obama-economy-vs-the-reagan-economy-its-literally-no-contest/#595ef5d638bc>).
- Uricchio, William. 2009. "Contextualizing the Broadcast Era: Nation, Commerce and Constraint." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 625: 60-73.
- US History. 2014. "The Great Depression." Philadelphia, PA: US History. Retrieved April 22, 2015 (<http://www.ushistory.org/us/48e.asp>)
- van Dijk, Teun A. 2003. "Critical Discourse Analysis. Pp. 352-371 in *Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. edited by Deborah Tannen, Deborah Schiffrin, and Heidi E. Hamilton. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, Ltd.
- VanGiezen, Robert and Albert E. Schwenk. 2003. "Compensation from before World War I through the Great Depression." *Bureau of Labor Statistics*, January 30. Retrieved February, 2016.
- van Ham, Peter. 2001. "The Rise of the Brand State: The Postmodern Politics of Image and Reputation." *Foreign Affairs* 80(5): 2-6.
- Verba, Sidney and Richard A. Brody. 1970. "Participation, Policy Preferences, and the War in Vietnam." *The Public Opinion Quarterly* 34(3):325-332.
- Vidich, Arthur J. "American Democracy in the Late Twentieth Century: Political Rhetorics and Mass Media." *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society* 4(1): 5-29.
- Wattenberg, Martin. P. 2004. "'Elections': Personal Popularity in U.S. Presidential Elections." *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 34(1):143-155.

- Weinraub, Bernard. 1985. "President Sees U.S. At 'Turning Point' as 2D Term Begins." *New York Times*. January 22.
- White, William S. 1949. "More Than a Million Roar in Approval of Inauguration." *New York Times*. January 21.
- White, William S. 1953. "'Internationalist' Inaugural Acclaimed in Both Parties." *New York Times*. January 21.
- Whitman, David. 1987. "The Key to Welfare Reform." *The Atlantic Online*. Retrieved February, 2016.
(<http://www.theatlantic.com/past/docs/unbound/flashbks/welfare/whitmaf.htm>).
- Wicker, Tom. 1965. "Nation Exhorted: Thousands Hear Plea for U.S. Dedication to Justice for All." *New York Times*. January 21.
- Wimberley, Ronald C. 1980. "Civil Religion and the Choice for President: Nixon in '72." *Social Forces* 59(1):44-61.
- Wodak, Ruth. 2002. "Aspects of Critical Discourse Analysis." *Foila Linguisitica*. 35(12):1-10.
- Zavattaro, Staci C. 2010. "Brand Obama: The Implications of a Branded President." *Administrative Theory and Praxis* 32(1): 123-8.

Curriculum Vitae

Michelle Leigh Casey
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
Department of Sociology
4505 Maryland Parkway Las Vegas, NC 89154
gladman@unlv.nevada.edu

Education

- Present Ph.D. Sociology, University of Nevada, Las Vegas (expected May, 2016)
- 2008 M.A. Sociology, University of Nevada, Las Vegas
- 2003 B.A. Sociology, University of Nevada, Las Vegas
Summa Cum Laude with Departmental Honors
- 2000-2001 Matriculation Toward B.A. Creative Writing, Agnes Scott College
Honors
- 1996-2001 Matriculation Toward A.A. Creative Writing, Georgia Perimeter College
Highest Honors
- 1999 Licensure for Certified Nursing Assistant, Crescent Manor
- 1995-1996 Certification for Massage Therapy, Capelli Learning Center

Areas of Interest

Cultural Studies, Gender and Sexuality, and Political Sociology

Teaching Positions

- 2013-current Durham Technical Community College
Sociology Instructor
- 2009-2012 Durham Technical Community College
Sociology Instructor and Public Schools Liaison
- 2008-2011 Georgia Perimeter College
Adjunct Sociology Instructor
- 2003-2007 University of Nevada, Las Vegas
Teaching, Graduate, and Research Assistant

- 2005-2007 Art Institute of Las Vegas
Sociology, Anthropology, Research Writing, and Political Science
Instructor
- 2007 International Academy of Design & Technology of Las Vegas
Developmental Psychology, Critical Thinking, Political Sociology, and
College Success/Education Instructor
- 2002-2004 University of Nevada, Las Vegas Center for Academic Enrichment and
Outreach
Tutor

Awards

- 2012 Excellence in Community Engagement
Durham Technical Community College
- 2005 Outstanding Masters Student
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
- 1999-2000 Regent's Outstanding Scholar
Georgia Perimeter College

Service and Committees

- 2015-present Committee Member of Community Engagement Council
Durham Technical Community College
- 2015-present Committee Member of Honors Program
Durham Technical Community College
- 2013-present Coordinator of the LGBTQ Safe Zone Program
Durham Technical Community College
- 2013-present Advisor of the LGBTQ Student Club: Spectrum
Durham Technical Community College
- 2013-present Chair of the Jack Kent Cooke Undergraduate Scholarship Committee
Durham Technical Community College
- 2005-2007 Graduate Representative for the Department of Sociology, Graduate and
Professional Student Association
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

- 2006 Member Ad-Hoc of the Committee for Graduate and Professional Development, Graduate and Professional Student Association
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
- 2007 Member of the By-Laws Committee, Graduate and Professional Student Association
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
- 2004 Submission Reviewer, 2nd Annual Graduate Student Conference
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
- 1999-2000 Secretary, Student Government Association
Georgia Perimeter College
- 1996-1998 Wellness Chairperson and Health Club President, Student Government Association
Georgia Perimeter College
- 1996-1998 Vice President of Fellowship, Phi Theta Kappa
Georgia Perimeter College

Papers Presented

- 2007 "Ecopsychology: Psychosocial and Environmental (Re)connections."
78th Annual Pacific Sociological Association conference: Oakland, CA
- 2006 "An Historical and Cultural Discourse Analysis of the Gendered and Sexual Categories in the *DSMs*."
77th Annual Pacific Sociological Association conference: Hollywood, CA
- 2005 "The Semantic Implications of Gendered and Sexual Categories in the *DSM-IV*."
76th Annual Pacific Sociological Association conference: Portland, OR
- 2003 "A Marxist Approach to 'White Trash' in Flannery O'Connor's Novels."
1st Annual Graduate Student Conference in Sociology: Las Vegas, NV

Guest Lectures

- 2006 "Gender and Sexual Related Categories in the *DSM*"
Sociology 470: Sociology of Deviance: University of Nevada Las Vegas

- 2005 “Feminist Theory: An Analysis of *Gender Outlaw* in the Context of the *DSM*”
Sociology 453: Gender & Society: University of Nevada Las Vegas
- 2004 “Microsociology: Theory & Research Methods of Symbolic Interactionism
and Rational Choice Proposition” Sociology 101: University of Nevada
Las Vegas
- 2004 “Social Stratification: Marxist and Weberian Theories Applied to Global
Gender, Class, & Race Systems” Sociology 101: University of Nevada
Las Vegas
- 2004 “Feminist Methods in the Social Sciences: Issues, Ethics, &
Considerations” Women’s Studies 302: University of Nevada Las Vegas