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ABSTRACT

This study examines the way soldiers as social actors are represented as heroes in the citations of the Medal of Honor. The objectives are to discover how soldiers are represented as heroes (the textual strategies of hero constructions) as well as to uncover the underlying ideological positioning that is reflected through the citations. This is done through the analysis of the textual strategies used in the said citations using Van Leeuwen’s Social Representation Theory. Using this framework, 40 citations from the official website at www.cmohs.org are selected and examined. The findings show the use of activation, individualisation, nomination and functionalization as a mean to represent and project the recipients as heroes. From the findings, it is believed that the voice of the decision makers is incorporated by inserting ideological representation into the discourse.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 INTRODUCTION

Heroism is a concept that has been open to debate and controversies for centuries (Zimbardo, 2009). This is largely due to the fact that heroism is culturally, historically and situationally conceptualized. Heroism has also been frequently mistaken for, due to overlapping definitions, to the likes of altruism, compassion and empathy. Heroism is also understandably a social attribution (Franco, Blau, & Zimbardo, 2011). The title ‘hero’ must be bestowed on to the actor and the deed done by the actor by someone else, although contradictingly, the acts of good deed is often, if not always, solitary and existential. Social consensus must be present regarding the significance of the act and the consequences of the act must be meaningful for the act to be deemed heroic and the actor, a hero.

The definitions of heroism are abundant due to the various domains heroism exists and the various platforms heroism is being discussed, a straightforward definition which is “acting in a pro-social action regardless of its risk to oneself” will not suffice. This surface definition, according to Franco (2011), can only barely mask a number of elusive, interrelated paradoxes which undoubtedly made the topics of heroes and heroism one of the most composite human behaviours to research on, which incidentally, makes the nature of heroism all the more compelling.

1.2 PROBLEM STATEMENT

As the concept of ‘hero’ has been expanded to be identified with popular celebrities and role-models from the media arena, heroes do come from a diverse sphere of influence which includes the entertainment industry, the sports arena, political parties and religion; solidifying the act of idolizing these heroes does run through all walks of life. Interestingly, you can only idolize a perceived ‘idol’ or hero, which could vary
from one individual or one social circle to another. This means heroes of an era can be proven to be villains in another era through the emergence of controverting evidence, although some heroes do endure across the centuries. Likewise, heroes from a nation can very well be the villains to another, and the very same act given a heroic status in one particular group can be seen as total abhorrent to other groups, e.g. suicide bombing.

As this study focuses on heroes, or to be specific attempts to answer the question of ‘heroic representation’, the definition should be pinned down. The very fact that the word ‘hero’ is overused in many domains poses as a problem to define heroes or heroism. To a child, his father would be seen as a hero. In a classroom of underprivileged students, the teacher becomes the hero. To a person with deep political interest, a politician may become his or her hero. To an old lady trying to cross the street, a caring fellow pedestrian may be her hero. In the military field, soldiers are deemed heroes for their sacrifices, and the list goes on and on. In addition, we do have fictional superheroes with amplified abilities used for the greater good. So they are all heroes, for one reason or another, but are they of the same kind? If so, how are they portrayed linguistically and textually which shape them as the hero that they are? All this questions lead to the need to examine how heroes are represented.

1.3 RESEARCH PURPOSE & QUESTIONS

As an attempt to narrow down the study of heroism, this study focuses on the military domain. To be precise, this study analyses how the Medal of Honor recipients are represented and portrayed linguistically in the citations (see section 3.2) of the Medal of Honor recipients as a way to contextualise heroism in the context of military. Further discussion of heroism in the military domain (see section 1.6) and the citations (and section 2.3.3) are given extensively in Chapter 1 and Chapter 2 respectively.
The significant of this research is two-fold. The first is, although many researches are done in the vast field of military, limited research has been done to examine the ways the industrial military complex in the United States has been propagated through the Medal of Honor citations. The citations serve a bigger purpose than just to accompany the soldiers in the award ceremony. When an educated guess or a likely interpretation (i.e. textual analysis) of a particular text is made, it serves to give an understanding and perhaps appreciation for certain political culture in a society, especially when paired up with the ideological predisposition that is being imparted from the particular text.

Second, the research also examines how ideas of heroism are conceptualised, the revelation of certain realities and how these realities are capable in aiding the maintenance of power of certain parties through the tradition of glorifying soldiers. An example would be how the civilians are encouraged to look up to those who have sacrificed themselves in conflict zones by giving them the highest honour possible.

The citations that are used in this study are retrieved from the Congressional Medal of Honor Society, which is the official website for the Medal of Honor recipients at http://www.cmohs.org/. This study is driven by a number of research questions which are:

i. What are the textual strategies used in the citations to represent Medal of Honor recipients as heroes?

This research question examines the language forms used in the citations which created the representations that the recipients are heroes. The representation of the selected recipients in the citations of the Medal of Honor is analysed through the ways the soldiers are referred to linguistically based on the van Leeuwen’s (1996) representation of social actors framework. Apart from the analysis of social actors,
semantic concepts like word classes, connotation, and denotation that are incorporated in the 
*citations* are looked at to support the analysis.

ii. What ideological predispositions are being imparted by the Medal of Honor 
*citations*?

This research question examines and interprets the textual strategies and 
manifestations from an ideological viewpoint. The outcome will be discussed in Chapter 5 with the support of relevant social theories concerning language and ideology.

**1.4 HEROES**

Heroes go a long way in the history of mankind. In fact, historians have laid down their findings for the evidence of heroes being part of ancient daily lives. One of the notable heroes who were greatly idolized during the era of *Before Christ* was Alexander the Great (356 - 323 B.C.). The following is an excerpt taken from the book ‘In the Footsteps of Alexander the Great: A Journey from Greece to Asia’:

> there was a sense of a continuing history; a realization that Alexander’s tale still reverberated across eastern Asia, especially, strangely enough, in the Muslim world, where he is regarded a as a great folk hero. (Wood, 2001).

Similarly, another excerpt taken from the book ‘Alexander the Great: A Hunt for a New Past’, which talks about the glory of the king:

> and for many other reasons too, of course, Alexander became in various countries and at various times a hero. (Cartledge, 2011).

From both the excerpts above, it is plain that there is evidence of acceptance by the society at large of the identity of the person in question as ‘greater than an ordinary man’ or in other, more commonly used word, a hero.
Another historical figure often regarded as a hero is Joan of Arc (1412 - 1431 AD). Joan of Arc, who was nick-named as ‘The Maid of Orleans’, is seen as a heroine in France who became a household name for leading the French army to victory over the British during the Hundred Years’ War. Due to her contributions, she was elevated to a Roman Catholic saint. An excerpt from the book ‘Joan of Arc: The Image of Female Heroism’ describes Joan as:

Joan had the hero’s essential quality, an unshakeable conviction in her rectitude and the rectitude of all her motives, her passions and her enterprises. (Warner, 2013).

Likewise, an excerpt from another book on her military leadership in ‘Joan of Arc: A Military Leader’ talks on the interest of academicians in Joan:

French nationalism, especially in the wake of the failed wars of the eighteenth century and the end of the nineteenth century, coupled with a drive for theological authenticity leading to sainthood undoubtedly aided the resurgence of academic interest in this fifteenth-century French hero. (DeVries, 2011)

Apart from historical heroes, there are plenty of ‘modern’ individuals who did their fair share of work to be regarded as heroes. An example of this modern hero is Martin Luther King, who was an American activist and leader of the African-American Civil Rights Movement. Dyson (2000), in his book, described Martin Luther King as a great American Hero, due to his ability to change, influence and improve the course of history with the help of his talents and visions. Martin Luther King was and still, regarded as a great man with great qualities, a hero in other words.

What sets them apart from the rest with the labelling of ‘hero’ and why they are the recipient of mass adoration? Adoration or heightened adoration is a subject matter that
interests many researchers. One such research is a study by McCutcheon, Lange, and Houran (2002) whereby a modified pre-existing celebrity worship questionnaires were used in the survey. The study is about adoration, which resulted in no biasness related to age and gender. This result contradicted with the study by Raviv et. el (1996), where these form of adoration only happens in the early years of a person. McCutcheon, Lange, and Houran’s study also shows no celebrity bias, where it means the scales used to measure celebrity worship is applicable to all kinds of celebrities including actors, musicians, sportsmen, politicians and even other celebrities.

1.5 THE EFFECT OF HEROES

It is established that certain individual do cause people to idolize them based on their actions or deeds and thus cause people to idolize them and regard them as heroes; just as the examples given in the previous subchapter. However, there is more to it than just regarding it as mere harmless idolization. The effects of hero idolization onto the heroes themselves and ultimately others, is a worthy topic all by itself. The fact is that here is where the real problem starts, because being idolized as heroes elevates them into a higher social being, and this indirectly gives them immunity against any offense, if they choose to do so. Having that controlling power in their hands, these idolized heroes have a higher tendency to not be questioned for any wrongdoings and are easily forgivable by the general public. This in turn gives them a chance to misuse the power that they possess and exhibit mistreatments, a sense of control and the ability to influence people to take their side willingly or unwillingly.

One such case is recorded in the history of North Korea’s ruling, by the Kim family for many years. The one-man dictatorship practice through consecutive generations requires a high level of loyalty and submission from the citizens and this is achieved through the cult personality (Suh, 1988). Park (2009) found that in North Korea, the
prestige of the supreme leader is very important that it has been given the highest priority over everything else in the country. Other sort of predicament was the destruction of over 2000 Buddhist temples and Christian churches (Cha, 2013), as this was seen as a threat by the ruling party which might deter the faithfulness of the public to the regime (Kim 2014). Also, too much attention was given to the family in the media as it was reported by New Focus International where about 300 articles were published every month, (2013). Labouyer (2005) claims that the nation does indeed practice genuine hero worshipping.

Another more prominent problem here is the lack of own voice and stand, as people who criticize the succession of the third generation of Kim leadership were sent to re-education camps or punished (Choi, 2012). Some losses of lives have been reported due to heightened adoration. According to People’s Daily Online (2012), a 14 year old girl had drowned in a failed attempt to save Kim Jong-il’s and Kim Il-sung’s portraits during a flash flood. Although the people have suffered under their ruling, this act denotes a great deal of love and loyalty. As an act of bravery was done in favour of the communists, the government bestowed her ‘Kim Jong–Il Youth Honor Award’. On top of that, the school that she went to was renamed after her, which might cause a new wave of admiration and devotion to the ruling party. In the 1980’s, the country underwent economic downturn, where large scale construction projects to maintain the personality cult of the Kim family were blamed for this affair (Bradley, 2006).

Another clear example can be seen in the case of a very well-known individual who was known for his notorious ways and was idolized for sensibly debatable reasons. Austrian-born Adolf Hitler (1889-1945) was a German politician. He is infamously known for his role as the leading light of the Nazi Party. According to psychologist Kressel (2008), Germans were mystified with the ‘hypnotic’ appeal of Hitler’s oratory
skills and his public speaking attitude. The word hypnotic being a recurrent feature can be translated to a powerful way of one’s stand or principles and the ability to penetrate into the minds of the general public. This in turn creates a cult-like status for the said individual, with mass followers, due to Hitler’s capability to mesmerize and capture the people’s attention in an unbreakable trance.

Likewise in 1977, Trevor-Roper has a parallel idea about this German politician and illustrates Hitler’s cult-like power in terms of a supernatural power, where his passion and beliefs have the ability to influence countless men to be on his side blindly (Evans, 2002).

Hitler became so powerful because of the way he had himself represented through his excellent rhetoric skills where it could be seen as hero representation. Heck (1985) captured one of his own reactions as a member of Hitler’s ‘fan base’ to the great speeches where he described that he was (alongside other members) practically bordering on being hysterical in a frenzy of nationalistic pride with tears streaming down his face when shouting out loud ‘Seig Heil! Seig Heil! Seig Heil!’ , declaring that his body and soul, belonged to Adolf Hitler.

It is apparent here that the love for the state has been somehow transferred to the love of the man, an unconditional love towards Adolf Hitler. This is very apparent during the times when Hitler was the Supreme Commander of the armed forces. In a short span of time the customary loyalty oath of servicemen which is done traditionally to affirm loyalty towards the office of supreme commander, was converted to assert loyalty to Hitler (Bullock, 1962).

With the examples given on the effects of heroes, we can somewhat understand the damage that can be caused by the individuals who are perceived as heroes and who
misuse their powers. Although this study will not go into greater details on the effects, it would suffice to bring this issue to light which will aid in understanding this study. The next section will narrow down the scope of heroism that this study would like to focus on, which is heroism in the military.

1.6 HEROISM IN MILITARY

As explained in the beginning of this chapter, heroism is a vast subject area on its own. Being a vast subject area, we came to accept that the term hero is widely used in many situations (see section 1.2), which would make it challenging to compress all of the situations in this research. However, one aspect that is widely accepted as an act of heroic deed or synonymous to a hero is in the field of the military. In retrospect, for the purpose and the particular interest of this study, this work is narrowed down to heroism from the military domain. The following sections will discuss on and give justice to the selection of the military scope for this study:

- Military (section 1.6.1)
- Military in the media (section 1.6.2)
- Military in USA (section 1.6.3)
- Military decorations (section 1.6.4)
- Medal of Honor (section 1.6.5)

1.6.1 Military

One domain that is highly generic in terms of heroism is the military domain. The military institution carries the connotation of selfless service to their own country due to the fact that they risk their lives for the safety of their country and fellow countrymen. By definition, military refers to the armed forces of a country (Oxford English Dictionary). The organization of a military or the armed forces has been around since ancient times (Mark, 2009). In fact the first recorded use of the word military, spelt
‘militarie’, was in 1582 (Oxford English Dictionary). At present in most countries, the military organization can be largely divided into three main subcategories or branches which are i) the Army, ii) the Navy, and iii) the Air Force. The military forces’ primary task is to defend the country and its citizens and the prosecution of war against another part or country with the authority to handle deadly weapons and machineries on par with the interest of the country and the decision makers. With this in mind, this research will look into the military domain to analyse on heroic representation.

According to Huntington (1957), military institutions belonging to any society are formed for two purposes: a “functional imperative” due to the society’s security being threaten and a “societal imperative” due to the social forces, ideologies, and institutions dominant within the society. The second purpose coincides agreeably with the purpose of this research. He continued further by saying “from 1820 to 1940, Americans had little cause to worry about their security”, and that it is “an inheritance rather than a creation”.

From this we can come to a conclusion that the United States was (if not still) a strong nation even in the wake of many conflicts and wars during the aforementioned time period. To add to this point, the projections of the superiority of American soldiers are indeed plentiful. In the military realm, the displays of many seemingly impossible achievements are abundant, and these achievements are smoothly arranged in many discourses for the public view such as the media, the internet, and even books in the form of autobiography since the beginning of recorded history. Soldiers and the armed forces are noticeable in every genre with the inclusion of positive values such as loyalty, courage, selflessness, and intelligence; all signs of positive self-representation.
1.6.2 Military in the media

The media also plays a big part in projecting heroes and the role of heroism to the viewers. Heroes are portrayed to be having the ideal characteristic, more so then just being intellectual or just being physically strong and capable, although being a hero means having somewhat both the attributes, including many other qualities that makes one a hero. The usual theme portrayed in the movies or series or even in advertisements would be the role of a saviour, be it saving a damsel in distress, one’s home, one’s community, one’s country or even in an extended role of saving the world of a certain catastrophe. The assortment of the heroic figures in the media can range from a mere child to genetically-enhanced man; and from magical beings to superheroes from another planet.

In line with the discussion on heroic portrayal in the media, and to tie in with the course of this research, the heroic representation in military-themed movies comes to light. Indeed there are many depiction of the soldiers in heroic roles for example: Saving Private Ryan (1998), Black Hawk Down (2001), American Sniper (2014), and Zero Dark Thirty (2014) to name a few. The plentiful heroic images of soldiers in the media also serves to solidify the profession as the ultimate heroic profession, the closest one can be to being a superhero. Some of the media platform where soldiers are other talked about other than movies are newspapers, magazines, television programs, documentaries, biographies and videogames to name a few.

1.6.3 Military in USA

In the United Stated of America, the department of defence is divided to three main departments namely the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy and the Department of the Air Force which encompasses three lines of work namely the army, the maritime and the aerospace (Snider & Watkins, 2002). Wong, Bliese & McGurk
(2003) added that the term military refers to three groups. The first group is those who wear their military uniform at all times and they are the active duty forces; the second group is those who wear the uniform some of the times and they are the reserves and national guard; and lastly the third type where they don’t wear their uniform at all and these are the defence employees and military families. However, this study only concerns with the active duty forces, to be more specific, the Medal of Honor recipients. Figure 1.1 is the complete chart that displays the department of defence in the U.S.:
Citizens of this country have high regards for their soldiers in the armed forces. A couple of evidences that they are being highly regarded in the United States can be seen in the excerpts taken from the Congressional Record (2007): http://www.netage.com/economics/gov/usdefense-chart-top.html
In 1986, Congress established…the U.S. Special operations Command. And today we gratefully honour … men and women who fill its rank. … to those who perished… we offer our sincere appreciation. And to those who carry out their noble mission, we pledge our Nations’ support. (Mr. Kline from Minnesota).

I have the highest regard for every man and woman who serves in the United States military. … everyone who volunteers to serve our county deserves the gratitude of every American citizen. And to the extent that they have provided the great service to our country, we all thank them, each and every one. And those who volunteer to be members of the SOC are often regarded as ‘the tip of the spear’ because they volunteer to put themselves in great danger very often. … for our country. … for our government. … for their families, friends and neighbours. And it makes them … a very special cadre of people in the United States. (Mr. Saxton from New Jersey).

A survey had also been conducted in the United States regarding the people’s opinion of the United State being the top military power in the world ranging from the year 1993 to 2012. All the respondents (US citizens) who had participated in this survey has the opinion of the United States as a big power, as seen in 2012 where 54% considered the U.S. as the top military power in the world while 45% voted the U.S. as among the leading military power in the world (Statista, 2015b). As for the people’s confidence of the United States’ military forces, a survey was conducted to measure the level of confidence they have towards their country’s military forces from 1975 to 2014. In the year 2014, 74% of the respondents said they had either a great deal or quite a lot of confidence in the military (Statista, 2015a). So it is safe to conclude that the
American soldiers are the main players of the global stage due to their involvement in many conflicts and wars, and this is where the research will be narrowed down into.

1.6.4 Military decorations

In order to show appreciation of their services for the country, the U.S. government, like many other countries, has awarded many military awards, medals and decorations. A military decoration symbolizes the soldiers’ bravery and courage in the light of defending or fighting for a common theme, which is generally the safety of their country and the people in it. It is also distinctively a designed mark of honour denoting heroism. In the United States, some of the medals awarded includes the Purple Heart, the Silver Star, the Navy Cross, the Air Force Cross, the Distinguished Service Cross, and the Congressional Medal of Honor to name a few.

The norms for awarding such medals ranges from i) rescue for example saving fellow soldiers despite obvious danger to oneself; ii) extra-aggressiveness like attacking a gun emplacement of the enemy all by oneself; iii) grenade situation such as shielding fellow comrades by absorbing the blast of a grenade; iv) rear defence which is holding off enemy’s attack long enough just to allow comrades to take shelter or escape; v) refusal of medical aid despite physical injury to continue fighting; to vi) leadership such as instinctively being in charge or displaying great leadership quality under extreme challenging and demanding situation on the battle field just to name a few of the highlights, (Blake 1973; Gal 1981 as cited in Wansink, Payne, & Van Ittersum, 2008).

Admittedly, awarding such decorations is not a current practice. Since ancient times, an acknowledgment of valour and courage is seen as necessary. During the Roman Empire (753B.C. – AD 476), many decorations were awarded for the show of courage and valour, and the decorations range from certificates of granting citizenship for foreigners and a variety of crowns. The grass crown or corona obsidionalis/corona
graminea in Latin is the highest and the rarest military decoration of that time. In the United States, the idea of recognizing the acts of bravery goes all the way back to the Revolutionary War, where the Badge of Military Merit was issued in 1782 by General George Washington, (Willbanks, 2011). This badge that consists of a purple cloth heart was dis-issued after the Revolutionary War and later revived in 1932 as the Purple Heart.

1.6.5 Medal of Honor

In the United States, the Medal of Honor is the highest military decoration that could be awarded for extreme gallantry and bravery while being in action against the enemy of the country that can be bestowed upon someone who served in the United States’ Armed Services, an applauding symbol of heroism. The Medals are accompanied by official citations of the recipients’ gallantry in the line of duty. The honour of receiving the Medal of Honor was exceptionally great that even President Harry S. Truman, who was a soldier during the World War I, on numerous times, said that he would rather be presented the Medal of Honor and wear it than being the President of the United States (Willbanks, 2011).

The Medal of the highest regard was first sanctioned in 1861 for Sailors and Marines, which was early in the Civil War, and the following year for soldiers as well. Despite the fact that the Medal was proposed only for the Civil War, it became permanent in 1863 by the Congress, and it has remained as the most prestigious military decoration for the U.S. armed Forces up till this date. The medal is generally presented in the name of Congress, by the President of the United States of America, to the deserving recipients and the said recipients can come from all walks of life and from every armed services and was involved in America’s wars, ranging from the Civil War to the War in Afghanistan. Despite that, the Medals of Honor are awarded sparingly, as they are
bestowed only to the ones displaying their bravest accomplishment, where action beyond the call of duty was performed.

Due to overwhelming submissions for the Medal of Honor decoration and without a clear guideline as to what encompasses the rights to earn the Medal of Honor, the Congress passed a legislation on the 26th June, 1897 to tighten the requirements, so that this highest decoration are presented only for bravery and courage at the highest degree. In addition to that, nomination had to be made by someone other than himself for the heroic deed. Furthermore, there must at least one eyewitness who would be called to swear under oath about the heroic deed. This recommendation must be submitted within a year of the said heroic action, (Willbanks, 2011). Due to the conditions of the Medal of Honor, it is generally presented posthumously.

The Congress yet again limit the number of recipients for receiving the Medal of Honor by establishing guiding principles to be adhered to on the 25th of July, 1963 under which the Medal of Honor could be awarded. The revised prerequisite to be bestowed such prestigious decoration is very much narrowed down to distinguish the bravest of the brave from the rest. According to the defence website (http://valor.defense.gov/DescriptionofAwards.aspx), apart from displaying noticeable dedication and devotion to the country though extreme courage and fearlessness without regarding one’s own life above and beyond the call of duty, the United States Armed Forces should be:

1. engaged in action against an enemy of the United States, or
2. engaged in military operations involving conflict with an opposing foreign force, or
3. serving with friendly foreign forces engaged in an armed conflict against an opposing armed force in which the United States is not a belligerent party.
The recommendation process therefore goes through a detailed scrutiny of up to 18 months to uphold the accuracy of the bravery performed \((\text{www.army.mil/medalofhonor/process})\). According to the archive statistics, the total number of recipients of the Medal of Honor up to this date is 3493. From that figure, a total of 79 are of living recipients and 19 are double recipients at the time of this writing. There are three distinct versions of the Medal of Honor for three different main bodies which are 1) the Army; 2) the Air Force, and 3) the Navy, the Marine Corps and the Coast Guard. As it appears, these \textit{citations} of the Medal of Honor recipients have the intention or the notion to celebrate national heroes.

Keeping this in mind, this research is directed towards the objectives to examine how soldiers are portrayed as heroes and how these heroes are defined and represented in a military discourse, to be specific the \textit{citations} of the Medal of Honor recipients. It is anticipated that through a textual analysis on the representation of the social actors of the \textit{citations}, a comprehensive depiction of what constitutes a hero or heroism will be acquired. The concept of how heroism is represented in the \textit{citations} through the representation of social actors is similar to the perception of hero in this institution and portrayed to the general public, thus subtly reflect their ideological positioning.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter strives to synthesize concepts and themes found in this dissertation as well as the theoretical framework which will be the backbone to address the research questions listed in the previous chapter (see section 1.3). In this study, van Leeuwen’s (1996) theory of social representation will act as the framework to analyse hero representation in the Medal of Honor citation context. Van Leeuwen’s (2008) revised and updated Social Actors Network framework is also used to how the social actors in the citations are represented. The concepts and themes that are discussed in this chapter are:

- Heroism (section 2.2)
- Military as an institutional discourse (section 2.3)
- Language and ideology (section 2.4)
- Representation of social actors (section 2.5)
- Studies on representation (section 2.6)

2.2 HEROISM

Being a concept with substantial boundaries for a concrete definition, it would be a challenge to confine the gist of the notion in a mere sentence or two. Not to forget the plentiful heroic figures that has emerged to date from folk heroes, cultural heroes, political heroes, athletic heroes and military heroes to name a few. However, due to the nature of this research, people who are merely famous like celebrities (i.e. movie stars, television stars, musicians) are not considered ‘hero’ materials due to the non-heroic deed performed by them.

Indisputably the most famous and thus widely cited definition of celebrity came from the cultural theorist Daniel Boorstin who convinced that the celebrity is a person who is
only famous for their famousness, and not for any particular skills or virtues, (Boorstin 1971, as cited in Turner, 2013, p.4), somewhat harshly suggests a vast contrast of celebrity with heroic figures, which he goes on to describe as distinguished by their accomplishments or by “the great simple virtues of their characters”.

In literature, a hero typically refers to the main character in a literary work, or a celebrated figure in the ancient legends. Not only characterized as a main character, heroes are almost always portrayed in a positive light, someone with good virtues and values, someone with heightened intellect, someone whom to look up to, someone whom we aspire to become, and someone who is well-liked and well-respected. That being said, there are many heroic epics such as Gilgamesh, the Iliad, Beowulf, and La Chanson de Roland (Britannica, n.d.).

In the academic world, researches have long shown interest in this unique subject matter most notably in the field of psychology. In psychology, Goethals and Allison (2012) explore heroes’ mannerism and behaviours or rather the perceptions to what we would think the mannerism or behaviour of heroes should be, which results in people perceive heroes as having high levels of competencies or high levels of morality or even both. This naturally translates to their perception of real-life heroes and fictional superheroes.

To understand the notion of heroism, the many definitions of the word ‘hero’ should be studied, but before we move on to the definitions, it is best if we review the origin of the word ‘hero’. According to an online encyclopaedia, the English word ‘hero’, which we so effortlessly use under various circumstances, is derived from the Greek word ἵρως (heros) for hero or warrior, which typically means protector or defender (Britannica, n.d.). Ironically, the word ‘hero’, which is well sought after stereotypically for the male gender, actually refers to a woman, a priestess of Aphrodite (the Goddess
of Love) to be exact, rendered in the Greek mythology. In the legend, as preserved in literary texts *Musaeus* and *Ovid*, the priestess Hero, in grief after learning the demise of her lover, drowns herself. Goethals and Allison (2012) believe Hero’s action in the myth might have played a part in the self-sacrificing ordeal of a hero, ‘an ideal’.

Despite the gender jumble, most of the definitions do echoes some similarities to the Greek allegory. CBS News correspondent Steve Hartman (2009) said as a kid, he viewed a hero as an *ideal*. He also further points out that there is a huge difference between a person who had a heroic moment and a person who is a true hero. Susan Ware (1999) understands that a hero represents what a society considers the best qualities of a human being at a particular time, a model of behaviour and a character we truly aspire to be. With this, it seems clear that a person would not have ‘a heroic moment’ if the said person is not ‘a true hero’ to begin with.

For the purpose of this study, a few notable definitions will be used. According to Franco et al. (2011), heroism is defined as a social activity comprising five key stage elements:

1. In service to other people or communities in need
2. Engaged in voluntarily
3. With recognition of possible risks or costs either physically, socially, or in terms of quality of life
4. In which the actor is willing to accept anticipated sacrifice
5. And without expecting external gain at the time of the act

A lot of definitions just like the one by Franco et al. really set the bar very high. From here it became translucent that the scope of being a hero is very tight and only a handful can fall under this categorization. Individuals like Mother Teresa, Florence
Nightingale, and Martin Luther King to name a few would be the perfect candidate following this parameters. What it means here is that a person need not aim to inspire someone but instead, by simply following the key elements stated, these individuals will be a source of inspiration to many.

Allison and Goethals (2011) on the other hand, believes that heroes do possess eight crucial traits termed ‘The Great Eight’, which are caring, charismatic, reliable, resilient, smart, strong, selfless, and inspiring. Although having polled eight traits, they also believe that a person may not possess all, but a good number of the traits listed, to be called a hero. This selection may seem logical, but it made the definition of a hero all the more elusive. Becker and Eagly (2004) however, confines heroism’s definition to actions that involves helping other people, regardless the risk of resulting in the action taker’s injury or even death. This can be seen as a selfless service and to go all out to help another with little or disregard to one’s own safety.

If we were to refer to dictionary definitions, we are able to see how heroes are defined in various discourses and perspectives. According to an online dictionary, ‘hero’ is defined as: a person who is admired for great bravery or fine qualities; an illustrious warrior; a person who is greatly admired; a man admired for his achievements and noble qualities; one who shows great courage; and an object of extreme admiration and devotion (Merriam-Webster online dictionary, n.d.). In Oxford Dictionaries, a hero is defined as a person, typically a man, who is admired for their bravery, notable accomplishments or noble qualities (n.d.). A conventional dictionary defines hero as a man distinguished by exceptional strength, courage and nobility; someone who fights for a cause; and the principle character in a play, movie, novel or poem while heroism refers to the qualities of a hero or heroine; exceptional or heroic courage when facing danger especially in battle, (wordnetweb.princeton.edu). As it is
evident here the definitions are not far off from each other, with many overlapping and diverse qualities that constitute a hero.

It is safe to conclude that since people are different from each other, therefore people do have different opinions and different degree of acceptance and justifications on what a ‘hero’ is. Goethals & Allison (2012) made a general statement by saying ‘heroism is in the eye of the beholder’. All the definitions given here are from psychologists, and it is no wonder that they are primarily concerned with the human behaviour and possible behaviour modification to mimic the ideal characteristics which a ‘hero’ deemed to possess to the eyes of the participants involved, which incidentally contribute to the portrayal of heroes and superheroes in movies and comic books. Even the dictionaries’ definitions closely resembles the various definition presented in this section. The lack of definition in the linguistics contexts however, shows that there are no specific definitions or outlines to pattern the textual data of hero representation.

2.3 MILITARY AS IN INSTITUTIONAL DISCOURSE

As explained in the previous chapter, heroism (see section 2.2) often coincides with military (see section 1.6.1), with the notion of selfless service. More often than not, extreme heroism commonly occurs during the times of war, as observed by Wansink, Payne, & Van Ittersum, (2008) too. This makes the military a best place to instigate a textual analysis which reflects on hero representation. Additionally, the military are placed on a higher pedestal from the rest in terms of having a decent quality as can be seen from the official vision statement of the U.S. Army, “We are about leadership; it is our stock in trade, and it is what makes us different”, (1999, as cited in Wong, Bliese & McGurk, 2003, pp. 647-658). In this section, the subthemes institution and discourse will be discussed further.
2.3.1 Institution

According to the Oxford online dictionary, by definition, institution means an organization established for religious, educational, professional, or social purposes (n.d.). According to Mayr (2008), institutions have the ability to construct a representation of the world due to their strategic interests. Some of the institutions that are targets of linguists are the university, the prison, the hospital, the media, and the military to name a few. By examining the language of an institution, Mayr (2008) said we can comprehend how these institutions are shaped by discourses and how these institutes consecutively, possess the ability to create and impose discourse. This means that the institutions have a major influence in shaping our views to how we perceive the world, and this leads to accepting the fact that institutions do have the capability to project or foster the identity that they wish to portray. Agar (1985) reviewed discourses in an institutional setting, particularly the courtroom and the clinic, to develop a framework which divides the discourses into diagnoses, directives and reports. A notable researcher who investigated language in an institutional setting is Wodak (1996), who focuses on courts, schools and hospitals.

2.3.2 Discourse

From Kress’ (1985) and Fairclough’s (1989) point of view, ‘discourse’ refers to contextualized language. According to Kress (1985), discourses are set of statements which are organised systematically that communicate the meanings and values of a certain institution. These set of statements has the ability to express, explain and restrict ideas or beliefs pertaining to the area of concern of that particular institution. The subordination of language use to institution is also discussed by Fairclough (1989). By definition, Fairclough sees discourse as “language as a form of social practice” (p.22).
Likewise, Phillips & Hardy agree with the description of discourse by Parker where discourses are sets of texts that are interconnected through the practice of the production, dissemination and reception that makes a certain option possible, (Parker 1992, as cited in Phillips & Hardy 2002). The distinction of text and discourse by Talbot (2007) gives a clear observation about the two terms, where ‘text’ is referred to as a product of interaction that is observable but ‘discourse’ is referred to as the process of the interaction itself, which is regarded as a cultural activity. Foucault too differs text, “an extended stretch of connected speech or writing” (1977, as cited in van Leeuwen, 2008, p. 6), to discourse, which is described as knowledge of a particular practice that is constructed socially and subsequently developed in a particular social context appropriately, ranging from large to small contexts and from strongly institutionalised context, e.g. military; to institutions of a lesser degree i.e. a friendly conversation.

Discourse as a whole can be viewed in two paradigms (Mayr, 2008). The first paradigm would be the formalist/structuralist paradigm, where discourse is seen as “language above the clause” (Stubbs, 1983, as cited in Mayr, 2008, p. 7). According to Stubbs, this particular view on discourse examines the form of the language, paying attention to the structural properties (i.e. cohesion and organization) but largely ignoring the social ideas which can provide insights on the usage and the interpretation of language by mankind. The second paradigm would be the functionalist paradigm which focuses on the social aspect of the language or the study of ‘language in use’. Discourse analysis cannot be constrained to the description of linguistic forms but rather to explore the purpose of the forms and functions in our daily lives, according to Brown and Yule (1983).

Discourse as a form of communication or interaction, is heavily embedded with social and cultural aspects. The assumption that “language is used to mean something
and to *do* something” (Discourse Analysis, para. 6), as observed by Richardson (2006) and other researchers tie in nicely with the functionalist paradigm. This research is in accordance to the second paradigm as it looks at the discourse at hand from a social point of view, although this research does use elements of the functions and forms to explain or to deconstruct the discourse in question.

Discourse analysis then, according to van Leeuwen, in one way, means ‘the analysis of a text, or type of text’ (2009, p. 144). Deriving from the works of Michel Foucault (1977), van Leeuwen defined discourses as socially constructed ways of knowing some aspect of reality (2009, p. 144). There are various ways in analysing data in discourse analysis. According to Wetherell *et al.*, there are four basic approaches used by researchers to analyse under discourse analysis. The research at hand is in tandem with the fourth approach, which is “to look for patterns within much larger contexts” (2001, p. 7).

The language of categorising or classifying people or activities will be implicated with the values, beliefs and logics underlying it and the consequences and social effects of the said classification. Wetherell *et al.* go on further to elaborate the basic assumption of this approach is “the language available to people enables and constrains not only their expression of certain ideas but also what they do” (2001, p. 9). An excerpt from Wetherell *et al.* further explains the fourth approach to discourse analysis:

..the way in which something or someone is talked about does make a difference to the larger workings of society. It is through language, for example, that certain things or people are either categorised together or separated out as different, and through language that value is attributed or denied. (2001, p. 9)
2.3.3 Citations: Procedures and practises

The institutional discourse scrutinized in this research would be the citations of the Medal of Honor recipients. Instructions or guidelines in producing the citations or ‘discourse’ for the Medal of Honor recipients have not been clearly defined. From the procedures of applying for the medals to the day the medals were being awarded, we can infer that:

i) the citations began in the form of narration (presumably verbally due to the eyewitness/nominator being under oath),

ii) narration in written form by the eyewitnesses and/or the production team,

iii) the construction of the citation by the production team based on evidences (should be brief and compact to accommodate the constrain of time during the ceremony of awarding the medal),

iv) the citation being read out loud during the ceremony to accompany the recipient as the recipient comes forward to receive the Medal of Honor,

v) and finally the transcription of the citations being recorded in relevant document (i.e. bibliography of soldiers, websites honouring the Medal of Honor recipients, military archives, etc.).

The construction of the citations is what this study is directed towards. This is because the production team has to take into consideration several other necessary aspects other than what is narrated. In order to have a clearer view of this concept, the 6 dimensions of journalistic role performance proposed by Mellado (2015) is referred to understand the necessary factor behind the construction of the citations. The 6 dimension are as in Figure 2.1:
Taking into account that the citations have the elements of highlighting national’s triumph, supporting institutional activities and patriotism among others listed, the end product of the citations of Medal of Honor reflects on the roles and responsibilities of the production team as ‘loyal-facilitators’, which is anticipated to be in accordance to the institutional demands (the military) and so these demands are projected through language forms and textual strategies to instil the institution’s embedded ideology to the intended target audience.

2.4 LANGUAGE AND IDEOLOGY

Being one of the major ways in which people interact with each other, discourse studies are primarily focused on language. Be it as it may that the term ‘language’ goes
beyond written and spoken with the examples of body language and sign language, for
the purpose of this research, the scope of language that is focused on is the written text,
i.e. the citations of the Medal of Honor. The way people use language in expressing
what they want is quite relevant in to what they believe in. This is because language,
being a tool of communication, is produced by involving the careful choices of the
linguistic system to implant the intentions of the producers of any discourses. Language,
to Kress (1985), is a tool to code certain habits and through time, reinforce these habits.
Therefore, through language as a tool, the perceived reality of a person or a group of
people can be changed or altered over time with proper reinforcement.

According to Bourdieu (1991), language is defined as a symbolic system of power
with the intrinsic capability that can persuade people to see the world and either confirm
or transform their perceptions and beliefs of the world. This in turn will affect the
actions of the people in the world, and by extension, the world itself. Language seen in
this light is the factor that gives the ability to the producers of the citations to construct
the text linguistically to seem appealing to their target audience. In order to bridge the
gap of definition between language and discourse (see section 2.3.2), Fairclough’s
(1990) claim will be adopted for this study where by the word ‘discourse’ encompasses
“language use is imbricated in social relations and processes which systematically
determine variations in its properties, including the linguistic forms which in text”. It is
also important to highlight from this association that an essential social aspect to the
concept of discourse is that “language is a form of ideology, and language is invested by
ideology” (p.119).

Ideology then can be defined as a relatively coherent unwavering set of ideas, values
and beliefs. The online English Oxford Living Dictionaries (n.d.) gave the definition of
ideology as a system of ideas and ideals, especially one which forms the basis of
economic or political theory and policy, implies a political connotation associated with the term ‘ideology’. Sociocognitively, ideologies are defined as shared representations of social groups (Van Dijk, 2006). Van Dijk had also emphasized that just like languages, ideologies are socially and mentally shared, (2006). Ideologies are classified as social due to their functions being socially shared by the social actors of a group.

Being the linking element between individual’s knowledge of the world and their social practices, language does have a crucial role in the ideological process. Hodge and Kress (1993) propose there is a connection between linguistic studies with the society which a given language represents, hence implying that language can reflect ideology and an instrument of power and control, as opposed to just as a means of communication. Likewise, Hodge, Kress and Jones (1979) bring forward the significance of language in the study of ideology. According to them, ideologies are sets of ideas which are crucial in assembling experience and making sense of the world. These set of ideas which are embedded with ideologies of a certain party are then expressed through the use of language. This goes hand in hand with the notion that ideology involves a systematically organised presentation of the reality brought forth by Hodge and Kress (1993). Therefore, language, as a tool, is the means to deliver people’s thought processes of the perceived reality. This can be seen through people experiencing and expressing the world and everything around them through the use of language.

Schieffelin, Woolard, and Kroskrity (1998) on the other hand describe language ideology as an explicit or an implicit representation which interprets the meeting point of language and human beings in a social world. According to van Dijk (2006), ideology which is systems of ideas are generally expressed and duplicated within the social practices of the members, and more importantly the system of ideas are not only
acquired through discourse, but one can confirm, change, and spread these ideas through discourse too. Likewise, scholars like Fairclough and van Dijk are convinced that ideologies are not only constructed, but naturalized and legitimized through the use of language, to be more precise through discourse, as a social practice (Fairclough 1992; van Dijk 2004). Similarly, Caldas-Coulthard (1996) believed that all texts code the ideological positions of their producers. Therefore language here is seen as a channel or a tool to convey and to preserve ideologies.

An idea of ideology can be sketched, according to Wodak & Meyer (2009), as any group of people or organization that has power, will want to impart their own ideology by influencing society’s ideology in any way possible to closely match theirs. This is to ensure the people in the society to think alike about certain matter, and subsequently due to the reinforcement of the ideology of those in power, it will result in making the society forget that there are any other alternatives to the ‘status quo’.

Another wholesome summary of what constitutes the multi-facet and multi-dimensions of ideology is presented van Dijk (1995) where ideology is defined not only as a basic system of fundamental social cognitions, but as a tool to organising the attitude, the knowledge and other social representation that are shared by members of groups. These social representations then indirectly control the mental representation or model of the discourse and its structures.

That being said, it is important to recognize the ideology of a particular discourse, so that as the readers/hearers, we can know what the writers/speakers are trying to impart on us. However, from the excerpt above, it is apparent that uncovering ideologies in discourses are not an easy task to do and unknowingly, we might be conditioned to believe a set of beliefs. This leads to the need for linguist to uncover or expose structures which leads to ‘unmasking’ ideologies embedded in any discourses. Van Dijk
Fairclough (2001) too had justly explained the reason behind the need to unravel the relationship between language and ideology in terms of power for a more practical sense, because to do so we can understand how language play a part in the domination of some people by others, and by this consciousness, one can be liberated.

In the media studies for last 30 years, a lot of emphases are put into studying the relationship between language and ideology (Kuo & Nakamura, 2005). This is because it is believed that there are contributing relation between ideological processes and linguistic processes. In other words the linguistic choices made by the producers of a discourse may carry ideological meaning. In 1979, Trew saw this relationship in his study when he discovered through ‘passivization’, the producers of a text are able to omit the social actors for any particular desired reason. With the acknowledgment of this aspect, linguists reason that the linguistic choices of a text can carry certain ideological meaning and so strive to examine the underlying ideologies that are embedded in a text with the likes of word choices and sentence structures (Fowler 1991). Fowler (1991) relates that any representational discourse about the world, be it said or written, is articulated from a particular ideological position (p. 10). Van Dijk (1995) explains that if ideologies are presumed to be produced and reproduced in societies of social actors via discourses (spoken or written), it would be convenient to accept that some semantic structures of a particular discourse are more effective than others.

In order to study these occurrences, Fairclough (1989) presents Critical Language Study (CLS). CLS largely emphasises as an approach to language study in an attempt to uncover hidden qualities of the particular language in use. With this, linguists and
people at large will be aware of the processes of domination through language. According to Fiorin (2008), the autonomous linguistic system is not where the ideological aspect presents itself; rather it is in the use of the language. Language reflects the structure of the society in which it is used, thus representing people’s mind and consequently embodying different worldviews, (Fowler et al., 1979). Fiorin (2008) states that ideological works at the phenomenological level, which means through linguistics choices, the structure of the discourse can signal the discourse producer’s intention. This view is also discussed by Fowler et al. (1979). Linguistic structures can be used to regulate the ideas and behaviour of others, to assert institutional or personal status.

2.5 REPRESENTATION OF SOCIAL ACTORS

Simply put, representations are manifestations of meanings through the use of language (Hall, 1997). This is due to the fact that representations allow mankind to understand everything around them. Besides, representations are also convenient in expressing and communicating complex though processes to make it understandable to others, and this can be achieved through the use of language (Hall, 1997). Representation in discourse then is described as a constructive process by Fowler (1991). This is because Fowler (1991) claims that it is impossible for the news industry for example, to cover and communicate ideas of events in a neutral manner due to the medium being controlled by the stakeholders; a.k.a. the people with power. The public are entitled to have their own perspectives and draw their own conclusion, which may not be in favour of the producers and the stakeholders. Therefore, a subtle manipulation is deemed necessary to influence the way people think, so that they might arrive to the same ideas and perspectives on their own.
This leads to the assumption of the social aspect of a discourse, where discourse can be viewed as a system of options from which language users make their ‘choices’ (Houliaraki, 1998 as cited in Barker, 2001). The construction of any ‘reality’ is bound to be selective, and this is where representation plays its role. This is because the construction of the ‘reality’ does entail the selections of which aspect of the ‘reality’ that should be included and how the arrangement of the construction should be (Barker, 2001). As such, each representation is socially constructed because each selection has its own share of socially ingrained values (Hodge and Kress, 1993).

When it comes to analysis, many researchers take many different approaches in deconstructing the seemingly innocent surface of a discourse, (Fairclough 1989, 1992, 1995 & 2003; van Dijk 1988, 1995; Wodak 1996; Kress & van Leeuwen 2001). Nonetheless, the analysis of social actor by van Leeuwen’s (1996) in terms of their representations has been useful for many researchers who focus on the way the actors are described in various discourses based on the categories that has been laid out form a social standpoint, (Todoli et al, 2006). He has described a number of categories under his sociosemantic network which helps in classifying the representation of social actors in an array of discourses. This framework of sociosemantic system is used to reveal the representation of the social actors involved, through language.

One such subsystem from his network is categorization, where the social actors are being portrayed in regards to their functions or identities that the social actors share with other people (van Leeuwen, 1996). Another example of the subsystem is nomination, where it refers to the social actors being represented in terms of their distinctive identity. Both of these subsystems and a few others are further elaborated in Chapter 3 before proceeding to the relevant analysis in Chapter 4 with examples taken from the citations of Medal of Honor.
The proposed network was summarized to three main types of transformation: i) deletion, ii) rearrangement and iii) substitution; which would be the basis of the research at hand. The application of this framework of social actors allowed van Leeuwen (1996) to uncover the representations of immigrants in Australian newspaper reports that were stained with racist issues.

This framework was drawn extensively on Halliday’s transitivity, which discusses on process types. According to Halliday, the notion of transitivity forms the cornerstone of representation due to its ability to represent in ‘multiple ways of an implied extra-linguistic reality’ (Barker, 2001, p.70). There are two main element in Halliday’s transitivity which are ‘process’ which is the subject matter and ‘participant’, which are social actors. The analysis of these processes (i.e. ‘action’, ‘event’, ‘relational’, and ‘mental’ processes) from a social standpoint assisted a critical linguist in analysing factors (social, cultural, ideological, political or theoretical) that determine how a process in signified in texts. In 1979, Trew was capable to uncover that certain process types chosen in a discourse suggest that there are political and ideological revelations (Fairclough, 1992).

2.6 STUDIES ON REPRESENTATIONS

A vast number of literatures have been produced to date focusing on the representations of social actors in the form of textual analysis. However, many draw the attention towards the power struggles and biasness towards a particular group be it the minority or the stereotyped group. Generally, the analysis is used to investigate the negative representation to examine the reason behind the choices used to portray a particular social actor. However, there are several studies that focus on the positive representations, which relate to the research at hand.
The study on the representation of the Iranian Supreme Leader is one such study that analyses the representation of the social actor, Ali Khamenei in news website by Zuraidah & May (2013). The study examines the linguistic representation of the Iranian leader using van Leeuwen’s social actor network model (2008). The findings of the study indicate that Ali Khamenei is discursively represented in a positive light, by assimilating him to the Prophet Muhammad and the 12 infallible Imams of the Shia tradition. This has been done through nomination and titulation that carries the ideology of a sacred position. Such positive representation of him elevates his authority and spread intended ideology. The news is believed to be utilized as a way to reinforce the dominance of powerful individuals.

Another study investigates the linguistic representation of male and female social actors in a successful ESL textbook with the help of van Leeuwen’s (1996) framework and Halliday’s Transitivity model. The outcome of the analysis indicates that the female social actors are more prominent, successful, active and independent as well as being associated with high status activities as compared to their male counterparts (Sahragard & Davatgarzadeh, 2012). This is in tandem with the ideology embedded in the text by the text producers which is in line with feminism and the great effort that is put into the production of the series of textbooks is to actually to change or ‘move on’ from the stereotyped submissive role of women.

Even though there are plentiful researches made in the representational sense across various social actors, there still is a lack of literature on the one of the greatest military force in terms of the positive representation analysis of its soldiers and how they are portrayed in a discourse to convey the intended meaning of the discourse producers. There this research contributes although in a small way to fill the gap of heroic representation in the context of military.
CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 INTRODUCTION

To address the research questions envisioned in Chapter 1, in this chapter, the discussion will be on i) the data for this research, ii) the procedures used in data selection, and iii) the methods for data analysing which includes the analytical framework (van Leeuwen’s representation of social actors) and the strategies for the construction of hero representation.

3.2 DATA

Having a much focused research direction, the data for this research are easily searched and identifiable. The data for this research are the citations, which are dedicated to summarise the bravery of Medal of Honor recipients, which are formally expressed during the Medal of Honor ceremony, prior to the recipients (or the representative of perished recipients in the case of a posthumous award) receiving the Medal of Honor from the President of the United States. However, this formal celebratory of the recipients of Medal of Honor only took place since 1905, when a conscious effort was taken by President Theodore Roosevelt to heed the setting in which the medal was awarded to ensure the award’s prestige. In addition to this, the 1905 executive order on September 20th specified that “the presentation of Medal of Honor will always be made with formal and impressive ceremonial by the President, as commander in chief, or by such representative as the President may designate” (www.theordore-roosevelt.com/texecutiveorders.html).

It is important to note that since the introduction of the Medal of Honor during the Civil War in 1861, the value of the medal skyrocketed as it signifies the tremendous sacrifice displayed during battles and wars. Due to this, and without a clearer criteria for the medal being awarded at that time, a large number of applications for the medal were...
made and according to Collier (2011), through mere letters. This leads to the secretary of war’s office to often grant them without questioning and many of the medals were mailed out in the regular post before a new set of standards for the Medal of Honor was announced in June 1897, to end the previously chaotic process.

The development of the Medal of Honor since its debut does effect the content of the citations. Prior to the reform in June 1897, the official citations were “a mere cursory sentence or two”, (Collier, 2011). However, after the reform, the citations were paid a much detailed attention where a more complete and comprehensive description of the heroic act being included. The citations generally consist of the particulars of the recipients, their affiliations to the Armed Forces, and their specific courageous deed that had led them to be deserving recipients of the Medal of Honor.

Due to the process of finding the videos of all the Medal of Honor ceremonies and subsequently transcribing the audios into texts could be taxing and time-consuming, for this research, the list of the recipients and their citations are taken from the official website, which is maintained by a group of surviving recipients themselves for the public view and knowledge at www.cmohs.org. The citations from the website are a collection of transcribed official citations given out during the ceremony of presenting the Medal of Honor to the recipients. This makes www.cmohs.org an excellent choice of data source as it saves considerable time and effort in transcribing the citations from audio/video recordings of the ceremony. Figure 3.1 shows an example of an entry in the official website:
There are a total of 24 conflicts that were scrutinized by the United States government for act of valour and gallantry ranging from the year 1866 to 2016 as listed in the website. There are also awards bestowed under Special Legislation for four different incidents for unidentified soldiers who fought for the United States Army. The Medal of Honor came to existence during the Civil War, in 1861 to be exact. Then in 1863, the Medal of Honor was made permanent by the Congress. In total, there are a total of 3493 citations to be looked at. Table 3.1 comprises the complete list of the conflicts scrutinized by the United States government in a chronological order and the number of Medal of Honor awarded for each of the conflicts.
Table 3.1: List of Conflicts and the number of Medal of Honor awarded for each of the conflicts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>CONFLICTS</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>NUMBER OF MOH AWARDED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Indian War Campaigns</td>
<td>1817 – 1898</td>
<td>426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Civil War</td>
<td>1861 – 1865</td>
<td>1523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Interim 1866-1870</td>
<td>1866 – 1870</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Interim 1871-1898</td>
<td>1871 – 1898</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Korean Campaign</td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>War with Spain (Spanish American War)</td>
<td>1898</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Boxer Rebellion (China Incursion)</td>
<td>1898</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Philippine Insurrection</td>
<td>1899 -1902</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Interim 1901-1911</td>
<td>1901 – 1911</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Action against Philippine Outlaws</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>World War I</td>
<td>1914 – 1918</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mexican Campaign (Vera Cruz)</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Interim 1915-1916</td>
<td>1915 – 1916</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Haiti Campaign</td>
<td>1919 – 1920</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Interim 1920-1940</td>
<td>1920 – 1940</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Second Nicaraguan Campaign</td>
<td>1927 – 1933</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>World War II</td>
<td>1939 – 1945</td>
<td>473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Korean War</td>
<td>1950 – 1953</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Dominican Campaign</td>
<td>1916-1924</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Vietnam War</td>
<td>1955 – 1975</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Somalia Campaign</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>War in Afghanistan</td>
<td>2001-present</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>War in Iraq</td>
<td>2003-2010</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Special Legislation</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3493</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3 DATA SELECTION

This research concurs to a qualitative textual analysis research design due to the nature of the data which is necessary in order to answer the intended research questions in Chapter 1 successfully. A qualitative approach is best suited for this research as it is a key for a deeper understanding of social occurrences and their dynamics, in this case, the citations of the Medal of Honor and the ideological predisposition that entails. As described, there are a total of 3493 citations of the Medal of Honor recipients (see section 3.2). Due to the overwhelmingly large number of raw data and the wide time frame from the first introduction of the medal to the current recipient of the medal at the time of the writing, for the purpose of this research, multistage sampling method (which is combining cluster sampling and followed by simple random sampling) is used. As the Medal of Honor awards are clustered according to their conflicts in the main source website (www.cmohs.com) where all the selected citations will be taken from, that aspect of multistage sampling has been dealt with.

However, the number of Medal of Honor awarded to each conflict is varied (see table 3.1). Due to these wide-ranging differences from as little as two medals awarded in the Somalia Campaign and 1523 medals awarded in the Civil War, the selection of equal numbers of citations of the conflicts to be studied proved to be challenging. To overcome this, some boundaries has to be established before continuing to reduce the number of selected data through a second cluster sampling. As such, a more comprehensive description of the citations is in order.

The citations vary in many aspects such as length, language, the degree of description and information as well as focus. There doesn’t seem to be a particular guidance or protocol in the writing of the citation apart from the general summary of the deed. This coincides with the problems occurred before the new standard criterion for
awarding the medal that was announced in 1897. Since the content of the citations was paid more attention to by providing a detailed recount of the ordeal after the new set of standards was announced, for an equal and fair representation of the selected data, citations before this date were not considered for this research. These conflicts include Indian War Campaigns; Civil War; Interims 1866-1870 and 1871-1898; and Korean Campaign.

Furthermore, the executive order by President Theodore Roosevelt on the manner of presenting the Medal of Honor in 1905 may further influence the writing of the citations. This is because the order had elevated the procedure from a private affair of those in concern to becoming a national celebratory event. To accommodate the changes here, conflicts before this date are excluded from the selection. These conflicts are War with Spain; Boxer Rebellion and Philippine Insurrection.

Even though many conflicts have been excluded for the sake of narrowing down the scope of the study as well as reducing the number of variables that may or may not affect the outcome of the analysis, there are still a number of conflicts to choose from according to the list of conflicts after the last changes in the way the medals should be presented in 1905. For this reason, the deadliest wars are sought out. As wars are never without casualties, there are reasons to believe that the higher the number of casualties, the more effort is put into the making of the citations in hindsight to give hope for the nation.

According the online website (www.militaryfactory.com) on the list of US casualties in conflicts that involves the United States, the top three most deadliest and costliest wars with a high number of deaths (more than 100 000 deaths) are the Civil War, World War I, and World War II. These figures are also documented in the book “American War and Military Operations Casualties: Lists and Statistics”, where the author included
a list of the deadliest wars in terms of the number of casualties. The top three wars in which the United States had participated with a very high number of the United States military personnel casualties are the Civil War with a total of 364,511 deaths, World War I with a total of 116,516 deaths and World War II with a total of 405,399 deaths (Leland, 2010). For the uniformity of the research, the Civil War is not included as it precedes the changes made in June 1897 and the delivery manner in 1905 in which the way the Medal of Honor should be dealt with. Therefore, the selected conflicts would be i) World War I and ii) World War II.

Since the affiliation of the United States in wars and conflicts seems to overlap with each other or take place one after another with a gap of two to five years, it would be interesting to see the development and the changes that take place in a leap of almost 20 years although a direct comparison between older citations and newer citations is not the focus of this study as this study looks at the patterns of hero representation in the citations. For this reason the selected conflicts that fall under this bracket are i) the Somalia Campaign, ii) War with Afghanistan and iii) War with Iraq.

The selection criteria above conclude the second cluster sampling that is needed for this study. Out of the 25 conflicts where the Medal of Honor was awarded, 5 conflicts are studied. These wars are i) the World War I, ii) the World War II, iii) War with Iraq, iv) War with Afghanistan and v) the Somalia Campaign.

As the total Medal of Honor awarded from the two earlier conflicts is large; World War I has a total of 119 citations and World War II has a total of 473 citations; random sampling method is used. 10 citations from each of the earlier wars will be randomly selected using simple random sampling method done in Microsoft Excel. However, all the citations from the War with Afghanistan (14 citations), War with Iraq (4 citations) and the Somalia Campaign (2 citations) is selected due to consisting a small number of
citations which leads to a total of 40 citations from all the five selected conflicts which are analysed for this research.

Table 3.2 lists all the selected citations with each given a reference number (Citation 1 to Citation 40) based on a chronological order of the selected conflicts and then the alphabetical order of the recipients’ surname within each conflicts. A keyword is added to the labels of the citations to indicate which conflicts the citations are associated with. The selected citations are provided in full in the Appendix.
Table 3.2: List of the Selected Citations of the Medal of Honor Recipients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REFERENCE NUMBER</th>
<th>RECIPIENTS’ NAME</th>
<th>CONFLICT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citation 1-WW1</td>
<td>ALLWORTH, EDWARD C.</td>
<td>World War I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation 2-WW1</td>
<td>BARGER, CHARLES D.</td>
<td>World War I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation 3-WW1</td>
<td>BOONE, JOEL T.</td>
<td>World War I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation 4-WW1</td>
<td>COVINGTON, JESSE W.</td>
<td>World War I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation 5-WW1</td>
<td>GAFFNEY, FRANK</td>
<td>World War I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation 6-WW1</td>
<td>DILBOY, GEORGE</td>
<td>World War I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation 7-WW1</td>
<td>HALL, THOMAS L.</td>
<td>World War I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation 8-WW1</td>
<td>MORELOCK, STERLING</td>
<td>World War I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation 9-WW1</td>
<td>TURNER, WILLIAM B.</td>
<td>World War I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation 10-WW1</td>
<td>VILLEPIGUE, JOHN C.</td>
<td>World War I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation 11-WW2</td>
<td>COLE, ROBERT G.</td>
<td>World War II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation 12-WW2</td>
<td>DAVIS, CHARLES W.</td>
<td>World War II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation 13-WW2</td>
<td>GALT, WILLIAM WYLIE</td>
<td>World War II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation 14-WW2</td>
<td>HAUDE, LOUIS JAMES, JR.</td>
<td>World War II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation 15-WW2</td>
<td>HEDRICK, CLINTON M.</td>
<td>World War II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation 16-WW2</td>
<td>HUGHES, LLOYD H.</td>
<td>World War II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation 17-WW2</td>
<td>McGILL, TROY A.</td>
<td>World War II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation 18-WW2</td>
<td>PARLE, JOHN JOSEPH</td>
<td>World War II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation 19-WW2</td>
<td>REESE, JOHN N., JR.</td>
<td>World War II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation 20-WW2</td>
<td>VANCE, LEON R., JR.</td>
<td>World War II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation 21-So</td>
<td>GORDON, GARY I.</td>
<td>Somalia Campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation 22-So</td>
<td>SHUGHART, RANDALL D.</td>
<td>Somalia Campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation 23-Af</td>
<td>BYERS, JR. EDWARD C.</td>
<td>War in Afghanistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFERENCE NUMBER</td>
<td>RECIPIENTS’ NAME</td>
<td>CONFLICT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation 24-Af</td>
<td>CARPENTER, WILLIAM KYLE</td>
<td>War in Afghanistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation 25-Af</td>
<td>CARTER, TY M.</td>
<td>War in Afghanistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation 26-Af</td>
<td>GIUNTA, SALVATORE A.</td>
<td>War in Afghanistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation 27-Af</td>
<td>GROBERG, FLORENT A.</td>
<td>War in Afghanistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation 28-Af</td>
<td>MEYER, DAKOTA</td>
<td>War in Afghanistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation 29-Af</td>
<td>MILLER, ROBERT J.</td>
<td>War in Afghanistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation 30-Af</td>
<td>MONTI, JARED C.</td>
<td>War in Afghanistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation 31-Af</td>
<td>MURPHY, MICHAEL P</td>
<td>War in Afghanistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation 32-Af</td>
<td>PETRY, LEROY A.</td>
<td>War in Afghanistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation 33-Af</td>
<td>PITTS, RYAN M.</td>
<td>War in Afghanistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation 34-Af</td>
<td>ROMESHA, CLINTON L.</td>
<td>War in Afghanistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation 35-Af</td>
<td>SWENSON, WILLIAM D.</td>
<td>War in Afghanistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation 36-Af</td>
<td>WHITE, KYLE J.</td>
<td>War in Afghanistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation 37-Ir</td>
<td>DUNHAM, JASON L.</td>
<td>War in Iraq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation 38-Ir</td>
<td>McGINNIS, ROSS A.</td>
<td>War in Iraq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation 39-Ir</td>
<td>MONSOOR, MICHAEL A.</td>
<td>War in Iraq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation 40-Ir</td>
<td>SMITH, PAUL R.</td>
<td>War in Iraq</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4 ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

For this study, van Leeuwen’s framework is selected due to the categorization of the choices made for the social actors in the discourse through sociosemantic meaning, as oppose to lexicogrammatical. Van Leeuwen argues that discourses are ultimately modelled on social practices (p. 145). They are essentially based on what people do. Taking from his example on the discourses of leadership, our knowledge of leadership is based on what the leaders do. However, the beauty of a discourse is that it can be shaped to whatever is necessary by the governing party of the discourse.

Aiming to answer the first research question and subsequently the second, the selected data of 40 citations are analysed based on the features discussed by van Leeuwen’s (1996) the representation of social actors. All the words and sentences in the selected citations will be critically read and analysed on their own and in accordance to the system explained and utilized by van Leeuwen (1996) focusing on each phrase, clause and sentence separately. Van Leeuwen’s model will be ideal in this research as it is a comprehensive framework in the discourse analysis which can analyse the representation of actors in a discourse from a social standpoint. The features of the framework are shown in Figure 3.2:
Figure 3.2: Van Leeuwen’s (1996) Framework of Social Representation
Typically, a particular piece of discourse does not comprise all the categories of representation described by van Leeuwen in his framework. Therefore, a few categories are selected based on the descriptions and examples provided by van Leeuwen (1996) in his work. The following elements from his framework are considered for this research based on the heroic representation theme which are: *Inclusion/Exclusion*, *Activation/Passivation*, *Individualisation/Assimilation*, *Nomination*, and *Functionalization*. These elements will be explained in further details based on van Leeuwen’s (1996) and (2008) descriptions and explanations:

1. **Inclusion/Exclusion**

   According to van Leeuwen (1996), representations of social actors are often included or excluded in accordance to the discourse producers’ intentions and purposes as well as their targeted readers. To understand what inclusion is, van Leeuwen (1996) gives a clear description of exclusion. In exclusion, social actors are either omitted with or without leaving traces; backgrounded; or supressed to serve a certain purpose.

2. **Activation / Passivation**

   Activation took place when the social actors are represented as the dynamic and active force when describing their activities. Conversely, when the social actors are represented as undergoing a certain activity, it is referred to as passivation. In other words, the social actor is the recipient of the action or activity. Passivated social actors can be further classified as *subjected*, where when the social actors are treated as objects or *beneficialised* (benefitting from a certain action either positively or negatively).
3. Individualisation /Assimilation

Individualisation is when social actors are referred to as individuals, as opposed to assimilation when they are referred to as a group. According to van Leeuwen (1996), these categories are primarily significant because individuality is an element that is placed as a great value in our society by large. Further examples are given through his work where elite persons tend to be individualised whereas ordinary people are assimilated. However, it depends on the producers of the discourses and their target audience which will determine on which social actor to be individualised or to be assimilated.

4. Nomination

At times when a social actor is represented based on his or her unique identity, it is referred to as nomination according to the systems laid out by van Leeuwen. Nomination is usually realized by proper noun, and they may or may not be titulated with honorifics (e.g. Dr., Prof) or affiliation (e.g. Auntie Barbara). Nomination can be further divided into three categories which are formal, semi-formal and informal. The nominated social actors largely depend on the medium or ‘story’ on who the producers of the discourse regard as important or who they give importance to.

5. Functionalization

Functionalization takes place if the actors are referred to regarding the activities that they do, such as their roles or their occupations, (van Leeuwen, 1996). There are three ways to realise this aspect: i) by a noun which is formed from a verb through the use of suffixes (e.g. interviewer,
payee); ii) by a noun formed by another noun through suffixes (e.g. pianist), and iii) by the compounding of noun (e.g. cameraman).

To answer the second research question, the understanding of how representation relates to ideology must be formed. The ability to consciously select the representation of social actors indicates that ideologies are formulated, reproduced and reinforced through discourses or other semiotic practice (Barker, 2001). Although ideology is the shared social representations by members of a group which are utilised to accomplish everyday social practices (Billig et al., 1988; Fowler, 1985; van Dijk, 1998 as cited in Barker, 2001), it is not as easy as to read-off the ideology embedded in a discourse. Furthermore, Chouliaraki and Fairclough did suggest that ideology has the ability to mould people’s perspectives which in turn are capable of ‘ironing out’ contradictions and dilemmas of practices to align with the intentions and perspectives of those in power (1999, as cited in Barker, 2001). Therefore, appropriate method of analysing the ideological predisposition is taken into consideration.

In the interest to achieve this and subsequently answer the second research question, Fairclough’s (1995) three dimensional framework is looked upon to examine the outcome of well-represented social actors for the benefit of the text producers/institution/people of power. Being one of the many approaches that can be used to analyse the legitimisation of one’s position in the place of power, it serves as a useful tool for the purpose of this research. A simplified understanding of the interrelated parts of Fairclough’s framework (text, discursive practices and social practices) is given by Yoong et al. (2013) as follows: i) the text is the ‘product’ or the physical manifestation of the social practice; ii) the discursive practice is a ‘tool’ used to create the text in order to actualise the social practice; and iii) the social practice can be equated with the ‘will’, ‘desire’ and ‘motivation’ of the establishment, institution or
individual (p. 235). Young et al. (2013) further explains that to understand the social practice level, an understanding of the social theories is necessary (p. 235). This is because the embedded ideologies can be highlighted if a particular discourse is seen through this angle. Through textual analysis, namely vocabulary and grammar, useful insights can be harvested in terms of the ideological predisposition.

The next chapter will look into the analysis of the representation of the awardees as described in the citations using the social systems of van Leeuwen with samples from the citations in a direction towards answering the first research question of this study.
CHAPTER 4: ANALYSIS

4.1 INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, the analysis of the citations (see section 3.2) is drawn from van Leeuwen’s representation of social actors. In an attempt to answer the research questions formulated in the first chapter, the citations are looked at in terms of the linguistic choices made which reflects on the representations of the social actors. In this research the social actors that will be looked at are the recipients. Van Leeuwen’s representation of social actor will give an in-depth reflection on the choices of linguistic elements to represent the recipients as heroes. The framework is used to interpret how the recipients of the Medal of Honor are represented as social actors and considers what is included as well as excluded in the representation of the recipients as heroes.

As shown in Chapter 3 Figure 3.2, van Leeuwen (1996) illustrates a number of major types of transformation in the realization of the representation of social actors. Based on the framework and the selected citations, there are four noticeable systems found in the Medal of Honor citations. These systems are:

- Activation
- Individualisation
- Nomination
- Functionalization

These noticeable systems will be explained further with excerpts taken from the Medal of Honor citations.

4.2 ACTIVATION OF RECIPIENTS

A form of representation under role allocation can be realised through the assigning of the social actors with either active or passive roles. By giving the social actor an
active role hence *activation*, the social actor would generally be represented as “the active dynamic force in an activity” (van Leeuwen, 1996). Reversely, by giving the social actors a passive role hence *passivation*, the actor is then represented as “undergoing” a certain activity or “being at the receiving end” of an activity. Passivation is further broken down into two subcategories; *subjection* and *beneficialisation*. However, in the selected citations, it is found that the soldiers are generally activated and rarely or never passivated. Some examples of activation of the social actors are shown in the examples 1 - 7.

Example 1: Lt. Col. Cole was personally leading his

battalion

(Citation 11-WW2)

Example 2: Lt. Col. Cole issued orders to assault the enemy

(Citation 11-WW2)

Example 3: he charged on and led the remnants of his battalion(Citation 11-WW2)

Example 4: he provided some of it (ammunition) to the dazed

pilot and then radioed for help

(Citation 21-So)

Example 5: Sergeant First Class Shughart provided

precision sniper fires

(Citation 22-So)

In examples 1, 2 and 3, the awardees were described as ‘leading’, ‘issuing orders’ and ‘taking charge’. These choices of words give the impression to the readers/listeners that the awardees have the authorization to do these acts without any objections by others, or simply put the awardees are someone of a higher rank; a superior. Whereas in examples 4 and 5, the word ‘provided’ here gives the impression of someone who is capable, equipped or strong enough to tend to the needs of others; a clear distinction
from a person who requires the help, as the person who requires help is definitely seen as a weak person who is incapable of protecting anyone.

Example 6: Pfc. Barger...made 2 trips...and rescued 2 wounded officers. (Citation 2-WW1)

Example 7: He (Pfc. Gaffney) killed the crew, captured the gun, bombed several dugouts, and, after killing 4 more of the enemy, held the position (Citation 5-WW1)

Similarly in examples 6 and 7, the social actors are portrayed as the doer, by utilizing verbs like ‘made’, ‘rescued’, ‘killed’, ‘captured’, ‘bombed’, ‘killing’ and ‘held’. In example 6, Pfc. Barger is described as making the initiative to go ahead with the trip, portraying the soldier’s ability to make a decision, quite the contrast to an incapable man. In addition to that, in example 6, the word ‘rescued’ here gives the impression that Pfc. Barger has his situation under control and that he also has the upper hand to protect his fellow comrades in the means of rescuing wounded soldiers from a far worse state. The word also gives the readers/listeners a sense of security as Pfc. Barger goes all out to help his fellow comrades. In example 7, Pfc. Gaffney is portrayed as a person with extreme strength and bravery due to the choices of words used in his citation, i.e. killed, captured, bombed. This activation also can be interpreted as the actor having a very high willpower and determination to do whatever he needs to do in a battle field.

What is important to note here is the type of activities the social actors are being activated in. With this in mind, Halliday’s (1985) work on the transitivity system is drawn on. This system is able to interpret the world of experience into convenient set of identifiable process types. Some of the process types in Halliday’s system include
mental process, verbal process, material process, behavioural process, existential process and relational process. Referring to the citations, it is clear that the soldiers are mostly represented as actors in material processes. As explained by Halliday (p. 106), material processes are the “processes of doing”, which can be expressed via concrete or abstract activity. From the examples above, the words ‘leading’, ‘issuing orders’, ‘taking charge’, ‘provided’, ‘radioed’ ‘made’, ‘rescued’, ‘killed’, ‘captured’, ‘bombed’, ‘killing’ and ‘held’ can be categorised under concrete material processes which directly activates the social actor.

Halliday further divides material processes into two types; transactive and non-transactive. Transactive involves two-way interaction between the actor and other participants whereas non-transactive refers to the actor alone with no other participants. In examples 1 to 7, it is clear that the material processes that take place are of the transactive material processes. The actions of the awardees do have an impact to other participants be it his comrades (examples 1-4 and 6) or the enemy (example 5 and 7).

Van Leeuwen (1995) reasons that it requires a certain power to be able to transact. So, an actor in the transactive material processes is inevitably ‘doing’ something which has an effect onto other people that are involved, which translates as having the upper hand or power. This precise position where the awardees are put into and represented in the citations elevates the status of the said awardees into a superior form; a person to look up to or a very capable person who protects the rest of his kind. Van Leeuwen further says “the actions of lower-status actors are more often represented as non-transactive”, which concludes the reason behind awardees rarely being passivated in the citations for fear of ‘lowering the status’ of a soldier.
4.3 INDIVIDUALIZATION OF RECIPIENTS

Social actors can be represented as specific, identifiable individuals, as oppose to assimilation, which groups the social actors. Individualisation is realised by singularity. On the other hand, assimilation is realised by plurality. Since individuality of a person is of a great value to ‘many spheres of our society’ (p. 48), the choice of individualising a social actor in any particular text is seen as a deliberate attempt to highlight importance. According to van Leeuwen in his examples, newspapers that are middle-class oriented have the tendency assimilate regular and ordinary people while individualising elite persons. This implies the middle-class oriented newspaper put higher importance to the elite people rather than the general public.

On the other hand, working-class oriented newspapers have the tendency to individualise ‘ordinary people’, and by doing so, they are able to connect more to the ordinary people. From the citations, the recipients are individualised and not assimilated. Individuality of the recipients is stressed on by the producers of the citations to portray the awardees’ personal contributions and their extraordinary service to their country.

This elevates them as an important figure which is realised linguistically, and singles them out from numerous other brave soldiers, as being the bravest of brave. This also brings a sense of capability among the individualised social actors to do the necessary action under great stress, as done by the recipients and subsequently, portrayed as such in the citations. Also, such importance on the individuality will enable the public to connect on a personal level to the specific soldier. Examples 8 – 14 highlight the individualisation of the social actors in the citations.
Example 8: this officer mounted the canal bank and
called for his men… (Citation 1-WW1)

Example 9: Jesse W. Covington, of the U.S.S. Steward,
plunged to… (Citation 4-WW1)

Example 10: he rose to his feet in front of his battalion
(Citation 11-WW2)

Example 11: he advanced alone on the enemy machinegun
(Citation 7-WW1)

Example 12: … Pvt. Morelock, with 3 other men…
(Citation 8-WW1)

Example 13: Single-handed he rushed an enemy machinegun…
and killed the crew with his pistol
(Citation 9-WW1)

Example 14: … he encountered 4 of the enemy…, whom he
attacked and killed…
(Citation 10-WW1)

Apart from using the soldiers’ name and their rankings to reflect on the individuality
of the recipients; (examples 9 and 12), the usage of demonstrative pronoun like ‘this’
(example 8), highlights the particular soldier in question which sets him apart from the
rest. The usage of personal and possessive pronoun like ‘he’ and ‘his’ (examples 8, 10,
11, 13 and 14) give a similar effect whereby the soldier’s individuality is reflected.

What is interesting to note here is that the individualisation of a social actor is very
much highlighted through an indirect comparison to an assimilated group of people, be
it the generic ‘the enemy’ which is rendered throughout the citations (examples 11, 13
and 14) or as in examples 8, 10 and 12; where the awardee is compared to ‘his men’, ‘his battalion’ and ‘3 other men’. Through such subtle contrast, it is clear that the citations focus on individualising the recipients, highlighting them as the strong leader that they are, and this projection is directed towards the public in contrast to other social actors in the citations.

4.4 NOMINATION OF RECIPIENTS

Nomination occurs when a social actor is represented in terms of their unique identity (van Leeuwen, 1996) and are typically realised by the usage of proper nouns (p. 52). Nomination is contrasted with categorisation, where the latter refers to the representation of the social actors in terms of identities and functions they share with others; this will be further elaborated in the next section. From van Leeuwen’s framework, there are three subcategories under nomination that undeniably shows a varying degree of importance given onto the social actors. Typically realised by the proper nouns, the subcategories under nomination are formalisation, semi-formalisation and informalisation.

Formalisation or formal nomination is when the social actor is referred to using his or her surnames only, which can be done with or without the honorifics. An example of formal nomination without honorific is Smith and an example of formalisation with honorific is Dr. Jones. Semi-formalisation sees the given name and the surname of the social actor and informalisation is realised with the usage of the social actor’s given name only. The examples given by van Leeuwen are ‘Dwight Harris’ for the former and ‘Beverly’ for the latter (p. 53).

According to van Leeuwen, nominations may be titulated. Apart from nomination on its own, titulation plays an important part in justifying the importance of the social actors. Titulation can be in the form of honorifications or affiliations. Honorifications
are the addition of standard titles or ranks while affiliations are the addition of a personal or kinship relation term (p. 53). In the military domain, the honorifics of a soldier or an officer are given an utmost importance. This may be seen as a way to distinguish accomplished officers that the rest. Examples of nominations from the citations are shown and explained further.

4.4.1 Formal Nomination

In the formal nomination, only the surname takes place, with or without the addition of honorifics. From the analysis, this is almost the only way the soldiers are addressed in the citations of the Medal of Honor recipients, with the addition of their full honorifics i.e. military ranks, hence a titulated formalisation. The inclusions of common honorifics like Master or Mr. are dropped out to give way to the military ranks. The examples 15 – 19 demonstrate titulated formal nomination:

Example 15: Master Sergeant Gordon’s sniper… (Citation 21-So)

Example 16: Lt. Col. Vance pinned in the cockpit… (Citation 20-WW2)

Example 17: Surg. Boone, leaving the shelter… (Citation 3-WW1)

Example 18: Maj. Davis (then Capt.), executive officer… (Citation 12-WW2)

Example 19: Capt. Galt manned the .30-caliber… (Citation 13-WW2)

Example 20: Cpl. Hauge boldly took the initiative… (Citation 14-WW2)

Example 21: each time, T/Sgt. Hendrick fearlessly… (Citation 15-WW2)

4.4.2 Semi–formal nomination

However, there are a few isolated cases where the awardees are nominated in the semi-formal manner, by using both the given name and the surname. Nonetheless, the
military ranks are still used and never dropped which indicates the existence of titulation in the semi-formal nomination. The examples are as such:

Example 22: **Specialist Ty M. Carter** distinguished… (Citation 25-Af)

Example 23: **Specialist Salvatore A. Giunta** distinguished (Citation 26-Af)

Example 24: **Staff Sergeant Jared C. Monti** distinguished… (Citation 30-Af)

Example 25: **Staff Sergeant Leroy A. Petry** distinguished… (Citation 32-Af)

Example 26: **Sergeant Ryan M. Pitts** distinguished… (Citation 33-Af)

Example 27: **Captain William D. Swenson** distinguished… (Citation 35-Af)

Example 28: **Specialist Kyle J. White** distinguished… (Citation 36-Af)

In addition to the surnames and military titles, all the awardees were addressed by their first names and the initials of their middle names as shown in the examples 22-28. However, this only occurred at the introductory of the citations and at the conclusion of the citations for examples 22, 23, 26, 27 and 28; while only at the introductory of the citations for examples 24 and 25. In an even more isolated case, an awardee was nominated semi-formally, but with the exclusion of the honorifics, as such:

Example 29: **Robert J. Miller** distinguished himself .. (Citation 29-Af)

Just like the previous examples of semi-formal nominations (see examples 22-28), this particular incident only happened once in the awardee’s citation; to be specific in the introductory sentence. Subsequently, the said awardee was referred to as ‘Staff Sergeant Miller’ seven times throughout his citation, reverting back to titulated formal nomination.
What is consistent here is the fact that the honorifics are rarely, if never, dropped out. Military ranks are generously repeated within the citations to heighten the importance of the said awardee and subsequently portrays the awardee as not only courageous, brave and fearless; but someone of a serious role in a war zone or plainly someone of a higher value. Some military ranks used are Lance Corporal, Specialist, Staff Sergeant, Lieutenant, Major, Corporal and Captain to name a few. It is also important to note that there was never an occurrence of the informal nomination (given name only). This scenario showcases the formality of the event of a military domain, therefore heightening the seriousness and the solemnity of the occasion, paying full attention to the recipients’ unique identity as a decorated soldier of a certain rank, and a long list of honorifics and affiliations to match their unique identity.

4.5 FUNCTIONALIZATION OF RECIPIENTS

In his framework, van Leeuwen (1996) distinguished two key types of categorisation, which are functionalisation and identification. While identification is when the social actors are defined in terms of what they are, functionalisation is realised when the social actors are referred to in terms of the “activity that they do”; in other words their role or occupation (pg. 54). There are three ways functionalisation is typically realised. The first is by forming a noun through a verb and suffixes, e.g. guardian. The second method is by forming a noun through another noun and suffixes e.g. pianist. Thirdly, it is by compounding two nouns e.g. cameraman. Some examples of each realisation of functionalisation from the citations are described further.

As explained, functionalisation can be realised by a noun which is formed from a verb, through suffixes such as -er, -ant, -ent and -ee to name a few. Evidence of this realisation would be as follow.

Example 30: …as a team leader with… (Citation 26-Af)
Example 31: …while serving as Rifle Squad Leader… (Citation 37-Ir)

Example 32: …while serving as Sniper Team Leader… (Citation 21-So)

Example 33: …as leader of a machinegun squad… (Citation 14-WW2)

Example 34: …and another stretcher bearer… (Citation 2-WW1)

The recipients of these citations (from examples 30-34) were given a function to lead their respective teams, which could be deciphered as superior to their fellow colleagues and is seen as having leadership qualities, which tie nicely to the plentiful definition of heroism explained in the previous chapters. In example 34, by giving an activity to carry the wounded out of the war zone a title (stretcher bearer), the person doing this task is indirectly elevated.

Another way to realise functionalization of a social actor is to from a noun using another noun that signifies a place or a tool closely associated with an activity through suffixes. Examples are as stated.

Example 35: Specialist Ty M. Carter…. (Citation 25-Af)

Example 36: … as an M2 .50-caliber Machine Gunner … (Citation 38-Ir)

Example 37: …automatic weapons gunner… (Citation 39-Ir)

Example 38: … this officer mounted… (Citation 1-WW1)

Example 39: …executive officer of an infantry… (Citation 2-WW1)

In this case, the word special functions as a noun as opposed to as an adjective because in this context, special can be referred as having a specific purpose. Additionally, the addition of the suffix –ist completes the realization of the second type
of *functionalization*. Example 35 shows the purpose or function of Ty M. Carter as a ‘Specialist’ in this ordeal, separating him from other soldiers, whom might not have the same expertise and knowledge as him. In examples 36 and 37, the function of the awardee is clearly stated as the person handling the said weapons (gunner). They are referred to the role they play in the battlefield. Similarly, in examples 38 and 39 the awardees are referred to their position or occupation which is ‘officer’.

Another observation of frequency from Citation 25 in regards of *functionalization* is that the word ‘Specialist’ was repeated 9 times throughout the *citation*. Similarly, in Citation 26, the word ‘Specialist’ is repeated 10 times.

In examples 40 and 41, the recipients were given a clear function through the compounding of nouns which denotes a tool closely relating to an activity (*rifle-shooting*) and a highly generalized categorisation (*man*).

Example 40: while serving as an Automatic Rifleman… (Citation 24-Af)

Example 41: an automatic rifleman, pushing forward.. (Citation 5-WW1)

### 4.6 SUMMARY

In the question of inclusion or exclusion of the main social actors, it is clear that the soldiers are always included which coincides with the intentions and purposes of the producers of the *citations*. Being descriptive paragraphs about their achievements and accomplishments in the battle field, the inclusion of the awardees are highlighted. A few categories of representation described by van Leeuwen in his framework of social representation was observed through the analysis which relates to the social actors being included are activation, individualisation, nomination and functionalization. Furthermore, the contrast of the exclusion of the enemy with the inclusion of the soldiers is very sharp. When the opponent is often supressed or backgrounded to reduce
the number of times they are being explicitly referred to (van Leeuwen, 2006, p. 41) and generalized (the enemy), the United States’ soldiers are individualised with personal pronouns, always nominalised in the formal nomination with proper titulation and are given clear functions as their role in the conflict which translate to the importance of their own soldiers compared to soldiers from the opposing team.
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION

5.1 INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, we will attempt to uncover the answer for the second research question regarding the ideological predisposition imparted by the Medal of Honor citations, through the analysis of the representation of social actors. White (2000, p. 142) believed that the analysis of social actors and discovering their consistency in representing within a particular text or discourse is a valuable tool for discovering ideological positioning, which may be concealed. According to Stubbs (1996, p. 93), it is important and crucial to identify the linguistic mechanisms which are embedded with ideologies. This is because ideology does not necessarily function at the level of conscious or intentional bias. Nevertheless, the point of realising that certain choices that have been made surfaces the idea that other choices could be made as well, which might result in the reality being presented in many different ways.

Ideology in the citations may be subtle, but it is regarded as an important tool to convey the views or intentions of the stakeholders, in this case the U.S. government, to the citizens of their country. In all honesty, the job scope of armed forces does include killing or ending the life of the enemy. This action cannot be hidden from the common knowledge and even from the sequence of events in the citations, although not to the point of overuse. Some of the verbs used in the citations to make references to this action are killed, killing (Citation 5-WW1), killed (Citation 7-WW1), killed (3 times in Citation 9-WW1), killed, killing (Citation 10-WW1), dispatched, killed (Citation 13-WW2), determined assault, destroyed, demolishing (Citation 14-WW2), killed (Citation 15-WW2), kill, (Citation 22-So), immobilized, eliminate (Citation 23-Af) and placed accurately deadly fire (Citation 25-Af) to quote a few.
Although the deeds are seen as crucial for the benefit of the country that the soldiers are fighting for, we cannot escape from the gruesomeness of this action. Therefore, there is a need for the stakeholders to polish up this action and present it to the general public in a manner that gives the U.S. military a glowing reputation, despite the heavy involvement of *ending other people’s lives* being intertwined although the severity of that thought is toned down by labelling the other people as *the enemy*.

The word ‘kill’ itself plays a part in minimizing the severity of the action and aids in achieving the representation of the soldiers in a glowing light. ‘Kill’ is used as opposed to other synonyms for ‘ending a life’ like murder, slaughter, execute, exterminate, and assassinate to name a few. In documenting warfare, i.e. *citations*, the word ‘kill’ is used due to the almost neutral connotation that comes with the word. Kill is defined as ‘to cause someone or something to die’, (dictionary.cambridge.org). As a comparison to other synonyms, the word ‘kill’ does not have ugly connotations latched to it to suggest a malicious intent, just a more direct ‘ending of life’.

Murder on the other hand comes with the connotation of a crime and a pre-planned killing, which does not suit the warfare scenario and especially for the U.S. soldiers as portrayed in the *citations* because it is not a personal vendetta, rather it is a deed for the country. Slaughter on the other hand means unfair and cruel massive killing especially in a war or killing animals for their meat (dictionary.cambridge.org). The definitions of slaughter doesn’t represent the soldiers well as the U.S. soldiers should neither be portrayed as killing innocents during war, just the opposing team of soldiers, their equals in combat ground; nor killing for the meat of their enemy. Execute means to kill someone as a legal punishment which would imply the harsh judgement of the U.S. soldiers by taking matters into their own hands and punishing the enemy, while assassinate simply means killing of famous people which is not the case in warfare.
Although this research is a textual analysis in nature, it cannot be denied that it is interesting to unearth the likely ideologies that may go hand in hand with the composition of the *citations*. As said, this chapter discusses the possible, as described by Cameron (2001), ‘hidden agenda’ (p. 123) that had led to the creation of the discourse as it is in the *citations*, in other words, its ideological dimension. Cameron (2001) also believes that the choices speakers and writers make in their discourse naturalize particular social arrangements that serve particular interest, where in time it might seem like the only possible or rational arrangements. When this happens, the underlying ideological stand will remain ‘hidden’ from the naked eye.

By implementing strategic representational choices into sets of statements in the systematically-organised *citations*, it gives the producers of the *citations* a textual landscape where they can present the awardees not as who they are, but as what the institution (i.e. U.S. military, U.S. government) would like the awardees to be perceived as (i.e. the ideal American soldiers) or in ways the institution needs the general public (i.e. citizens of America) to perceive the awardees or the institution as.

From the analysis in Chapter 4, a few themes emerge through the representation of the awardees as heroes. The analysis shows that the grammatical and lexical usage of language ‘wrought’ by the producers of the *citations* reflects certain aspects of reality. These outcomes on the emerging heroic themes through the representation of the awardees in the *citations* of the Medal of Honor and the ideological predisposition that are embedded in the *citations* are elaborated and discussed further with the support of relevant social theories concerning language and ideology.
Therefore this chapter develops in the discussion of the following sections that which are:

- Heroic themes in the military context (see section 5.2)
- Ideologies embedded in heroism (see section 5.3)

### 5.2 HEROIC THEMES IN THE MILITARY CONTEXT

From this qualitative research, a few themes were found in the making of heroic representation of the recipient of the Medal of Honor in the citations. All the recipients of the Medal of Honor are no doubt, seen as heroes. The next sections will discuss on the themes found that contribute to the representation of the recipients as heroes:

- Decision-making soldiers are heroes (section 5.2.1)
- Bold soldiers are heroes (section 5.2.2)
- High calibre soldiers are heroes (section 5.2.3)

#### 5.2.1 Decision-making soldiers are heroes

From the representations of the social actors in the citations, the recipients are always the decision makers. A decision maker is a person who decides things at a higher level of an organization, a trait that is seen and portrayed by all the recipients through the citations. An example that portrays this clearly can be seen in the following sentence: *Seeing his advance unit making slow headway up the steep slope ahead, this officer mounted the canal bank and called for his men to follow* (Citation 1-WW1). This sentence visibly breaks down the flow of a decision maker- from the soldier identifying the problem at the beginning, comes up with a counter action, and urges the others to do the same.
Some other examples of phrases that is used in the citations to signify these soldiers as decision makers are: upon their own initiative (Citation 2-WW1), ordering his men (Citation 7-WW1), plunged overboard to rescue a survivor (Citation 4-WW1), led a small group of men to the attack (Citation 9-WW1), and pushing forward alone, after all the members of his squad had been killed (Citation 5-WW1) to say the least. These phrases portray the actions taken on their own, believing it to be the best decision at the time of the event and moving forward, and in some cases roping in others to do the same. Decision makers are always seen as at the top of the food-chain in any organization. No doubt the acquisition of power comes in during decision making. This is seen as a crucial fact in hero representation, where heroes have the ability to make the decisions, be it big or small and this seems to elevate the recipients from the other soldiers.

The representation of the social actors/recipients as the decision makers is necessary and can be seen as two-folds, the first is to gain the respect and confidence of the citizens of the U.S. and to reinforce that the country is defended by capable people; and the second is to ensure future enlisters to take part in this glorious occupation and to entice them to utilize their quick thinking action and leadership quality for the country, and to be more specific, on the combat ground.

5.2.2 Bold soldiers are heroes

Being bold in this context of warfare is seen as someone who is confident, courageous and has the ability to take risks (even in the face of a certain death). Bold here is used as an umbrella term to refer to all courageous feats such as daring, brave, valiant, valorous, fearless, dauntless, intrepid, gallant and unflinching just to name a few. From the citations, some of these words are in fact used to refer to the soldiers. Such examples are gallantry, intrepidity, undaunted courage, bold fighting spirit
(Citation 24-Af); gallantry, intrepidity, heroic actions, heroism, selflessness (Citation 25-Af); gallantry, intrepidity, courage, selflessness, heroism, selflessness (Citation 26-Af); and daring, bold fighting spirit, courage (Citation 28-Af). Some of the words used are repetitive within a single citation, as well as across other citations. This repetitive pattern is to reinforce and to emphasise the bold actions taken by the recipients. Tenacity is also regarded as a bold quality where tenacious people are people who keep on going or continuing their core intentions despite setbacks. In this context of warfare, setbacks here are referred to their injuries. Many of the citations include the tenacity of the soldiers to attack, defend or aid fellow soldiers despite severe injuries.

5.2.3 High calibre soldiers are heroes

Another theme that emerges from representation of heroes in the citations is ‘high calibre’ soldiers are heroes. In this research, the word high calibre is used as a broad term to refer to any kind of ‘step up’ from a normal, regular human being. High calibre is defined as higher in rank and status or the quality of the action performed.

When high calibre is seen through the possession of high rank and status, it translates as the soldiers having the intelligence and capability as portrayed through the higher status or ranking of the recipients. From the ranking of the recipients, which is explained in the nomination of the recipients in Chapter 4, we can conclude that the soldiers are regarded with people of rank, which comes with admiration and respect for the particular soldier. Some examples of nomination is the repetition of the title ‘Captain’ in Citation 13-WW2 (8 times), ‘Lieutenant Colonel’ in Citation 14-WW2 (5 times), ‘Specialist’ in Citation 25-Af (9 times), and ‘Sergeant First Class’ in Citation 22-So (11 times). It is important to note that although citations from World War I have the repetition of the titles; it is not to the extent of the other examples from other
conflicts which may be due to the shorter texts style for that period. By repeating the titulation of the recipients in the *citations*, it suggested a more hierarchical-oriented ideology being embedded into the texts, which translates to readers/listeners that people with power are regarded as high calibre and in extension to that, the high calibre of soldiers are translated to being heroes.

However, a high calibre soldier is not defined through having ranks and titles only, but also the actions that is undertaken at the battle field with or without the ranks and titles. Some words and phrases used in the *citations* that suggest leadership qualities are *called for his men, followed by his men* (Citation 1-WW1); *ever conscious and mindful of the suffering fallen, saving the lives of the wounded* (Citation 3-WW1); *on his own initiative* (Citation 19-WW2 & Citation 26-Af); *led his formation* (Citation 20-WW2); *led his men* (Citation 3-Af); *led his team, ordered his squad to dismount, led his fire team on foot* (Citation 38-Ir); *choose instead to protect his teammates* (Citation 39-Ir). These examples showcases their stand as leaders of high calibre who act on their own will (either to protect someone by exposing oneself with the risk of being hit or finding an alternative way or route to advance in the battle field) when it is above and beyond the call of their duty.

### 5.3 IDEOLOGIES EMBEDDED IN HEROISM

This section will describe the social theories that are embedded in the production of the *citations* which are:

- Patriotism (section 5.3.1)
- Nationalism (section 5.3.2)
- Militarism (section 5.3.3)
- Group cohesion (section 5.3.4)
5.3.1 Patriotism

An ideology that one can derive from the direction of the citations is patriotism. The Merriam-Webster online dictionary defines patriotism as love for or devotion to one’s country, which coincides with any standard dictionary definition. A philosophical study of the subject by Nathanson (1993) defines the essential attitudes for patriotism which are:

1. Special affection for one’s country
2. A sense of personal identification with the country
3. Special concern for the well-being of the country
4. Willingness to sacrifice to promote the country’s good. (pp. 34-35)

If one possesses all the features listed, then he or she is a patriot. The definition highlights the association of sacrificing, in other words dying for the country, with patriotism. Often wars are glorified and embellished to evoke patriotism in the hearts of the citizens. Patriotism is therefore deemed as relevant and important in the industry of the military. This is because recruiting or alluring someone to fight and possibly die in a warzone for a country is a difficult feat, and through the means of patriotism it is possible.

The representation of the soldiers in the citations through activation where the citations recount the deeds done by them (i.e. leading, issuing orders, charged, killed, rescued and captured) is constructed to promote patriotism. Also, by rewarding gestures of patriotism shown by the soldiers in the citations with the highest military decoration, the patriotism of the audience is evoked. By associating the act of self-sacrifice to one of the glorified ways to show the nation your love and commitment, the citations are able to make ‘dying for your country’ exclusive. Some of the examples from the citations are risking his life in saving the life of this man, this gallant soldier was
mortaly wounded, resisted a hostile counterattack until he was finally surrounded and killed, continuing his advance without aid, with utter disregard for his own safety, at the risk of his life, etc.)

According to Bodnar (1992), patriotism serves as a symbol that “coerce the discordant interests of diverse social groups and unites them into a unitary conceptual framework” (p. 16) on a cultural level. Be it may to honour the deeds of the soldiers for the country, the citations can be seen as serving another purpose, wherein it unites the citizens of the United States, regardless of race or class, under one umbrella, which is belongingness to the same country, in the name of patriotism.

5.3.2 Nationalism

Another ideology that is relatable in terms of the representation of the awardees as heroes is nationalism. The notion of nationalism is not to be interchanged with patriotism and therefore it must be distinguished from patriotism and requires a separate section on its own. Orwell (1945, 2007) stresses that a line should be drawn between the two terms, as patriotism is defensive in nature in terms of military and culturally but nationalism however, is inseparable from the desire of power, with the purpose of seeking more power and more prestige. Nationalist, according to Orwell, feel that their country is superior to another in all factors and thus militant by nature due to its aggressive approach. The term nationalism, according to Smith (2013), is understood in three usages which are a language and symbolism, a socio-political movement and an ideology of a nation (p. 6). Smith further elaborates:

That each of these (three usages) nevertheless presupposes some measure of national feeling, certainly among the nationalists themselves, if not the designated population at large, needs to be borne in mind; for it serves to
connect the more active and organised sectors to the usually much larger, more passive and fragmented segments of the population (p. 6).

In simpler words, the term nationalism refers to the loyalty of an individual or a group to a particular nation. According to the Encyclopaedia Britannica’s “Nationalism” entry (n.d.), it is an ideology that is based on the premise that the individual’s loyalty and devotion to the nation-state surpass other individual or group interests. The entry also detailed that nationalism was the most successful political force at the end of the 18th century, starting in the American Revolution, where it brought the nation together through exuberant feeling of identity. Since history has recorded the victory of the U.S. in several wars, the citizens began to be proud to live in the U.S. and thus nationalism began to flourish.

Grammatically, the producers of the citations positioned a reality where their country, the United States of America, is a great nation with great soldiers and therefore they should be proud of their soldiers and their country as a whole. A seemingly innocent gesture to unite the citizens, it brings about the notion of elevating the status of one’s nation above others and while focusing on promoting their own culture and strength, it dangerously borders the degradation of others’ cultures, beliefs, values and rational.

5.3.3 Militarism

Militarism is another possible ideology that leads to the creation of the citations as it currently is. The broad term of militarism can be described as a belief that it is necessary to have strong armed forces and that they should be used for the sake of winning political or economic advantages. However, according to Enloe (2016) militarism is not a simple idea but a complex package that fosters military values in both military and civilians affairs (p. 11). Some of the ideas behind militarism as
explained by Enloe (2016) are: i) the belief that soldiers deserve special praise for their contribution to their countries; ii) the belief that hierarchies of command are a natural part of society; iii) the belief that in human affairs it is natural to have enemies; iv) the valuing of physical force over other modes of human interaction to resolve difference and v) the idea that any country without a state military is not a fully ‘mature’ state (p. 11).

The ideas described by Enloe on militarism construct a justification of military priorities and military influences in cultural, economic and political affairs of the particular state. These sentiments are noted by Bacevich (2013), and quite bluntly purported that the citizens of America succumb to the militarism ideology, where it come to the point that they have a “romanticised view of soldiers” and to view military power as the “truest measure of national greatness”, (p. 2). However, Enloe (2016) also noted that there is evidence that not everyone shares the same values on the importance of military and that militarism comes naturally, for example Iceland and Costa Rica (p.11).

In the citations, the nominations of the social actors (i.e. soldiers) which are textually arranged amidst the many activities done by them (e.g. leading his battalion, issued orders to assault the enemy, charged on, provided precision sniper fires, led his battalion, captured the gun, bombed the dugouts, killed the enemy and killing the enemy) and their functions (e.g. Rifle Squad Leader, Sniper Team Leader, leader of a machinegun squad, M2 .50-caliber Machine Gunner and automatic weapons gunner). This suggests a high regard for anything military. In the words of Bacevich (2013), “the global military supremacy that the United States presently enjoys and is bent on perpetuating, has become central to our national identity”, (p. 1).
Bacevich understood that military power is part of the citizens’ identity, for military officers and civilians alike. According to Mills (2000), militarism has been defined as “a case of the dominance for the purpose of heightening the prestige and increasing the power of the military”, (p. 9). By rewarding soldiers of the United States military with the highest level of decoration, it implies military supremacy and the nation’s dominance in term of military power. Classifying the stakeholders and decision makers as “the power elite” (p. 1), Mills says the military has the power to manipulation the opinion of civilians and this can be seen through the glorification of the soldiers in the citations.

5.3.4 Group cohesion

For an ideology to transpire successfully albeit subtly to the intended group of people, which in this case the citizens of the entire nation, is not a simple act, which is why a common factor uniting them has to be there. This is where the psychology of group cohesion comes in. Group cohesion is achieved by the sum of all the factors that lead to each member of a group to be attracted to the group, which ensures them to stay in the group. In other words, group cohesion functions as a social glue that binds a group together, similar to Mudrack’s (1989) description where a cohesive group “is one which sticks together, one whose members are bonded to one another and to the group as a whole” (p. 772).

Cohesiveness is also the establishment and maintenance of a group identity, a sense of “we-ness”, (French, 1941; Scheidel and Crowell, 1979, as cited in Owen, 1985, p. 415) and this sense of “we-ness” has the ability to surpass individual motives and differences. By show-casing the cohesiveness of the soldiers in the citations, it indirectly ‘attracts’ and ‘entices’ the readers to connect to them. The stakeholders and the producers of the citations understood well the uniqueness of group cohesion and the
effects it may have for the observers, in this case, civilians view towards the soldiers who are in great sync with one another in order to bring victory to the country, where the soldiers, for the most part, display fearlessness, personal bravery and outstanding leadership; all while having little regard for their own safety. This translates as the soldiers valuing the life of their comrades more, which is very reassuring and appealing to the general public.

Gioia in a similar vein, questions the “identification of a competitor as a thread would cue a “group cohesion” script among organizational participants”, (1986, as cited in Mudrack, 1989). This is highly likely in the production of the citations where the common enemy is often used to highlight the bravery and gallantry of the soldiers, often dehumanizing the enemy and the showcase of no empathy towards them.

5.4 SUMMARY

Many scholars in the likes of philosophers, historians, sociologists, and political sciences to name a few have worked tirelessly to comprehend the gist of ideology, having being convinced that ideology ranks with the prime determinants of human actions, especially the actions of the masses in politics. This chapter uncovers the ideological predisposition imparted by the Medal of Honor citations through textual analysis. The soldiers in question are highlighted as the perfect heroes for their ability and capability to make decisions, bold and by being superior in ranks and actions. In favour of connecting, influencing and ‘winning over’ the civilians, the stakeholders’ ideologies of patriotism, nationalism, militarism and group cohesion are embedded in the citations.
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION

6.1 SUMMARY

Recent developments have made tremendous impact on the awareness of ideology in the field of research particularly concerning discourse analysis (Fairclough, 2013), although historically, the study of ideology has begun long before, (Larrain, 1979). An important feature of human beings whilst analysing ideology highlighted by Maynard (in press, Ideological analysis) is a reflection of awareness that individual ideas cannot be studied in isolation. Maynard further elaborates that “to explain why human beings buy into certain ideas, and to explain how and why those ideas affect their behaviour in certain ways, we have to appreciate how those ideas operate as part of broader systems of ideas” (p. 2).

This research begins with the focus on Medal of Honor awardees being portrayed as heroes linguistically in the citations. Since the military institution and the soldiers are synonymous to heroic deed in the real world, the military domain is taken into consideration for the research on heroic representation. The data used are collected from the official website of the Professional Medal of Honor Society (http://www.cmohs.org/), focusing on the citations of the Medal of Honor’s recipients. There are a total of 3493 recipients and 19 of that number are double recipients.

To aid the research, two research questions are formulated; i) what are the textual strategies used in the citations to represent Medal of Honor recipients as heroes? and ii) what ideological predispositions are being imparted by the Medal of Honor citations? Through language, reality can be manipulated via linguistics and sociosemantic means, to shape the intended meaning that is wished to be conveyed. The reality chosen by the responsible body (the government, the military) to be shared with the general public (the citizens of the United States and by extension, the world) is a careful selection of
linguistic and sociosemantic categories for the main social actor, i.e. the U.S. soldiers, within the formal platform i.e. the citations of the Medal of Honor. This discourse is designed with the intention to impart selective information in an empowering manner for the government’s own political advancement.

To answer the first research question, the analysis of the hero representation of the Medal of Honor recipients in their citations is done using van Leeuwen’s (1996) and van Leeuwen’s (2008) ‘the representation of social actors’. The employed framework comprises the various ways social actors are represented through discourses. The categories described under the sociosemantic network aid in the representations of the recipients, which is then used to identify the intended realities of language laced within the citations of the Medal of Honor recipient. In total, 40 citations are selected using the multistage sampling method from the official website (www.cmohs.org) to be analysed.

In analysing the citations, a few strategies in heroic representations are identified. From the many categories described by van Leeuwen in his framework, four categories were prominent which are: activation, individualisation, nomination and functionalization of the social actors, i.e. the awardees (see Chapter 4). Through activation, the soldiers are portrayed as “the active dynamic force” (van Leeuwen, 1996). Some of the examples that portray the soldiers as the active force are leading, issued orders, charged and provided. These selections impress readers/listens as they connote someone who is of a higher rank, a capable person and they also indicate that the soldier is someone whom a group of people (other soldiers) listen and adhere to. The awardees are also individualized which is realised by singularity. Though this, the civilians will be able to connect on a personal level to that particular awardee. The usage of the awardees’ name complete with ranks repeatedly coupled with the frequent use of pronouns like he and his enables the text to reflect the awardee’s individuality.
Though titulated nomination which is the use of honorifics and affiliation such as *Master, Lt. Col., Maj., Capt.* and *Cpl*, they are seen as distinguished officers. Although nomination can be realised in formal, semi-formal and informal manner, the awardees are largely portrayed in the formal nomination as this form best portray them as important social actors. The awardees are also functionalized by referring them to the activity that they do. From the citations, most of the awardees are referred to as *leader, gunner, specialist* and *officer*. Again, the choices of words here reflect the leadership qualities and imply them as superior when compared to the other soldiers.

From the representation of the recipients in the citations, it came into light to understand the need for the government to do what they do, which is the heroic representation of the recipients. Van Leeuwen states that all texts should be viewed not only as representations, but interactions as well (2008, p. 4). Therefore, members of a society are consciously or unconsciously used to representations for more than just basic communication, but to convey their intended meaning as well. Nevertheless, only the ones in power has the ability to manipulate the language to maintain or reproduce a set of believe or ideology. This means that the stakeholders can attract the public by creating a perceived reality which is favourable to the governing institution. The textual analysis aids in unravelling the underlying ideologies embedded in the discourse. Although one would think the primary reason for Medal awarding accompanied by citations would definitely be to glorify the soldiers in a prestigious thanks-giving ceremony, there may be more than what meets the eye.

To answer the second research question, based on the textual analysis, the social actors are grouped into three emerging themes of heroic representation. The themes are i) decision makers are heroes; ii) bold people are heroes; and iii) superiors are heroes. The themes are further explained through the highlight of the embedded ideologies that
are derived from the textual analysis and the themes found in the citations. The embedded ideological that came to light in terms of associating dying for the country as patriotism, glorification of own soldiers in a perceived reality of one’s own country’s greatness and loyalty to one’s own country which is supported by the nationalism ideology, reinstating the belief that a strong armed force only brings benefit to the country through the military ideology and a sense of we-ness through the maintenance of group identity in group cohesion.

6.2 RECOMMENDATION FOR PROBLEM STATEMENT

As discussed in Chapter 1, this study is directed towards contextualising heroism in the context of military due to the vastness of definitions that can be found for heroism. When heroism in military is distinguished from heroism in other domains such as the entertainment industry or the sports arena to name a few, a clearer meaning arises on what is sought after in the military institution and to what extent they will go to achieve their goals. Therefore, this study has contributed in creating the awareness of textual representation of the soldiers in a heroic light and the ideologies that are embedded in the citations to portray them as heroes and to reach out to the mass public with their likely ulterior motive, i.e. the maintenance of status quo and power through the demands of traditions by glorifying the soldiers. This in turn can cause a backlash where unnecessary hatred might occur towards the ‘outsiders’ or people from another country as ‘the enemy’ is being objectified and not being regarded as human as compared to the soldiers.

6.3 RECOMMENDATION FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

This research is not without its limitations. Acknowledging that, limitations can carve a path in terms of recommendations for future studies. Firstly, a vast number of data available in the form of citations of the Medal of Honor recipients is an aspect that
plays an important role in the research. However, due to the constrains of time that plays a big factor in the decision to analyse 40 Medal of Honor citations, a recommendation for a future research would be to incorporate all of the citations or a greater number of citations to have a denser analysis.

Secondly, being a research directed towards the qualitative analysis approach, this research is very much focused on the textual analysis of data that are readily available. As a recommendation for a future research, the research may benefit greatly in terms of triangulation through other sources of data which can be done by interviewing both Americans and non-Americans to get a first-hand view of their perceptions and opinions in the development of heroic representation and the effects of the textual arrangements that leads to the representations of the awardees as heroes.

Last but not the least, this research is a textual analysis utilizing van Leeuwen’s (1996) representation of social actors framework. However, the concept of heroism in the military domain may be explored using different framework of analysis linguistically which can be then compared and contrasted to extract richer analysis of the readily available data.
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APPENDIX

Citation 1

While his company was crossing the Meuse River and canal at a bridgehead opposite Clery-le-Petit, the bridge over the canal was destroyed by shell fire and Capt. Allworth's command became separated, part of it being on the east bank of the canal and the remainder on the west bank. Seeing his advance units making slow headway up the steep slope ahead, this officer mounted the canal bank and called for his men to follow. Plunging in he swam across the canal under fire from the enemy, followed by his men. Inspiring his men by his example of gallantry, he led them up the slope, joining his hard-pressed platoons in front. By his personal leadership he forced the enemy back for more than a kilometer, overcoming machinegun nests and capturing 100 prisoners, whose number exceeded that of the men in his command. The exceptional courage and leadership displayed by Capt. Allworth made possible the re-establishment of a bridgehead over the canal and the successful advance of other troops.

Citation 2

Learning that 2 daylight patrols had been caught out in No Man's Land and were unable to return, Pfc. Barger and another stretcher bearer upon their own initiative made 2 trips 500 yards beyond our lines, under constant machinegun fire, and rescued 2 wounded officers.

Citation 3

For extraordinary heroism, conspicuous gallantry, and intrepidity while serving with the 6th Regiment, U.S. Marines, in actual conflict with the enemy. With absolute disregard for personal safety, ever conscious and mindful of the suffering fallen, Surg.
Boone, leaving the shelter of a ravine, went forward onto the open field where there was no protection and despite the extreme enemy fire of all calibers, through a heavy mist of gas, applied dressings and first aid to wounded marines. This occurred southeast of Vierzy, near the cemetery, and on the road south from that town. When the dressings and supplies had been exhausted, he went through a heavy barrage of large-caliber shells, both high explosive and gas, to replenish these supplies, returning quickly with a sidecar load, and administered them in saving the lives of the wounded. A second trip, under the same conditions and for the same purpose, was made by Surg. Boone later that day.

**Citation 4**

For extraordinary heroism following internal explosion of the Florence H. The sea in the vicinity of wreckage was covered by a mass of boxes of smokeless powder, which were repeatedly exploding. Jesse W. Covington, of the U.S.S. Stewart, plunged overboard to rescue a survivor who was surrounded by powder boxes and too exhausted to help himself, fully realizing that similar powder boxes in the vicinity were continually exploding and that he was thereby risking his life in saving the life of this man.

**Citation 5**

Pfc. Gaffney, an automatic rifleman, pushing forward alone, after all the other members of his squad had been killed, discovered several Germans placing a heavy machinegun in position. He killed the crew, captured the gun, bombed several dugouts, and, after killing 4 more of the enemy with his pistol, held the position until reinforcements came up, when 80 prisoners were captured.
After his platoon had gained its objective along a railroad embankment, Pfc. Dilboy, accompanying his platoon leader to reconnoiter the ground beyond, was suddenly fired upon by an enemy machinegun from 100 yards. From a standing position on the railroad track, fully exposed to view, he opened fire at once, but failing to silence the gun, rushed forward with his bayonet fixed, through a wheat field toward the gun emplacement, falling within 25 yards of the gun with his right leg nearly severed above the knee and with several bullet holes in his body. With undaunted courage he continued to fire into the emplacement from a prone position, killing 2 of the enemy and dispersing the rest of the crew.

**Citation 7**

Having overcome 2 machinegun nests under his skillful leadership, Sgt. Hall's platoon was stopped 800 yards from its final objective by machinegun fire of particular intensity. Ordering his men to take cover in a sunken road, he advanced alone on the enemy machinegun post and killed 5 members of the crew with his bayonet and thereby made possible the further advance of the line. While attacking another machinegun nest later in the day this gallant soldier was mortally wounded.

**Citation 8**

While his company was being held up by heavy enemy fire, Pvt. Morelock, with 3 other men who were acting as runners at company headquarters, voluntarily led them as a patrol in advance of his company's frontline through an intense rifle, artillery, and machinegun fire and penetrated a woods which formed the German frontline. Encountering a series of 5 hostile machinegun nests, containing from 1 to 5 machineguns each, with his patrol he cleaned them all out, gained and held complete mastery of the situation until the arrival of his company commander with
reinforcements, even though his entire party had become casualties. He rendered first aid to the injured and evacuated them by using stretcher bearers 10 German prisoners whom he had captured. Soon thereafter his company commander was wounded and while dressing his wound Pvt. Morelock was very severely wounded in the hip, which forced his evacuation. His heroic action and devotion to duty were an inspiration to the entire regiment.

**Citation 9**

He led a small group of men to the attack, under terrific artillery and machinegun fire, after they had become separated from the rest of the company in the darkness. Single-handed he rushed an enemy machinegun which had suddenly opened fire on his group and killed the crew with his pistol. He then pressed forward to another machinegun post 25 yards away and had killed 1 gunner himself by the time the remainder of his detachment arrived and put the gun out of action. With the utmost bravery he continued to lead his men over 3 lines of hostile trenches, cleaning up each one as they advanced, regardless of the fact that he had been wounded 3 times, and killed several of the enemy in hand-to-hand encounters. After his pistol ammunition was exhausted, this gallant officer seized the rifle of a dead soldier, bayoneted several members of a machinegun crew, and shot the other. Upon reaching the fourth-line trench, which was his objective, 1st Lt. Turner captured it with the 9 men remaining in his group and resisted a hostile counterattack until he was finally surrounded and killed.

**Citation 10**

Having been sent out with 2 other soldiers to scout through the village of Vaux-Andigny, he met with strong resistance from enemy machinegun fire, which killed 1 of his men and wounded the other. Continuing his advance without aid 500 yards in
advance of his platoon and in the face of machinegun and artillery fire he encountered 4 of the enemy in a dugout, whom he attacked and killed with a handgrenade. Crawling forward to a point 150 yards in advance of his first encounter, he rushed a machinegun nest, killing 4 and capturing 6 of the enemy and taking 2 light machineguns. After being joined by his platoon he was severely wounded in the arm.

Citation 11

For gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his own life, above and beyond the call of duty on 11 June 1944, in France. Lt. Col. Cole was personally leading his battalion in forcing the last 4 bridges on the road to Carentan when his entire unit was suddenly pinned to the ground by intense and withering enemy rifle, machinegun, mortar, and artillery fire placed upon them from well-prepared and heavily fortified positions within 150 yards of the foremost elements. After the devastating and unceasing enemy fire had for over 1 hour prevented any move and inflicted numerous casualties, Lt. Col. Cole, observing this almost hopeless situation, courageously issued orders to assault the enemy positions with fixed bayonets. With utter disregard for his own safety and completely ignoring the enemy fire, he rose to his feet in front of his battalion and with drawn pistol shouted to his men to follow him in the assault. Catching up a fallen man's rifle and bayonet, he charged on and led the remnants of his battalion across the bullet-swept open ground and into the enemy position. His heroic and valiant action in so inspiring his men resulted in the complete establishment of our bridgehead across the Douve River. The cool fearlessness, personal bravery, and outstanding leadership displayed by Lt. Col. Cole reflect great credit upon himself and are worthy of the highest praise in the military service.

Citation 12
For distinguishing himself conspicuously by gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty in action with the enemy on Guadalcanal Island. On 12 January 1943, Maj. Davis (then Capt.), executive officer of an infantry battalion, volunteered to carry instructions to the leading companies of his battalion which had been caught in crossfire from Japanese machineguns. With complete disregard for his own safety, he made his way to the trapped units, delivered the instructions, supervised their execution, and remained overnight in this exposed position. On the following day, Maj. Davis again volunteered to lead an assault on the Japanese position which was holding up the advance. When his rifle jammed at its first shot, he drew his pistol and, waving his men on, led the assault over the top of the hill. Electrified by this action, another body of soldiers followed and seized the hill. The capture of this position broke Japanese resistance and the battalion was then able to proceed and secure the corps objective. The courage and leadership displayed by Maj. Davis inspired the entire battalion and unquestionably led to the success of its attack.

Citation 13

For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty. Capt. Galt, Battalion S3, at a particularly critical period following 2 unsuccessful attacks by his battalion, of his own volition went forward and ascertained just how critical the situation was. He volunteered, at the risk of his life, personally to lead the battalion against the objective. When the lone remaining tank destroyer refused to go forward, Capt. Galt jumped on the tank destroyer and ordered it to precede the attack. As the tank destroyer moved forward, followed by a company of riflemen, Capt. Galt manned the .30-caliber machinegun in the turret of the tank destroyer, located and directed fire on an enemy 77mm. anti-tank gun, and destroyed it. Nearing the enemy positions, Capt. Galt stood fully exposed in the turret, ceaselessly firing his machinegun and tossing hand
grenades into the enemy zigzag series of trenches despite the hail of sniper and machinegun bullets ricocheting off the tank destroyer. As the tank destroyer moved, Capt. Galt so maneuvered it that 40 of the enemy were trapped in one trench. When they refused to surrender, Capt. Galt pressed the trigger of the machinegun and dispatched every one of them. A few minutes later an 88mm shell struck the tank destroyer and Capt. Galt fell mortally wounded across his machinegun. He had personally killed 40 Germans and wounded many more. Capt. Galt pitted his judgment and superb courage against overwhelming odds, exemplifying the highest measure of devotion to his country and the finest traditions of the U.S. Army.

Citation 14

For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty as leader of a machinegun squad serving with Company C, 1st Battalion, 1st Marines, 1st Marine Division, in action against enemy Japanese forces on Okinawa Shima in the Ryukyu Chain on 14 May 1945. Alert and aggressive during a determined assault against a strongly fortified Japanese hill position, Cpl. Hauge boldly took the initiative when his company's left flank was pinned down under a heavy machinegun and mortar barrage with resultant severe casualties and, quickly locating the 2 machineguns which were delivering the uninterrupted stream of enfilade fire, ordered his squad to maintain a covering barrage as he rushed across an exposed area toward the furiously blazing enemy weapons. Although painfully wounded as he charged the first machinegun, he launched a vigorous single-handed grenade attack, destroyed the entire hostile gun position and moved relentlessly forward toward the other emplacement despite his wounds and the increasingly heavy Japanese fire. Undaunted by the savage opposition, he again hurled his deadly grenades with unerring aim and succeeded in demolishing the second enemy gun before he fell under the slashing fury of Japanese
sniper fire. By his ready grasp of the critical situation and his heroic 1-man assault tactics, Cpl. Hauge had eliminated 2 strategically placed enemy weapons, thereby releasing the besieged troops from an overwhelming volume of hostile fire and enabling his company to advance. His indomitable fighting spirit and decisive valor in the face of almost certain death reflect the highest credit upon Cpl. Hauge and the U.S. Naval Service. He gallantly gave his life in the service of his country.

Citation 15

He displayed extraordinary heroism and gallantry in action on 27-28 March 1945, in Germany. Following an airborne landing near Wesel, his unit was assigned as the assault platoon for the assault on Lembeck. Three times the landing elements were pinned down by intense automatic weapons fire from strongly defended positions. Each time, T/Sgt. Hedrick fearlessly charged through heavy fire, shooting his automatic rifle from his hip. His courageous action so inspired his men that they reduced the enemy positions in rapid succession. When 6 of the enemy attempted a surprise, flanking movement, he quickly turned and killed the entire party with a burst of fire. Later, the enemy withdrew across a moat into Lembeck Castle. T/Sgt. Hedrick, with utter disregard for his own safety, plunged across the drawbridge alone in pursuit. When a German soldier, with hands upraised, declared the garrison wished to surrender, he entered the castle yard with 4 of his men to accept the capitulation. The group moved through a sally port, and was met by fire from a German self-propelled gun. Although mortally wounded, T/Sgt. Hedrick fired at the enemy gun and covered the withdrawal of his comrades. He died while being evacuated after the castle was taken. His great personal courage and heroic leadership contributed in large measure to the speedy capture of Lembeck and provided an inspiring example to his comrades.
Citation 16

For conspicuous gallantry in action and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty. On August 1943, 2d Lt. Hughes served in the capacity of pilot of a heavy bombardment aircraft participating in a long and hazardous minimum-altitude attack against the Axis oil refineries of Ploesti, Rumania, launched from the northern shores of Africa. Flying in the last formation to attack the target, he arrived in the target area after previous flights had thoroughly alerted the enemy defenses. Approaching the target through intense and accurate antiaircraft fire and dense balloon barrages at dangerously low altitude, his plane received several direct hits from both large and small caliber antiaircraft guns which seriously damaged his aircraft, causing sheets of escaping gasoline to stream from the bomb bay and from the left wing. This damage was inflicted at a time prior to reaching the target when 2d Lt. Hughes could have made a forced landing in any of the grain fields readily available at that time. The target area was blazing with burning oil tanks and damaged refinery installations from which flames leaped high above the bombing level of the formation. With full knowledge of the consequences of entering this blazing inferno when his airplane was profusely leaking gasoline in two separate locations, 2d Lt. Hughes, motivated only by his high conception of duty which called for the destruction of his assigned target at any cost, did not elect to make a forced landing or turn back from the attack. Instead, rather than jeopardize the formation and the success of the attack, he unhesitatingly entered the blazing area and dropped his bomb load with great precision. After successfully bombing the objective, his aircraft emerged from the conflagration with the left wing aflame. Only then did he attempt a forced landing, but because of the advanced stage of the fire enveloping his aircraft the plane crashed and was consumed. By 2d Lt. Hughes' heroic decision to complete his mission regardless of the consequences in utter disregard of his own life, and by his gallant and valorous execution of this decision, he
has rendered a service to our country in the defeat of our enemies which will everlastingly be outstanding in the annals of our Nation's history.

Citation 17

For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty in action with the enemy at Los Negros Island, Admiralty Group, on 4 March 1944. In the early morning hours Sgt. McGill, with a squad of 8 men, occupied a revetment which bore the brunt of a furious attack by approximately 200 drinkcrazed enemy troops. Although covered by crossfire from machineguns on the right and left flank he could receive no support from the remainder of our troops stationed at his rear. All members of the squad were killed or wounded except Sgt. McGill and another man, whom he ordered to return to the next revetment. Courageously resolved to hold his position at all cost, he fired his weapon until it ceased to function. Then, with the enemy only 5 yards away, he charged from his foxhole in the face of certain death and clubbed the enemy with his rifle in hand-to-hand combat until he was killed. At dawn 105 enemy dead were found around his position. Sgt. McGill's intrepid stand was an inspiration to his comrades and a decisive factor in the defeat of a fanatical enemy.

Citation 18

For valor and courage above and beyond the call of duty as Officer-in-Charge of Small Boats in the U.S.S. LST 375 during the amphibious assault on the island of Sicily, 9-10 July 1943. Realizing that a detonation of explosives would prematurely disclose to the enemy the assault about to be carried out, and with full knowledge of the peril involved, Ens. Parle unhesitatingly risked his life to extinguish a smoke pot accidentally ignited in a boat carrying charges of high explosives, detonating fuses and ammunition. Undaunted by fire and blinding smoke, he entered the craft, quickly snuffed out a
burning fuse, and after failing in his desperate efforts to extinguish the fire pot, finally seized it with both hands and threw it over the side. Although he succumbed a week later from smoke and fumes inhaled, Ens. Parle's heroic self-sacrifice prevented grave damage to the ship and personnel and insured the security of a vital mission. He gallantly gave his life in the service of his country.

**Citation 19**

He was engaged in the attack on the Paco Railroad Station, which was strongly defended by 300 determined enemy soldiers with machineguns and rifles, supported by several pillboxes, 3 20mm. guns, 1 37-mm. gun and heavy mortars. While making a frontal assault across an open field, his platoon was halted 100 yards from the station by intense enemy fire. On his own initiative he left the platoon, accompanied by a comrade, and continued forward to a house 60 yards from the objective. Although under constant enemy observation, the 2 men remained in this position for an hour, firing at targets of opportunity, killing more than 35 Japanese and wounding many more. Moving closer to the station and discovering a group of Japanese replacements attempting to reach pillboxes, they opened heavy fire, killed more than 40 and stopped all subsequent attempts to man the emplacements. Enemy fire became more intense as they advanced to within 20 yards of the station. From that point Pfc. Reese provided effective covering fire and courageously drew enemy fire to himself while his companion killed 7 Japanese and destroyed a 20-mm. gun and heavy machinegun with handgrenades. With their ammunition running low, the 2 men started to return to the American lines, alternately providing covering fire for each other as they withdrew. During this movement, Pfc. Reese was killed by enemy fire as he reloaded his rifle. The intrepid team, in 21/2 hours of fierce fighting, killed more than 82 Japanese, completely disorganized their defense and paved the way for subsequent complete defeat of the enemy at this strong point. By
his gallant determination in the face of tremendous odds, aggressive fighting spirit, and extreme heroism at the cost of his life, Pfc. Reese materially aided the advance of our troops in Manila and providing a lasting inspiration to all those with whom he served.

**Citation 20**

For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty on 5 June 1944, when he led a Heavy Bombardment Group, in an attack against defended enemy coastal positions in the vicinity of Wimereaux, France. Approaching the target, his aircraft was hit repeatedly by antiaircraft fire which seriously crippled the ship, killed the pilot, and wounded several members of the crew, including Lt. Col. Vance, whose right foot was practically severed. In spite of his injury, and with 3 engines lost to the flak, he led his formation over the target, bombing it successfully. After applying a tourniquet to his leg with the aid of the radar operator, Lt. Col. Vance, realizing that the ship was approaching a stall altitude with the 1 remaining engine failing, struggled to a semi-upright position beside the copilot and took over control of the ship. Cutting the power and feathering the last engine he put the aircraft in glide sufficiently steep to maintain his airspeed. Gradually losing altitude, he at last reached the English coast, whereupon he ordered all members of the crew to bail out as he knew they would all safely make land. But he received a message over the interphone system which led him to believe 1 of the crew members was unable to jump due to injuries; so he made the decision to ditch the ship in the channel, thereby giving this man a chance for life. To add further to the danger of ditching the ship in his crippled condition, there was a 500-pound bomb hung up in the bomb bay. Unable to climb into the seat vacated by the copilot, since his foot, hanging on to his leg by a few tendons, had become lodged behind the copilot's seat, he nevertheless made a successful ditching while lying on the floor using only aileron and elevators for control and the side window of the cockpit for
visual reference. On coming to rest in the water the aircraft commenced to sink rapidly with Lt. Col. Vance pinned in the cockpit by the upper turret which had crashed in during the landing. As it was settling beneath the waves an explosion occurred which threw Lt. Col. Vance clear of the wreckage. After clinging to a piece of floating wreckage until he could muster enough strength to inflate his life vest he began searching for the crewmember whom he believed to be aboard. Failing to find anyone he began swimming and was found approximately 50 minutes later by an Air-Sea Rescue craft. By his extraordinary flying skill and gallant leadership, despite his grave injury, Lt. Col. Vance led his formation to a successful bombing of the assigned target and returned the crew to a point where they could bail out with safety. His gallant and valorous decision to ditch the aircraft in order to give the crewmember he believed to be aboard a chance for life exemplifies the highest traditions of the U.S. Armed Forces.

**Citation 21**

Master Sergeant Gordon, United States Army, distinguished himself by actions above and beyond the call of duty on 3 October 1993, while serving as Sniper Team Leader, United States Army Special Operations Command with Task Force Ranger in Mogadishu, Somalia. Master Sergeant Gordon's sniper team provided precision fires from the lead helicopter during an assault and at two helicopter crash sites, while subjected to intense automatic weapons and rocket propelled grenade fires. When Master Sergeant Gordon learned that ground forces were not immediately available to secure the second crash site, he and another sniper unhesitatingly volunteered to be inserted to protect the four critically wounded personnel, despite being well aware of the growing number of enemy personnel closing in on the site. After his third request to be inserted, Master Sergeant Gordon received permission to perform his volunteer mission. When debris and enemy ground fires at the site caused them to abort the first attempt,
Master Sergeant Gordon was inserted one hundred meters south of the crash site. Equipped with only his sniper rifle and a pistol, Master Sergeant Gordon and his fellow sniper, while under intense small arms fire from the enemy, fought their way through a dense maze of shanties and shacks to reach the critically injured crew members. Master Sergeant Gordon immediately pulled the pilot and the other crew members from the aircraft, establishing a perimeter which placed him and his fellow sniper in the most vulnerable position. Master Sergeant Gordon used his long range rifle and side arm to kill an undetermined number of attackers until he depleted his ammunition. Master Sergeant Gordon then went back to the wreckage, recovering some of the crew's weapons and ammunition. Despite the fact that he was critically low on ammunition, he provided some of it to the dazed pilot and then radioed for help. Master Sergeant Gordon continued to travel the perimeter, protecting the downed crew. After his team member was fatally wounded and his own rifle ammunition exhausted, Master Sergeant Gordon returned to the wreckage, recovering a rifle with the last five rounds of ammunition and gave it to the pilot with the words, "good luck." Then, armed only with his pistol, Master Sergeant Gordon continued to fight until he was fatally wounded. His actions saved the pilot's life. Master Sergeant Gordon's extraordinary heroism and devotion to duty were in keeping with the highest standards of military service and reflect great credit upon him, his unit and the United States Army.

Citation 22

Sergeant First Class Shughart, United States Army, distinguished himself by actions above and beyond the call of duty on 3 October 1993, while serving as a Sniper Team Member, United States Army Special Operations Command with Task Force Ranger in Mogadishu, Somalia. Sergeant First Class Shughart provided precision sniper fires from the lead helicopter during an assault on a building and at two helicopter crash sites,
while subjected to intense automatic weapons and rocket propelled grenade fires. While
providing critical suppressive fires at the second crash site, Sergeant First Class
Shughart and his team leader learned that ground forces were not immediately available
to secure the site. Sergeant First Class Shughart and his team leader unhesitatingly
volunteered to be inserted to protect the four critically wounded personnel, despite
being well aware of the growing number of enemy personnel closing in on the site.
After their third request to be inserted, Sergeant First Class Shughart and his team
leader received permission to perform this volunteer mission. When debris and enemy
ground fires at the site caused them to abort the first attempt, Sergeant First Class
Shughart and his team leader were inserted one hundred meters south of the crash site.
Equipped with only his sniper rifle and a pistol, Sergeant First Class Shughart and his
team leader, while under intense small arms fire from the enemy, fought their way
through a dense maze of shanties and shacks to reach the critically injured crew
members. Sergeant First Class Shughart pulled the pilot and the other crew members
from the aircraft, establishing a perimeter which placed him and his fellow sniper in the
most vulnerable position. Sergeant First Class Shughart used his long range rifle and
side arm to kill an undetermined number of attackers while traveling the perimeter,
protecting the downed crew. Sergeant First Class Shughart continued his protective fire
until he depleted his ammunition and was fatally wounded. His actions saved the pilot's
life. Sergeant First Class Shughart's extraordinary heroism and devotion to duty were in
keeping with the highest standards of military service and reflect great credit upon him,
his unit and the United States Army.

**Citation 23**

For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the
call of duty as a Hostage Rescue Force Team Member in Afghanistan in support of
Operation ENDURING FREEDOM from 8 to 9 December 2012. As the rescue force approached the target building, an enemy sentry detected them and darted inside to alert his fellow captors. The sentry quickly reemerged, and the lead assaulter attempted to neutralize him. Chief Byers with his team sprinted to the door of the target building. As the primary breacher, Chief Byers stood in the doorway fully exposed to enemy fire while ripping down six layers of heavy blankets fastened to the inside ceiling and walls to clear a path for the rescue force. The first assaulter pushed his way through the blankets, and was mortally wounded by enemy small arms fire from within. Chief Byers, completely aware of the imminent threat, fearlessly rushed into the room and engaged an enemy guard aiming an AK-47 at him. He then tackled another adult male who had darted towards the corner of the room. During the ensuing hand-to-hand struggle, Chief Byers confirmed the man was not the hostage and engaged him. As other rescue team members called out to the hostage, Chief Byers heard a voice respond in English and raced toward it. He jumped atop the American hostage and shielded him from the high volume of fire within the small room. While covering the hostage with his body, Chief Byers immobilized another guard with his bare hands, and restrained the guard until a teammate could eliminate him. His bold and decisive actions under fire saved the lives of the hostage and several of his teammates. By his undaunted courage, intrepid fighting spirit, and unwavering devotion to duty in the face of near certain death, Chief Petty Officer Byers reflected great credit upon himself and upheld the highest traditions of the United States Naval Service.

Citation 24

For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty while serving as an Automatic Rifleman with Company F, 2d Battalion, 9th Marines, Regimental Combat Team 1, 1st Marine Division (Forward), 1 Marine
Expeditionary Force (Forward), in Helmand Province, Afghanistan in support of Operation Enduring Freedom on 21 November 2010. Lance Corporal Carpenter was a member of a platoon-sized coalition force, comprised of two reinforced Marine squads partnered with an Afghan National Army squad. The platoon had established Patrol Base Dakota two days earlier in a small village in the Marjah District in order to disrupt enemy activity and provide security for the local Afghan population. Lance Corporal Carpenter and a fellow Marine were manning a rooftop security position on the perimeter of Patrol Base Dakota when the enemy initiated a daylight attack with hand grenades, one of which landed inside their sandbagged position. Without hesitation, and with complete disregard for his own safety, Lance Corporal Carpenter moved toward the grenade in an attempt to shield his fellow Marine from the deadly blast. When the grenade detonated, his body absorbed the brunt of the blast, severely wounding him, but saving the life of his fellow Marine. By his undaunted courage, bold fighting spirit, and unwavering devotion to duty in the face of almost certain death, Lance Corporal Carpenter reflected great credit upon himself and upheld the highest traditions of the Marine Corps and the United States Naval Service.

**Citation 25**

For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty: Specialist Ty M. Carter distinguished himself by acts of gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty while serving as a Scout with Bravo Troop, 3d Squadron, 61st Cavalry Regiment, 4th Brigade Combat Team, 4th Infantry Division, during combat operations against an armed enemy in Kamdesh District, Nuristan Province, Afghanistan on October 3, 2009. On that morning, Specialist Carter and his comrades awakened to an attack of an estimated 300 enemy fighters occupying the high ground on all four sides of Combat Outpost Keating,
employing concentrated fire from recoilless rifles, rocket propelled grenades, anti-aircraft machine guns, mortars and small arms fire. Specialist Carter reinforced a forward battle position, ran twice through a 100 meter gauntlet of enemy fire to resupply ammunition and voluntarily remained there to defend the isolated position. Armed with only an M4 carbine rifle, Specialist Carter placed accurate, deadly fire on the enemy, beating back the assault force and preventing the position from being overrun, over the course of several hours. With complete disregard for his own safety and in spite of his own wounds, he ran through a hail of enemy rocket propelled grenade and machine gun fire to rescue a critically wounded comrade who had been pinned down in an exposed position. Specialist Carter rendered life extending first aid and carried the Soldier to cover. On his own initiative, Specialist Carter again maneuvered through enemy fire to check on a fallen Soldier and recovered the squad's radio, which allowed them to coordinate their evacuation with fellow Soldiers. With teammates providing covering fire, Specialist Carter assisted in moving the wounded Soldier 100 meters through withering enemy fire to the aid station and before returning to the fight. Specialist Carter's heroic actions and tactical skill were critical to the defense of Combat Outpost Keating, preventing the enemy from capturing the position and saving the lives of his fellow Soldiers. Specialist Ty M. Carter's extraordinary heroism and selflessness above and beyond the call of duty are in keeping with the highest traditions of military service and reflect great credit upon himself, Bravo Troop, 3d Squadron, 61st Cavalry Regiment, 4th Brigade Combat Team, 4th Infantry Division and the United States Army

**Citation 26**

Specialist Salvatore A. Giunta distinguished himself conspicuously by gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty in action with an armed enemy in the Korengal Valley, Afghanistan, on October 25, 2007. While
conducting a patrol as team leader with Company B, 2d Battalion (Airborne), 503d Infantry Regiment, Specialist Giunta and his team were navigating through harsh terrain when they were ambushed by a well-armed and well-coordinated insurgent force. While under heavy enemy fire, Specialist Giunta immediately sprinted towards cover and engaged the enemy. Seeing that his squad leader had fallen and believing that he had been injured, Specialist Giunta exposed himself to withering enemy fire and raced towards his squad leader, helped him to cover, and administered medical aid. While administering first aid, enemy fire struck Specialist Giunta's body armor and his secondary weapon. Without regard to the ongoing fire, Specialist Giunta engaged the enemy before prepping and throwing grenades, using the explosions for cover in order to conceal his position. Attempting to reach additional wounded fellow soldiers who were separated from the squad, Specialist Giunta and his team encountered a barrage of enemy fire that forced them to the ground. The team continued forward and upon reaching the wounded soldiers, Specialist Giunta realized that another soldier was still separated from the element. Specialist Giunta then advanced forward on his own initiative. As he crested the top of a hill, he observed two insurgents carrying away an American soldier. He immediately engaged the enemy, killing one and wounding the other. Upon reaching the wounded soldier, he began to provide medical aid, as his squad caught up and provided security. Specialist Giunta's unwavering courage, selflessness, and decisive leadership while under extreme enemy fire were integral to his platoon's ability to defeat an enemy ambush and recover a fellow American soldier from the enemy. Specialist Salvatore A. Giunta's extraordinary heroism and selflessness above and beyond the call of duty are in keeping with the highest traditions of military service and reflect great credit upon himself, Company B, 2d Battalion (Airborne), 503d Infantry Regiment, and the United States Army.

Citation 27
Captain Florent A. Groberg distinguished himself by acts of gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty while serving as a Personal Security Detachment Commander for Task Force Mountain Warrior, 4th Infantry Brigade Combat Team, 4th Infantry Division, during combat operations against an armed enemy in Asadbad, Kunar Province, Afghanistan on August 8, 2012. On that day, Captain Groberg was leading a dismounted movement consisting of several senior leaders to include two brigade commanders, two battalion commanders, two command sergeants major, and an Afghanistan National Army brigade commander. As they approached the Provincial Governor’s compound, Captain Groberg observed an individual walking close to the formation. When the individual made an abrupt turn towards the formation, he noticed an abnormal bulge underneath the individual’s clothing. Selflessly placing himself in front of one of the brigade commanders, Captain Groberg rushed forward, using his body to push the suspect away from the formation. Simultaneously, he ordered another member of the security detail to assist with removing the suspect. At this time, Captain Groberg confirmed the bulge was a suicide vest and with complete disregard for his life, Captain Groberg again with the assistance of the other member of the security detail, physically pushed the suicide bomber away from the formation. Upon falling, the suicide bomber detonated his explosive vest outside the perimeter of the formation, killing four members of the formation and wounding numerous others. The blast from the first suicide bomber caused the suicide vest of a previously unnoticed second suicide bomber to detonate prematurely with minimal impact on the formation. Captain Groberg’s immediate actions to push the first suicide bomber away from the formation significantly minimized the impact of the coordinated suicide bombers’ attack on the formation, saving the lives of his comrades and several senior leaders. Captain Groberg’s extraordinary heroism and selflessness above and beyond the call of duty at the risk of life are in keeping with the highest
traditions of military service and reflect credit upon himself, 4th Infantry Brigade Combat Team, 4th Infantry Division and the United States Army.

Citation 28

Corporal Meyer maintained security at a patrol rally point while other members of his team moved on foot with two platoons of Afghan National Army and Border Police into the village of Ganjgal for a pre-dawn meeting with village elders. Moving into the village, the patrol was ambushed by more than 50 enemy fighters firing rocket propelled grenades, mortars, and machine guns from houses and fortified positions on the slopes above. Hearing over the radio that four U.S. team members were cut off, Corporal Meyer seized the initiative. With a fellow Marine driving, Corporal Meyer took the exposed gunner's position in a gun-truck as they drove down the steeply terraced terrain in a daring attempt to disrupt the enemy attack and locate the trapped U.S. team. Disregarding intense enemy fire now concentrated on their lone vehicle, Corporal Meyer killed a number of enemy fighters with the mounted machine guns and his rifle, some at near point blank range, as he and his driver made three solo trips into the ambush area. During the first two trips, he and his driver evacuated two dozen Afghan soldiers, many of whom were wounded. When one machine gun became inoperable, he directed a return to the rally point to switch to another gun-truck for a third trip into the ambush area where his accurate fire directly supported the remaining U.S. personnel and Afghan soldiers fighting their way out of the ambush. Despite a shrapnel wound to his arm, Corporal Meyer made two more trips into the ambush area in a third gun-truck accompanied by four other Afghan vehicles to recover more wounded Afghan soldiers and search for the missing U.S. team members. Still under heavy enemy fire, he dismounted the vehicle on the fifth trip and moved on foot to locate and recover the bodies of his team members. Corporal Meyer's daring initiative and bold fighting spirit
throughout the 6-hour battle significantly disrupted the enemy's attack and inspired the members of the combined force to fight on. His unwavering courage and steadfast devotion to his U.S. and Afghan comrades in the face of almost certain death reflected great credit upon himself and upheld the highest traditions of the Marine Corps and the United States Naval Service.

Citation 29

Robert J. Miller distinguished himself by extraordinary acts of heroism while serving as the Weapons Sergeant in Special Forces Operational Detachment Alpha 3312, Special Operations Task Force-33, Combined Joint Special Operations Task Force-Afghanistan during combat operations against an armed enemy in Konar Province, Afghanistan on January 25, 2008. While conducting a combat reconnaissance patrol through the Gowardesh Valley, Staff Sergeant Miller and his small element of U.S. and Afghan National Army soldiers engaged a force of 15 to 20 insurgents occupying prepared fighting positions. Staff Sergeant Miller initiated the assault by engaging the enemy positions with his vehicle's turret-mounted Mark-19 40 millimeter automatic grenade launcher while simultaneously providing detailed descriptions of the enemy positions to his command, enabling effective, accurate close air support. Following the engagement, Staff Sergeant Miller led a small squad forward to conduct a battle damage assessment. As the group neared the small, steep, narrow valley that the enemy had inhabited, a large, well-coordinated insurgent force initiated a near ambush, assaulting from elevated positions with ample cover. Exposed and with little available cover, the patrol was totally vulnerable to enemy rocket propelled grenades and automatic weapon fire. As point man, Staff Sergeant Miller was at the front of the patrol, cut off from supporting elements, and less than 20 meters from enemy forces. Nonetheless, with total disregard for his own safety, he called for his men to quickly move back to covered
positions as he charged the enemy over exposed ground and under overwhelming enemy fire in order to provide protective fire for his team. While maneuvering to engage the enemy, Staff Sergeant Miller was shot in his upper torso. Ignoring the wound, he continued to push the fight, moving to draw fire from over one hundred enemy fighters upon himself. He then again charged forward through an open area in order to allow his teammates to safely reach cover. After killing at least 10 insurgents, wounding dozens more, and repeatedly exposing himself to withering enemy fire while moving from position to position, Staff Sergeant Miller was mortally wounded by enemy fire. His extraordinary valor ultimately saved the lives of seven members of his own team and 15 Afghanistan National Army soldiers. Staff Sergeant Miller's heroism and selflessness above and beyond the call of duty, and at the cost of his own life, are in keeping with the highest traditions of military service and reflect great credit upon himself and the United States Army.

Citation 30

Staff Sergeant Jared C. Monti distinguished himself by acts of gallantry and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty while serving as a team leader with Headquarters and Headquarters Troop, 3d Squadron, 71st Cavalry Regiment, 3d Brigade Combat Team, 10th Mountain Division, in connection with combat operations against an armed enemy in Nuristan Province, Afghanistan, on June 21, 2006. While Staff Sergeant Monti was leading a mission aimed at gathering intelligence and directing fire against the enemy, his 16-man patrol was attacked by as many as 50 enemy fighters. On the verge of being overrun, Staff Sergeant Monti quickly directed his men to set up a defensive position behind a rock formation. He then called for indirect fire support, accurately targeting the rounds upon the enemy who had closed to within 50 meters of his position. While still directing fire, Staff Sergeant Monti
personally engaged the enemy with his rifle and a grenade, successfully disrupting an attempt to flank his patrol. Staff Sergeant Monti then realized that one of his Soldiers was lying wounded in the open ground between the advancing enemy and the patrol’s position. With complete disregard for his own safety, Staff Sergeant Monti twice attempted to move from behind the cover of the rocks into the face of relentless enemy fire to rescue his fallen comrade. Determined not to leave his Soldier, Staff Sergeant Monti made a third attempt to cross open terrain through intense enemy fire. On this final attempt, he was mortally wounded, sacrificing his own life in an effort to save his fellow Soldier. Staff Sergeant Monti’s selfless acts of heroism inspired his patrol to fight off the larger enemy force. Staff Sergeant Monti’s immeasurable courage and uncommon valor are in keeping with the highest traditions of military service and reflect great credit upon himself, Headquarters and Headquarters Troop, 3rd Squadron, 71st Cavalry Regiment, 3rd Brigade Combat Team, 10th Mountain Division, and the United States Army.

Citation 31

For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty as the leader of a special reconnaissance element with Naval Special Warfare Task Unit Afghanistan on 27 and 28 June 2005. While leading a mission to locate a high-level anti-coalition militia leader, Lieutenant Murphy demonstrated extraordinary heroism in the face of grave danger in the vicinity of Asadabad, Konar Province, Afghanistan. On 28 June 2005, operating in an extremely rugged enemy-controlled area, Lieutenant Murphy’s team was discovered by anti-coalition militia sympathizers, who revealed their position to Taliban fighters. As a result, between 30 and 40 enemy fighters besieged his four-member team. Demonstrating exceptional resolve, Lieutenant Murphy valiantly led his men in engaging the large enemy force.
The ensuing fierce firefight resulted in numerous enemy casualties, as well as the wounding of all four members of the team. Ignoring his own wounds and demonstrating exceptional composure, Lieutenant Murphy continued to lead and encourage his men. When the primary communicator fell mortally wounded, Lieutenant Murphy repeatedly attempted to call for assistance for his beleaguered teammates. Realizing the impossibility of communicating in the extreme terrain, and in the face of almost certain death, he fought his way into open terrain to gain a better position to transmit a call. This deliberate, heroic act deprived him of cover, exposing him to direct enemy fire. Finally achieving contact with his Headquarters, Lieutenant Murphy maintained his exposed position while he provided his location and requested immediate support for his team. In his final act of bravery, he continued to engage the enemy until he was mortally wounded, gallantly giving his life for his country and for the cause of freedom. By his selfless leadership, courageous actions, and extraordinary devotion to duty, Lieutenant Murphy reflected great credit upon himself and upheld the highest traditions of the United States Naval Service.

Citation 32

For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty: Staff Sergeant Leroy A. Petry distinguished himself by acts of gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty in action with an armed enemy in the vicinity of Paktya Province, Afghanistan, on May 26, 2008. As a Weapons Squad Leader with D Company, 2nd Battalion, 75th Ranger Regiment, Staff Sergeant Petry moved to clear the courtyard of a house that potentially contained high-value combatants. While crossing the courtyard, Staff Sergeant Petry and another Ranger were engaged and wounded by automatic weapons fire from enemy fighters. Still under enemy fire, and wounded in both legs, Staff Sergeant Petry led the other
Ranger to cover. He then reported the situation and engaged the enemy with a hand grenade, providing suppression as another Ranger moved to his position. The enemy quickly responded by maneuvering closer and throwing grenades. The first grenade explosion knocked his two fellow Rangers to the ground and wounded both with shrapnel. A second grenade then landed only a few feet away from them. Instantly realizing the danger, Staff Sergeant Petry, unhesitatingly and with complete disregard for his safety, deliberately and selflessly moved forward, picked up the grenade, and in an effort to clear the immediate threat, threw the grenade away from his fellow Rangers. As he was releasing the grenade it detonated, amputating his right hand at the wrist and further injuring him with multiple shrapnel wounds. Although picking up and throwing the live grenade grievously wounded Staff Sergeant Petry, his gallant act undeniably saved his fellow Rangers from being severely wounded or killed. Despite the severity of his wounds, Staff Sergeant Petry continued to maintain the presence of mind to place a tourniquet on his right wrist before communicating the situation by radio in order to coordinate support for himself and his fellow wounded Rangers. Staff Sergeant Petry's extraordinary heroism and devotion to duty are in keeping with the highest traditions of military service, and reflect great credit upon himself, 75th Ranger Regiment, and the United States Army.

Citation 33

Sergeant Ryan M. Pitts distinguished himself by extraordinary acts of heroism at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty while serving as a Forward Observer in 2d Platoon, Chosen Company, 2d Battalion (Airborne), 503d Infantry Regiment, 173d Airborne Brigade during combat operations against an armed enemy at Vehicle Patrol Base Kahler in the vicinity of Wanat Village, Kunar Province, Afghanistan on July 13, 2008. Early that morning, while Sergeant Pitts was providing perimeter security at
Observation Post Topside, a well-organized Anti-Afghan Force consisting of over 200 members initiated a close proximity sustained and complex assault using accurate and intense rocket-propelled grenade, machine gun and small arms fire on Wanat Vehicle Patrol Base. An immediate wave of rocket-propelled grenade rounds engulfed the Observation Post wounding Sergeant Pitts and inflicting heavy casualties. Sergeant Pitts had been knocked to the ground and was bleeding heavily from shrapnel wounds to his arm and legs, but with incredible toughness and resolve, he subsequently took control of the Observation Post and returned fire on the enemy. As the enemy drew nearer, Sergeant Pitts threw grenades, holding them after the pin was pulled and the safety lever was released to allow a nearly immediate detonation on the hostile forces. Unable to stand on his own and near death because of the severity of his wounds and blood loss, Sergeant Pitts continued to lay suppressive fire until a two-man reinforcement team arrived. Sergeant Pitts quickly assisted them by giving up his main weapon and gathering ammunition all while continually lobbing fragmentary grenades until these were expended. At this point, Sergeant Pitts crawled to the northern position radio and described the situation to the Command Post as the enemy continued to try and isolate the Observation Post from the main Patrol Base. With the enemy close enough for him to hear their voices and with total disregard for his own life, Sergeant Pitts whispered in the radio situation reports and conveyed information that the Command Post used to provide indirect fire support. Sergeant Pitts' courage, steadfast commitment to the defense of his unit and ability to fight while seriously wounded prevented the enemy from overrunning the Observation Post and capturing fallen American soldiers, and ultimately prevented the enemy from gaining fortified positions on higher ground from which to attack Wanat Vehicle Patrol Base. Sergeant Ryan M. Pitts' extraordinary heroism and selflessness above and beyond the call of duty are in keeping with the highest traditions of military service and reflect great credit upon himself, Company C,
2d Battalion (Airborne), 503d Infantry Regiment, 173d Airborne Brigade and the United States Army.

Citation 34

For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity in action at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty while serving as a Section Leader with Bravo Troop, 3d Squadron, 61st Cavalry Regiment, 4th Brigade Combat Team, 4th Infantry Division, during combat operations against an armed enemy at Combat Outpost Keating, Kamdesh District, Nuristan Province, Afghanistan on 3 October 2009. On that morning, Staff Sergeant Romesha and his comrades awakened to an attack by an estimated 300 enemy fighters occupying the high ground on all four sides of the complex, employing concentrated fire from recoilless rifles, rocket propelled grenades, anti-aircraft machine guns, mortars and small arms fire. Staff Sergeant Romesha moved uncovered under intense enemy fire to conduct a reconnaissance of the battlefield and seek reinforcements from the barracks before returning to action with the support of an assistant gunner. Staff Sergeant Romesha took out an enemy machine gun team and, while engaging a second, the generator he was using for cover was struck by a rocket-propelled grenade, inflicting him with shrapnel wounds. Undeterred by his injuries, Staff Sergeant Romesha continued to fight and upon the arrival of another soldier to aid him and the assistant gunner, he again rushed through the exposed avenue to assemble additional soldiers. Staff Sergeant Romesha then mobilized a five-man team and returned to the fight equipped with a sniper rifle. With complete disregard for his own safety, Staff Sergeant Romesha continually exposed himself to heavy enemy fire, as he moved confidently about the battlefield engaging and destroying multiple enemy targets, including three Taliban fighters who had breaches the combat outpost’s perimeter. While orchestrating a successful plan to secure and reinforce key points of
the battlefield, Staff Sergeant Romesha maintained radio communication with the tactical operations center. As the enemy forces attacked with even greater ferocity, unleashing a barrage of rocket-propelled grenades and recoilless rifle rounds, Staff Sergeant Romesha identified the point of attack and directed air support to destroy over 30 enemy fighters. After receiving reports that seriously injured soldiers were at a distant battle position, Staff Sergeant Romesha and his team provided covering fire to allow the injured soldiers to safely reach the aid station. Upon receipt of orders to proceed to the next objective, his team pushed forward 100 meters under overwhelming enemy fire to recover and prevent the enemy fighters from taking the bodies of the fallen comrades. Staff Sergeant Romesha’s heroic actions throughout the day-long battle were critical in suppressing an enemy that had far greater numbers. His extraordinary efforts gave Bravo Troop the opportunity to regroup, reorganize and prepare for the counterattack that allowed the Troop to account for its personnel and secure Combat Post Keating. Staff Sergeant Romesha’s discipline and extraordinary heroism above and beyond the call of duty reflect great credit upon himself, Bravo Troop, 3d Squadron, 61st Cavalry Regiment, 4th Brigade Combat Team, 4th Infantry Division and the United States Army.

Citation 35

For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty: Captain William D. Swenson distinguished himself by acts of gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty while serving as embedded advisor to the Afghan National Border Police, Task Force Phoenix, Combined Security Transition Command-Afghanistan in support of 1st Battalion, 32nd Infantry Regiment, 3rd Brigade Combat Team, 10th Mountain Division, during combat operations against an armed enemy in Kunar Province, Afghanistan on September 8,
On that morning, more than 60 well-armed, well-positioned enemy fighters ambushed Captain Swenson's combat team as it moved on foot into the village of Ganjgal for a meeting with village elders. As the enemy unleashed a barrage of rocket-propelled grenade, mortar and machine gun fire, Captain Swenson immediately returned fire and coordinated and directed the response of his Afghan Border Police, while simultaneously calling in suppressive artillery fire and aviation support. After the enemy effectively flanked Coalition Forces, Captain Swenson repeatedly called for smoke to cover the withdrawal of the forward elements. Surrounded on three sides by enemy forces inflicting effective and accurate fire, Captain Swenson coordinated air assets, indirect fire support and medical evacuation helicopter support to allow for the evacuation of the wounded. Captain Swenson ignored enemy radio transmissions demanding surrender and maneuvered uncovered to render medical aid to a wounded fellow soldier. Captain Swenson stopped administering aid long enough to throw a grenade at approaching enemy forces, before assisting with moving the soldier for air evacuation. With complete disregard for his own safety, Captain Swenson unhesitatingly led a team in an unarmored vehicle into the kill zone, exposing himself to enemy fire on at least two occasions, to recover the wounded and search for four missing comrades. After using aviation support to mark locations of fallen and wounded comrades, it became clear that ground recovery of the fallen was required due to heavy enemy fire on helicopter landing zones. Captain Swenson’s team returned to the kill zone another time in a Humvee. Captain Swenson voluntarily exited the vehicle, exposing himself to enemy fire, to locate and recover three fallen Marines and one fallen Navy corpsman. His exceptional leadership and stout resistance against the enemy during six hours of continuous fighting rallied his teammates and effectively disrupted the enemy's assault. Captain William D. Swenson's extraordinary heroism and selflessness above and beyond the call of duty are in keeping with the highest traditions.
of military service and reflect great credit upon himself, Task Force Phoenix, 1st Battalion, 32nd Infantry Regiment, 3rd Brigade Combat Team, 10th Mountain Division and the United States Army.

Citation 36

Specialist Kyle J. White distinguished himself by acts of gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty while serving as a radio telephone operator with Company C, 2d Battalion (Airborne), 503d Infantry Regiment, 173d Airborne Brigade, during combat operations against an armed enemy in Nuristan Province, Afghanistan on November 9, 2007. On that day, Specialist White and his comrades were returning to Bella Outpost from a shura with Aranas Village elders. As the soldiers traversed a narrow path surrounded by mountainous, rocky terrain, they were ambushed by enemy forces from elevated positions. Pinned against a steep mountain face, Specialist White and his fellow soldiers were completely exposed to enemy fire. Specialist White returned fire and was briefly knocked unconscious when a rocket-propelled grenade impacted near him. When he regained consciousness, another round impacted near him, embedding small pieces of shrapnel in his face. Shaking off his wounds, Specialist White noticed one of his comrades lying wounded nearby. Without hesitation, Specialist White exposed himself to enemy fire in order to reach the soldier and provide medical aid. After applying a tourniquet, Specialist White moved to an injured Marine, similarly providing aid and comfort until the Marine succumbed to his wounds. Specialist White then returned to the soldier and discovered that he had been wounded again. Applying his own belt as an additional tourniquet, Specialist White was able to stem the flow of blood and save the soldier's life. Noticing that his and the other soldier's radios were inoperative, Specialist White exposed himself to enemy fire yet again in order to secure a radio from a deceased comrade. He then
provided information and updates to friendly forces, allowing precision airstrikes to stifle the enemy's attack and ultimately permitting medical evacuation aircraft to rescue him, his fellow soldiers, Marines and Afghan Army soldiers. Specialist Kyle J. White's extraordinary heroism and selflessness above and beyond the call of duty are in keeping with the highest traditions of military service and reflect great credit upon himself, Company C, 2d Battalion (Airborne), 503d Infantry Regiment, 173d Airborne Brigade and the United States Army.

Citation 37

For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty while serving as Rifle Squad Leader, 4th Platoon, Company K, Third Battalion, Seventh Marines (Reinforced), Regimental Combat Team 7, First Marine Division (Reinforced), on 14 April 2004. Corporal Dunham's squad was conducting a reconnaissance mission in the town of Karabilah, Iraq, when they heard rocket-propelled grenade and small arms fire erupt approximately two kilometers to the west. Corporal Dunham led his Combined Anti-Armor Team towards the engagement to provide fire support to their Battalion Commander's convoy, which had been ambushed as it was traveling to Camp Husaybah. As Corporal Dunham and his Marines advanced, they quickly began to receive enemy fire. Corporal Dunham ordered his squad to dismount their vehicles and led one of his fire teams on foot several blocks south of the ambushed convoy. Discovering seven Iraqi vehicles in a column attempting to depart, Corporal Dunham and his team stopped the vehicles to search them for weapons. As they approached the vehicles, an insurgent leaped out and attacked Corporal Dunham. Corporal Dunham wrestled the insurgent to the ground and in the ensuing struggle saw the insurgent release a grenade. Corporal Dunham immediately alerted his fellow Marines to the threat. Aware of the imminent danger and without hesitation, Corporal
Dunham covered the grenade with his helmet and body, bearing the brunt of the explosion and shielding his Marines from the blast. In an ultimate and selfless act of bravery in which he was mortally wounded, he saved the lives of at least two fellow Marines. By his undaunted courage, intrepid fighting spirit, and unwavering devotion to duty, Corporal Dunham gallantly gave his life for his country, thereby reflecting great credit upon himself and upholding the highest traditions of the Marine Corps and the United States Naval Service.

Citation 38

For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty: Private First Class Ross A. McGinnis distinguished himself by acts of gallantry and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty while serving as an M2 .50-caliber Machine Gunner, 1st Platoon, C Company, 1st Battalion, 26th Infantry Regiment, in connection with combat operations against an armed enemy in Adhamiyah, Northeast Baghdad, Iraq, on 4 December 2006. That afternoon his platoon was conducting combat control operations in an effort to reduce and control sectarian violence in the area. While Private McGinnis was manning the M2 .50-caliber Machine Gun, a fragmentation grenade thrown by an insurgent fell through the gunner's hatch into the vehicle. Reacting quickly, he yelled "grenade," allowing all four members of his crew to prepare for the grenade's blast. Then, rather than leaping from the gunner's hatch to safety, Private McGinnis made the courageous decision to protect his crew. In a selfless act of bravery, in which he was mortally wounded, Private McGinnis covered the live grenade, pinning it between his body and the vehicle and absorbing most of the explosion. Private McGinnis’ gallant action directly saved four men from certain serious injury or death. Private First Class McGinnis’ extraordinary heroism and selflessness at the cost of his own life, above and beyond the call of duty, are in keeping with the
highest traditions of the military service and reflect great credit upon himself, his unit, and the United States Army.

Citation 39

For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty as automatic weapons gunner for Naval Special Warfare Task Group Arabian Peninsula, in support of Operation IRAQI FREEDOM on 29 September 2006. As a member of a combined SEAL and Iraqi Army Sniper Overwatch Element, tasked with providing early warning and stand-off protection from a rooftop in an insurgent held sector of Ar Ramadi, Iraq, Petty Officer Monsoor distinguished himself by his exceptional bravery in the face of grave danger. In the early morning, insurgents prepared to execute a coordinated attack by reconnoitering the area around the element’s position. Element snipers thwarted the enemy’s initial attempt by eliminating two insurgents. The enemy continued to assault the element, engaging them with a rocket-propelled grenade and small arms fire. As enemy activity increased, Petty Officer Monsoor took position with his machine gun between two teammates on an outcropping of the roof. While the SEALs vigilantly watched for enemy activity, an insurgent threw a hand grenade from an unseen location, which bounced off Petty Officer Monsoor’s chest and landed in front of him. Although only he could have escaped the blast, Petty Officer Monsoor chose instead to protect his teammates. Instantly and without regard for his own safety, he threw himself onto the grenade to absorb the force of the explosion with his body, saving the lives of his two teammates. By hisundaunted courage, fighting spirit, and unwavering devotion to duty in the face of certain death, Petty Officer Monsoor gallantly gave his life for his country, thereby reflecting great credit upon himself and upholding the highest traditions of the United States Naval Service.
For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty: Sergeant First Class Paul R. Smith distinguished himself by acts of gallantry and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty in action with an armed enemy near Baghdad International Airport, Baghdad, Iraq on 4 April 2003. On that day, Sergeant First Class Smith was engaged in the construction of a prisoner of war holding area when his Task Force was violently attacked by a company-sized enemy force. Realizing the vulnerability of over 100 fellow soldiers, Sergeant First Class Smith quickly organized a hasty defense consisting of two platoons of soldiers, one Bradley Fighting Vehicle and three armored personnel carriers. As the fight developed, Sergeant First Class Smith braved hostile enemy fire to personally engage the enemy with hand grenades and anti-tank weapons, and organized the evacuation of three wounded soldiers from an armored personnel carrier struck by a rocket propelled grenade and a 60mm mortar round. Fearing the enemy would overrun their defenses, Sergeant First Class Smith moved under withering enemy fire to man a .50 caliber machine gun mounted on a damaged armored personnel carrier. In total disregard for his own life, he maintained his exposed position in order to engage the attacking enemy force. During this action, he was mortally wounded. His courageous actions helped defeat the enemy attack, and resulted in as many as 50 enemy soldiers killed, while allowing the safe withdrawal of numerous wounded soldiers. Sergeant First Class Smith’s extraordinary heroism and uncommon valor are in keeping with the highest traditions of the military service and reflect great credit upon himself, the Third Infantry Division, Rock of the Marne, and the United States Army.