

UNIVERSITY OF TARTU
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH STUDIES

**GENDER DISCOURSES IN THE 2016 US PRESIDENTIAL
ELECTION CAMPAIGN**

MA THESIS

LILIAN ALICE LAANEPERE
SUPERVISOR: PROFESSOR RAILI MARLING

TARTU 2019

ABSTRACT

Poststructuralist schools of thought hold that discursive practices influence social practices and vice versa. Dominant discourses in society determine the ways in which major issues and topics are discussed and they (re)produce social order. Discourses produce identities, social relations and systems of knowledge and meaning. This makes discourse analysis an effective tool to understanding social and political reality. In this thesis, the analysis focuses on the gendered discourses in the 2016 US presidential election.

This thesis tests a combined model for analysing political and social processes by combining Norman Fairclough's model of critical discourse analysis (CDA) with insights from Michel Foucault and from the field of developmental and social psychology. This thesis aims to find a balance between linguistics and social praxis.

This thesis demonstrates the effect of discourses of masculinity in the political field as disadvantaging female political candidates. In particular, women's fitness for office tends to be assessed through a masculine lens in which traits generally associated with masculinity are considered a requirement. As a result, women candidates are usually automatically at a disadvantage when running for public office. Another prevalent political discourse in the US addresses the stereotypes of the Republican Party as a strict father and the Democratic Party as a nurturing parent (Lakoff's 1996 model) which further highlights the importance of gender in political discourse.

This thesis examines how articles on the influential right-wing nationalist website *Breitbart* utilised gender discourses leading up to Election Day 2016. *Breitbart* is considered a mouthpiece for the so-called *angry white men*, a demographic consisting of non-college educated white males who strongly supported Donald Trump in the 2016 elections. This demographic is important to investigate given their overwhelming support for right-wing populist candidates in the recent elections in both the US.

Contents

ABSTRACT	2
INTRODUCTION	4
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	9
Historical Context	9
Women in Politics	12
Political Rhetoric	16
Presidential Discourse and Populism	21
2016 Campaign	22
Hillary Rodham Clinton	23
Donald Trump and Working-Class White Male Identity	25
Precarious Manhood	28
Methodology	30
EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS	36
Analysis of the Textual Dimension	36
Foucauldian Framework	77
CONCLUSION	81
REFERENCES	84
Primary Resources	84
Secondary Resources	85
RESÛMEE	90

INTRODUCTION

The election of Donald Trump as president of the US was and remains exceptionally controversial, indicating the extreme ideological polarization of the American population. Several polls predicted that Hillary Clinton would defeat Donald Trump in the race to become president of the US. Reuters (Tamman 2016) predicted only hours before the election outcome that she had a 90 percent chance to win. This implies that the media and much of the American society was caught off guard by the prevalence and impact gender discourses and media outlets spreading them had in 2016. Hillary Clinton won the popular vote by nearly 3 million and received 62,521,739 votes while Donald Trump only received 61,195,258 votes (Bloomberg 2016).

This was Hillary Clinton's second bid for presidency and the 2008 campaign has already been analysed from the perspective of gender (Sykes 2008; Lawless 2009; Sherman & Zurbriggen 2010). The findings of the research into the 2008 campaign suggested the continued relevance of gender in voter perception of political candidates. The features analysed in scholarship on Clinton's 2008 presidential bid are also going to be incorporated into the present study. Gender played an integral role during the 2016 election campaign coverage, especially since conservatives and democrats have different view on gender.

Much of social science research has by now focused on how Trump's electoral win came to be as well as why his rhetoric resonated with a certain demographic – non-college educated white males. The 2016 election stands out from prior elections with its unprecedented percentage of non-college educated whites voting for the Republican Party (GOP). According to Schaffner (2017), white voting trends remained relatively similar from 1980 through 1996 but in 2000, a gap began to emerge which pushed non-college educated whites towards the Republican candidates. In 2016, this gap had grown from 5-6 percentage points to 18 (Schaffner 2017: 3). This indicates a shift in public discourses and group

identities. Research suggests that education bears a strong correlation with ideological preferences. For instance, Bobo & Licari (1989) found that non-college educated people tended to hold more conservative views, including less tolerant views on race and more fixed views on gender norms.

Several explanations have been offered for this trend. For example, the *precarious manhood* theory states that manhood needs to be achieved and then protected carefully because manhood is a lifelong quest (Vandello and Bosson 2013). Because manhood is something that needs to be carefully cultivated and maintained externally, it is subject to great anxiety among men. “Regardless of culture-specific markers of masculinity, cultures around the world view manhood as a social status that must be earned and can be lost” (Vandello and Bosson 2013: 111). Research suggests that the demographic of non-college educated white male might be more susceptible to the anxiety that comes with unstable masculine identities. This could explain why certain gender discourses resonate with this demographic and produce greater impact.

Gender has been an important feature of American political history. The nation was founded on a gendered division between the masculine American colonists and the effeminate British aristocrats seeking to rule them. Throughout American history, several gender discourses emerged, among them *the common man*, the *self-made man* and the *man from the west* discourses. Another prevalent feature in American history is the discourse of victimisation which can be linked to the sense of precariousness in the precarious manhood theory – manhood is constantly challenged and can be lost. Another concept related to this is the sense of status threat which strengthens discriminatory views to maintain status or a dominant position. The USA has long been depicted as the leader of the free world and challenges to this title also impact the national identity, particularly the masculine identity.

The field of politics has traditionally been inhabited, dominated and shaped by men. Until the year 2009, all US presidents had been white men and 42 of 43 Protestant Christians (Katz 2016). This has helped establish a homogenous cultural and political standard, a set of characteristics and qualities that Americans have been conditioned to expect from candidates for public office. Given this masculine history, culture, and standard in American politics, women running for political office are experiencing challenges directly related to gender. Female leadership has historically been an oxymoron because leadership has been associated with masculinity. This puts women in a difficult position: on the one hand, in order to compete for a position, women must possess traditionally masculine qualities, but on the other hand, displaying qualities not typically associated with one's gender might result in a backlash.

The historical, cultural and psychological origins of gender discourses in the US can be further illustrated by Lakoff's (1996) description of the two major parties in the USA, the Republican party and the Democratic party by using the *strict father model* (Republican party) and the *nurturing parent model* (Democratic Party). Indeed, in right-wing media outlets, the image of the Democratic party as soft, feminine and weak was used in contrast to the Republican party as strong, masculine and powerful long before the 2016 election. Gendered rhetoric influences what kinds of candidates are considered appropriate political leaders and strongly influences the way voters perceive political parties and their foci.

Gender discourses were also central throughout the 2016 US presidential election for several reasons. For one, the Republican party endorsed a candidate – Donald Trump – who was not an ideological match for Republican views and policies but excelled in masculine discourse and aggressive rhetoric which invoked both outrage and hitherto unseen support. His opponent, the Democratic party nominee, Hillary Clinton, was a political figure with a lengthy and complex relationship with the public and the media since her position as the

First Lady and her political career as senator, her candidacy in 2008, and serving as Secretary of State.

There is already considerable research on different aspects of the 2016 presidential campaign. However, there is as yet no research detailing the gender discourses in the rhetoric and language used. This thesis seeks to cover this research gap. Language and the discourses used in the media play, among other things, an important role in cultivating social norms, views and group identities as well as creating and maintaining dominant discourses within a society. It is therefore crucial to study the rhetoric used in media outlets that had the greatest impact during the last month of the 2016 presidential campaign.

Research question. This thesis seeks to identify the dominant gender discourses used in *Breitbart* leading up to Election Day 2016. This thesis combines theories from linguistics, sociology and developmental psychology to provide comprehensive insight into how discourses are created, accepted as norms and used for political purposes. I will be analysing the discursive examples of gender in the *Breitbart* articles and how those examples produce and reproduce a conception of a gendered society. The instances in which gender is used in favour of one presidential candidate and in opposition to another will be construed as the reiteration of a traditionalist view of society, in which men and women are judged according to different standards. Expressions of expectations of how men and women should behave in society and in politics, as well as manifestations of the Lakoffian notions of political paternalism and maternalism are of particular interest.

The rationale behind choosing *Breitbart* for analysis is its considerable popularity during the 2016 election. *Breitbart* was the single most shared media outlet on both Facebook and Twitter during the months preceding election day (Bovet & Makse 2019). Its sensationalist content adhered to several current news media trends (receiving the greatest number of clicks for outrageous content) and its headlines reached a vast audience. The

views increased 89 % within a little under one year. Breitbart was also one of the most frequently cited media source on Donald Trump's campaign website.

I will focus on the discourses employed by articles published on *Breitbart* in the final three months before the election day (8 November 2016). I chose to limit the time scope of the analysis to this period because the looming election day led to more heated content than on average. The period also includes the fallout from the second presidential debate (4 October 2016), as well as the release of Trump's infamous "grab them by the pussy" *Access Hollywood* tape (7 October 2016) and then-FBI Director James Comey announcing the reopening of the investigation into Clinton's emails (28 October 2016). These events are extensively covered in right-wing media and provide ample examples of how gender is perceived, depicted and used to further one political candidate over another.

This thesis argues that social science research would benefit from a more comprehensive and extensive analytical model for analysing discourses. The use of CDA is appropriate for the purposes of the thesis because it emphasises the different functions of discourse and its impact on other social phenomena, with its analysis of text, discursive practice and social practice. CDA is a suitable for the study gender in society because it does not view characteristics associated with masculinity or femininity as fixed. Discursive psychologists consider gender as something that is and has been constantly remade (Wetherell & Taylor 2001). The thesis investigates psychological factors behind discourses and intends to move towards a more interdisciplinary method of discourse analysis.

This thesis consists of three chapters: the theoretical framework, methodology and the empirical analysis. In the theoretical framework chapter, I discuss the historical, psychological and political background of gender discourses in American society. The second chapter describes the methodology of this paper, critical discourse analysis (CDA). The empirical chapter applies the CDA to the articles on *Breitbart*.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Historical Context

Gender has been a creative force and a normative system throughout American political history. The colonisation of America was already gendered. The masculine identities and discourses developed in these circumstances were manifold. American manhood was in the discourses of the time pitted against British manhood. The British man was depicted as a threat to the newly established claim for independence of the American man. Thus, the American masculine ideal was constructed in contrast to the British aristocratic one, which, for the sake of establishing one as dominant over the other, was necessarily feminised. This is the beginning of the suspicion of aristocracy or elites in general, anti-intellectualism, and in part the making of the *common man* discourse. American manhood was defined by the man's ability to provide for himself and his family, his usefulness to the country and the recognition of responsibilities (Kimmel 1996). These characteristics have remained central to the idea of ideal manhood to this day. Alongside a new country, a new man emerged, and that entailed a certain amount of identity making. This was the basis for the *self-made man* discourse.

Harvey (2005: 298) describes four "phases of man" that were present in 1650–1800: the Household Patriarch, Libertine/Fop, the Polite Gentleman and Etiquette/Domesticated. Michael Kimmel, in his *Manhood in America* (1996), argues that there have been three main archetypes of masculinity in American history: the Genteel Patriarch, the Heroic Artisan and the Self-Made Man.

The Genteel Patriarch was the dominant version of masculinity until American independence from the British Crown. The Genteel Patriarch transformed into the stereotype of an effeminate dandy, a stereotype associated mostly with Southern slave-owners and used disparagingly by the supposedly more tough self-made men of the North. The portrayal of

masculinity as explicitly anti-feminine is particularly indicative of dominant attitudes then as well as now. While there have been exceptions (for example, many Republican and Democratic presidents are graduates of Ivy League universities), it is the Democrats that are generally thought of as the out-of-touch elites, evoking the now out of date image of the Genteel Patriarch.

The second historical archetype of manliness proposed by Kimmel is the Heroic Artisan, honest craftsmen who worked hard in their shops or on their small patches of land. Again, masculinity is associated with independence and tapping into the self-made man discourse. Men making a fortune became sort of legendary which made it a self-reinforcing discourse. This was meritocracy in a nutshell. As long as one worked hard and had enough patience, success was theoretically always possible. This was and remains an inspiring message to natives and immigrants alike, contributing to the American Dream discourse. The downside of this conception of masculinity is its precariousness.

One of the consequences of precarious identity is a sense of victimisation. Since the very inception of American history, a discourse of being discriminated against has endured. Samuels (2016) argues that victimisation of oneself is used to justify means that appear questionable or unjustifiable otherwise. It is important to note that in such a discourse, there can only exist one victim and one perpetrator at the same time.

A significant part of American mythology and cultural history is based on cowboy culture and paved the way for the *man from the west* discourse. “West was equated with authentic Americanness at least since the times of Andrew Jackson who was the first to campaign as a Westerner and a *common man* against the corruption of the elites” (Põldsaar 2007: 167). Manhood is discursively contrasted to femininity and it follows that boys grow up to be men if they leave home and going West was the most emphatic form of departure.

The *common man* is, by definition, relatable in his ordinariness. He is a part of the crowd, set in opposition to the distant aristocracy and the elite (including the intellectuals). This discourse gathers great support from working-class supporters in the US and has very successfully been utilised by Republican leaders like George W. Bush in the past (Ducat 2003). A common enemy – the elite – generates an opposition of *us vs them*. In this context, it is relevant to mention that 58 % of Republicans believe that higher education has a negative impact on America (Sullivan & Jordan 2017). Politicians are not conventionally seen as common men because they are not but it helps to connect with the voters to be the kind of person “you could sit down and have a beer with” (Ducat 2003: 172).

This is doubly useful for the political right: identifying oneself with the population and disidentifying the political opponent by portraying them as the feminised elite. It is effective even if a candidate is undeniably masculine, both, in appearance and in accordance with societal gender norms (Põldsaar 2007). The voters rely on the belief that if a candidate resembles themselves and is able to at least superficially relate to them, that candidate is better able to represent their interests in politics. A good candidate understands the plight of the common man and, from the perspective of the Republican voter base, is not overly focused on minorities, immigration, women’s rights, LGBT rights or the environment.

Discourses of masculinity are directly linked to political self-ideal of the USA. The discourse of exceptionalism and world domination renders the American mind sensitive to fluctuations in power relations. If a society where exceptionalism and greatness is emphasised feels their status as the greatest and the most powerful country is threatened, groups who identify with these ideas the most react defensively. There is strong evidence that perceived group-based status threat was one of the main reasons why non-college educated white males voted for Trump (Mutz 2017: 8). Media headlines about increased dependence on organisations, treaties, other countries as well as obligations within

international organisations (such as climate, industry and science) are posing a threat to the American status as the most powerful nation. Such headlines and the increased relevance of the topic have resulted in an increased level of conservatism, identification with the Republican Party and greater opposition to immigration (Mutz 2017: 41). This is particularly relevant for the 2016 presidential election given that one study found that reminding people about the impending racial shift in majority-minority status increased the likelihood of people supporting Trump (Mutz 2017: 44).

On a societal level, this type of status threat exists strongly within the psyche of the non-college educated white male. Progress for minorities is interpreted as a change in the dominant group's relative position and this causes insecurity. The Democrats' perceived focus on minority issues signals an impending shift in a white lower-class men's current societal position. The topics of racial progress, equal rights for minorities (women, LGBTQ, immigrants) and the threat of the white man becoming a minority one day (regardless of the fact that no one alive today will live to experience such a change) push many Americans to adopt racially bigoted attitudes to increase their own self-worth which decreases when other groups start doing well around them (Mutz 2017: 3).

Women in Politics

Given the masculine history, culture, and standard in American politics, female leadership has historically been an oxymoron. In order to become a successful leader, one must demonstrate adequate assertiveness, confidence, aggressiveness, and ambition. This puts women in a difficult position: on the one hand, in order to compete for a position, women must possess traditionally masculine qualities, but on the other hand, displaying qualities not typically associated with one's gender might result in backlash and dislike. An experiment by Okimoto and Brescoll (2010) found that ambition and power-seeking

qualities in women negatively affect the likability of women because such women are not only regarded as unpleasant but also unnatural. “Thus, power-seeking women were disadvantaged on two fronts: (a) they were not given the agentic credit afforded to males exhibiting power-seeking behaviour and (b) they were assumed to lack communality, affecting voting preferences through both competence perceptions and affective backlash.” (Okimoto and Brescoll 2010: 932) It also affected the way subordinates rated their bosses. “Women who use stereotypically masculine leadership styles are rated as worse managers by their subordinates than men who use the same tactics.” (Schneider *et al.* 2010: 371)

Women are underrepresented in politics relative to their population numbers. While in most Western countries, women constitute a little over half the population, they only constitute about a quarter of elected officials on average. Various studies (e.g. Elder 2004, Campbell and Wolbrecht 2006) have demonstrated that the main reasons behind the underrepresentation of women in politics stems from women being significantly less likely to run for office than men. There are several reasons for this, including the socialisation of political gender roles, the lack of political confidence and family responsibilities. The more women there are in powerful positions, the more they serve as inspiring role models for other women (Eagly & Karau, 2002).

Men have occupied leadership positions throughout history and have thus greatly contributed to the masculine image of such positions. Traditional social roles serve as internalised guidelines for the people within that society, providing unwritten rules on how to behave and which roles are appropriate for which gender and which roles are not (Eagly & Wood 2012).

The separate spheres discourse maintained for a long time that men and women belong to the private and the public sphere by nature (Ford 2017). Women have long since entered the public sphere and been active participants in politics for a century but they cannot

seem to escape the dominant association with the private sphere – family, children and appearance in their media representation. A study by Shoaf and Parsons (2016) found that in the case of Hillary Clinton, Michelle Bachmann and Sarah Palin, there was an inordinate amount of media coverage about their personal lives (marriage, children) during their respective candidacies compared to their male counterparts. This might leave the impression that personal lives are still the main area of expertise for women and while the male candidates discuss foreign policy and economics the women are asked about their children. Because voters devote a limited amount of time to parsing information, this can be crucial in determining the types of discourses most commonly associated with either gender.

Power can be exerted over someone in several ways, one of which is forms of addressing people publicly. One example of this is a study that compared data about the media representations of two presidential candidates in the 2008 election (Coren and Uscinski 2011) The study found that in comparison with her male counterparts, Hillary Clinton was referred to more by her first name or marital status and that this might have impacted people's attitudes towards her. Formality vs informality in the media sets the tone for who has authority over whom. The article also suggests that the manner in which people are addressed in media or in conversation sets the bar on authority or lack of it. Persistent addressing by one's surname can signal importance while the repeated mentioning of the first name or marital status places emphasis elsewhere.

It can be deduced that gender roles in society function normatively and transgressing the parameters of one's assigned role can lead to negative feedback. Women are traditionally seen as nurturing, empathetic and communal whereas men are seen as more agentic, assertive and independent (Schein 1973, 2007). In politics, this means that healthcare, education, social welfare policies are considered more feminine and foreign policy, economics and justice are considered masculine. People tend to believe that leadership qualities and manly

qualities are similar to one another while leadership qualities and feminine qualities are not. (Eagly and Karau 2002) According to the same research, women encounter more disapproval while occupying or trying to apply for such positions but that societal change in gender roles may occur when disconfirming evidence is present. (Eagly & Karau, 2002)

However, one study found that when a woman is perceived as not ‘naturally’ suitable for a certain role or position but succeeds, they receive greater admiration and support than their male counterparts. (Eagly & Karau 2002: 576) Thus, women may receive both backlash and positive feedback upon the fulfilment of a masculine role. Yet, women receive backlash for striving for leadership positions which might not allow them to demonstrate success in such positions. Such women are often called power-hungry, ambitious, devious, arrogant and cold – unnatural, in other words. In one study, participants were presented with successful female and male leaders and the female leaders were considered more hostile, devious, arrogant, selfish, seeking conflict, and bitter as well as less professional, emotional, less rational/objective. (Eagly & Karau 2002: 576) Another factor influencing the perception of men and women is manner of speech. (Eagly & Karau 2002: 584) This means that men give higher ratings to women who talk tentatively and warmly rather than confidently. However, women rate the confident women higher than the tentative ones. This lends further credence to the idea that women who trespass gender lines are punished. Self-promotion was found to be unattractive in women but attractive in men. (Eagly & Karau 2002: 584)

The gender roles that are deeply rooted in society and the discourses through which they are expressed, are enforced partly through the media. Research suggests that gendered information in media coverage influences gender stereotypes and activates these ideas among the viewers. (Bauer 2018: 4) Stereotyping does not occur automatically but rather requires a specific context. (Bauer 2018: 6)

Lawless (2004) suggests that women are viewed as more capable of dealing with issues pertaining to social welfare, education and healthcare while men were seen as better suited for finance, defence and crime. Hayes (2005) who studied 7 presidential campaigns since 1980, argues that GOP candidates have been considered more masculine and stronger than Democratic candidates. Hayes (2011: 9) argues that associating parties with certain traits influences voters' perceptions of the political parties and candidates. For instance, the Democrats' concern for immigrants, racial and sexual minorities, social welfare and women's issues has earned them the derogatory label 'identity politics' which, as opposed to 'actual' or 'serious' politics caters to a small minority and is thereby not to be taken seriously.(Peck 2019).

As could be seen from the discussion above, perceptions of men and women in politics are dependent on the broader stereotypical beliefs about the two main political parties in the USA. The Republican party and the Democratic party are fundamentally different in their ideologies, priorities, and attitudes to gender norms in society. This is manifested in gendered discourses on both sides.

Political Rhetoric

The two parties also represent two distinct political styles. George Lakoff's *Moral Politics* (1996) argues that politics is shaped by perceptions of morals. Much of political discourse occurs in the category of morality. People assess policies through a particular moral framework. According to Lakoff (1996), there are two main frameworks of morality, the *strict sather model* (which describes the Republican Party) and the *nurturant parent model* (which describes the Democratic Party). The first model includes self-interest, authority, strength, self-reliance, and order. The second includes nurturing, empathy, fair distribution, self-development, growth and strength. These models offer a basis for how we distinguish

between right and wrong. This is evident in the metaphors that associated with either model. Lakoff's models are rooted in gender discourse which illustrates how the political parties view the world and what their voters view as important.

The two models are deeply gendered. The *strict father model* describes a traditional patriarchal family structure where the father supports and protects the family and acts as the source of authority but remains somewhat detached. Children are taught rules and those rules are upheld under the threat of punishment. The woman in the family is expected to handle the everyday responsibilities of running the household. Children are expected to obey and respect their parents. The Nurturant Parent model emphasises that love, success, and happiness are rooted in interactions and mutual care for one another. Children are expected to become responsible and self-reliant but not through tough discipline but rather through care and respect. Obedience is cultivated through love not through fear of punishment.

There are other ways in which metaphors can affect the gendering of politics. Linguistic evidence suggests most of our ordinary conceptual systems are metaphorical in nature (Lakoff 1980: 4). For example, much of public discourse frames debates, arguments and discussions through the war metaphor (Lakoff 1981: 6) and this can, in political discourse, be considered a disadvantage for women who have traditionally been absent or distant from the domain of war. Jackson Katz (2016) suggests that one of the reasons why women might be perceived as outsiders in politics is that the metaphors used in elections and campaigns are largely to do with war or sports, both, traditionally masculine domains. Another example is the word 'taxation' which, if coupled with 'relief', creates the concept of taxation as an affliction. (Lakoff 2004: 4) This can then be used, mostly to the benefits of conservatives, politically to create the negative metaphorical association between taxes and being ill. Lakoff (2004) defines this as framing an issue. Frames are created to make sense of the world in a way that is beneficial to the author of the frame. "When we give everyday

descriptions, for example, we are using categorisation to focus on certain properties that fit our purposes. Every description will highlight, downplay, and hide.” (Lakoff 1980:163) This is essentially how different discourses are cultivated.

The conceptual systems of liberals and conservatives are inherently different and influence the way important political issues are understood. This means that words can have different meanings for different people, relative to their conceptual system. (Lakoff 1996: 28) Conservatives and liberals are divided on several issues – taxes, gay marriage, immigration, government regulations, abortion, death penalty, welfare programs etc – but to fully understand how they arrived at two very distinct ways of viewing the same issue, one must first analyse what is moral and immoral within the *strict father-nurturant parent* model. Lakoff argues that it is not enough to simply ask someone about their world view to be able to comprehend how they reason and think. (Lakoff 1996: 35)

The *strict father model* depicts the government as a strict father who runs the household (country) and disciplines and instructs the children. The most important metaphorical attributes related to this model are:

1. Moral strength – the self-control and self-discipline to stand up to external and internal evils);
2. Moral order – natural hierarchy of power is moral – God above man, man above woman, white man above other races);
3. Moral essence – a trait people are born with or develop early in life and that remains unchanged for the duration of the person’s life); and
4. American dream – anyone can climb the ‘ladder of success’ if they work hard enough and anyone who is not successful must be weak and/or untalented as there are no societal causes for people’s success or lack thereof).
5. Moral accounting – retribution is acceptable against someone who has been immoral.

6. Moral wholeness – emphasis on homogeneity and unity which makes a community stable and predictable.
7. Self-indulgence – a vice.
8. Ladder of success – the assumption that everyone has equal opportunities for success in society.

These metaphors enable conservatives to create certain frames on which to build their ideology and politics. Their conceptual system is based on what is moral and what is not within the *strict father model* morality. Metaphorically, morality is often expressed through purity and impurity and this is identifiable in discourses in present day media as well. For example, in 2016, Trump alluded to female bodily functions several times to generate disgust. (Nussbaum 2018: 169) This includes guilt by association – if you are in contact with an immoral person, you are also contaminated (Lakoff 1996: 93). It follows that metaphors are tools for enabling and creating discourses. For example, the metaphor of moral strength excludes several issues liberals deem societal simply on the basis of personal choice. For example, single mothers who are welfare recipients are judged on this basis. If they are now unable to support themselves and the child and need help from the government, they too lack *moral strength* because they had a child out of wedlock (which challenges the traditional *strict father* household) and, through *moral accounting*, deserve their punishment of financial difficulty.

The metaphor of *moral order* dictates that hierarchies are moral, and some people deserve to be better off than others because they have more *moral strength* through which they have reached a higher position in society. The issue of class does not exist insofar as the differences of financial success can be explained by the richest being model citizens who have earned their wealth and power through hard work and talent. The poor deserve to be poor because the *ladder of success* exists for everyone and those who do not climb it are

simply less talented or weak. This way of thinking entails aversion towards taxation and government regulations. This extends to people in dire circumstances – *strict father morality* views such people not as victims but as somehow having earned their fate. This does not stem from ideology alone but, according to Grinnell (2018), people are conditioned to believe in a just world in which bad things happen to bad people and not to good people.

Taxation is seen as an affliction and as the government wrongfully taken away a model citizen's well-earned property. If a person does well, why should they be punished for it by having to give to those who have less *moral strength* than them? Conservatives believe in competition as the system that produces morally upright citizens. It provides incentive to get ahead in life. Following ideas borrowed from Adam Smith's economics, this perspective suggests that if people get support or help, they no longer have any need to work hard themselves and this corrupts society. "If each person seeks to maximise his own wealth, then by an invisible hand, the wealth of all will be maximized." (Lakoff 1996: 93) It follows that self-interest is actually a moral virtue because if each person seeks to maximise their profit, it benefits all (Lakoff 1996: 93) Conservatives see the liberal support for welfare programs as inherently immoral and threatening the natural order of things. Controlled markets impede the search for self-interest and therefore are immoral (Lakoff 1996: 94) Those who do not manage success are lessons for others to try harder. Curiously, Krugman (2004) found that the states who voted for Bush in 2000 and greatly opposed big government as well as welfare program, received the greatest amount of government subsidies. This suggests that ideologies and actual practices can be in conflict.

Deviant people who do not conform to the *strict father morality* threaten to ruin society for everyone because they make deviant ways seem acceptable. Feminism is also seen as immoral in the *strict father morality* because it challenges the natural order of things (*moral order*) and seeks to undo the traditional family model. (Lakoff 1996: 98)

Presidential Discourse and Populism

There is a discrepancy between the theoretical masculine ideal and the types of real masculinities prevalent and possible in society and politics today. A certain demographic of American men – in large part economically and educationally disadvantaged white males (the so-called *angry white men*) – are unable to sufficiently reconcile their position in society with the current masculine ideal. Structural changes in the economy, such as the shift from agrarian society to a post-industrialised one, has left them vulnerable to failure. Their socio-economic position is not one that encourages great personal change, indeed, change might seem both undesirable and impossible. Because of this, that group of population is likely to find solace in candidates who reiterate historical ideals and revive discourses of masculinity that fit their culture and status in society. Trump’s campaign slogan *Make America Great Again* implies strongly the way to move forward is to go backwards which might result in his voters remaining in a standstill, waiting for another shift back to blue-collar jobs being central to the American economy. Trump’s mission, however unsuccessful, to bring back “clean” coal, to open new mining sites, and to put a stop to foreign labour pouring in, is a surge of hope to a fraction of the population that has not received sufficient attention over the recent years. Ironically, this would not be remedied by Republican policies.

The voters are, to an extent, experiencing masculinity through a leader they choose based, not only on policies (which too are gendered), but also on masculine/feminine discourses. Presidential elections are a method of making a statement on the current dominant version of masculinity in society. As Katz argues, “Presidential campaigns function as symbolic contests over competing definitions of *real manhood*, and thus over what kind of man can and should be in charge” (Katz 2016). Thus, although elections are not overtly about gender, gender ideals are indirectly an integral part in more ways than one.

Attacks against political candidates in the media are often gendered. Bill Clinton, for example, was ridiculed for having a politically active and outspoken wife. This detracted

from his masculine identity because Hillary Clinton was not following the normative gender roles in society, as represented in such political discourse. Only after Bill Clinton's sexual scandals became a media event, was his masculine identity redeemed (Ducat 2004). Not because any of the archetypal masculine ideals had advocated cheating, sexual deviance, or dishonesty, but because it seemed to punish Hillary Clinton for having transgressed her role as a woman and wife of the president.

These strategies are evident also in populist political rhetoric that was widely used in the 2016 presidential campaign. Wodak (2015: 20) describes two populist discursive techniques: scapegoating and victim-perpetrator reversal. The phenomenon of fictionalised politics has become increasingly relevant (Wodak 2011: 157). It entails creating a divide in the reality of political events and an entertaining and often fictional image of a simple system. This diminishes the complexity of the actual events and discourages analysis as well as nuanced thinking and empathy. Foucault distinguishes between 'immediate enemy' and 'chief enemy' by which he means that people tend to criticise things that affect them very directly and miss the root cause of those things.

2016 Campaign

Trump has repeatedly expressed his displeasure with the Democrats and the previous administrations being too soft and passive, even going as far as to suggest that Putin is a better leader than Obama (Holland & Mason 2016). He is diverging from American democratic values as well as Republican ideology by favouring authoritarian leadership styles over actual policies. Failure to deliver on most of his campaign promises is, in this discourse, not his fault but rather caused by regulations, Congress, the Democrats and the Republican party. This creates a convenient discourse in which the masculine actor is being suppressed by the elite: Trump would get things done the establishment would step aside.

Another important factor in politics is appropriate physical features, often stemming from societal gender expectations. Donald Trump and the right-wing media were quick to criticise his opponents based on their appearance, emphasising physical inadequacies rather than professional qualifications as reasons for why Trump was superior. Running to become the Republican nominee, Trump dealt out several nicknames that quickly became very popular among his supporters. Marco Rubio became “little Marco” because of his height, his heeled shoes were subject to mockery and humour. Jeb Bush was “low-energy Jeb”. Chris Christie was described as too fat to be professional (Katz 2016: 243).

Hillary Rodham Clinton

Hillary Clinton has been in the eye of media for several decades and is perhaps one of the richest sources for gendered discourses. Regardless of her complicated relationship with the public and the media throughout her time as First Lady and Secretary of State, prior to running for president, her approval rating was 66 % (Bordo 2016: 15). Her 2008 presidential bid saw great activation of gendered discourses. Some of the politer versions of misogyny against Hillary during her 2008 campaign were “Iron my shirts” and “Make me a sandwich” which was replaced by 2016 with “put the bitch in jail” and... (Bordo 2016: 27). During the 2016 campaign, 84% of Hillary’s coverage was negative while Trump’s was 43% and Sanders’ only 17%. (Bordo 2016: 53).

Hillary Clinton’s persona and career were represented during the 2016 campaign in some media outlets as something deeply emasculating, illustrated by the election memorabilia (the Hillary Clinton nutcracker tool with the caption *No more nuts in the White House*) as well as the prominent discourses disparaging her in the media. *The nagging wife* discourse has had a long run in the media. “Men won’t vote for Hillary Clinton because she reminds them of their nagging wives” (Schneider *et al.* 2010: 365). Placing Clinton in the

nagging wife role effectively diminishes her image as a professional politician. Few questioned Clinton's competence to hold office but many harboured a deep dislike towards her as a person. "Clinton always appeared smart – you just didn't like her." (Schneider *et al.* 2010: 366) Her unquestionable expertise and qualifications for the job rendered her more or less immune to professional critique, however, her emails, her vote for the Iraqi war and involvement in Benghazi were enough to destroy decades worth of work (Bordo 2016: 27).

Clinton has received criticism for her professional demeanour and behaviour as well. She exemplifies the likeability vs competence tightrope through leaning heavily towards the competence side. In order to be professional, a woman must not be overly emotional or feminine but in order to be likeable within the gendered societal frames, a woman must also be warm (Bordo 2016: 37). Being in control of one's faculties, not losing temper, not raising one's voice in the face of provocation has resulted in an image of an 'unnatural' and cold person who must be up to something. She has been described as robotic and even her ability to debate and her knowledge can be depicted as a detriment. For example, Chuck Todd criticised Hillary for having been too prepared for her first debate against Trump (Bordo 2016: 38). The control and professional demeanour she has in order to be taken seriously has been framed as inauthenticity and cause for suspicion. She has been called 'Darth Vader – more machine than a woman' (Bordo 2016: 88). Appearance is another tightrope women in public eye and office have to walk. Appearing too sexual detracts from qualifications while dressing too much like a man ("Those damn pantsuits") inspires backlash as well. Palin's appearance worked in her favour while Hillary's did not (Bordo 2016: 42-43). Hillary Clinton's voice has received quite a bit of attention as well. She has been accused of shouting and shrieking unpleasantly in pro-Trump conservative media (Sean Hannity 2016: Fox News). Her voice has been described as 'angry' and 'bitter' (Satlin 2016).

Katz (2016) suggests that Trump's aggression towards Hillary Clinton, particularly his popular promise to *lock her up*, was something *angry white men* had been longing to express for a long time. The chants at his rallies were proof of that. Clinton had been disparaged for attempting to be co-president to her husband for years and her second attempt at becoming president was interpreted by this demographic power-hunger. Her qualifications and ambition were framed as corruption and deviousness. During the 2016 campaign, Trump stated explicitly that the so-called 'woman card' was all she had to offer (Bordo 2016: 65). This successfully erased the decades worth of work experience and qualifications for presidency Trump himself could not boast of. But even the 'woman card' discourse did not work in her favour because she was not considered a true feminist (Bordo 2016: 47) because she stayed with her husband after his cheating. This is an example of the personal sphere interfering with the professional sphere. It enabled several gender discourses to flourish: career woman not paying enough attention to her husband; dominating woman forcing husband to act out; cold woman; lying woman. Trump used this to great success and labelled her 'crooked Hillary' to address her supposed lying and conspiring nature.

Healthism was a tool to create doubt whether Hillary Clinton would be up to the task of being president. Experts from all sides weighed in to discuss the several alleged illnesses (Alzheimer's and Parkinson's, most frequently). When she finally revealed she had been suffering from pneumonia, nobody seemed to be very assured and jumped on the chance to accuse her of having 'lied' about it (Bordo 2016: 108). This coverage resorts to a cultural myth of women's deceitfulness enforced by popular media and tv shows.

Donald Trump and Working-Class White Male Identity

Trump has stated on numerous occasions that he could shoot someone in the middle of a crowded street and his followers would still support him. He is not ignorant of the

somewhat blind loyalty of his supporters: “Trump won over 70% of the two-party vote among whites without a college degree, which easily exceeded the performance of any Republican going back to at least 1980” (Schaffner 2017: 4). Given the salience of this demographic, it is important to study the discourses surrounding it.

Identity politics is predominantly associated with Democrats as catering to minorities but Trump himself used identity politics to great effect. The identity he was signalling was the working-class white male with a limited educational background. The point of identity politics is to focus on a group that has been either marginalised, discriminated against or oppressed. Working-class white males are not and have not been for a while in a favourable position in society and within conservative discourse, a few key scapegoats are to blame. Creating ‘us vs them’ oppositions is a popular populist technique. ‘The Other’ (immigrants, refugees, women, minorities) can be blamed for economic difficulties experienced by the working class (Samuels 2016: 65). Trump’s success can be partly explained by his persistent populist tactics to activate a group who, owing to their conservative background and discourses, needs to frame problems through the *strict father morality* in order to maintain their identity as a group.

For his followers Trump is the hero who is not ashamed to hold racist and sexist views. Trump starts several of his speeches with “you know I’m not supposed to say this but...” to emphasise his divergence from what he calls political correctness (Bordo 2016: 65). This resonates with his voters because they can relate to this and take the victim position. Even though Trump has very little in common with his voter base, he has successfully touted the ‘common man’ and the ‘self-made man’ discourses regardless of his inherited wealth. Trump has chanted “I love uneducated people” in his rallies and expressed disdain for higher education, framing it as snobbish and detached from reality (Hafner 2016). The victim-perpetrator reversal technique has allowed him, like so many Republicans before him, to sell

the idea that the ultra-rich and the corporations are not the cause for dire conditions of the working class. The blame lies on liberals who keep bringing in immigrants, creating expensive welfare programs, pushing for regulations and raising taxes. In this view, liberals control the media, education and political discourse by not allowing people to speak out simple truths (Samuels 2016: 72).

Trump's basis for authority is his non-politician background. His lack of experience in the field did not work against him. Rather, he successfully turned his reality-TV background into an alibi. The whole concept of reality TV is to add authenticity and remove the distance between the viewer and the viewed. Trump is well versed in reality TV and his image in the *Apprentice* was fatherly and powerful. This fits in well with Lakoff's *strict father model* and explains his allure to the conservative mind (Samuel 2016: 72).

The right-wing populist style has flourished under Trump – making false and outrageous statements, denying factual evidence or things one has been recorded saying on national television and get away with it through the simple saving grace of “telling it like it is” or “not being politically correct”. This style has been evident among right-wing populist politicians (Wodak 2015). ‘Saying it like it is’ is not necessarily telling the truth but framing whatever a politician wants to convey as such is effective. This, coupled with repetition, exaggeration, sensationalism is an effective media tool. The social media industry plays a role in what type of content gets shared most and in order to sell itself, headlines are tailored to cause outrage and be ‘clickbait’. People were more interested in outrageous news than any clarifications such as detailed articles on what happened in Benghazi or the legal background of Hillary Clinton's emails (Bordo 2016: 173).

Precarious Manhood

One reason behind the gender discourse in which women are represented as being out of place in politics might be the fear that if women enter yet another level of what was formerly considered a masculine endeavour, the ways in which men can reaffirm their masculine identities diminishes. Because manhood is something that needs to be carefully cultivated and maintained, it is subject to great anxiety among men, especially men who have indeed seen a radical change in their social position, like working-class men (Vandello and Bosson 2013: 101). The discourse of the *self-made man*, popular among conservatives, is a good example of the quest to prove oneself. Manhood can always be challenged and the challenging and defending needs to happen in the public eye because manhood is determined as a status by the audience's acknowledgement. "Manhood is confirmed primarily by others and thus requires public demonstrations of proof" (Vandello and Bosson 2013: 101).

The *precarious manhood* theory states that manhood needs to be achieved and then protected carefully because manhood is a lifelong quest (Vandello and Bosson 2013: 101). Because the traditional requirements for womanhood were limited to homemaking and children, womanhood is perceived as more secure. Manhood is performed and affirmed by the spectators. The public affirmation aspect of the precarious manhood is also evident in men's seat belt use, fighting, seeking out social support, getting an annual physical exam, using tobacco, exercising, and dietary choices (Hammond, Matthews, Mohottige, Agyemany, & Corbie-Smith, 2010). Studies have confirmed that boys exposed to traditional masculine ideals during childhood may suffer attachment anxiety which translates into insecurities during adulthood. (Schwartz, Waldo, & Higgins, 2004) Furthermore, evidence suggests that intimate partner violence has its roots in adhering to traditional masculine ideals in childhood and that justifying violence in adulthood is strongly linked to the very same traditional masculine ideology (Mahalik, Aldarondo, Gilbert-Gokhale, & Shore, 2005; McDermott & Lopez, 2013).

Because some men are unable to address their insecurities about their masculinity and attack those who, within the parameters of the traditional masculine ideology, are not considered “real men” in an effort to secure their own masculine identity against the “other”. (Franklin 2004; Whitehead 2005) Public displays of aggression at, for example, political rallies or demonstrations, can be interpreted as attempts to establish a secure masculine identity in a society in which science is increasingly suggesting that there is a problem with masculinity.

“Thus, the only enduring quality characterising ‘real manhood’ is its continual anxiety, and this anxiety” (Vandello and Bosson 2013). This anxiety might become the foundation on which some men make political choices. Because manhood is primarily affirmed by others, men suffer the spotlight effect (the false feeling of being constantly watched and judged) and feel that unless they act in a certain way, they risk losing their status. These factors, this thesis argues, played an important role in the 2016 campaign.

Finally, human psychology is divided along the lines of gender and used in everyday political discourse as well. Emotions for example, are divided into good and bad emotions, active and passive emotions and feminine and masculine emotions. Ahmed (2004: 8) claims that the gendered aspect of emotions is expressed through metaphors. For instance, being soft or tough/hard on societal issues betrays a gendered view which distinguishes between ‘being’ and ‘feeling’ which means active and passive. ‘Feeling’ means one is affected by someone or something, lacking autonomy. Which is why women are often described as too emotional and empathetic for the hard world of politics. ‘Being’ is inherent and an active state. (Ahmed 2004: 9) Being tough is what in conservative discourse has led a country or a race as far as it has come and the gist of it having the “right” emotions at the right time. Allowing a nation to become soft on several issues (as right-wing politicians often lament) is also allowing a country to become more feminine (which is a threat to Lakoff’s model and

masculine identity) and according to Ahmed (2004: 9) less white because being soft on immigration for example allows for the influx of people of other races. Both of these options signify going backward because being tough is what has brought the nation forward.

Methodology

How we speak of the world influences how we perceive the world. This has significant epistemological and ontological consequences and, through that, potential to identify power relations within society. Discourse is a concept that unites language and social practice and it constructs identities, social relationships and systems of knowledge and meaning (Jørgensen and Phillips 2002: 67). Discourse also constructs mind frames (Lakoff 1996) and social norms and does so through a thorough process of naturalisation and internalisation. It is a tool for the maintenance of hierarchies and power relations within a society. The broad field of discourse analysis (DA) that studies how language operates in society is a method that underlines this thesis.

In essence, DA is about analysing language to question that which is taken for granted. Foucault defines discourse as ‘unwritten rules and structures which produce particular utterances and statements Foucault does not propose a specific methodology for text analysis but offers two analytical approaches: ‘archaeology’ and ‘genealogy’ (Mills 2003: 68). The first, ‘archaeology’, means analysing the set of rules which during a certain time and place determine the ‘limits and forms of the sayable’ (Foucault 1991: 59). Archaeology studies under which conditions certain discourses emerge. His term ‘discursive formation’ is the practice by which certain types of statements group together and form a discourse based on the limits and forms determined (Mills 2003: 79). Genealogy addresses the workings of power and the means through which discourses are reproduced and used for power. In short, ‘archaeology’ analyses the context and ‘genealogy’ the process. (Mills 2003: 40)

Foucault offers four in-depth dimensions for discursive formation:

1. The *formation of objects* means reconstructing the rules according to which the objects in discourses are created: which scientific disciplines have an impact and in which way. Which patterns of classification are used.

2. The *formation of enunciative modalities* refers to determining a legitimate speaker, or the institutional locations and subject positions from which objects of discourse are spoken about? How different forms of enunciation – statistics, narratives, experiments, and so on – relate to each other.

3. The *formation of concepts* refers to rules that form the basis of a statement: How are textual elements connected to one another? Which rhetorical schemas are used? How is the statement positioned regarding in relation to other texts?

4. The *formation of strategies* refers to the external relationships of a discourse: What are the topics and theories of a discourse? How do they interact with other discourses? To what extent do they purport to be better solutions to problems than those others? (Wodak & Forchtner 2018: 96)

How discourses operate within a society is not always self-evident or transparent (Mills 2003: 57) but because discourses impose structures and norms within a society, it is important to understand how they come into being, maintain relevance and reproduce within a society. The goal of discourses operating within society is usually to gain or maintain a power. Foucault views power not only as a direct and forceful coercion but rather as a strategy and a technique (Foucault 1988: 38). This means that power is exercised not through force but through persuasion and naturalisation of certain norms that help uphold hierarchies.

The framework entails Foucault's *regime of truth* which is a system of knowledge that has established a position of authority in society in order to maintain a hierarchical

position. Every society has a regime of truth – types of statements which can be made by authorised people and accepted by the society as truthful. Those truths are maintained by social practices (Foucault 1981: 133). The regime utilises exclusionary tactics to differentiate between truth and falsehood through the process of rarefaction of a subject – limiting who gets to speak authoritatively on a subject (Mills 2003: 58). Other practices to exclude contesting knowledge include commentary – reacting to the disconfirming knowledge within the discursive framework of the regime – which serves the double purpose of excluding the undesirable information as well as keeping the regime’s own value system in circulation through discourses (Foucault 1981: 58).

Foucault’s concept of power as persuasive rather than direct means that the *regime of truth* needs *subjects* to accept the regime as truth willingly. It is essential for the regime of truth to neutralise the freedom of the subject to choose between regimes (Lorenzini 2016: 73). The individual constructing him or herself as a subject allows power to be exerted over them. Constructing oneself as a subject occurs in two stages (Foucault 1997: 282). First, de-subjection, which is an attempt by the subject to reject the mechanisms of power that govern the individual within another regime of truth. Second, a creative moment – subjectivation – creating a new subjectivity within another *regime of truth*. For a subject to be able to accept the truth depends on the subject’s instruments required to discover it, categories necessary to process it and language for formulating it (Foucault 2006, 235). This means that the rhetoric of a regime produces discourses that are linguistically specific.

For Norman Fairclough, similarly to Foucault, discourse is a social praxis that “both reproduces and changes knowledge, identities and social relations including power relations, and at the same time is also shaped by other social practices and structures” (Jørgensen and Phillips 2002: 65). Therefore, the social structure (relationships between people, institutions etc.) should be seen as consisting of discursive and non-discursive elements. Discursive

practices reproduce the social structure, but they may also be used to challenge and change it.

What distinguishes Fairclough from poststructuralists such as Foucault is his endeavour to create a methodology to analyse discourse. Fairclough sees discourse analysis as a method of exploring the relationships between abstract social structures and concrete social events (Fairclough 2003: 17). Because language is manifested as text and images, while the manifestation of social structure remains abstract, the textual dimension of Fairclough's model allows the interdisciplinary combination of linguistics and sociology.

Fairclough's three-dimensional CDA deals with the following levels:

1. the text (the linguistic features of a speech, a writing or an image),
2. the discursive practice (how a given text is produced and consumed),
3. the social practice (how the discursive practice maintains or transforms the social order).

The textual dimension analyses the formal features of the text (vocabulary, grammar and syntax). On the textual level, Fairclough distinguishes between three types of value that the formal features of a text may have. First, experiential value provides insight into how the producer of the text perceives the world and the social order (knowledge and beliefs). Second, relational value entails social relationships present in a discourse. Third, expressive value is to do with subjects and identities. In addition to the discourses present in a text, Fairclough also stresses the importance of significant omissions or what is notable only through absence (Fairclough 1989: 112). I will use a redacted version of Fairclough's framework in which I analyse the texts through his textual dimension and contextualise the results using Foucault's framework.

The first stage of analysis looks at the three values outlined by Fairclough: experiential, relational and expressive. Experiential values are analysed by looking at

ideological classification schemes. Relational values expressing social relationships described in the text will be outlined as well. The expressive values – the author’s evaluation of subjects and social identities as well as reality – are identified by the author’s use of vocabulary. The analysis of the vocabulary looks at meaning relations (synonymy, antonymy, hypernymy), over-wording and under-wording, metaphors, classification schemes, euphemistic expressions, marked formality or informality. In the following, each text is analysed individually to gain a deeper understanding of the three intertwined values established by Fairclough. The results of the analysis are contextualised as the discourses described in the theoretical chapter and presented after the text analysis.

The second stage of the analysis seeks to contextualise the identified discourses through Foucault’s framework. Foucault views power in contemporary society as not only direct and forceful coercion but a strategy of persuasion and naturalisation of certain norms and ideas which help uphold hierarchies. The division between truth and falsehood is an exclusionary practice (Mills 2003: 58) which enables those who are in a position of authority to present themselves as experts and define what counts as truth within a discursive community. Instances of such practices in the rhetoric used by Breitbart can provide useful insight into how a *regime of truth* is maintained and systematically recreated. This can be done by identifying the types of statements presented as truthful within the rhetoric and types that are rejected. A regime of truth requires *subjects* to accept the knowledge within the regime as truthful and to help reproduce it. It can be argued that the regime of truth represented in Breitbart’s rhetoric contributes to the formation of the non-college educated white males as subjects.

This thesis will look at how gender discourses are used in politics to produce and reproduce a particular kind of social order among a certain segment of American voters. I will focus on the discourses employed by articles published on the right-wing nationalist

outlet *Breitbart* in the final 3 months ahead of election day (8 November 2016). I chose to limit the time scope of the analysis to this period because the looming election day led to media producing more heated content than on average. The period also includes the fallout from the second presidential debate (4 October 2016), as well as the reveal of Trump's infamous "grab them by the pussy" *Access Hollywood* tape (7 October 2016) and then-FBI Director James Comey announcing the reopening of the investigation into Clinton's emails (28 October 2016). These events are extensively covered in right-wing media and provide ample examples of how gender is perceived, depicted and used to further one political candidate over another.

The analysis will focus on dominant gender discourses found in 14 *Breitbart* articles. The articles were extracted from *Breitbart*' archive and selected from the category of 2016 Presidential Election. A little over 300 articles were published between the first presidential debate and the Election Day, November 8. Roughly 60 of those articles utilised some gender discourses. The present analysis covers 14 articles to demonstrate the use of gender discourses in the 2016 presidential campaign. These articles were selected for their gendered content – how the authors had utilised gender discourses (on topics ranging from foreign policy and immigration to economy). Out of the 60 topical articles found in *Breitbart*, these 14 represent the most popular gender discourses utilised throughout the larger corpus.

EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS

Analysis of the Textual Dimension

Feminist Camille Paglia on Hillary Clinton: 'The Woman Is a Disaster'

Discourses: *self-made man, common man, strict father morality, nurturing parent morality, dangerous woman*

Experiential value

The author presents her conception of the social world by establishing her immigrant background and rough childhood. She had to learn early on that the world is a 'dangerous place' and one must 'learn to defend' oneself, not be a 'fool' and 'stay alert'. The author identifies herself as self-reliant and by suggesting she learned not to be a 'fool', the implied antonym is that she is smart. Her experience of the social world rests on her 'philosophy' of 'street-smart Amazon feminism'. 'Street-smart' suggests first-hand experience and the implied antonym is 'book-smart' which fits in the *common man* discourse in which the weak and often effeminate elite is the antagonist. The mythological 'Amazons' were the embodiment of female warriors and toughness and the adaptation of this archetype in modern society must already include 'street-smarts' which makes the use of both words ('Amazon' and 'street-smart') in describing her idea of feminism unnecessary – over-wording. In this way, the author establishes her authority subtly, not wanting to be associated with the elite.

The author's upbringing is later idealised by contrasting it to how 'young girls' are taught nowadays. She further defines her understanding of feminism as achieving 'independent thought and action'. It sets itself apart from the mainstream definition of feminism (equality between the sexes) and suggests that feminism is the freedom to think and act independently within the existing system. This approach is more concerned with the idea of self-sufficiency within the *strict father morality* than with inequalities stemming from gender differences.

The author does not contrast the policies she addresses (childcare, education, loans, healthcare and care for the elderly) in critiquing Barack Obama campaign ad Life of Julia (in which a fictional woman named Julia is shown to lead a very different life under Obama and Romney). Instead, she stresses the abstract notion of ‘looking after themselves’. In Lakoffian terms, *strict father morality* suggests that everyone can achieve success if they work hard. This is contradictory because it suggests that equality is simultaneously possible and not possible. The metaphorical concept of *ladder of success* from the *strict father morality* is there for everyone but the whole rather pessimistic premise of the article is that there can ‘never’ be equality while ‘we’ still have ‘big government’ which takes away women’s incentive to work hard.

The author takes the fact that Obama’s campaign ad features a woman named Julia quite literally and excludes men from the group that benefits from the services Obama promised to provide. This is evident in how she only addresses women as lacking incentive, as being ‘coddled’. While the collective pronoun ‘we’ includes the author who is a woman, the interpretation of the campaign ad (as ‘big government talking away women’s incentive to work’) implies that men do have the incentive to work. This places women on a lower position in the *moral order*.

Relational value

The author’s description of the current state of things fits the metaphorical *strict father morality* – and conservatism – because it posits that the ‘big government’ assumes ‘women not capable of making their own decisions’. The social relationship between government and women is represented as that of a parent and a child. This, according to the author’s view, results in a collective ‘we’ ‘rocketing’ – a metaphor expressing forceful movement – back to the ‘Victorian period’. The ‘young girls’ are made into ‘helpless victims’. This is overwording, as victimhood already implies the inability to help oneself. The girls are also

‘coddled’ (verb most frequently accompanied by gendered words like *mother*, *nanny* and *over-parent*) when life is ‘challenging’. The idea behind the author’s interest in women making their own decisions is mainly to do with women not needing help (welfare or regulations) from the ‘big government’. If women can make up their own minds, government help is not needed. This implicitly makes a case against the *nurturing parent model* and the Democrats. The author states that the position of Hillary Clinton and her ‘feminist colleagues’ is that women need ‘tax-payer funded assistance’ throughout their lives ‘from cradle to grave’. A classification scheme aligning the text with conservative ideology, emerges as a social relationship is presented between the tax-payer and women: tax-payers are forced to pay for women to remain ‘helpless victims’. Essentially, the tax-payer is forced to pay for women to not be able to experience ‘equality between sexes’, which can never occur while the government renders women ‘handicapped’ and unable to ‘look after themselves’. Positioning ‘women’ and ‘taxpayers’ in separate categories in that sentence implies that women are not taxpayers.

Expressive value

The author’s own social identity is that of an immigrant and her particular approach to feminism.

The author describes Hillary Clinton as ‘a woman’ without ‘accomplishment’. This makes her use of the ‘gender card’ during the election a transgression which caused ‘outrage’ in the author. The metaphor of a ‘gender card’ is often used to invalidate women trying to address topics of sexual harassment, gender inequality in society. The implication behind this is that women should not address the topic of women’s issues because in doing so, they are somehow appropriating the fact (which in this context is depicted as privilege) that they are women.

'Hillary's' accomplishment of having sponsored 400 bills is belittled by the author's claim that these bills were to 'rename bridges'. The results of her foreign policy work are sarcastically reformulated: 'destabilizing North Africa' and causing a 'flood of immigrants'. The 'flood' metaphor depicts immigrants in terms of a natural disaster which as a technique intends to trigger fear. The disaster metaphor is repeated with 'the woman is a disaster'. Trump's victory is characterised as a 'release of energy' which would 'destroy' the 'power structures' of both political parties and the media. The reference to the release of energy implicitly creates the sense that currently, energy is lacking and that the metaphorical 'disaster' that is the current administration and Hillary Clinton, can be destroyed by Trump who commands that energy.

Hillary Clinton's interest in holding political office is explained by her 'knowledge on bureaucracy and all the offices of government' but vilified by describing her as 'sitting behind scenes' and manipulating the 'levers' of power. Depicting the workings of power as pulling switches simplifies her role as a politician, describing her work as sitting down passively. The description of her ambition is markedly negative, contributing to the *devious woman* discourse. Donald Trump's ambition is described as revolutionary. Framing him as possessing powerful energy contrasts the passive, sitting down unaccomplished image of Hillary Clinton that the article conveys.

Jack Abramoff: If Hillary Clinton Is Elected, She Will Have 'Gotten Away with Selling Our Government for Hundreds of Millions of Dollars'

Discourses: *Hillary Clinton as power-hungry and greedy; elite versus common man; strict father morality*

Experiential value

Jack Abramoff, a former lobbyist for the Republican party, talks about pleading guilty to 'honest services fraud', establishing himself as having engaged in criminal activity:

‘basically bribery’ or ‘things that were related to bribery of public servants and other areas’. The speaker calls himself a ‘public servant’ and describes his conviction ‘falling’ within the ‘purview of that law’ because he was involved in a transaction that ‘Hillary’ (informal throughout) and ‘her folks’ (also informal) are involved in now.

Focusing on Hillary Clinton, Abramoff admits that he does not know her but ‘from what I’ve read and what I’ve seen’ it is nonetheless ‘very clear to me’ (in the position of a person who has already committed such a crime) that ‘they’ are selling the assets of ‘the people’ and the ‘federal government’ in order to benefit the Clinton Foundation. He calls this ‘classic honest services fraud’ and distinguishes that definition again from ‘bribery’ which he claims is very difficult to define in ‘U.S. law’ because ‘it’ (not bribing) is a ‘standard’ that is ‘usually too high to meet’, emphasis placed to lessen the seriousness of his own acts while Hillary Clinton’s acts are held to a different standard.

Relational value

The author establishes that he broke the law and ‘was properly punished’ and is therefore ‘puzzled’, as are the ‘over two million Americans’ and ‘many more’ who have also broken this law, why ‘someone’ is ‘blatantly and flagrantly’ breaking the same law and is not ‘brought to justice’ by James Comey, the director of the FBI. Emphasis is placed on the outrageousness of the act by over-wording: ‘blatantly’ and ‘flagrantly’ are synonyms and do not complement one another. The implication is that there is cooperation between Hillary Clinton and the FBI, ‘a political decision was made’, because, ‘very bizarrely’, her interviews were not recorded, notes were not taken. The social relationship presented here is first, between Hillary Clinton (informally ‘Hillary’) and the law enforcement, who are cooperating illegally. Second, there is a relationship between Hillary Clinton and the ‘American people’ in which Hillary Clinton has privilege and is not brought to justice while the ‘people’ are punished. This is ‘wrong’ and ‘unjust to our justice system’ and encourages

‘people out there’ who are contemplating crime to commit criminal acts. This is described as ‘undermining our society’ even more than the potential election of ‘Hillary (informal)’ as president. This is ‘extremely dangerous’ and ‘disgusting and profound’, ‘a backroom game’ with ‘money, power, government’. Hillary Clinton is described, thus, as dangerous, power-hungry and greedy. Hillary Clinton is ‘flaunting the laws’ and ‘selling the government’ conveys the same point as the ‘dangerous disgusting backroom game with money, power and government’ and is therefore repetition to emphasise the gravity of her deviousness. ‘Power’ and ‘government’ in the context of politics can be viewed as hyponymy: ‘government’ is a hyponym of ‘power’.

He positions himself as neutral by saying that, ‘whether it’s Hillary’ or Trump or ‘even Reagan’, holding high political office should not enable politicians to ‘escape the consequences of their actions’ because Abramoff himself was brought to justice. This is contrasted with the ‘extremely political Obama administration’ which did not prosecute ‘Hillary’ (informal) when it should have. The implication behind this is that the Obama administration is political and corrupt, thus lacking moral authority, and the potential Trump administration would counter that as neutral. Another social relationship is presented based on an ideological classification scheme: The Democrats are described as having a privilege over the Republicans because their corruption is treated differently. The author’s reference to Nixon as an example of a Republican prosecuted further emphasises that point. This theme is repeated at the very end by saying that the Republicans would have to leave the country or ‘pull out of the race’. ‘Pulling out’ is also considered a sexual metaphor (i.e. the *pull-out method*) and can be considered to denote emasculation. Additionally, having to leave the country to avoid prosecution already includes not continuing in the race to become president which makes this a case of over-wording in the form of hyponymy on phrase level.

Expressive value

Abramoff is vague on his views on his criminal activity. He establishes that he broke the law but whether law enforcement was unjust to him, remains ambiguous. He identifies himself as having accepted his punishment and through this experience, becoming qualified to judge other such people.

He identifies Hillary Clinton both as corrupt and criminal and as part of the elite that gets away with crimes. To counter this, he appeals to the ‘American people’, who, since Hillary Clinton was not charged or properly investigated, will have to ‘make that decision for themselves’ and take action through voting. He appeals again to the collective ‘we’ through inciting family values: ‘what kind of message have we sent to our kids?’ (and ‘to ourselves’) if we ‘ratify’ this ‘country’ and ‘are okay with’ such a ‘corrupt politician’. Citing family values is part of the Republican classification scheme in which the *strict father* must teach children the right values. He says this has never been the case in ‘American history’, appealing to tradition.

The Nuclear Option — Wikileaks Reveals Even Hillary’s Own Staff Knows Truth: She’s Psychotic

Discourses: *Deviant woman, crazy woman, fake feminist*

Experiential value

The author focuses on Hillary Clinton, repeating that she ‘is a liar’ and ‘has terrible instincts’ and ‘doesn’t believe in anything’. This establishes the *deviant woman* discourse which is complemented by pathologising her. ‘Her head’ is ‘broken’ and she ‘doesn’t know’ why she should be president. ‘She’ is ‘pathological’ and ‘psychotic’. These are instances of overwording as ‘pathological’ and ‘head is broken’ do not convey a markedly different meaning. ‘Psychotic’ is also pathological and does not add to the original meaning, only specifies it to an extent.

Her attacks on Donald Trump are ‘rabid’ which emphasises her pathology in the use of a word that denotes a disease which, apart from being most common among animals, causes a fatal inflammation of the brain. The author’s source is ‘everybody who works for her’ and ‘John Podesta’ (who also works for her) and as a repetition ‘people working the hardest to get her elected’. This establishes the statements as credible knowledge.

Relational value

The author makes a sexual innuendo in mentioning Bill Clinton and his ‘Oral Office’ and the use of the words ‘molesting’ and ‘young intern’ emphasise the immorality of his actions to the point of hinting at paedophilia. Describing him as ‘lying, conniving, dissembling’ (over-wording: synonymy) and ‘commander-in-cheek’ points out all the aspects of his devious behaviour while also denigrating his position as president because of his scandals. The social relationship implied here through a classification scheme: Democrats being in a position of privilege and getting away with anything (metaphorical ‘skate by’ even on such scandals, implies the ease with which they engage in corruption) evokes the elite versus the common man discourse.

To emphasise Bill Clinton’s guilt, the author compares his actions to Bill Cosby’s actions (allegedly drugging and sexually assaulting 60 women) and suggest ‘Mrs. Clinton’, now in the role of wife to emphasise her involvement, give answers as to why Bill Clinton’s actions were treated differently. The comparison between Bill Clinton and Bill Cosby greatly exaggerates Bill Clinton’s actions. The social relationship of husband and wife also serves to describe Hillary Clinton as an insincere feminist because despite having said ‘every woman should be believed’, she ‘wrongly smeared’ the women her husband was involved with. The description of her ‘ethos’ as ‘never apologize’, ‘never admit’ and ‘always keep lying’ suggests the author would have liked for her to apologize to the victims, thereby accepting her portion of the blame in what Bill Clinton has done. This is a common discourse

in right-wing media (Ducat 2004), partially blaming Hillary Clinton for Bill Clinton's misdeeds and scolding her for not owning up to it.

Expressive value

The author establishes the Clintons as having a habit of lying. 'Turns out the Clintons have been right all along: lying really does work'. This is repeated as hyperbole, suggesting that the Clintons 'spend every breathing second of their day lying, plotting to lie and lying about the lies'. The word 'lie' is repeated four times within one sentence. Later, the word 'lie' is repeated eight times to describe the areas in which Hillary Clinton lies about.

Exclusive — Gen. Mike Flynn: Hillary Clinton's Email Setup Was 'Unbelievable Active Criminal Behavior'

Discourses: *common man versus elite, self-made man, dangerous woman, inhuman woman, leadership as masculine*

Experiential value

The article establishes Michael Flynn, named a retired 'U. S. army Lt. Gen', as expert on Hillary Clinton's criminal actions. He is also established as unbiased by stating that he has been a 'lifelong Democrat' who worked in the Obama administration. He states that he has been part of investigations where 'people have spied on our country and done espionage or been used to extort information'. 'Spying' and 'espionage' are synonyms and the overwording here emphasises his experience.

The topic of the private e-mail server, which at the time was not illegal (Bordo 2016), is framed in this way to trigger fears that this has allowed enemies to spy on 'our country' as well as depict Hillary Clinton as a permanent security risk because spies could blackmail her in the future. The use of the collective pronoun in 'our' country implicitly unites the readers against Clinton and establishes her as dangerous.

Relational value

FBI director James Comey is described to be ‘rushing’ to ‘clear Hillary Rodham Clinton before the election’. This represents a corrupt relationship between Hillary Clinton and the FBI. Hillary Clinton is placed in the role of harming ‘our country’, creating a us vs them controversy. The ‘media’, ‘99 percent of the media’ or the ‘mainstream media’ (repetition) is on Hillary Clinton’s side and is ‘covering up’ her ‘alleged crimes’, indicating a relationship and cooperation. This also creates an implicit opposition between ‘us’ and the media. Flynn warns that if ‘we’ elect her, ‘we’ will have nothing but ‘scandal’ and ‘dark cloud scandal’ (nature metaphor and repetition of ‘scandal’) over our country.

The collective ‘we’ and Hillary Clinton are described to have an enemy relationship and ‘we’ are in the role of having to stop her. She is referred to as the ‘Clinton Machine’ which dehumanises her. The ‘machine’ metaphor is used in this rhetoric to depict her as not traditionally feminine. Hillary Clinton’s power is described as ‘madness’ which is a common theme around female politicians in right-wing media.

Donald Trump is described as saving the USA, using the hero discourse. Flynn echoes Trump’s promise of ‘draining the swamp’ and suggests the need for ‘fresh blood’ again emphasising ‘our country’. He emphasises the importance of this election and describes the outcome as either becoming a ‘socialist country’ or moving on the ‘path to prosperity’. This classification scheme creates a false opposition between socialism and prosperity, in addition to erroneously identifying Clinton’s economic policies with socialism. This fits the gendered notion that the Democratic party supports the nanny state in the *nurturing parent model*, while Trump’s rhetoric of ‘path to prosperity’ echoes the Ladder of Success in *strict father morality*. Trump ‘loves this country’ and has benefitted ‘from the time he was a kid all the way up’ from the ‘power of opportunity and prosperity’, invoking the *self-made man* discourse. This indirectly suggests that Clinton was a member of the elite who did not earn her success. Flynn characterises Trump through traditionally

masculine terms such as ‘leadership’, ‘instincts’ repetition of ‘leadership ability’ and ‘decision-making ability’, ‘vision’, ‘vision statement’, ‘new leadership’. Leadership already includes good instincts and the ability to make decisions which means the author is using over-wording to emphasise the good qualities of Trump. These qualities are contextualised against Hillary Clinton’s e-mail scandal in an attempt to suggest that her ‘sick, disgusting behavior’ exhibits none of the masculine characteristics desired in an American leader. ‘Sick’ and ‘disgusting’ are synonyms which marks another example of over-wording.

Expressive value

Flynn describes Hillary Clinton’s crimes by comparing them to ‘*the* paedophilia’ and asking the reader to ‘forget about it’ for the moment. The purpose of this is to show the reader that the criminality involved in the private e-mail server is worse than paedophilia and deserves more focus. Because the article is not focused on Bill Clinton’s scandals, but the author wants to remind the reader about them regardless, he uses a greatly exaggerated term (‘paedophilia’) to create a bigger impact. This ensures that while his main focus is on the e-mail scandal, the reader still keeps in mind that the husband of the person accused of criminal behaviour is also a paedophile. He also asks the reader to forget about the ‘Clinton Foundation’. To further illustrate the gravity of her transgression, he makes a point about the e-mail scandal being a ‘criminal act’ and not merely inability to follow ‘state department guidelines’. Another repetition of this being ‘beyond violating state department policy’, ‘unbelievable active criminal behaviour’, ‘indefensible behavior’, ‘damaged our country’. The series of negative adjectives and the repetition of the terms evoking patriotism serve to increase the anger of the readers.

Sharon Day: Rescind your Clinton Endorsement

Discourses: *devious woman, elite vs common man*

Experiential value

The author uses intertextuality by referencing Jim Thompson's novel *The Grifters* and its film version. The reference brings to mind the female villain Lilly who is a con artist whose actions include deceit, murder, incest and theft. The author defines 'grifter' as 'someone who has made money dishonestly' or 'in a swindle' and applies this definition to the Clinton Foundation and its 'self-motivated' tactics (unacceptable for a charity organisation). Hillary Clinton, in this light, has 'swindled (repeated three times) countries, corporate America and the American people' out of donations and this makes her 'disqualified' to be a candidate for the 'highest office' but 'legislators, leaders, media outlets' have endorsed her. The author implies they are complicit in her deviousness and the 'American people' want change.

The author applies the *strict father morality* principle of *moral essence* to claim that Hillary Clinton's corrupt ways are not likely to change as president because people's characters are immutable throughout life. The closing line of the article repeats this point: 'once a grifter, always a grifter'.

Relational value

Hillary Clinton's supposed selfishness, defined as the 'Clinton-first approach', is contrasted to Donald Trump's 'America first' slogan. Hillary Clinton is described as having a 'blatant disregard' of the 'American public' and 'cavalier approach' to national security, suggesting a relationship in which Hillary Clinton does not care about the 'public' or its values. Describing a 'secret server' in her 'home basement' as well as implying she is collaborating with the FBI fits the theme of the 'grifter'. The implication is a contrast of a caring relationship between Donald Trump and the 'public'.

Hillary Clinton's goal of becoming the first female president is invalidated by questioning the sincerity of her feminist identity. This is done by suggesting that the Clinton Foundation received millions of dollars from countries that 'show little concern for women's

rights'. The social relationships between Hillary Clinton and her donors as well as between Hillary Clinton and women, are characterised as insincere.

Expressive value

Hillary Clinton is described as 'dangerous' in a quote the author has taken from Thompson's book: 'Anyone who deprived her of something she wanted, deserved what he got'. This aligns Hillary Clinton, 'grifter-in-chief', with the main villain of the story, depicting her as capable of anything to achieve her goals.

MILO: Lena Dunham Wants the 'Extinction of White Men,' While Hillary Plans to Import ISIS

Discourses: *effeminate man, emasculating woman, devious woman, war on masculinity (and white males)*

Experiential value

Milo Yiannopoulos, a well-known right-wing provocateur, claims that with Hillary Clinton in power, America – 'Hillary's America' – will become a 'rape culture', owing to Hillary Clinton's foreign policies which she plots with Muslim sponsors of ISIS. The article focuses largely on vindicating the 'white male' demographic which, the author claims, is wrongfully 'demonized'. This classification scheme indicates a conservative ideology in which immigrants have privileges over white males. He is reacting to the recent effort college campuses have made to tackle rape culture on college campuses (Jordan 2017). This discourse as targeting male college students (majority of them being white) as the perpetrators is subject to much criticism in right-wing media. One strategy with which the discourse on sexual assault in college campuses is addressed is scapegoating. This is done through depicting immigrants as the 'real' perpetrators of 'rape culture' and suggesting that

the Democrats and Hillary Clinton's foreign policy will result in 'real' rape culture. These are examples constituents of the conservative classification scheme.

Relational value

The implication is that because Hillary Clinton and Bill Clinton are in a relationship, she is also included in the scandals involving Bill Clinton. Milo Yiannopoulos describes Hillary Clinton addressing the problem of the wage gap as unable to stop 'complaining' about it. Such a portrayal frames both the issue of the wage gap as well as Hillary Clinton talking about it as annoying, recalling the image of a nagging wife (another common discourse surrounding Hillary Clinton). The issue of the wage gap is ridiculed by suggesting 'poor' Bill Clinton 'gets hard' whenever Hillary (informal throughout) mentions 'gender' and 'gap' in the same sentence but is immediately turned off upon seeing Hillary Clinton's 'crossed eyes' and 'evil smile'. Their relationship is described as asexual and as that of a dominating wife versus effeminate husband. The author correlates this with Bill Clinton booking another flight on the 'Lolita Express' – reference to Jeffrey Epstein's private jet used to transport people to a private island where he allegedly organised sex parties. Epstein was convicted in 2008 for soliciting an underage prostitute. Connecting Bill Clinton with Epstein is another instance of guilt by association. The euphemism used to describe the jet contains a reference to paedophilia – 'Lolita'.

Donald Trump, on the other hand, is represented in the role of 'protector of women', suggesting a paternal relationship within the *strict father morality*.

The author abruptly changes the topic to Lena Dunham, described as 'Hillary's surrogate', a metaphor intended to convey her lack of judgement and independent thought by suggesting she is merely carrying around Hillary Clinton's agenda, as if a baby. She is described to be attacking the 'straight while male' demographic in a short video. Emphasising Hillary Clinton's connection with Lena Dunham serves the purpose of

implicating her in the attacks against white males. This allows the author to generalise about the suggested antagonistic relationship between the demographic of straight white males and women like Hillary Clinton and Lena Dunham who use their power to attack them. This argument indirectly evokes the fears about the readers about their own weakness and represents the conservative classification scheme (through the opposition of white males and women).

Expressive value

The article mocks Hillary Clinton for identifying herself as feminist and seeks to invalidate that identity based on Bill Clinton's actions and the Clinton Foundation's own issues regarding the 'gender wage gap'. The Clinton Foundation is described as also having a gender wage gap which questions the moral authority of Hillary Clinton to address the issue in general. The implication is that if she were a real feminist, she would surely address the issue in the Clinton Foundation first. In not doing so, she implies that different moral standards apply to her and the rest of Americans, whom she expects to take the issue seriously.

The 'straight white male' identity, identified here as a minority (nearing 'extinction'), is described as under attack.

Milo Defends Hazing, College Fraternities at Dartmouth

Experiential value

As part of introduction, the author jokes about only 'the dead' voting for Hillary Clinton who is a 'zombie' (continuing Halloween imagery). Milo Yiannopoulos' vocabulary is heavily gendered. Donald Trump as 'Daddy Trump', 'epitome of pure masculinity' and 'unapologetic playboy billionaire' is described as achieving the 'greatest f*ck you in the history of American politics' after having dedicated his life to 'chasing beautiful women' and 'shit-talking everyone who gets in the way'. He is here not associated with the *strict*

father but with a hyper-sexualised playboy. ‘Daddy’ in Yiannopoulos’s rhetoric does not represent an actual family father figure but the sexualised language used in pornography where women refer to their partners as ‘Daddy’ to express submission. His win is termed the greatest ‘landmark win’ for ‘masculinity’ and ‘pure masculinity’, emphasised through over-wording.

Hillary Clinton’s win, on the other hand, would mean a ‘struggle’ for ‘freedom of speech’ because of a ‘crazy social justice warrior president’ who represents ‘man-hating feminism’ and considers the constitution ‘toilet paper’. The euphemism ‘toilet paper’ as depicting the American constitution expresses extreme disrespect to rule of law and the American culture in general and is intended to incite anger in the reader. ‘Social justice warrior’ is a derogatory term in right-wing rhetoric intended to mock left-wing activism (defending minorities).

Milo Yiannopoulos describes her bid for the presidency as using the woman card: ‘get a woman in office no matter how terrible a president they’d be...’. The ‘woman card’ metaphor is here directly used to state that the political left cares more about having a woman in power than having a good president. Such a classification scheme suggests identity politics associated with the Democrats. She’s ‘a woman’ and this is ‘feminism’. The automatic association between women and feminism suggests that, by definition, any woman is a threat to the vulnerable white masculinity. The description of Hillary Clinton as ‘hospital-bound’ (reference to the claims that her health would not withstand the job of being president) and ‘wearing ugly pantsuits’ (implying that women are expected to dress femininely) leads to the sarcastic statement that the author is sure ‘we’ would all feel ‘stunning and brave’ for having elected her as the world ends. Focusing on Hillary Clinton’s gender in order to invalidate her bid for presidency draws attention away from actual skills and qualifications which are summarised as causing the world to end.

Milo bases his understanding of masculinity in biology and history. The conservative classification scheme is continued as he speaks from a position to defend the tradition of hazing and ‘traditional masculinity’ which is opposed by ‘left-wing cucks’. His opponents are dismissed without any valid argumentation as emasculated. The biological basis of masculinity is expressed by stating that men are ‘by nature’ more ‘competitive’ and ‘aggressive’, can be ‘maniacally driven’ and that this knowledge is a ‘hormonal’ and ‘behavioural fact’ which has been true ‘throughout the history of humanity’. He is describing the conservative *moral order* in which hierarchies are considered natural.

The discourse of masculinity containing traditional leadership qualities ‘by nature’ further explains the disdain expressed towards Hillary Clinton who, identified as ‘woman’ earlier, also possesses and exhibits these characteristics but is not supposed to. This is a transgression and is either mocked or described as ‘unnatural’ in right-wing gender discourses. This biological argument is used as reasoning why ‘men commit nearly all of violent crime’. This counters the current discussion around ‘toxic masculinity’ in society, particularly by the American Psychological Association, which states that some elements of ‘traditional masculinity’ cause men to be self-destructive and violent. The difference is that the APA does not consider all elements of traditional masculinity to be determined by nature. Hence, what Yiannopoulos represents as science does not correspond to actual science. His argument rests on the implication that whatever issues surround masculinity in society today are caused by biology and cannot be changed. To balance the former negative statement on men and crime, Milo contends that biology is also the reason why men have invented and built nearly everything ‘you’ own as well as landed on the moon. In this discourse, if masculinity is behind all society’s progress and major achievements, criticising it is indeed absurd. This makes men who adhere to traditional masculinity victims.

Relational value

The historical basis for masculine supremacy is explained by the idea that ‘society is constructed on the backs of men’ and this has always been a ‘biological fact’. In the *strict father morality* – in which hierarchies are natural – the superiority of men is simply part of the *moral order*. This establishes a social relationship between men and society in which men have created society. He views labour as gendered and claims that ‘a woman digging dirt at a construction site’ is as ‘common’ (sarcastically) as encountering an ‘attractive feminist’. The lack of women in some jobs is frequently used to combat the claim that women have unequal opportunities in some fields (STEM or leadership for example) – if women really wanted equality, they would want women to be represented equally in all jobs, including blue-collar ones. But because this is not the case, feminism is actually interested in achieving power, not equality.

The association of feminism with ‘unattractive’ women is a particularly gendered way of looking at things: women who are not attractive enough to be successful among men become feminists. In this discourse, feminism is nothing more than bitterness. Milo addresses the physical appearance of women by suggesting the ‘fatties’ should sign up for a gym ‘also built by men’ (the ‘built by men’ is repeated three times). He theorises that if civilisation had been the responsibility of ‘female hands’, ‘we’ would not have advanced far: ‘still be living in grass huts’.

Milo addresses the female perspective, making the case that women should want ‘men to be men’ because this has greatly benefited them as well. Men having invented all house-hold appliances is essentially what ‘liberated the time and energy of women’ and this puts the ‘generous and self-destructive patriarchy’ in a positive light. The social relationship described here is a positive one: men as the liberators of women and women as benefitting from masculinity. This ridicules the idea of an existing patriarchy as it points to the logical

inconsistency behind men, by improving women's conditions within the household, ended up liberating them.

The elite versus the common man discourse is represented in the statement 'educated culture routinely denigrates masculinity and manhood'. The relationship between men who represent this type of masculinity and of the intellectual elite is antagonistic. 'Masculinity' and 'manhood' are synonyms and the use of both is a case of over-wording in order to place emphasis. Milo warns that if this continues, women 'will be stuck' with immature 'boys' who do not 'honour their commitments' instead of 'strong men' who serve as 'models' women can either 'embrace or resist'. The latter point is that the 'models' women react against (either embracing or resisting) is what gives basis to a 'centered and profound sense of themselves as women'. The idea that masculinity is the foundation of women's identity pertains to the *moral order* of things as well as *moral hierarchy* within the *strict father morality* and implies a social relationship of the head of the family who the child can either imitate or contrast.

The 'science-denying backwards feminism' holds a position of power in society. Yiannopoulos has not explained the science feminism is denying but this statement draws attention away from the fact that his own discourse on men is science-denying. This classification scheme easily allows for the dismissal of information that does not support the *moral order* as foundational. Feminism as attempting to control society is further expressed as going after the media, academia and entertainment. The purpose of depicting feminism as attempting to control education, media, politics and men is to create a victim-perpetrator reversal in which feminism is placed in the role of patriarchy and men are in the role of the oppressed.

Yiannopoulos references Alexis De Tocqueville's warning that if the difference between 'the sexes' is not emphasised in society, society will produce "weak men and

disreputable women'. He disregards the context of Tocqueville's work which was written in a different era and Milo 'Bill and Hillary' and 'Huma and her Weiner' as examples of this trend. The latter is a reference to Hillary Clinton's aide Huma Abedin, whose husband Anthony Weiner was caught in a sexting scandal. Effeminate or weak men in this discourses are primarily defined by a wife with a career in politics. The two social relationships exemplified here are the one between feminism and the media, academia and entertainment and the other between strong career women and weak men. This is supposed to function as a warning of what happens when women transgress their gender roles: men become promiscuous.

Milo labels American colleges 'insane asylums' and suggest that primary education 'does everything in its power' to turn boys into 'neuters'. He reframes contemporary education as a 'war on boys'. Classifying education as a propaganda tool of the political left and depicting the process of acquiring education as being neutered is part of the elite versus common man discourse and conveys a negative relationship between education and men. These are also elements of the conservative classification scheme. Anti-intellectualism is framed as 'being a man'. Milo argues that boys are both punished and medicated for 'boyish' behaviour, expressed as natural. This is represented as victimising boys and men in schools. Not only does patriarchy not exist, there exists what appears to be matriarchy. In this social relationship, women are described as the norm that men must conform to in their behaviour.

The result is that 'lad culture' and 'frat culture' are considered 'pejoratives' to 'demonize' half the population – 'men and male pastimes'. In this way hazing, initiating a person into a fraternity, sorority or club by putting them through painful and/or humiliating activities, is represented as a harmless pastime. He depicts hazing as creating a bond 'strong as steel' and as character-building tradition similar to military basic training. Some universities have banned hazing (after students have died) and Milo argues that this is

because it is considered ‘too masculine’ by ‘lesbianic feminist administrators’ and their ‘beta male collaborators’ on campus. Here, attempts to curb dangerous behaviours are associated with sexual slurs. Not only are female administrators labelled as feminists, but also as lesbians, thus creating a double stigma in the eyes of the readers. The campus culture is described with words like ‘coddling’, ‘nanny’ and ‘maternal’.

The author argues that in a society where men have very few opportunities to make decisions for themselves and figure out ‘what they’re made of’, mainly because they live under their ‘mother’s guidance’ until college and then ‘settle down with a wife’, college is the only time they are free to do so. The parent-child relationship described between men and women (first as mothers, then as wives) is limiting men’s freedoms. The author assertively over-stresses male powerlessness to anger his readership.

Expressive value

The author identifies himself as the ‘frettiest fag on the Internet’ as a way of relating to the audience and the topic he addresses. Milo’s rhetoric in general is sexualised, his humour somewhere between self-deprecating and self-glorifying, which enables him to fit in among the conservative rhetoric of political incorrectness, stereotyping minorities (Milo is gay and Jewish) and the culture of not taking offense – toughness. He frequently refers to himself with offensive terms (‘fag’, ‘faggot’, ‘frettiest fag’) in order to please his right-wing audience who take pleasure in offensive language directed at minorities. The reference to fraternities in ‘frettiest fag’ seeks to establish a connection between himself and his audience, comprised largely of college students. His opening remark about his black outfit looking ‘almost as good as black looks in me’ refer to his outspoken sexual preference in African-American men.

The author’s own supposedly biological basis is contrasted with the worldview of feminists who believe in ‘gender-bending’ and ‘non-binaries’, making gender a ‘social

construct' created by a 'misogynistic patriarchy' to maintain power. There is an instance of over-wording with 'Gender-bending' and 'non-binary' which are similar terms used to describe not conforming to gender norms (in personal style for example).

The belief in the existence of patriarchy is merely 'denying biology' because in his view, expressed through over-wording, men and women have different 'tendencies, skills and behaviours' which need to be 'accepted and fostered, not demonized'. He supports his claim by resorting to absolute statements, for example that nobody wants to see 'effeminate men' or 'masculine women', depicting transgressing traditional gender stereotypes as the cause of 'American decline'. The consequence of breaking gender stereotypes is described as 'women getting more and more miserable with every generation' because 'pathetic beta cucks' are not able to 'satisfy them'. In addition to the suggestion that the decline in traditional masculinity results in miserable women, this statement implies that one of the ways for men to perform their masculinity is through satisfying women. This is an example of *precarious manhood* and the formation of the externally performed masculine identity. If men can no longer satisfy women, they are not masculine and are termed 'cucks'.

Milo describes common male pastimes which include 'telling dark jokes' and 'roasting each other' as a form of male bonding, emphasising the difference between men and women by suggesting that the 'female perspective' cannot understand this. In this context, Trump's Access Hollywood tape was harmless because first, it happened 'behind closed doors' and second, it was just an example of male bonding.

While Milo acknowledges the existence of effeminate men, he seems to be viewing the world through the assumption that there is one form of masculinity grounded in biology, and based on this, he talks about men as if they all shared the same identity. The word 'left' is pitted against 'men' who the demonised left, seek to control, which, having been associated with effeminate characteristics and feminism, can be considered gendered female.

Yiannopoulos offers ‘scientific basis’ to men’s ‘rough and tumble’ socialising by explaining that allowing men to ‘blow off steam’ decreases the likelihood of them becoming violent. This is based on a study (not referenced) which suggests that acting out violence in videogames actually reduces violence in real life situations. This proposed correlation implies that the ‘left’ and feminists are forcing men to become more violent and effeminate by not letting ‘men be men’.

The Nuclear Option: Man vs. The Clinton Machine

Experiential value

A ‘machine’ metaphor is used throughout the article to refer to Hillary Clinton. ‘The Clinton Machine’ or ‘C2016’ is compared against the two previous ‘versions’, ‘C2000’ and ‘C2008’. The fact that the ‘Clinton Machine’ was ‘crafted’ as female bears no significance and is a ‘political calculation’. This point is emphasised by suggesting that Hillary Clinton would ‘reassign itself as male’ if that would help her win the presidency. Dismissing Hillary Clinton as a woman is done by referring to her through a gender-neutral pronoun ‘it’. In addition to rendering her genderless, this choice of pronoun has a dehumanising effect. The significance of Hillary Clinton as the first woman to possibly become president of the US is downplayed by the sentence ‘the Machine wanted to take a hammer to the glass ceiling but her foot soldiers had another idea for that hammer’. ‘Glass ceiling’ is the metaphor used to describe the invisible barrier stopping women from achieving success in society. This sentence posits that Hillary Clinton does not make her own decisions is controlled by her ‘foot soldiers’, emphasising yet again her lack of free will necessary for an American leader. The author claims that no doctor has confirmed the ‘actual gender’ of the ‘Machine’. This statement is a segue to the topic of Hillary Clinton’s health which was under scrutiny for several months. She – again as gender-neutral ‘it’ – is described to have ‘short-circuited disastrously’ and hoisted ‘feet first’ into the ‘campaign ambulance’ by ‘handlers’. The event in question is

Hillary Clinton fainting at the 9/11 memorial service and being taken to her daughter's apartment nearby. She was later revealed to have had pneumonia.

Relational value

Hillary Clinton's marriage to Bill Clinton is described as follows: 'sometimes very bad machines marry humans who are accused rapists.' Depicting Bill Clinton as a rapist has been a prominent discourse in Breitbart regardless which is intended to draw attention away from Donald Trump's scandals regardless of the fact that there are no credible rape accusations against Bill Clinton. This creates an ambiguous timeline of Bill Clinton's sex scandals by implying that Hillary Clinton knew about them before marrying him, thus, passing judgement on her *moral essence*. 'Mr. Trump' (formal) invited one of the women involved in an alleged sex scandal with Bill Clinton to watch the debate and 'root against' the 'Machine'. In such a rhetoric, the social relationship represented is Hillary Clinton as her husband's accomplice, if not enabler.

Expressive value

The article describes the first presidential debate as Donald Trump the 'man' and 'real estate mogul against the 'Clinton Machine' stepping into 'the political' ring (sports metaphor implying the debate was physical). Hillary Clinton is referred to as inhuman 'machine' throughout the article: 'the machine', 'very bad machine', 'C2016', 'C2000', 'C2008'. Words used together with the 'Clinton Machine' include 'most evolved', 'tinkering', 'latest version', 'work out the kinks', 'programmed and reprogrammed', 'finely tuned', 'calibrated', 'recalibrated', 'scientific wonder of algorithms and demographics', 'blew a fuse', 'robotic rigidity', 'short-circuited disastrously', 'it'. There are several instances of over-wording in that segment. Synonymy: 'most evolved' and 'latest version', 'calibrated' and 'finely tuned', 'blew a fuse' and 'short-circuited' (as 'malfunctioning'). Antonymy:

‘programmed’ and ‘reprogrammed’, ‘calibrated’ and ‘recalibrated’. The over-wording is intended to emphasise the ‘machine’ metaphor.

Dehumanising Hillary Clinton through a robot metaphor contrasts Donald Trump’s humanity and connection with voters. This classification scheme is indicative of the conservative discourse in which the political elite is distant from the common man. ‘Donald Trump the human’ possesses ‘free will’ and ‘says what he wants’. The word ‘Clintonworld’ is used to further establish Hillary Clinton as separate and different from ‘our world’ and her implied lack of free will and willingness to speak her mind are viewed as inauthenticity.

The confrontation between Trump and the ‘Machine’ is paralleled to John Henry – an American folk hero – versus the steam engine and Garry Kasparov versus the chess machine named Deep Blue. Both men are described as ‘heroes’ alongside Trump. This is the tragic hero discourse. The article ends on an uncertain note on whether or not Trump would win.

The Nuclear Option: Media Elite Decry Trump’s Gettysburg Address as Dog Whistle to Racists, Here’s Why They’re Wrong

Experiential value

The author distinguishes ‘stupid media’ which might not know what ‘Gettysburg’ means. This implies the existence of a ‘smart media’ which is not mentioned explicitly but which is implicitly associated with Breitbart. He sarcastically describes what the ‘stupid media’ thinks the Civil War was about (one side fighting to maintain slavery, one side for the freedom of slaves) and then proceeds to describe some of the events of the war – ‘deadliest war America ever had’ – from the side of the ‘South’. Pickett’s charge was led by Gen. Armistead described as the ‘tip of the spear’. The charge – culmination of the battle of Gettysburg – was a ‘complete and disastrous failure’ that the ‘South never recovered from’.

Over-wording occurs with ‘complete’ and ‘disastrous’ which do not add meaning variety and function as synonyms.

The author aligns Donald Trump with Lincoln, rather than the South, invalidating the media’s claims of racism against Trump. This classification scheme attempts to distance Trump from the racism associated with the American South. Trump is said to be seeking the same kind of ‘dramatic and decisive turnaround’ as Lincoln. Lincoln’s ‘turnaround’ was freeing the slaves and saving the Union. The parallel with Trump implies that the ‘white southerners’, identified as an unfairly termed racist demographic earlier, are in a similar position and require freeing and America requires saving. From the perspective of this article which seeks to establish that the Civil War was not fought over slavery (but never specifies the real reason), it follows that Trump would unite the warring sides. In today’s context this would mean the political left and right.

Relational value

The article proposes a close relationship between the media and the political elite, who are accusing Donald Trump of being racist. The reaction of the ‘elite media’ is exaggerated through over-wording instances such as Trump’s ‘true inner racist self’. ‘True’ and ‘inner’ do not add meaning to this phrase and ‘self’ and ‘inner’ are also filling the same semantic purpose. The author uses the term ‘racist’ sarcastically to demonstrate how Trump – who is identified as a ‘loud Yankee’ – is not racist.

Expressive value

The author describes the demographic of ‘white southerners’ as a victim of a ‘blind and belligerent’ government ‘failing’ them. They are ‘out of work’ and ‘under invasion’, phrases which illustrate the ‘war against white males’ discourse in which immigrants are privileged and taking the jobs of the whites who for some reason are inferior. The same demographic is sarcastically referred to as ‘evil racist white men’ who are up against ‘great noblemen with

unblemished hearts'. This is the common man versus the elite discourse. Over-wording occurs with 'great' and 'noblemen' (hyponymy: 'nobleman' already implies 'greatness') and 'evil' and 'racist' (hyponymy as 'racist' already contains 'evil').

Trump's presidential run is described as a hill 'every bit as steep as Cemetery Ridge' with the 'phalanx of enemy troops' as 'in media and in politics' are 'every bit as formidable'. Describing his candidacy through historical war metaphors enforces his role as a national hero. Trump's plans to 'drain the swamp' and prosecute Hillary Clinton might not succeed in the light of 'universal' media hatred. On a positive note, if America survived the Civil War, it will survive 'this' which suggests the current situation is worse than what was described earlier as the 'deadliest war' in America.

The author describes the continuation of the war until Lincoln found General Ulysses S. Grant, described as 'coarse', 'brash', 'impolitic', 'aggressive', 'brute', 'drunkard', 'unsophisticated' and 'not pretty'. This is over-wording as 'coarse', 'brash', 'brute' are synonyms. These characteristics align with the discourse of *common man* contrasted with the elite 'gasping in horror' over Lincoln's pick. He ended up saving the Union and a parallel to Trump is being created. In this view, the characteristics necessary to save America are not sophistication (antonym of 'unsophisticated' and 'impolitic'), politeness or manners (antonyms of 'brute', 'brash', 'coarse') but aggression and the type of traditional common man masculinity expressed through these adjectives.

EXCLUSIVE – Linda Tripp Exposes Hillary's Temperament: Threw Hard Objects, Endless Screaming, Profanity, Paranoia

Discourses: *deviant woman, dangerous woman, common man, effeminate man*

Experiential value

Linda Tripp, a former White House staffer, established her credibility by locating her workspace as being 'right outside' Bill Clinton's office, having worked on the Lewinsky

scandal ('collecting evidence') and getting a 'peek behind the Clinton curtain' (referencing Churchill's Iron Curtain, equating the Clintons' alleged marriage problems with the Soviet regime). She is in the position of an informant confirming 'long-reported accounts' of Hillary Clinton's violent behaviour: 'throwing hard objects' at Bill Clinton.

She assumes a common ground with the readers by establishing that 'you've all heard of these rumours. Although she is said to confirm the accounts of violence, she states that nobody saw the throwing, but that the 'results' were visible on 'the president's face'. Referring to Bill Clinton as 'president' in this context illustrates Hillary Clinton's lack of respect for the institution. The very notion of Bill Clinton walking around with bruises on his face after being beaten by his wife is emasculating, implying the effeminate man discourse.

Tripp takes the *strict father morality* position on a person's character by claiming that 'past portends the future' and suggests that Hillary Clinton lacks *moral essence*. Her ambition is evident by the claim that right after Bill Clinton's inauguration, people chanted 'eight years for Bill, eight years for Hill' despite Hillary Clinton's claim that she was not sure she would ever run for president. The implication is that she always knew and so did everybody else. Tripp suggests Hillary Clinton's whole career (belittled here as 'the senate thing') was a plan to 'punch her ticket' to become president.

Tripp emphasises her role as a credible source of information on the 'Clinton scandal machine' by stressing that she worked under G.H.W. Bush and claiming to have witnessed 'Travelgate', 'filegate', 'Whitewater', and 'Vince Foster's death'. The scandals are described in as natural disasters: 'the scandal rocked the Bill Clinton administration' like a storm. The natural disaster metaphor adds to the gravity of the situations.

Relational value

The relationship between Hillary Clinton and the White House staff is described as volatile. Hillary Clinton's temperament is described as inciting fear in her staff who were 'cowering' in her presence. Hillary Clinton's relationship with her voters was one of self-interest: she had 'zero concern for the masses' and 'the voting block was a necessary evil'. Describing her supporters as a 'block' has a dehumanising effect. Tripp's emphasises the divide between Hillary Clinton and the common man by explaining that people who are 'working, taking care of kids, paying bills' fail to notice such a reality. Another example of pitting the common man against Hillary Clinton occurs when Tripp describes a former staffer from the Bush administration who was so honoured to be working at the White House that he 'pinched himself every day as he entered. Tripp wishes to emphasise this aspect by using synonyms like 'respect', 'honour' and 'reverence'. This sets Hillary Clinton apart from people with genuine respect and reverence for the institution.

Expressive value

Tripp refers to Hillary Clinton formally as 'First Lady', a choice of title to emphasise the importance of the position she held at the time of the alleged events as well as to emphasise the gendered notions carried by the word 'Lady', the female version of 'gentleman'. Tripp refers to her as 'First Lady' throughout the article as a mark of her respect to the institution. This contrasts Hillary Clinton's lack of respect for the institution as well as her transgression of the gender norms associated with the role of First Lady. This clashes with the description of Hillary Clinton's 'temperament' and behaviour and Tripp admits that it is 'hard' for her to refer to her as 'First Lady'.

Hillary Clinton is characterised by over-wording in phrases like 'endless screaming' (repeated twice) 'significant temperament issues', 'constant use of profanity' (repeated twice), 'complete vulgar profanity' (synonymy: 'profanity' is 'vulgar') 'disdain for U.S. electorate and the presidency' 'coarse' and 'profane' (repetition as well as synonymy), 'no

moral compass' and 'ethical bankruptcy' (synonymy), 'vast wealth', 'complete willingness to manipulate', 'total political power', 'completely different human being', 'fearsome', 'paranoid', 'commingling' and 'above the law' (hyponymy: 'commingling' goes under 'above the law'). Her actions are described as 'hurling objects', 'besmirching women', 'perjury', 'obstruction of justice', hiding documents', 'abusing', and 'stacking the deck' (metaphor of cheating in a game). These constitute the *deviant woman* discourse as well as *dangerous woman* discourse which resonate with the 2016 campaign focusing largely on her e-mail scandal and the FBI investigation into it. Tripp's account of her 'real' personality is presented as evidence of Hillary Clinton's deceptiveness and immorality, as it points to a 'smoke and mirrors act' in which she deceives the voters. More specifically, Tripp's description of her as having no respect for the 'presidency' and as feeling 'entitled' to her position suggests her unsuitability for the position. Her 'hatred for Republicans' and 'contempt for the military' further emphasise that she is not only unsuitable for it but also does not deserve the position. The classification scheme in which Hillary Clinton hates Republicans, opposes the military and disrespects the highest office in government positions Tripp as Republican and Hillary Clinton as Democratic.

Ann Coulter: Our New Country — Women and Minorities Hit Hardest

Discourses: *Nurturing parent and strict father, dangerous woman, emasculated man, common man, evil woman, white masculinity under attack*

Experiential value

Coulter points to a problem of 'white' voters who 'sat out' the election in 2012 because they did not want to vote for an 'out of touch rich guy' Mitt Romney. This establishes the *common man* discourse in which the elite is distant, rich and not a good choice for the common man. Now, the 'out of touch rich guy' will vote for 'Hillary' (informal throughout) because Trump is described as 'tacky and gross'. This classification scheme suggests that the 'whites' who

did not vote for Romney ‘sat out’ the election and did not vote for Obama either. This positions them as Republicans, indicating the ideological position of the author.

Gender norms are strongly correlated with cultural background. The author creates false associations by claiming that ‘Latino culture’ is accepting of ‘incest and child rape’ and sees ‘women as subordinate to men’. Although conservative discourse also usually stresses the secondary status of women, in order to stigmatise Latino immigrants, Coulter presents herself as a defender of women’s rights. This is evidenced by the alleged fact that ‘Hispanics and Latinos are more likely than any other racial or ethnic groups to blame the victim’ as well as the examples of crimes committed by immigrants.

Relational value

In this article, social relationships are determined by race and gender. The first relationship represented is the one between ethnic groups and the Democratic party (‘every ethnic group except whites vote for Democrats’). Associating immigrants with the Democratic party is part of the conservative classification scheme that also seeks to disidentify the white voters with the party. This is done by stating that the Democrats have brought in 30-40 million ‘non-white immigrants.’ Here once again the common man discourse is used to explain that the only people benefiting from this ‘new country’ established with all these immigrants are the ‘top 0.1 % white plutocrats’ and the rest – collective ‘us’ – are ‘servants.’ Worst off will be the working class and middle class (‘who will soon be working class’), women, minorities, children, elderly who are identified as ‘the weakest and the most vulnerable’, implying that they would benefit from a government based on the *strict father morality* which protects the weak.

Coulter claims that Latino culture’s failings (exaggerated examples like ‘child rape’) are justified by cultural background. An example of this is the supposed training American police receive on how to ‘keep an open mind about child rape’ because it is a

‘cultural thing’. This describes immigrants with a Latino background not simply as sexual predators but as paedophiles who have successfully emasculated the American law enforcement. ‘Our media’ is also depicted as having a ‘totally open mind’ about incest, rape and murder ‘when it is committed by immigrants’.

Coulter gives an example about why the media and society should talk about the danger that ‘illegal aliens’ pose. Media and the police are criticised for not warning the residents of a building about the danger of ‘illegal immigrants’ after a young girl was ‘gang-raped’. The situation, described in this way, is seemingly ridiculous: immigrants commit horrific crimes while the media and the police turn a blind eye. A contradiction emerges when Coulter claims that the immigrants who come to America are glad to escape cultures where rape, incest and ‘spousal murder’ is acceptable only to discover that those crimes are acceptable for immigrants in America. So, on one hand, the immigrants who want to escape criminal behaviour come to America and suddenly start engaging in the same criminal behaviour.

Gender factors can also be seen clearly when Coulter describes a Chinese immigrant receiving a lenient punishment for murdering his wife because of respect for his ‘traditional values about adultery and loss of manhood’. In demonstrating how other cultures perform masculinity, the author seeks to prove that the masculinity of the white male should be given similar respect, even if it means gender discriminatory behaviour. Coulter seeks to show that immigrants have privileges in America. This strategy is also combined with gender, for example in the description of a ‘female’ head of the Asian-American legal defence and education fund who allegedly ‘applauded’ the ruling. This makes women with immigrant backgrounds complicit in the sexist tendencies of their cultures and demonstrates the author’s underlying point about white men being judged more harshly in society.

Expressive value

Coulter uses images to describe multiculturalism: one does not only get ethnic foods ('empanadas') but also '40-year-old men raping their nieces'. The characteristics of immigrants are not an 'a la carte menu' and 'we' get everything 'we import' – a dehumanising verb used to transport goods for trade, further emphasising the Democrats' self-interest in bringing in immigrants. Another metaphor for describing immigrants coming to America is 'flowing'. Describing a social phenomenon as a natural disaster triggers a fear response.

Women's role in this is further amplified by stating that 'Hillary's foreign policy success' has resulted in 'Muslim rapists' in America. Coulter implies the press is 'desperate' to connect the crimes of immigrants to 'white American men'. The 'real problem', Coulter writes sarcastically, is the 'American bosses and colleagues' and not the 'Muslim rapists' or Islam. This intends to put into perspective the increased focus on sexual harassment in the workplace which in this article, in comparison to 'Muslim rapists', is depicted as ridiculous. 'American women' are about to discover that 'they never had it so good' which implies an impending worsening of the situation for women.

Coulter predicts that 'our country' will become 'Zimbabwe' with Democrats acting as 'Mugabe' – this is 'Hillary's (informal) plan'. Depicting Hillary Clinton as embodiment of a murderous socialist tyrant who rigged elections helps create the *dangerous woman* discourse.

Donald Trump, a Good Sport from Way Back

Experiential value

Discourses: *common man, strict father morality, devious woman,*

The author starts by describing Donald Trump's character through various encounters he has had with him. Upon encountering Donald Trump at a sports game and having the 'billionaire businessman' move him and his grandfather to the front seats, he expresses admiration for

his kindness. He emphasises the difference between himself and Donald Trump when he describes another incident where Trump hangs up his phone – something the author points out not many people had at the time – to talk to the author and his friends: ‘us’ and ‘yes, us’. Donald Trump’s character is described by ‘kindness that shined through’ and as possessing ‘great warmth’, ‘genuinely friendly’, ‘good man’ and ‘always been amazing’. These are all positive synonyms which emphasise this depiction of his character.

Relational value

The main social relationship described in this text is the one between the author and Donald Trump. The author expresses great respect for Trump who is described as having been very kind to the author on numerous occasions, despite his status and wealth. The relationship is considered paternal in the sense that the author describes encountering Trump several times while growing up and admiring him. Trump inviting the author and his friends to a tent reserved for his relative also signals this. This relationship is later generalised into the common man vs elite in which Trump, although clearly part of the elite, is still a common man. The other major relationship described in the text is the alliance between Hillary Clinton and the media.

Expressive value

Trump’s difference from the common man is emphasised by his popularity (‘his face was in every home’), his possessions (the phone) and his private tent at a golf course having plates and forks that ‘were not plastic of course’. This establishes him as part of the elite but the author’s emphasis on his associating with the common man as well as his interests (attending sporting events) also establishes him as a ‘blue-collar billionaire’. He is described to demonstrate ‘normalness’ just like a ‘construction worker, bus driver and the police officer’.

This connection with the common man is contrasted with ‘unlike those who need a teleprompter’ and ‘pretend’, Trump is not a ‘phony’ and ‘keeps it real’. Ideological

classification is stated outright when the author says he is proud to have supported Trump from the very ‘first day’. The author’s use of the collective ‘we’ now extends to the American people when he says Trump is the best ‘man’ for ‘our’ security, ‘our’ economy, ‘our’ children and ‘our’ country. The repetition strengthens the connection with the reader.

The antagonists are the Clinton campaign – ‘Trump haters’, ‘Never Trumpers’, ‘Phony Republicans’, ‘the media’ – and their ‘smearing’ and ‘painting’ of a ‘false narrative’ and ‘lying at every turn’. These phrases are instances of the conservative classification scheme in which all opponents of Trump are grouped together, even ‘phony’ Republicans which implies that real Republicans support Trump. ‘Never Trumpers’ and ‘Trump haters’ is an instance of over-wording.

Hillary Clinton is described as attempting to ‘tear down’ Trump’s character (he will be called ‘disgusting things’) – ‘attacks will be fired’ and Trump will be ‘made into a monster’. The phrasal verb ‘tear down’ portrays Trump as monumental. This is part of the *devious woman* discourse in which Hillary Clinton, with the media and other allies backing her, is going after the candidate who, in this discourse, is described as the hero of the *common man*.

The author addresses the controversy of the ‘ridiculous’ Access Hollywood tape and uses victim-perpetrator reversal to point out that this was a secret recording of a ‘private conversation’. This places the media and the Democrats in the wrong by suggesting that the wrongdoing was the recording and publishing of a private conversation, not the content of the conversation in question. The author repeats his position on Trump’s character through over-wording with phrases like ‘good guy’, ‘great man’ and ‘good sport’.

My Final Argument for Trump: Humiliate the Media!

Experiential value

Discourses: *nurturing parent and strict father morality, devious woman, promiscuous woman, lying woman, effeminate man, dangerous woman*

Coulter's belief is that regardless of what is said of Donald Trump (mainly on the topic of his sexual harassment allegations), 'Hillary' (used informally throughout) is worse. This statement is illustrated through a series of examples of people from the entertainment industry who Hillary Clinton has appeared together with. The examples include Beyonce (Coulter quotes her lyrics 'curvalicious, p*ssy served delicious'), Madonna (offered to give 'blow jobs for anyone who votes for Hillary') and Miley Cyrus ('regularly invites men in the audience to grab her p*ssy'). These examples serve to emphasise Hillary Clinton's hypocrisy in criticising Trump and attempt to frame Trump's words 'You can grab them by the p*ssy' on the same level as song lyrics or performances. Coulter's argument is that if women can express themselves provocatively, men cannot be judged for reacting to the provocations and that society is being unfair in expressing outrage over Trump but not pop culture. The author states that it would be safer to give the nuclear codes to Miley Cyrus unless she 'kept them in her p*ssy'. The author's position is that women in the entertainment industry are sexually promiscuous and that their performance on stage can be extended to attest to their behaviour off stage.

The allegations against Trump are further invalidated by claiming that all the media's 'investigation' managed to find on Trump was that he, 'a bachelor', 'complimented' a woman in a bikini and ended up 'dating her' afterwards. And yet, there is not 'one female Democrat' (conservative classification scheme) who does not claim to have been 'groped' by Trump. These claims are framed as attempts to get 'loads of fawning publicity' which makes the author's position of sexual harassment clear: women are using gender to receive attention from the media.

Relational value

The author presents a social relationship between Hillary Clinton and the evil ‘ruling class’ (who wants ‘bad things’ for America) and Hillary Clinton and the media, one of cooperation. Media is described as in the position of attacking Donald Trump in order to facilitate a win for Hillary Clinton. The example Coulter gives is the Access Hollywood tape coverage in the media. First, she establishes that the tape was ‘secretly recorded’ which makes her view on the matter clear – the media engaged in deception. Second, she points that Hillary Clinton, whom she sarcastically labels a ‘born-again Victorian virgin’, is in fact hypocritical in judging Trump for what was said on the tape as if she herself has never done anything wrong. In addition to pop stars, Hillary Clinton’s husband is also reported to have discussed ‘p*ssy’ with Vernon Jordan.

Bill Clinton is referred to informally as ‘Hillary’s husband’ to emphasise the connection with Hillary Clinton and Bill Clinton’s scandals or ‘serial predations’, to make her complicit. Bill Clinton is established as a ‘groper’, ‘pants-dropper’ and ‘well-established rapist’ and Hillary Clinton as ‘his fixer’. Because there are no actual credible rape allegations against Bill Clinton, the author counters this with over-wording in the case of ‘well-established rapist’. Hillary Clinton as partially responsible for Bill Clinton’s actions fits in the *dangerous woman* discourse as well as the *effeminate man* discourse in which the dominating woman pushes the man around, fixes his problems as if he were a child. Both are interlinked given that the latter implies that the woman is dangerous as she covers up for criminal activity of a man who cannot do so for himself. Coulter sarcastically couples these examples with ‘Trump is a sexual predator’ to the effect that this statement appears ridiculous next to the ‘serial predations’ of the Clintons.

Another social relationship is established – between Hillary Clinton and the elderly, retirees and working-class Americans. The relationship is characterised as ‘money-hungry’ Hillary Clinton ‘scheming and scamming’ these people. The phrase ‘money-hungry’ in the

case of Hillary Clinton – an established wealthy person – implies a pathological drive for power and greed for more wealth even after having already achieved both. She is framed as a woman blinded by ambition but also as unfit for political office.

Furthermore, the *strict father morality* principle of *guilt by association* as well as *moral purity* dictates that any association with guilty people reflects the poor *moral essence* of people. This is evidenced by blaming Hillary Clinton for her husband's scandals as well as judging her moral character based on her association with pop stars who produce sexually loaded content.

Coulter also expresses her views on 'single mothers' with immigrant backgrounds within the framework of *nurturing parent* model. The vocabulary once again suggests a conservative classification scheme. They are described as having 'no marketable job skills' and it is therefore 'stupid' to bring them in because they only add to the 'dependent class' and their ('Alicia Machado's') only job skill is voting. This establishes a social relationship between the Democrats and immigrant women. Hillary Clinton described as getting 'another vote' while 'you' and 'America' will have to support 'Machado and her anchor baby' for the rest of their lives, suggesting a relationship characterised by financial obligation between the reader and the immigrant women. The metaphor of 'anchor baby' describes the law under which any baby born in the U.S. is granted American citizenship. This suggests women are having babies to gain access to better conditions, thus using their gender to get ahead. Alicia Machado, a former Miss Universe, campaigned with Clinton and talked about her experience with Donald Trump who she claims 'fat-shamed' her. To contextualise this, Machado is described to have been grateful to Trump for having been pushed to lose weight. But because she was not currently expressing gratitude but rather speaking out against Trump, Coulter characterises her as a 'publicity-seeking clown', detracting from her credibility further by

identifying her as the ‘baby mama’ of a drug cartel ‘kingpin’, again emphasising the *guilt by association* model.

Expressive value

The discussion on foreign policy frames Hillary Clinton’s ‘temperament’ as a defining characteristic of her policies. She is described as ‘deeply evil’ and waking up early every morning to make sure she does something wrong for America. ‘Libya’ is labelled ‘Hillary’s baby’, invoking the *nurturing parent model* in which the government provides care for the people but in Coulter’s example, this ends badly as the Libyan civil war breaks out. The result of her actions based on this model also led to Benghazi and a refugee crisis. From this, the author moves to describing some of the criticisms of the Republicans.

The first instance is to make light of David Duke (famous white supremacist) who, according to Coulter, ‘nobody knows if he actually exists’ or is just a ‘phantom produced by the media’. This exaggeration attempts to trivialise the unmentioned issue of white supremacy. The author also points out that Duke’s speeches have not led anybody to commit murder while Al Sharpton (American civil rights activist) as his equivalent on the political left, has inspired ‘9 deaths’ with his rhetoric. The purpose of this comparison is to draw attention to the fact that Hillary Clinton has not disavowed Sharpton, the father of the Orlando nightclub shooter or the mother of the ‘Ferguson thug’ both of whom she is said to have campaigned with. These outrageous associations are not in any way corroborated. The guilt by association is again emphasised by suggesting the media ask Hillary Clinton whether she ‘approved of their parenting techniques’ which are implied to have contributed to the crimes committed. This is responding to criticisms on Trump not wanting to disavow David Duke.

The racism of Donald Trump is framed as simply wanting to ‘remove’ criminals (‘drug dealers, rapists, jihadists’) from ‘our country’. Because those words do not actually

denote race or ethnicity, he is not racist. This rhetoric fits the conservative classification scheme. The reason why they are committing crime in ‘our country’ is because, in the line of the *nurturing parent model*, ‘we’ sent them financial aid. Hillary Clinton in comparison to Trump is depicted as genuinely racist because she asks for ‘blacks’ to vote for her but ‘brings in’ millions of Muslims and Mexicans’ who ‘take their jobs’. Beneath this, there is an assumption that certain jobs belong to Americans alone and describing the process of immigrants acquiring jobs as ‘taking’ implies already existing ownership. Donald Trump is thus framed as simply protecting ‘our’ country and the people, minorities included, in it as depicted in the *strict father morality* by being tough in his foreign policy views.

Ann Coulter: Hillary’s Advantage: the Media; Trump’s Advantage: the Issues

Experiential value

Discourses: *common man vs elite, devious woman, white masculinity under attack*

The premise of this article is that the only reason the media is focusing on Trump’s ‘groping’ and ‘fat-shaming’ is because Trump’s policy specifics are so clear and popular. The author describes the media as having an ‘interest in sex’ depending who the perpetrator is (‘uninterested’ in Clinton’s scandals). The classification scheme within this article is conservative as expressed through the relationship described between the ‘ruling class’ and the ‘lecturing elite’ and the ‘American people.’

Relational value

This marks the interest in covering Trump’s scandals as insincere and not in the interest of the victims. A strong social relationship between the media and liberal politicians is established. Trump is presented as the opponent of both the media and the Democrats. As evidence of this, the author gives the example of a false accusation against the Duke Lacrosse Team who hired a ‘couple of black strippers’ and were later accused of ‘gang-rape’. The author uses sarcasm to suggest the media was eager to use the ethnic background of the

strippers in order to emphasise the ‘centuries of entitlement’ white males have had. The social relationship emphasised here is a racial one: Coulter wants to stress to her readers that in mainstream media crimes committed by whites against blacks are worse than if the victims had been white as well, making one race privileged against the other.

The author suggests that the media’s bias in favour of the Democrats is evident in the case of U.S senator John Edwards who ‘cheated on his dying wife’ while ‘running for president’ and lying to the ‘American people’ about it while paying his ‘mistress’ with campaign funds, all the while ‘lecturing’ the collective ‘us’ about morality. The social relationship presented here is the relationship between the American people and the elite. The use of the word ‘lecturing’ emphasises the difference between ‘American people’ and the senator who, despite engaging in immoral behaviour, holds a superior intellectual position in society (as part of the elite). This relationship is also characterised by inequality, going against the *moral order* of the *strict father model* and is later repeated by the mentioning of ‘the ruling class’ and the ‘political class’ attempting to distract the ‘American public’ and the ‘voters.’

Another social relationship in the article is between men as ‘frat boys’ and women like ‘the Mattress Girl’. This is the case of Emma Sulkowicz who carried around a mattress on University of Columbus campus to make a statement about sexual harassment on campus after ‘claiming’ to have been raped. The rape is depicted as ridiculous based on text messages between the rapist and the victim (which include ‘F*ck me in the butt’ and ‘I love youuu’). The relationship in question here is one where instances of expressing interest, both sexual and loving, means that men can expect consensual sex from a woman at any time. It is inconceivable that the woman should at some point refuse. The author is essentially describing a social contract between a man and a woman. It is clear from the use of sarcasm

that the author does not consider the rape allegations valid precisely because there is evidence that at some point, the woman was interested in her attacker.

The author points to the lack of action taken by the university to help the victim of a ‘brutal rape’ as evidence of the falseness of her claim. To illustrate this point, the author gives examples like changing mascots if ‘some feminist yelps’ and cancelling ‘traditional celebrations’ (hazing) to argue that feminists are in a power position and the university administration seeks to please them. The use of the verb ‘yelps’ in the context of women expressing opinions is degrading and dehumanising.

The social relationship between the media and the Democrats is emphasised through repetition: ‘Bill Clinton’s serial sexual assaults’ and ‘Kennedys’ family whoring’. The phrase ‘family whoring’ is particularly grotesque as it combines two words that are virtual opposites. The author establishes Trump as a ‘rich celebrity’ for the last 40 years and suggests that if he really were guilty of ‘any sexual impropriety’, the accusations would have emerged earlier. In this statement, the author reveals that she too is only interested in sex scandals if they pertain to one political party. She does not acknowledge that accusing public figures of sexual assault was harder in the past. In contrast, Trump has ‘denied the allegations’ and the author presents this as reasonable cause to expect the media to issue a ‘correction’. In the case of Trump, accusations are called allegations, while in the case of all other instances she uses no qualifications. This is an example of the author unintentionally representing a social relationship: the credibility of men and women in society is different, particularly among the political left and right.

Foucauldian Framework

The gender discourse in which Democrats are a nurturing parent and Republicans as a strict father is prevalent throughout the selected articles. Examples of this were found in

each article and the issues framed through these two metaphors included welfare (as a deterrent of gender quality), education (as a mechanism to destroy the existing *moral order*), feminism (as threat to the *moral hierarchy* of masculine superiority) and equality (as already existing, given the equal access to the *ladder of success*), immigration (as an example of the *nanny state*), corruption (the concept of *moral essence* implying the immutability of a person's character), government regulations (as interfering with the *moral order*), foreign policy (president as obligated to protect his people). Given that the premise of these gendered metaphors is that hierarchies within society are natural as well as moral, it is evident that the rhetoric presented in Breitbart articles seeks to uphold a certain hierarchy. As could be seen above, attempts to shake the hierarchy, by example, by adding women to top positions, are seen as intrusions in the natural order and emphatically pathologized.

The way in which one *regime of truth* presents the knowledge within that regime as truthful and the knowledge outside the regime as false is an instance of 'discursive policing' in which the opposite side is attacked and invalidated (Foucault 1972: 224). Within the articles analysed in this thesis, this is practiced through gender discourses. The use of gender discourses in recreating and maintaining the regime of truth suggests that for policy issues like immigration or welfare to be depicted in gendered terms, the *regime of truth* must itself contain fixed ideas about gender and not just the policy in question. In this view, not only is Breitbart presenting an ideologically distinct worldview on politics but also, as identified based on linguistic choices in the articles, a distinct view on gender.

While some views on gender were expressed directly (the superiority of men over women as creators of civilization), some were not. Fairclough emphasises that in addition to analysing what is said, what is not said is also important (Fairclough 1989). Examples of expressing views on gender while addressing a policy include the framing of education as the enemy of traditional masculinity (as represented by non-college educated white males).

The 'educated elite' is described as 'denigrating' that masculinity, attempting to 'neuter' boys. In such a view, the enemy cannot be masculine and must therefore be either female or an effeminate man and if the enemy is female, negative attitudes towards females are formed. This is evident in the depiction of Hillary Clinton as 'evil', feminism as waging a war on 'white males', and women and single mothers as burdens for the taxpayer.

It is unlikely that Democratic female political candidates fare well within this *regime of truth* which indicates that gender discourses are an effective and productive way of favouring one political candidate over another based on gender and the gendered conception of the Democratic party. The gendered rhetoric in Breitbart articles supports Lakoff's claim that the human conceptual system is consistently metaphorical. This is significant too because in accepting that one political party has authority in certain areas (foreign policy, economics) and the other does not, the process that occurs is the rarefaction of a subject which means that not everyone can speak authoritatively on a subject. This is one technique of upholding a *regime of truth* (Mills 2003: 61).

For such a *regime of truth* to maintain a position of relevance in society, it must convince and not coerce people to accept it as truth. Foucault (1980: 235) claims that in order for the subject to be able to accept something as truth, they must possess the categories necessary to think something is true and adequate language for formulating positions. This means that the subject's mental categories – a metaphorical conceptual system for instance – enable them to accept the knowledge presented as truth. This also means that there must exist a specific type of rhetoric. The text analysis shows that the authors of the articles are aware of the mental categories of the demographic and are using them linguistically. This is the persuasiveness of power – how a *regime of truth* convinces people to take up the position of subject within one specific regime. This means that the demographic is actively constructed through a set of practices and techniques (Foucault 1980: 282). The

subjectivation process is two-fold: the *de-subjection* happens when the demographic of the non-college educated white male rejects the mechanisms of power of a previous regime of truth. For this demographic, this means rejecting the value of education in getting ahead in society, the notion of their gender identity labelled as toxic masculinity, and the value system under which women, immigrants, sexual minorities are equal with men. The second stage of the process of *subjectivation* is a *creative moment* which constitutes adopting a different form of subjectivity and accepting a different *regime of truth*.

For the demographic of the non-college educated white males, this means a regime which, for the continuation of its existence, encourages the view that the reasons why this demographic is falling behind in society is the Democrats consistently focusing on the issues of minorities and not the ‘American people’ (in the articles, this term usually denotes white males as it is contrasted with the interests of women or minorities). This explains why the demographic which suffers the most through the policies of the Republican party (tax cuts for wealthy, support for corporations, cutting of healthcare), remains loyal and continues to vote for those policies. The functioning of governmental mechanisms of power rely on the subject’s freedom to choose and it is therefore crucial to produce discourses that conceal this freedom from the subjects (Lorenzini 2016: 73).

This is evident in how hierarchy is emphasised as natural and as the basis of the views represented in right-wing discourse. If something is natural, it cannot be contested and any argument against the existing hierarchy is ridiculed as ‘science-denying’ (Yiannopoulos 2016). The articles analysed all demonstrate the attempt to frame gender differences as natural, transgressing existing gender norms as unnatural, and the class system in America as natural.

CONCLUSION

The aim of this thesis was to identify the dominant gender discourses in the right-wing media outlet Breitbart during the last three months before the 2016. U.S. presidential election. Donald Trump was particularly popular among the demographic of non-college educated white males. Research suggests there are several reasons for this. According to Schaffner (2017), this demographic has been gravitating towards Republican candidates since 2000 and that there is a correlation between the level education and views on women and groups with different ethnic background. The analysis supported this position as gender was used to create negative perceptions of political issues (e. g. immigration, inequality) as well as enforce existing gender norms through the circulation of gender discourses.

The theoretical framework provided insight into the historical, sociological and psychological foundations of gender discourses within the right-wing rhetoric represented in Breitbart. This chapter also described the situation of female politicians in society, exemplified by Hillary Clinton, and the populist rhetoric of Donald Trump. It addressed the issues associated with this type of masculinity – historically pitted against the elite, creating scepticism towards education, and the external validation of masculine identity which entails insecurity in the societal position of this demographic.

The empirical chapter contained the analysis of the 14 articles from Breitbart through Fairclough's method of CDA and a broader analysis of the social practice of gender discourses using Foucault's framework of regimes of *truth* and *subjectivation*. The analysis found that the gender discourses described in the theoretical chapter were present in the articles analysed and that gender discourses are used as a method to maintain a *regime of truth*. The subjectivation process of the non-college educated white male demographic was shown to support the *regime of truth* with which it was associated.

The historical gender discourses of *common man* and *self-made man* were used throughout the articles analysed. Lakoff's metaphorical division of the *nurturing parent* and the *strict father* models which correspond with the two major political parties in the U.S. – the Democrats and the Republicans, also corresponded to the gender discourses associated with either party in Breitbart's rhetoric. Political issues were shown to be divided on the lines of gender: healthcare, education and welfare associated with the Democrats and foreign policy, national security and economy associated with the Republicans. This determines who can speak authoritatively about certain political issues and is therefore highly relevant in the context of political campaigns. Hillary Clinton and the Democrats were routinely depicted as dangerously incompetent in foreign policy, immigration and national security while also criticised for their approach to education, welfare and equality. The Republicans were depicted as protectors of women (and minorities), tough on crime and immigration and as a better choice for the *common man*.

This thesis demonstrates the relevance of gender discourses in political media coverage and illustrates the need for such analysis because as demonstrated in the analysis, the subjects of a *regime of truth* are not aware of the regime they are reproducing. This provides insight into how and which discourses become and remain dominant in a regime and this is important as it reveals the mechanisms through which power operates in society. These findings also suggest a difference in how female political candidates are perceived and depicted in the media. This is relevant because it might disadvantage a political party, or its candidate based on gender. The coverage of Hillary Clinton in Breitbart articles illustrated that tendency in practice. This analysis proves that gender discourses were used to reproduce norms and knowledge associated with the right-wing conceptual system.

Even though two years have passed since election day 2016, the topic remains controversial and discourses of gender and race remain relevant. This thesis can provide

useful insights into current and future political discourse. Given that many Western countries have recently witnessed considerable support for populist right-wing parties, it is important to understand why these political shifts have taken place and what can be done to improve the condition of the people that are more susceptible to populism.

REFERENCES

Primary Resources

- Berry, Susan. 2016. Feminist Camille Paglia on Hillary Clinton: ‘The Woman Is a Disaster’. Breitbart. Available at <https://www.breitbart.com/politics/2016/10/28/feminist-camille-paglia-hillary-clinton-woman-disaster/>, accessed May the 20th, 2019.
- Boyle, Matthew. 2016. Exclusive — Gen. Mike Flynn: Hillary Clinton’s Email Setup Was ‘Unbelievable Active Criminal Behavior’. Breitbart. Available at <https://www.breitbart.com/politics/2016/11/06/exclusive-gen-mike-flynn-hillary-clintons-email-setup-was-unbelievable-active-criminal-behavior/>, accessed May the 20th, 2019.
- Coulter, Ann. 2016. Ann Coulter: Our New Country — Women and Minorities Hit Hardest. Breitbart. Available at <https://www.breitbart.com/politics/2016/10/26/ann-coulter-new-country-women-minorities-hit-hardest/>, accessed May the 20th, 2019.
- Coulter, Ann. 2016. Ann Coulter: My Final Argument for Trump: Humiliate the Media! Breitbart. Available at <https://www.breitbart.com/politics/2016/11/02/ann-coulter-final-argument-trump-humiliate-media/>, accessed May the 20th, 2019.
- Coulter, Ann. 2016. Ann Coulter: Hillary’s Advantage: the Media; Trump’s Advantage: the Issues. Breitbart. Available at <https://www.breitbart.com/politics/2016/10/20/ann-coulter-hillarys-advantage-media-trumps-advantage-issues/>, accessed May the 20th, 2019.
- Day, Sharon. 2016. Sharon Day: Rescind your Clinton Endorsement. Breitbart. Available at <https://www.breitbart.com/politics/2016/10/29/sharon-day-rescind-your-clinton-endorsement/>, accessed May the 20th, 2019.
- Hayward, John. 2016. Jack Abramoff: If Hillary Clinton Is Elected, She Will Have ‘Gotten Away with Selling Our Government for Hundreds of Millions of Dollars’. Breitbart. Available at <https://www.breitbart.com/radio/2016/10/14/jack-abramoff-if-hillary-clinton-elected-she-will-have-gotten-away-selling-government-hundreds-millions-dollars/>, accessed May the 20th, 2019.
- Hurt, Charles. 2016. The Nuclear Option — Wikileaks Reveals Even Hillary’s Own Staff Knows Truth: She’s Psychotic. Breitbart. Available at <https://www.breitbart.com/politics/2016/10/29/nuclear-option-wikileaks-reveals-even-hillarys-staff-knows-truth-shes-psychotic/>, accessed May the 20th, 2019.

- Hurt, Charles. 2016. The Nuclear Option: Man vs. The Clinton Machine. Breitbart. Available at <https://www.breitbart.com/politics/2016/09/26/nuclear-option-man-vs-clinton-machine/>, accessed May the 20th, 2019.
- Hurt, Charles. 2016. The Nuclear Option: Media Elite Decry Trump’s Gettysburg Address as Dog Whistle to Racists, Here’s Why They’re Wrong. Breitbart. Available at <https://www.breitbart.com/politics/2016/10/27/nuclear-option-media-elite-decry-trumps-gettysburg-address-dog-whistle-racists-heres-theyre-wrong/>, accessed May the 20th, 2019.
- Klein, Aaron. 2016. EXCLUSIVE – Linda Tripp Exposes Hillary’s Temperament: Threw Hard Objects, Endless Screaming, Profanity, Paranoia. Breitbart. Available at <https://www.breitbart.com/politics/2016/10/03/exclusive-linda-tripp-hillary-threw-hard-objects-bill-clinton/>, accessed May the 20th, 2019.
- Nash, Charlie. 2016. MILO: Lena Dunham Wants the ‘Extinction of White Men,’ While Hillary Plans to Import ISIS. Breitbart. Available at <https://www.breitbart.com/social-justice/2016/11/04/milo-lena-dunham-wants-extinction-of-white-men-hillary-wants-to-import-isis/>, accessed May the 20th, 2019.
- Scholla, Kevin. 2016. Donald Trump, a Good Sport from Way Back. Breitbart. Available at <https://www.breitbart.com/sports/2016/11/05/donald-trump-good-sport-way-back/>, accessed May the 20th, 2019.
- Yiannopoulos, Milo. 2016. FULL TEXT: Milo Defends Hazing, College Fraternities At Dartmouth. Breitbart. Available at <https://www.breitbart.com/social-justice/2016/11/01/full-text-milo-defends-hazing-college-fraternities-dartmouth/>, accessed May the 20th, 2019.

Secondary Resources

- Ahmed, Sara. 2004. *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- American Psychological Association. 2018. *APA Guidelines for Psychological Practice with Boys and Men*. Available at <https://www.apa.org/about/policy/boys-men-practice-guidelines.pdf>, accessed May the 20th, 2019.
- Bauer, Nichole. 2018. Untangling the Relationship Between Partisanship, Gender Stereotypes, and Support for Female Candidates. *Journal of Women, Politics & Policy*, 39:1, 1–25,

- Bloomberg. Election 2016 Center. Available at <https://www.bloomberg.com/graphics/2016-election-results/>, accessed May the 20th.
- Bobo, Lawrence and Frederick Bobo. 1989. Education and Political Tolerance: Testing the Effects of Cognitive Sophistication and Target Group Affect. *Public Opinion Quarterly*. 53: 3, 285–308.
- Bovet, Alexandre and Herman Makse. 2019. Influence of fake news in Twitter during the 2016 US Presidential election. *Nature Communications*. 10: 7.
- Campbell, David E. and Christina Wolbrecht. 2006. See Jane Run: Women Politicians as Role Models for Adolescents. *The Journal of Politics*, 68: 2, 233–247.
- Ducat, Stephen. 2004. *The Wimp Factor: Gender Gaps, Holy Wars, and the Politics of Anxious Masculinity*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Eagly, Karau. 2002. Role Congruity Theory of Prejudice Toward Female Leaders. In *Psychological Review*, 109: 3, 573-598.
- Eagley, Alice H. and Wendy Wood. 2012. Biosocial Construction of Sex Differences and Similarities in Behavior. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* 46, 55–123
- Elder, Laurel. 2004. Why Women Don't Run: Explaining Women's Underrepresentation in America's Political Institutions. *Women & Politics*, 26: 2, 27–56.
- Fairclough, Norman. 1989. *Language and Power*. London: Longman.
- Fairclough, Norman. 2003. *Analysing Discourse*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Ford, Lynne. 2017. *Women and Politics: The Pursuit of Equality*. Westview Press.
- Foucault, Michel. 1972. *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. London: Routledge.
- Foucault, Michel. 1980. Truth and power, in C. Gordon (ed.), *Power/Knowledge*. 107–133.
- Foucault, Michel. 1981. The order of discourse, in R. Young (ed.), *Untying the Text: A Post-structuralist Reader*, 48–79.
- Foucault, Michel. 1982. The Subject and Power. *Critical Inquiry*, 8: 4, 777–795.
- Foucault, Michel. 1988. 'Critical theory/intellectual theory', interview with Gerard Raulet, in L. Kritzman (ed.), *Michel Foucault: Politics, Philosophy, Culture: Interviews and Other Writings*, 20–47.
- Foucault, Michel. 1991. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Foucault, Michel. 1997. The Ethics of the Concern of the Self as a Practice of Freedom. In *Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth*, Paul Rabinow (ed.), 281–301. New York: The New Press.

- Foucault, Michel. 2006. *Psychiatric Power: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1973– 1974*. Jacques Lagrange (ed.). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Franklin, K. 2004. Enacting masculinity: Anti-gay violence and group rape as participatory theater. *Sexuality Research & Social Policy*, 1, 25–40.
- Goren, Lilly J. and Joseph E. Uscinski. 2011. What's in a Name? Coverage of Senator Hillary Clinton during the 2008 Democratic Primary. *Political Research Quarterly*, 64: 4, 884–896
- Grinnell, R. 2018. *Just-World Hypothesis*. Psych Central. Available at <https://psychcentral.com/encyclopedia/just-world-hypothesis/>, accessed May the 20th, 2019.
- Hafner, Josh. 2016. Donald Trump Loves the ‘poorly educated’ – and they love him. *USA Today*. Available at <https://eu.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/onpolitics/2016/02/24/donald-trump-nevada-poorly-educated/80860078/>, accessed May the 20th, 2019.
- Hammond, W. P., Matthews, D., Mohottige, D., Agyemang, A., & Corbie-Smith, G. 2010. Masculinity, medical mistrust, and preventive health services delays among community-dwelling African American men. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, 25(12), 1300–1308
- Harvey, Karen. 2005. The History of Masculinity, circa 1650–1800. *Journal of British Studies*, 44, 296–311.
- Hayes, Danny. 2011. *When Gender and Party Collide: Stereotyping in Candidate Trait Attribution*. Cambridge University Press.
- Holland, Steve and Jeff Mason. 2016. Trump Says Putin Better Leader Than Obama in TV Event. *Reuters*. Available at <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-election-commander/trump-in-tv-event-with-clinton-says-putin-better-leader-than-obama-idUSKCN11D12K>, accessed May the 20th, 2019.
- Jordan, Sky. 2017. Rape culture is normalized across college campuses. *The State Press*. Available at <https://www.statepress.com/article/2017/02/spopinion-rape-culture-is-normalized-on-campuses>, accessed May the 20th, 2019.
- Jørgensen, Marianne and Louise Phillips. 2002. *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method*, 60–95. London: SAGE Publications.
- Katz, Jackson. 2016. *Man Enough? Donald Trump, Hillary Clinton, and the Politics of Presidential Masculinity*. Interlink Publishing Group.
- Krugman, Paul. 2004. *The Great Unraveling: Losing Our Way in the New Century*. USA: W. W. Norton & Company.

- Kimmel, Michael. 1996. *Manhood in America: A Cultural History*. New York: Free Press.
- Lacan, Jacques. 2001. *Écrits*. London: Routledge.
- Lakoff, George. 1980. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, George. 1996. *Moral Politics: How Liberals and Conservatives Think*. Chicago University Press.
- Lakoff, George. 2004. *Don't Think of an Elephant*. Vermont: Chelsea Green Publishing.
- Lorenzini, Daniele. 2016. Foucault, Regimes of Truth and the Making of the Subject. *Foucault and the Making of Subjects*. London: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Mahalik, J. R., Aldarondo, E., Gilbert-Gokhale, S., and Shore, E. 2005. The role of insecure attachment and gender role stress in predicting controlling behaviours in men who batter. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 20(5), 617–631.
- McDermott, R. C., and Lopez, F. G. 2013. College men's intimate partner violence attitudes: Contributions of attachment dimensions and gender role stress. *Journal of Counselling Psychology*, 60(1), 127–136.
- Mutz, Diana. 2018. *Status Threat, Not Economic Hardship, Explains the 2016 Presidential Vote*. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America.
- Nussbaum, Martha. 2018. *Monarchy of Fear*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Okimoto, Tyler and Victoria Brescoll. 2010. The Price of Power: Power Seeking and Backlash Against Female Politicians. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 36: 7, 923–936.
- Pöldsar, Raili. 2007. Cowboys and Girliemen: manipulation of masculinity in the 2004 US presidential election campaign. *North America: Tensions and (Re)solutions*, 8, 164–177.
- Satlin, Alana. 2016. MSNBC Interrupts Hillary Clinton's Speech To Complain About Her Voice. Huffington Post. May the 20th.
- Satlin, Alana. 2016. People Won't Stop Criticizing Hillary Clinton For Raising Her Voice. Huffington Post. May the 20th.
- Samuels, Robert. 2016. Psychoanalyzing the Left and Right After Donald Trump. In *Critical Theory and Practice in Psychology and the Human Sciences*. Sloan, T (ed).
- Schaffner, Brian. 2016. *Explaining White Polarization in the 2016 Vote for President: The Sobering Role of Racism and Sexism*. University of Massachusetts.
- Schein, Virginia. 1973. The Relationship Between Sex Role Stereotypes and Requisite Management Characteristics. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 57: 2, 95 – 100.

- Schneider, Andrea, Catherine Tinsley, Sandra Cheldelin and Emily Amanatullah. 2010. Likeability v. Competence: The Impossible Choices Faced by Female Politicians, Attenuated by Lawyers. *Duke Journal of Gender Law & Policy*, 17: 2, 363–384.
- Schwartz, J. P., Waldo, M., & Higgins, A. J. 2004. Attachment styles: Relationships to masculine gender role conflict in college men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 5(2), 143-146.
- Tamman, Maurice. 2016. Clinton enjoys solid lead in early voting: Reuters/Ipsos poll. *Reuters*. October 29. Accessed on May the 20th.
- Vandello, Joseph and Jennifer Bosson. 2013. Hard won and easily lost: A review and synthesis of theory and research on precarious manhood. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 14: 2, 101–13.
- Wetherell, Margaret. 2001. Debates in Discourse Research. In Wetherell, Margaret, Stephanie Taylor and Simeon J. Yates (eds.). *Discourse Theory and Practice: A Reader*, 380–399. London: Sage Publications.
- Whitehead, A. 2005. Man to man violence: How masculinity may work as a dynamic risk factor. *The Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*, 44(4), 411–422.
- Wodak, R. 2011. Politics as Usual: investigating political discourse in action. *The Routledge Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. London: Routledge p. 525-540.
- Wodak, Ruth. 2015. *Politics of Fear: What Right-Wing Populist Discourses Mean*. UK: Sage.
- Wodak, R. Forchtner, B. 2018. *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Politics*. New York: Routledge.
- Shoaf, Nicole and Tara N. Parsons. 18 Million Cracks, but No Cigar: News Media and the Campaigns of Clinton, Palin, and Bachmann. *Social Sciences* 5:3, 1 – 15
- Sykes, Patricia. 2008. Gender in the 2008 Presidential Election: Two Types of Time Collide. *Political Science & Politics*. 41: 4, 761–764.
- Zurbriggen, Eileen and Aurora M. Sherman. 2010. Race and Gender in the 2008. U.S. Presidential Election: A Content Analysis of Editorial Cartoons. *Social Issues and Public Policy*. 10: 1, 223–247.

RESÜMEE

TARTU ÜLIKOOL

ANGLISTIKA OSAKOND

Lilian Alice Laanepere

Gender Discourses in the 2016 US Presidential Election Campaign [Soodiskursused USA 2016. a presidendivalimiste kajastustes]

Magistritöö

2019

Lehekülgede arv: 90

Annotatsioon:

Käesoleva magistritöö eesmärk oli analüüsida soodiskursuseid USA 2016. aasta presidendivalimiste kajastustes parempoolses meediaväljaandes Breitbart. Meediatekstide analüüsimiseks rakendati Norman Fairclough diskursusanalüüsi tekstitasandi analüüsi ning Foucault' tõerežiimide ja subjekti loomise raamistikku, et näidata, kuidas soodiskursuseid kasutatakse erinevate poliitikavaldkondade kirjeldamisel ning kuidas diskursused end ühiskonnas taastoodavad ning seeläbi tõerežiimide püsimist toetavad.

Magistritöö koosneb sissejuhatusest, kahest sisupeatükist ning kokkuvõttest. Esimene sisupeatükk kirjeldab soodiskursuste teoreetilist tausta ajaloolisest, psühholoogilisest ning poliitkultuurilisest perspektiivist ning esitab USA kaheparteisüsteemi kirjeldamiseks Lakoffi soometafooridel põhineva jaotuse. Magistritöö teine peatükk koosneb 14 meediateksti analüüsist, mis tugineb Fairclough' tekstitasandi analüüsimise meetodile, milles on vaatluse all keelelised valikud, mille abil on tekstide autorid väljendanud soodiskursuseid. Teine peatükk asetab tuvastatud soodiskursused laiemasse ühiskondlikku konteksti Michel Foucault' tõerežiimide ning subjektiloome raamistiku toel. Analüüs näitas, et meediaväljaanne Breitbart kajastas USA 2016. aasta presidendivalimisi läbi soodiskursuste ning kõnetas seeläbi madala haridustasemega valgeid meesvalijaid kui konservatiivse tõerežiimi subjekte. Analüüsi tulemused võimaldavad meediatekstide analüüsimisel arvesse võtta asjaolu, et soodiskursused mängivad poliitika kajastamisel olulist rolli.

Märksõnad: meediadiskursus, soodiskursused, USA valimised, diskursusanalüüs

Lihtlitsents lõputöö reprodutseerimiseks ja üldsusele kättesaadavaks tegemiseks

Mina, Lilian Alice Laanepere,

1. annan Tartu Ülikoolile tasuta loa (lihtlitsentsi) minu loodud teose Gender Discourses in the 2016 US Presidential Election,

mille juhendaja on Raili Marling,

reprodutseerimiseks eesmärgiga seda säilitada, sealhulgas lisada digitaalarhiivi DSpace kuni autoriõiguse kehtivuse lõppemiseni.

2. Annan Tartu Ülikoolile loa teha punktis 1 nimetatud teos üldsusele kättesaadavaks Tartu Ülikooli veebikeskkonna, sealhulgas digitaalarhiivi DSpace kaudu Creative Commons'i litsentsiga CC BY NC ND 3.0, mis lubab autorile viidates teost reprodutseerida, levitada ja üldsusele suunata ning keelab luua tuletatud teost ja kasutada teost ärieesmärgil, kuni autoriõiguse kehtivuse lõppemiseni.
3. Olen teadlik, et punktides 1 ja 2 nimetatud õigused jäävad alles ka autorile.
4. Kinnitan, et lihtlitsentsi andmisega ei riku ma teiste isikute intellektuaalomandi ega isikuandmete kaitse õigusaktidest tulenevaid õigusi.

Lilian Alice Laanepere

20.05.2019

Autorsuse kinnitus

Kinnitan, et olen koostanud käesoleva magistritöö ise ning toonud korrektselt välja teiste autorite panuse. Töö on koostatud lähtudes Tartu Ülikooli maailma keelte ja kultuuride kolledži anglistika osakonna magistritöö nõuetest ning on kooskõlas heade akadeemiliste tavadega.

Lilian Alice Laanepere

20.05.2019

Lõputöö on lubatud kaitsmisele.

Raili Marling