UC Santa Barbara
UC Santa Barbara Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Title
Boundary Affects: Race, Gender, Sex, and Species in the U.S. "War on Terror"

Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/0nh3k0ns

Author
Diamond-Lenow, Chloe E

Publication Date
2018

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

eScholarship.org Powered by the California Digital Library
University of California

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Santa Barbara

Boundary Affects:

Race, Gender, Sex, and Species in the U.S. "War on Terror"

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the

requirements for the degree Doctor of Philosophy

in Feminist Studies

by

Chloe E. Diamond-Lenow

Committee in charge:

Professor Barbara Tomlinson, Chair

Professor Mireille Miller-Young

Professor George Lipsitz

Professor Esther Lezra

December 2018

The dissertation of Chloe Diamond-Lenow is approved.

Mireille Miller-Young

George Lispitz

Esther Lezra

Barbara Tomlinson, Committee Chair

November 2018

Boundary Affects:

Race, Gender, Sex, and Species in the U.S. “War on Terror”

Copyright © 2018

by

Chloe E. Diamond-Lenow

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Completion of this dissertation was a labor of love that would not have been possible without the support of many—mentors, colleagues, friends, family, and pets.

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my committee chair, Barbara Tomlinson, whose commitment to ethical ways of thinking with shaped the core of this project and my own sense of what it means to be a scholar. I thank her for her dedication to thinking with me and my work, accompanying me at every step with full attention, curiosity, rigor, and humor. Her work on affect, feminist argument, and intersectionality continue to shape my approach to feminist scholarship, pedagogy, and life. Without her mentorship, guidance, support, and generosity, this dissertation would not have been possible.

I am incredibly grateful for a brilliant dissertation committee who provided me with generous and generative support. Mireille Miller-Young helped me at critical stages of this project with insightful mentorship. I am so appreciative of her innovative work in sexuality studies and for the communities of scholars in sexuality studies she created at the University of California, Santa Barbara. George Lipsitz provided me with feedback on this project at various stages and helped me think critically about the insidious workings of racialized power and the ever-present possibilities for resistance. I thank him for his poetic teachings and continued support. Esther Lezra offered compassion and support at the start and end of this project and I am grateful for the lenses of visual culture and global politics she offered in discussions of my work.

Faculty and staff in the Feminist Studies Department at UCSB provided me with invaluable support during my time in graduate school—intellectually and emotionally.

Laury Oaks assisted and encouraged me in innumerable ways—from helping me hone my research skills, to providing immense kindness and care through difficult times. Edwina Barvosa, Eileen Boris, Leila Rupp, and Jennifer Tyburczy all facilitated my intellectual growth as a graduate student; from discussions in their seminars, to advice on research and writing, they helped me develop the tools to undertake my research and writing. Christina Toy and Lou Anne Lockwood welcomed me to Santa Barbara and made me feel at home immediately and I am thankful for their friendship, for the many conversations we shared about life, and for their administrative work and support. Crystal Carlos and Sonya Baker also offered generous administrative support, particularly as I completed this project.

I was lucky to receive guidance and teaching beyond my home department and am grateful for other faculty at UCSB who helped me to sharpen my tools of analysis and critique—Paul Amar, Felice Blake, Avery Gordon, Chela Sandoval, Glyn Salton-Cox, Sherene Seikaly, and Russell Samolsky. I am also thankful for the feedback from scholars including Claire Jean Kim, Lori Gruen, Kari Weil, and Susan McHugh whose work in feminist animal studies and feedback on this project in various stages has been central to developing my own arguments, theories and interventions.

I also benefitted immensely from friendships and working groups with fellow graduate students during my time at UCSB. Collegiality and support of fellow graduate students in the UCSB Feminist Studies PhD program—particularly from Anna Wald, Chelsea Jones, Rachel Rys, Anita Stahl, Sandibel Borges, Karen Hanna, and Leigh Dodson—were central to my own intellectual growth and happiness in graduate school. I cannot imagine the beginning years of my PhD without Leigh Dodson by my side—my comrade and accomplice from day one.

My colleagues in the HumAnimality Research Focus Group at UCSB and at the Animals in Society Institute and Wesleyan University's Human-Animal Studies Fellowship provided wonderful collaboration and conversations that helped me think through central problematics in animal studies as they related to my work. I am particularly thankful for support from Erica Tom, Marianna Szczygielska, Sharalyn Sanders, Katherine Kelpp-Stebbins, Marcel Brousseau, Alexandra Megaru, and Alston D'Silva. I am also grateful for the support from The New Sexualities Research Focus Group at UCSB and the generous feedback I received on my project during our writing retreats. I am lucky to have found a network of colleagues in feminist animal studies through collaborative work at conferences. Logan O'Laughlin and Meredith Clarke became important friends, colleagues, and interlocuters as we developed our projects together and thought with each other on various panels over the years, and I am appreciative of their willingness to think and work together.

I would also like to express my deepest gratitude and love for my friends from graduate school who helped me not only in writing this project in its various stages, but also in building queer kinship networks of love, support, and generosity: Maryam Griffin, Mary McGuire, Teddy Pozzo, J.J. Allen, Alison Reed, Athena Tan, Bridget Harr, Bri Spears, Elizabeth Rahilly, Alyssa Newman, and Félix Solano Vargas. I thank them for sharing compassion, warmth, and pleasure from near and far.

Financial support from the UCSB Feminist Studies Department, the UCSB Graduate Division Regents' Special Fellowship, the UCSB Interdisciplinary Humanities Center, and the Animals in Society Institute and Wesleyan University's Human-Animal Studies Fellowship all allowed me to undertake and complete my research and writing for this project and I am thankful for this support.

I am tremendously appreciative of my time in Santa Barbara during graduate school and am forever grateful to have been able to spend my time in this small paradise. Thank you to the ocean, the sand, and then sun, for the warmth, the comfort, and the beauty that surrounded me. I am extremely thankful for the communities of support I found in Santa Barbara and for those who kept me grounded. Kelly Heath's wise and vulnerable teachings gave me space to connect to myself in all the ways I did and didn't know I needed. Cara Ferrick provided me with a new path to healing and gave me the tools to share this healing with others. Torrey Trover, Madeleine Foster, Kimberly Zimmerman and Laura DuSchane helped me re-connect to the pleasure of movement and held space for me in many powerful ways.

I am indebted to my family for their continued love, wit, generosity, and support. My father, Howard Lenow, instilled a commitment to social justice in me from an early age. I am forever and profoundly grateful for his dedication to my happiness and well-being in my personal and professional life, for his depths of generosity, and for modeling for me how to approach life with compassion and humor. I am also thankful for my twin, Sasha, for continuing to be the nag to my mule, to Jared, my brother, for helping me sharpen my tools of feminist argument, and to Derry, for her sweet words of encouragement and understanding. I am also thankful for animal kin. My bulldog Rumples and cat Jack provided me with grounding companionship as I completed this project and I am thankful for the joy and warmth they bring to my life every day.

And finally, I owe my deepest thanks to Alexandra Duncan, my partner in life, who has shown me unwavering love and compassion as we moved from sunshine to snow. She continues to help me find new depths of love, curiosity, vulnerability, and joy as we build

our lives together. I thank her for being my sun and my rock and for supporting me through the highs and lows of this project and this life.

VITA OF CHLOE E. DIAMOND-LENOW
December 2018

EDUCATION

Doctor of Philosophy in Feminist Studies, University of California, Santa Barbara, December 2018

Master of Science in Gender Studies, The London School of Economics and Political Science, June 2009 (with Distinction)

Bachelor of Arts in Women and Gender Studies, Smith College, June 2008 (cum laude)

PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYMENT

University of Minnesota Duluth
Visiting Assistant Professor in Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies (August 2017-present)

University of California, Santa Barbara
Teaching Associate/Teaching Assistant in Feminist Studies (June 2011-August 2017)

PUBLICATIONS

"Tracing the Animal in the Human: A Review of Christopher Peterson's *Bestial Traces: Race, Animality and Sexuality*." *Humanimalia: A Journal of Human/Animal Interface Studies* 6(2): 2015.

FELLOWSHIPS, AWARDS, HONORS

Charlotte Stough Memorial Prize: Best Paper in Feminist Studies, University of California, Santa Barbara, 2017

Graduate Student Teaching Associate Excellence in Teaching Award, Graduate Student Association, University of California, Santa Barbara, 2016

Outstanding LGBTQ Graduate Student Mentor Award, The Resource Center for Sexual and Gender Diversity, University of California, Santa Barbara, 2016

Summer Fellowship, Animals and Society Institute and Wesleyan Human-Animal Studies, 2015.

Travel and Registration Grant, Graduate Center for Literary Research, 2015

Travel and Registration Grant, National Women's Studies Association, 2015

Graduate Affiliate Program Fellow, "The Anthropocene: Views from the Humanities

Series," Interdisciplinary Humanities Center, University of California, Santa Barbara, 2014-2015

Travel Grant, National Women's Studies Association, Academic Senate, University of California, Santa Barbara, 2014

Regents' Special Fellow, University of California, Santa Barbara, 2011-2015

Grant for HumAnimal Research Focus Group, Interdisciplinary Humanities Center, University of California, Santa Barbara, 2012-2013, 2013-2014

Distinguished Graduate Teaching Award, Department of Feminist Studies, University of California. Santa Barbara, 2013

Lavender Graduate Student Award, Resource Center for Sexual and Gender Diversity, University of California, Santa Barbara, 2013

FIELDS OF STUDY

Major Field: Feminist and Queer Theory

Minor Fields: Sexuality Studies, Animal Studies, Critical Race Studies, Global Studies

ABSTRACT

Boundary Affects: Race, Gender, Sex, and Species in the U.S. “War on Terror”

by

Chloe E. Diamond-Lenow

Contemporary public discourses in the United States about the “war on terror” are pervaded by cultural discourses of human-animal intimacy set in contexts of nationalism, humanitarianism and militarism: specifically discourses of American “puppy love” and Middle Eastern “hatred of dogs.” These two intimately interconnected discourses work to shift boundaries between human and animal: one set of discourses dehumanizes everyone positioned as potential “terrorists”—including people in Iraq and Afghanistan figured as “enemy others”; the other set of discourses humanizes military working dogs and dogs adopted from Iraq and Afghanistan. Considering these discourses together highlights how the boundary between human and animal is unstable and intimately connected to gendered and sexualized processes of racialization deployed for political purposes. The shifting value ascribed to some dogs’ lives in the “war on terror” emerges at the nexus of the racialized, gendered and sexualized discourses of human exceptionalism and orientalism, working to iteratively reproduce unstable boundaries.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1: Introduction ... 1

Chapter 2: Abjecting Middle Eastern Masculinity ... 24

Chapter 3: Affective Discourses of Dog "Rescue" ... 88

Chapter 4: Homecomings and "Queer Hauntings" ... 130

Chapter 5: The Affective Biopolitics of Military Working Dogs ... 183

Works Cited ... 222

Chapter 1: Introduction

The figure of the dog has figured centrally in the U.S. "war on terror"[1] and to articulations of U.S. nationalism. Western discourses constantly call on the figure of the dog to create affects justifying U.S. military action in the Middle East. Manichean binaries positioning Middle Eastern men as cruel toward dogs in contrast to the kindness of U.S. soldiers serve as evidence of enormous cultural and religious difference. The "civilized" status of the United States is reinscribed by discourses about U.S. soldiers deployed in Iraq and Afghanistan who claim to find companionship with stray dogs they take on to their bases; charitable organizations spend thousands of dollars per dog to "rescue" the soldiers' adopted stray dogs and transport them to the United States. The "homecomings" of transported dogs and returning U.S. female soldiers are a site to develop gendered and sentimentalized pro-military affects—though subject to "queer hauntings." In addition, with 2,800 dogs as of 2010, the U.S. military has what has been called the largest "canine contingent in the world" (Frankel 2011), using military working dogs to carry out search and rescue missions, to find explosives, to guard bases, and to interrogate prisoners (Drury 2013). Dogs associated with the U.S. military serve as potent material and symbolic weapons of war and U.S. nationalism.

Tropes of animality have also figured centrally in the "war on terror" as those considered "enemy others" in this war have been rendered in the metaphoric position of "animality"[2] through material practices and racialized cultural representations (Ahuja 2016; Butler 2006, 2010; Derrida 2009; Glenney Boggs 2013; Puar 2007). Renewed frameworks of orientalism[3] and Islamophobia in U.S. nationalism during this war have had significant

impact for the ways in which racial regimes are articulated in U.S. public discourse (Considine 2017). These frameworks have bolstered discourses of American exceptionalism and facilitated the creation of a new racial category of "'anyone who looks like a Muslim' in which targets of racism include Muslims, Arabs, Sikhs, and any other people with olive or brown skin" (Bacchetta et al. 2002, 305). This new formation of Islamophobic racialization grounded in orientalism groups together Muslim, Arab and Middle Eastern people together under the sign of "terrorist" (Bacchetta et al. 2002, 305; Volpp 2003).[4] Part of this project argues that racism—in Ruth Wilson Gilmore's terms, "the state-sanctioned or extralegal production and exploitation of group-differentiated vulnerability to premature death, in distinct yet densely interconnected political geographies" (2002, 261)—becomes articulated under the terms of U.S. militarism and nationalism through claims about Islam and Middle Eastern culture in ways that enhance the precarity of Iraqi and Afghan people.

Boundary Affects: Race, Gender, Sex and Species in the "War on Terror" offers analysis of Islamophobia and militarism within the "war on terror" to argue that the figure of the animal—in particular the figure of the dog—is central to racialized and sexualized processes that work to dehumanize Middle Eastern people as "enemy others." Drawing on cross-disciplinary frameworks and insights from queer of color critique and critical animal studies (Chen 2012; Dayan 2011; Freccero 2011; Glenney Boggs 2013; Jean Kim 2014; Shukin 2009),[5] this project argues that racialized projects of dehumanization are intimately connected to the formative role of the human/animal binary in contemporary thought. Discourses that rest on the mutually constitutive and performative boundaries between human and animal—and between "West" and "East"—within racialized and sexualized projects of orientalism mobilize dogs as affective capital in the "war on terror" to bolster

support for, and to sanitize, U.S. nationalism and militarism—presenting discourses about war, life, and death, through the seemingly innocuous figure of the dog.

In my analysis, I engage with several interrelated questions: What symbolic work is done by the use of dogs as part of the U.S. military industrial complex? What symbolic work is done by this use of dogs as part of the discourses of the "war on terror"? How is this symbolic work attached to significations of nation, race, gender, class, and sexuality? How are various human-dog affective bonds and intimate relationships within the "war on terror" variously promoted, normalized, disciplined, and rendered abject? What power/knowledge formations do these different reactions to framings of human-animal intimacies serve? How do these various reactions contribute to the production, maintenance and deconstruction of the racialized, gendered, and sexual boundary between human and animal? What are the stakes of these framings for how some lives are protected and others are rendered expendable?

The Shifting Boundary between Humanity and Animality

This project, following work in critical animal studies, asks how representations of, and discourses about, human and dog intimacies can be a site where subjectivity is produced and negotiated. For Jacques Derrida, the animal is the "disavowed core of subject formation" (2008, 49). Derrida argues that Western philosophical, religious and scientific discourses reproduce an ideology of human exceptionalism—an ideology that creates the illusion of an "abyssal rupture" between man and animal, situating humans and animals as ontologically and epistemologically disparate in terms of ethical and moral questions. Under this framework, Derrida argues that man positions himself as sovereign over animals through what he calls "logocentrism," an ideology that defines humans as radically distinct from and

superior to animals, based on humans' supposed unique capacity for self-conscious thinking and auto-reference (2008, 94). He claims that logocentrism not only excludes animals from humanism's frames of subjectivity, but also excludes those human subjects positioned as being outside of this logocentrism through what he calls "carnophallologocentrism." According to Derrida, carnophallologocentrism refers to how animals as well as women, children, people of color, and those who are defined as not being capable of having "logos" are excluded from humanist formulations of subjectivity.

Derrida argues that both of these frameworks produce a "sacrificial economy" that values human and humanized lives differently from those of animal others. For Derrida, the sacrificial economy of human exceptionalism establishes an economy of life that gives different value to human and animal life, permitting the non-criminal killing of animals (2006, 66; 2008, 30). According to Derrida, humans as well as animals may be rendered expendable within the sacrificial economy of carnophallologocentrism. He argues that this economy justifies killing humans who are animalized, considered not to have the "logos" that marks man as a superior and rational animal.

The shifting boundary between human and animal that undergirds these sacrificial economies is not new: it is deeply embedded in a history of gendered and racialized significations that establish hierarchies of value for human lives. These significations produce the category of "human" through a chain of substitutions that position women and men of color as close to the boundary between human and animal (see, for example, Adams 1990; Chen 2012; Deckha 2013; Gossett 2015; Haritaworn 2015; Jackson 2013; Kim 2009, 2015; Mbembe 2001; McKittrick 2014; Morgan 2004; Muñoz 2015; Weheliye 2014). The hierarchical relations of humans and animals are therefore predicated on sets of mutually

constitutive binaries: man and woman, culture and nature, mind and body, reason and emotion, white and nonwhite, "occident" and "orient," with the second term always positioned as inferior to the first (see, for example, Chen 2012; Derrida 2008, 2009; Glenney Boggs 2013).

The racialized shifting boundary between human and animal in the "war on terror" is central to the biopolitics[6] of U.S. nationalism that considers some lives as important and deserving protection, and others as expendable (Ahuja 2016; Butler 1993, 2004, 2009; Foucault 1990, 2006). Nicole Shukin argues that biopower hinges on the production of "species difference as strategically ambivalent rather than as an absolute line, allowing for the contradictory power to both dissolve and reinscribe borders between humans and animals" (2009, 11). While biopower is often considered in terms of human life, it is also relevant to the promotion and destruction of animal life, to what Nicole Shukin terms "zoopolitics," an account of power that describes how animal life is variously protected or framed as expendable especially as instrumentalized within biopolitics (Shukin 2009; see also Chen 2012; Dayan 2011; Haraway 2003, 2008).

Racialization, Animality, and Subjectivity

While the categories "human" and "animal" appear to be coherent and stable, they are constantly reproduced through the categories of liberal subjectivity—which positions white males as most fully human and deserving of a protected moral status and people of color as always less-human and outside of these terms of subjectivity (McKittrick 2014, Weheliye 2014). I use and trace the positionality of "liberal subjecthood" throughout this project in relation to projects of racialization and animalization. I do so to uncover how some discourses about the figure of the dog in the "war on terror" rhetorically disrupt the terms of

human exceptionalism and the formation of liberal subjectivity on which it is grounded (Gillespie and Collard 2015). I use this framework in part to add nuance to claims about "humanization" and "dehumanization"—concepts which depend on a strict boundary between "human" and "animal"—rather than understanding both as discursive constructions with histories in liberal Enlightenment humanism (Wynter 2003). I also do so to read these discourses in relation to processes of racialization and colonialism, which consistently construct the "nonpersonhood" of subjugated populations through ontologies of animality, such that, as Claire Jean Kim argues, "race has been articulated in part as a *metric of animality*, as a classification system that orders human bodies according to how animal they are—and how human they are not—with all of the entailments that follow" (2015, 18).

Boundary Affects argues that discourses in the "war on terror" blur the boundary between humans and animals by situating some humans—such as "terrorists," prisoners, and general enemy "others"—within a discursive space of animality, or "animalized humanity," outside of the boundaries of liberal subjectivity. Judith Butler argues that the position of life at the shifting boundary between human and animal is the space of (unrecognized) "precarious life" (2006, 2010). For Giorgio Agamben, that space is the site of "bare life," life rendered in the discursive space of animality, such that it is produced as "homo sacer," a figure who can be killed but not murdered (1998, 2004).[7] For Colin Dayan, that shifting boundary is the space of "negative personhood" (2011). According to Dayan negative personhood refers to the "creation of a species of depersonalized persons. Deprived of rights to due-process, to bodily integrity, to life, these creatures remain *persons in law*" (2011, 32). She argues that within this position of "negative personhood," humans are subject to what

she calls "civil death," "the state of a person, who though possessing *natural life* has lost all *civil rights*" (Dayan 2011, 44).

The enactment of dehumanizing violence in detention centers like Abu Ghraib and Guantanamo Bay not only *compares* detainees to animals, but *produces* detainees within a structural position of animality, producing them at the outside of the constitutive limits of the human, in a position of what Jasbir Puar (2007) calls "unhuman" and Butler (2004, 2006, 2009) calls "inhuman." Butler (2008, 16) argues that the torture U.S soldiers committed against Iraqis at Abu Ghraib, Guantanamo Bay, and other detainment facilities sought to construct those framed as "enemy others" to the United States—as well as Islam as a whole—as animalistic, barbaric and backwards. Butler argues that this dehumanizing violence reflects U.S. subjects' "efforts to seize absolute control over the construction of the subject" (2008, 16), reducing these subjects to the status of animality, figured as "out of control and in need of total restraint" (1997, 68).

Discourses that condemn those labeled as "terrorists" to conditions of precarity through these terms of dehumanization create the circumstances for the operation of "necropower" (Puar 2007).[8] Postcolonial theorist Achille Mbembe defines "necropolitics" as a formation of citizenship that produces certain bodies as expendable and disposable (2003, 27). Writing about necropower, Mbembe argues that technologies of imperialism create animalized colonized subjects, positioning these people as savage, barbaric and uncivil. He argues that colonialism depends on the

> racial denial of any common bond between the conqueror and the native. In the eyes of the conqueror, *savage life* is just another form of *animal life*, a horrifying experience, something alien beyond imagination or comprehension.

> In fact, according to Arendt, what makes the savages different from other human beings is less the color of their skin than the fear that they behave like a part of nature, that they treat nature as their undisputed master. Nature thus remains, in all its majesty, an overwhelming reality compared to which they appear to be phantoms, unreal and ghostlike. The savages are, as it were, "natural" human beings who lack the specifically human character, the specifically human reality, so that when European men massacred them they somehow were not aware that they had committed murder. (Mbembe 2003, 24)

U.S. biopolitics operates by producing racialized others in Iraq and Afghanistan in a category of alterity, such that they experience war as "necropolitics."

The Figure of the Dog and Biopower

Dogs as literal animals, as signifiers, and as containers for affect are an important site for theorizing biopolitics, zoopolitics, and necropolitics. Dogs are rich signifiers for affective structures of militarism, nationalism, humanitarianism, and the construction of liberal subjectivity. They are deployed to evoke sentimentality as "man's best friend" and also signify loyalty, companionship, and normative Western ideologies about pet ownership (Garber 1997; Halberstam 2011; McHugh 2004; Nast 2006). Because dogs are embedded in affective structures of sentimentality and the heteronormative nuclear family, they also hold symbolic and affective capital for U.S. biopolitics (Glenney Boggs 2013).

Biopower can work on animals through law (for example, "at what point are dogs legally recognizable, and when do they cease to count?" Dayan 2011, 213) and through

revalorization ("to make men dogs and dogs trash" Dayan 2011, 241). Affect is central to the processes by which matter and animals "participate in making life and coerced death" (Chen 2012, 6). Examining discourses about dogs, and practices involving them, is instructive for examining how discourses of humanity, public life, war, and law establish which lives, and under which conditions, become disposable and killable, and which are given the right to health and life (Haraway 2008, 38).

Theorizing Boundary Affects

This project introduces the concept of "boundary affects" to reveal and examine how affect infuses the conceptualization of human and animal as well as the politics of U.S. militarism through the figure of the dog as an affective technology of precarity in the "war on terror." I introduce this concept to focus attention on the co-creation and changing relationships of human and animal subjectivities in the age of the "war on terror." The concept of "boundary affects" serves to illuminate how emotions function as affective-discursive tools of power to produce, maintain, and deconstruct the racialized, gendered and sexualized boundaries between "human" and "animal," subject and object, and "grievable" and "ungrievable" life.

Affective Economies

Sara Ahmed argues that emotions function as affective capital and reproduce power by aligning certain bodies and objects together and against others in "affective economies" (2004). For Ahmed, emotions are culturally embedded, infused with relations of power and "affect what they come into contact with" to *generate* subjects, communities, and nations (2004, 85). Ahmed's theory of affective economies suggests that emotions do not reside

positively in a sign or object, but are rather *produced* as an "effect of the circulation between objects and signs" and "generate effects" as they move between objects, signs, and bodies, gaining affective value as they circulate (2004, 45, 14).

Ahmed argues that fear, for example, is central to consolidating borders between self and other, as well as the borders of the nation. She argues: "fear does not involve the defense of borders that already exist; rather fear makes those borders, by establishing objects from which the subject, in fearing, can flee. Through fear not only is the very border between self and other affected, but the relation between the objects that are feared (rather than simply the relation between the subject and its objects) is shaped by histories that 'stick,' making some objects more than others seem fearsome" (Ahmed 2004, 67).[9]

Ahmed argues that love is a *productive* affect in relation to frames of nationalism in the "war on terror." Ahmed argues that a powerful tool of discourse is to turn "hate" into "love," such that a project that is grounded on hate and violence can be turned into a story that is "redemptive, or about saving loved others" (2004, 123). She also argues that discourses of heteronormative love, familial love, and patriotic love *stick* together under U.S. nationalism in the "war on terror" to centralize the domestic home and nuclear family as "the origin of love, community and support" (2004, 144), while making the Middle Eastern "other" the site of fear and terror. In this framework, she argues, "experiences of fear became lived as patriotic declarations of love, which allow[s] home to be mobilized as a defense against terror" (Ahmed 2004, 74). In such a context, "self-love becomes national love that legitimates the responses to terror as protection of the loved other, who may be 'with me' by showing signs (such as flags) of being 'like me'" (Ahmed 2004, 75).

Ahmed, as well as other theorists such as Lauren Berlant and Michael Warner (1998) argue that investments in *heteronormative* expressions of love create a sentimental and sanitized vision of the nation during war, such that “national heterosexuality is the mechanism which a core national culture can be imagined as a sanitized space of sentimental feeling” (147). Ahmed, particularly concerned with how claims of love are used to justify militarism, argues that “the ‘injustice’ of war, and the injustices that are legitimated through the narrating of war as a mission of love, depend on the exclusion of others from the emotional response of grief” (Ahmed 2004, 192).

Boundary Affects also draws on Mel Chen’s (2012) concept of an “animacy hierarchy.” Chen (2012) argues that animacy hierarchies are perceptual systems through which humans, animals, plants, and objects are hierarchically categorized based on a presumed ordering of animacy tied to historically produced associations between race, gender, sex, class, and species and the relationship between life and death. Although the “animacy hierarchy” appears to be stable, it is unstable, performative, and “slips” in Ahmed’s terms. For Ahmed, “slipperiness” refers to how affect slides between bodies and objects informed by their historical associations. Chen argues that given the durability of these hierarchies which produce the illusion of “ontological closure,” it is possible to trace the fissures within them to disrupt the “hierarchical closures” that animacy hierarchies present as apolitical, natural, and static (2012, 237). She claims that slippages within this hierarchy are informed by historical associations between race, gender, sexuality, and animality, “perhaps in part because these are the fragile grounds upon which they have been built in popular ontologies and political cultures in the United States” (2012, 234). I use Chen’s theory to

trace how expressions of affects, like grief, love, and hatred in the "war on terror" are part of "slippages" across the boundaries of liberal subjectivity.

Boundary Affects extends Ahmed's theory to consider the ontological production of specific boundaries—including boundaries of species and of life—to theorize how discourses mobilize animals as a form of affective capital to make and unmake biopolitical boundaries of life, species and nation in the "war on terror."

Affect and Abjection

Particularly significant to the operations of boundary affects is the process of abjection, through which affect produces and reproduces boundaries around the self through disgust, fear, and terror (Kristeva 1982). Abjection emphasizes that boundaries are sites where ontological categories must be constantly (re)negotiated within structures of power and affect. At stake in Julie Kristeva's (1982) theory of abjection are the ways in which abjection constantly produces boundaries around the self, distinguishing the "me" from the "not-me." Kristeva claims that abjection produces and maintains these boundaries during the primal moment the subject is formed. She argues that the subject cannot exist without the production of these ontological boundaries of difference, such that the abject "signifies the other side of the border, the place where [the subject is] not and which permits [it] to be" (1982, 71). Thus, for Kristeva, abjection is centrally about how otherness functions in subject-formation. According to Kristeva, the subject "give[s] birth to [it]self" as a subject, at the very moment it ejects and produces the abject (1982, 3), indicating that subjectification is coextensive with, and indeed a result of, abjection.

Kristeva argues that although the abject is expelled from the subject, “from its place of banishment, [it] does not cease challenging its master” (1982, 1). She claims that the ambiguity of abjection means that it never establishes a clear and stable border and that abjection and subjectification are both continuous processes. The abject, she argues, haunts the subject’s insecure borders, threatening to pollute and disrupt them (1982, 2). Thus, for Kristeva, the abject looms at the constitutive outside of the subject, haunting it and threatening to pollute it from within and without.

Affects such as abjection—what I call “boundary affects”— are not merely reactive responses to transgressions and consolidations of pre-discursive “natural” boundaries. Rather, affect *produces* boundaries, bodies and nations (see, for example, Ahmed 2004, 2006; Butler 1993, 2004, 2009; Chen 2012; Kristeva 1982). Indeed, affect circulates and intensifies: “bodies and worlds materialize and take shape [and produce] the effect of boundary, surface and fixity” (Ahmed 2004, 25).

Ahmed draws on Kristeva’s theory of abjection to claim that responses of disgust are not only fundamental to the subject’s becoming, but are deeply political and grounded in power hierarchies (2004). Ahmed grounds theories of abjection in power relations, arguing that affective responses of disgust (re)produce systems of power and binaries that position some subjects as good, “free,” “modern” and “human,” while positioning others as bad, unfree, barbaric and animalistic. In doing so, she provides tools to analyze the way that disgust both reproduces and naturalizes power hierarchies through processes of abjection. She argues that reactions of disgust produce and stabilize boundaries between binaries including self/other, east/west, citizen/terrorist, as well as human and nonhuman. She claims

that these reactions of disgust privilege the superiority of the first term of these binaries through disgust reactions.[10]

Central to Ahmed's theory of how abjection secures boundaries of the subject, community, and nation through affective responses of disgust is her analysis of how objects, signs, and bodies become what she calls "sticky" (2004). Stickiness, for Ahmed, refers to the way in which signs, words, and bodies are associated through their constant repetition and gain affective value through their circulation. Stickiness, Ahmed argues, creates blockages as signs resist being "cut off" because they are informed by constantly reproduced chains of significations (Ahmed 2004, 93). Ahmed explains the process of the blockage of signs around the Middle Eastern body, arguing,

> The naming of disgust metonymically sticks… signs together, such that terror and fear become associated with bodies that are already recognized as 'Middle-Eastern'. It is the association or contact between those signs 'Middle-Eastern' and 'terrorists' that 'blocks' the sticky flow of disgust (2004, 97).

According to Ahmed's theory of "stickiness," in a "disgust encounter," for example, objects become disgusting when they encounter other objects that have been rendered disgusting before the disgust encounter and accrue value and the quality of disgust through this proximate encounter (2004, 87). Thus, Ahmed claims, signs, bodies, and objects become sticky and accumulate value as they are associated with other words through constant repetition, metonymy, and substitution. Metonymy substitutes objects for each other, rendering them sticky through this substitution—through dense historical associations and significations attributed to the object, signs, and bodies (Ahmed 2004, 89).

The stickiness of signs, according to Ahmed, means that a certain sign can be invoked, recalling various other words and signs that do not have to be spoken, but are deeply embedded in and informed by power relations. For example, Ahmed argues that the word “Paki” is a sign that accumulates value and is stuck to other abject words and signs such as “immigrant, outsider, dirt, etc.” (2004, 92). Accordingly, through metonymic substitution, signs like object, animal, terrorist, and “other” get stuck to each other, while signs like subject, human, citizen, and self are stuck to each other within fields of power/knowledge relations. These sticky signs accrue affective value, re-securing the boundaries between those who are rendered as innately disgusting and those who are not.

Contemporary discourses about the “war on terror” rely on public expressions of shared affect—including of mourning, grief, pride, love and nationalism. Thinking in terms of boundary affects draws attention to the multiple boundaries being remade in such discourses, as they (re)produce and disrupt racialized ontological species boundaries as well as other power-laden boundaries.

The Boundaries of Liberal Subjectivity

The discourses and boundary-processes I analyze thus serve to challenge and redraw the contours of the liberal subject by elevating the figure of the dog while devalorizing humans depicted as “enemy others.” In this situation, specific dogs may be framed so as to embody elements of a “quasi-liberal subjectivity” through the affective labor of print and media discourses portraying them as uniquely valuable—as innocent, rational, conscious, *political* beings, despite a history of defining the human by abjecting the animal. Concurrently, Iraqis and Afghanis are abjected from the boundary of the “human”—

positioned like animals, rendered expendable, disposable and ungrievable in the collective U.S. conscience.

Dogs are mobilized as tools of war and technologies of racialized and sexualized power in ways that bolster the terms of American exceptionalism—a framework supported by orientalist ways of thinking that positions the United States as the pinnacle of "freedom" and democracy. Amy Kaplan argues that American exceptionalism functions through a "paradoxical claim to uniqueness and universality" (2004, 5), which according to Puar "posits America as the arbiter of appropriate ethics, human rights, and democratic behavior while exempting itself without hesitation from such universalizing mandates" (2007, 8). At stake in this project is a concern with how frames of species— informed by ideologies about American exceptionalism in the U.S. "war on terror"—are central to how frames of race, nation, sex, gender and war are articulated through claims about the figure of the dog. Thinking in terms of boundary affects highlights how the figure of the dog is made to function as a material and symbolic weapon for U.S. nationalism and militarism in the "war on terror."

The orientalist discourses that endow military dogs with symbolic capital are based on strong affective investments in self and nation. These discourses deploy dogs to evoke sentimentality and also to signify loyalty, companionship, and normative Western ideologies about pet ownership (Halberstam 2011; Nast 2006). Discourses of American exceptionalism mobilize this symbolic capital through producing and reproducing orientalist representations of humans' affective attachments with dogs (see, for example, Glenney Boggs 2013; Mbembe 2001; Shukin 2009). These orientalist representations frame those from the United States as having affective ties with dogs, ties that are not only appropriate, but morally

elevated, in contrast to the alleged inappropriate and morally degenerate relationship between Middle Eastern people and animals.

Description of Remaining Chapters

Chapter 2 of *Boundary Affects*, "Abjecting Middle Eastern Masculinity," argues that Western news and popular discourses use human/animal tropes saturated with affect to frame Iraqi and Afghan men as inappropriate and devalued, characterized by both excessive love and excessive hatred for animals. The chapter analyzes Western discourses, photographs, and cartoon images that treat Middle Eastern masculinity as being characterized by extreme affects and abnormal relationships to animals: one set of tropes frames these men as monstrous agents of wanton violence against animals—hating animals *too much* so as to slaughter them with excessive cruelty; another set of tropes frames them as agents of perverse love and improper desire for animals—loving animals *too much* through a depraved bestial sexuality. These shifting human/animal tropes serve to bind together animals and Western populations as vulnerable to the potential violence of Middle Eastern men. The tropes reproduce gendered and sexualized frames of racialization and Islamophobia that depend on *species as an affect-laden signifier* signaling who can bind to others, who can count as "human," and who is expendable.

Chapter 3, "Affective Discourses of Dog 'Rescue,'" illuminates the ways the figure of the dog is mobilized as an affective technology of precarity to bolster the terms of a racialized American exceptionalism in "rescue" narratives about saving dogs from Iraq and Afghanistan. The chapter analyzes discourses, photographs, documentaries, and memoirs about "rescuing" dogs from Iraq and Afghanistan that have produced by non-profit organizations, U.S. soldiers, and news media. The discourses that subtend these

organizations' "rescue missions" use species as a form of affective capital in reproducing culturally essentialist Islamophobic claims that racialize and dehumanize Middle Eastern people, particularly males. I argue that these dog "rescue" narratives are often framed according to the narrative conventions of the fairytale as described by Vladimir Propp (2009), reinforcing U.S. military policy through constructions of protagonists and villains. These representations demonstrate how public discourse in the "war on terror" about Islam, Middle Eastern people and animals mobilizes a sexualized boundary between the human and animal as a central site to articulate racialization and American exceptionalism.

Chapter 4, "Homecomings and 'Queer Hauntings,'" argues that the climax and "happy ending" to the fairytales of dog "rescue" from the Middle East depends on affects surrounding the concept of "homecoming." The chapter considers the differently framed use of the affect of "homecoming," examining representations in news media of female soldiers' "coming home" to their dogs—in some cases dogs the soldiers had as pets before they left for war, and in other cases dogs that had been transported to the United States from Iraq and Afghanistan. Such stories of female and maternal homecoming use sentimentality to recuperate the potentially disruptive and masculinized figure of the female soldier into frames of normative femininity. I argue that the complications of affects of love and intimacy are such, however, that these nurturing female-dog relationships may be haunted by specters of cross-species sexual love.

Chapter 5, "The Affective Biopolitics of Military Working Dogs," examines how military policy, popular discourses, documentaries, and monuments, all work to re-value the lives of military working dogs as soldiers, heroes, cargo, weapons, cyborgs, pets, and companions—in the process coming to position these dogs as quasi-liberal subjects. The

chapter traces how the figure of the dog is symbolically and materially folded into the discursive apparatus of the "war on terror" in the service of nationalism—deployed as tools of domination, pets to be loved, victims to be saved, equipment to be cared for and heroes to be honored.

Stakes

Through my analysis, I argue that public discourse in the United States mobilizes dogs as affective capital in the service of orientalist terms of racialization through sentimental "rescue" and "homecoming" narratives about "puppy love" and elevating narratives about dogs as "heroes" to make and unmake biopolitical boundaries of life, species, and nation. These discourses interpellate the U.S. public into a framework of "puppy love" through a pro-war American nationalism that depends on an orientalist racism. This affective interpellation depends on a blurred species divide central to frameworks of orientalism: producing the humane and human American soldier (hero) against the inhumane and inhuman Muslim Middle Eastern (monster).

This research has important implications for a feminist and transnational intersectional analysis of war, as it extends a feminist, queer, and critical race engagement with theories of dehumanization in war to locate frames of species as a central, yet often overlooked, element of intersectional power, as it not only relates to animalized humans, but humanized animals. The project also helps to extend the newly emerging field of critical animal studies, with this attention to the co-articulations of race, sex, species and war.

Notes

[1] I use "war on terror" to refer to U.S. military action from 2001-present, including the U.S. occupation of Iraq and the ongoing war in Afghanistan, accompanied by ideologies of Islamophobia and orientalism underpinning broader U.S. security practices and rhetorics staged against those framed as "terrorist others."

[2] I follow Colleen Glenney Boggs in understanding "humanity" and "animality" not as fixed and stable subject positions, but rather as "structural positions. (2013)Under these terms, as Glenney Boggs argues, "animality refers to the structural position that is the opposite of humanity. Because a human being can also inhabit this structural position, animality is not limited to literal animals. Although the opposition between human and animal is meant literally, it functions figuratively…that a human can occupy the "animal's "structural position" (2013, 49).

[3] Orientalism is a discourse that *produces* an imaginative geography, imposing a false binary between the "West" and the "East" in a teleological narrative, where "West" represents modernity and freedom and the "East" represents the contrasting pre-modern, backward "other" (Said 1978). The false binary produced through orientalist discourse is not innocent, but works in the service of colonialist and imperialist power/knowledge formations. This discourse frames the Middle East as barbaric and pre-civilized, contrasting it to an "American exceptionalism" that marks America as the pinnacle of freedom, democracy, and civilization (Puar 2007).

[4] Leti Volpp argues that in the United States post-9/11 orientalism and Islamophobia group together Muslim/Arab/Middle Eastern people under the sign (potential) "terrorist." She argues that this racialization is demonstrated in the rise of racial profiling of Arab/Muslim/Middle Eastern people in general, but particularly in airports, the shifting contours of American citizenship around configurations of whiteness, and the redeployment of old orientalist tropes. Volpp cites, for example, a 2001 Gallup poll that indicated that 1/3 of those surveyed would support interning Arab Americans (2003, 155, n. 27).

[5] Decolonial posthumanist feminist theorists argue that frames of species and tropes of animality are central to the co-articulation of anti-black white supremacist heteropatriarchy (Chen 2012; Deckha 2012; Freccero and Kim 2013; Livingston and Puar 2011). They suggest that blackness and animality co-construct ideas of who and what counts as "human," and as such,

who is constructed as demonstrating a vulnerable and mournable life (Gossett 2015; McKittrick 2014, 205; Weheliye 2014).

[6] For Foucault, "biopower" refers to a "soft technique" of power—the state's power to foster life or to "let die" (1990, 2003). Biopower works at the nexus of the individual and the population. In contrast to early iterations of sovereign power exercised solely by the "right to kill," this type of power is focused on the administration of life. Foucault's theory of biopower provides a way to understand how power operates to foster and protect some lives and not others, accounting for a state technology of power that works by "individuating and specifying bodies and populations with a focus on making life" (1990, 139). For Foucault, biopower represents "the entry of phenomena peculiar to the life of the human species into the order of knowledge and power" (1990, 141-142) and describes a technique of power that "disallow[s] [life] to the point of death" (1990, 138). Foucault argues that because biopower is foundational to the state's interest in the production of life, it masks the ways that power sets the conditions under which life is discounted and condemned to non-life and social death. The concept thus accounts for the production, maintenance and disallowance of life. Thus, Foucault's theory reveals the *ontological* stakes of power-knowledge formations. Foucault argues that biopower "subdivide[s] the species it controls, into the *subspecies,* known, precisely, as races (2003, 255).

[7] Agamben argues that the boundary between human and animal is produced and disrupted through what he calls "the anthropological machine": "a machine or device for producing the recognition of the human" (2004, 26). According to Agamben, the anthropological machine *produces* a disjuncture and hierarchical continuity between "human" and "animal" (2004, 16). He claims that the anthropological machine presents the boundary between human and animal as natural and prediscursive, even though it is responsible for producing this boundary through philosophy, science and religion.

Agamben argues, for example, that Carl Linnaeus' system of taxonomic classification that produced the categories "mammalia" and "homo sapiens" reflects the operation of the anthropological machine. According to Agamben, while Linnaeus classified species based on their shared characteristics, he classified humans as a coherent group through their ability to recognize themselves as human (2004, 24). Agamben writes that in Linneaus' taxonomy, "homo sapiens…is a machine or device for producing the recognition of the human…it is an optical machine constructed of a series of mirrors in which man, looking at himself, sees his own image as always already deformed in the features of an ape" (2004, 27). According to

Agamben's interpretation of Linneaus' taxonomy, man "must recognize himself in a non-man in order to be human" (Agamben 2004, 27). Thus, Agamben argues that for Linneaus, "homo [is] the animal that is only if it recognizes that it is not" (2004, 27).

According to Agamben, the anthropological machine must be stopped because it creates a position of what he calls "bare life" for the "nonhuman human." For Agamben, bare life refers to life that is rendered in the discursive space of animality. He explains this concept using the Greek concepts of "*bios*" and "*zoe*." For Agamben, *zoe* is life that men, animals, and dogs all have in common. Conversely, *bios* is uniquely human life that is valued, social, public, and hence, deserving of protection. He argues that a situation of "bare life" emerges when someone who should be seen as having *bios* is only seen as having *zoe* and is placed outside of the law. He claims that the anthropological machine, in producing a hierarchy between humans and animals, creates a symbolic economy in which both animals and humans can be treated like animalized animals through a position of "bare life."

Agamben claims that the anthropological machine is fundamental to the operation of sovereign power under modern biopower. He understands biopower as a negative force tied to death as it allows the sovereign to determine which forms of life count by distinguishing between the two forms of life—*bios* and *zoe*. He argues that the anthropological machine needs a remainder who needs to be excluded from the operation of power that depends on it, such as the figure he calls "homo sacer," a figure that can be killed but not murdered (Agamben 1998).

[8] Puar argues that necropower functions as a form of state power oriented to projects of death (2007).

[9] Ahmed argues, for example, that "the word 'terrorist' sticks to some bodies as it reopens histories of naming, just as the word 'terrorist' slides into other words in the accounts of the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq (such as fundamentalism, Islam, Arab, repressive, primitive and so on). Indeed, the slide of metonymy can function as an implicit argument about the causal relations between terms (such as Islam and terrorism), but in such a way that it does not require explicit statement. The work done by metonymy means that it can remake links—it can stick words like 'terrorist' and 'Islam' together—even when arguments are made that seem to unmake these links…the sliding between signs also involves 'sticking' signs to bodies, the bodies who 'could be terrorists' are the ones who might 'look Muslim.' Such associations stick precisely as they resist lateralisation" (Ahmed 2004, 76).

[10] Ahmed's theory of the cultural politics of disgust suggest that abjection secures boundaries of bodies as well as boundaries of communities and nations. For example, Americans' reactions of disgust to 9/11 created a shared community, who "stick together," while abjecting the Middle Eastern body (Ahmed 2004, 98). Ahmed contends that through this sticking, "disgust aligns the individual and collective at the very moment both are produced" (2004, 95). She argues, for example, that the reaction "that's disgusting!" produces individual subjects as well as a shared community of American nationals, defined through this declaration as good modern subjects against backwards Arab abject others (Ahmed 2004, 94).

Chapter 2: Abjecting Middle Eastern Masculinity

In this chapter I argue that Western news and popular discourses use human/animal tropes saturated with affect to frame Muslim/Arab/Middle Eastern men[1] as devalued, uncivilized subjects, on the basis of their inhumane attitudes toward animals. Their imputed bad attitudes are contrasted—explicitly or implicitly—with humane attitudes attributed to U.S. soldiers and society. These discourses treat Arab/Muslim/Middle Eastern masculinity as characterized by extreme affects and abnormal relationships to animals: they are framed as subject to *both* excessive hatred *and* excessive love for animals. One set of tropes frames these men as monstrous agents of wanton violence against animals—hating animals *too much* so as to slaughter and neglect them with excessive cruelty; another set of tropes frames them as agents of perverse love and improper desire for animals—loving animals *too much* through a depraved bestial sexuality. I argue that both tropes position animals as helpless victims of an uncontrolled and degenerate Arab/Muslim/Middle Eastern masculinity. These shifting human/animal tropes serve to bind together animals and Western populations as jointly vulnerable to the potential violence of Muslim/Arab/Middle Eastern men. The tropes reproduce gendered and sexualized frames of racialization and Islamophobia that depend on *species as an affective-laden signifier* signaling who can bind to others, who can count as "human," and who is expendable.

I analyze here several prominent discourses from Western media[2] that construct dramatically different relations between people and dogs according to whether their cultural and religious affiliations are in the United States or the Middle East, specifically Iraq and Afghanistan. I focus on three discursive sites: 1) a cluster of news reports about an Iraqi

public health program from 2008-2010 designed to reduce the population of dangerous and diseased feral dogs in Baghdad; 2) a set of claims appearing in news reports and materials released by dog "rescue" organizations that use allegations about treatment of dogs to create a dramatic distinction between an "inhumane" Iraqi and Afghan culture and the "humane" culture of U.S. soldiers; and 3) cartoon representations from 2001-2013 in Western television, newspapers, and websites that frame Muslim/Arab/Middle Eastern people—or even the prophet Muhammad—as bestial subjects engaged in sexual relationships with animals. At stake in this chapter's line of analysis is a questioning of how systems of racialization and dehumanization mobilize claims about animal cruelty to enhance the precarity of Iraqis and Afghans and those framed as "enemy others" in the "war on terror."

I analyze these discourses to consider a series of questions: What is the symbolic work accomplished by human/animal tropes in distinguishing an inhumane Middle East from a humane United States? How does the figure of the animal and the figure of the dog in particular become a potent signifier signaling worthy and unworthy human populations? How do these discourses reflect a species-infused framework of orientalism? How does the figure of the "dog as victim" shape orientalist fantasies of a cruel and barbaric Iraqi and Afghan masculinity? How does sexuality infuse these fantasies?

Excessive Cruelty to Animals:

Framing Dog-Killing as a Technology of Orientalism

The first set of tropes I analyze appeared in Western news media in 2008-2010 in response to the Iraqi government's planned public health program to reduce the excessive population of dangerous and diseased feral dogs. Long-standing Western assumptions that

“Muslim” cultures have a deep-seated fear and dislike of dogs rooted in religious strictures of Islam—as well as concomitant blindness to Western practices of controlling animal populations—set the stage for a remarkable representation of this Iraqi public health program as evidence of a culture of barbaric cruelty. A range of discursive strategies establish dramatic contrasts, both explicit and implicit, between Western and Middle Eastern “cultures” and “religions,” repeatedly figuring Muslims and Iraqis as cruel while cultures and religions in the United States are humane.

Differential Visibility of Programs

Differential strategies of visibility and invisibility characterize tropes of Western news media discussing Iraq’s attempts to reduce the population of dangerous and diseased feral dogs. The tropes amplify the visibility of Iraqi killing of dogs, yet render invisible—or establish as benign and necessary—he systematic killing of dogs both by the U.S. military in Iraq and by a wide range of institutions in the United States. The result is to produce Iraqi violence against dogs as unusual: specifically cruel, cultural, religious, masculine, and hypervisible.

The news reports that I analyze here respond to the Baghdad Provincial government's decision in 2010 to undertake a public health program to reduce the excessive population of dangerous and diseased feral dogs in Baghdad—an estimated 1.25 to 1.5 million stray dogs (*Daily Mail* 2010). The program was argued to be necessary because of an increase of the population of feral dogs since the U.S. invasion of Iraq in 2003, which had disrupted the previous governmental animal control programs. The program was reportedly “prompted by a spate of fatal attacks on residents” (Associated Press 2008a). Baghdad's provincial council reported that in 2008, “thirteen people died in August alone in the capital after being attacked

by dogs" and many children contracted rabies after being bitten by the dogs (Associated Press 2008a). Furthermore, residents claimed they were reluctant to leave their houses to go to work for fear of being attacked by the dogs.

The Iraqi program was coordinated by the Iraqi National Ministry of Agriculture's veterinary services, the municipality of Baghdad, the police, and even in some areas the army (Dagher 2009). The Baghdad program was comprised of twenty teams of veterinarians, police officers, and county officials. The veterinarians first tried to attract dogs by distributing meat laced with strychnine. If that was unsuccessful in killing the dogs, a police officer would shoot them with a shotgun. The teams then disposed of the dogs (*Mail Online Reporter* 2010). The teams coordinated with local security forces so that they were not mistaken for insurgents (Bushra 2010). Officials from Baghdad reported that 58,000 dogs were killed in the first three months of the program (Vallis 2010).

Various Western news sources, such as *The New York Times*, *The Los Angeles Times*, *The Daily Mail*, *Mother Jones*, *The National Post*, FOX News, Reuters, NBC, MSNBC, CNN, and others featured stories and segments about the program, with an explicit focus on what they presented as the excessive cruelty and extreme nature of the program.[3] Some of the Western news reports do mention the sensible and even compelling rationale for the public health program. A story from Reuters about the program quotes a government health official who explains that the dogs "cause many diseases for humans, so to eliminate them is a service to the citizens" (Kami 2010).[4] A story from *Mother Jones* reports comments of residents of Bagdad who claim that daily life is influenced by the threat of the feral dogs. One resident is reported to have commented, "Because of the threat of death and disease, many Iraqis fear to go outside when the dogs are present, making some Iraqis miss work"

(Weinstein 2010a).[5] Another resident is reported in the article by Reuters to have expressed concern for his children: “I wish they would kill all the dogs because they are harmful, they carry diseases and I'm afraid for my children . . . we encourage the authorities in their campaign and we are ready to help” (Kami 2010).[6] The reflection of the concerns of residents of Bagdad found in these stories is unusual. Although most of the Western news discourses acknowledge the necessity for the program, they efface this reasoning by “spectacularizing” the “cruelty” of the feral dog reduction as a barbaric practice through strategies of differential visibility.

One strategy of differential visibility is to focus on the cruelty of the dog’s experience of violence and death rather than the experience of residents who are threatened, attacked, or fearful of disease. An example is a story by CNN, which opens with a vivid portrayal of the death of feral dogs:

> The shotgun blast rips into the stray dog's midsection, sending it tumbling over and over. Agonizing yelps echo through the streets as it tries to reach and bite at the gaping wound. Minutes later, the dog is dead. A few miles away, a puppy eats a piece of poisoned meat. Its body starts to twitch and spasm as the toxins kick in. It dies within 15 minutes. The two strays were among the thousands that roam the streets of Baghdad. Authorities have been killing them since November. (Damon 2009)

The CNN story sensationalizes the maiming and pain of the dogs as a result of the program’s methods—shooting and poisoning—rather than considering, for example, the budget constraints and other problems of feasibility that preclude the program from collecting the dogs and removing them for release elsewhere or using a less visible program of killing.

Iraqi public health officials and citizens approve of the program not because they claim to "hate dogs," but because they find the feral dogs are a danger to public health and well-being. Claims that Iraqis are afraid of dogs because of fear of disease and death for themselves and their children reveal the killing programs are intended to protect Iraqi life and health, a humane goal for its citizens. They also claim that given the infrastructure of Baghdad, the public killings are the most realistic and effective approach.

Another strategy of differential visibility is the virtual *invisibility* in these press reports of a very similar dog population reduction program conducted by U.S. military contractors in Iraq, and the quite different treatment of the U.S. program when it is occasionally mentioned. The program of the U.S. military contractors is in many ways quite similar to the Iraqi program. The U.S. military hired KBR (formerly Kellogg Brown and Root), a U.S. engineering and construction company that was formerly a subsidiary of Halliburton, to help kill animals around the U.S. Victory Base Complex on Baghdad's outskirts. The program claims to target feral dogs considered a threat to U.S. soldiers and to military working dogs. The purpose of the program is labelled "vector control"— "vector" indicating "an animal or insect capable of transmitting the causative agent of human disease" ("Vector" 2002). This program is explicitly characterized as "humane" as in the claim that "the military follows the Iraqi government's lead, albeit in a more humane way" (Weinstein 2010b). Yet the primary difference between the Iraqi public health program and that of the U.S. military contractors is that KBR sequesters the dogs at the point of death, so that their killing occurs in isolated and hidden areas. KBR takes the dogs to an annex of the base, officially named "Camp Slayer," where contractors kill them (Weinstein 2010a). Depending on the method of killing the dogs, it would appear that concealing the death scene from

public view is the difference that justifies the KBR program to be characterized as "more humane." Rather than being highlighted as barbaric, the program of the U.S. military contractors is treated through strategies of virtual invisibility: seldom mentioned, its acts downplayed, neutralized, and framed as a necessary practice to protect U.S. soldiers and their military working dogs.

Thus, *both* the U.S. military and Iraqi government are responsible for quite similar projects of animal death in Iraq and are part of a larger apparatus of what Nicole Shukin calls "zoopolitics," the capacity either to sustain and give life to animals or to take life (2009). The central difference that emerges between the U.S. and Iraqi killing of stray dogs in Iraq is the level of visibility and invisibility with which their killing practices are treated, and their role in grounding differential claims about nation, culture, religion, and security. Because the animal deaths delivered by the U.S. program are hidden inside buildings or courtyards rather than on the public streets the program is treated as nearly invisible and "humane." In contrast, the Iraqi program is rendered hypervisible—both in practice in Iraq and in public discourses in the Western media. It is spectacularized in Western media discourse, which details the tactics used and the number of dogs' lives threatened. As a result, the Western media produces the spectacle at the moment they describe it.

A central strategy of differential visibility in these discourses is the amplification of attention toward the relatively small number of dogs killed in the Iraqi program, accompanied by complete inattention paid to the large number of dogs and other pet animals annually killed in the United States in various agricultural, health, and security programs. Western news discourses emphasize the number of dogs allegedly at risk in Iraq: "One Million Dogs Face Death," "their goal: Killing one million canines," "they've scratched

42,000, and they're averaging 2,400 a day" (Weinstein 2010a). These claims are dramatic primarily because the news sources elide the scope and cruelty of related practices in the United States that kill unwanted and undesirable pets. The news sources neglect to mention that some 1.2 million dogs are killed every year in the United States ("Pet Statistics"), in addition to other pet animals, through methods of killing that are painful, such as gas chambers where animals may suffer for many minutes before they die ("Animal Gas Chamber"). The news sources neglect to compare Iraqi programs to U.S. practices such as "breed-specific-legislation" that mandates the systematic removal from their homes and subsequent killing of dogs of certain breeds on the grounds that they are dangerously aggressive.[7] The result is to frame Iraqis as intentionally cruel to animals while overlooking programs of animal killing controlled by the United States.

The visibility accorded the government feral dog reduction program in Iraq within Western news media works in a discursive framework that downplays the widespread practices of animal death in the United States, treating such practices as nearly invisible. Public health animal-eradication programs in Western countries such as the United States eliminate unwanted pets as well as creatures considered potentially diseased or dangerous to people or to pets and farm animals or other animals deemed valuable ("Pets by the Numbers" 2014). The United States has programs to shoot, snare, trap, and poison wild animals, including wolves, coyotes, foxes, bobcats, and mountain lions. The U.S. Department of Agriculture reports killing over 40 million wild animals between 2000 and 2014, killing over 4 million wild animals in 2014 alone.[8] Some of the U.S. programs are justified through precisely the same reasoning as the Iraqi program. Los Angeles, for example, has established a program to trap and kill coyotes to protect humans and pets held to be at risk of violence

from the coyotes. Citizens approved "trapping coyotes" because the coyotes are "wild dogs, they…. come in and look for food and water" (Ellery Deaton quoted in Larson 2014).[9] Such programs use justifications similar to Iraq's, but are orchestrated on an even larger scale. The language of necessity and science infuses the rationale for programs in the United States. The United States Wildlife Services frames its eradication work as "resolv[ing] human/wildlife conflicts in a strategic way" (Larsen 2014). It claims that these killings are "guided by a science-based decision-making model" (Larsen 2014). The language of technical professionalism positions the killings as objectively necessary, rational, calculated, and managed. It would appear that the United States—not Iraq— functions as an extensive and effective animal-killing machine—far exceeding the endeavors of the Iraqi government.

Another strategy of differential visibility is to omit any discussion of U.S. military policy toward the military's killing of its own working dogs, which would cast some doubt on the notion that the United States is a source of particularly humane attitudes toward dogs. Until new legislation in 2000, military policy *required* all U.S. military dogs to be killed after their service (Hurley 2012). The U.S. military either killed or left behind an estimated 4,000 military dogs in Vietnam after the Vietnam War (Frankel 2014a). In recent years, the U.S. military has killed over 1,200 dogs that had been deployed in wars in Iraq and Afghanistan but were deemed unadoptable because they were "too aggressive" (Crossley Coker 2014). Though current policy allows former military working dogs to be adopted if they are deemed fit, many are still killed after service when they are deemed unadoptable (Blumenthal 2012).

Differential Language for Describing Programs

Differential strategies of language use are also central to the distinction created between U.S. and Iraqi dog reduction programs. The police officers with shotguns assigned

to Iraqi reduction teams were described by news reports as “designated shooters” or even “gunmen”; the teams were said to dispose of the dogs in “refuse dumps.” In contrast, U.S. programs are almost never mentioned, and if they are mentioned, are described in scientific, technical, neutral, or “humane” terms; the personnel of U.S. military contractors killing dogs in Iraqi and the locations where they dispose of the dogs’ bodies are not specifically characterized.

In dramatic contrast to the technical, neutral, or positive language used to describe the dog-killing program of U.S. military contractors (in the few times it was mentioned), a plethora of dramatically negative terms is applied to the methods and motives of Iraqi programs. “Execution” is often used, including variations such as “mass execution,” or “the biggest campaign of dog execution ever” (Weinstein 2010a). “Execution” here means “the act of killing someone especially as punishment for a crime” (“Execution” n.d.). The term establishes that an authoritative force has marked the victim as a subject who must die—generally because of guilt or criminality. Conjoining “dog” and “execution” frames animal death through language that connotes human death. Coupling “dog” and “execution” frames Iraqis as treating dogs as “guilty” criminals.

“Massacre” and “slaughter” are also used to describe the Iraqi program. “Massacre,” defined as “a general slaughter, as of persons or animals” is also used (“Massacre” n.d.). More specifically, the term “massacre” is defined as “the unnecessary, indiscriminate killing of a large number of human beings or animals, as in barbarous warfare or persecution or for revenge or plunder” (“Massacre” n.d.). This language frames the Iraqis as barbarians engaged in irrational and random acts of killing—rather than carrying out necessary policies based on rational public health concerns. The use of the term “slaughter” in these sources is

more complex. "Slaughter" is defined as "1. The brutal or violent killing of a person 2. The killing or butchering of cattle, sheep, etc., especially for food 3. The killing of great numbers of people or animals indiscriminately; carnage" ("Slaughter" n.d.). In U.S. contexts, "slaughter" tends to refer to animal death performed as routine practices of factory farming and butchering—animal killing that is normalized. In the context of reports on Iraqi dog reduction programs, the use of "slaughter" echoes "execution" and "massacre" to imply wholesale savagery—animal killing that is not normalized.

In even more dramatic language, the Iraqi program was called a "killing spree" (Weinstein 2010a) perpetrated by "killing squads" (Vallis 2010). For example, a *National Post* article describes the programs by opening: "The Associated Press reports there is a new killing squad in Iraq, this one targeting the feral canines roaming the streets" (Vallis 2010). Killing spree" describes the acts of humans who kill other humans wantonly. A "spree killer" is defined as "a serial killer whose murders occur in a very short span of time and follow no discernible pattern" ("Killing Spree" n.d.). Calling the public health program a "killing spree" positions Iraqis assigned tasks to improve the health of the human population as randomly destructive without reason, profligate, psychopathic, and murderous.

The affectively-saturated language of Western news media *produces* the Iraqi cruelty it purports to describe. The systematic killing of feral and pet dogs by U.S. military contractors is not characterized as "execution," "massacre," "slaughter," or a "killing spree." Rather it is characterized as "euthanasia." "Euthanasia" is defined as "the act or practice of killing someone who is very sick or injured in order to prevent any more suffering" or "the act or practice of killing or permitting the death of hopelessly sick or injured individuals (as persons or domestic animals) in a relatively painless way for reasons of mercy"

("Euthanasia" n.d.). This term is clearly inappropriate and inaccurate for the mass killing of dogs by U.S. military contractors. While some feral dogs may carry disease, most are not "suffering," "hopelessly sick," or "injured." They are not killed to reduce their pain or "for reasons of mercy," but to further U.S. military goals. Under this reasoning, Western news discourses frame the dogs' deaths as "humane" because the lives saved by the killings—those of U.S. soldiers and their dogs—are lives deemed more valuable than the lives saved by the Iraqi program.

The Western discourses further link the program and public support for them to Saddam Hussein, who they claim used similar dog killing programs to "enhance the government's standing with its discontented populace" (Weinstein 2010). These programs stopped after the United States executed Hussein. This discourse connects a practice that is used to *protect* Iraqi life to a figure associated with brutal mass murder, making Iraqis seem evil and in alignment with Hussein—a figure tied to ideas of monstrosity and barbarism. This discursive framing makes hypervisible the association of Saddam Hussein with killing dogs, while effacing the contribution of U.S. military policy to the problem: Iraq would not have so many stray dogs, nor need this killing campaign, if the United States had not invaded Iraq and executed Saddam Hussein as it did.

Differential Treatment of Iraqis

The *Mother Jones* article frames the Iraqi government as treating feral dogs exactly as it does internal political opponents, beginning "In addition to Sunni jihadists, Shiite radicals, and Kurdish separatists, the Iraqi government is training its sights on a new enemy: dogs" (Weinstein 2010a). The same article conflates humans and dogs living in Iraq: "Iraq's Slumdog Massacre: One Million Dogs Face Death" (Weinstein 2010). The term "slumdog"

is defined as “1. A slum dweller. 2. A person who lives in a poor makeshift locality in extremely dirty conditions *like a stray dog*. 3. A person who lives in an overcrowded and poor area of a city in which in which the housing is unplanned” [emphasis added] (“Slumdog” n.d.). Although the term could apply to anyone living in a slum, it is often associated with people who live in the slums of India’s cities, particularly after the success of *Slumdog Millionaire*, a 2008 “rags to riches” film about a boy who grew up in the slums of Mumbai, India. “Slumdog” denigrates humans living in poverty by labeling them as dogs. The news report uses the term to elevate feral dogs to a humanized status. This discursive move demonstrates the slippery border between human and animal pervasive in discourses related to Iraqi men.[10]

Differential Visual Framings

The photographs accompanying the various news reports about the dog killing programs further the systematic differences in the framing of the Iraqi dog-reduction programs and various programs of animal-killing controlled by those in the United States, creating though the photographs selection and framing a differential visual economy. For example, photographs in various sources show Iraqi men authorized by the state in acts of killing, or trying to kill, the dogs—by poisoning, for example. In one image featured in a story from NBC, an Iraqi veterinarian is shown kneeling to give poisoned meat to a dog. The small slender dog stands an arm’s length distance away from the man as he reaches out to it.

Figure 2.1: Veterinarian Feeds Dog Meat

Image from Mouhsin, Asaad in Associated Press. "Baghdad Opens Campaign to Kill Stray Dogs," NBCNews.com, 23 Nov. 2008b, www.nbcnews.com/id/27873599/ns/world_news-mideast_n_africa/t/baghdad-opens-campaign-kill-stray-dogs/.

This image presents a stark scene: a veterinarian kneels down with hand outstretched to the dog. In a different context, the image might appear to be showing the veterinarian reaching for the dog as an act of kindness—to help and nurture the dog. Instead, the image is presented as a scene of public killing—the veterinarian outstretches his hand to give the dog poison. The veterinarian, a figure who could be considered "life-giving" to animals, is here, instead, shown taking a life. The image further undercuts the crudeness of this measure—not undertaken in a clean and sterile veterinarian office or clinic, but on a dirt parking lot in Iraq. The image also shows a soldier standing at attention watching as the vet feeds the dog. This

adds a militarized and securitized frame to the vet's actions—further entrenching the scene as one of inevitable death and violence.

In another news story, from the *San Diego Union Tribune*, a photograph depicts an Iraqi man—a police officer—in the act of killing, his rifle pointing down at a dog. The dog is curled up in a ball behind a stone barrier with its ears floppy, low on its head, evoking a sense of innocence. The man's gun points just a foot away from the dog's head; the man's eyes point down the barrel of the gun at the dog. The dog lies in stillness, its gaze towards the camera, evoking a sense of doomed hopelessness. The photo caption reads "Iraqi police officer Qassim Ahmed takes aim before shooting a stray dog in the Mansour neighborhood of Baghdad, Iraq" (Associated Press 2008a).

Figure 2.2: Police Office Aims Gun at Dog

Image from Mouhsin, Asaad in Associated Press. "Baghdad Opens Campaign to Kill Stray Dogs," NBCNews.com, 23 Nov. 2008b, www.nbcnews.com/id/27873599/ns/world_news-mideast_n_africa/t/baghdad-opens-campaign-kill-stray-dogs/.

In yet another article, a photograph captioned “Armed and ready: Two riflemen search for some of Baghdad's 1.25m strays,” (Foreign Mail Services 2010) shows two Iraqi men standing with rifles—one man has his rifle slung over his shoulder, and the other has his rifle in position as if preparing to point the gun.

Figure 2.3: Two Iraqi Men with Guns

Image from Reuters in Foreign Mail Services. “Baghdad to Cull a Million Stray Dogs as Rogue Canine Population Soars,” *Daily Mail Online*, 10 Jun. 2010, www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1285763/Baghdad-cull-million-stray-dogs-rogue-canine-population-soars.html.

The image does not specify that these men are police officers, but rather frames them as subjects who wield large guns in order to kill wantonly.

The visual economies of death created by the selection of photographs to accompany news stories—particularly Iraqi men killing dogs—are affectively potent. They give a visible representation of a violent scene of killing between Iraqi men and seemingly innocent dogs. These work on a psychic and symbolic level beyond descriptions of the dog killing programs. They present individual actors with faces—both the face of the Iraq killer and that of the apparently innocent dog. The dog's face is especially potent in these images as it is largely considered a signifier of "cuteness" for many Western audiences—positionality that always and already frames them as innocent and helpless. Showing these "cute" animals in scenes that seem to present them moments before their death underlies the inhumane nature and cruelty the Western media reads onto the Iraqi-culling program.

Photographs of dogs' bodies also serve to spectacularize the dogs' deaths at the hands of the Iraqis. Dead dogs are rarely shown in U.S. media. In contrast, some of the news stories about the Iraqi public health program make the bodies of the dead dogs hypervisible. A story from *The National Post* shows a pile of dead dogs lying on top of each other in a large shallow metal box. An Iraqi man is shown walking past the dogs with a rifle slung over his shoulder as he casually gazes sideways at the dead dogs.

Figure 2.4: Pile of Dead Dogs

Image from Mouhsin, Asaad in Associated Press. “Baghdad Opens Campaign to Kill Stray Dogs,” *NBCNews.com*, 23 Nov. 2008b, www.nbcnews.com/id/27873599/ns/world_news-mideast_n_africa/t/baghdad-opens-campaign-kill-stray-dogs/.

The image shows the dogs’ bodies piled up, one body almost indistinguishable from the next. This scene of death is reinscribed onto Iraqi masculinity through the figure of the Iraqi man walking behind the dogs with his rifle. His rifle is positioned as the instrument that could have killed the dogs, and he as the one who could have—or would have—pulled the trigger. The story does biopolitical work as it presents an image of zoopolitics (Shukin 2009). Iraqis are figured squarely as those who *take* animal life, rather than protecting it.

Another image depicting a dog’s dead body from a *Daily Mail* article shows two Iraqi men holding a limp dog from its paws as they start to throw it into the back of a truck. The

photo is captioned “Dispatched: Municipality workers throw a dead dog in to the back of a truck” (“Baghdad to Cull a Million Stray Dogs” 2010).

Figure 2.5: Men Dispose of Dead Dog

Image from Reuters in Foreign Mail Services. “Baghdad to Cull a Million Stray Dogs as Rogue Canine Population Soars,” *Daily Mail Online*, 10 Jun. 2010, www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1285763/Baghdad-cull-million-stray-dogs-rogue-canine-population-soars.html.

Both images link the dead dog with Iraqi men. They show the men in ways that frame them as callous and uncaring about the dead dogs.

Differential Visual Economies

A *Mother Jones* photo essay "The Dogs and Cats of War" (Weinstein 2010a) that reports on both the Iraqi and U.S. dog killings in Iraq demonstrates the contrasting economies of visibility framing the two programs informed by Manichean binaries of orientalism—the "free" and civilized United States against the barbaric and cruel Middle East (Abu-Lughod 2002; Puar 2007; Said 1978). The photo essay shows an image of a dead dog which the article frames as being a "victim" of the Iraqi dog killing program. The dog's body lies on the ground, a bloody wound visible.

Figure 2.6 Dead Dog with Wound

Image from Staff Sgt. Curt Cashour / Creative Commons in Adam Weinstein "The Dogs and Cats of War," *Mother Jones*, 18 Jun. 2010b, www.motherjones.com/slideshows/2010/06/dogs-and-cats-war-iraq-soldiers/melissa.

In contrast, when the essay provides photographs illustrating its report on the U.S.-sponsored program, it does not show dead dogs, but pictures of living dogs in cages. KBR is said to have "rounded up" the dogs around Victory Base to "dispose of" elsewhere.

Figure 2.7 KBR Contractor and Caged Dog

Image from Sgt. Cashour, Curt in Adam Weinstein, "Iraq's Slumdog Massacre: One Million Dogs Face Death." *Mother Jones*, 18 Jun. 2010a, www.motherjones.com/politics/2010/06/iraq-kbr-one-million-dogs-death.

Figure 2.8 Dogs Caged in Truck

Image from Sgt. Cashour, Curt in Adam Weinstein, “The Dogs and Cats of War,” *Mother Jones*, 18 Jun. 2010b, www.motherjones.com/slideshows/2010/06/dogs-and-cats-war-iraq-soldiers/melissa.

The dog’s death on the streets at the hands of the Iraqi health program is spectacularized as a *visible* death—and the dead body of the dog is associated with Iraqi actions. This is not the case in the description and photographs about the U.S.-sponsored killing program: the dogs in the cages, although facing “disposal,” are not depicted in an immediate scene of violence—they are neither already killed nor depicted as immediately threatened with death. Although this photo essay is unusual in even mentioning the U.S.-sponsored killing program,

it typical of Western news reports in framing the Iraqi program as cruel and inhumane, through the visible scene of animal violence and death. The photographs showing Iraqis in the act of killing (or preparing to kill) the dogs present a human agent responsible for the dogs' deaths.

Together these images render dogs' deaths in Iraqi at the hands of Iraqis as *hypervisible*. The symbolic system of human exceptionalism, an ideology that positions humans and animals in different moral economies and that lets animals be "killed but not murdered" routinely in the United States every year, depends on rendering animal deaths invisible (Haraway 2007). In contrast to this erasure, the various photographs of dead dogs in Iraq coupled with images of dogs facing imminent death at the hands of the Iraqi-dog killing teams render the killing of dogs hypervisible.

Strategies of Erasure

The news discourses seem to erase from view any responsibility of the United States in producing a dangerous situation for dogs and people in Iraq as part of its 4.4 trillion-dollar war. The discourses elide how some of the most violent conditions in Iraq are the result of U.S. militarism—bombs (phosphorous bombs, daisy cutter bombs, or cluster bombs), on-the-ground gunfire, and drone strikes. The U.S. military's ecological impact in Iraq and Afghanistan also contributes to the harsh conditions in these countries. The wars have led to a destruction of forestry, a contamination of water supply from oil from military vehicles and depleted uranium from ammunition, and a destruction of animal and bird populations (Al-Azzawi 2016). The discourses ignore how the U.S. military presence disrupts government services (such as programs to control the population of feral dogs). The discourses further

efface the increasing insecurity in Iraq and Afghanistan as a result of the U.S. military presence and decades-long war.

The discourses deflect attention from U.S. responsibility for the violent conditions for dogs in Iraq towards an amplified focus on Iraqi violence as the cause of the dire situation for dogs. A *New York Times* story frames the large number of stray dogs in Iraq as a result of indulgence in Iraqi sectarian violence. The story opens with the claim:

> While human beings in Iraq were killing each other in huge numbers, they ignored the dogs, which in turn multiplied at an alarming rate. Now stray dogs are such a menace that municipal workers are hunting them down, slaughtering some 10,000 in Baghdad just since December. (Dagher 2009)
>
> …
>
> With fewer bombs going off and hardly any bodies being dumped anymore, the dogs are perhaps the biggest problem on the filthy and rubble-strewn streets of Baghdad." (Dagher 2009)

The discourses elide U.S. responsibility for military destruction, amplify the visibility of Iraqi and Afghan killing of dogs, yet render invisible similar systematic killing of dogs by U.S. military contractors in Iraq and by institutions in the United States.

The discourses also ignore that the killing methods that Iraq employs— shooting and poisonings—are the most readily available and cost-efficient strategies to eliminate dogs in Iraq. These discourses further minimize the very real need for the program in protecting Iraqi lives. Rather than being linked to a structural analysis of the infrastructures that would allow for such practices, the different killing techniques are taken to signify the civilized nature and

humanity of a nation. This move is particularly displaced onto Iraqi men—who are framed as cruel agents of these measures.

Having framed the Iraqi program to kill diseased and dangerous feral dogs as excessively cruel, Western news sources also claim that the feral dog reduction program is "incredibly popular among Iraqis" (Weinstein 2010b). The implication of the story is that Iraqis enjoy the cruelty of the program, rather than approving of ways to reduce danger to citizens. In contrast, U.S. soldiers are framed as not enthusiastic about the KBR program dog-killing program, implying that they are too humane to approve of the killing of even feral and dangerous dogs. However, it would appear that the soldiers' lack of enthusiasm is based not on the innately humane masculinity of Western culture, but on the fact that KBR kills *not only* feral dogs, like the Iraqi program does, *but also* dogs that U.S. soldiers on the base have adopted as pets (contrary to military regulations).[11] For example, one source notes that the KBR program is "a tough pill to swallow for many U.S. service members in Iraq, who find comfort in adopted Iraqi pets that wandered in from the wild" (Weinstein 2010b). In fact, precisely because they have been adopted as pets and are therefore available for confiscation, the adopted pet dogs may be more likely to be killed than wandering feral dogs that must be sought out and captured by KBR. Military regulations aside, taking and killing pet dogs surely cannot be described as "humane." Just as the Western news media's use of terms with strong negative affect creates a picture of cruel Iraqis, its use of terms such as "vector control" represents a U.S. military that justifies killing dogs in technical, "scientific," professional, and neutral terms.

Justifications for the Iraqi and U.S. military dog-killing programs are framed differently. Both kill dogs to protect human and military lives. The U.S. program is framed

as a necessary evil, nonetheless carried out humanely, precisely *because* it positions itself as protecting U.S. soldiers and U.S. military dogs—lives that are important. The Iraqi program is framed as wanton and indiscriminate, despite its goal of protecting Iraqi citizens and children—lives that in the framing of these news reports seem less important because of the seeming excessive focus on the dogs', and not peoples' lives. The differential valorization of dogs and Iraqis' lives in these discourses thus asks readers to sympathize with the dogs that are allegedly at risk of death—rather than the Iraqis whose lives the dogs threaten.

Distinguishing Those Who Love Dogs and Those Who Do Not: The Figure of the "Rescued" Dog as a Technology of Orientalism

In the discourses about the Iraqi and U.S. dog killing programs that I have traced above, Iraqi men are framed as culturally inhumane toward dogs in contrast to the apparently humane behavior toward dogs of U.S.-based military contractors. Similar contrasts operate in narratives about "rescuing" and "adopting" dogs in Iraq and Afghanistan and transporting them to the United States. These narratives articulate race, gender, and species together explicitly and implicitly to create Iraqi masculinity as "inhumane," and the masculinity of U.S. soldiers as "humane."

I examine in this section how dog "rescue" discourses serve as a tool or technology of orientalism and Islamophobia, framing those living in the Middle East in stereotyped ways that reflect a colonialist attitude. I argue these discourses operate as a technology, or what Foucault calls a "*techne*," not merely as an abstract ideology, but as a set of material techniques and practices that provide the foundation for the ideologies of orientalism that undergird them. (In chapter 3 I will analyze the structure of sentiment that infuses discourses

advocating the "rescue" of local dogs that soldiers deployed in Afghanistan and Iraqi wished to adopt and transport to the United States.)

The dog "rescue" discourses mobilize the figure of the vulnerable dog to construct a Manichaean binary—a dualistic contrast or conflict between good and evil: U.S. soldiers are framed as innately and culturally humane and civilized, in absolute contrast to people living in Iraq and Afghanistan, who are framed as innately and culturally inhumane and uncivilized. The discourses of Western news reports and organizations engaged in dog "rescue" provide a relentless litany of alleged horrors against local dogs as evidence of the racialized cultural and religious differences between the United States and the Middle East. For example, a leader of one dog "rescue" organization notes: "Time and again soldiers' emails mention the all-too-common sight of lifeless animals strewn along roadside and rotting in neighborhoods. Carcasses lay where the animals had died from culling, torture, starvation, or disease" (Crisp 2012, 81). The emphasis on the dog corpses lining the roads of Iraq and Afghanistan makes the dead dog function as a visible symbolic of cultural difference between U.S. and Middle Eastern treatment of dogs—a difference not grounded in financial resources but in innately uncivilized attitudes.

While neglect and cruelty toward dogs is endemic in the United States, as I have argued above, when found in any form in Iraq and Afghanistan it is relentlessly positioned as unique to a barbaric Middle Eastern masculinity. "Rescue" discourses work to present local conditions as casually and viciously cruel: for example, U.S. soldiers are said to have observed "Iraqi men in a circle kicking a puppy [and] a boy pulling a puppy down the street with a rope around its neck" (Fromer 2008); dogs are "in danger of being stoned to death [and] kicked" (Kiefaber 2013); and it is not "uncommon for dogs to be used as target

practice" (Dove 2013). One organization claims that it seeks to "bring to light the horrible conditions which animals are exposed to in Afghanistan" (Mission, "Our History" n.d.). According to the organization's website: "Animals in Afghanistan are literally treated like trash, used for target practice, blown up, run over and used in fights in the case of many, many dogs." The organization concludes that "Afghanistan [is] a country where very little humanity and normalcy exists" (Mission, "Our History" n.d.).

Alleged widespread enjoyment of dog-fighting is framed as further demonstrating a culture of brutality positioned at the heart of Middle Eastern masculinity.[12] One *Los Angeles Times* article—titled "Afghans Unapologetically Cheer on Dogfights"— reports that the "blood sport, technically illegal, is lucrative and popular even among government officials. In a culture accustomed to violence, few see it as barbaric" (Magnier 2011). While most reports denigrating treatment of animals in the Middle East make little attempt to report comparable activities in the United States, the *Los Angeles Times* article does make reference to dogfighting as part of the culture of Black masculinity in the United States. The article speculates, "If Michael Vick, the American quarterback convicted of participating in an illegal dogfighting operation, were from Afghanistan, he'd probably be a national hero" (Magnier 2011). This claim is somewhat peculiar. Given the article's assertions about the apparent popularity of dogfighting in Afghanistan, many men must be involved. Surely not all men who organize and participate in dogfighting in Afghanistan are framed as "national heroes." In the context of the article, the evocation of Michael Vick works to position dogfighting in the United States as an aberrant racialized practice, rather than truly "American" (see Dayan 2013; Kim 2015; Weaver 2013). The claim also implies that Vick was shunned after his involvement in dogfighting became public. In fact, many sports fans

argued that Vick's dogfighting was simply an unfortunate personal event that should be forgiven because of his athletic prowess. He was in fact welcomed back as "national hero" after his release from prison, went on to complete his successful professional football career to considerable acclaim, and was subsequently hired as a television sports analyst.

Confusing and Conflating Cultures, Religions, and Nation

Western discourses of dog "rescue" and "dog-killing" overwhelmingly treat Islam as a monolithic and uniform set of religious rules—irrespective of different types of Islamic practices and beliefs. Western discourse also tends to conflate the *Qur'an* with Islamic law and ignore the different interpretations and practices of Islam in the Middle East. According to Kristen Stilt (2008), there is no universal understanding of dogs as "clean" or "unclean" in Islam. The Hanbali and Shafi'i schools of law position dogs as impure, "so that touching a dog or being licked by a dog requires washing that portion of the body or clothing before prayer" (Stilt 2008, 31). The Maliki school, however, does not position dogs as impure, according to Stilt. Often dog rescue narratives in Islam ignore the fact that Islam considers many objects to be "unclean." The designation "unclean" does not mean, however, that the object or practice is hated, considered frightening, or condemned—just that individuals in proximity to "unclean" objects must cleanse themselves before prayer (Stilt 2008, 29). For example, butchers who get blood on themselves must wash themselves before they pray. Dogs are not more "unclean" than many other objects Muslims engage with and practices that they follow. These discourses frame the treatment of dogs as creating an incommensurable divide between the Middle East and the United States, ignoring the fact that dogs are also considered to be "unclean" in some denominations of Christianity.[13] Acknowledgement of these religious and cultural complexities is absent in the Western

discourses that depend on these claims to amplify the difference between Iraqi and U.S. attitudes toward and treatment of dogs.

The "rescue" discourses frequently attribute alleged Iraqi and Afghan mistreatment of dogs to what are actually ill-informed speculations about Islam as a religion and conflations of Muslim religion practices with Middle Eastern cultures. These discourses show not the slightest interest in acknowledging or respecting cultural or religious differences: such differences are framed as insignificant in the face of the elevation of the figure of the dog as symbolic of the humanity of Western culture. "Rescue" discourses are characterized by bold claims that Iraqis are "animal-fearing Muslims" (Crisp 2012, 73); that Afghan people "don't like dogs, believing them to be dirty creatures, not companions…. [in Afghanistan] there is no kindness or compassion" (Dove 2013); and that "According to the Afghan culture, if a person is bitten by a dog, the person cannot get to Allah, the god Afghans worship, as dogs are considered to be a disgrace" (Mission, "Our History"). These simplistic claims conflate culture and religion, do not account for the different denominations, different interpretations, and different religious practices of Islam, as well as the complexity of Islamic writings about animals. The claims also ignore the significant presence of non-Muslims in Iraq and Afghanistan as well as national differences in cultural practices. By ignoring the nature and complexity of civilian life in Iraq and Afghanistan, "rescue" discourses imply that what is framed as neglect and cruelty toward dogs is based on innate inhumanity or twisted cultural practices, rather than the chaotic conditions of war and poverty and reasonable cultural and religious differences.

Both the "rescue" and "killing" discourses blame the overpopulation of the feral dogs in Iraq and Afghanistan on Iraqis' alleged refusal to keep dogs as pets in the house. This is a

particularly interesting claim, given that the United States is often considered to have a severe problem caused by the rising population of unwanted pet animals—in a country where many people—but means all—keep pet dogs in the home. However, the claim allows emphasis to be placed on religious difference. The discourses locate the problem in the effects of Islamic law that, they argue, stipulates that dogs are unclean and must not be allowed in the house as family pets. One article reports, for example, "In Iraq, as in the wider Islamic world, canines are widely considered practically and ritually unclean. Even where they're kept as pets or herders, they usually live outside rather than in the home" (Weinstein 2010b). This claim positions *Islam* as responsible for the alleged mistreatment of dogs in Iraq, and as a result, frames Islam as a backwards and barbaric religion that encourages cruelty to animals. Such positioning renders U.S. pet-keeping practices as the standard, desirable, and acceptable frame of engagement with dogs.

It might be that from an Islamic view of pet-keeping, U.S. pet practices could be seen as antithetical to an animals' well-being. Under Islam's parameters for the proper treatment of dogs, dogs are not to be kept as ornamental pets, as they are in the West. Western methods of pet-keeping may be framed as cruel and inhumane to the well-being of the dog, since Islamic law states that dogs should always be kept with a purpose—given with a specific job, such as "guarding, herding, hunting, and for assistance with agriculture" (Stilt 2008, 32). According to Islamic law, keeping a pet in the home as an ornamental companion is selfish and does not serve the dog's needs (Stilt 2008). Western discourses make invisible the deeply ethical nature of these beliefs in order to frame them as deliberately, knowingly cruel.

The Western discourses I trace above elide the nuances of Islam and the diversity of attitudes and people in Iraq and Afghanistan in favor of totalizing orientalist frameworks. The discourses frame any behavior or situation in Iraq and Afghanistan as emanating from a culture of depravity. They construct all behaviors of Muslims as reflecting the same pathology that they link to Islamic extremists. It is instructive, then, to consider Judith Butler's claim in *Precarious Lives: The Powers of Mourning and Violence*, that:

> Indeed, one has to wonder whether it is not simply selected acts undertaken by Islamic extremists that are considered outside the bounds of rationality as established by a civilizational discourse of the West, but rather any and all beliefs and practices pertaining to Islam that become, effectively, tokens of mental illness to the extent that they depart from the hegemonic norms of Western rationality. (2006, 72)

In a move of cultural imperialism, the discourses I analyze frame Western investments in normative "puppy love" and practices of pet keeping as neutral signifiers of rationality, framing any other attitudes towards dogs and pets as signifying a lack of such rationality and even cultural depravity simply because they do not necessarily adhere to Western norms. The Western discourses about Iraqi violence against dogs thus reproduce frames of Islamophobic orientalism as they reinscribe a Manichaean binary, positioning the practices of the West (and implicitly Christianity) as civilized and humane in contrast to barbaric and uncivilized Middle Eastern culture and religion.

These "rescue" discourses present the difficult and dangerous conditions of military occupation, war, and poverty that local citizens as well as dogs must endure as if important only to the well-being of the dogs. They also present the neglect and cruelty that

characterizes the treatment of animals in both the United States and the Middle East as if it were found only in the Middle East.[14] These culturally essentialist claims about Iraq and Afghanistan serve the colonial imaginary and dehumanize those captured by its gaze (Narayan 1997; Volpp 2003).

Contrasts with Protective and Loving U.S. Soldiers

Dog "rescue" discourses incessantly reiterate claims based on Manichaean binaries, assuming absolute contrast between black and white, good and evil. These discourses purport to show evidence of the cruelty of violent Muslim masculinity in order to contrast it to what is presented as the other side of the binary: the humane, loving, protective U.S. soldier. These "rescue" discourses frame U.S. soldiers as intervening to disrupt what is presented as characteristic mistreatment of dogs by denizens of Iraq and Afghanistan, or extending kindness to stray dogs (implicitly suffering from the neglect of the carelessly cruel local population). For example, according to one report, U.S. soldiers

> saw a few Afghanis standing around something and firing at the ground . . . [they] could see an adult dog and figured that they were shooting the dog over and over again. When [they] got closer, [they] saw that the situation wasn't what [they] expected. The corpse of a dog on the ground had a litter of puppies no more than a week old and [the Afghanis] weren't just shooting the mother but also shooting the pups. (Stoneburner 2014)

Another news story claims:

> Sometimes the only kindness [the dogs] ever know comes from deployed American soldiers who befriend, feed and watch out for them. Soldier and dog

> can't help but become best pals… Soldiers sometimes end up persuading the locals to leave the dogs alone by giving them cigarettes or other personal items. They are often the creatures' only defenders. ("Not easy being a dog in Afghanistan" 2014)

Other stories claim that a U.S. soldier's interaction with a dog may be "the first time in her young life that she [received] any human kindness and love" (Kiefaber 2013). The discourses present benevolent U.S. military subjects who rescue the victimized (mother) dog from the alleged abject evils of Iraqi and Afghan men through their capacity to be "loving" subjects.

Dog "rescue" discourses present U.S. soldiers as full of love and compassion for the dogs they encounter in the Middle East. A documentary about one of the "rescue" organizations that aired on the *Military Channel* called "No Dog Left Behind" (2009) echoes this argument, opening with the claim: "Iraq is the wrong place to go if you're a dog lover. You see 100 dogs a day you want to save" ("No Dog Left Behind," 2009). The video then shows images of U.S. soldiers petting and playing with many dogs, in implied contrast to the alleged Iraqi dislike for dogs.

Figure 2.9: U.S. Male Soldier with Group of Dogs

Still from Goosenberg-Kent, *No Dog Left Behind* (2009) (0:21)

A preview video for the documentary shows a soldier crouching by a dog's side. A male voice says: "It's basically like leaving one of your buddies behind. No soldier would ever do that." This narrative of sentimental attachment connects traditional military discourses with affection for dogs and situates the dog as similar to a human comrade. The video frames the soldiers and dogs through figurations of loyalty attached both to ideas about military fraternity and dogs as "man's best friend." Such claims position U.S. soldiers as "kind-hearted" and loving (yet masculine). Through claims about U.S. soldiers' alleged kindness to and love for dogs, the dog "rescue" discourses construct U.S. security forces in Iraq and Afghanistan under the terms of masculinist protection—a formation of gendered logic of war and securitization that positions men as "protectors" of the nation, figured as

the homeland, as well as those framed as dependent on him—women and children (and here, as I argue, dogs) (see Young 2003).[15]

The descriptions of U.S. soldiers' alleged kindness to animals produces the image of a benevolent and tough U.S. masculinity that is nonetheless gentle and kind to dogs. According to the sister of one soldier whose dog was transported by a rescue organization, affection for the dog co-exists with the masculinity of the U.S. soldier: she claimed the dog "found the weak spot in [her brother's] soldier-toughened amour, and it's this crack that allows the horrors to drain out while laughter and warmth flow in" (Danielle Berger, quoted in Crisp 2012, 53). The brother's position as a U.S. soldier in war positions him under the terms of hegemonic masculinity—tough and unemotional—while his caring for the dog he "rescued" in Iraq reveals his capacity to be a feeling subject in an acceptable form. His demonstration of the ability to love a dog and care about the dog's capacity for suffering marks the U.S. soldier in this binary construction as what Lauren Berlant calls a "subject of 'true feelings'" (Berlant 2002). Berlant argues that such a subject is founded by revealing the presence of moral feeling and especially "the capacity for feeling and responding to the suffering of less fortunate others who could be described not as individuals but as members of a subordinated population" (2005, 51). The subject of true feeling is framed as demonstrating not a personal but a political stance. The binary structure, then, characterizes the discourses of dog "rescue," to frame the Iraqi or Afghan citizen as incapable of becoming the subject of true feeling.

As the subject of true feeling, the U.S. soldier represents himself as fearful and threatened while threatening and killing the enemy other. The figure of the dog, then, allows the soldier to select one subordinated population—dogs—to "feel for," so as to divest himself

of responsibility for his participation in violence toward another subordinated population—Iraqi and Afghan civilians. The "rescue" discourses emphasize that soldiers claim that the dogs they befriend provide a sense of "home and normalcy" for them, in a move that renders soldiers as humane subjects in inhumane circumstances. Many news stories about the soldiers' work to transport the dogs stress the "grueling, emotional, isolating experience" of being deployed (Campion 2014) and the "chaos and wreckage of war" (Stokes 2013). One news story reports, "living in an austere and hostile location, it can be difficult at times to remember the simple and innocent things life has to offer" (Rivezzo 2013). These stories present the dogs as the antidote to these harsh conditions, as the "next best thing to being home" and a "taste of home" (Cooper 2011). As one soldier quips: "what could be more reminiscent of home than having a dog around?" (Callahan 2011).

The discourse provides testimony from U.S. soldiers that juxtaposes what they frame as the harsh conditions of living in war while deployed in Iraq and Afghanistan to the comfort and familiarity found through the presence of a dog and its ability to "comfort, heal, and inspire the best in people in the worst situations; to find their humanity in the midst of dehumanizing conditions" ("No Dog Left Behind" 2009). The humanizing aspect of the soldier's interactions with their dogs are continuously reiterated: "Caring for animals can often be a lifeline to decency…especially in war zones, the environment is so harsh that soldiers are often drawn to animals as a way to preserve their humanity" (Dove 2013). One soldier remarks, for example, "coming home and feeding the dogs—it's better than a CARE package or a phone call" (Callahan 2011). The soldiers mobilize these claims in appeals for contributions toward transporting their adopted dogs to the United States. Another soldier writes, for example, "I have sacrificed a lot to serve my country. All that I ask is to be

allowed to bring home the incredible dog that wandered into my life here in Iraq and prevented me from becoming terribly calloused toward life" (Crisp 2012, 50). This attitude is presented not as a result of the situation but innate to his subjectivity and his culture. Affection for the dog seems to substitute for empathy for the people who cannot leave the violence of their country.

So powerful is the notion that— in contrast to Middle Easterners—U.S. soldiers are uniquely able to love dogs, that the discourses of dog "rescue" even position local dogs as politically and militarily aligned with those in the U.S., united against a common enemy. The discourses suggest that in response to the soldiers' love, dogs come to recognize the alleged cultural differences so as to love soldiers from the United States and hate people from Iraq or Afghanistan. The discourses present the dogs themselves as understanding U.S. soldiers as loving and Iraqi and Afghan people as evil and cruel—apparently even Middle Eastern allies of the United States. Mission's website claims, for example, "While the military does not condone befriending animals, dogs and cats alike tend to find their way into the hearts of many, many soldiers stationed in Afghanistan. According to one U.S. NGO worker 'it's as if the animals know the difference between the heart of an American versus that of an Afghan . . . [soldiers] would tell . . . stories of how dogs growl at the Afghan soldiers but show nothing but love towards American soldiers" ("Our History," n.d.). Because the Afghan soldiers referred to are politically aligned with the United States, the dogs' apparent enmity must be based on their underlying innate, cultural, or religious "hatred" of dogs. Another source claims there is political alignment between U.S. soldiers and Iraqi and Afghan dogs, so the two groups faced a common enemy: According to this

report: “soldiers realized that without their protection, the dogs lived in heightened danger from *enemy forces*” (Stoneburner 2014, emphasis added).

In these dog “rescue” discourses the operations of the U.S. military and its contractors to kill local populations of both humans and dogs do not appear, but stories about the “enemy other” using U.S. soldiers’ alleged love for dogs as a weapon abound. For example, according to one of the leaders of a “rescue” organization, a soldier is said to have reported:

> We are forbidden to provide any kind of assistance to an injured animal we come across. The enemy discovered Americans can be real softies when it comes to animals, especially dogs, so they use that knowledge to their advantage. They have been known to purposefully injure a dog, making it unable to move, and then they place a booby trap underneath its body. When a kind-hearted soldier sees the animals, feels sorry for it and goes to help, guess what happens next? Boom. (Crisp 2012, 82)

This claim is more significant than it might seem for understanding the binary of good/evil, humane/inhumane constructed by dog “rescue” discourses. While presented as demonstrating the evil cruelty of Middle Eastern men, it also makes salient the dangers created by soldiers who violate military regulations by taking in local dogs. It is curious that the discourses of “rescue” do not come to grips with a fundamental contradiction of their own narrative: they encourage support for soldiers who violate military regulations, perhaps putting at risk both their fellow soldiers and U.S. military goals. This disobedience is obscured because of the affect of puppy-love that circulates in the narratives. Discourses such as these that position U.S. soldiers as protecting and “saving” dogs refashion the image

of the U.S. soldier as violent killer and repurposes the soldier as compassionate, warm and humane.

The Nurturing Femininity of the Female Soldier

The discourses of these "rescue" organizations goes further in producing racialized and gendered militarized subjects: because the dog "rescue" is the site for demonstrating the U.S. soldiers as humane, protectionist, even nurturing and domestic, it is particularly influenced by the ambiguous case of female soldiers. The "rescue" discourses deploy figurations of sentimentality to center a morally normative U.S. maternal femininity in relation to the citizen-soldier. One case, for example, describes Casey Warrick and her relationship with a dog and the dogs' six puppies. Warrick is said to have found the dog, Robo, when the dog was heavily pregnant.

> [She] had a nasty wound around her neck where a collar had grown into her flesh then had been cut out…[Warrick's] animal-lover instincts kicked in. She began cleaning Robo's neck wound with what little medical supplies she had. She kept it bandaged and cleaned whenever possible. She often found herself rubbing Robo's belly, talking to the unborn puppies. (Aiken Standard 2012)

Warrick is framed as a good white hetero-feminine citizen-soldier who counters Iraqi cruelty with her maternal kindness. She becomes surrogate mother via her care for the mother dog and the "unborn puppies." These unborn puppies in turn stand in for the innocent lives protected through a benevolent and even maternal U.S. militarism signified by Warrick. This discourse *produces* Warrick's femininity—and by extension U.S. femininity writ large—that is "liberated" (fighting on the frontlines), while retaining the domesticity and

nurturing tendencies of a homefront femininity. The descriptions of the caring, maternal nurturing female soldier also plays on long-existing discourses that figure white motherhood as an incubator for civilization. These scenes revive the historical terms of the "empire of the mother" in which "white women domesticated the frontiers of the empire" (Terry 2009, 216). Here, Warwick is presented as domesticating the harsh conditions of war in Iraq with her maternal care for the maternal dog—a normative U.S. motherhood and humane framing for the U.S. soldier.

Disrupting Figurations of the "Humane" U.S. Soldier

The notion of U.S. soldiers as humane lovers of dogs because of their innate subjectivity and Western cultural norms is dramatically contradicted by instances of U.S. male soldiers killing dogs wantonly: using dogs for target practice, for example, or throwing puppies off cliffs (see, for example, Roberts 2011; "Video Appears to Show Marine Abusing Puppy" 2008). Examples are found on YouTube videos as well. In one video from 2011, for example, a group of U.S. soldiers huddled together as they target a dog during an explosives practice, and then blow it up while they laugh in the background (Roberts 2011). Another video published on YouTube in 2011 shows a U.S. soldier in Iraq shooting a dog and watching it die ("U.S. Soldier Shoots a Dog and Watches the Dog Die"). Another video that surfaced on YouTube in 2008 documented a U.S. soldier throwing a puppy over a cliff to its death in Iraq ("Video Appears to Show Marine Abusing Puppy" 2008).[16]

Contra the frames of the dog "rescue" discourses, these instances reveal that violence is also engrained in hegemonic U.S. masculinity—a racialized and gendered formation under which men can engage in violence against people and animals through claims of "securitization" and the "masculinist protection" of the U.S. military (Young 2003).

Western news media treat these violent acts against dogs by U.S. soldiers as idiosyncratic and exceptional. This is also the official stance of the U.S. military. For example, responding to the puppy-throwing video, a Marine Corps spokesman called it a "shocking and deplorable video that is contrary to the high standards that we set for every marine."[17] The spokesman reaffirms the Marine Corp's humane normative masculinity, though his phrasing seems to condemn the *video* of the puppy-throwing rather than the *act*. The military explains the soldiers' violent acts depicted on the YouTube videos as exceptional aberrations. A public affairs director for the military base where the soldier who threw a puppy over the cliff was stationed remarks on the event, saying:

> We're all outraged…We're probably more outraged than the general public. I hate that it happened…The vast majority of Marines conduct their duties in an honorable manner that brings great credit upon the Marine Corps and the United States…There have been numerous stories of Marines adopting pets and bringing them home from Iraq …Those are the stories that exemplify what we stand for and how most Marines behave. ("Marines Outraged by Puppy-Throwing Video" 2008).

The official distances himself and the military from this cruel act of violence. His claim produces a boundary between good normative and "honorable" soldier and the bad aberrant cruel soldier—a "bad apple" in an otherwise civilized and humane institution, a central strategy for managing outrage at militarized violence (Gordon 2006; Puar 2007). The military officials' claim also reorients attention to the dogs "rescued" because of the U.S. military intervention, working to reconcile this example of violence by re-emphasizing the benevolent masculinist protection of the U.S. soldier.

Despite the implications of the arguments of military officials, the documented cruelty toward dogs by U.S. soldiers is not an aberrational example of violence outside of an otherwise non-violent military. Rather, the wanton violence is indicative of the dehumanization that operates in the "war on terror," which applies to both humans and animals when the power to kill, and render subjects killable is a driving affective and ideological force of war (Butler 2004, 2009; Puar 2007). The amplified focus of dog "rescue" discourses on the alleged cruelty of Iraqi and Afghan people towards the dogs in these countries while disavowing U.S. violence against dogs functions to distance the military masculinity foster by U.S. militarism from its role in producing dangerous situations for dogs *and people* in Iraq and Afghanistan. The discourses promoting dog "rescue" ignore the mass violence the U.S. military has enacted in Iraq and Afghanistan against civilians as well as combatants—as of 2015, 370,000 people have been killed in Iraq and Afghanistan, 210,000 of whom are civilians (Costs of War 2015, 1). The focus on the emotions of the individual soldier also directs attention from massive disparity between the number of lives lost by Iraqis and Afghanis in the war in comparison to the number of U.S. lives lost. The individual focus of dog "rescue" discourses also functions to displace attention from the 7.6 million war refugees and internally displaced persons that have resulted from U.S. military action in Iraq, Afghanistan and Pakistan since 2001 (Watson Institute 2015, 2). The "rescued" dog has a new home; the refugees do not. The attention focused on the "innocent, vulnerable" dog and the emotions of its "rescuer" justify the damages of war suffered by Middle Eastern people and recreate the "innocence" of the U.S. soldier.

Discourses about dog "rescue," like discourses about dog population control programs, attend to dog deaths that are visible or invisible, deaths justified and unjustified,

deaths kind and cruel. The discourses also efface the role of race in valorizing or condemning specific cultural practices. There is a long history of Western "civilizing" discourses that admonish colonized groups for their treatment of animals as a central strategy of racialization that also bolsters claims to national and cultural superiority (Glenney Boggs 2013; Kim 2015; Oliver 2012; Weaver 2013).[18] The discursive evidence I analyze here makes clear that animal bodies continue to serve as a site "of political struggle over the construction of cultural difference and help to maintain white American supremacy" (Elder, Wolch and Emel 1998, 194).

The effect of differential visibility and differential language, of treating Iraqi and Afghan masculinity as inherently violent and U.S. masculinity as affectionate and humane, of attributing barbarism to Iraq and Afghanistan, and humanitarianism to the United States is to continue to provide discursive justification for orientalist terms of Islamophobia that circulate in the U.S. "war on terror." Discourses that position residents of the United States as "humane" to animals thus construct culturally essentialist inaccurate claims about both the United States and structures of U.S. masculinity. These claims hide the everyday practices of violence in the United States that arise from hegemonic formations of masculinity under white supremacy—in civilian and military policy and practice.

Western discourses about the Iraqi dog-control program and dog "rescue" employ a variety of affective strategies to redefine the liberal subject: U.S. soldiers are valorized—treated as full liberal subjects—humane and civilized—while Iraqi men and public health workers, women, and children are devalorized—treated as inhumane, barbaric, or simply invisible. These terms work together to frame an Iraqi public health measure as the act of monstrous, irrational depravity and everyday treatment of animals as emerging from a

cultural depravity, not a structural and economic situation of war and occupation and differing cultural norms. On the other hand, the terms also frame an act of military occupation and formations of neocolonialism as kind, necessary and justified—expressed through the sentimental image of the U.S. soldier swept away by "puppy love."

Excessive Love of Animals: Constructing the Bestial "Other"

Western popular and political discourses that reproduce dehumanizing orientalist terms—framing Middle Eastern masculinity through notions of innate barbarism—also use *sexuality* as a central tool to secure such representations. Prominent in this discourse is a figure that Jasbir Puar and Amit Rai call the trope of the "monster-terrorist-fag"—a sexually perverse, feminized and queer Muslim rendered abject through failed heterosexuality (2002).[19] For Puar and Rai, the trope of the "monster-terrorist-fag" represents terrorists as having a perverse, failed heterosexuality (Puar and Rai 2002, 124). This trope deploys orientalist and racialized homophobic imagery as it positions the terrorist within the position of the "sodomite" (Freccero 2001). The discourses provide psychological explanations for a failed Middle Eastern masculinity in positioning these men as all potential terrorists. The discourses contribute to the construction of what Paul Amar defines as "hypersexual terrorist masculinities" (2013). These racialized fantasies render all Afghan and Iraqi men as hyperviolent potential-insurgent enemies with an abnormal backwards psyche marked by what is constructed as their perverse sexuality and their inability to be good heteronormative subjects (see also: Ahmed 2004; Bhattacharyya 2008; Puar 2007; Rai 2004). Puar and Rai locate this trope, for example, in the image that circulated of a U.S. bomb headed to

Afghanistan with "highjack this fags" scrawled across it (Harnden 2001, Puar and Rai 2002).[20]

Puar and Rai draw on Foucault's concept of the "West's abnormal"—a person to be contained and corrected—to argue that the trope of the "monster-terrorist-fag" produces the image of the deviant monstrous other marked by a failed heterosexuality who needs to be contained and understood through "counterterrorist" measures (2002, 118). The trope also disciplines and normalizes the U.S. citizens under terms of heteronormative patriotism. The trope thus ushers in two forms of power—a necropolitics of torture, containment and violence for the enemy other as well as a "softer" formation of biopower for the U.S. citizen—the "docile patriot" (Puar and Rai 2002, 119).[21]

Puar and Rai argue that the trope works to frame terrorism as an individual pathology resulting from a deviant psyche, rather than understanding terrorism and violence as a political issue and reaction to foreign policy. The trope captures the fantasies of U.S. orientalism and Islamophobia—presenting an image of terrorism that is affectively potent, culturally essentialist, and outside of an analysis of imperialism and other systems of power (Puar and Rai 123).

I examine in this section a series of sites that reproduce the trope of the "monster-terrorist-fag" through an explicit framing of various Middle Eastern and Muslim people and figures as interested in bestiality, not merely those framed as "terrorists" like Osama bin Laden, but also the sacred Islamic figure of Muhammad. First, I examine a series of cases from the United States that rework the trope of the "monster-terrorist-fag" to encompass bestiality: a representation from *South Park* that depicts Osama bin Laden as sexually desiring a camel, a 2001 cartoon posted to the site *Cox&Forkum* that extends the trope of the

bestial monster terrorist fag beyond the "terrorist" to an everyday Muslim man, and finally claims from Pamela Geller, a well-known U.S. conservative who also frames Muslims as bestial. Second, I analyze how the trope of the bestial "monster-terrorist-fag" extends beyond Islamophobia in the United States through global resonances in Western Europe. I unpack claims made by a famous Dutch conservative talk show host, Theo van Gogh, who often claimed that Muslim men like to have sex with sheep and goats. I then examine how the trope of the bestial "monster-terrorist-fag" echoes in framings of not only "terrorists" and individual Muslims, but the prophet Muhammad as well. I locate these depictions in both a U.S. and Danish context. I analyze these cases to trace how a politics of sexualized abjection subtends these dehumanizing representations.

The Bestial "Monster-Terrorist-Fag"

I consider here in relation to the trope a set of grotesque sexual representations of Osama bin Laden that appeared on an episode of the raunchy U.S. animated cartoon television show *South Park*. The episode, titled, with *South Park*'s characteristic vulgar humor, "Osama bin Laden Has Farty Pants," aired on November 7th 2001 and was the first *South Park* episode to air after 9/11.[22] The apparent humor of the episode is based on misdirection and surprise. In a series of moves, a cartoon caricature of Osama bin Laden is represented as successively displaying three different perverse sexualities. At the beginning of this sequence, a white boy has been trapped in Afghanistan, near where Osama bin Landen is represented as hiding. In order to escape, the boy first puts on women's clothes to present the appearance of an Arab/Muslim and Middle Eastern woman, hoping a dress will make Osama bin Laden think he is a woman. The boy mounts a camel and starts to ride away. When bin Laden sees the figure in a chador on the camel, he howls like a wolf, his jaw

dropping to the floor and his eyes bulging out, a familiar cartoon trope. This lecherous and lewd reaction presents the character's sexuality as excessive and uncontrolled. However, because the audience is aware that the apparent woman is actually a boy, the episode also implies that bin Laden exhibits a queer pedophilic desire. The final surprise occurs when the boy dismounts from the camel. Bin Laden rushes over and appears ready to pounce on the "woman," but bypasses her for the camel. It becomes evident that bin Laden's sexual desire is actually directed toward the camel. In the same out-of-control fashion earlier apparently displayed toward the woman/boy, he is seen hugging, licking, and kissing the camel. The scene in *South Park* starts with bin Laden displaying excessive heterosexual desire when he appears to be attracted to what he assumes is a woman; he is then figured as possibly demonstrating pedophilic desire in response to what the audience knows is a boy; the scene concludes by figuring bin Laden as aroused by bestial desire. *South Park* here frames bin Laden as sexually perverse, *specifically as interested in bestiality*, positioning him at the abject sexual boundary between human and animal.

Other Western discourses echo the above evocation of the trope of a *bestial* "monster-terrorist-fag," using this trope to frame not only those considered to be "terrorists," but all those who are Muslim. In another U.S.-based image produced in response to the 9/11 attacks, the site *Cox&Forkum* published a cartoon in October 2001 that depicts a Muslim man as romantically invested in his goat.[23] [24] The cartoon depicts a man wearing what appears to be a turban sitting across from a woman in a chador and a goat. Like the *South Park* episode, part of the humor of the cartoon rests on misdirection and a confusion of appropriate heteronormative love. The man says: "I hope you know you're special to me and I'll always care for you." The woman wearing a chador, replies to him, "Thank you, dear."

The man responds “I wasn’t talking to you.” The apparent humor is based on the revelation that the man had been addressing the goat, not the woman, with his declaration of love and support.

The cartoon continues the framing of the bestial “monster-terrorist-fag” by positioning a Muslim man as having a particular intimacy with a goat, rather than what is understood to be his appropriate object of desire—the Muslim woman. As Puar and Rai (2002) argue about the trope of the “monster-terrorist-fag,” the cartoon positions the man as a failed heterosexual subject. The cartoon extends the framing of monstrosity and sexual perversion from the “terrorist” to the everyday Muslim man.

Pamela Geller, a prominent Islamophobic right-wing conservative in the United States, has also bolstered the trope of the bestial “monster-terrorist-fag” in her repeated claims that Muslims engage in bestiality. For example, she posted a video to her website implying “that Muslims practiced bestiality with goats” (Southern Poverty Law Center “Pamela Geller”).[25] Geller often conflates all Muslims with Islamic extremists, claiming that “terrorism” comes not from the “perversions of Islam, but from the religion itself” (Barnard and Feuer 2010).[26] Her framing of Muslims as bestial thus binds the trope of the “monster-terrorist-fag” to all Muslims, furthering an Islamophobic framing is all Muslims as psychologically failed subjects and potential “terrorists.”

In another extension of the trope that frames not only those imagined as terrorists as bestial, but all Muslim men as bestial, Theo van Gogh—a well-known Dutch white man renowned in the Netherlands for his filmmaking, talk show, online presence, and weekly newspaper column—regularly claimed that Muslim people were interested in bestiality.[27] This Dutch case is relevant to my analysis of the circulation of orientalism and Islamophobia

in the "war on terror," because, in Foucauldian terms, it is part of a larger apparatus, or *dispositif*—a set of material and ideological power relationships—of the global "war on terror" and the global iterations of Islamophobia that circulate in Western Europe as well as the United States, grounding claims to the exceptional benefits of secular liberalism and democracy.

Van Gogh was known for developing one of the Netherlands' most public and openly Islamophobic personas—often making xenophobic comments about Muslim immigrants to the Netherlands. Van Gogh adamantly claimed that he supported "free speech," holding the Netherlands as a pinnacle of freedom, progress, and civilization, and vilifying the Muslims who immigrate there as backwards and barbaric. In his blog and news reports and on his television show, van Gogh often referred to Muslims (particularly Muslim immigrants to the Netherlands) as "goatfuckers" (*geiteneuker*). On September 21, 2001 van Gogh called Muslims "goat fuckers" on his website as he discussed the U.S. 9/11 Twin Tower attacks and the position of Moroccan Muslims in the Netherlands. He wrote: "[there are] goat fuckers in this country, who despise and trample on the native-born Dutch. They hate our freedom" (Panayiotopoulos 2006, 166). In his book, *Allah Knows Best* (2003), van Gogh substitutes the term "goatfucker" for "immigrant from an Islamic country" (Panayiotopoulos 2006, 168). He again drew on this Islamophobic rhetoric on his website, writing: "this is what our multicultural society has brought us: a climate of intimidation in which all sorts of goatfuckers can issue their threats freely" (Rovers 2004). At one point he brought two stuffed goats on set of his television show, claiming that they were there "for those who might feel the urge," referring to his Muslim guests (Buruma 2006, 9).

The term “goatfucker” positions Muslim men as the signifier of the abject sexually queer figure engaged in bestiality and binds them to an orientalist animalized frame. The term also implies penetrative activity on the part of the person doing the “fucking”—a man penetrating a goat, not a woman being penetrated by one. This phrase thus also frames *Muslim women* as inhuman—as those who can be substituted as sexual subjects with an animal. The claim thus frames both Muslim men and women at the blurred and shifting boundary between human and animal. Van Gough thus animalizes and dehumanizes Muslims through particularly sexualized tropes of racialization.

Defaming the Sacred: Muhammad as Bestial-Monster-Terrorist-Fag

Some Western Islamophobic comments and representations extend the trope of the bestial “monster-terrorist-fag” beyond the figuration of the “terrorist” and contemporary Muslim people to also frame the Islamic prophet Muhammad, as bestial and a terrorist. In September 2005, the Danish newspaper *Jyllands-Posten* published 12 editorial cartoons, most of which depicted the Islamic prophet Muhammad in deliberately offensive and unflattering ways. [28] According to one source, “One cartoon pictured Muhammad with the explosive turban. Another depicted him in heaven greeting suicide bombers; in Islamic tradition, martyrs are promised sensual rewards in paradise. ‘Enough,’ Muhammad is portrayed as saying. ‘We've run out of virgins’” (Norton 2011). Other sources in Europe and the United States also reposted the incendiary and offensive images. Muslim groups in Denmark and around the world protested. These protests and the ensuing controversy led to a proliferation of other inflammatory images—some depicting Muhammad as engaged in sex with animals—images that were sent to Danish Muslim leaders (Eskow 2011).

In a similar U.S.-based depiction of Muhammad as bestial, Sidney Allen Elyea, a white U.S. citizen, in 2010 posted Islamophobic images outside of a mosque and other locations in Saint Cloud, Minnesota. The cartoons he posted depicted Mohammad engaging in sex with animals and with a child, and also showed the prophet defecating on a *Qur'an* (Espinoza 2010).

These cases reveal a deeply *sexualized* form of Islamophobia that is particularly offensive in the use of the sacred figure of Muhammad. The depictions of Muhammad as bestial are particularly offensive to Muslims, since Islam dictates that Muhammad should never be depicted *in any form*, especially by those who do not believe in the prophet and are not Muslim. Saba Mahmood argues that in the Islamic tradition, a Muslim's "relationship to Muhammad is predicated not so much upon a communicative or representational model as an assimilative one" (2009, 847). This assimilative model establishes a similitude between individuals and Muhammad. Mahmood contends that "in this economy of signification, [Muhammad] is a figure of immanence in his constant exemplariness and is therefore not a referential sign that stands apart from an essence that it denotes" (2009, 847).[29] Because devout Muslims live with, and in relation to, Muhammad, depictions of Muhammad as bestial directly insult their very being and sense of self.

Framing Muslim men and Muhammad as monstrously disgusting is central to the various depictions of "Muslim bestiality" that I have described above. Bestiality represents the disturbance of seemingly stable ontological boundaries between human and animal in bringing the human into sexual proximity with the animal (Glenney Boggs 2013; Brown and Rasmussen 2010). Because bestiality represents the crossing of the boundaries between human and animal, it is an abject practice that attaches disgust to those represented as being

engaged in it. In the "war on terror," representations of Arab/Muslim/Middle Eastern (usually) men engaged in bestiality circulate and *stick* signs of disgust on these men, positioning them as abject, at the blurred boundary between human and animal.

Conclusion:

Racialization, Animality and Biopolitical Boundaries

The three sets of related discourses that I have analyzed position Iraqi men as inhumane towards dogs, and Arab/Muslim/Middle Eastern men as characterized by perverse and bestial sexual desire. The discourses position these men's lives as a threat to "innocent" human and animal lives, producing an *imaginary* Muslim/Arab/Middle Eastern masculinity marked by barbarism and monstrosity. The shifting boundary of humane/inhumane in these discourses reflects how Western discourses use species as a central discursive and affective frame to construct claims about devalorizing cultural difference. The discursive regime that frames Iraqis and Muslims as barbaric and monstrous is steeped in the affective and discursive work of nationalism, deploying the human and animal binary as an affect-laden signifier of the boundary between the human and the "abject" under a species-infused framework of orientalism.

The racialized and sexualized orientalist rendering of Iraqi and Afghani men as hyperviolent and barbaric towards humans and dogs, frames these men, and Iraqis and Afghani people more generally, not simply as inhumane, but as *inhuman*. This dehumanization reworks the contours of the human through a U.S. biopower that works, as Judith Butler argues, to "[register] the inhuman in the human face, producing a symbolic

identification of the face with the inhuman, foreclosing our apprehension of the human in the scene" (2006, 147).

The biopolitical dehumanization of Iraqis and Afghans in the discourses I analyze above "de-faces" them, rendering their pain and suffering invisible, warranting treating them violently—permitting them to be killed in order to secure U.S. "freedom" (Butler 2006, 2010). The dog killing and "rescue" discourses participate in these terms of dehumanizing racialization through a construction of the *dog as victim*. They reconfigure orientalism—a discourse that marks the "West" as "civilized and human(e)" and the "East" as "sub-human, inhuman(e) and closer to a position of animality" (Said 1978, 109)—s a *regime of racialization* that works through the figure of the "dead" or "rescued" dog.

Notes

[1] As I indicated in Chapter 1, I use the phrase "Arab/Muslim/Middle Eastern men" following Leti Volpp's (2003) argument that these men are conflated together under gendered racialization in the United States that positions them all as potential "terrorists." Although not made explicit, the discourses about Iraq program and general attitudes of Iraq treatment of dogs particularly draw on the image of Middle Eastern *men* as brutal, inhumane, and inhuman. For example, while the discourses make claims about the "Iraqi government" or "Iraqi attitudes," I argue that it is Iraqi men who are most imagined as agents of violence.

[2] I use "Western" here to stand for the United States, the United Kingdom. and the Netherlands, the countries from which the discourses I analyze emerge.

[3] I particularly focus on discourses from *Mother Jones*, *NBC, The Daily Mail* and *CNN*. I examine 17 articles, including the following: ("Ahmad Saadawi's 'Dogs" 2011; "Baghdad Opens Campaign to Kill Stray Dogs" 2008; "Baghdad Police Kill More than 58,000 Stray Dogs" 2010; "Campaign against 'Fatal Attacks on Humans'" 2010; "CNN Report" 2009; Dagher 2009; Damon 2009; "Group Urges Humane Dog Killing in Iraq" 2008; Juhi 2010; Kami 2010; Kareem 2010; Paster 2010; Susman 2008; Weinstein 2010a; Weinstein 2010b; Vallis 2010; Zellerman n.d.).

[4] Kareema Mousa, head of the department of health and environment in the Baghdad governorate council, quoted in Kami (2010).

[5] Jinan Abdul-Amir quoted in Weinstein (2010).

[6] Mohammed Hussein, Iraqi citizen, quoted in Kami (2010).

[7] According to the ASPCA, "'Breed-specific' legislation (BSL) is the blanket term for laws that either regulate or ban certain breeds completely in the hopes of reducing dog attacks. Some city/municipal governments have enacted breed-specific laws…regulated breeds include not just American Pit Bull Terriers, American Staffordshire Terriers, Staffordshire Bull Terriers, English Bull Terriers and Rottweilers, but also a variety of other dogs, including American Bulldogs, Mastiffs, Dalmatians, Chow Chows, German Shepherds, Doberman Pinschers, or any mix of these breeds—and dogs who simply resemble these breeds" ("Breed Specific Legislation").

[8] The breakdown of animals killed by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) in 2013, for example, are the following: 75,326 coyotes, 866 bobcats, 528 river otters, 3,700 foxes, 12,186 prairie dogs, 419 black bears, 973 red-tailed hawks, and at least three eagles, golden and bald (Fears 2014).

[9] Mayor Ellery Deaton, quoted in Larsen (2014).

[10] Discourses that position Iraqi men as inhumane and inhuman position these men within a position of "animalized humanity," and dogs in a position of "humanized animality." "Animalized humanity" represents a position in which a human is rendered an animal, is constructed as less than human. "Humanized animality" conversely locates a position in which animals are anthropomorphized, endowed with a humanized subjectivity (Wolfe 2003, 101).

The mobilization of the shifting boundary between human and animal is not new: it is deeply embedded in a history of gendered and racialized significations that establish hierarchies of value for human lives. These significations produce the category of "human" through a chain of substitutions that position women and men of color as close to the boundary between human and animal (see, for example, Adams 1990; Chen 2012; Kim 2007, 2009; Mbembe 2001; Morgan 2004). The hierarchical relations of humans and animals are therefore predicated on sets of mutually constitutive binaries: man and woman, culture and nature, mind and body, reason and emotion, white and nonwhite, "Occident" and "Orient," with the second term always positioned as inferior to the first (see, for example, Chen 2012; Derrida 2008, 2009; Glenney Boggs 2013). Racialized, gendered and sexualized representations of animals and human-animal intimacy mediate the boundary between human and animal.

[11] Under "General Order 1A," established by the Department of Defense, U.S. soldiers in Iraq are prohibited from "adopting as pets or mascots, caring for or feeding any type of animal" (Frankel 77, 2014).

[12] Some soldiers are said to claim that the dogs are "in danger of being…used for dog fighting by the locals" ("Soldier Reunited with Afghan Puppies" 2013).

[13] Leviticus:11:27 "And whatsoever goeth upon his paws, among all manner of beasts that go on all four, those are unclean unto you: whoso toucheth their carcase shall be unclean until the even." (see "Which Animals Does the Bible Designate").

[14] Chapter 2 provides background on the U.S. treatment of animals. "Rescue" discourses like Crisp's that position the United States as a safe "home" for dogs efface the violence that many dogs

are subject to in the country—like the killing of over 1.2 million dogs in kennels each year in the United States (ASPCA, "Pet Statistics" n.d.). These discourses also ignore dominant and widespread brutal "normalized" practices of killing many kinds of animals in the United States.

[15] The representation of this protectionist masculinity signals a shift from a virulent and aggressive post-9/11 redemptive masculinity to a softer, more subdued and controlled masculinity that emerges as the new face of a benevolent securitization in relation to American military presence in Iraq and Afghanistan under Obama. Tracing early shifts in military masculinity, Robin Wiegman (1994) argues that popular representation remade the representation of the phallicly castrated American masculinity of the Vietnam-war era into a "hyperphallicized" Rambo-esque muscled masculinity in the 1980s, which was then remade in the 1990s into a "sentimentalized masculinity" that mediates cultural discourses of 'family' that function in strategies of containment for post-Cold War fears" in the 1990s. She thus argues that a shift in hegemonic nationalist soldier masculinity occurs from an emphasis on what Susan Jeffords calls the "hard body" of the 1980s to a "more nuanced masculine interiority, a 'soft body' of emotionality, inward struggle, and familial crisis and confrontation" (1994, 175). She further argues that "sentimentality [is] attached to the masculine in context of everyday" to this soft-body masculinity (1994, 183). Resonances of this domesticated masculinity re-invoked in terms of gendered-orientalism of the "war on terror" that use dogs to produce this sentimental and domesticated American soldier masculinity. The framing of the soldiers through melodramas about rescuing "helpless" victims from Iraq and Afghanistan—here dogs—helps produce a sentimentalized masculinity and produces the American domestic home as a place of freedom and safety that "encloses the so-called theater of war" (Wiegman 1994, 184).

[16] This video was removed immediately, but was subsequently re-posted by many blogs, as this event sparked outrage about soldier's cruelty to animals (Wortham 2008). The Marine, Lance Cpl. David Motari, was discharged (Mount 2008).

[17] Marine Corps spokesman Maj. Chris Perrine quoted in "Video Appears to Show Marine Abusing Puppy" (2008).

[18] There is a rich literature about how human-animal relationships are mobilized to signify certain communities of color as "backwards" as a tool for racialization. Kelly Oliver (2012) argues that discourses of racialization operate through reductive discourses that construct certain cultures and racial groups as backwards and uncivilized based on claims that these groups

treat animals cruelly. Mel Chen (2012) and Clare Jean Kim (2015) argue, for example that orientalist discourses position Chinese culture as backwards, fixating critique on the consumption of dogs in China. Carla Freccero (2011) and Clare Jean Kim (2015) also argue that racist discourses position black communities as backwards through fixating on a few examples of black people engaged in dog fighting.

[19] This figure is an extension of the Muslim man produced by Islamophobic thinkers like Raphael Patai in *The Arab Mind* (1983). (See discussions in Puar and Rai 2002, and also in Freccero 2002; Puar 2007; Rai 2004).

[20] The image is from a picture captured on the USS Enterprise in October 2001 (Harnden 2001).

[21] Discourses that slip between "Saddam" and "Sodom" as well as images, like a billboard in Time Square depicting Osama bin Laden being sodomized by the Chrysler building, for example, produce the "terrorist" as queerly perverse under this trope (Freccero 2001; Butler 2008).

[22] Jasbir Puar has briefly discussed the *South Park* episode's focus on the allegedly small size of Bin Laden's penis and apparent sexual interest in the camel (2007, 68).

[23] The cartoon was later re-published in the book, *Black & White World* by John Cox and Allen Forkum (2002), named for its stark orientalist presentation of the U.S. and Middle East post-9/11.

[24] Cox and Forkum are conservative U.S. cartoonists who claim that they were inspired to start their cartoon work—through print publishing in their nook and online with their blog—after the September 11, 2001 attacks. Forkum claimed, for example, that "September 11 totally changed our approach. Rather than casually pursuing the work, I suddenly had burning desire to speak out. The large majority of our cartoons have since dealt directly or indirectly with what we think is the appropriate response to the 9/11 attacks." Cox made a similarly argument about the impact on him of 9/11: "It also triggered a dictum that Allen and I really treasure: Cartooning is pointless only if you make it pointless. September 11, 2001, was a watershed moment for everybody. For us as cartoonists, it was a call to arms, a call to challenge complacency and inaction. That's what we strive to do" (Little 2003). The cartoonists' work deploys orientalist strategies that demonize Arab and Muslim people and frame the United States in contrast as strong, virile and "free." Responses to the book on Amazon.com laud it as a good book for conservatives who "see the world as it really is post-9/11." One commentator notes that the "editorial cartoons that have a decidedly pro-American, pro-Israel, pro-War-On-Terror bend to them. They do not engage in knee-jerk

jingoism, but rather offer intelligent and thoughtful responses to the often thoughtless anti-American opinions expressed by many other cartoonists" (Silverman 2004).

[25] Geller formed the Islamophobic site "Atlas Shrugs" (the site is known for its extreme racism). In 2015, Geller also hosted a "Draw Muhammad" cartoon contest in Garland, Texas (Calamar 2015).

[26] Geller's posting of the cartoons drastically increased traffic to her site, Atlas Shrugged,—"from scores to tens of thousands," since at the time, many media sources chose not to post the incendiary images (Barnard and Feuer 2010). Geller, a Jewish American, is part of a larger apparatus of conservative right-wing Islamophobia in the United States and more broadly in increasingly globalized Islamophobic rhetoric and practices in the United States, Europe, and Israel. Geller is co-founder of the group "Stop Islamization America," an organization committed to espousing anti-Muslim ideals. The group, which is also euphemistically referred to as the "American Freedom Defense Initiative" tries to block the construction of mosques and Muslim community spaces. The Southern Poverty Law Center classifies the group as an "anti-Muslim hate group." Geller founded the group with Robert Spencer, the proprietor of Jihadwatch.org, a site also backed by the David Horowitz Freedom Center and anti-Muslim Israeli right-wing philanthropists and Anders Gravers, a Danish "anti-Islamization" activist who was head of "Stop Islamization of Europe" (Barnard and Feuer 2010). Her group funded an ad featured on New York subways in 2015 that said "In any war between the civilized man and the savage, support the civilized man" (Calamar 2015).

Geller is perhaps most famous as one of the most prominent voices and figureheads opposing Park51, a Muslim community center built about two blocks from the World Trade Center. Because of its location, she called the proposed development "the ground zero mega-mosque" and the "9/11 monster mosque being built on hallowed ground zero" (Barnard and Feuer 2010). Her claim, first posted on a blog on her site Atlas, helped to initiate the widely-circulated panic that a mosque was being built at the site of the Twin Towers—echoed in sources including *The New York Post* (Peyser 2010) and FOX News. She was also featured as a guest on Mike Huckabee's television show and Sean Hannity's radio show discussing her stance against the community center and her work with "Stop Islamization of America" (Barnard and Feuer 2010).

Geller, a Jewish American, is part of a larger apparatus of conservative right-wing Islamophobia in the U.S. and more broadly in increasingly globalized Islamophobic rhetoric and practices in the United States, Europe, and Israel. Geller is co-founder of the group "Stop

Islamization America," an organization committed to espousing anti-Muslim ideals. The group, which is also euphemistically referred to as the "American Freedom Defense Initiative" tries to block the construction of mosques and Muslim community spaces. The Southern Poverty Law Center classifies the group as an "anti-Muslim hate group." Geller founded the group with Robert Spencer, the proprietor of Jihadwatch.org, a site also backed by the David Horowitz Freedom Center and anti-Muslim Israeli right-wing philanthropists and Anders Gravers, a Danish "anti-Islamization" activist who was head of "Stop Islamization of Europe" (Barnard and Feuer 2010).

Geller and the groups with which she is allied work to incite affects of hatred against Muslims in the United States—drawing clear boundaries between the United States as a place of "freedom" and the Middle East—rendered a uniform amorphous whole full of potentially-terrorist Muslims. Geller's group funded an ad featured on New York subways in 2015 that said "In any war between the civilized man and the savage, support the civilized man" (Calamar 2015).

Geller is perhaps most famous as one of the most prominent voices and figureheads opposing Park51, a Muslim community center built about two blocks from the World Trade Center. Because of its location, she called the proposed development "the ground zero mega-mosque" and the "9/11 monster mosque being built on hallowed ground zero" (Barnard and Feuer 2010). Her claim, first posted on a blog on her site Atlas, helped to initiate the widely-circulated panic that a mosque was being built at the site of the Twin Towers—echoed in sources including *The New York Post* ("Mosque Madness at Ground Zero") and FOX news. She was also featured as a guest on Mike Huckabee's television show and Sean Hannity's radio show discussing her stance against the community center and her work with "Stop Islamization of America" (Barnard and Feuer 2010).

[27] Van Gogh was eventually killed on November 2, 2004 by Moroccan, Mohammad Bouyeri, a 26-year old man described in Dutch news as an "Islamic fundamentalist" (Norton 2011 68). Bouyeri fastened letter to van Gogh's chest condemning him for his Islamophobic rhetoric and work. The killing was focus of media arguments about a "clash of cultures" in the Netherlands. The media coverage of van Gogh's death focused on Bouyeri's alleged Islamic fundamentalism and disgust and hatred of van Gogh's Islamophobic rhetoric. The media reports about van Gogh's murder thus participate in a circular logic that van Gogh worked to establish: Muslims are backwards and barbaric—hence he calls them goatfuckers. In contrast, van Gogh, and other Dutch citizens (imagined for him as white and secular), are

from the Netherlands—where free speech is important. As such, van Gogh's calling Muslims "goatfuckers" signifies Dutch freedom, rather than xenophobic racism. Under van Gogh's logic, Muslims are imagined as all Islamic fundamentalists who are the enemy of free speech. The discourses around Bouyeri's murder of van Gogh intimate that the murder exposes Muslims' inability to deal with such modern tolerance of speech that may critique their religion. This inability to accept free speech, however hateful, is then framed as reactionary not only for the condemnation—but also for the violent murder that a reaction to this "free speech" incited. Thus, the reports about van Gogh's murder *produce* Muslims as barbaric and backwards, sticking the actions of *one man* to an entire group of religious people—who are also *stuck* to brown and Middle Eastern bodies post-9/11. The heightened attention to van Gough's death, the killer, and his Islamic commitments *produces* the enemy Muslim other that van Gogh's comments sought to establish.

[28] The cartoons were initially created because Flemming Rose, an editor for the Danish newspaper *Jyllands-Posten* asked 25 Danish newspaper cartoonists to draw Mahammad as they saw him—12 responded and were all subsequently printed in the paper. Rose claims he was inspired to do this because of what he frames as an over-investment in "PC culture" in Denmark particularly as it applied to Islam, and hat comedians artists alike were censoring their own free speech for fear of offending Muslims/for fear of being seen as Islamophobic (Shadid and Sullivan 2006). Rose claimed "We have a tradition of satire in Denmark…We do the same with the royal family, politicians, anyone. In a modern secular society, nobody can impose their religious taboos in the public domain" (Shadid and Sullivan 2006).
There was widespread protest from Muslims and anti-Islamophobia activists in relation to the incendiary depictions of Muhammed and the overall blatant racist Islamophobia in Denmark. Groups of Muslim leaders and community members organized against the publication of the images. Their goal was to appeal to the Danish minister of culture, organized a petition to submit to the Prime Minister, Anders Fogh Rasmussen, and met with ambassadors from 11 Muslim countries who also wanted to meet with the Prime Minister (Shadid and Sullivan 2006). The activists also protested other grotesque and incendiary images of Muhammed that had circulated elsewhere in Denmark—including images of Muhammed engaged in bestiality that were sent to Danish Muslim leaders as a response to the initial controversy around the cartoons (Shadid and Sullivan 2006).

The impacts of the debates and effects of the cartoons were widespread— according to one source, "Protests have erupted in an arc stretching from Europe through Africa to East Asia

and, at times, the United States. About a dozen people have died in Afghanistan; five have been killed this week in Pakistan. Muslim journalists were arrested for publishing the cartoons in Jordan, Algeria and Yemen. European countries have evacuated the staffs of embassies and nongovernmental organizations, Muslim countries have withdrawn ambassadors, and Danish exports that average more than $1 billion a year have dried up in a span of weeks...[as] the economic boycott… had nearly shut down sales of Danish cheese, butter and other products in the Muslim world" (Shadid and Sullivan 2006). There was also widespread response from Arab nations against the Danish government. One source notes "Governments were already taking action: Interior ministers from 17 Arab nations called on the Danish government to punish the *Jyllands-Posten* newspaper. The Saudi interior minister urged the other nations to recall their ambassadors from Denmark. Protesters burned a large photo of Prime Minister Rasmussen outside the U.N. compound in Gaza City, scenes repeated elsewhere in Muslim countries. Algeria and Yemen, among others, were calling for U.N. action against Denmark" (Shadid and Sullivan 2006). There were further widespread protests in Lebanon, Afghanistan, and Syria (Shadid and Sullivan 2006). The protests around the sacrilegious images of Muhammad were framed as a "clash of civilizations" between the "East" rallying against the defacement of a scared figure, and the "West" rallying to protect "free speech" and "freedom of expression." Because of mounting pressure from the Muslim protest against Danish goods and Islamophobia, the Prime Minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen and the editors of *Jyllands-Posten* issue shallow statements of apology for the cartoons. He said, "I personally have such respect for people's religious feelings that I personally would not have depicted Muhammad, Jesus or other religious figures in such a manner that would offend other people" (Rasmussen). "In our opinion, the 12 drawings were not intended to be offensive, nor were they at variance with Danish law, but they have indisputably offended many Muslims, for which we apologize" (*Jyllands-Posten* editor). (Shadid and Sullivan 2006).

In response to the apologies, some other European newspapers decided to reprint the image to emphasize European investment in free speech. The German newspaper *Die Welt*, for example, printed a front-page cover story about the Muhammad cartoon controversy the day after the Danish apologies, complete with a large reprint of the image of Muhammad with a bomb on his turban (Shadid and Sullivan 2006). Roger Koppel, editor of *Die Welt* claimed in justification of his reprinting that "This had now become a huge political story…In a secular Western society, a prime minister and a newspaper had to issue an apology for exercising

their right to satire…You don't deliberately stir up religious hatred, but, sorry, we live in a secular country in the West…It's part of our culture. It's just not possible that our culture gets somehow penalized by threats" (Shadid and Sullivan 2006).

[29] According to Mahmood (2009), many Westerners claimed that Muslims needed to "lighten up" and have a sense of humor in response to the Muslim outrage at the cartoons. They claimed that the cartoons were a form of satire—which they understood to be an important form of freedom of expression in a liberal democracy. Under this framework, they construct satire as an expression of free speech central to liberal democracy that can be mobilized to caricature and ridicule anything, including religious icons, without concern for people's feelings (Mahmood 2009, 839).

Mahmood argues that Western semiotic theories about representation and language informed Western responses to the cartoon controversy. She claims that although Western semiotics purports to be secular, it is embedded in Christian epistemologies and ontologies "signifiers are arbitrarily linked to concepts" (Mahmood 2009, 841), such that a representation that someone might find to be offensive and blasphemous, another might find to be satirical and humorous (Mahmood 2009, 841). Mahmood argues that this model presupposes an ontological separation between a sign and what it represents. She argues that this ideology emerges from Protestant ideology that understands a distinction between form and essence and substance and meaning, an idea grounded in Christian Protestant ideology that proposes that a transcendental God could only ever be represented by symbols (Mahmood 2009, 843). Mahmood argues that this Protestant semiotic ideology "naturalize[s] a language ideology in which the primary task of signs is the communication of referential meaning" (Mahmood 2009, 854). This system posits that representations of sacred figures and idols are arbitrarily linked to abstract sacred figures. This system proposes that a sign, like the cross, does not actually literally embody Christ, and has only taken on such a meaning because of human interpretation and representation (Mahmood 2009, 844). Mahmood thus argues that a Western semiotic system offers an "impoverished understanding of images, icons, and signs [and] naturalizes a certain relationship between structures of meaning, representation and subjectivity" (Mahmood 2009, 848).

Mahmood claims that the supposedly "secular" Western response to the cartoons that disciplined Muslim affect drew on an understanding of religion that was grounded in Protestant Christian semiotic ideologies (Mahmood 2009, 843). These ideologies *produce* the proper "modern" religious subject as one who can distinguish between the individual and

the abstract as well as the material and the transcendental (Mahmood 2009, 843). Mahmood claims that Westerners argued that Muslims should not find the cartoons insulting because they were merely a representational caricature of the divine. They claimed that Muslims, in not being able to make the distinction between the divine and a representation of the divine, did not appropriately understand the relationship between symbols and icons. Thus, these Western reactions framed Muslims as religious subjects whose values were out of sync with modern religious ideologies.

Chapter 3: Affective Discourses of Dog "Rescue"

Military policy prohibits deployed soldiers from keeping pets on base and transporting animals with them back to the United States. General Order 1A prohibits soldiers from "adopting as pets or mascots, caring for or feeding any type of animal" (Sullivan 2009).[1] It also enjoins "soldiers in the U.S. Central Command, which includes Iraq, from adopting pets or transporting them home" (Lade 2008). Despite these regulations, it is not uncommon for U.S. soldiers stationed on military bases in Iraq and Afghanistan to make pets of local dogs, to bring them onto base, and to desire to have them transported to the United States to keep as pets with the help of their families and dog "rescue" organizations. For more than a decade, discourses about "rescuing" these dogs and transporting them to the United States have circulated throughout U.S. news outlets and media sources. Particularly prominent in the production of this discourse of dog "rescue" are two organizations: Operation Bagdad Pups (hereafter, "Operation"), founded by Terri Crisp in 2007 and sponsored by The Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals International[2] and "The Puppy Rescue Mission" (hereafter, "Mission"), founded by Anna Cannan in 2012.[3] The two are among several dog "rescue" organizations that help arrange the complicated logistics of transporting dogs from Iraq and Afghanistan to the United States, which can cost between $3,000-$5,000 per dog ("Operation Baghdad Pups: Where Your Money Goes" n.d.).[4] The organizations are funded through individual and corporate donations and fundraising campaigns which strongly influence the nature of their discourses and their impact on the national imaginary.[5]

In this chapter I analyze discourses about "rescuing" dogs taken in by U.S. soldiers and transporting them to the United States. I analyze these discourses to consider a series of questions: What is the symbolic work done by the figure of the "rescued" dog in the national imaginary? How is the figure of the "rescued" dog mobilized to create an exemplary homefront in the United States—a site of unquestioned generosity and integrity, in contrast to a debased frontline in Iraq and Afghanistan? How does the figure of the "rescued" dog and its transportation by private organizations generate pro-military sentiment at home and reinscribe gendered colonial formations abroad?

The first section provides a brief overview of a dog "rescue" narrative. The second section argues that the "rescue" discourses reproduce a species-infused frame of orientalism in their rhetorics: constructing the dogs as "waifs, "vulnerable victims" in need of protection of "inhumane" Iraqi and Afghan people by "humane" U.S. soldiers. The third section argues that the "rescue" discourses echo the narrative structure of conventional heteronormative fairytales—the vulnerable victim dog in danger from the evil "enemy other" who is "rescued" by the humane U.S. soldier and everyday citizen, and transported to the United States—constructed as a place of safety and "freedom" for these dogs. The fourth section argues that the dog "rescue" discourses, framed through the narrative structure of fairytales, function as an affective technology of nationalism in the intimate public sphere—a sphere of national belonging structured through private and intimate acts, often as they relate to the family (Berlant 1997). The fifth section demonstrates how the dog "rescue" discourses are infused with heterofamilial, racialized, and gendered ideologies. The sixth and final body section, argues that the claims made by the "rescue" discourses are often false and provides examples that disrupt the logic of the "fairytales of rescue."

These analyses together illuminate the ways that discourses about dog "rescue" work both to bolster the affective economies of U.S. nationalism and pro-war militarism—in Sara Ahmed's (2004) terms, structures of feeling that tie together signs, objects, bodies, and identities together with communities—with frames of "puppy love" through mobilizations oriented to the intimate public sphere. Ahmed's theory provides the tools to understand how individuals become aligned together as a community and nation through the articulation and repetition of certain emotions—like love, fear, disgust, and hate. I trace in this chapter how the political emotions or affects of *love*—and in particular love for dogs, the family, and the military—are together articulated as indicating love for the nation, and by extension, U.S. militarism.

The "Rescue" of K-Pot and Liberty

Crisp describes her early work with Operation in her memoir *No Buddy Left Behind* (2012). One section, in specific, describes her initial work to bring two dogs—K-Pot and Liberty—from Iraq to the United States, with a narrative characteristic of subsequent discourses about dog "rescue." Crisp claims that Matt Berger, a soldier deployed in Iraq, found a 4-week old "bleeding puppy" tangled in a "heap of razor wire" (2012, 163). Crisp reports that Berger and his colleague brought the dogs to the base where they were stationed and adopted one of them as their pet, naming him "K-Pot."

Crisp describes Berger's difficulty trying to arrange transportation to the United States for the two dogs and her work in helping him through Operation Baghdad Pups. In order to circumvent the restrictions outlined under General Order 1A that would prohibit Berger from legally having K-Pot and Liberty on base with him, he persuaded a military vet to classify K-Pot and Liberty as "canine force protection dogs." Such a classification shift

meant the dogs were considered U.S. army property, rather than feral Iraqi dogs, allowing Berger to keep the dogs on base legally (Crisp 2012, 57). This reclassification, however, also meant that the dogs would be considered "expendable equipment" as "canine force protection dogs" and would have to be euthanized in accordance with military policy when the soldiers left Iraq (Crisp 2012, 53). Thus, although this shift in classification helped Berger keep the dogs under his protection at that moment, the solution was only temporary as the military would still kill the dogs when Berger's troop left Iraq. Berger resolved to have the dogs transported to the United States in violation of military policy based on the claim he wanted to *protect* them from the U.S. military *and* save them from the dangers said to be posed by Iraq and Iraqis. With the help of Operation, Berger transported the dogs to the United States.

Dogs as Victims in Need of "Rescue": Constructing Sentimental Victims

The most prominent trope in framing dogs in need of "rescue" is to present the dogs as innocent, helpless, and "in danger" of death, violence, and disease in Iraq and Afghanistan. Echoing this framing, another organization that also works to "rescue" dogs, called "The Soldier's Animal Companion Fund" (hereafter, "Companion Fund") makes characteristic claims about why dogs should be "rescued" on their website:

> [I]n Afghanistan dogs are considered unclean by the Taliban. They may be used as target practice, blown up, run over, or starved. Their only value is to be used in dog fighting, a miserable so-called sport for which dogs' ears and tails are cut off to enable them to be more competitive fighters. The dogs who find their way into our soldiers' compounds and into their hearts, are often left behind to suffer terribly when the soldiers must move on.

The Companion Fund frames dogs as helpless victims suffering in Afghanistan and in need of support from U.S. soldiers. It also reinscribes the discursive structures analyzed in Chapter 2 that attribute "inhumane" treatment to Middle Easterners and "humane" treatment to U.S. soldiers.

The discourses of the Companion Fund reflect how the dog "rescue" discourses frame the figure of the dog through what Laura Briggs (2003) calls "the trope of the waif," a trope that also circulates in discourses on international aid. A "waif" is "a homeless and helpless person, especially an abandoned or neglected child" and as an "abandoned pet animal" (OED). The discourses use this trope to present the dogs as "vulnerable victims," "orphaned by war" (Savage 2013), "cling[ing] to life, struggling to survive in a world that doesn't care what happens to them" (Dove 2013). The discourses also position dogs who die in Iraq and Afghanistan as the "uncounted casualties of this war" (Crisp 2012, 81).[6] The dogs emerge in these discourses as hypervisible "voiceless victims" who are positioned as always already in danger of violence or death in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Narratives that position the dogs as "waifs" are replete with gendered representations of victimization—particularly when the dog is imagined as female, maternal and with puppies. Many stories in the "rescue" discourses are about mother dogs and their puppies. A special report by Anderson Cooper on *CNN* titled "From Afghanistan with Love: Soldiers Reunited with Dogs They Promised to Not Leave Behind" focuses on a story about a group of U.S. soldiers from the Army National Guard in Afghanistan finding and caring for a dog who had puppies and working to transport the dog and her puppies to the United States (Cooper 2013).

Figure 3.1: Anderson Cooper Reports on "Operation Puppy Rescue"

Still from Cooper, Anderson, "From Afghanistan with Love: Soldiers Reunited with Dogs they Promised to Not Leave Behind." *Anderson Cooper 360. CNN*, *YouTube*, uploaded by LSUDVM, 6 Sept. 2013. (0:24)

The story reports: "When [the dog] got pregnant, they knew her life and the puppies' lives were in danger, the puppies were hungry, and Sheeba was dangerously thin, so the men started giving her, and her seven pups their rations: MRE's, beef jerky, you name it. They bathed them, swaddled them in blankets, and loved them like their own" (Cooper 2013). The dog's precarity is enhanced as she is presented as a *mother* dog—her and her puppies framed as "in danger," presented as innocent and suffering. The story shows the dog, Sheeba, nursing her puppies—presenting her through a maternal framing of nurturance and the puppies as young, innocent, and cute.

Figure 3.2: Mother Dog with Puppies Featured on *Anderson Cooper 360*

Still from Cooper, Anderson, "From Afghanistan with Love: Soldiers Reunited with Dogs they Promised to Not Leave Behind." *Anderson Cooper 360. CNN*, *YouTube*, uploaded by LSUDVM, 6 Sept. 2013. (1:10)

Some of the stories about mother dogs and their puppies emphasize the danger to them from starvation but also from what is reported to be the cruelty of local people. According to one story also discussed in Chapter 2, a U.S. soldier reported that he witnessed acts of cruelty against mother dogs. The story reports Sergeant Mike Cava, one of the soldiers who found Sheeba as saying:

> [I] saw a few Afghanis standing around something and firing at the ground…[I] could see an adult dog and figured that they were shooting the dog over and over again. When [I] got closer, I saw that the situation wasn't what I expected. The corpse of a dog on the ground had a litter of puppies no

> more than a week old and they weren't just shooting the mother but also shooting the pups. (Stoneburner 2014)

Sheeba and her puppies are presented as feminized, animalized and infantilized—an innocent family in danger—are quintessential victims for the "rescue" discourses.

Briggs (2003) argues that the trope of the "mother-with-child" functions in concert with the waif to produce the innocent and hypervisible victims, relevant to these "rescue" discourses. The focus on the mother dog with her puppies in these discourses joins together the waif, mother-with-child, and innocent animal in need of "rescue." These renderings of the dogs' innocence and victim-status in Iraq and Afghanistan make them available for recuperation into the U.S. home. Ignoring the many local citizens in the Middle East who remain in danger at the frontlines, particularly children who also might be considered "innocent," the dogs— "innocent," like the fetus—can be plucked out of danger and brought to the United States, a place they have never been which is nevertheless constructed as their proper, warm, and loving home.

The "rescue" discourses depend on the "cuteness" of the dogs to construct the image of the victim dog available for "rescue." One of the soldiers responsible for transporting Sheeba and her puppies, Cava claimed on the Anderson Cooper special that when he met Sheeba's puppies, "I fell in love. From the second they were born, we were like, 'oh they're cute.' And then we started getting to know their personalities, and you know, you can't leave something like that behind" (Cooper 2012). The *CNN* segment focuses on this "cuteness," showing a variety of images of puppies swaddled in blankets asleep and being held by soldiers.

Figure 3.3 Puppies Swaddled in Blankets Featured on *Anderson Cooper 360*

Still from Cooper, Anderson, "From Afghanistan with Love: Soldiers Reunited with Dogs they Promised to Not Leave Behind." *Anderson Cooper 360. CNN*, *YouTube*, uploaded by LSUDVM, 6 Sept. 2013. (6:23)

The "cuteness" of the dogs further solidifies their location as subjects in need of "rescue." "Cuteness," as Sianne Ngai argues, "[aestheticizes] powerlessness [and] hinges on a sentimental attitude toward the diminutive and/or weak" (Jasper and Ngai 2012). Ngai claims that cute objects are "associated with the infantile, the feminine, and the unthreatening [and] get even cuter when perceived as injured or disabled" (Jasper and Ngai 2011). The focus on the dogs as often young, injured and/or malnourished amplifies this infantilized and debilitated "cuteness."

In some cases, the dog to be "rescued" is constructed as a "hero" dog in its capacity to overcome the alleged violence that threatens it and U.S. troops. The stray dogs can also be framed as hero dogs of war: "stray dogs in Iraq . . . [are] war dogs [and] are often every bit as

heroic in their actions and support of soldiers as the highly-trained military working dogs in Seal Team Six" (Ellis 2011). In one case, U.S. soldiers in Afghanistan claim that a stray dog, Target—which they had found and taken in to their base as a puppy—helped to save them from a suicide bomber. According to a news report, "When a suicide bomber entered a U.S. military barracks in Afghanistan in February, it was not American soldiers but Afghan stray dogs that confronted him. Target and two other dogs snarled, barked and snapped at the man, who detonated his bomb at the entrance to the facility but did not kill anyone" (Lacey 2010).[7] The soldiers eventually transported Target to the United States. This event catalyzed the formation of The Puppy Rescue Mission. News sources reporting on Target's situation emphasizes that she and the other dogs who allegedly stopped the suicide bomber "deserved" to be brought to the United States: "For most, a heroic act such as foiling a suicide bomber's attack on an overseas U.S. Army installation would result in medals, commendations and national acclaim, just to start. For Target (and six other dogs), their reward was medical care, a free trip to the United States, some chew toys and a few rawhide bones" (Ellis 2011). Stories about Target, celebrating her as a "hero" dog, circulated in the mainstream media. She even had an appearance on Oprah. She was even given the title of "Hero Dog" (see, for example, *Daily Mail Reporter* 2010; Ellis 2011; Eowyn 2010; "Hero Afghanistan Dog Target" 2010; Lacey 2010; Pavia 2010; Taylor 2010). News stories about Target construct the dog through a politics of cuteness, as reflected in pictures the media showed of her as a puppy.

Figure 3.4 Target as a Puppy with U.S. Soldier

Image from "Hero Dog Euthanized in Arizona Pound." *Global* Animal, 17 Nov. 2010. https://www.globalanimal.org/2010/11/17/hero-afghanistan-stray-dog-euthanized-in-arizona-pound/

While the figuration of Target as hero dog momentarily elevates the dog from the victimized status of the waif assigned to most stray dogs in Iraq and Afghanistan (and results in one article misgendering her as a "he" [see Lacey 2011]), she serves as an exceptional example of a dog's ability to challenge the conditions that make it a "waif"—here, for example, the (*female)* dog's actions against a suicide bomber. Target's heroism is framed through her victimization. One news source reports that the U.S. soldiers who found her in Afghanistan named her "Target" "because the Afghan men they were training constantly tried to shoot her" (Pavia 2010). Target also is figured as a wounded hero who sustained injuries and wounds because of her alleged "heroic" behavior. The context, then, of the politics of "cuteness" and the infantilized framings of being a "waif" in danger of violence and harm, evidenced by her wounds, continues to structure the figuration of Target as hero.

Discourses of dog "rescue" reveal that dogs are endowed with symbolic capital in U.S. nationalism and renewed frames of orientalism as they are figured as "cute" innocent victims (and, at times, heroes) available for "rescue." They are thus rich figures for inciting and continuing a pro-war sentimental nationalism.

The Fairytales of War "Rescue"

The dog "rescue" discourses, with their positioning of the dog as victim, are framed in terms of the narrative structures of a fairytale described by Vladimir Propp (2009): innocent victim dogs in need of "rescue" from inhumane Iraqis and Afghan people by humane and benevolent U.S. citizen-soldiers, with the help of dog "rescue" organizations as "magical agents" or "fairy godmothers." I provide here the outlines of the narrative form, followed by an example.

Components of the Fairytale: Absentation, Interdiction, and Counter-Actions

As in fairytale narratives, stories about dog "rescue" begin with a description of absentation, in which a protagonist leaves the home—in these stories a soldier leaves the security of the domestic scene—here the United States. As in fairytale narratives, an interdiction is placed on these protagonists—that they cannot adopt local pets or bring these pets to the United States. The protagonist then violates this interdiction—the soldiers bring the dogs to base and try to transport them to the United States. The soldier/protagonist does this in the face of *two* cruel villains: the military and the Iraqi people. The cruel villains threaten to harm the protagonist or his loved ones, to kill or capture them—either U.S. military contractors will capture and kill the dog or it will be tormented by the Iraqi and Afghani people. In some versions of fairytales, the villain carries away the "magical object"

(the dog), which then must be retrieved. The protagonist/soldier desires to have the dog in the United States. In both versions, the military and Middle Eastern people implicitly threaten to expel or destroy the dog. This threat of villainy is then met with a beginning counter action in which the protagonist seeks to redress the lack caused by the villainy. According to Propp (2009, 46), this beginning counter-action is a central moment for the hero, as the decision initiates a set of consequences through which an ordinary person tales on the qualities of heroism This beginning "counter-action" emerges in these stories when the soldiers decide to transport the dogs to the United States. Fairytales are then marked by a "receipt of a magical agent," during which the hero spontaneously stumbles upon help or is offered help by a fellow character.

Components of the Fairytale: Magical Agents and Difficult Tasks

In these "rescue" narratives, organizations like Operation emerge as the "fairy godmother," or "magical agent" who offers to transport the pets to the U.S with help of other more minor magical agents—donors, FedEx, Graphite Airlines etc. (organizations and individuals who contribute to together enable Operation Baghdad Pup to help the hero). In fairytale narratives, the hero then experiences a difficult task that provides an obstacle to their success. In the "rescue narratives" these difficult tasks emerge in the form of various factors that interfere with the transport of the pet to the United States —the military enacting General Order 1A or Iraqi cultural depravity complicating the success of the hero and health of the dogs.

Components of a Fairytale: Victory, Solutions, and Celebrations

The next step in fairytales is then "victory" during which the hero defeats the villain. In "rescue" narratives, this victory comes as the dogs are successfully removed from the threat of the U.S. military and Iraqis and put on a plane to the United States. The fairytale is then marked by "liquidation" in which the initial misfortune or lack is resolved—the dog is folded into the U.S. American family—often taking place or standing in for the protagonist—the family member who initially left the security of the domestic home.

Fairytales are then followed by a "solution" where the task is resolved. In these "rescue" narratives, the solution emerges as the dog is transported to the United States and eventually the soldier is also transported to the United States to join the pet. This solution is then followed by a celebration—often a wedding in classical fairytales during which the hero marries and is rewarded for his actions. In the "rescue" narratives, the hero *adopts* the dog into his/her family. Finally, the fairytale ends with "recognition," as the hero is recognized for his/her actions. Such recognition emerges in these "rescue narratives" when the hero gains public acclaim for his/her actions (becoming a local celebrity, being featured on CNN and Oprah's show, etc.).

Crisp's Fairytale: Rescuing K-Pot and Liberty

The narrative structure of the fairytale and the heteronormative nuclear family in the domestic provides discursive force to the various media reports about Matt Berger and "K-Pot," mentioned at the beginning and throughout this chapter. Crisp frames the story according to the trope of the waif, emphasizing, as previously noted, that Berger found K-Pot as a young and "bleeding puppy" tangled in a "heap of razor wire" (2012, 163).

As in the fairytale narrative, Berger is framed as having to overcome an interdiction—here the U.S. military's policy against having pets on base. Berger was "tested" when his commanding sergeant found out about K-Pot and "Liberty," another dog the troop had adopted, and feared that his superior would shoot and kill the dogs in alignment with General Order 1A. To save the dogs' lives, Berger and his colleagues asked their Iraqi interpreter to take the dogs for the night but according to Crisp's account, such an action still failed to insure that the dogs were treated with appropriate affection. Berger claims that the interpreter kept the dogs in his car because he did not want to bring them into his house. Berger and his fellow soldiers therefore left the base to get K-Pot and Liberty from the interpreter immediately that night. Crisp and Berger both use the story of the failure of appropriate affection on the part of the Iraqi interpreter to emphasize what they allege to be the "backwards" cultural attitudes of Iraqis to dogs. This attitude then in part justifies their collection of funds and work to transport the dogs to the United States. While Crisp and Berger's framing of the case emphasizes this cultural difference as potentially threatening to the dogs, the framing obscures the fact that many people in the United States would not want an unknown and potentially dirty, flea-ridden dog in their own house. Their framing also elides the fact that the Iraqi interpreter was offering to *help* save the dog from the U.S. military—no doubt at some personal inconvenience and perhaps risk—and should not be framed as the reason the dogs were in jeopardy.

Crisp's protagonist, Berger, was again "tested" when he had to break military policy and put his job on the line to "rescue" K-Pot from the Iraqi interpreter—a temporary solution to the imminent death posed by the commanding sergeant and U.S. military policy—but not a long-term solution, as it still left K-Pot at the hands of an Iraqi—who although benevolent—

is still framed as being unable to properly care for the dog. Berger resolved to "rescue" K-Pot from the interpreter and bring him back to the base after the commanding sergeant believed the dogs were gone. Berger knew he was breaking military policy leaving to get the dogs. He told Crisp in an email, "you can't just go outside the wire in enemy territory during the middle of the night and certainly not for a dog" (Crisp 2012, 57). He acknowledged to Crisp that he knew his pay could be docked and that he could lose his rank and commission. Berger is framed as a "hero" under the conventions of a fairytale—willing to risk his own life to protect and "rescue" the victim dog.

Berger sought the aid of a "magical agent," the organization Operation, through his sister, Danielle Berger. According to Crisp, Danielle Berger wrote to her of the dire circumstances: "Unless Operation Baghdad Pups can transport K-Pot and Liberty to the states before [Matt's] platoon moves out, these life-saving dogs will die. I hate to think what it will do to my brother and the other soldiers if two members of their close-knit family are destroyed by the same country they have risked life and limbs for" (Crisp 2012, 53).

The conventions of this fairytale narrative construct the U.S. military as a villain. The narrative frames U.S. soldiers deployed in the Middle East as loving, the dogs that they have adopted as innocent, and the U.S. military as insensitive to this love. The U.S. military threatens to separate the protagonist from the dog who is in the process of being transformed into a "family member." Military regulations threaten to remove the desired object, installing at the center of the relationship fear of love lost.

In this explanation I have foregrounded a narrative in which the unconditional love of soldier and dog is threatened by the intransigent power of the U.S. military. But this story of love is founded on and justified by a story of hate. Like the narrative of love, the narrative of

hate positions U.S. soldiers as loving, and the dogs that they have adopted as innocent. But the widely circulated story of hate is animated by the presence of a villain represented as more barbarous even than the U.S. military whose regulations require the death of the dog: the cruel, inhumane people of Iraq. The story of hate creates a monstrous villain, so that hating the villain justifies loving the dog, and loving the innocent dog justifies hating the villain. The protagonist "rescues" the dog from those he hates who, he claims, hate the dog. For example, Crisp, program coordinator of Operation, frames K-Pot as poised between life (in the United States) or death (in Iraq). She confidently asserts the Iraqi villain's depravity, claiming that dogs "face a painful death on Iraqi streets" and that "Iraqis view dogs and cats as rats, as nuisances, carriers of disease" (Fromer 2008), echoing claims of negative Middle Eastern attitudes toward dogs discussed in Chapter 2.

Crisp writes about the obstacles she experienced while transporting K-Pot from Iraq to the United States. She emphasizes what she frames as the cultural fear of dogs by "animal-fearing Muslims" (Crisp 2012, 73) as one of the major obstacles she has to overcome as she attempts to transport the dogs safely to the United States. She writes about having to spend 24 hours in a Kuwait airport because of a missed connection. She frames this as a dangerous and perilous time in which she had to navigate how to care for the dogs in a culture that she presents as being at best apathetic and at worst disgusted, by dogs. As in the discourses I identified earlier in the chapter, Crisp deploys culturally essentialist Islamophobic claims as she recounts this story, stating that she can't leave the dogs alone in the airport because she claims that "people here would be too afraid to give them food or water, let alone to walk them" (Crisp 2012, 67). Crisp frames herself—the magical agent—as helping the victims during this perilous time.

Under the logic of Crisp's fairytale, she, Matt Berger, Danielle Berger, and Operation defeat the villains (both the U.S. military and Iraqis) when she reports that she successfully transported K-Pot and Liberty to the United States. The fairytale is concluded when Danielle Berger greets Crisp at an airport in Washington, D.C. as Crisp and the dogs alight from a plane from Iraq. The narrative resolution to fairytales emerges after the hero returns home and there is a celebration—often a wedding—where the romance that was threatened during the obstacles of the fairytale is secured and restored. In Crisp's narrative, the meeting between female relatives of the soldiers who sent K-Pot to the United States functions as the "celebration" within this fairytale narrative resolution, folding the dogs into the hetero-nuclear American family. Crisp structures the scene of the dogs arriving in the United States as a scene of "return" for the dogs—despite the fact that these dogs were born and raised in Iraq and had no connection to America besides their relationship with the soldiers who took the dogs onto their bases in Iraq. One news source reporting about K-Pot claimed that "Danielle is dog-sitting until her brother returns from his tour of duty. Her two young sons love K-Pot, and the only thing K-Pot loves more than them is rolling in the green grass in their backyard; something he didn't experience in Iraq" (Thomas-Laury 2008).

Crisp's fairytale narrative of "rescuing" K-Pot sentimentalizes U.S. militarism and casts war in the terms of family drama and melodrama—a story about a male soldier, his sister, and their work to transport a dog into their domestic home and family. Robin Wiegman (1994) argues that melodrama is a narrative strategy often deployed to describe militarism in which "familial tears and fears serves as the emotional texture of war" (177) such that "a process of individual and familial tragedy define[s] and characterize[s] war's emotionality" (179). Similarly, Laura Briggs argues that the domestication of militarism

recasts “international politics as family drama” (2003, 186). Briggs argues that “U.S. intervention in…war [is] figured as the resolution to a familial problem, the needed appearance of the mother/parent/husband who will save [orphaned children] from this dreadful aloneness, incompleteness” (186). As Crisp’s narrative about K-Pot and Berger reflects, dog “rescue” discourses deploy familial tropes through melodramatic narratives that echo constructions of classic fairytales: the soldiers are heroes, the “rescue” organizations are magical agents that help them, Iraqi and Afghani men are villains and the dogs are innocent orphaned victims—potential family members who can be “rescued” from the frontline and folded into the domestic homefront.

The Fairytale of the “Rescued” Dog as an Affective Device

The fairytale narratives I identify above of “rescuing” Iraqi and Afghan dogs to become pets in the United States for returning soldiers intertwine together two “affective economies” in Ahmed’s terms (2004): pet love and pro-military American nationalism. According to Ahmed, “affective economies” constitute formations of emotions, signs and discourses that align some bodies and communities *with* each other and *against* others. The discourses of “pet rescue” organizations deliberately bring together these two sites saturated with affect for Americans in order to encourage support and donations. As their names suggest (Operation, Mission), they frame themselves in terms of both sentimentality and pro-military patriotism, folding together dogs, soldiers, and families, emphasizing their virtues and “bonds” among them. As one donor to Operation reflects: “I was on board because I thought saving animals and supporting the troops, you know, what two things could be better?” (Cooper 2012). Given these discourses, to donate to a “rescue” organization or to take a “rescued” dog into one’s home is, in effect, to participate in military action at a

distance. It thus becomes a kind of militarism of everyday life in the domestic sphere, where one can demonstrate patriotism and support military action by caring for a “rescued” dog.

Ahmed argues that the circulation of positive affects—such as affects of patriotism and sentimentality toward U.S. soldiers and Middle Eastern dogs in these discourses—is often crucially linked to claims of love, but claims of love that extends only to *some* bodies and *some* communities; creating positive affect for some bodies and communities relies on the circulation of affects of hate for *other* bodies and communities (Ahmed 2004). The discourses of “rescue” that I analyze mobilize the figure of the dog as an affective-laden signifier to present a sanitized and heart-warming fairytale narrative that provides a sentimental image of the frontlines as a site of friendship and bonding, placing a humanizing face on a war marked by damage to U.S. soldiers, but also to hundreds of thousands of Iraqi and Afghani civilians as well as combatants.[8]

The fairytale narratives in the dog “rescue” discourses’ use of rhetorics of “love”—love between families, between soldiers and dogs and between citizens and the nation—where “dogs carry the hearts of the they had left behind”—contrasts to the reliance on rhetorics of “hate” and “fear” in describing Iraqis and Afghanis in relation to dogs. Ahmed argues that evoking love in the context of race and nationalism is a powerful maneuver that rewrites a project grounded on hate and violence into one framed as “redemptive, or about saving the loved other” (2004, 123). This is a central affective maneuver of the “war on terror,” according to Ahmed, and a mechanism by which the fairytale narrative of the “rescue” discourses persists in ways that justify the hatred of the “enemy other” marked as villain and evil in these frameworks.

The trope of the victimized Iraqi dog—and the affects of love it elicits from the U.S. soldier and U.S. public—is a central mechanism through which the discourses of Operation bring together affective economies of "puppy love" with the affective economies of American nationalism that contain pro-war sentiment. The final frame of a commercial advertisement for a documentary that focuses on the work of Operation shows a small brown and white puppy curled up under a camouflage military hat and gun (shown below).

Figure 3.5: Puppy Sleeping on Ground Covered with Military Hat and Gun

Still from Goosenberg-Kent, Ellen. *No Dog Left Behind.* 15 Nov. 2009. *YouTube*, uploaded by American Heroes Channel, 6 Nov, 2009. (1:15)

The image reflects how Operation brings together affects surrounding humanitarianism, dogs and militarism. This confluence is central to Operation's discourse. It is explicit when Crisp states:

> isn't only about saving a dog…It's [also] about supporting our troops… [Bagdad Pups] does more than save the lives of these animals; it also brings comfort and peace of mind to our U.S. soldiers serving overseas and helps them cope when they return home. (SPCAI n.d.)

Notable in this regard are the quasi-military names of the two organizations—including "operation" and mission"—evoking such recent military labels such as "Operation Iraqi Freedom" (2003-2010) and "Operation New Dawn" (2010-2011). Through their names, the organizations frame their "humanitarian" work as a military operation, just as military names its operations as humanitarian (e.g. "Operation Iraqi Freedom"). The "humanitarian" work of these organizations helps the military materially and ideologically. This help is privatized and rendered outside of the military's scope, but justified because of the alleged loving nature of U.S. soldiers and U.S. citizens. The confluence of these frames allows support for the military—a commitment to killing the Middle Eastern "enemy"—to join with a support for a humanitarian organization that claims to protect the lives of dogs—objects of "love" in U.S. affective economies of "puppy love."

These "rescue" organizations and discourses are part of the larger politics in the "war on terror," displaying what Michel Foucault (2007) terms "governmentality"—the multifaceted and dispersed nature of modern power beyond the state that works through the management and control of the everyday to produce disciplined citizen-subjects. Humanitarian projects oriented to "saving lives" through rhetorics of love are central to

formations of governmentality in war. The “rescue” formations reflect an example in which the work to “save lives” (here of dogs) coalesces with military projects of death, here through a rhetoric of love—love for the dog, the soldier, and the nation. Inderpal Grewal argues that within the co-articulation of humanitarianism with militarism, “the powers of freedom . . . [that] produce modes of governmentality are undertaken not simply by the sovereign right to kill, but also through the legal right to save. . . It is the interrelation between the sovereign right to kill and the humanitarian right to “rescue” that constitutes modes of modern power, whether by states or other institutions of power” (2003, 537). Although humanitarianism and militarism are presented as dialogically opposed, they are linked in what Jennifer Terry calls “the symbiotic relationship between war-making and humanitarianism” (2009, 220). According to Terry, “we cannot afford to assume that war, imperialism, and humanitarianism belong to different moral orders.” For Terry, “’saving’ or ‘rescuing’ are…regulatory mechanisms [that] draw on an ideal of freedom and an anxiety about unfreedom” (2009, 220). The “rescue” discourses depend on this construction of the free and unfree to justify their work and play on the sentiments of the American public.

The “Rescued” Dog as an Affective Technology of Nationalism

The fairytale rhetorics, affects, and effects of the dog “rescue” organizations fit well within what Lauren Berlant calls the “intimate public sphere”—a culture that is structured on the spectacles and experiences of private life (1997). Berlant argues that the intimate public ties national belonging to moralizing discourses, domesticity and family values, such that American citizenship becomes privatized, domesticated, sentimentalized and infantilized. In this sphere, citizenship emerges as a “mode of volunteerism and privacy” between domestic spaces and the endangered families within them (1997, 5). In the family-oriented focus of

the intimate public sphere, Berlant claims, "the most hopeful national pictures of 'life' circulating in the public sphere are not of adults in everyday life, in public, or in politics, but rather of the most vulnerable, minor or virtual citizens—fetuses, children, real and imaginary immigrants—persons that, paradoxically, cannot yet act as citizens and are in need of protection" (1997, 5). Berlant maintains that subjects such as the child and the fetus are understood to be characterized by their powerlessness, and their status as not yet citizens. Their "innocence" and need for protection brings them to the fore; their apparent lack of agency creates an ethical claim on those with political power (1997, 6).

The figure of the dog is central to the American intimate public sphere (see Uddin 2003; Weaver 2013).[9] Dogs are folded into the hetero-nuclear family—treated as pseudo-citizens—at the same time they remain innocent victims—property to be protected and discarded at will (Dayan 2011; Glenney Boggs 2013; Haraway 2003, 2008). Within the Western imaginary, the figure of the dog has long been deployed to signify loyalty and companionship, to evoke sentimentality as "man's best friend" (Nast 2006a, 2006b).

The rhetorics of fairytale depend on familial stories about the "private" sphere that are made intensely public. For Berlant, in the intimate public sphere, intimacy is both private and public, individual and collective—and it mediates between these two allegedly opposing spheres: "intimacy…involves an aspiration for a narrative about something shared, a story about both oneself and others that will turn out in a particular way. Usually, this story is set within zones of familiarity and comfort: friendship, the couple, and the family form, animated by expressive and emancipating kinds of love. Yet the inwardness of the intimate is met by a corresponding publicness" (1998, 281).

The rhetorics of fairytale capture how the "rescue" discourses enter into the "intimate public sphere" through heterofamilial frameworks. As stories that position soldiers as heroes—almost like the heroic prince, rescuing the dog as "damsel in distress," with the help of NGO workers, who are positioned similarly to "fairy godmothers," through the work of bringing the dog to the U.S. family—the "rescue" discourses carry a familiar and well-established rhetorical structure and affective framework in terms of familial and national love. The rhetorics interpellate—hail and call out to—subjects in the United States into heteronormative fairytales about war that position these subjects as able to help resolve the fairytale through their everyday actions in the intimate public sphere.

Berlant argues that the intimate public sphere "renders citizenship as a condition of social membership produced by personal acts and values, especially acts originating in or directed towards the family sphere" (1997, 43). The dog "rescue" organizations depend on these types of mobilizations—asking Americans to donate cash, to volunteer to care for dogs, and to host fundraisers to help support the organization's work. Where the soldier makes her sacrifice on the frontlines, the "rescue" organizations allow people in the United States to also support the war as part of their everyday life. The organizations provide soldiers' testimonies in their fundraising efforts. By appealing to the public through these soldiers' words, the organizations make an appeal for those *at home* to support those on the frontlines—dogs and soldiers.

Those in the United States can thus participate in the intimate public sphere by donating to support the "rescue" organizations fairytale work—work that is oriented to supporting the nation and recuperating the normative nuclear family—including its pets. In Berlant's terms, those who donate to organizations such as Operation and Mission

demonstrate their citizenship through these personal acts oriented toward the private domestic sphere—framing themselves as good citizens who participate in, and support, war from the intimate public sphere. Their personal response to the narratives of dog "rescue"—being moved by affects of love and threat—can be seen as verifying their role as "compassionate subjects," demonstrating their own capacity for love in the midst of violence. Their affect reveals to themselves and to others their own "kindness," and by extension, the kindness of the nation (see Ahmed 2004).

These everyday performances of patriotic love and "puppy love" in the domestic sphere become expressions of national love that also help to ground feelings of hatred and fear towards the "enemy other" through the rhetorics of the fairytale narrative I describe above. Ahmed claims that "experiences of fear became lived as patriotic declarations of love, which [allows] home to be mobilized as a defense against terror" (2004, 74). In these contexts, according to Ahmed, "self-love becomes national love that legitimates the responses to terror as protection of the loved other" (2004, 75). The figure of the "rescued" dog in the American home serves as an affective technology to develop a widely recognized "loved other"; in these fairytales of war, the need to "rescue" that "loved other" from a place framed as irredeemably cruel helps to justify a militarized nationalism in the United States.

The "rescue" discourses also use the rhetorical force of the fairytale narrative to treat the dog's integration into the intimate public sphere in the United States as part of the resolution of the fairytale. The discourses are based on the goal of bringing the dogs to the United States to become, in effect U.S. immigrants, "sponsored" by U.S. citizen-soldiers. One news source frames some of the "rescued" dogs under these terms: "the seven mixed-breed dogs are the latest furry immigrants to our country and the newest members of seven

military families in Maine, Georgia and Arizona" (Neff 2010). Pro-military and nationalistic sentiment infuse the discourses of dog "rescue" in their relentless positioning of the dogs as coming "home," despite the fact that the dogs are from Iraq and Afghanistan and have never been to the United States before. The "rescue" discourses construct the United States as the appropriate home for dogs, claiming "no animal is truly safe until its paws touch U.S. soil," rendering the U.S. homefront as a place of peace and safety (Crisp 2012, second cover).[10]

Crisp (20012) references proper notions of U.S. patriotism and consumerism in claiming that the [immigrant] dog accepts his or her new cultural responsibilities. She describes the dogs engaging in various behaviors she frames as making them "American." For example, the arrival of "Charlie," the first dog that Operation transported to the United States, provoked a narrative where in after landing in Washington, D.C., Crisp "walk[ed] Charlie past his new country's beautiful buildings and military monuments," reflecting, "our stroll along the National Mall could not have felt more patriotic. Charlie stopped to christen every corner and claimed this country as his own" (2012, 36). In another instance, she describes emailing a soldier about the dog he sent with her to the United States: "I treated [the dog] to his first McDonald's cheeseburger minus the ketchup, lettuce and pickles. Your dog is a real American now" (2012, 87). In both cases, Crisp uses imagery saturated with American nationalism—from iconic patriotic landmarks and memorials in Washington, D.C., to a trip to McDonald's—to fold the dogs into a familiar narrative of a safe and even triumphant arrival to the United States.

Crisp further positions the dogs as willing participants who desire to be folded into the terms of American citizenship, in effect producing citizenship in the ways that Berlant argues.

The Fairy Godmothers of Dog "Rescue"

Gender and race infuse the heterofamilial fairytale rhetorics of dog "rescue." The founders of Operation (Terri Crisp) and Mission (Anna Cannan) are both white women. The rhetorics they deploy in the "rescue" discourses shape them as "magical agents"—virtually "fairy godmothers"—maternal, nurturing, and caring individuals who are willing to risk everything to help innocent dogs, as well as U.S. soldiers, their families, and by extension, the nation.

Crisp positions herself in the role of "magical agent" in the fairytale "rescue" narratives. She frames herself as the dogs' "protector" (2012, 66) and as a "lone woman" who "risks everything" to transport the dogs (2012, fourth cover). Crisp positions herself as risking her life because she enters a "war zone" to get the dogs and understands that what she is doing is also against military policy. For example, in a documentary *No Dog Left Behind* about Operation's work, she says, "I knew from the beginning that we were breaking the rules. And I thought, boy, if they're willing to take the chance, I'm willing to do it too" (2009). Crisp positions herself and the soldiers as violating the rules of the nation for the greater love of a dog.

Figure 3.6 U.S. Soldier and Terri Crisp with a Dog in Crate

Still from Goosenberg-Kent, Ellen. *No Dog Left Behind.* 15 Nov. 2009. *YouTube*, uploaded by American Heroes Channel, 6 Nov, 2009. (0:59)

The documentary shows Crisp with a U.S. soldier together kneeling down on either side of a dog crate with a dog inside. The image and voice over together frame Crisp as a central element in the successful work of the “rescue” missions.

Crisp describes her work through a rhetoric of loyalty and sentimentality, writing, for example, that her memoir is “dedicated to all the animals that have suffered and died in Iraq. They are my reason not to give up” (2012, n.p.). She continues this sentimentality through her memoir, writing: “the face of each of the Iraqi dogs will forever be etched in my mind and heart. Each time I am reminded of one, I smile. It is a comfort to know that they are

now smiling, too" (2008, xiii). Through these claims, she positions her work as selfless and emerging from a self infused with love and nurturance.

Cannan also positions herself in the role of "magical agent" in the fairytale "rescue" narratives as she describes her work to form Mission. Cannan claims that she decided to continue her work transporting dogs for her fiancé, a soldier in the Middle East, by creating an official organization to transport dogs for other U.S. soldiers stationed there.[11] Canaan claims, "I'm the type of person who absolutely loves animals, and I wasn't just going to save one, I was going to save them all." Like Crisp, she positions her work as dangerous and challenging:

> The scariest thing was transporting them from the base to a shelter in Afghanistan and having to go through mine fields and war zones…I wouldn't want anyone else to have to do it all themselves, but it's been very rewarding…Putting smiles on all these soldiers' faces has made it more rewarding. (Neff 2010)

Cannan situates herself as the "magical agent" in this fairytale framework—she is the good heteronormative citizen— undertaking work to care for her family and the nation through humanitarian work that supports U.S. militarism.[12]

I argue that the work of Crisp, Cannan and their respective organizations is rooted in a gendered colonial formation central to the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan in which white American women work to "save" what they frame as innocent threatened lives in Iraq and Afghanistan.[13] These narratives shift the orientalist colonial fantasy of the white woman "rescuing" Muslim women (in Spivak's terms, "white women saving brown women from

brown men" [1988, 293]) to one where the white woman "rescues" dogs ("white women saving dogs from brown men"). The story of Crisp's and Cannan's work with Operation and Mission thus enables framing the United Sites as a place of gender equality, where liberated women serve alongside enlightened men.[14]

Disrupting the Fairytales of "Rescue"

Multiple contradictions are at work in the gendered orientalism of the "rescue" discourses which reveal the way the discourses instrumentalize the figure of the dog. In providing a restorative and recuperative narrative for U.S. militarism—the "rescue" discourses elide well-documented, widespread examples and structural manifestations of American violence against humans and animals in Iraq, Afghanistan, and the United States. The rhetorical force of the fairytale narrative of dog "rescue" discourses hides incongruities of their work and rhetoric. While the "rescue" narratives attempt to present seamless fairytale accounts of (dogs as) victims, (U.S. soldiers as) heroes, (non-profit workers as) "magical agents," and (U.S. military, Iraqis, and Afghan people as) villains, the nuanced complexities and material realities of the activities and organizations of dog "rescue" reveal the gap between the "rhetoric" of these fairytales and the "reality" of neoliberal capitalism, racialized militarism and heteronormative familial sentimentality. Various cases involving financial controversy, U.S. dog-killing practices, and false and exaggerated claims about "rescuing" dogs reveal the gaps, problematic assumptions, and misrepresentations of the "rescue" discourses.

The exigencies of fundraising and publicity requires dog "rescue" organizations to use all of their discursive resources to position themselves as successful, in order to attract more funding. The result may be that the discourses of the organizations present a glowing

picture contradicted by reality. For example, a CNN investigative report on Operation's claims alleges that the organization transported only 26 service animals, while the remainder of the 500 dogs it transported were strays ("Baghdad Pups' Charity Investigated" 2012).[15] Operation's claim that they "rescue" only *stray* dogs in Iraq and Afghanistan is misleading. Crisp and Operation, for example, have apparently also transported dogs who already had homes in the Middle East. In one remarkable case, Crisp and Operation appeared on HLN with "Ivy" and "Nugget," two former bomb-sniffing dogs that Crisp said were abandoned military working dogs. She claimed: "As the military pulls out and there's not as great a need to have these dogs, there's a surplus…These contractors don't know what to do with them so these are the dogs that are falling through the cracks and they need homes desperately" (Feldman 2012). According to Crisp it is "unthinkable" that the military contractors do not return the dogs back to their countries of origin. "And that's why SPCA International is trying to put a spotlight on this so these dogs are not overlooked," Crisp said (Feldman 2012). Yet according to the CNN report: "A spokesman for Reed, the contractor that employed the dogs, however, told CNN that the animals had been given secure new homes out of the war zone in Kurdistan and that Crisp had suddenly shown up 'out of the blue' asking to take them to the United States" (Cooper 2012). The CNN report claimed that the dogs were in reality "donated and taken from adoptive homes after SPCA International asked for them" (Cooper 2012). When asked about the allegations, an SPCA International spokeswoman told CNN the charity had "not heard that from Reed before" and said the dogs had been removed from "an uncaring environment in Iraq" (Cooper 2012). The discourses of dog "rescue" *require* all environments in Iraq to be "uncaring" in order to sustain the fairytale narrative.

The exigencies of fundraising and publicity may also lead to problems in coordinating activities and meeting requirements about vaccinations and other health-related issues. In one case, upon his arrival in the United States, a dog named "Crusader" was found to have rabies (Hartocollis 2008).[16] According to a report from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Crusader was hospitalized upon his arrival to the United States because he has signs of illness, "including fever, diarrhea, wobbly gait, agitation and crying" ("Rabies in a Dog Imported from Iraq" 2008). Days later he was euthanized. The other dogs with him were quarantined, but then shipped across 16 states to their new adoptive homes, five days before lab results revealed Crusader had rabies. Many of the dogs transported were the center of "welcome home" events where the dogs could have exposed people and other pets to rabies (Hartocollis 2008). The CDC report claims that Crusader was not subjected to standard protocol that requires all pets imported to the United States to be vaccinated 30 days before their arrival ("Rabies in a Dog Imported from Iraq" 2008). The CDC report claims the dogs were given shots only a few days before their flight. According to a *New York Times* article about the case, federal and state authorities located the 23 other Iraqi dogs that had been sent throughout the country (Hartocollis 2008). The dogs were vaccinated and put in a six-month quarantine.

In some of the "rescue" discourses, Middle Eastern people disrupt the logic of the orientalist constructions the narratives depend on. Crisp, for example, describes waiting with two empty dog crates (intended for K-Pot and Liberty) at an airport in Kuwait. According to Crisp,

> Two [men] came over to where I was standing. One cautiously touched the crates as if afraid he might be bitten, while the other man inquired, "where are dogs?"
>
> "Baghdad," I said. "I take two dogs to U.S. for soldiers."
>
> "You don't have dogs in America?"
>
> "Yes, we do," I replied, trying not to laugh. "But these dogs are special."
>
> (Crisp 2012, 64)

In this interaction, the Kuwaiti man questions and potentially ruptures the logic of Crisp's "rescue" mission. One of the men inquires why Crisp is bringing dogs to America—noting that there are already dogs in America. To Crisp—and, she assumes, to her audience—the man's inquiry registers as silly and laughable. It frames the Middle Eastern man as deficient in love of dogs, unable to understand the larger "special" significance of the dogs she presents herself on a mission to save. From another point of view, however, the man's question exposes the peculiarity of the economy of value within which the love for one dog justifies its "rescue" and transportation—at enormous expense, paid by unknown publics. For the man in the Kuwait airport, the idea of Crisp bringing dogs from Iraq to the United States seems nonsensical, because there are already dogs in America. The discursive frame for the fairytale narratives of dog "rescue" positions the teller of the tale (U.S. citizens) to characterize the villain and his cruel nature. But occasionally, as demonstrated above, the teller may not recognize that comments by the purported villains call into question their villainy and turn attention to the tellers' unquestioned values.

The discursive construction of the fairytale narrative depends on a binary between a cruel and unsafe Middle East and a warm and welcoming United States. Crisp's claim that "no animal is truly safe until its paws touch U.S. soil," situated the U.S. homefront as a place of peace and safety (Crisp 2012, second cover). The fictional nature of this binary is always evident when considering the number of dogs killed in the United States. However, its fictional nature is particularly evident when Target, the dog rendered "hero" for saving U.S. troops from a suicide bomber and transported to the United States by Mission, was killed in a pound in Casa Grande, Arizona, after she went loose from her owner's home (Taylor 2010). A news story about the incident reports:

> Target, not used to being confined, escaped last Friday afternoon from [her owner's] home…After being spotted on the loose, she was reported to Pinal County's animal control. Target was brought to the county animal shelter in Florence, where she was held just like any other run-of-the-mill stray.
> Because she had no tag, microchip or license with the county, her photo went up on the shelter's website last Friday in hopes that her owner might respond. (Lacey 2010).

Although her owner identified her on a website and even paid a fee to retrieve her, the dog was killed before the owner could get her back. The pound framed Target's death as a mistake resulting from employee negligence.

The routine nature of the killing of Target in the United States disrupts the "rescue" discourses' construction of the United States as a place of safety that assures a "good life" for the dogs, in contrast to Iraq and Afghanistan as places of danger and death for them. As one report notes, Target "lived through explosions in war-torn Afghanistan couldn't survive a

brief stay at an Arizona animal shelter" ("Hero Dog from Afghanistan Mistakenly Killed" 2010). The case reveals that dogs are indeed *not* safe in the United States and that stray dogs are routinely killed there by government and organizational authorities, often more expeditiously than would be the case in Iraq or Afghanistan.

The fairytale narrative of "rescue" is also undermined by controversy about the finances of SPCA International (SPCAI), the organization in which Operation is housed. A CNN special investigative report revealed, for example, that SPACI raised over $14 million and only spent "about $450,000" to transport dogs from the Middle East (or 3% of the organization's overall fundraising for the year). It also only spent about $60,000 (or .5% of the organizations overall fundraising revenue) to support animal shelters in the United States (Cooper 2012). The majority of the money went to pay for fundraising—primarily direct-mail, from which the organization is still in debt.[17]

Crisp was also the center of a controversy in relation to a previous charity she ran called "Noah's Wish," which claimed to help "rescue" dogs from Hurricane Katrina. The Attorney General of California investigated Crisp and the Charity to see if they really spent the money on rescuing the dogs—since the majority of the charity's money was spent also on direct-mail fundraising through a company called Quadrangle (Cooper 2012). Crisp reached a settlement with the State of California in 2007 surrounding a case involving Noah's Wish. Part of the agreement for Crisp was that she was not to serve on the board of any more charities. Despite these controversies and complexities, the fairytale framework for these "rescue" discourses operates as an ever-renewing rhetorical form that hides misrepresentations and disruptions.

Conclusion

To summarize the claims I have made in this chapter, the dog "rescue" discourses mobilize orientalist discourses of "puppy love" as affective capital to interpellate subjects within the intimate public sphere into orientalist affective economies of the "war on terror" The discourse constructs Americans as trustworthy allies and soldiers, while they frame Iraqis and Afghanis as monstrous villains who must always be understood as the "enemy" of those with "worthy" lives: Americans and dogs they love. The discourses thus position treating an animal with appropriate affect—as defined by U.S. hegemonic frameworks—as capital for life: one gains a worthy life by being folded into the normative frames of Western pet love. The effect of this framing is a discursive dehumanization of Iraqis and a move toward quasi-human status for the dogs that are produced as hypervisible innocent victims who can be "rescued" by militarized humanitarianism.

Notes

[1] General Order 1A. http://cdn.factcheck.org/UploadedFiles/2013/08/GeneralOrderGO-1A.pdf

[2] Operation Baghdad Pups, founded in 2008, is based in New York. The program is an initiative of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty against Animals International (SPCAI), which presents itself as working for "global animal rescue" and helping to unite national animal shelters globally ("Operation Baghdad Pups" n.d.). Crisp indicates that she started to think about the program in 2007 after a soldier contacted the SPCAI along with other organizations in an effort to arrange to transport a local Middle Eastern dog to the United States. The arrangements were made by Crisp, who worked at the SPCAI and had previous experience transporting dogs after Hurricane Katrina. After this initial case, other soldiers contacted Crisp and the SPCAI, which led to the permanent formation of the organization. The organization claims it has "rescued" over 550 animals from Iraq as of 2016 ("Operation Baghdad Pups: Helping Soldiers' Pets" n.d.). The organization is funded through private donations. Operation has been featured in multiple media outlets—CBS, NBS, MSNBC etc. Terri Crisp, the program coordinator of Operation Baghdad Pups, has written a memoir that grounds some of this analysis.

[3] The Puppy Rescue Mission, founded in 2012, is based in Celina, Texas. The organization claims that is has brought almost 1,000 animals from the Middle East to the United States since its inception. Anna Cannan, a military spouse, founded the organization. Cannan claims that she began Puppy Rescue mission after her fiancé at the time, Christopher Chiasson, a soldier with the Army National Guard stationed in Afghanistan, told her about several dogs that he and his fellow soldiers had befriended while in Afghanistan and wanted to bring to the United States. Chiasson claimed that two dogs, Rufus and Target, protected his troops' combat post from a suicide bomber (Mission, "Our History," n.d.). and that Chiasson and his friends had cared for the dogs and Target's puppies and grew attached to them. Cannan ran an online raffle, sold candles, and created a Facebook page that she called "Puppy Rescue Mission" to try and fundraise to bring the dogs to the United States (at a cost of about $3,000 per dog) ("Our History" n.d.). After successfully raising funds to transport the original three dogs, Cannan created an official organization. The organization depends on homefront mobilizations—

asking Americans to donate cash, volunteer to care for dogs and host fundraisers to help support the organization's work, and, in effect, according to the organization's logic, support U.S. soldiers and the nation. Cannan was a guest on the show "Lost and Found" on The Oprah Winfrey Network (OWN) in a show titled "Connected at the Heart" (2013).

[4] Organizations such as Operation, Mission, Nowzad ("Nowzad: Winning the War for Animals," n.d.), and Guardians of Rescue's (GR) ("Guardians of Rescue," n.d.) arrange the logistics of transporting dogs from Iraq and Afghanistan to the United States, which can cost $3,000 to $5,000 per dog ("Operation Baghdad Pups: Where Your Money Goes" n.d.). Operation claims to have transported some 550 dogs from the Middle East to the United States. and Mission, almost 1,000 ("Operation Baghdad Pups" n.d.).

[5] I analyze material from Operation and Mission—their websites, fundraising material, YouTube videos, media interviews with their directors. I also analyze discourses about the organizations and their activities as they circulate into broad public arenas, news reports, and media outlets such as CBS, NBS, and MSNBC. By 2013, Puppy Rescue Mission raised over $1.5 million for its work (Gaudiosi 2013).

[6] Including the deaths of Iraqi and Afghani dogs as "casualties of war" emphasizes the distinction made by the U.S. government between those lives that should be grievable and those that should not. The U.S. government has an extensive and precise list of deaths of U.S. citizens in Iraq and Afghanistan—6,700 as of 2015 (Watson Institute 2015)—there are no official U.S. records of Iraqi and Afghani casualties—estimated to be between 170,000 to 250,000 Iraqi deaths and 90,000 Afghani deaths (with almost an equal number wounded or debilitated) (Watson Institute 2015). Turning attention to the dead dogs keeps attention focused away from the Iraqi and Afghani lives injured and lost in war.

[7] Another source provides more details of what appears to be the same incident, claiming that "One night in February a man wearing 25lb (11kg) of explosives stole into the base, pausing for a moment to pray, and headed towards the building that housed the American soldiers. The three dogs attacked the bomber, waking most of the base in the process, and he detonated the explosives in a doorway…Five soldiers were wounded, and Sasha had to be put down, but Target and Rufus survived and were declared heroes" (Pavia, 2010). Yet a third report claims "Bear's mother and two other dogs [including Target] attacked a suicide bomber as he tried to enter a small compound in which more than 40 U.S. Army soldiers were present on Feb. 11. 'Fortunately, the door he chose to come through was the one the dogs [Sasha, Target and

Rufus] slept near. They attacked him and barked and kept him from coming inside,' said U.S. Army Sgt. Chris Duke, one of the soldiers present during the attack. 'He got the door open and was at a 45-degree angle and then he prematurely detonated himself while inside the doorway because he couldn't get past the dogs. The majority of the blast went into the walls because the door was inset. Shrapnel hit Sasha, and Rufus had severe injuries. Sasha had to be put down, but our regular medics, with the help of some advice from a veterinarian we called, saved the other two'" (Neff 2010).

[8] Absent from this framing of the "kindly American" are the systematic eradication programs of the U.S. military—of people and dogs—the role of the U.S. military and its contractors in systematically killing dogs on and around U.S. bases, the documented cruelty of U.S. soldiers toward local dogs, and the systematic cruelty in the United States toward pets, livestock, and wild animals (see Chapter 2).

[9] Racialized, gendered and classed systems of power in Victorian England together with Enlightenment ideals and the rise of the public and private sphere, and with it, the cult of domesticity, were central to the development of modern day "pet love" in the West (see Nast 2006a). In Victorian England, animals shifted from being perceived as merely commodities and tools to being considered as pets: from utilitarian animals to being sentimental animals (Deckha 2013, 520). The shift of some kinds of animal from property to pet was accompanied by the shifting conceptions of the domestic home in Victorian England.

With the rise of the distinction between the public and the private sphere, and the concurrent development of the "cult of domesticity," pets emerged as class and gender signifiers of the domestic home. Deckha (2013) argues that the pet was central to the construction of the domestic home: signaling the private realm of refuge that is deeply gendered: a refuge for the working husband to return to after work where his wife will be waiting. The "lady's lap dog," emerged as a central icon in this system of signification that helped to produce a racialized, classed and gendered representation of the domestic home through a representation of human and animal intimacy. The gendered depiction was deeply classed as it signified an upper-class leisurely domesticity (Deckha 2013). The growth of animals as domestic pets in upper-class Victorian spaces was also a practice that the lower classes adopted. Thus, because of the growth of "pet keeping" in Victorian England—*some* animals—particularly dogs and cats— shifted from being treated as tools and commodities to being treated with sentimentality and compassion: as sentimental animals that were part of the nuclear and domestic family.

[10] As Crisp reflects, “When those paws of those dogs or those cats touch American soil, than I know we did it” (Cooper 2013).

[11] She claims that she “made up a Facebook profile [Puppy Rescue Mission], had to create an online account for people to chip in online, opened up a KeyBank account to store the money coming in, and spent hours on end promoting and advertising the site and [her] cause” (Neff 2010).

Cannan claims she received help from other organizations as well. Cannan reflects: “Robert’s Cause helped me get the dogs through customs, which is complicated, from John F. Kennedy Airport. Pilots and Paws flew the animals up from Maine to Bangor free, and Pen Sarthing of www.nowzaddogs.com really helped me a lot with the research and information on how to do this,” Canaan’s work was featured throughout mainstream media; she was, for example, featured on CBS News with Katie Couric, ABC News with Diane Sawyer, an on a segment on Fox & Friends (Neff 2010).

[12] Cannan’s role as founder of Mission in 2012 dovetails with the increased rhetorical emphasis on family support for deployed troops that emerges with Michelle Obama and Jill Biden’s “Joining Forces” initiative that started in 2011. The initiative claims to support service members’ families and veterans with employment as well as private and public services. Discourses about the initiative frame military families as active participants in supporting U.S. military efforts. The initiative’s motto, “when our troops serve, their families serve, too” signals the initiative’s domestication of U.S. militarism within the U.S. family (“Joining Forces”). Like Cannan, women on the homefront—often wives and mothers of soldiers, are expected to do the ideological work of caretaking—both of the family and the nation—during war, such that they become “caretakers of national sentiment” (Cohler 2006, 252).

[13] Orientalist discourses that positioned women and queers as needing to be “rescued” from a barbaric Islamic patriarchal culture have been central to American’s *production* of ideological justifications the U.S.-led invasions of Iraq and Afghanistan, a continuation of what Gayatri Spivak characterizes as a gendered colonial relationship (see also Abu-Lughod 2002; Bacchetta 2002; Cohler 2006; Puar 2007). These gendered orientalist “rescue” narratives “*stick*,” in Ahmed’s terms, to the discourses about “rescuing” dogs from Iraq and Afghanistan.

[14] The emphasis on women as nurturers for the dogs found in the “rescue” discourse echoes the way that white women have been central to creating a humane face to Missions of empire on the

frontlines as well as homefront (McClintock 1995). In the postfeminist orientalist context of the "war on terror," descriptions of female soldiers like Warwick, who work to "rescue" dogs on the frontlines of Iraq and Afghanistan, in addition to civilians like Crisp and Cannan, helps to position the United Sites as the site of gender equality, under a "nationalist feminism" that deploys a depoliticized feminist rhetoric to support empire (Cohler 2006), where liberated women demonstrate their own freedom and freedom they are afforded in the United States by "rescuing" subordinated others. This narrative serves postfeminist fantasies of U.S. sexual exceptionalism that imagine (white) women as liberated demonstrated through their work to "rescue" victimized "others." At the same time, the women's work as *caretakers* for the dogs and their work to *domesticate* the dogs frame them through normative gendered configurations of reproductive labor under a homefront nationalism.

[15] The investigative report also notes that the 26 service animals "rescued" "were not attached to military K-9 units but belonged to Reed Inc., a private contractor that built roads in Iraq and Afghanistan." ("Baghdad Pups' Charity Investigated" 2012).

[16] Operation transported the dog with 23 others from Iraq to Newark Liberty International Airport on June 5, 2008 (Hartocollis 2008).

[17] In 2010, SPCA International owed $8.4 million to Quadriga Art LLC and its affiliated company, Brickmill Marketing Services, according to publicly available Internal Revenue Service 990 tax records (Cooper 2012).

Chapter 4: Homecomings and "Queer Hauntings"

In this chapter I analyze several prominent discourses about military homecomings from deployment in the "war on terror" that focus on the interactions between soldiers and dogs as contributing to and constituting the military family.

I analyze these discourses to consider a series of questions: How do gendered and racialized politics of heteronormative nationalism inform representations of soldiers' homecoming to their dogs? How do these representations negotiate the shifting presence of women as combatants and soldiers in the "war on terror" and manage the figure of the female soldier as citizen-subject? How do these representations promote and domesticate militarism? How might these representations also present "queer" disruptions of heteronormative nationalism? In effect, I ask: how are gender and heteronormativity produced at the scene of homecoming through the figure of the dog?

I draw on a broad archive of U.S. news reports and media representations of the homecomings of soldiers that involve reunions with dogs from 2003 to 2017. Stories about the meetings circulate in news reports as varied as ABC News (2009) and NBC News, *Anderson Cooper Live* (2012), *The Queen Latifah Show* (2013), mainstream commercials marketing dog food ("Iams Dog Food Commercial: Keep Love Strong" 2013), and popular culture products such as fictional television shows and films.

The "traditional" military homecoming—welcoming the male soldier back into the heterosexual family—has long been a staple in establishing connections between military action and secure domesticity in the national imaginary. Representations of contemporary scenes of military homecoming have been dramatically shaped by the increase in the number

of women soldiers fighting in the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. Although they were not allowed to serve as ground combat troops until 2013, women have served on the frontlines in Iraq and Afghanistan since 2003. As of 2013, women were 14 percent of the 1.4 million active American military personnel (Associated Press 2013). Between 2001 and 2013, over 280,000 women were deployed to Iraq, Afghanistan, and other neighboring nations in support of the "war on terror" (Associated Press 2013). Of the 6,700 members of the U.S. military killed in the "war on terror" as of 2013, 150 were women (Associated Press 2013). In June 2013, senior defense officials announced plans to integrate women by 2016 into special operations forces, including Army Rangers and Navy SEALS (Bahadur 2013). Previously, women had been excluded from these roles because of the 1994 Combat Exclusion Rule, which prohibited women from serving in "assignment to units below the brigade level whose primary mission is to engage in direct combat on the ground" (Bahadur 2013).

Continuing controversy about the shifting gender composition of the U.S. military demonstrates the challenge of changing gender roles to traditional gendered nationalism predicated on the military as a masculine enterprise meant to protect the family and other "innocent" lives at "home"—framed as women and children. Tropes of sentimentality are used to mask the contradictions created by these changes in gender roles, saturating representations of the female soldier in the United States. Deborah Cohler argues that "Sentimentality is mobilized as Americans send female soldiers off to war, contemplate heroic sacrifice, and grapple with the possibility of female combat-related casualties in the early months of the conflict" (2006, 252). As part of what Berlant calls the "intimate public sphere" (1997), homecoming scenes present private and intimate acts by individuals as

public spectacles, consequently serving to produce and discipline gendered citizen-subjects in terms of heteronormative nationalism and discourses about human-dog intimacy. Representations of the returning female soldier "reuniting" with her dog and other constructions of "homecoming" are often imbued with sentimental tropes grounded in affective economies of pet love, family love, patriotism, pro-war militarism, and maternal sentimentalism, producing frames through which the public can manage anxieties about the return of soldiers from war. But, as evident in several cases I examine in this chapter, scenes of homecoming also offer rhetorics of sexuality and violence that disrupt the narrative of the soldier's recuperation into the heteronormative family and nation.

The first section examines two cases that rework the traditional military homecoming to re-domesticate the female soldier through tropes of sentimentalism, species, and spectacle. These cases work to assuage anxiety about the soldier's possible loss of femininity in the face of her participation in military endeavors, assuring her ability to take up what appears to be a maternal role in a heteronormative family drama created through the figure of the dog and linked to U.S. military nationalism. The second section focuses on a case that uses similar tropes to demonstrate the overwhelming importance of the heteronormative family drama for reinforcing sentimental links between U.S. military endeavors abroad and the intimate public sphere. The case focuses on a description of the scene of arrival in the United States of two dogs selected by deployed soldiers, transported by Operation Bagdad Pups, and met by two female relatives of the soldiers who have agreed to serve as caretakers. In the absence of actual family ties, the scene nonetheless deploys the power of family affects by fusing absent soldiers, dogs who are strangers, and women who had not previously met into an invented family, with the dogs serving as "surrogates" for the soldiers deployed overseas.

The third section closely examines discourses related to a particular television commercial for Iams dog food, "Welcome Home," part of a national marketing campaign titled "Keep Love Strong." Centered on the scene of military homecoming, the commercial evokes the figure of the dog as part of the heteronormative family drama that works to re-domesticate the female soldier, while also serving to establish commodified patriotism as central to the intimate public sphere. However, the emphasis on the intensity of the love between the returning female soldier and her dog in the visual rhetorics of the commercial has been interpreted by some viewers as not "maternal" but "sexual," evoking debates about intimacy and sexual "perversion" that continue to "queer" and "haunt" cross-species intimacy. The fourth section examines discourses related to an episode of the U.S. television melodrama *Nip/Tuck*, an episode that frames cross-species sexual activity as disrupting the military homecoming. In the episode, the returning male soldier's response to learning of his wife's sexual activities with their dog "queers" the homecoming, it also triggers an excess of male violence and gender abjection. This violence and abjection disciplines the errant dog and particularly the military wife—who stands in for anxieties about the vulnerability of heteronormative formations of the family in war. The discourse of viewers' comments reinforces the ways in which abjecting women and their sexuality serves to justify and even celebrate a male violence that is always latent in the heteronormative family drama, but promoted particularly through discourses of military masculinity. These analyses illuminate the ways that discourses about military homecomings work both to recuperate traditional gender norms challenged by the military deployment of female soldiers and to "queer" heteronormative nationalism through representations of intimacies between women and dogs.

Re-Domesticating the Female Soldier in the Family Drama

Jempsen and Emma on the *Queen Latifah Show*

An episode of *The Queen Latifah Show* features a segment on the reunion of a female soldier, Jess Jempsen, and her dog, Emma (Latifah 2013). The televised reunion is presented to demonstrate the success of Dogs on Deployment, an organization that works to place soldiers' pets with foster families while these soldiers are deployed ("Mission" n.d.). When Jempsen was deployed, Dogs on Deployment apparently helped Jempsen arrange for foster care for Emma from Sylvia. Thus, while focusing on a female soldier and occurring in a public setting, the homecoming presented on the show represents the "traditional" scene of the deployed soldier returning to loved ones who had remained at home.

Jempsen, in her uniform, stands next to Queen Latifah, observed by a predominantly female audience. Jempsen tells the audience and Queen Latifah, "It's been twelve months [since she saw Emma]… I got deployed August 2012 and turned her in August 3rd." Queen Latifah responds: "Oh, . . . just you saying 'turned her in' really makes my heart sink. Like I can't even imagine being away from my dogs that long. How has it been for you?" Jempsen responds, "It's been hard. Really hard. I've had Emma since she was 8 weeks old . . . she's my baby! Um, and, you know, being deployed is hard enough, but not having her close by, not having your loved ones near you is the hardest thing."

In their conversation, Queen Latifah and Jempsen meet the norms for discourses of sentimentality, which require that most aspects of military deployment—grueling conditions overseas or in combat, for example—go unmentioned. In traditionally sentimental terms, they establish the relations between Jempsen and Emma in the terms of the heteronormative

family drama, here with Jempsen calling Emma her "baby." Their conversation on the hardship of war focuses on family separation.

The segment claims to feature Emma and Jempsen's first reunion since the soldier's return. Jempsen's excitement is palpable: "I get to see Emma today and I cannot wait to wrap my arms around her." Sylvia emerges from back stage with Emma in hand on a pink leash. Jempsen kneels down and calls Emma's name. Seeing Jempsen, the dog rises on to her hind legs and licks Jempsen's face as the audience of claps and cheers. The camera catches one woman in the audience wiping tears from under her eyes.

Figure 4.1

Still from "Dogs on Deployment Reunites Soldier's Dog on the *Queen Latifah Show*." 1 Oct. 2013. *YouTube*, uploaded by Queen Latifah (4:32)

After all watch Jempsen's and Emma's jubilant "reunion," Queen Latifah addresses Sylvia: "Sylvia, you look a little bit sad." Sylvia replies: "She's ready to go home to her mom." The camera then cuts to Jempsen on the floor rubbing Emma's stomach. Queen

Latifah remarks: “You know, she remembers that momma”—to which the studio audience responds affirmatively “yeah!”

Once again the relation between the soldier and the dog is framed explicitly in terms of the heteronormative family, both Latifah and Sylvia framing Jempsen’s relationship to the dog as maternal (“mom,” “momma”). Jempsen and Sylvia are positioned as being united through their role as feminine nurturers and caregivers—for pets and the nation. Queen Latifah is “so happy [Jempsen] came home” because she is reunited with Emma, her “baby.” Given that the terms of the U.S. heteronormative nuclear family extend beyond species lines (see Halberstam 2010; Nast 2006a, 2006b), it is the figure of the dog, Emma, that assures Jempsen’s re-domestication. Jempsen’s return to her dog signifies her full return to her proper feminine domestic role as caregiver in the family.

This is an affectively saturated scene that imbues the gendered-altered script of the traditional military homecoming with the sentimental tropes of motherhood, pet love, and feminized nurturance to present a feminized and domesticated U.S. militarism. The female soldier’s safe return to the well-cared for—healthy and happy—dog demonstrates the security of the nation.

Beberg Returning to Ratchet

A variation on the traditional homecoming scene involves cases where soldiers deployed overseas decide to “adopt” a local dog as a pet, have the dog transported to the United States, and subsequently return to join their dog, involving the kinds of “rescue” discourse discussed in Chapter 3. These discourses provide restorative narratives that see the dog and soldier moved from a frontline constructed as dangerous to a homefront constructed as secure and safe. This is the case with Gwen Beberg and her dog Ratchet. Beberg’s

homecoming and subsequent re-encounter with Ratchet were the center of international media coverage (see, for example, "Iraqi Dog Ratchet, Spc. Beberg Reunited" 2009; Lade 2008; Raeke 2009; Smetanka 2008; Xiong 2008).

Beberg, a white 28-year old female soldier, was said to have found Ratchet, then a four-week-old black and white border collie mix, in a pile of burning trash outside of Bagdad, Iraq ("Iraqi Dog Ratchet, Spc. Beberg Reunited" 2009). Against military policy, Beberg brought the dog on base, named him Ratchet, and made arrangements with Terri Crisp and Operation Bagdad Pups to transport the dog—an operation that cost almost $10,000 (Lade 2008). Crisp's first attempt to transport the dog failed, stopped by military authorities citing General Order 1A, the military policy that prohibits soldiers from keeping animals as pets. In response, one of Beberg's friends created an online petition that received over 70,000 signatures, gaining sympathetic media attention. Ratchet was eventually transported by Operation in October 2008 and stayed with Beberg's parents until the soldier returned from her service in January 2009 (Raeke 2009).

Discourses about Ratchet's arrival in the United States and meeting with Beberg framed their meeting as a triumphant military homecoming and "reunification" between a female soldier and her dog. ABC produced an affectively-charged special about the pair's meeting, "a long-awaited reunion for a Minnesota soldier and the dog that she rescued in Iraq," a story that they claim "touched people all around the world" (Gamel 2008). The value of Beberg's story in part stems from its ability to fulfill sentimental desires and provide narrative development: the awakening of love, the struggle of separation, and the closure of reunion in heteronormative terms. According to Newland, "Long after the camera lights stop flashing, they will simply be a woman and her dog, back home in Minnesota" (Gamel 2008).

ABC reporter Maggie Newland identified some of the sentimental and hopeful threads that made the story gain attention: "It's a good story. A story of friendship forged in war, of separation and determination, of overcoming obstacles. It's a wonderful story" (Gamel 2008). The story included scenes of Beberg kissing Ratchet as he licks her mouth.

The news stories celebrate the close bond between woman and dog—their shared love and joy greeting each other. The traditional terms of military homecoming are fulfilled by suturing the dog into the normative heterosexual family scene through demonstration of sentimental "puppy love" between a woman and her dog.

Representations of Beberg and Ratchet are also framed particularly through maternal sentimentality based on the claim—taken up in many stories—that Beberg found Ratchet "in a pit of burning trash *on Mother's Day*" (Smetanka 2008, emphasis added). Drawing on the sentimentality of Mother's Day, these stories re-feminize Beberg, focusing on her love for the dog rather than her role as an occupying soldier. She is framed as generously taking on the role of mother, while Ratchet is positioned according to the "trope of the waif" discussed in chapter 3—endangered, debilitated, and infantilized. In effect, the stories treat Beberg's adoption of Ratchet in ways similar the framing of "innocent" "abandoned" international children who might be rescued for adoption by people in the United States. As discussed in Chapter 3, Laura Briggs (2003) maintains that international adoption framed as rescuing the "waif" domesticates militarism in part by recasting "international politics as family drama" (186). She argues that "U.S. intervention in . . . war [can be] figured as the resolution to a familial problem, the needed appearance of the mother/parent/husband who will save [orphaned children] from this dreadful aloneness, incompleteness" (2003, 186). A relationship created under violent conditions of imperialism, occupation, militarism, and

violence—and maintained through illegal transnational transportation—is thus presented as a hyper-sentimentalized heartwarming family reunification story.

The Recuperated Soldier as Familial Citizen

The sentimentalized emphasis on the return of the female soldier as mother to her dog demonstrated in stories about Jempsen and Beberg is particularly important given what Deborah Cowen and Emily Gilbert (2008) describe as a "wartime familialization of citizenship" during the "war on terror." They argue that positive, sentimental, and endearing representations of U.S. families in the post-9/11 era are contrasted with depictions of broken, failed and even incestuous families of "the enemy"—extrapolated as well to what is constructed as the failed family structure of those in al Qaeda networks and fundamentalist Islam. In this context, the heteronormative nuclear family serves normalizing functions, to discipline citizen-subjects. According to Cowen and Gilbert, the normalizing function of the family extends beyond individual citizens and the domestic home to the realm of a heteronormative orientalism that positions the U.S. as a united national family under threat from a racialized other. Under these conditions, "familial spaces like the home [command] our political geographic imaginaries" (Cowen and Gilbert 2008, 269). The "home" thus becomes central to managing national affect:

> the national and private family and their respective homes are presented as a response to and means for managing the anxieties generated in and through the "war on terror" … subjects are encouraged to produce stable homes to help protect the stability of the homeland, as domestic family and domestic politics are intertwined: not quite conflated but interdependent. Hence the home also becomes a site of anxiety as the home and the family must be

> secured—not just for the tranquility, serenity, and calm of individuals, but also for the good of the nation. (Gilbert and Cowen 2008, 274)

While the home may be positioned as threatened in the "war on terror," Jempsen's return to Emma and Beberg's reuniting with Ratchet demonstrate the security of the home, the homefront, and the nation—safe from the terror and threat of the racialized dog-abusing enemy "other" with the appropriately feminine reintegrated citizen-soldier.

Inventing Families and Homes to Come To

The figure of the heteronormative family is so important for creating individualized pro-military sentiment in the intimate public sphere that family relations must be invented if they are not present. An example of this rhetorical gesture appears in Crisp's memoir of her work with Operation (2012). Crisp uses the trope of the homecoming scene to describe the arrival in the United States of the two dogs discussed in Chapter 3—K-Pot and Liberty—adopted by two male soldiers still deployed in Iraq, then transported by Crisp to the United States to be cared for by the soldiers' female relatives, Amanda Byrnside and Danielle Berger.

Describing the moment when the crates were opened and the dogs delivered, Crisp writes, "it was time to let these women properly meet their loved ones' dogs" (Crisp 2012, 80). Her claim that onlookers made space and quiet around the crates imbues the scene with a sense of ritual:

> Without being prompted, everyone moved back and watched in silence while two women—a soldier's sister and another soldier's wife—squatted down to open the crate doors. After the women clipped on the leashes, the dogs stepped out of the crates, sniffed the new faces, and wagged their tails.

> *Everyone remarked that the dogs seemed to understand that they were carrying the hearts of the men they had left behind* . . . As much as it hurt to say goodbye to my traveling companions, the satisfaction I got from watching the puppies *bridge the physical gap* that separated U.S. soldiers from their family made it all worthwhile. (Crisp 2012, 80, emphasis added)

Crisp frames the dogs as literal and figurative containers for affect: as "carriers" of the soldiers' hearts. They are also framed as affective "bridges" across geographical space.

The normative emotional power of the "homecoming" scene in demonstrating all-embracing familial love is framed as self-evident, visible to all involved: Crisp, the relatives, onlookers, and *the dogs themselves*. Conventional narratives of "homecoming" have such strong resonances in the cultural imaginary that they can be evoked for sentimental effect—even when virtually none of their preconditions have been satisfied, as is the case here: the dogs were born and raised in Iraq; they have never been to the United States; they have never encountered the people who will be caring for them. The convention only works within the terms of a rescue narrative that frames the dogs' life in Iraq as nothingness and empty space until the encounter with the soldier, whose love will fill them as they wait in their new location in the United States—in a home evoked but not yet created. Discourses like Crisp's narrative about K-Pot and Liberty's "homecoming" to Byrnside and Berger deploy the figure of the dog as a sticky signifier that can stand in for the broken hetero-familial bonds that war disrupts. While the war may separate husbands and wives, sisters and brothers—it is also a site where dogs are rescued—brought back to America—recuperated into the normative nuclear family. In effect, the dogs function as metonymic substitutes for the soldiers that "saved" them.

The affective resources of the conventions of homecoming narratives allow Crisp to attribute deep significance to the scene by relying on the gendered terms of familial love: a woman who already loves a soldier demonstrates this by *also already loving* a dog she has never met. Failing to love the dog would be failing to love the soldier. The dog "stands in" for the soldier and allows the woman to express what is implied to be a natural instinct to nurture. According to Crisp, prior to the encounter at the airport, the two women had communicated, sharing emails, phone calls, and pictures: "their common goal of *saving the dogs* sealed their friendship" (Crisp 2012, 80, emphasis added). The significance of the heteronormative family is so central to the rhetoric of the homecoming scene that friendship is not enough. In this case, where neither the women nor the dogs are related, Crisp fabricates metaphorical family relations to ground the scene, claiming, that "although we hadn't met in person, my greeting with Danielle and Amanda was as warm *as if we were reunited sisters*" (Crisp 2012, 80, emphasis added).

Crisp's depiction of the "homecoming" of K-Pot and Liberty demonstrates the gendered affective and reproductive work attached to the heteronormative family formation, where women associated with the domestic sphere also take care of the nation—and now dogs—as part of their performance as citizen-subjects. Performances of intimacy between women and dogs enter the intimate public sphere to frame pro-military patriotism as an individual act based on family love. The figure of the dog is seen as completing the heteronormative nuclear family that constitutes a central formation for homefront nationalisms (Briggs 2003; Cohler 2006; Maye 2008), emphasizing that part of women's role is to serve as "caretakers of national sentiment" (Cohler 2006, 252).

Consumer Culture, Patriotic Militarism, and Pet Love

Keep Love Strong

The Iams commercial called “Welcome Home” is part of a 2012 national ad campaign called “Keep Love Strong.” The campaign and scenes of the commercial were developed through a program of consumer participation in branding (see Banet-Weiser 2012).[1] The commercial depicts a U.S. soldier, “Dawn,” and her dog, “Rocky” meeting upon Dawn’s return from war. Dawn is a young, conventionally attractive woman whose appearance is racially ambiguous. She is outfitted in military camouflage—a large jacket and baggy military jeans, her medium-length hair pulled back in a ponytail. Rocky is an Irish Wolfhound—a very large dog with a long, silver shaggy coat.[2]

The commercial opens showing Rocky looking out of a window as a male voice says “Rocky had no idea *why* Dawn was gone for so long…” Rocky then turns from his set gaze outside and lunges towards the front door. The camera shows a hand and arm reaching to open the door for Rocky (though it does not show to whom the arm belongs). The camera follows Rocky as he bolts out of the door and gallops to the driveway towards a blurry figure in military camouflage. The figure comes more into focus and the camera reveals Dawn, who stands in a military uniform next to a large white SUV. The voice continues “but he’d wait for her forever. For any reason.” Dawn opens her arms as Rocky bounds towards her.

Rocky rises up onto his hind legs to greet Dawn, standing taller than her as his front paws launch up to rest on top of her shoulders, so that he appears to hug her. Eye to eye, the dog licks Dawn’s face around her mouth, in ways resembling kissing. The voice-over continues, “And he’d always be there with the biggest welcome home.”

The camera then shows Rocky falling to the ground next to the car where Dawn lies next to him and embraces him with her head resting on his body. Rocky rolls over on his back and looks up at Dawn. Dawn wraps her arms around Rocky as she meets him on the ground and settles her head on his shoulder. The voice-over comes back and says "For a love this strong, Dawn only feeds him Iams."

The commercial cuts from this scene of reunion outside to a domestic scene inside a kitchen, in which Dawn prepares a bowl of dog food for Rocky. After establishing the strength of the love between Dawn and Rocky, the commercial moves from emotional appeals showing love between a female soldier and her dog to explaining the "science" that makes Iams a particularly good food for dogs. The voice-over comes back and claims that "compared to other leading brands, it has 50% more animal proteins." The commercial uses military colors throughout this scene—Rocky's food bowl is green, the computer-generated graphs that show the "facts" Iams presents about their food are all in a military palette—green, mustard, and white.

The commercial then cuts back to its sentimental depiction of Dawn and Rocky's "reunification." It shows Dawn sitting on the ground while Rocky pushes his head against her chest and playfully pushes her to the ground and lies on top of her.

Figure 4.2 Irish Wolfhound Lying Down on Top of Female Soldier

Still from “Iams Dog Food Commercial: Keep Love Strong - Welcome Home.” *YouTube*, uploaded by Iams, 28 Nov. 2013 (0:27)

The voice-over says “To help keep Rocky’s body as strong as a love that never fades. If he ever lets you leave again.” As the commercial draws to a close, Rocky and Dawn lie against one another on the driveway. The camera fades out from showing Rocky lying on top of Dawn and into an image of Dawn and Rocky looking into each other’s eyes. The images fade into each other so that the commercial shows simultaneously Rocky lying on Dawn and Dawn and Rocky peering into each other’s eyes. The commercial closes showing a standing embrace between Dawn and Rocky on his hind legs. Dawn lowers her nose to Rocky’s and Rocky licks her nose as she closes her eyes and smiles. Sentimental music plays as the voice-over says “Iams. Keep love strong.”

The representation of Dawn and Rocky evokes a hetero-domestic nationalist homecoming scene. The Iams commercial transposes the normative script of domestic military homecoming that positions a woman at home waiting for her soldier husband into

one about a dog waiting for his owner—a scene of "puppy love." The "domestic romance" is emphasized by the interactions between the two as well as by the fact that there are no family members or other people identified or incorporated into the narrative of the commercial. To have Rocky rather than a husband greet Dawn sidesteps the gendered contradictions involved in recuperating the female soldier—with her training and experiences in potentially "masculinizing" violence— to a "domestic" husband, a disruption of the traditional heteronormative homecoming. The female soldier returning to her *dog*—master to pet—upholds heteronormative formations.

The commercial returns the female soldier to the domestic realm under a normative gendered order of affective and reproductive labor, suggesting that the practice that will bring Dawn back to her appropriate nurturing role is to feed Rocky Iams dog food. The gendered logic of the commercial positions the reinstatement of the soldier's womanly role as her success in caring for her "love object"—though here her love object is a dog, not man.

In keeping with the advertising campaign's slogan— "Keep Love Strong"—the commercial uses discourses of "love" to frame Dawn's return to Rocky—and the strength of their love and bond.[3] The logic of the commercial suggests that Dawn loves Rocky, Rocky loves Dawn, Dawn loves the nation, and Iams sustains this love—Iams will keep love between an owner and animal strong—despite distance—despite war. The commercial deploys and mobilizes various representations of "love," including love for the military and the nation as well as "puppy love." The imperative of Iams' slogan "Keep Love Strong" generalizes to multiple forms of love that must be kept strong—love for one's dog, love for the Army, love for the nation. It also frames the affect of love—one associated with softness, with a certain feminine frame—through a discourse of strength. Iams' slogan is one of a

confluence of significations about "puppy love" and the military—allowing love to remain sentimental and endearing while also being something that is not just an intimate love between pet and owner, but between an individual and her country.

Like the representations of the reunions of Jempsen and Emma, and Beberg and Ratchet, the Iams commercial's representation of the reunion of Dawn and Rocky in effect sanitizes the experiences of war by mobilizing discourses of love: national love, maternal love, family love, and "puppy love." Because current affective economies of American pet love appear to extend the heteronormative nuclear family beyond species lines (Halberstam 2010; Nast 2006a, 2006b), relations between female soldiers and their dogs can be framed within those terms. The returning female soldiers are folded into the terms of maternal nationalism mediated through the figure of the dog.

Their relationship to the dog provides evidence that they can leave war behind to become appropriate loving, sentimental, patriotic, heteronormative, maternal subjects. This framing serves to mediate the history of production of violence that haunts the female soldier, repositioning her in the proper place of the feminine—the kind caregiver of the domestic sphere. Anxieties raised by the possibility that the female soldier may have been "masculinized" by her military role are assuaged by her loving return to her dog, which signifies her willingness to return to a civilized domestic life and her appropriately feminine nurturing role.

A Caveat: Queer Hauntings of "Puppy Love"

The interplay between Dawn and Rocky is all connotative of intimate interactions—of mutual love and affection between two subjects. These intimate interactions can be framed as normative ways of interacting with pets in the "West"—where, as Heidi Nast

argues, “pet love” serves as a signifier of normative human affect (Nast 2006a, 2006b). Both the frame of military homecoming and the specific visual rhetorics of the commercial appear to offer rich significations of a broader range of intimacy between humans and animals. In this scene of homecoming, the dog stands in for the domestic lover left behind. Rather than the male soldier returning to the waiting wife (with implications of homecoming sex)—the female soldier returns home to the dog—who straddles her as he kisses her face. The emphasis on the intensity of the love between the returning female soldier and her dog in the visual rhetorics of the commercial has been interpreted by some viewers not simply as “maternal,” “protective,” “nurturing,” and “affectionate,” but as specifically as “sexual,” evoking concerns about intimacy and sexual “perversion,” a long-standing “queering” and “haunting” of cross-species intimacy.

The result of the sexual ambiguity in the visual rhetorics of the commercial has been a spirited online debate that demonstrates the complications of Colleen Glenney Boggs’s argument that bestiality and “puppy love” have long been “conjoined discourses” providing a double legacy of animal love (2013, 15).[4] Glenney Boggs argues that “different practices and representations of animal love” can reveal “how the affective engagement with animals functions as a site of biopolitical regulation as well as resistance” (2013, 15). This online debate serves as a specific site where the terms of cross-species biopolitical regulation and resistance play out.

Comments on the commercialdemonstrate that a significant number of viewers interpret its visual rhetorics as evoking scenes of intimacy that appear sexual or erotic.[5] Presenting Rocky as a stand-in for the domestic love left behind becomes complicated when he lays the length of his body on Dawn and straddles her as he licks her face. For some

viewers, this representation suggests a transgression of sexual normativity, which they often term "bestiality" (though the proper definition of "bestiality" involves sexual intercourse). The commercial's use of a male Irish Wolfhound—a very large dog that can stand eye-to-eye with Dawn—is read by some as encouraging viewers to anthropomorphize Rocky. In the eye-to-eye and subject-to-subject encounter as he stands on his hind legs and gazes into Dawn's eyes, Rocky may appear to become a subject equal to Dawn. The use of a *male* dog and the absence of a human spouse suggest to some viewers that Rocky is positioned as Dawn's waiting lover.

Sexual boundary crossing between human and animal appears to be suggested both by the setting of the homecoming scene and specific nature of the physical interaction between Dawn and Rocky. Both are mentioned in one comment:

> a woman coming back from war to her giant dog and, after a quick hello, we see the pair getting down and dirty. That's right. Iams, it appears, are saying that you should love your dog so much that you should make love to it, in broad daylight, in the middle of your drive. Iams want us all to "Keep Love Strong" … as strong as a giant dog's erection, clearly. (Giffers 2013).

While the scene does not show an erection, another comment develops the focus on the nature of the physical interaction, particularly on what appeared to be mutual rubbing of the genitals (a concern that became central to the debate).

> [Iams's] latest TV spot veers into the bestiality zone. It shows a woman dressed in military fatigues, apparently just back from deployment somewhere. She is seen inside the house gushing over her huge Irish

> wolfhound (Russian wolfhound?), and walks outside, where she proceeds to lie flat on her back on the driveway, while the dog lowers itself on top of her, its legs splayed. The genital areas match up. Yes, it looks like this man-sized dog is having sex with her. No, my mind isn't in the gutter; friends and family agree with me about the ad, they are grossed out by it as well. (Paul 2012).

Another comment links the scene to pornography and implies that some viewers would use the scene to enhance masturbation:

> This image is burned in my brain as one of the most disgusting things I have ever seen. All the commercial needed was some cheesy bump and grind music and bad lighting and it would have easily been peddled as porn. Which I'm sure there is a group of individuals who have this on a loop for their midnight rendezvous with Mr. Hand. (mfatpony@aol.com 2014)[6]

A significant number of viewers on several websites expressed reservations about the appropriateness of the sexual implications of the commercial. One comment described it as "gross," indicating: "the ad is fine up to the ending when Rocky . . . mounts his master Dawn on the driveway. This part is truly inappropriate and needless for this commercial" (Charlie Kirby 2013).[7] Another viewer agrees: "That was the exact same thing I thought when 'Dawn' was on the driveway, spread-eagle, and Rocky was on top of her! I guess Iams wanted [t]o [*sic*] show 'true love'" (Janice 2013).[8]

No viewers claimed that actual penetration had occurred (which would be required to meet the definition of the term "bestiality"). The evidence of the visual rhetorics might be seen as foregrounding the erotics or sensuality of kissing and licking, or the practice of

frottage (the act of consensual rubbing between two or more people, either clothed or unclothed, to attain sexual gratification), but these points were almost never discussed. Instead the discourses of biopolitical regulation as well as resistance characterizing the debate focused on a remarkably limited set of claims: 1) whether or not Dawn and Rocky in their close full-length positioning mimicked full-frontal coitus in the missionary position,[9] 2) whether the spreading of Dawn's legs signaled sexual positioning,[10] 3) whether or to what purpose Dawn had put her hand between the dog's hind legs,[11] 4) the significance of the dog's position on top of or "mounting" Dawn,[12] and, particularly, whether the genitals of Dawn and Rocky were in alignment (not required for the practice of frottage).[13]

Many vigorous replies contested intimations of bestiality by claiming that there was absolutely nothing sexual about the commercial, that it was darling, sweet, loving, and pure,[14] that it simply reflected the strong bonds between dogs and their people,[15] and that it reflected relations of innocence and unconditional love.[16] The terms of biopolitical regulation and resistance at play in these counter arguments replicate an uncompromisingly sanitized frame through which "puppy love" must be understood—a pure, normative, and unexceptional frame of unconditional love that under no circumstances can ever be imagined as sexual.

Countering the notion that the commercial intimated cross-species sexuality often took the form of claiming that dogs were family members—almost human—so even to imagine these interspecies relations as potentially sexual was virtually unthinkable. Such claims led to a counter-argument that it is exactly the positioning of dogs as "pseudo-human" that can lead to the slippery slope of cross-species sexual intimacy.

> Who would imagine that making bestiality references would sell more dog food? When you think about it though, it starts to seem plausible. Many people, particularly women, tend to humanize their pets. This is why people do silly things like give their dog an extra-large dog bone, new toys, or treats on the dog's birthday, at Christmas time, etc., as if the dog understands what a birthday or what Christmas even means. So now that we've established that people think of their dogs as human at some level, we must ask: What do humans that love each other do when they reunite after a long absence? They have sex, natch. (Damon 2013)[17]

This comment demonstrates the insouciant provocation of much online debate.

The debate reveals that the investment in keeping "puppy love" pure—protected from even the slightest imputations of sexuality—is so important and yet so fragile that its boundaries must be constantly shored up and protected at all costs. Notably, this is not a general debate, but one focused on an exceptional incident, on the rhetoric of a *single commercial*. With the exception of Damon's provocative comment just above, those criticizing the depiction of the commercial do not generalize from it; they do not make any comprehensive claims about sexuality in the relations between people and their dogs. Under those circumstances, perhaps the most dramatic evidence of the investment in keeping "puppy love" pure is the overwhelmingly vituperative and personally abusive responses on the part of those who wish to seal it off from considerations of sexuality. Those suggesting that the Iams commercial is sexually suggestive are reviled. They are deemed sick, pathetic, and perverted;[18] sick, mentally ill, with their minds in the gutter;[19] demented, crazy, with an unhealthy mind, seeing filth everywhere, shameful;[20] needing professional help, something is

wrong with them;[21] on drugs, with a warped brain, fucked up;[22] an idiot who was probably molested;[23] an idiot who must also promote hatred against gays and minorities;[24] and a redneck asshole, prick, and coward who undoubtedly perpetrated incest with his own mother.[25]

One comment implies that interpreting the commercial sexually is a result of a male's shameful tendency to see sex everywhere. The viewer counters allegations of sexual intimacy by pointing out that the limited development of dogs' brains would keep Rocky too young to have sexual feelings.

> OK so it figures that this was written by a man. A man who sees sex in just about everything he looks at. What is wrong with you? Thank god that dog's brains are only equivalent to a 3 year old human brain which keeps them innocent and sweet and shame on you for making this into something sex related. This says more about how your brain works than that poor innocent dog. Shame on you. (er#394 2013)[26]

This view would seem to find concerns about cross-species sexuality so threatening that in effect the commenter erases the possibility of the dog as a sexual being, framing him as asexual—as she implies is true of a human child.

Another comment fails to acknowledge that the commercial is a "fictional" construction, albeit one emerging from a viewer-contributed story.

> You guys are the disgusting ones! . . . Not only are you degrading a BEAUTIFUL animal, but you are also degrading a person in the military

> protecting your DUMB ASSES! . . . You are all hateful idiots that have NO heart. . . . BUNCH OF IDIOTS. (Buff 2013)[27]

This debate of about the implications and significance of the Iams commercial demonstrates "how the affective engagement with animals functions as a site of biopolitical regulation as well as resistance" (Glenney Boggs 2013, 15). The discourses reveal the ways that boundary transgressions—here particularly between the maternal and the sexual, and the human and animal—are managed in part through affective claims. The stakes of this debate are heightened because it also addresses the proper management of a militarized femininity that seeks to discipline transgressions of heteronormative domesticity.

The debate occasioned by viewers' comments on the Iams commercial tends to assume clear binary distinctions between humans and animals, between "innocent intimacies" and sexuality, between love and bodily expression, that fail to recognize the complications of these distinctions and how they are being called into question by contemporary theorizing about sexuality, human/animal distinctions, and the nature of liberal subjectivity. Our culturally shared taken-for-granted notions tend to foreclose what we might mean by "sexuality." If "bestiality" is specifically *sexual intercourse* between a person and an animal (not depicted in the commercial), then it seems that there might be physical and mental interactions between humans and animals that include eroticism, sensuality, and warmth that are not explicitly "sexual," yet nonetheless "queer" and "haunt" the scene of cross-species physical pleasure. The terms of biopolitical regulation and resistance that plays out in these debates work to shore up boundaries between sexuality and "puppy love" in order to render "puppy love" always already pure and beyond the thought of sexuality. It seems that the Iams commercial is so shocking for some because it implicates everyday U.S.

practices of pet love in intimate frames that may blur the boundary between platonic love and sexual intimacy.

Interlude: Military Bestiality

The debate about the Iams commercial demonstrates that its implications of sexuality in the intimacy of the returning female soldier and her welcoming dog proved controversial. The nexus of militarized femininity, intimacy, sexuality, and nurturing relations with dogs represent a complex tangle of motives and affects. But it appears that the transgression represented by sexual intimacy between women and animals varies according to the specific circumstances, even in cases that are not media representations. An example is the reports of bestiality between a male soldier, a female soldier, and a dog at Abu Ghraib. On March 21, 2006, Sergeant Michael J. Smith was found guilty of committing an act of indecency at Abu Ghraib prison in Iraq for "directing his dog to lick peanut butter off the genitals of a male soldier and the breasts of a female soldier" (Dishneau 2006). The female soldier, Jennifer Scala, testified that she let the dog lick peanut butter off her breast. Her motives were variously reported as arising from "boredom" and "because of a dare." The male soldier, former Sgt. John Lemala, said he placed peanut butter on his genitals, but the dog stopped "an inch away" ("Trial Opens with Claim of 'Rogue' Acts" 2016). Smith publicly apologized for the act, characterizing it as "juvenile."

The incident received relatively little attention given the larger questions raised by the human rights violations at Abu Ghraib. Glenney Boggs (2013, 41-42) argues that the case reveals the biopolitics of U.S. nationalism and human exceptionalism. Glenney Boggs—noting that Smith apologized for this incident of bestiality but not for his violations toward Iraqi prisoners—argues that Smith apologizes about the incident of bestiality because the

people involved were U.S. soldiers and because the symbolic order of human exceptionalism depends on a firm distinction between humans and animals. For Glenney Boggs, the apology reveals a performance of affect—remorse—that is meant to frame the human-animal sexual interaction as an aberration of normative U.S. behavior.

Queering the Scene of Military Homecoming: *Nip/Tuck*

In September 2006, six months after Smith's trial, an episode of the U.S. television show *Nip/Tuck* titled "Shari Noble" (Season 4, Episode 4, 2006) presented a scene that echoed Smith and Scala's peanut butter breast "joke," transposed to a scene of military homecoming between a male soldier, his wife, and their dog. The story of the episode may be related to the situation revealed through the trial on Abu Ghraib, given that *Nip/Tuck* represents itself as based on stories that are "99% true." The story of the episode also represents a version of a common urban legend.[28]

In the episode a woman named Shari Noble visits a plastic surgeon for breast repair surgery. She explains to the surgeon that her pit bull bit off her nipple in a dogfight. Shari Noble tells the surgeon that the dog, Rojo, is "an angel," but if her husband, Mark Noble, a soldier deployed in Iraq, found out about the incident, he would have the dog put down. Noble tells the doctor, "I need it to look like it never happened." Mark Noble having unexpectedly returned from deployment, enters the doctor's office while the surgeon is conducting his post-surgery examination. As Mark Noble enters the doctor's office, the doctor says to him: "Sir, the homecoming is going to have to wait until your wife is discharged." Mark Noble responds, "I'll be done in 60 seconds." Still wearing his uniform, holding himself rigidly at attention, Mark Noble confronts Shari Noble in a bullying and antagonistic manner.

The episode reveals that Mark Noble's rage was triggered when he returned home from overseas deployment only to discover an open jar of peanut butter by the marital bed. In a few deft phrases, the narrative conveys that even before Mark Noble was deployed, Shari Noble had a practice of using peanut butter to entice the dog to lick her breasts, that Mark Noble knew about this practice, and that Shari Noble had promised to stop. Discovering the peanut butter jar by the bed, Mark Noble infers that despite her promise, Shari Noble has continued to use peanut butter to encourage the dog to perform sexual acts on her. The episode positions the returning husband as stiffly, angrily, denouncing his wife for cheating on him with a lover during his absence overseas. He scorns Shari Noble, calling her "a faithless, demented whore!" He asks, "Who would use peanut butter to seduce your own DOG?!"

Treating his wife as a cheating spouse, Mark Noble treats the dog as a sexual rival who has made a cuckold of him. Throughout the scene in the doctor's office he has been carrying a large knapsack. Shari Noble looks at the knapsack and says nervously: "What's in your duffle bag, Mark? What did you do?" Looking at her coldly, Mark Noble replies, "What was I supposed to do? What any man would do to his wife's lover." He then picks up the duffle bag and shakes it so that the dog's dead body falls out on to the hospital bed.

Mark Noble positions his actions as justified—and indeed as necessary—to discipline Shari for transgressing heteronormativity and normative species boundaries. He defends his action in killing his wife's "lover" and confronting her with the body as what "any man" would do to a rival—human or animal. Yet as a returning soldier in uniform, Mark Noble is not just "any man," but a man who also represents the nation, with the implication that a threat to his masculine control of the family is also a threat to the nation. He repairs what he

sees as a threat to his masculinity by his wife's sexual relationship with their dog by exercising the power that the Army bestows on him—the legitimized power over death. Mark Noble's killing of his "rival" is presented as an act to restore his white, hegemonic masculinity by asserting his sovereignty—his supremacy over his wife, his dominance over his dog, his prerogative to determine life and death—of those he killed at war and the animal body that disrupts the heteronormativity of his marriage. The killing returns him to the position of the sovereign: sovereign American soldier, sovereign commander of life, sovereign over animals.

In contrast to the sentimentality typical of scenes of homecoming, *Nip/Tuck* presents something quite different—a homecoming that is cold, terse, violent, and abusive. It signifies the military family's undoing rather than reunion. This scene thus shifts the space of homecoming and offers instead an unromantic, violent, and tragic representation of "homecoming" in which the heteronormative family is unraveled.

Before Mark Noble enters in the hospital room, Shari Noble tells the doctor about her relationship with Rojo. She explains, "Mark's away a lot and Rojo is my protector. He makes me feel safe." Shari Noble positions Rojo as the "man of the house" in Mark's absence, such that Rojo *stands in* as Shari's domestic partner while Mark Noble is at war. Rojo is represented as a *literal substitution* for the absent male soldier—assuming a position only thought proper to a (white male) human—rupturing heteronormativity and U.S. (human) sexual exceptionalism. By standing in corporeally for the male soldier, Rojo disrupts and forecloses the normative relationship between military wife and male soldier. Shari Noble's puppy love is thus positioned as threatening and abject: an affect that betrays heteronormativity, undoes her husband's sovereign hegemonic masculinity, threatens the

state by undermining the home lives of deployed soldiers, and blurs ontological racialized boundaries between "human" and "animal" that are central to the "war on terror."

Because the scene positions Rojo as Mark Noble's stand-in, it queers the scene of military homecoming. As the object of Shari's abject attachments, Rojo functions as a queerly perverse racialized other—both through his literal position as animal (a position scholars have argued to be always and already *stuck* to people of color) (McKittrick 2013; Morgan 2004; Weheliye 2014; Wynter 2003) and through his name, "Rojo"—the only name in the episode that is racialized. These terms of racialization produce Rojo as a *sticky signifier* in broad economy of significations around "puppy love" that also are haunted by anxieties about miscegenation. Rojo may stand in for Mark Noble—as the replacement sexual partner for a military spouse. Simultaneously, he may stand in for the animalized Iraqis that U.S. soldiers (like Mark Noble) can kill indiscriminately and without reproach. Rather than securing heteronormative and national relations, Rojo is affectively saturated: the object that evokes perversity and disgust that threatens the heteronormative relationship between soldier and wife.

Shari Noble betrays the dictates of heteronormative feminine domesticity by engaging in sexual acts outside of her marriage with her dog. She is framed as being improperly sexual in three ways: she cheats on her husband, transgressing the terms of monogamy; she cheats on her soldier husband when he is deployed overseas; and she cheats on him with *a dog*. She thus subverts the proscriptions of heteronormativity by transgressing the boundaries of human exceptionalism. Such a transgression positions Shari Noble as monstrous *and* unpatriotic—as betraying the boundaries of the nation and species. Her "puppy love" thus functions against the nation: her actions threaten to undo the hegemonic

masculinity of her husband and a domestic white femininity. Here, Shari Noble functions to signify the improper adulterous wife—whose adulterous *interspecies* encounter not only threatens her marriage and heteronormativity, but also the "civilization" of the nation.

The representation in *Nip/Tuck* of the military wife as bestial "whore" and the soldier as cuckold and dog-murderer not only disrupts the sentimental heteronormative scene of "homecoming" and the gendered relationships with dogs in war, but also the insistence found in the discourses analyzed in earlier chapters that those in the United States treat dogs humanely—in contrast to those in the Middle East. Further, the representation of the sexual relationship between the woman and her dog exposes the extreme of U.S. "puppy love"—U.S. "puppy love" that crosses normative boundaries of human exceptionalism.

There is a complex interplay between frames of "animalized humanity" and "humanized animality" within the transgression of heterosexuality in the scene. Carey Wolfe (2003, 101) argues that "animalized humanity" represents a position in which a human is rendered in the subjective location of an animal, constructed as less than human. "Humanized animality" conversely locates a position in which animals are anthropomorphized, endowed with a humanized subjectivity (Wolfe 2003, 101). The plastic surgeon that Shari Noble visits reflects such a discursive shift when he tells his assistant that Shari Noble confused her "puppy dog for a pussy cat." The doctor's double entendre allows an "innocent" interpretation that Shari Noble confuses two pet animals, but the context of the episode implies the meaning that Shari Noble has mistaken her dog—an object that is not meant to be sexual— as an object that can be used for sexual pleasure. The quip also demonstrates that the very abjection of Shari Noble's transgression becomes a site of entertainment and titillation.

While the *Nip/Tuck* scene may suggest a rupture in discourses that render U.S. puppy love as normative and universal, the scene also positions Shari Noble's actions as transgressive and exceptional—such that *she* is used as a foil for American normative affect. She thus functions as the "whore" that allows other military wives' love for their dogs to emerge as maternal and innocent—their love does not cross such abject boundaries. The scene positions both Shari Noble and Mark Noble as exceptional aberrations to American normative affect by framing Shari as abject and inhumane and by attributing Mark Noble's violence to a necessary disciplining of such inhuman(e) monstrous actions. This positioning justifies Mark Noble's violence as provoked and justified by his wife's abject transgressions. Because the scene positions the pair's actions as aberrations to U.S. "puppy love," their abject actions do not disrupt the larger economy of significations that produce good docile, patriotic wives and soldiers positioned as humane, reinforcing the claim that those in the United States inhabit the proper affect toward animals. While the scene is thus haunted by suggestions that U.S. "puppy love" may be excessive and inhuman(e), the scene functions as the abject limit—allowing what are seen to be "real" expressions of U.S. "puppy love" to continue to function as normative and pervasive in mainstream discourse.

The traditional military "homecoming" of the U.S. male soldier serves to reincorporate the soldier into the family, suppressing his role as killer and emphasizing the role of protector. In contrast, the representation in *Nip/Tuck* of the military wife as bestial "whore" and the soldier as cuckold and dog-murderer disrupts the sentimental heteronormative scene to discipline the military wife.

Fans and online commenters had various reactions to the "Shari Noble" *Nip/Tuck* episode. I trace a sampling of these responses from on-line discussion forums, including

Facebook, *niptuckfans.com* and the *Nip/Tuck* discussion forum on *www.tv.com*. The commenters tend to agree that the episode depicts "bestiality"—what they argue to be an "unnatural" sexual relationship between woman and dog that crosses normative sexual boundaries. Many draw on the language describing affects of abjection—including of disgust, shock, horror—to articulate their reactions to, and claims about the episode. At stake in their responses are *gendered, sexualized, racialized, nationalized, and species* ontological boundaries

Many commenters used rhetorics of shock in responding to the Mark Noble scene. They mobilize this rhetoric to frame the interaction between Shari Noble and Rojo as unexpected and unnatural. Some positioned the interaction between Shari Noble and Rojo as shocking because they position it as unthinkable—as outside of the realm of expected behavior. One commenter wrote, for example, that the Noble storyline was "definitely shocking… I kept thinking to myself, 'It can't be! I must've heard that wrong...'"[29] The commenter's insistence that "it can't be" points to how such a sexual boundary crossing between woman and dog is positioned as "unthinkable" under the terms of human sexual exceptionalism and gendered discourses about female sexuality that frame white women according to ideals of moral purity and sexual chastity.

In another common response expressing shock, commenters referred to their embodied experiences while viewing the episode. One commenter wrote, for example, "when the bomb was dropped, my jaw dropped. When the dog was dropped, I fell off of my bed in shock and *literally* tried to crawl away from the TV."[30] Another wrote that after the scene ended, "I was still sitting there with my mouth wide open saying, 'Oh my god."[31] Yet another wrote, "My mouth dropped several times during this eppy . . . like the peanut butter

scene."[32] Such comments indicate a visceral and affective embodied shock: affects central to abjection. Other commenters focused on the disgust and horror that they experienced after watching the scene. One wrote that the scene was "Sick beyond words."[33] Another wrote that a "cold shiver ran down [his] spine"[34] when the episode revealed that Shari had had sexual interactions with her dog. Such reactions indicate viewers' visceral reactions to the show.

It is useful to think of viewers' assertions of their "shock," "horror," "disgust," etc. through what Sara Ahmed (2004) calls a "disgust encounter," discussed in Chapter 1. A "disgust encounter" is a specific kind of encounter between a subject and object or two objects that come into close proximity. As the object and subject come into proximity, the subject pulls away from the object because it threatens to disrupt the boundaries of the subject. This "pulling away" produces an affect that characterizes the object as being inherently disgusting (Ahmed 2004, 86). The disgust reaction makes the object itself seem inherently disgusting, rather than locating disgust as a result of an encounter (Ahmed 2004, 88).

Commenters' "disgust encounters" indicate affective responses of abjection to the Shari Noble storyline. Abjection describes an affective process through which boundaries of the subject are produced and maintained by distinguishing ontological boundaries such as those between self and other as well as between human and animal (Kristeva 1982). The abject looms at the constitutive outside of the subjects, threatening to pollute the subject and disrupt its boundaries. The abject is thus rendered monstrous and polluting and produces anxiety and disgust when it comes in a certain proximity to the subject (Kristeva 1982).

The politics of abjection are visible in comments that frame Shari as an aberrant woman. Commenters variously call Shari Noble "insane"[35] or describe her as a "wacko woman."[36] Such rhetoric frames her as abject—as threatening the well-being of an innocent dog. These comments position Shari Noble as outside the normative boundaries of femininity and of western "puppy love."

Commenters rendering Shari Noble as aberrant position her as such because of her sexual relationship with Rojo. Some also regard her as aberrant because of Rojo's death, which they argue is a result of Shari Noble's transgression. These commenters frame her as being directly responsible for Rojo's death, rendering invisible Mark's instrumentality in *killing* Rojo. This claim, then, implies that Shari Noble's perverse behavior is to blame for Rojo's death—rather than Mark Noble's murderous actions. Such a position is reflected, for example, in one commenter's question, "does anyone feel bad for the poor dog that was murdered because of that wacko woman?" (September 28, 2006).[37] The construction of this question conflates the culpability of the person who actually killed the dog and the person whose actions initiated a set of consequences that led to the dog's death. Some viewers view Shari Noble as the villain and her husband as one of the victims of her monstrous acts that leave him with no recourse besides what "any man would do"—kill the dog. Thus, Mark Noble is rendered almost blameless in an equation that positions Shari Noble's actions as directly leading to Rojo's death.

These responses of shock and horror are notable particularly because the series is well-known for, and indeed premised on, delivering "shocking" storylines. It appears that the Shari Noble storyline was of particular shock to some of the fans who were accustomed to such a provocative and shocking show. For some fans, this episode made them ask the

question of where *Nip/Tuck* would "draw the line." They note that the show had featured many controversial themes before such as incest and necrophilia, but tend to see bestiality—the representation of Shari Noble with Rojo—as the most radical perverse transgression that the show offered to that date (tjman). Such reactions are invested in maintaining, disciplining and (re)securing normative boundaries between humans and animals, as well as of the gendered boundaries of the (white) nation. This line appears to be moral and about "decency." Thus, the question as to where *Nip/Tuck* will "draw the line"—and the implicit claim that intimating a bestial relationship crossed such a line—is also an indication of the politics of abjection at work in responses to the episode.

The anxiety, shock, and horror that some viewers express in response to Noble storyline about cross-species sexual intimacy is informed by deeply entrenched ideals about appropriate intimate exchanges between people (and here, particularly white women) and dogs. These ideologies are always already informed by fears of miscegenation and the inherent instability of heteromonogamy that must constantly be performed, reproduced, and reconsolidated. The abjection of the "bestial" military wife helps to discipline heteronormative gendered nationalism in the face of these insecurities.

While many commenters focus their blame at Shari for seducing her dog, others also admonish Mark Noble for killing Rojo. Such comments generally do not criticize Mark Noble for his violence per se. One commenter, for example, indicates that he didn't expect a "military man" to commit such a seemingly "uncivilized" act in a doctor's office, that he would have expected to see Mark Noble commit such violence in the domestic space. (The commenter then laughs—"LOL.") This comment implies that domestic violence is normative and even to be expected of a certain hegemonic military masculinity. Such a

suggestion represents disruption of the vision of the noble and humane soldier promoted in some of the discourses discussed in other chapters. It also ruptures the illusion of non-problematic homecoming that discourses of military homecoming often reproduce. The comment also normalizes domestic violence as a part of military homecoming—pointing to the unromantic, taxing re-integration of soldiers to a civilian domestic life.

Some commenters who expressed disgust, shock, and horror at the scene demanded that Shari Noble and Mark Noble should be arrested or killed. One commenter claimed, for example, "Shari/Mark - I wanted to kill these two for what they did to that dog. Sick beyond words. Please tell me they got arrested for sexual assault and murder respectively?"[38] The logic of this comment suggests that both of the Nobles harmed Rojo and because of this, they themselves should be similarly harmed. Such claims reproduce the economy of violence that the original scene depends on. Through such a discursive move, the commenter reproduces the overall economy of violence that renders some people as killable. In reproducing a narrative that justifies murder and positions the state as the guarantor of justice, the commenter participates in a project of normalizing the overall practices of violence, murder, and state-authority central to the system that would let Mark kill Rojo with impunity (see Ioanide 2007). Such a claim reveals the shared sentiments and public narratives that authorize imprisonment and mass violence to occur on a large scale: the logic suggests that if someone is perceived to be the agent of violence, they themselves should be the target of violence and/or state punishment. Although a show such as *Nip/Tuck* and its fan commentary may appear to be benign sites of entertainment, these sites are affectively saturated within the larger ideologies of violence, militarism, the law, and human and animal relationships under U.S. militarism.

In response to shawnlunn2002's inquiry as to the fate of Shari and Mark ("Please tell me they got arrested for sexual assault and murder respectively?"), commenter BabyPhat responded, saying, "Shari and Mark - She is in prison and he was hanged,"[39] to which another commenter responds, "That's not what I heard. I heard Mark is in jail and Shari got eaten by her new pitbull. heeee heeee..." (bignip).[40] These comments continue the economy of violence suggested in shawnlunn2002's post.

The second comment from bignip however, ruptures shawnlunn2002's seemingly uncritical assumption that the Shari-Mark storyline is based in real events and BabyPhat's answer which seems to imply that the event was based in reality (although the claim that Mark was hanged exposes that this claim is also false—as no one would be hanged for killing a dog). bignip sarcastically flips the script of BabyPhat's comment—drawing on sexualized language to claim that Rojo "ate" Shari. Here, the claim that Rojo "ate" Shari Noble functions as a double entendre: On the one hand it indicates that Rojo killed and ate her—on the other, it refers back to the scene of bestiality claiming that Rojo "ate" her—implying that Rojo performed oral sex on her.

This exchange among commenters reveals that some commenters frame the terms of their debate as if the story about Shari Noble and Mark Noble is based on a *true* event and that both wife and husband should be punished for their actions. One commenter even conjectured that the Shari Noble storyline was a "huge ripped-from-the-headlines copyplot?!" He continues, "of course i dont think that woman was having her dog lick her for peanut butter though. or maybe this is based on some kind of [unreported news] husband comes home from Iraq to find his wife cheating on him..."[41] Some of these claims position *Nip/Tuck* as being based on *real* events, while others position it as creating such storylines

for shock value. Such claims negotiate the "authenticity," "reality," and truth" ascribed to the scene. Because *Nip/Tuck* produces a discourse about itself as being *true*—as representing a truth that is "crazier than fiction"—the possibility that a military wife *really did* have sexual interactions with her dog haunts this episode and informs commenters' responses to the episode. Thus, fan responses to the episode are based on a perceived symbolic and literal transgression of normative species boundaries that has serious implications for how the boundaries of sex, gender, race and species are understood during war.

In this scene, Rojo, as a racialized animal that threatens the boundaries of a racialized human exceptionalism, disrupts heteronormative whiteness in contradistinction to previous examples of representations of "puppy love" that I have analyzed, where dogs function in public representations of familial and romantic love *in the service of heteronormativity*—as affectively saturated signifiers that link lovers and family members, as discussed in previous chapters. In other representations of dogs as companions of female family members of male soldiers who are deployed, dogs stabilize the boundaries of heteronormativity when they are folded into their proper place on the animacy hierarchy as pets who are part of the nuclear family (see Chen 2012). These dogs are framed as *standing in* for the women's male husbands abroad—as Terri Crisp remarks "carrying the hearts of the soldiers they left behind"—suturing the ruptures of heteronormativity in war.

Differential Responses between Iams and Nip/Tuck

The differential responses to the scenes of dog-woman intimacy in Nip/Tuck and Iams reveals that representations of bestiality are mediated differently depending on context. Images of bestiality appear to be read differently, dependent on who is looking at the

representations, how they are positioned in their own relationships to their pets, and how they either do or do not feel implicated in the scenes presented of human-animal intimacy.

The *Nip/Tuck* scene of bestiality, though representing a more dramatic and abject transgression of human-animal sexual boundaries, is not met with the same intensity of response as the Iams commercial. While some commenters note their "shock" at suggestion of bestiality in *Nip/Tuck*, many treat it as a joke, and an almost expected element in a show renowned for its shock-value. The clear violation of normative human-animal intimate boundaries in the episode may be more acceptable in the discursive frame of *Nip/Tuck* since its fans are trained to expect the "shocking" and abject as part of the show's promise of titillation and scandal. The suggestion of bestiality is also mediated by the clearly fictional nature of the show. Furthermore, although the show suggests a bestial interaction between Noble and Rojo, it does not actually show this interaction. Together, this means that the episode presents a clear distinction between Shari Noble's relationship to Rojo and the viewers' relationships with their pets. Under these terms, Noble can be presented as abject—a subject who has transgressed norms of heteroromance and femininity—without implicating everyday practices of pet love.

The Iams commercial, conversely, shown on a variety of networks and media platforms, does not have a singular audience and invites U.S. pet owners to imagine themselves in Dawn's place. As a commercial meant to reflect "unconditional love" between owners and their pets, the Iams commercial implicates everyday practices and expressions of pet love. Many viewers have a strong response to the Iams commercial's depiction of woman-dog intimacy because it suggests that everyday pet love has a sexual component. The implication of an ambiguous boundary between innocuous "puppy love" and grotesque

bestiality echoed in commenters' responses to the Iams commercial reveals the discursive and affective work necessary to keep "pet love" pure from sexual innuendo—producing a firm line between sexuality and intimacy.

Where the *Nip/Tuck* episode presents a bestial femininity to *discipline* a transgression of heteronormativity, the Iams commercial consolidates a maternal hetero-femininity through the depiction of woman-dog intimacy. Part of commenters' claims of perversion in response to the Iams commercial, then, may involve an investment in and desire to protect a clear boundary between the maternal and the sexual. Those commenters who did not see the interaction between Dawn and Rocky as sexual often claimed that Dawn is like Rocky's "mother"—evoking their relationships with their own pets—and to claim that sexual intimacy characterizes such interaction would be to intimate that everyday U.S. pet practices may also contain sexual intimacy, a position they deplore.

These examples help illuminate the nuances of what Glenney Boggs calls "the double legacy of animal love (that is bestiality and 'puppy love' as conjoined discourses)" (2013, 15) operate in popular culture and dominant media discourse around female-dog relationships. For Glenney Boggs, part of this "double legacy" is that animal love can signify an ultimate expression of national and maternal love (two of the most venerated forms of love)—while it can also signify a bestial and abject desire. For Glenney Boggs, "the subject is not self-sufficient but relies on affective relationships that cross species line" (2013, 6). She argues that the complex negotiation of a distinction between pet love and bestiality reveals important lessons about biopower (Glenney Boggs 2013). The negotiation of these frames of love—between normative pet love and monstrous bestiality, is central to subjectification.

Conclusion: "Queer" Hauntings of Heteronormative Military Nationalism

In reading the discourses about Shari and Rojo and the Iams commercial it is helpful to consider the intimacies and erotics of nationalism—the circuits of desire, frames of intimacy, and depictions of sexuality—that help to shape and discipline the nation and its citizen-subjects. An erotics of nationalism is informed by histories of gendered racialization and colonialism that specifically present the white woman's body as a site of both promise and anxiety for the reproduction of the nation, the body-politic, and the nation as a secure and domesticized/civilized place.

This chapter in part analyzes how different formations of human and dog intimacy—particularly "puppy love" and bestiality—operate in popular culture and dominant media discourse around humans, dogs, and human-dog relationships in the "war on terror." As in Chapter 2, it takes evocations of bestiality as an important and under-theorized element that circulates in the production and disciplining of both U.S. citizens and Iraqis and Afghan people in discourses and practices connected to the U.S. "war on terror."

The homecoming scenes I have examined both perform and discipline gender for the female soldier as well as the military wife. Together, these discourses—Jempsen and Emma on *The Queen Latifah Show*, the many stories about Beberg and Ratchet, Crisp's memoir of introducing dogs transported from Iraq to soldiers' female relatives, the Iams "Keep Love Strong" commercial, and the "Shari Noble" episode of *Nip/Tuck*—reveal the way that representations of military homecomings involving dogs and women can work both to secure and to disrupt heteronormativity. The discourses around these cultural products reveal the negotiation of a domestic femininity through representing a relationship between woman and dog. These discourses can sanitize the female soldier who returns from war, enabling the

soldier returning to the homefront to display a nurturing heterofemininity, while they also discipline femininity to be oriented to normative hetero-domesticity. Together, the various cases reveal the intimate connections between frames of gender, the nation, and species in mediating representations of the domestic under U.S. militarism. Public discourses about these media products further reveal the complex negotiations between boundaries of maternal/sexual, human/animal, and disgust/sentimentality central to the representational politics of white femininity under U.S. militarism.

The ideologies of human and animal intimacies produce gendered nationalisms in war through a politics of affect around sentimentality and abjection that mediate anxieties around the soldier who returns from the “frontlines” to everyday civilian life. The dog serves as an affective technology that helps to produce gender in heteronormative terms. These homecoming scenes further shape “intimate publics” they present as public spectacle performances of intimate life. The figure of the dog is a central tool in the affective and discursive work of homecoming discourses in establishing heteronormative pro-military sentiment in the national imaginary.

Notes

[1] On its Facebook page, Iams asked consumers to submit real-life videos about their love of their pets for a competition; the winners would be featured in Iams' television and print ad campaign that would represent the "strong love" between a dog and its owner. Iams made several commercials based on the videos sent in. The company posted these commercials on its Facebook page and asked website visitors to vote on which commercial they would like to see. Iams claims that it chose the commercial that received the most "shares," "likes," and comments during November 2011. It reports that the video of Dawn and Rocky won the competition—with 83,986 "likes," 3,282 comments, and 12,204 "shares" ("Welcome Home" 2013).

Iams claims that the commercial is based on a "true life" story—about a woman named Andrea Robinson and her dog, "Monster." This basis for the commercial is supported by a blog written by Andrew Robinson, apparently the husband of Andrea Robinson. He wrote in his blog, "Today my family—okay my wife and our five dogs—received word that an Iams commercial Andrea did with our Irish Wolfhound 'Monster' was chosen as their next national TV spot. Apparently, it has already begun airing across the country as we have received several messages from friends and family letting us know that they've seen it. If you haven't seen the 30-second commercial you can view it below. I'm so proud of both of them, they did a great job!" (Robinson 2012).

Iams' marketing strategy reflects what Sarah Banet-Weiser (2012) calls a "new mode of engagement" between consumers and brands: in effect, brands ask consumers to generate content from which they present themselves as jointly creating their brand. Banet-Weiser argues that this strategy presents itself as establishing "authentic relationships between consumers and producers, and [building] culture out of these relationships" (46). According to Banet-Weiser, this new mode of engagement produces a new "producer consumer," an active subject whose immaterial labor is central to the production of the brand and its affective community (47). Iams thus recruited the immaterial labor of Andrea (and perhaps Monster), as well as the judgment of the "fans" who voted for their favorite user-generated commercial. The Iams commercial, then, is a cultural product that actively *produces* and secures normative representations of pet love. By attributing the scene of the commercial to a "real" story—to one embedded in narratives of war—Iams draws on heavily affectively

saturated significations of the nation through a narrative about "personal experience" that is firmly situated in the intimate public sphere.

[2] The Irish wolfhound is said to be the tallest dog in the world, standing 28 to 35 inches and weighing between 90 and 150 pounds ("Choosing an Irish Wolfhound" n.d.). According to the American Kennel Club, the male Wolfhound's minimum size is 32 inches, and minimum weight is 120 pounds ("Irish Wolfhound" n.d.).

[3] Iams founds its campaign on appeal to affects of pet love it frames as "universal": "Pet owners continue to love Iams and with the launch of this new campaign, we feel positive it will resonate strongly with even more animal lovers since *this bond is universal among all pet owners*" (emphasis added). The company claims that the marketing campaign that includes this commercial demonstrates "the unconditional love between people and their dogs" and intends to "[showcase] the important role premium nutrition like Iams plays in keeping a dog or cat's body as strong as their love" ("Iams Launches New Campaign" n.d.). The New-York branch of the advertising company Saatchi & Saatchi developed the campaign through television and print ads. The commercial's logic suggests that feeding pets Iams dog food is the best way to express love for animals. Love here serves as cultural capital for the market and the military. In these various affective economies of neoliberalism, love for one's pet is reflected in capital investment—here in Iams dog food. This investment is also in the animal—in keeping him strong so that, as the commercial suggests, he can keep you strong. A strong love means an investment in Iams—as well as pro-military sentiment—a strong love for the nation.

[4] Glenney Boggs argues that attention to human-animal intimacy is missing from our histories of sexuality. She argues interrogating the negotiation of scenes of animal love—from "puppy love" to bestiality—is an important yet undertheorized and missing element in the study of sexuality. According to Glenney Boggs, "Animal love forms an effective spectrum that connects bestiality with puppy love and presses us beyond the human-animal dyad in ways that encourage us to specify[…] how we are seeing the partners of the relationship. Part of the issue here is that these partners are social constructed: the structure of witnessing that is integral to bestiality makes these relationships public in was that we are talking not only about the direct partners of the (sexual) relationship, but also about the witnesses to these affective encounters…the strange publics we construct around animal intimacies" (Glenney Boggs 2013, 188).

A few scholars have, as Glenney-Boggs (2013) suggests, theorized bestiality in relation to the politics of sexuality. Midas Dekkers and Marjorie Garber (1997) argue that human and animal sexual encounters are pervasive in the Western imaginary. Other scholars, such as Jens Rydstrom (2003) and Jonas Liliquest (1991) focus on the way bestiality has been tied to representations of sodomy and homosexuality. Rydstrom and Liliquest, as well as Brown and Rasmussen (2010) identify the way discourses of bestiality or read onto rural spaces to produce an account of sexuality in rural spaces as backwards and perverse. Other work on bestiality is focused on the way in which bestiality may be framed as "interspecies sexual assault" (Beirne 1997), or conversely, as something that needs to be understood outside of anthropocentric law.

Feminist and queer theorists have also taken account of the work that discourses of bestiality *do*. Marjorie Garber (1997) argues that fantasies about human and animal sexual relationships have been present in western literature and popular culture in the 18th and 19th century. Glenney Boggs calls for "an understanding of the specifically gendered and sexual constructions that occur via bestiality" (Glenney Boggs 2010, 100). Kathy Rudy argues that dogs are central objects of love for her, and argues that the line between platonic love and what some may call "bestiality" is more tenuous than many would think (Rudy 2011). These analyses are productive for highlighting the ambiguous way in which we understand acts as representing bestiality, or conversely, normative expressions of love between humans and animals. These works are also important in their call for understanding the gendered discourses that are part of the way bestiality is understood, though these accounts do not fully develop how women and women's bodies are a crucial site of analysis to understand the how appropriate intimacies between humans and dogs are framed.

[5] I trace a sampling of these responses from sites including *Facebook* and, AdFibs, *Why I Hate Dogs*, *Trends Journal*, *I Will Have Told You So*, *BitterWallet, Why I Love Dogs*, and *Christian Chat Rooms & Forum*. I read the comments on these sites as not necessarily representing "true" emotions, but rather, as expressions of the biopolitical disciplining of human and animal intimacies. The comments are themselves performances that reveal a politics without revealing "true" unmediated responses to the discourses of the episode. In other words, to express disgust on an online forum is not necessarily to "feel" disgust. The comments are power-laden rhetoric: as political arguments that are produced by, and conduits of, power that discipline norms of subjectivity—of themselves as individual subjects and in terms of collective norms around heteronormative citizen-subjects.

[6] mfatpony@aol.com, 17 July 2014, www.whyihatedogs.com/2012/12/disgusting-iams-dog-food-commercial/.

[7] Charlie Kirby, December 15, 2013, www.adfibs.com/iams-rocky-the-dog-and-dawn-the-soldier/#.

[8] Janice, December 15, 2013, www.adfibs.com/iams-rocky-the-dog-and-dawn-the-soldier/#.

[9] Full-frontal/ missionary position/ coitus: "They showed her on her back, legs spread, with the dog hunched down onto her torso and crotch like they were having frontal coitus (missionary position sex)" (Kirk 2013). "Also, for the record, the dog's genital area is a good 3 feet from the soldier's genital area. It's down by her ankle. Even a cursory knowledge of human anatomy and canine anatomy could tell you this is in no way 'frontal coitus'" (wtf3000 2013). "The ad in question does indeed show frontal genital to genital contact between the woman and the wolfhound, aka missionary position" (Wondering 2013). "It's so tedious that the cultists trolling this site are always making an issue of whether or not the anatomy of the beast is aligned with that of the human. Conceptually, they appear to be in missionary position" (dogsfromhell 2013). (All from: "Disgusting Iams Dog Food Commercial" 2013).

[10] The woman's legs spread: "The girl clearly has her legs spread wide open, and the dog facing her, on top of her, his genitals pressing up against her!" (ed 2013). "They showed her on her back, legs spread, with the dog hunched down onto her torso and crotch like they were having frontal coitus (missionary position sex)" (Kirk 2013). "I feel that you can certainly get the message across that can definitely exist a great human/animal bond without the dog laying between her straddled legs" (Jen 2013). "It doesn't matter if the 'genitals don't match up' the girls still has her legs wide open, and the dog is pressing against her genitals its highly inappropriate and I am TOTALLY against beastiality" (ed 2013). "A girl shouldn't have her legs open like that, and a dog pressing up against her genitals. I don't care if the genitals weren't touching. That's disgusting" (ed 2013). (All from: "Disgusting Iams Dog Food Commercial" 2013).

[11] Woman put her hand between the dog's hind legs: "First, I saw the woman stick her hand between the dog's hind legs while wrestling around with him" (Kirk 2013). "Woman also places her hand between and up the animal's hind end. Very disturbing behavior and should not be deemed to be normal" (Wondering 2013). (All from: "Disgusting Iams Dog Food Commercial" 2013).

[12] Dog on top of the woman or mounting: "That commercial was disgusting. The dog was clearly on top of her to the point where it would make people think……what is up here" (Sidney 2014).

"It is a bit odd to lay in a drive way with your legs spread while a dog is on top of you" (DogHater#1 2012). "The girl clearly has her legs spread wide open, and the dog facing her, on top of her, his genitals pressing up against her!" (ed 2013). "Was that dog mounting that woman in way that it looked like they were having sex…OMG?" (Mark 2013). "No need for those of you who are concerned 'what lines up or not' that's just splitting hairs" (Jen 2013). (All from: "Disgusting Iams Dog Food Commercial" 2013).

[13] Alignment of genitals: "The girl clearly has her legs spread wide open, and the dog facing her, on top of her, his genitals pressing up against her!" (ed 2013). "Firstly the genitals do not even closely match up" (Jason 2013). "I didn't see any genital areas matching up either" (DogHater#1 2013). "Also, for the record, the dog's genital area is a good 3 feet from the soldier's genital area It's down by her ankle. Even a cursory knowledge of human anatomy and canine anatomy could tell you this is in no way 'frontal coitus'" (wtf3000 2013). "I don't think it's sexual. I don't think the genitals match up at all" (prfctday 2013). "Even though it might not be a perfect genital alignment it is still offensive based on the fact that it is perceived as sexual in nature" (dogsfromhell 2013). "I feel that you can certainly get the message across that can definitely exist a great human/animal bond without the dog laying between her straddled legs. No need for those of you who are concerned 'what lines up or not' that's just splitting hairs" (Jen 2013). "It doesn't matter if the 'genitals don't match up' the girl still has her legs wide open, and the dog is pressing against her genitals its highly inappropriate and I am TOTALLY against bestiality" (ed 2013). "A girl shouldn't have her legs open like that, and a dog pressing up against her genitals. I don't care if the genitals weren't touching. That's disgusting" (ed 2013). "What a complete and utter head in the gutter perspective you take…Genital contact/sex with a dog—gimme a break" (steve 2013). "And, are you so delirious that you would suggest their 'genitals' match up? Quite contrary, she is, at most, 5'3, he, sprawled as you state, is about 5'10. Do the math" (Jenn 2013). "And if you think the 'genitals are aligned' in that sweet display of affection, then you also don't know the anatomy of a human OR a canine. For that to be true, that animal's genitals would have to be on his chest" (Buff 2013). "But, if you know anything about a dog's anatomy, his 'parts' were down by her right shoe, hardly bestiality" (Doglover#394 2013). (All from: "Disgusting Iams Dog Food Commercial" 2013).

[14] Darling, sweet, loving, and pure: "I must say I think this commercial is sweet and pure and there are no sexual undertones" (Lovelily 2013). "I love that commercial with Rocky. So sweet and loving!!!! I have an old black lab just as wonderful and yes we lay on the floor together"

(Dog Lover 2013). "That is a darling commercial. I too have an Irish Wolfhound, they are huge dogs, and they 'over power' you. He was just showing her how much he loves her. There was nothing gross about it. I have an Irish Wolfhound, and they are very loving. Dawn is his 'mommy' in real life" (Jinx Arthur 2014). "And if any of you ever owned a dog, or any pet which you loved you would realize that laying on the floor and the dog on top of you or next to you whatever is not uncommon at all" (Josh 2013). "The dog's brain isn't thinking like your warped brain (is). The dog is happy and I like the commercial. How is it that a dog, who's instincts are to roll over, be playful, and show affection for its owner could possibly be turned into what you described as gross and perverted?" (Jeff Poppen 2013). (All from: "Disgusting Iams Dog Food Commercial" 2013).

[15] Reflects strong bonds between dogs and their people: "Anyone with dogs, especially the giant breeds would look at that and see only the joy of best friends being reunited" (Jason 2013). "We own one [an Irish Wolfhound] and they are awesome" (bill 2013). "Irish Wolfhound. . . And anyone who knows the breed knows how cuddly and affectionate they are and there's nothing 'dirty' about them wrestling on the ground. They are just sweethearts. Partly because they are so big, just hand petting them is not enough" (wolfhound lover 2013). "The [Irish Wolfhound's] bond with people is truly amazing – perhaps unparalleled. The commercial totally captures this bond effectively. IW'S thrive on human companionship and make for a terrific family pet as they are fantastic with children and adults alike" (steve 2013). "Dogs jump on their owners quite often, especially if they just got back from over sees and they haven't seen them in a while" (Amber 2013). "My dogs are just like family…..and I think the IAMS commercial is awesome" (rae 2013). "Rocky's only fault is that he is so large – he is a small dog in a huge dog body. Just before he ran over to give his military "mom" a snuggle, he was smiling from ear to ear and on his back which showed that he was totally submissive and happy" (er#394 2013). (All from: "Disgusting Iams Dog Food Commercial." https://www.whyihatedogs.com/2012/12/disgusting-iams-dog-food-commercial/) "Dawn is his 'mommy' in real life" (Jinx Arthur, AdFibs 2014), "So cuddling with your dog is inappropriate? Guess I'm inappropriate then" (Hanna, AdFibs, 2014).

[16] Reflects relations of innocence and unconditional love: "You are reading too much into a beautiful innocent moment with a dog and it's master. . . You don't understand the joy a dog brings to your life" (ND 2013). "It's a commercial about the unconditional love of a pet…..that's it, not a prelude to animal porn" (leslie 2013). "There is NOTHING inappropriate about this commercial!! It is depicting an unconditional love between an owner and her dog–who

missed her while she was away and nothing more" (Ann 2013). "There is nothing even REMOTELY sexual about or in this commercial! . . . it is just showing their unconditional love—and how much they missed one another while she was away—it is pure, INNOCENT and heartwarming, in all it's true REALITY—there ARE NO SEXUAL UNDERTONES or OVERT ones—I know some of you may just never experienced the unconditional love of an animal" (Ann 2013). "That is a film of how much a dog feels for his owner and vice versa. Unadulterated, unsexual, real love! And that's it!" (Kim 2013). "[It shows] the genuine love . . . between people and their pets" (eve brehman 2013). "I only saw the love of one [of] our 4 legged kids for their human parent" (susan 2013). "Our pets are companions and enrich our lives" (Crystal 2013). "Dogs are very loving and it has nothing to with sexuality. Dogs give unconditional love, they can listen and understand what you're saying and make you feel better without saying a word. . . . a sweet dog commercial" (Stacy 2013). "Dogs are beautiful, loving, protective, and love you unconditionally. I have seen this commercial a thousand times….and it's AWESOME!" (Buff 2013). (All from: "Disgusting Iams Dog Food Commercial" 2013).

[17] Damon, May 13, 2013: "If you love your dog, feed him Iams dog food and have sex with him." (http://www.iwillhavetoldyouso.com/2013/05/if-you-love-your-dog-feed-him-iams-dog-food-and-have-sex-with-him/).

[18] Sick, pathetic, and perverted: "You're a bunch of sickos !!!!" (Dog Lover 2013). "You people are sick if you seriously put a connection between this commercial and anything sexual" (Amber 2013). "You are one sick & perverted person, that's all I have to say!" (Sherri Smail 2013). "I feel only a perv would take that commercial the wrong way" (Tanisha 2013). "You're a PERV" (Jim 2013). "Only those of you which have thought of bestiality would have been threatened by this commercial. After all, one who has nothing to hide does not feel the need to state that they indeed, have nothing to hide. Guilty Conscious you creeps?" (Josh 2013). (Available at: "Disgusting Iams Dog Food Commercial," 2013). "In response to whoever made the 'bestiality' complaints – you are sick. It's pathetic your mind even goes there" (Kira 2014, www.ohmidog.com/2013/11/08/woof-in-advertising-rocky-and-dawn/).

[19] Sick, mentally ill, mind in the gutter: "Your mind must be in the gutter. . . . You're sick. And you took that add to a level it never need to go" (Jason 2013). "Obviously your mind is in the gutter. Who in their right mind would find something sexual in that commercial? You're gross for seeing anything else!" (Kim 2013). "What a complete and utter head in the gutter perspective you take on this Iam's commercial and dog. Genital contact/sex with a dog—

gimme a break" (steve 2013). "The love shown here has nothing to do with the filth that only someone like you would come up with. . . Try to get your mind out of the gutter and back on your shoulders where it should be(?)" (susan 2013). ("Disgusting Iams Dog Food Commercial" 2013).

[20] Demented, crazy, unhealthy mind, see filth everywhere, shame: "I feel sorry for poor demented people who find filth in everything" (bill 2013). "Anyone who could view this commercial as 'gross' or 'wrong' should seek help. Just because you don't like dogs, it should not bother you that bad, nor, possess you to post such demented thoughts" (Jenn 2013). "The contention that anything untoward is going on in this commercial is not only laughable but downright sick. YOU CRAZY PEOPLE are putting that spin on it yourselves . . .. These are clearly your own thoughts and perversions being transferred onto a harmless commercial" (wtf3000 2013). "It's a shame you cannot see the ad for the genuine love it showed . . . Your mind is not in a place of health and it makes sense that your family feels the same way" (eve brehman 2013). "I feel sorry for poor demented people who find filth in everything" (bill 2013). "This says more about how your brain works than that poor innocent dog. Shame on you" (er#394 2013). "And seriously if you think there was any form of sexual under tones in that commercial you're absolutely crazy and I recommend you find a therapist ASAP! Then maybe you can enjoy life" (Kim 2013). ("Disgusting Iams Dog Food Commercial" 2013). "You see 'dirty' everywhere (Kira 2014, www.ohmidog.com/2013/11/08/woof-in-advertising-rocky-and-dawn/).

[21] Need professional help, something wrong with you: "Beastiality?! Really?! You really need professional help" (Crystal 2013). "Beastiality? Really what is wrong with you? Do you think when mothers are kissing on their babies in diaper commercials that they are child molesters?? . . . If you have nothing to do but make something out of nothing because of a sweet dog commercial then you have real problems" (Stacy 2013). "What is wrong with you?" (er#394 2013). "And seriously if you think there was any form of sexual under tones in that commercial you're absolutely crazy and I recommend you find a therapist ASAP! Then maybe you can enjoy life" (Kim 2013). ("Disgusting Iams Dog Food Commercial" 2013).

[22] On drugs, warped brain, fucked up: "Are all you people smoking crack????? . . . what chemicals have to run through a person's brain to even actually go there???" (leslie 2013). "Are you on drugs or just stupid?" (susan 2013). "Your opinion that you and your friends/family agree with your perception of the Iams Rocky dog commercial is ridiculous. The dog's brain isn't thinking like your warped brain (is). . . . Go read a book or something. Or better, go volunteer

at the Humane Society and witness unconditional love from the poor creatures who crave human attention" (Jeff Poppen 2013). "OMGosh!!!! How can you look at yourself….you must be miserable in your lives!!!!! . . . anyone thinking it is beastiality is just f___ed up" (rae 2013). ("Disgusting Iams Dog Food Commercial" 2013).

[23] Idiot, probably molested: "You are an idiot! What happened to you in your sad life for you to see something sexual in this commercial? I suppose you were molested….is that your excuse? Go get therapy, please (Kim, "Disgusting Iams Dog Food Commercial" 2013).

[24] Inbred idiot, must promote hatred: "You're an idiot. . . . It is inbred people like you that teach and promote hatred and hypocrisy. You must hate gays too huh? or women who make more money than you? Maybe minorities as well? You should keep your bitter hatred to yourself, perhaps in your own private journal, or in a closed session with a psychologist. Because you are truly the ones who need help" (Josh 2013). ("Disgusting Iams Dog Food Commercial," 2013).

[25] Redneck asshole, prick, coward, perpetrator of incest with mother: "Douche bag. watch the commercial again. What kind of redneck asshole has to spew hate over a dog commercial? What a giant prick you are. That is all I have because I am busy watching your Mom lay on the driveway and get humped. PS. I did serve in the military and I can guarantee you rode your Mother instead of stepping up for your country" (Sanders 2013). ("Disgusting Iams Dog Food Commercial" 2013).

[26] er#394,"Disgusting Iams Dog Food Commercial" 2013.

[27] Buff 2015, "Disgusting Iams Dog Food Commercial" 2013.

[28] The episode also echoes a common urban myth called the "lap dog legend," usually focused on cross-species sexual activity initiated by young women. According to a popular version of this myth, a group of friends waiting in the darkness to surprise a woman with a party catches her offering herself to her dog with peanut butter smeared on her private parts. Sometimes a husband or boyfriend throws the surprise party only to find out that the woman has been engaging in sexual interactions with her dog. Older "surprise party" legends focused on revelatory scenes of pre-marital or adulterous sex. The "lap dog legend" appears to be a new iteration focused on scenes of bestiality. The dogs involved are often named "Lucky," "Chief," "Kippy," or "Skippy"— signifying a male dog's name, a brand of dog food, and a brand of peanut butter, particularly evocative of the incident of "Shari Noble" ("Fact Check" 2008).

[29] Jake, Sep 27 06 12:22 "Nip/Tuck Fan Forum." http://niptuckfans.com/forum/show.php?f=6&topic=20060926190821.

[30] JaceJones, Sep 27, 2006 http://www.tv.com/shows/niptuck/forums/official-discussion-thread-4x04-shari-noble-spoilers-8290-509920/?page=1.

[31] Xx_King_Beef_xX, Sep 27, 2006 http://www.tv.com/shows/niptuck/forums/official-discussion-thread-4x04-shari-noble-spoilers-8290-509920/?page=1.

[32] TheDisorder, Sep 27, 2006 http://www.tv.com/shows/niptuck/forums/official-discussion-thread-4x04-shari-noble-spoilers-8290-509920/?page=1.

[33] shawnlunn2002, Oct 3, 2006, http://www.tv.com/shows/niptuck/forums/official-discussion-thread-4x04-shari-noble-spoilers-8290-509920/?page=1.

[34] jmac4ever, Sep 27, 2006 http://www.tv.com/shows/niptuck/forums/official-discussion-thread-4x04-shari-noble-spoilers-8290-509920/?page=1.

[35] tjaman http://www.tv.com/shows/niptuck/forums/official-discussion-thread-4x04-shari-noble-spoilers-8290-509920/?page=1.

[36] Texgal, September 28, 2006, http://niptuckfans.com/forum/show.php?f=6&topic=20060926190821&u=18.

[37]Anonymous, Oct 4, 2006, http://niptuckfans.com/forum/show.php?f=6&topic=20060926190821&u=18.

[38] shawnlunn2002, Oct 3, 2006, http://www.tv.com/shows/niptuck/forums/official-discussion-thread-4x04-shari-noble-spoilers-8290-509920/?page=1.

[39] BabyPhat, Oct 03 2006, http://www.tv.com/shows/niptuck/forums/official-discussion-thread-4x04-shari-noble-spoilers-8290-509920/?page=1.

[40] bignip, Oct 03 06 - 1:19 pm, http://www.tv.com/shows/niptuck/forums/official-discussion-thread-4x04-shari-noble-spoilers-8290-509920/?page=1.

[41] Anonymous, http://niptuckfans.com/epguide/4x04.php.

Chapter 5: The Affective Biopolitics of Military Working Dogs

In this chapter I examine several prominent discourses about military working dogs in relation to U.S. nationalism drawn from a broad archive of material about U.S. military working dogs published from 2001 to 2017 in U.S. media, policy and law.[1] Military working dogs have figured centrally in the U.S. "war on terror" and its articulations of U.S. nationalism. As I indicated in Chapter 1, the U.S. military has what has been called the largest "canine contingent in the world," with 2,800 dogs as of 2010, (Frankel 2011). The military uses working dogs to carry out search and rescue missions, to find explosives, to guard bases, and to interrogate prisoners (Drury 2013). These dogs serve as weapons and soldiers. Some are trained to jump out of planes from 25,000 feet in the air with their handlers to find "enemy insurgents" (Jeon 2011a), and some are outfitted with K9 Storm tactical vests that cost over $20,000 each (Holloway 2011). Military working dogs figure as powerful sites for generating affects of sentimental patriotism to further U.S. militarism.

I analyze these discourses to consider a series of questions: What is the symbolic work done by the figure of the military working dog in the U.S. national imaginary? How is the figure of the military working dog mobilized to generate pro-military sentiment? How do discourses about the military working dog work in a discursive economy that elevates dogs framed as supporting U.S. military endeavors and makes expendable those humans framed as racialized enemies of the United States?

Narratives about military working dogs, like the narratives discussed in Chapter 3 about "rescuing" Iraqi and Afghani dogs, rely on and develop the affective economies of pet love and pro-military American nationalism. But rather than framing military working dogs

as innocent, helpless victims to be rescued, through the "trope of the waif" (Briggs 2003), discourses about military working dogs rely on a different set of rhetorical constructions. These discourses draw on the dogs' direct participation in U.S. military endeavors in terms that, while infused with sentimentality, also work to establish them as valued in some of the ways that human soldiers are valued in the national imaginary. Two rhetorical frames are particularly influential in developing the affective biopolitics of military working dogs: the trope of the dog as hero and the rhetoric of sacrifice. Tropes of the military dog as "hero," as generously sacrificing safety and life for the nation, as conscious patriots furthering U.S. national interests, elevate military working dogs to the position of what I call "quasi-liberal subjects"[2] in U.S. popular discourse. The rhetorical elevation of U.S. military working dogs—valued almost as military comrades—operates within an affective economy that in turn devalues the lives of those positioned as racialized enemy others, the "targets" of U.S. military endeavors.

The discourses about military working dogs that I examine are linked with certain cultural practices that encourage those living in the United States to participate in a sentimental nationalism within what Lauren Berlant calls "the intimate public sphere"—a sphere of national belonging and public life structured on the spectacles and experiences of private life (1997). Particularly relevant to my argument here is Berlant's claim that intimate publics elaborate themselves in part through participation in commodity culture (1997, 2008).[3] Berlant argues that in this sphere, "the dominant idea marketed by patriotic traditionalists is of a core nation whose survival depends on personal acts and identities performed in the intimate domains of the quotidian" (1997, 4). Berlant maintains that the

intimate public sphere ties national belonging with moralizing discourses and domesticity, such that citizenship in the United States has become sentimentalized.[4]

I argue that narratives about military working dogs spread and reproduce through the intimate public sphere by relying on, connecting, and developing what Sara Ahmed (2004) calls "affective economies"—in this case particularly the affective economies of pet love and pro-military U.S. nationalism. Thinking in terms of affective economies allows us to dismiss taken-for-granted notions that emotions are simply created by or emerge from people or objects. Instead, according to Ahmed, emotions circulate between objects, bodies, and nations, so that repetition and circulation of affects leads them to "stick" to specific objects and bodies. In effect, affects of pet love and U.S. military nationalism circulating in the intimate public sphere become "performative," *producing* that which they are often taken to reveal.

In the next section I review recent history of policy about dogs in the U.S. military. Then I examine the trope of the military working dog as hero and its accompanying rhetoric of sacrifice in discourses that celebrate the dogs' participation in military achievements and establish how they should be mourned as national heroes. I argue that these entangled discourses serve to justify providing the dogs with special recognition. In the fourth section I examine how technologies of memory and national sentimentality play out in the U.S. Military Working Dog Teams National Monument, created in 2013 at Lackland Air Force Base in Texas. In the fifth section I consider more fully the ways that the intimate public sphere encourages people to demonstrate their citizenship and patriotism through personal consumer acts—in this case, acts that align the treatment of their own domestic dogs with the success of U.S. military endeavors. I examine three cases demonstrating how these species-

linked tropes of heroism and sacrifice bolster U.S. nationalism and pro-military sentiment by permeating the actions of the sentimental consumer-citizen. The final section interrogates the politics of grief engendered by U.S. nationalism and considers the effect of elevating of the military working dog to the status of a "quasi-liberal subject" worthy of grief at the expense of "enemy others" deemed disposable. The conclusion draws the argument together to emphasize the unexpected and slippery role of the military working dog at the center of affective frames of nationalist biopolitics[5] and zoopolitics[6] in the U.S. "war on terror."

Recent Histories of Dogs in the U.S. Military

The U.S. military has used dogs in war in the past. In World War I, dogs were used as messengers, in search and rescue missions, to guard bases, and as "military mascots." In World War II, the U.S. Army asked families to donate their dogs to support the war effort, with a promise that it would return these dogs when the war was over (Alger and Alger 2013, 81). In Vietnam, the U.S. army mobilized approximately 5,000 dogs.[7] Military working dogs in the war in Vietnam were not pets redeployed in war, but dogs bred for purposes of military action. These dogs were considered "expendable equipment"—either killed or left in Vietnam when no longer needed for military purposes (Hediger 2013).[8]

Discourses Around Robbie's Law (2000)

The U.S. military continued to classify military working dogs as "expendable equipment" until 2000. It required the disposal of the dogs after they were deemed no longer of use. Prior to legislation passed in 2000, when dogs located in the United States were considered no longer useful to the military, they were sent to work as K9 dogs for police

units or used in training programs for new handlers. When dogs located overseas were deemed no longer useful, the military abandoned or killed them (Hediger 2013).

Discourses criticizing the U.S. policy disposing of military working dogs emerged from animal rights organizations, as well as from veterans who were former dog handlers, and were taken up by politicians and the general public. Critics argued that rather being abandoned or killed, older dogs should be released from service to the military and made available for adoption by former handlers and other U.S. citizens. They argued that the dogs should be rewarded for the labor that they had contributed to the military, rather than having to continue to work. The opportunity to "retire" was sometimes presented through comparison to human workers. For example, one news story states, "Commercial airline pilots may face mandatory retirement, but working dogs are pulled from duty only when they get rusty, hurt or sick" (Christenson 2001). Another news story argues that the dogs should "not have to work until their dying day" (Hoffman 2000). These discourses frame military working dogs as having contributed valuable labor to the nation and in consequence deserving the chance for a good life. The discourses also recognize the dog's capacity to suffer—and to deserve a life beyond such suffering.

Discourses criticizing military policy about military working dogs mobilized efforts around the long career, loyalty, and eventual suffering of one dog in particular: Robby, an 11-year old Belgian Malinois bomb-sniffing dog.[9] Robby was framed as suffering from numerous health problems after his long work for the military, but as still having to work until his "dying day."[10] Representations of Robby figured centrally in discourses seeking to garner public support to overturn the military's policy on dogs. In fact, one source claimed that Robby was the "dog who triggered the concern on Capitol Hill and across the country"

(*Dallas Morning News* 2000). The organization People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA) initiated a "save Robby" campaign to mobilize dog-lovers across the country to protest Robby's "plight" and work for legislation to protect and respect other military working dogs. The campaigns that circulated around Robby emphasized that he deserved to "retire" from service work and live out the rest of his life as a pet. As part of this campaign, PETA wrote a letter to the chief of veterinary services at the U.S. military's dog training facility, arguing, "We hope you will agree that forcing Robby to work despite his deteriorating health until the day he dies, without being able to experience the comfort and joys of normal companionship, would be tragic . . . .We respectfully ask that you do what is in the best interest for Robby by retiring him from duty altogether and granting him a well-deserved reward for his lifelong service to the U.S. military" (Hoffman 2000). Despite the public mobilization around Robby, he was euthanized in January 2000 "because he was in constant pain" (Hoffman 2000).

Discourses about Robby's bodily suffering frame him in ways that are both sentimental and anthropomorphic. He is framed as a subject who feels pain that should be alleviated and who has contributed to the nation in ways that should be rewarded by the chance to experience "normal" companionship. He was given a "face," since his pain became visible, audible, and legible. In effect, these individuating discourses framed Robby as a member of the intimate public sphere, as both individual and representative of other military working dogs—and a figure that will elicit collective affect from the U.S. public based on his position as a suffering animal and patriotic canine-soldier. Normative ideologies of human exceptionalism often exclude animals from the capacity to suffer (see Derrida 2008; Haraway

2008). Discourses supporting Robby and other military working dogs emphasize these animals' capacity for suffering to frame them as deserving national subjects.

In 2000, H.R. 5314—popularly referred to as "Robby's Law"[11]—was passed,[12] allowing military working dogs, after their usefulness to the military has ended, to be adopted by their former handlers, law enforcement agencies, or other civilians.[13] The law originally required the military to keep official count of how many dogs it allows to be adopted and euthanizes per year (although a provision in the 2012 defense authorization repealed this reporting requirement).[14] While Robby's Law allowed military working dogs to be adopted after they were released from duty, the dogs were still classified as "excess" and treated as equipment. According to military policy, "Once that dog is adopted, it becomes a pet, and therefore loses its MWD [Military Working Dog] status, so it would be fraud, waste and abuse for the DOD [Department of Defense] to transport that pet" (Hurley 2012). In such circumstances, the military would not pay to transport these dogs to the United States so people who wanted to adopt the dogs would have to spend thousands of dollars to bring them back from overseas ("Canine Members" 2010). In addition, adopters had to pay veterinarian fees associated with any health problems that the dogs had incurred while deployed ("Canine Members" 2010). Robby's Law did not necessarily shift the structural underpinnings of the military's treatment of military working dogs. Although it made the dogs adoptable, it did not remove many of the financial and logistical barriers to adopting and caring for the dogs. No longer fully termed "expendable," the dogs were considered to be potentially "adoptable"—straddling the boundary between military weaponry and potential family member (Christenson 2001).

Discourses Around the Canine Member of the Armed Forces Act (2012)

Further alteration in the status in law of military working dogs was codified with the "Canine Members of the Armed Forces Act," which was added onto The National Defense Authorization Act for FY2013 (H.R. 4310 and S. 2134).[15] The legislation addressed what were argued by some to be inadequacies in Robby's Law in terms of the costs of transporting and caring for military dogs post-service.[16] The legislation required the military, rather than adopters, to pay for transporting to the United States dogs located overseas when deemed no longer of military use, and also made provision for a program to provide veterinary care to military working dogs who have been adopted (not requiring federal funds).[17] While the Act provided for transportation for the dogs and veterinary care, it did not adopt central provisions of the original Act 1) re-classifying the dogs from "equipment" and 2) providing for commemoration and dedication to those dogs who died during service or who performed "heroic" feats while on duty.[18] The distinction between status as equipment and as "fellow soldier" permeated discourses from advocates challenging the continued classification of dogs as equipment, mere objects. For example, a military wife who owned a retired military working dog claimed, "those dogs should be considered a soldier and not just a computer, a desk, a number, and this is all they are" (DogTime Staff 2013).

Some of the major tropes used to frame U.S. military working dogs—particularly the dog as hero—appear in a statement by Senator Richard Blumenthal, the bill's sponsor in the Senate. He stated, "Senate passage of the Canine Members of the Armed Services Act is an important first step, but this fight is far from over. These *courageous companions* and *comrades*, who *save lives* on the battlefields by detecting roadside bombs and other threats, now can retire to homes in America with critical care and support. I will continue to fight for

the provision in my original bill that reclassifies these *brave* and *talented dogs* from equipment to canine members of the armed forces. These dogs are so much more than a rifle or a tank. They are *living breathing heroes* who have *saved the lives of our troops* and provided many of our veterans with *companionship* long after they retire from service" (Blumenthal 2012, emphasis added). Blumenthal justifies his appeal for the subjectification of these dogs by framing them through their service to U.S. militarism—as brave heroes who serve U.S. military goals.

The Dog as Hero

Perhaps the most prominent and ultimately significant rhetoric framing the military working dog is that of the dog as "hero," a trope that infuses the discourses of celebration and mourning I trace. I argue that the readily deployed trope of dog as hero rests on links to taken-for-granted notions of bravery, whiteness, masculinity, and sacrifice that should be interrogated.

Heroes, Cyborgs, and Superheroes

A prominent example of the trope of the military working dog as hero characterizes discourses about a particular military working dog, Cairo, who came into the spotlight by participating in the Navy SEAL team mission that captured and killed Osama bin Laden on May 1, 2011. Cairo's presence was framed as a vital "human interest" story in celebrating what was seen as success for the United States in completing this mission. According to one source: "the identities of all 80 members of the American commando team who thundered into Abbottabad, Pakistan, and killed Osama bin Laden are the subject of intense speculation, but perhaps none more so than the only member with four legs" (Harris 2011a).

Public discourses repeatedly framed Cairo through the language of heroism, as well as related tropes: he was framed as a "dog hero" (Harris 2011b), a "canine superhero," (Goodavage 2012, 9) and an "International Dog of Mystery" (Harris 2011a). Robin Ganzert, president and chief executive of the American Humane Association, echoing military language, said: "When you think about the Osama bin Laden *take down*, a military dog was there. A *hero dog* was there" (Samuels 2011, emphasis added). President Obama remarked in a news conference: "I would like to meet that dog" (Jeon 2011b). One story, titled "AWWW: A War Dog Helped Take Out Osama," links the politics of cuteness with the militarized trope of the hero. The story claims, "You know what this whole Osama Is Dead story has been missing? A cute animal angle to fawn over. But no longer! […] Enough with the discussion of the photos of Osama's corpse, we want to see photos of the war dog who helped take him out!" (Johnston 2011). Emphasizing the "cuteness" of Cairo works to erase from view the vicious effects of U.S. violence: not only on the body of bin Laden, but on the bodies of so many others killed in the war, whether labeled "insurgents" or "collateral damage." Here patriotism becomes a positive feeling by presenting part of the war as a pleasurable "pet" commodity, distancing the United States from acknowledging its responsibility for the causes of violent events (see Sturken 2007).

Celebration of the successful deployment of military technology through Cairo and other military working dogs is part of the script complicating the notion of dog as hero. There was much discussion of Cairo's "night-vision goggles, bullet-resistant body armor, a live-action camera between his shoulders, earbuds to hear whispered commands, rappelling gear [and] four deadly titanium teeth" (Goodavage 2012, 8). Such connections between dogs, the use of military technology and the costs of military technology are common. The military

spent, for example, almost $90,000 on four K9 Storm tactical vests for Navy SEAL dogs in 2010 (Holloway 2011). Deployed as tools of war, military working dogs outfitted with thousands of dollars of equipment, become what Donna Haraway calls "cyborgs," figures that blur the boundaries between human and animal, as well as machine and organism (Haraway 1985, 101; see also 1991). The figuration of the dog as hero slides into the notion of the cyborgian military dog as "superhero." So, one story argued, "Cairo's image made Batman look like a gadget-impoverished Spartan" (Goodavage 2012, 8). The dogs become superhuman figurations for war—through their organic capacities for smell, through their outfitting with advanced weaponry and armor, as well as through the intense and disciplined training regime to which they are subjected. Rendering Cairo as a "canine superhero" superior to the likes of Batman positions him as exceeding the category "dog" and even the category "human"—in fantasy and figuration.

Connecting the figure of the military working dog to the successful deployment of military technology complicates the trope of the dog as hero. It is not just the "subjectivity" of the dog that is celebrated, but its ability to embody U.S. military power and the wealth of a country that spends so much on technology deployed by animals. The dog as cyborgian hero is also a phallic symbol under militarized masculinity (see Wiegman 1994). The dogs extend these phallic significations as weapon, cyborg, and superhuman—reifying a militarized hegemonic masculinity through the figure of the dog as war hero. Thus, references to military technology figure the dog at a tenuous boundary: the dog is sometimes framed as *itself* a technological tool of war, while at other times, the use of technology is used to frame the dogs as "quasi-human" agents. Difference is continually framed within shifting hierarchies of comparison.

The Qualities of Heroes

Traditional discourses of heroism have focused on the display of specific virtues, traits, attributes, achievements, or behaviors that are deemed exemplary, making individuals stand out from the group they are in. What does this attribution of heroism imply? A hero is "a person, typically a man, who is admired or idealized for courage, outstanding achievements, or noble qualities: a war hero" (OED 2014). Heroism is traditionally framed by reference to traits such as courage (the ability to do something that frightens one; strength in the face of pain or grief), bravery (courageous behavior or character), or fearlessness—all these traits are admired when the individual is seen as behaving in heroic ways while fully aware of facing potential consequences of danger and death. The term is used without acknowledging that dogs are generally not seen as having such awareness.

The move to imagine dog as hero and hero as dog renders these figures *sticky* in Ahmed's terms—as objects that have been tied to a multiplicity of significations with affective currency. The signs attached to the figure of the hero—a noble, courageous, usually white, male person—are transposed on to the figure of the military working dog. The affects attached to soldiers and dogs also stick together—pride, respect, and courage. The heroism of the soldier is transferred to stick to the dog; at the same time, sentiments and noble characteristics attributed to the dog are transferred to stick to the soldier—further ennobling the soldier as a sentimental subject.

The use of the trope of dog as hero demonstrates how the term "hero" has changed since 9/11 to become a virtually automatic way of attributing special significance to those whose specific employment status links them to the achievement of military or governmental goals (such as enforcement of the law). The incessant repetition of the claim that soldiers,

police officers, firefighters, and other "first responders" are "heroes" serves to establish their heroism and is embodied at the moment they are employed, rather than on the occasion when specific outstanding behaviors appear during that employment. Heroism is unmoored from evaluation of specific contributions and behaviors of individuals, serving to elevate entire groups of people according to their employment status. This move elevates state authority and those who enforce it, while rendering invisible and unintelligible the many noble, unselfish, courageous acts and behaviors exhibited by those not involved in the military. It serves to glorify state authority based on violence and shut down critical discussion about political and military policies.

In the U.S. national imaginary, the term "hero" is embedded in the terms of hegemonic militarized masculinity and unmarked whiteness (Prividera and Howard 2006). The result of the widespread use of the trope of dog as hero is to frame both the handler and the military working dog as male, effacing female handlers and dogs and reinscribing masculinity as the desired normative position. Although military working dogs are both male and female, discourses about these dogs consistently refer to the dogs as male and generally use the pronoun "he" when talking about individual dogs. While this linguistic move is predicated in part on the very nature of androcentric language and the use of "he" and "man" as unmarked gender-neutral signifiers, this gendered language also reveals the ways in which the military dog is always imagined in relation to the sign of the soldier and hero—both imagined as male. The construction of the trope of dog as hero thus also reveals the construction of the trope of the white man as "American hero."

The Hero Dog Sacrificing for the Nation

The trope of the dog as hero necessarily includes the rhetoric of sacrifice, perhaps the second most powerful frame positioning the military working dog in the national imaginary and establishing it as worthy of memorial recognition by the state.[19] Framing military working dogs as having "sacrificed" their lives works—like the trope of the dog as hero—to endow them with some of the characteristics of liberal personhood—as having a conscious understanding of nation and war, deliberately *choosing* to "lay down their lives for their partners" for the U.S. political project and its investment in "freedom" and "liberty," despite the knowledge that they can be killed. This discourse frames the dogs as sharing a national investment in "freedom" and "liberty." This is an anthropocentric move that frames the dogs as choosing subjects who explicitly join war—rather than acknowledging that military working dogs are created from the moment they are born in U.S. military breeding programs as disposable animal bodies meant to protect human lives. The sense that the dogs are individual subjects choosing to sacrifice is enhanced by the frequency with which legislative rhetorics list the heroic sacrificing dogs they praise specifically by name.[20] These discourses of sacrifice efface the U.S. military's role in killing dogs and letting some die in previous wars like Vietnam, where 5,000 dogs were either killed or left, and also erases the military's role in producing these dogs in a position in which they might die in present wars (for history of U.S. war dogs, see Alger and Alger 2013; McHugh 2004).

The rhetoric of "sacrifice" recalls religious significations (e.g. Christ's sacrifice in Christianity)—and thus binds the subject framed under its terms to a notion of disinterested and spiritual selflessness. Particularly relevant is the definition of sacrifice as "an act of slaughtering an animal or person or surrendering a possession as an offering to God or to a

divine or supernatural figure" (OED 2014). Presenting the dogs under these terms—as sacrificing to the nation—positions what could be considered an inhumane practice—exposing dogs to danger and death—into a frame for reinforcing the goals of the nation. This framing also reflects another definition of sacrifice: "An act of giving up something valued for the sake of something else regarded as more important or worthy" (OED 2014). Binding the dogs to this notion of sacrifice presents the dogs as giving over their lives for the more important project of protecting U.S. lives and the global hegemony of the U.S. military and political project. Statements that use the passive voice ("were sacrificed")[21] hide the agent responsible for sacrificing the dogs. More importantly for this argument, use of the passive voice does not frame the dogs as conscious patriots choosing to die for the political goals of their country. It is more accurate to claim that the *U.S. military sacrifices the dogs*—recalling another definition of sacrifice: "An animal, person, or object offered in a sacrifice" (OED 2014). Re-framing the military, and not the dogs, as the agents of sacrifice calls into question the notion that dogs can be framed as willing participants in the military project and their own deaths, placing responsibility on the U.S. military project.

Elevating the Sacrificing Hero Dog as a "Quasi-Liberal Subject"

The continual repetition of and reinvestment in the trope of dog as hero—and possibly consciously self-sacrificing hero—is central to a discursive shift elevating the position of the military working dog in the national imaginary. The trope of dog as hero positions the dogs as "quasi-liberal subjects" who come into being specifically to broaden and strengthen support for U.S. military endeavors. Within such rhetorics, military working dogs are marshalled as figures who are ideologically committed to principles of "American freedom" and poised as voluntarily ready to give their lives to protect these principles. Such

discourses appear, for example, in some of the texts surrounding the bestowal of "Hero Dog Awards," established in 2010 by the American Humane Association to "search out and recognize America's Hero Dogs, who unconditionally avail themselves to us in so many important ways" (Newsok 2012). A 2012 Hero Dog Award went to "Gabe." According to the announcement,

> Gabe began his service to the United States of America as a Military Working Dog in 2006 and had an impact not only on the life of Charles Shuck, his handler and best friend, but indeed American soldiers around the world […]. While deployed to Iraq, Gabe completed over 210 combat missions with 26 finds of explosives and weapons […]. What he does is *out of a love of his country and the people of the United States* […]. He will *proudly* represent the U.S. Military Police for many years to come (American Humane Hero Dog Awards 2012, emphasis added).

This claim represents Gabe as a "quasi-liberal subject": political, philosophical, and patriotic, consciously willing, and eager to serve the political and military goals of the United States. The dog here has become a specifically political subject in support of U.S. militarism, and as such, a subject with a life that "matters" in terms of U.S. nationalism and biopolitics.

Technologies of Memory and National Sentimentality: Mourning the Dog as Hero

Mourning and remembrance are central affects in constructing the meaning of the military hero for the nation. Discourses of military working dogs as sacrificing heroes establish them as worthy of memorializing by the state. Many state legislatures have passed

bills and resolutions that grant official recognition for the work of military working dog teams, for example, creating "military working dog team days"[22] and approving and/or endorsing memorials and monuments for the dogs in their states.[23] It is also customary for handlers to provide memorial recognition for dogs when they die during service through a "missing dog" display.[24]

I trace here the ways in which the trope of the dog as hero infuses a particular kind of commemoration: The Military Working Dog Teams National Monument at Lackland Air Force Base in Texas, completed in 2013.[25] In the mid-2000s, former military dog handler John Burnam proposed the building of a monument to military working dogs and their handlers. Burnam claimed that he wanted to establish the monument to celebrate the dogs since he believes that they "died as heroes" (Manning 2012) and deserved to be honored as such.[26] The dog team monument reveals one site under which the terms of liberal subjectivity are negotiated through the use of dogs to craft a national subjectivity complicit with U.S. militarism.

The 3,000 square foot granite and bronze monument depicts a male military handler and four dogs: a Doberman, German Shepherd, Labrador Retriever, and Belgian Malinois. The statue of the handler is over nine feet tall and weighs 1,500 pounds, while the figure of each dog is about five feet tall and weighs 555 pounds. The statue of the handler is positioned in the middle of the monument. The handler stands outfitted in military garb with one hand on a gun at his chest and the other holding a dog's leash by his side. The statues of the four dogs encircle him as they appear to stand alert and on guard. They all stand atop a plinth with a sleek black surface, the words "Guardians of America's Freedom" inscribed in large block letters below. A tall stone slab is positioned behind them with the title "Military Working

Dog Team National Monument" at the top, followed by lengthier and smaller text that describes the monument's dedication to military working dog teams—including the handlers and dogs. Five flags fly behind the stone slab—each representing one of the five service branches of the U.S. Department of Defense. The monument is inscribed: "Dedicated to all U.S. Military Working Dog Handlers and their beloved dogs who defend America from harm, defeat the enemy, and save lives."

Figure 5.1 The Military Working Dog Team National Monument

Image from Slater, Paula. "US Military Working Dog Teams National Monument," *Paula Slater Website*, paulaslater.com/sculpture/u-s-military-working-dog-teams-national-monument/

A fountain (called the "Not Forgotten Fountain") sits beside the monument—a bronze sculpture that depicts a dog handler from the Vietnam War pouring water from his canteen into his helmet for his dog. The water spills from the helmet into a small pool designed to provide water for dogs if they are brought to the monument. The fountain is a tribute to war dogs left in Vietnam after the war.

The rhetoric of the dog as hero infuses the monument's text, sometime in its melancholic form as protest against the possibility that the hero will be "forgotten." Burnam claimed, "As a leading free-world nation, America owes its war dogs this memorial, mandated by the U.S. Congress . . . so the entire world can see and know that they are *not* America's forgotten heroes" (Burnam 2006). Burnam positions the dogs as "deserving" grievable subjects, subjects whose devotion to the nation must be continually returned by the nation through memorialization.

The rhetoric of the dog as sacrificing is also central to the creation of affect at the monument. The reverse side of the black slab on the monument has a photo montage of images of dogs and soldiers with the inscription "service and sacrifice since World War II." The rhetoric of sacrifice infuses the monument's text. Like the trope of the dog as hero, the rhetoric of sacrifice positions the dogs as political subjects, having "given" their lives to fight for the United States, to protect their handlers, and to protect "Americans at home." [27] The text on the monument grounds the dogs" grievability as deserved specifically on the basis of their sacrificing their lives for "America's freedom and security."[28]

The text on the monument also states: "the U.S. Military Working Dog Teams National Monument pays tribute to every dog who has served in combat since World War II."[29] This move uses the figure of the dog as sacrificing hero to obscure disappointments

with the Vietnam War and the ongoing militarism in Afghanistan and Iraq through a larger narrative of U.S. heroism and victory grounded in the virtues of World War II. Contentious histories and present politics of U.S. military intervention are transformed into a sentimental memory that produces a politics of the present rooted in sentimental narratives of the past. Like all historical monuments, the dog team monument is a structure of the present (see Sturken 2013).

My analysis of the Military Working Dog Team National Monument and other practices to celebrate military working dogs as "sacrificing heroes" raises several interrelated questions: How, for whom, and to what effect, does the monument participate in nation-building through the figure of the dog? Under what terms are military working dogs rendered grievable subjects through the monuments? How does the monument serve as a technology controlling and containing affects of militarized nationalism?

Part of the work of the Military Working Dog Team National Monument is to produce a *positive* frame of memory for U.S. militarism, extending from memories of World War II to the creation of presentist memories about U.S. military action in Iraq and Afghanistan. Such a rendering depends on erasing and effacing the deaths caused by U.S. military action in these different wars—including the estimated 213,400 Iraqi deaths and 103,989 Afghan deaths, numbers which continue to grow every day and remain uncounted in U.S. public discourses (Crawford 2016).

The monument, like other memorials dedicated to military working dogs, provides a sentimental line to create affect about war within U.S. biopolitics, particularly by evoking sentimental relationships.[30] As such, the monument operates as what Marita Sturken calls a "technology of memory," an object "through which memories are spread, produced, and

given meaning," rather than "[a vessel] of memory in which memory passively resides" (1997, 9). As a technology of memory, the monument is *productive*—it *generates* memory within the power dynamics of national memory and racialized U.S. affective economies of war. The monument is meant to represent and hold forth the bodies of the dogs and their handlers who fought and died in war. It embodies them in an effort to ensure pro-military sentiment in the intimate public sphere, producing a sentimentalized frame for war that can appear to be divorced from the possible guilt raised by the history of U.S. military violence, racism and imperialism. The monument thus functions to contain memory around U.S. military intervention by focusing attention on the *symbol* of the military working dog, an abstract figure that stands in many ways for the purest form of the fallen hero.

Sentimental Consumer-Citizenship and the Intimate Public Sphere

I examine here three instances where apparent appreciation of the "heroism" and "sacrifice" of the military working dog authorizes consumer-citizens to frame their acquisition of specific products (or, in fact, specific dogs) as demonstrating patriotic values and pro-military sentiment. The first case examines a specific marketing strategy of Petco and Natural Balance Pet Foods, companies that widely advertised their support for the creation of the Military Working Dog Teams National Monument, encouraging consumers to frame the purchase of pet foods for a personal, family pet as also demonstrating patriotic support for the military dogs to be celebrated and mourned through the monument. The second case considers the spike in interest in bringing military working dogs into domestic settings that arose in response to the celebrity of the dog Cairo (the dog involved in the operation to capture and kill Osama bin Laden). The third case analyzes the production and consumption of a chew toy for dogs fashioned in the image of Osama bin Laden.

Petco, Natural Balance, and the Military Working Dog Teams National Monument

Fundraising for the Military Working Dog Teams National Monument—which cost about two million dollars—reveals how practices of consumer citizenship are encouraged through deploying sentimentality around patriotism, dogs, and war. Financial support for the monument came from donations to the John Burnam Memorial Foundation—individual donations as well as corporate sponsorships from Natural Balance Pet Foods, Inc. and Petco (Manning 2012).[31] In a co-written press release, the companies claim to support the monument because "Military Working Dogs are heroes […because they] support the war on terror" (Petco News Wire 2012). To help raise money for the monument, Natural Balance Pet Foods packaged a special jerky treat—Natural Balance Limited Edition Jerky Bark Treats (12 oz.)—with images of the imagined monument on the packaging, claiming that all proceeds from the sales would go to support the monument ("Honoring Service Dogs" n.d.). According to the companies' position, consumers are not simply buying food for their own dogs when supporting Natural Balance and Petco, but at the same time are participating in patriotic citizenship, respecting those dogs who are "protecting" the nation—and hence, supporting the nation against "terror."

Petco and Natural Balance Pet Foods also created hyper-visible public replicas and representations of the monument in various publicity maneuvers.[32] The companies, for example, designed a large truck with an American flag painted across it from front to back; two doors in the middle open to display a replica of the monument on the side. Both companies' logos figure prominently on the front of the truck, which is also decorated with an image of the monument.

The companies also sponsored a float for the monument at the Rose Bowl Parade on January 1, 2013 called the "Canines with Courage" float. The float was a floral replica of the monument, and also had dog teams on it during the parade—including Gabe and his handler. The float was awarded The Rose Parade's President's Trophy (Xia 2012; see also Rockhill 2013). These public spectacles were infused with positive affects attached to dogs and to patriotism in order to market both the companies' brands and U.S. military endeavors.

Being a Patriot by Adopting Cairo

The intimate public sphere encourages framing personal gestures as political action. Under such circumstances, offers to adopt former military working dogs can bring together puppy love and patriotism—thereby demonstrating investment in pro-military nationalism. As I argued earlier, the celebrity of the military working dog Cairo was a major highlight of the story celebrating the assassination of Osama bin Laden by the U.S. military. As one source wrote: "When it was revealed that one member of the elite commando team that raided Osama bin Laden's compound had four legs and a tail, the contributions of Military Working Dogs (MWDs) were thrust into a new light" ("Canine Members" n.d.). While it would appear that Cairo's celebrity created interest in other military working dogs, the attention was on his specific role as celebrity. When former Air Force Staff Sergeant James Bailey walked his Belgian Malinois around his neighborhood in Virginia, people would ask him "Is that the dog that *got* Osama bin Laden?" (Goodavage 2012, 238, emphasis added). Such questions imply interest in Cairo the celebrity, rather than interest in military working dogs in general. The questions also imply that Cairo had a direct role in *killing* Osama bin Laden, rather than as a member of a team patrolling the perimeter as the compound was raided.

The fantasy of adopting a celebrity dog having a direct role in the killing of Osama bin Laden apparently stimulated the desire to acquire him as a domestic pet. Interest in adoptions of military working dogs rose dramatically after Cairo's involvement with bin Laden's assassination (Watson and Manning 2011). John Engstrom, the adoption coordinator for the military working dog adoption program in 2011, reports that immediately after news of Cairo's participation spread, "the phone [began] ringing off the hook [on] May 1. Everyone and his brother and sister and aunt wants one of these dogs now" (Goodavage 2012, 253). Engstrom notes that he had to explain that handlers leaving the service usually adopt the dogs they have been working with. Dogs most likely to be available to the public are, in fact, "dog school washouts" (Goodavage 2012, 253). These dogs were apparently of less interest for potential adopters.

The combination of celebrity, the "high-tech" military mission, and implication in the killing of Osama bin Laden created the figure of a patriotic super-dog that was seen as also a desirable addition to domestic life. Maria Goodavage, writing on the public fascination with Cairo, reflects: "You don't have to be a dog lover to be fascinated by the idea that a dog—the cousin of that furry guy begging for scraps under your table—could be one of the heroes who helped to execute the most vital and high-tech military mission of the new millennium" (2012, 7).

The adoption of former military working dogs meets the terms of the intimate public sphere—tying personal acts of quotidian domesticity to national belonging. In effect, to adopt these dogs is to bring an American patriot into the family, allowing adoptees to perform U.S. military nationalism in the home—through the intimacy of "puppy love." Unlike the danger seen to surround "pit-bull type dogs" (breeds put to death in some areas), the military

working dog framed as an experienced killer of the racialized enemy other seems to offer a fantasy and investment in securitization to the home.

The Osama Bone-Laden Chew Toy

Other consumer practices conflate the play activities of everyday dogs with military destruction of those deemed "enemy others." Dog owners may purchase the "Osama Bone-Laden Chew Toy" (2011 Global Animal). The stuffed chew toy, with a rawhide bone inside, depicts bin Laden with a white cloth wrapped around his head, holding a sword and saying says "Ouch, I'm ready to fight!"

The website *ohmidog* (2012) claims that "if you have a dog that tears apart every toy, this is for them! Now, instead of a plastic squeaker you throw away, your dog can enjoy the chew bone for hours or days." The implication is the chew toy is for one's dog to rip apart completely—to bring the destruction of the enemy other into the home—through the pet dog. The website *Global Animal* (2012) writes, "With the Osama Bone-Laden chew toy, your dog will see to it that the al Qaeda terrorist will, uh, Rest in Pieces." While the toy was manufactured before news of Cairo's role in the bin Laden mission, many pet stores stocked it only after news of Cairo's celebrity and bin Laden's death (Grouchy Puppy 2011).

The toy gains currency by treating the sign of the "terrorist enemy other" as a degraded figure for animal obliteration. The toy sticks together two figurations of the military working dog in the U.S. "war on terror": 1) the military working dog as agent of torture—evoking the dogs used in interrogations at Abu Ghraib and Guantanamo Bay, and 2) the dog as war (super)hero who captures and kills Osama bin Laden. Sticking these two figurations of the dog together presents a scene proposing that the everyday family dog can also assume

the military dogs' role of securitization and revenge—annihilating the "terrorist other," embodied here through the figure of bin Laden. The Osama Bone-Laden toy brings the affective economies of Islamophobia and orientalism permeating the U.S. intimate public sphere into the home. The invitation for the pet dog to "chew up" bin Laden demonstrates that the incitement to celebrate violence against the racialized "enemy other" pervades the family. The U.S. family, as well as the nation, creates itself in contrast to "disposable enemy others." The quotidian consumer practices of the intimate public sphere make invisible the family's participation in establishing the violent disposability of Arab/Muslim/Middle Eastern people (see Volpp 2003) stuck to the sign of "terrorist."[33]

Nationalism and The Politics of Grief

Racialized Economies of Grievability

The tropes of sacrificing hero dogs, the construction of The Military Working Dog Teams National Monument, and the consumer practices of the intimate public sphere—all work as technologies of memory to highlight the species-infused affective politics of nationalism and grief in the U.S. "war on terror." Judith Butler maintains that the differential distribution of frames of grief in this war is intimately linked to a state-created differential distribution of precarity. She argues that the state induces precarity in war, for example, by deciding who is, and is not, considered to have a grievable life. She claims that public discourse reflects this differential distribution of grievability and precarity, marking certain lives as grievable and hypervisible while excluding others from these terms. She argues that in the "war on terror," for example, those in the United States tend to be produced as valuable beings with grievable lives, while the nation's racialized "enemy others" are erased from discourse or rendered so hypervisible (the face of Saddam Hussein, the woman in the

veil) that they lose individual subjecthood and are rendered ungrievable, uncounted, and expendable—available for violence and killing with impunity. For Butler, these ungrievable subjects have been "derealized"—not recognized as having valuable lives—they "cannot be mourned because they are always already lost or, rather, never 'were'" (Butler 2004, 33).

Grieving for Military Dogs

Elevating U.S. military working dogs as visible subjects for mourning is set against this differential racialized distribution of precarity and grief. Following Butler's line of argument, forms of mourning such as the Military Working Dog Team National Monument use the trope of the heroic sacrificing dog to provide a sentimental image of war that, I have argued, reinscribes the hegemonic white masculinity of the idealized grievable soldier. Ways of mourning military working dogs are situated within the economies of grief organized around the value given to white deaths and the grief for white lives lost.

Part of the discursive regime of making *visible* certain dogs' death through memorial, monument and other techniques is making *invisible* the deaths of other dogs. The dogs who are recognized through elaborate public and state-sponsored mourning practices are dogs that die while furthering U.S. military endeavors. The dogs that the U.S. military routinely kills—dogs that are sick, disabled, or no longer of use to the military and unable to be transported to the United States—do not receive these visible spaces of mourning. Like the over two million dogs killed annually in U.S. shelters each year, such dogs are rendered expendable. Their deaths are not framed as "heroic." They do not register as individual subjects *as such*, as grievable lives that deserve public recognition and mourning.

Is it necessarily a bad thing to celebrate, recognize, mourn, and memorialize military working dogs? In a context in which animal death is often not recognized or grieved, the move to honor dogs and animals who have died as a result of state action may be a productive move, a way to honor lives that are often disavowed and ignored. This recognition of the loss of grievable lives may be a way to imagine what Lori Gruen calls "entangled empathy"—a framework that recognizes the inevitable interconnectedness and instrumentality inherent in human-animal relationships, honoring both frames of lives as important and deserving recognition. Gruen suggests that acknowledging loss of animal lives helps in recognizing what Butler calls the "precariousness of life"—the fundamental mutual vulnerability that emerges from the recognition that all beings suffer and can be killed (Gruen 2014, 136). Given the relative invisibility of animal death and lack of grieving practices that honor animals in U.S. culture, the Military Working Dog Teams National Monument could be understood as constructing what Gruen calls a "counter-practice of mourning" (2014), one that makes U.S. military dependence on and use of dogs in war visible and intelligible.

While acknowledging the potential productivity of these moments of public grief in relation to the dogs used in U.S. militarism, it is also important to recognize the discursive and affective frames that offer specifically and only *these* animal lives for remembrance and mourning—the animal lives presented as furthering U.S. military goals—while overlooking the lives and deaths of other animals subjected to both culturally accepted and U.S. government-orchestrated projects of animal death. It is also important to recognize that ultimately, the military continues to treat even many of those dogs as expendable.

My analysis and critique of the discursive elevation of military dogs in policy and practice is not intended to condemn the public mourning and honoring of any dogs, but to

reveal the *work* such practices can do in relation to building support for U.S. militarism and patriotism. While celebrating and mourning the dogs are not inherently bad moves, and are in fact productive moves for disrupting the biopolitics of human exceptionalism, supporting the mobilization of dogs as part of the military—training them to kill and be killed—can never be an ethical practice committed to animal well-being. It is also important to acknowledge the relations central to this affective economy: the elevation of the military working dog to a kind of "quasi-human liberal subject" does not function in isolation from the ways in which the lives of racialized "enemy others" in Iraq and Afghanistan and marked as "collateral damage," are devalued, reduced, treated as disposable, their deaths framed as ungrievable.

Conclusion

In this chapter I have argued that discourses of U.S. biopower use the sentimental discourses of the intimate public sphere to create an affective economy that elevates some subjects at the expense of others. Within that affective economy, dogs associated with the U.S. military project are produced as valuable and grievable by explicitly devaluing and negating the grievability of Iraqis and Afghans subjected to that project: those positioned as political enemies of the United States, resembling those who are political enemies, or framed as properly vulnerable to "collateral damage" in the quest to improve the security of U.S. interests. While mourned in specific ways, the dogs simultaneously remain tied to frames of animality and the attendant sacrificial economies that undergird this category. The discourses mourning the dogs use them in an attempt to render humane a practice that can never be anything but inhumane—using dogs to serve U.S. militarism in wars that endanger their lives and well-being.

Reframing the national politics of grief is not a zero-sum game. Valuing human life does not necessitate devaluing animal life; honoring human lives currently devalued by U.S. military nationalism does not require diminishing recognition of the dogs' lives. The ideologies of speciesism and racism are intimately linked—and one cannot be overcome without the other also being challenged (see Gillespie and Lopez 2015; Kim 2015). The analysis in this chapter hopes to suggest, instead, that to challenge human exceptionalism and racism in the sacrificial economies of war, practices, and analytics requires being oriented to what Clare Jean Kim (2015) calls a "politics of avowal," an intersectional approach to power that challenges a politics of disposability for all those rendered abject others under U.S. biopower. Approaching military working dogs in this way would be to work against accepting any bodies as legitimately "killable." It would also be to recognize that the U.S. biopolitics that differentially distributes precarity in war results from a cross-species entanglement with frames of racialization, incorporated in the intimate public sphere under the seemingly innocuous terms of "puppy love."

Notes

[1] I examine a broad archive of material about U.S. military working dogs published from 2001 to 2017 in U.S. media, policy and law. Stories about the dogs circulate in news reports and in various sites in popular culture, including features and "photo essays" in sources such as the *New York Times*, the *Los Angeles Times*, *National Geographic, The Atlantic,* and *Mother Jones*, They are found in popular memoirs by and about working dog handlers like Mike Dowling's *Sergeant Rex: The Unbreakable Bond Between a Marine and His Military Working Dog* (2013), and in documentaries such as HBO's *War Dogs: A Soldier's Best Friend* (2017), and Hollywood films like *Max* (2015) and *Megan Leavey* (2017). Books about Military Working Dogs include: Rebecca Frankel's *War Dogs: Tales of Canine Heroism, History, and Love* (2014), Maria Goodavage's *Soldier Dogs: The Untold Story of America's Canine Heroes* (2012) and *Top Dog: The Story of Marine Hero Lucca* (2015), Mike Ritland and Gary Brozek's *Trident K9 Warriors: My Tale from the Training Ground to the Battlefield with Elite Navy SEAL Canines* (2015), and Dorothy Hinshaw's *Dogs on Duty: Soldiers" Best Friends on the Battlefield and Beyond* (2012).

[2] I use and trace the positionality of "liberal subjecthood" in relation to projects of racialization and animalization, especially to uncover how dogs become "quasi-liberal subjects" in U.S. discourse. I do so to uncover how some of the discourses about military working dogs rhetorically disrupt the terms of human exceptionalism and the formation of liberal subjectivity on which it is grounded (Gillespie and Collard 2015). While the categories "human" and "animal" appear to be coherent and stable, they are constantly reproduced through the categories of liberal subjectivity, which positions white people as most fully human and deserving of a protected moral status while people of color are always less-human and outside of these terms of subjectivity (McKittrick 2014; Weheliye 2014). I use this language in part to move away from claims of "humanization" and "dehumanization" which reproduce the logic of human exceptionalism and a strict boundary between "human," and "animal," rather than understanding both as discursive constructions with histories in liberal Enlightenment humanism (Wynter 2003). I also do so to read these discourses in relation to processes of racialization and colonialism, which consistently construct the "non-personhood" of subjugated populations through ontologies of animality, such that, as Claire Jean Kim argues, "race has been articulated in part as a *metric of animality*, as a classification

system that orders human bodies according to how animal they are—and how human they are not—with all of the entailments that follow" (2015, 18).

My work on the construction of liberal subjecthood in relation to the dogs also thinks with Nicole Shukin's claim that military working dogs are "treated as amenable to techniques productive of subjectivities that experience the state of security as their own desire" (2013, 178) under what she calls "animal governmentality," such that military working dogs have "feeling power"—a "relationship through which [they] become subjects of, and subject to, governmentality, *regardless of whether or not their subjectivity is deemed a fiction*" *(*2013, 178). Shukin applies Foucault's argument that "governmentality operates by inculcating the very "conduct of conduct," that is, the self-conduct of subjects who govern themselves" to argue that animals can become "biopolitical subjects who undertake to govern themselves and subjectively participate in political mentalities" (2013, 178)—in essence, emerging as "liberal subjects."

[3] Lisa Uddin (2003) and Harlan Weaver (2013) both extend Berlant's (1997) argument to argue that dogs are central to the intimate public sphere.

[4] I use and trace the positionality of "liberal subjecthood" in relation to projects of racialization and animalization. Discourses of racialization and colonialism consistently construct the "nonpersonhood" of subjugated populations. In addition, human exceptionalism depends on the performance of the boundary between "human" and "animal" as ontologically and ethically separate. While these categories appear to be coherent and stable, they are constantly reproduced through the categories of the liberal subject—which positions white people as most fully human, and people of color as always less-human.

[5] For Foucault, biopower refers to a "soft technique" of power— the state's power to foster life or to "let die" (1990, 2003). Biopower works at the nexus of the individual and the population. In contrast to early iterations of sovereign power exercised solely by the "right to kill," this type of power is focused on the administration of life.

[6] Nicole Shukin introduces the concept of "zoopolitics" to provide a non-anthropocentric account of power that traces the promotion and destruction of animal life and the instrumentalization of animals within biopolitics, since biopower hinges on the production of "species difference as strategically ambivalent rather than absolute line, allowing for the contradictory power to both dissolve and reinscribe borders between humans and animals" (2009, 11).

[7] There is no official tally of how many war dogs were used or died in Vietnam, since the military only began tracking official records of the dogs in 1968. It is estimated around 4,000-4,900 dogs were used and 200 were brought back to the United States (Frankel 2014, 236).

[8] Ryan Hediger argues that the dogs' status changed in Vietnam from "heroes set for moments above human soldiers to mere machinery, pressed below even animals, in order to excuse official United States policy to leave the dogs in Vietnam" (2013, 54).

[9] The discursive practice of focusing on the example of individual dogs is characteristic of discourses about military working dogs. Ronny, an 11-year-old Belgian Malinois who was the first dog to "retire" and be adopted after Robby's Law was passed, also provided an individual narrative and the face of a dog that was given a "good" life because of Robby's law. Ronny's former handler of three years, Marine Sgt. Kevin Bispham adopted him. A press release from the military quoted Bispham as saying: "I love my dog, and I'm really excited to get him. Ronny's done his time, and I want to make a good home for him. I'm making everything nice for him. He's not going to work anymore" (Denger 2001).

[10] Discourses emphasized Robby's health problems. News stories framed Robby as a "toothless, lame Marine Corps explosives-sniffing dog" (Scripps Howard News Service 2000), "aching with arthritis and a bum hip, and missing some front teeth" (Hoffman 2000), and having a "pronounced limp, missing teeth, and arthritic and weak front shoulders" (Hoffman 2000).

[11] Calling the law "Robby's Law" frames the law under the name of the victim the law is crafted for. This is a similar move to other victim-centered laws like "Megan's Law," "Kari's Law," etc. which present policy often under the case of specific incidents that have received increased public attention (Smith n.d.).

[12] Rep. Roscoe Bartlett, R-Md. initially sponsored "Robby's law" in the House and Sen. Bob Smith, R-N.H followed suit by sponsoring a similar bill in the Senate. President Clinton signed the official legislation for Robby's law on November 6, 2000.

[13] The Department of Defense releases some 300 military working dogs each year to civilian homes. Dogs who are "retired" from military service may be adoptable, as well as those dogs who have not passed the requisite training courses and cannot, therefore, be certified as military working dogs or police dogs. The Department categorizes some dogs as adoptable and others as "unfit" for adoption. To determine eligibility for adoption, the dogs must have a veterinary screening, paperwork completed and a "suitability test," to determine whether they would react negatively to encountering certain beings or situations in civilian life—other dogs,

children, cats etc.[13] The dogs are rated into three categories based on their responses: "suitable," "guarded," or "not suitable." Those in charge of the adoptions take such classifications into consideration when matching dogs with handlers based on their experience and with families based on the composition of their household. Those dogs considered to be too dangerous and too much of a liability are killed—or "euthanized" in Lackland's terms. Robby's Law gives priority for adoption to former military handlers, families of dog handlers who died during war, and law enforcement agencies. Civilian applicants fill out a two-page adoption form and must demonstrate that they can provide good care and a suitable environment for the dog. According to a worker at the Lackland kennel, the process only takes up to 30 days if the family and dog meets the eligibility requirements. However, civilian families waiting to adopt a military working dog may have to wait months for a dog because of the high-demand for these dogs. General Hertog, who helps coordinate the adoptions, said about these dogs: "there is no shortage of suitable homes ready and willing to provide a comfortable retirement for our four-legged heroes" (Lyle 2009).

[14] Gerry Proctor, a spokesman for Lackland Airforce Base in San Antonio which houses the military dog adoption program, said that "None are euthanized now…. All the animals find a home…There's a six-month waiting list right now for people wanting to adopt. And [the applications] have gone up substantially since the [bin Laden] raid" (Watson and Manning 2011).

[15] The act was signed into law by President Obama on January 2, 2013. It had been introduced to the House by Rep. Walter B. Jones, Jr. (R-NC) as S. 2134 and into the Senate by Sen. Richard Blumenthal (D-CT) as H.R. 4103, https://www.congress.gov/bill/112th-congress/house-bill/4103/related-bills; https://www.congress.gov/bill/112th-congress/senate-bill/2134; http://www.blumenthal.senate.gov/newsroom/press/release/blumenthal-announces-senate-passage-of-amendment-to-improve-treatment-of-military-working-dogs-vows-to-continue-fight-to-reclassify-dogs-as-canine-members-of-the-armed-forces

[16] The Animal Welfare Institute claims, "It seems that everyone, from the dogs' handlers to top military brass, recognizes that MWDs are 'not just a piece of equipment,' but rather 'heroes' and 'true members of the military.'" The Institute claims that the "bill acknowledged in a concrete way the service and sacrifice of these valuable and valued members of the military by recognizing them as true members of the armed services and by facilitating their adoption and access to appropriate veterinary care upon retirement" ("Canine Members" n.d.).

[17] The act "authorize[d] the Secretaries of the various military services to transfer back to Lackland Air Force Base or another location for adoption any Military Working Dog (MWD) who is to be retired and for whom "no suitable adoption is available at the military facility where the dog is located." Vet Adopts Pets "Military Working Dogs Adoptions" Available at: http://vetsadoptpets.org/militaryworkingdogadoptions.html.

[18] Ron Aiello, President of the United States War Dog Association, claimed that this was because the Senate decided that "to get the bill passed they had to take out a portion of it. That portion was the reclassification of the Military Working Dogs from Equipment to Canine Members of the Armed Forces" (DogTime Staff 2013).

[19] The rhetoric of sacrifice characterizes state-sponsored memorialization of military working dogs. A resolution passed by the New Jersey legislature, for example, states that: "tens of thousands of military working dogs have *placed themselves in harm's way*, in some cases making the *ultimate sacrifice by laying down their lives for their partners*" (New Jersey, emphasis added). This resolution frames the dogs as *choosing* to sacrifice themselves, to go to war, to give their lives in order to save their handlers, and in extension, the lives of other U.S. citizens. The Utah legislature uses similar language, writing: "the legislature offers their gratitude for … *sacrifice that war dogs have made* as American service person's auxiliary and best friend" (Utah, emphasis added). A resolution passed by the Alabama legislature frames dogs as conscious and sacrificing subjects, writing that the dogs "have *given of themselves to ensure our continued freedom, liberty and way of life*" (Alabama, emphasis added). These state resolutions tend to frame the military working dog as having a concept of, and commitment to, American exceptionalism. See "The Senate and General Assembly for the State of New Jersey Joint Legislative Resolution on K9 Veterans Day"; "Utah State Legislature Official Citation Honoring America's Military War Dogs" 2006; "Proclamation by the Governor of Alabama, 'Military Dog Handler Day'" 2005).

[20] Legislative discourses that list the specific *names* of the dogs who have died underscore the dogs' status as individual subjects—elevating them to quasi-personhood as heroes who have sacrificed for the nation. A New Mexico legislative memorial, for example, lists dogs' names: "Whereas thousands of War Dogs with everyday names like Prince, Duke, Gomer, Tuffy, Fritz, Lady, Rebel, Sarge, Pirate, Krim, Buck, Rusty, Satan and Blackie never returned from their duty in harm's way." A Utah legislative memorial employs almost identical form: "whereas thousands of war dogs with names such as Stubby, Chips, Prince, Ranger, Rebel, Sarge, Kelly, Tiger, Smokey and Missy never returned from their duty in harm's way." The

Colorado legislature draws on a similar strategy: "these four-legged heroes had names like Rex, Lucky, Brandy, Clipper, Big Boy, Kirby, Fruits, Logo, Prince, Major, Duke, Kiki, Crypto, and King." By focusing on specific names, the language of these bills makes the dogs emerge as individual subjects for Americans to celebrate, honor, and mourn ("A Joint Memorial Commending the Courage of Heroism and Sacrifice of War Dogs, Utah" 2006; State of Colorado "Senate Joint Resolution" 2005).

[21] An example is a resolution in Maine that is couched in the passive voice: "thousands of men and their dogs have served, many have died and, sadly, many dogs *were sacrificed*. For their efforts, we offer this token of respect and appreciation and our best wishes." (State of Maine Proclamation 2005, emphasis added).

[22] See, for example: "I, Bob Riley, Governor of the State of Alabama do hereby proclaim November 18, 2005 of military dog handler day... and call upon our citizens to recognize the outstanding contributions as handlers and their dogs have been in the defense of our nation" (Governor Bob Riley, Proclamation by the Governor of Alabama, "Military Dog Handler Day," November 18, 2005) and "their dogs will forever be remembered by the citizens of Louisiana and of the United States of America. Therefore be it resolved that the legislature of Louisiana recognizes elite group of veteran dog handlers and they're amazing companions on their commitment and service to Louisiana and their country" (Senator Thomas and Representative Nevers 2001).

[23] Evoking the dog as hero is also central to governmental statements memorializing military working dogs. Resolutions commend "the courage, *heroism* and sacrifice of war dogs" (New Mexico, *emphasis added)*, the dogs" "*heroic* duties and great feats" (New Mexico, emphasis added). A bill in Maine praises military working dogs that "[lead] the way on missions of danger." This move frames the dogs as leaders in the military—while it also simultaneously refers to the way dogs are asked to literally lead troops into dangerous situations—positioned in front of their human handlers and platoons to sniff out IEDs, and at times, be killed by them. This framing of the dog as "leaders" thus simultaneously evokes this positioning of dogs as hero warriors, while their role as "expendable equipment"—more easily disposed of than the humans behind them—recedes from view. See: The Legislature of the State of New Mexico 48th Legislature First Session, 2007, Senate Joint Memorial 1, Senator Michael S. Sanchez, A Joint Memorial Commending the Courage of Heroism and Sacrifice of War Dogs; State of Maine Proclamation. Members of Senate and House of Representatives, August 11, 2005.

[24] Lisa Rogak describes these instances of mourning and memorialization in an article called the "Dogs of War: Photos Remembering the Military's Canine Heroes." The article, published on Memorial Day in 2012, calls attention to the military working dogs' lives lost in war as lives that should be counted, remembered and mourned on this militarized national holiday. She claims that "This Memorial Day, Americans are rightfully paying tribute to the brave fallen military men and women in uniform who have made the ultimate sacrifice in the line of duty. But what about the Military Working Dogs?" The article contains a "photo essay" showing various instances of memorials to military working dogs. These photos make visible the individual dogs lost in war and provide public mourning for these "hero" dogs
It is customary for the handlers to provide memorial recognition for dogs when they die during service through a "missing dog" display. The display usually consists of "an empty kennel, leash, and an inverted Foods bucket signifying the unbreakable bond between a handler and dog, [sometimes] centered in [a] chapel's front stage" (Rogak 2012).

[25] Before this monument, the U.S. was the only industrial nation to not have a national monument dedicated to service dogs (McHugh 2004, 119). There are, of course, many other monuments dedicated to military working dogs across the U.S.—in cities, cemeteries, military bases and dog parks (See, for example, "A Pet Cemetery Proposal" 1992; Elliot 2011).

[26] In 2004, Burnam formed the John Burnam Monument Foundation Inc. with two other former working dog handlers. They enlisted the help of Republican North Carolina Representative Walter B. Jones who introduced congressional legislation "for the establishment of a National Monument to honor the service and sacrifice of the United States Armed Forces working dog teams that have participated in military operations of the United States since WWII" (Forysth 2013). Congress unanimously passed the legislation. President George W. Bush signed the congressional legislation into public law 110-181, Section 2877 on January 28, 2008, authorizing the establishment of a National Monument for United States Armed Forces working dog teams. President Obama amended public law 110-181, Section 2877 on October 28, 2009 to authorize the John Burnam Monument Foundation, Inc. to manage, fund and build the monument, which it did with significant financial contributions from Natural Balance Pet Food. The John Burnam Memorial Foundation created the design for the monument, the Department of Defense authorized it and sculptor Paula Slater created it (Slater n.d.; "National Military Working Dog Teams Monument, Virginia" 2008).

[27] Congressman Walter Jones draws on this language of sacrifice to frame his support of the monument as "a tribute to the loyalty, service, and sacrifice of these dogs and their handlers" (Jones 2013).

[28] The monument's inscription reads: "Part of the sacrifice for America's freedom and security belongs to the military working dogs who serve on the battlefield alongside their faithful masters together. They both strive valiantly as a team to bravely defend their ground because they know that decisive victory is saving American lives. And when death takes his master on the battlefield, there his dog will be found his eyes sad, but vigilant faithful and true to the very end." The U.S. Military Working Dog Teams National Monument [monument text]. Available at: https://myairmanmuseum.org/military-working-dogs/.

[29] The U.S. Military Working Dog Teams National Monument [monument text]. Available at: https://myairmanmuseum.org/military-working-dogs/.

[30] For example, the monument's text celebrates the relationship of the team of military working dog and handler. One inscription is framed in terms of direct address to the handler: "Dog Team: The dog is your best friend, your partner and life saver. You are his focus, trainer, provider, leader and interpreter. Together you train to hone your skills and bond as a team. A dog team's ability to detect enemy targets near and far with exceptional accuracy is far greater than any human on the battlefield." This framing positions the dog team—handler and dog—as a synergistic yet weapon of war under the control of the handler that is nonetheless a relationship available for sentimentalizing. The U.S. Military Working Dog Teams National Monument [monument text]. Available at: https://myairmanmuseum.org/military-working-dogs/.

[31] Both Petco and Natural Balance Pet Foods Inc. are part of American Supplies Inc. The company's website claims that it is "the nation's leading wholesale distributor of pet foods and supplies," and "Everything we do, we do for the love of animals" ("About ASC" n.d.).

[32] Natural Balance chose in 2013 to include military dogs as the target of their annual fundraiser to benefit service dogs. Explaining the reasoning for their fundraising for the monument, a press release co-written by Petco and Natural Balance reads: "Military Working Dogs are heroes…[they] support the war on terror, safeguard military bases and activities, and detect explosives before they inflict harm…This year, we hope to raise $1 million to help these incredible… Military Working Dogs for their important work" (Petco PR News Wire 2012). The company produces affective frames through which their consumers can feel good about

buying their products—one is not simply buying foods for one's own dog, but at the same time is respecting dogs "protecting" the nation—and hence, supporting the nation against "terror."

[33] As I mentioned in Chapter 1, scholars such as Volpp argue that the "war on terror" facilitated in the U.S. public imagination a new frame of racialization under an Islamophobic orientalism that conflated all Muslim, Arab and Middle Eastern people—a disparate group of people—together under the sign of "terrorist." This racialization sticks to Iraqis and Afghans to the sign of the terrorist "enemy other" (see Volpp 2003).

Works Cited

"4-Legged War Refugees." *Northwest Military*, www.northwestmilitary.com/military-life/military-life/2015/08/4-legged-war-refugees. Accessed 17 June 2016.

"A Pet Cemetery Proposal to Honor the Dogs of War." *Huffington Post*, 11 Aug. 1992, www.nytimes.com/1992/08/11/nyregion/a-pet-cemetery-proposal-to-honor-the-dogs-of-war.html. Accessed 11 Oct. 2018.

"A Time to Kill, A Time to Save." *Global Animal*, 20 Nov. 2010, www.globalanimal.org/2010/11/20/a-time-to-kill-a-time-to-save/24214/. Accessed 11 Oct. 2018.

"About ASC." *Animal Supply Company*, www.animalsupply.com/about/. Accessed 11 Oct. 2018.

Abu-Lughod, Lila. "Do Muslim Women Really Need Saving? Anthropological Reflections on Cultural Relativism and Its Others." *American Anthropologist*, vol. 104, no. 3, 2002, pp. 783–790.

"Adopted War Dog Reunites with Injured Soldier." *WESH*, www.wesh.com/Adopted-War-Dog-Reunites-With-Injured-Soldier/13120960. Accessed 15 June 2016.

"Afghanistan Pups Reunite with Soldier: Dogs from Afghanistan Arrive in S.C." *The Sun News*, 7 Jan. 2012, infoweb.newsbank.com/resources/doc/nb/news/13C23B99182AD038?p=AWNB. Accessed 21 Dec. 2015.

"After a Deployed Soldier Surrendered his Mom's Dog, The Shelter Wrote Him a Beautiful Letter." *Distractify*, distractify.com/avericlements/letter-from-shelter-to-deployed-soldier-about-dog/. Accessed 8 Oct. 2018.

Agamben, Giorgio. *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. Translated by Daniel Heller-Roazen, Stanford UP, 1998.

---. *The Open: Man and Animal*. Translated by Kevin Attell, Stanford UP, 2004.

"Ahmad Saadawi's 'Dogs.'" *Zunguzungu* (blog), 29 Aug. 2011,

zunguzungu.wordpress.com/2011/08/29/dogs/. Accessed 14 Oct. 2018.

Ahmed, Sara. *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*. Routledge, 2004.

Ahuja, Neil. *Bioinsecurities: Disease Interventions, Empire, and the Government of Species*. Duke UP, 2016.

Aiken Standard. “Afghanistan Pups Reunite with Soldier - Dogs from Afghanistan Arrive in S.C.” *Sun News* (Myrtle Beach, SC). 7 Jan. 2012, infoweb.newsbank.com/resources/doc/nb/news/13C23B99182AD038?p=AWNB. Accessed 21 Dec. 2015.

Al-Azzawi, Souad N. “The Deterioration of Environmental and Life Quality Parameters in Iraq Since the 2003 American Occupation of Iraq.” *International Journal of Contemporary Iraqi Studies*, vol. 10, no. 1/2, 2016, pp. 53–72.

Alger, Janet M., and Steven F. Alger. “Canine Soldiers, Mascots and Stray Dogs in U.S. Wars.” *Animals and War: Studies of Europe and North America,* edited by Ryan Hediger, Brill, 2013, pp. 77-104.

Amar, Paul. *The Security Archipelago: Human-Security States, Sexuality Politics, and the End of Neoliberalism*. Duke UP, 2013.

“Animal Gas Chamber.” *Animal Aid*, animalaidusa.org/legislation/animal-gas-chamber/. Accessed 1 Nov. 2013.

“Animal Rescue: 5 Yrs of Operation Baghdad Pups.” *YouTube*, uploaded by *SPCA International,* 5 Feb. 2013, www.youtube.com/watch?v=URhSrVchf7Y&feature=youtube_gdata_player. Accessed 29 May 2013.

Appadurai, Arjun. *Fear of Small Numbers: An Essay on the Geography of Anger*. Duke UP, 2006.

Associated Press. “Baghdad Opens Campaign to Kill City's Stray Dogs.” *The San Diego Union Tribune,* 23 Nov. 2008a, www.sandiegouniontribune.com/sdut-ml-iraq-baghdad-dogs-112308-2008nov23-story.html. Accessed 26 Jan. 2015.

Associated Press. “Baghdad Opens Campaign to Kill Stray Dogs.” *NBCNews.com*, 23 Nov.

2008b, www.nbcnews.com/id/27873599/ns/world_news-mideast_n_africa/t/baghdad-opens-campaign-kill-stray-dogs/. Accessed 26 Jan. 2015.

Associated Press. “Marine Expelled over YouTube Puppy Video.” *MSNBC.com*, 12 June 2008c, www.nbcnews.com/id/25108189/ns/us_news-military/t/marine-expelled-over-youtube-puppy-video/. Accessed 28 Fab. 2015.

Associated Press. “Pentagon to Begin Training Women for Combat Roles by 2015.” 18 June 2013, www.cbsnews.com/news/pentagon-to-begin-training-women-for-combat-roles-by-2015/. Accessed 14 Oct. 2018.

Associated Press. “Ratchet, Iraqi Puppy Rescued by U.S. Soldier Gwen Beberg, Arrives Safely in New Home of Minneapolis.” *Nydailynews.com*, 23 Oct. 2008, www.nydailynews.com/news/world/ratchet-iraqi-puppy-rescued-u-s-soldier-gwen-beberg-arrives-safely-new-home-minneapolis-article-1.304262. Accessed 16 Oct. 2018.

Bacchetta, Paola, Tina Campt, Inderpal Grewal, Caren Kaplan, Minoo Moallem, and Jennifer Terry. “Transnational Feminist Practices against War.” *Meridians*, vol. 2, no. 2, 2002, pp. 302–308.

Badger, Emily. “Why the Iraq War has Produced More PTSD than the Conflict in Afghanistan.” *The Washington Post,* 3 Apr. 2014, www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2014/04/03/why-the-iraq-war-has-produced-more-ptsd-than-the-conflict-in-afghanistan/. Accessed 12 Oct. 2018.

“Baghdad Opens Campaign to Kill Stray Dogs.” *NBC.com*, 23 Nov. 2008, www.nbcnews.com/id/27873599/ns/world_news-mideast_n_africa/t/baghdad-opens-campaign-kill-stray-dogs/. Accessed Jan. 26, 2015.

“Baghdad Police Kill More than 58,000 Stray Dogs.” *CTV* News, 10 July 2010, www.ctvnews.ca/baghdad-police-kill-more-than-58-000-stray-dogs-1.531229. Accessed Oct. 4, 2018.

“Baghdad Pups’ Charity Investigated.” *YouTube*, uploaded by *CNN*, 15 June 2012, www.youtube.com/watch?v=nGf5UlW5iIc&feature=youtube_gdata_player.

Accessed 29 May 2013.

"Baghdad to Cull a Million Stray Dogs as Rogue Canine Population Soars." *Daily Mail Online*, 10 June 2010, www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1285763/Baghdad-cull-million-stray-dogs-rogue-canine-population-soars.html. Accessed 26 Jan. 2015.

"Baghdad Opens Campaign to Kill Stray Dogs." *MSNBC.com*, 23 Nov. 2008, www.nbcnews.com/id/27873599/ns/world_news-mideast_n_africa/t/baghdad-opens-campaign-kill-stray-dogs/. Accessed Jan. 26, 2015.

Banet-Weiser, Sarah. *Authentic™: The Politics of Ambivalence in a Brand Culture*. NYU Press, 2012.

"Bark Busters Launches Nationwide Fundraiser for SPCA International's Operation Baghdad Pups." *Chino Champion*, 11 June 2011, p. 6C.

Barnard, Anne, and Alan Feuer. "Outraged, and Outrageous." *The New York Time,* 8 Oct. 2010, archive.nytimes.com/www.nytimes.com/2010/10/10/nyregion/10geller.html. Accessed 4 Oct. 2018.

Bhattacharyya, Gargi. *Dangerous Brown Men: Exploiting Sex, Violence and Feminism in the "War on Terror."* U of Pennsylvania P, 2008.

Berlant, Lauren. *The Queen of America Goes to Washington City: Essays on Sex and Citizenship*. Duke UP, 1997.

Berlant, Lauren. "Intimacy: A Special Issue." *Critical Inquiry*, vol. 24, no. 2, 1998, pp. 281-288.

---. "The Subject of True Feeling: Pain, Privacy, and Politics." *Left Legalism/Left Critique*, edited by Janet Halley, Wendy Brown. Duke UP, 2002, pp. 105-133.

---. "The Epistemology of State Emotion." *Dissent in Dangerous Times*, edited by Austin Sarat, U of Michigan P, 2005, pp. 46–78.

Berlant, Lauren and Jordan Greenwald. "Affect in the End Times: A Conversation with Lauren Berlant." *Qui Parle: Critical Humanities and Social Sciences*, vol. 20, no. 2, 2012, pp. 71-89.

Berlant, Lauren, and Michael Warner. “Sex in Public.” *Critical Inquiry*, vol. 24, no. 2, 1998, pp. 547-566.

Bernstein, Mark. “10 Tips on Writing the Living Web.” *A List Apart: For People Who Make Websites*, 16 Aug. 2002, alistapart.com/article/writeliving. Accessed 4 May 2009.

Beirne, Piers. “Rethinking Bestiality: Towards a Concept of Interspecies Sexual Assault.” *Theoretical Criminology*, vol. 1, no. 3, 1997, pp. 317–340.

Blumenthal, Richard. “Blumenthal Announces Senate Passage of Amendment to Improve Treatment of Military Working Dogs, Vows to Continue Fight to Reclassify Dogs as Canine Members of The Armed Forces.” 14 Dec. 2012, www.blumenthal.senate.gov/newsroom/press/release/blumenthal-announces-senate-passage-of-amendment-to-improve-treatment-of-military-working-dogs-vows-to-continue-fight-to-reclassify-dogs-as-canine-members-of-the-armed-forces. Accessed 19 June 2014.

“Breed Specific Legislation.” *The American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty Against Animals*, www.aspca.org/fight-cruelty/dog-fighting/breed-specific-legislation. Accessed 3 Mar. 2015.

Briggs, Laura. “Imperialism as a Way of Life Thinking Sex and Gender in American Empire.” *Radical History Review*, no. 123, 2005, pp. 9-31

---. “Mother, Child, Race, Nation: The Visual Iconography of Rescue and the Politics of Transnational and Transracial Adoption.” *Gender and History*, vol. 15, no. 2, 2003, pp. 179-200.

Bright, Susie. “I Can’t Wrap My Vulva Around This,” 30 Mar. 2006, *Huffington Post*, www.huffingtonpost.com/susie-bright/i-cant-wrap-my-vulva-arou_b_18207.html. Accessed 7 June 2013.

Brown, Michael, and Claire Rasmussen. “Bestiality and the Queering of the Human Animal.” *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, vol. 28, no. 1, 2010, pp. 158 – 177.

Burnam, John. “Why a ‘National’ Monument?” *Free Public*, 2006, freerepublic.com/focus/news/1634131/replies?c=1&q=1&;page=50. Accessed 30

Aug. 2018.

Buruma, Ian. *Murder in Amsterdam: Liberal Europe, Islam, and the Limits of Tolerance*. Penguin, 2006.

Butler, Judith. *Precarious Life: The Power of Mourning and Violence*. Verso, 2006.

---. "Sexual Politics, Torture, and Secular Time." *The British Journal of Sociology*, vol. 59, no.1, 2008, pp. 1-23.

---. *Frames of War: When Is Life Grievable?* Verso, 2010.

Calamur, Krishnadev. "No Regrets for Organizer of Muhammad Cartoon Contest." *National Public Radio*, 7 May 2015, www.npr.org/sections/thetwo-way/2015/05/07/405052650/no-regrets-for-organizer-of-muhammad-cartoon-contest. Accessed 6 Oct. 2018.

Callahan, Maureen. "The Dogs of War: Military's Adopted Mutts Join their Masters as Returning Heroes." *The New York Post,* 13 Feb. 2011, nypost.com/2011/02/13/the-dogs-of-war/. Accessed 21 Dec. 2015.

"Campaign Against 'Fatal Attacks on Humans' by Strays Sees 58,000 Dogs in Killed in Baghdad in THREE Months." *Daily Mail Online*, 10 July 2010, www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1293606/Campaign-fatal-attacks-humans-strays-sees-58-000-dogs-killed-Baghdad-THREE-months.html. Accessed Oct. 4, 2018.

Campion, Tracy. "Guardians of Rescue Helps Special Forces Team Bring Two Puppies from Afghanistan." *Seattle Examiner*, 16 July 2014, infoweb.newsbank.com/resources/doc/nb/news/14F1E10092948FB0?p=AWNB. Accessed 21 Dec. 2015.

"Canine Members of the Armed Forces Act." *Animal Welfare Institute,* awionline.org/content/canine-members-armed-forces-act. Accessed 11 Oct. 2018.

Castellanos, Sharon. "Can Dog Toys Be Controversial?" *Grouchy Puppy*, 12 May 2011, dogdays.grouchypuppy.com/2011/05/dog-toy-controversy-debate.html. Accessed 11 Oct. 2018.

Celente, Gerald. "Iams Hound Humping Chick Commercial." *Trends Journal*, 1 Apr. 2013,

www.youtube.com/watch?v=EkzEhSCwomM&feature=youtube_gdata_player. Accessed 23 Dec. 2013.

"CBS News Interview with Terri Crisp." *CBS, YouTube*, uploaded by SPCA International, 13 Oct. 2011, www.youtube.com/watch?v=BUm9j79KI3w&feature=youtube_gdata_player. Accessed 29 May 2015.

Chen, Mel Y. *Animacies: Biopolitics, Racial Mattering, and Queer Affect*. Duke UP, 2012.

"Choosing an Irish Wolfhound." PetPlace, www.petplace.com/article/dogs/breeds/choosing-an-irish-wolfhound/. Accessed 14 Oct. 2018.

Christenson, Sid. "He's a Jolly Good Canine—Working Dog at Lackland AFB will be First to Retire Under New Law." *San Antonio Express-News*, 21 Mar. 2001, p. 1B.

"CNN Report: Dogs Being Killed in Iraq." *CNN,* 2009, www.youtube.com/watch?v=rEBriBURL08&feature=youtube_gdata_player. Accessed 11 June 2015.

"CNN Scrutinizes Operation Baghdad Pups." *Ohmidog!* www.ohmidog.com/2012/07/18/cnn-scrutinizes-operation-baghdad-pups/. Accessed 29 May 2013.

Cohler, Deborah. "Keeping the Home Front Burning: Renegotiating Gender and Sexuality in US Mass Media after September 11." *Feminist Media Studies*, vol. 6, no. 3, 2006, pp. 245-261.

"Connected at the Heart: Canine Battle Buddy." *Lost and Found, Oprah Winfrey Network*, *YouTube,* uploaded by *Oprah Winfrey Network*, 16 Mar. 2013, *www.youtube.com/watch?v=9bzUvisYevk*. Accessed 13 Oct. 2018.

Considine, Craig. "The Racialization of Islam in the United States: Islamophobia, Hate Crimes, and 'Flying while Brown.'" *Religions,* vol., 8, no. 9, 2017, pp. 165-184.

Cooke, Miriam. "War, Gender, and Military Studies." *NWSA Journal*, edited by Lamia Rustum Shehadeh et al., vol. 13, no. 3, 2001, pp. 181–188.

Cooper, Anderson. "Veterans Charity under Scrutiny." *Anderson Cooper 360 Degrees, CNN*,

6 July 2012. www.cnn.com/TRANSCRIPTS/1207/06/acd.01.html. Accessed 2 June 2013.

---. "From Afghanistan with Love: Soldiers Reunited with Dogs they Promised to Not Leave Behind." *Anderson Cooper 360. CNN*, *YouTube*, uploaded by LSUDVM, 6 Sept. 2013. www.youtube.com/watch?v=pJsQzjqoFy4&feature=youtube_gdata_player. Accessed 28 Mar. 2013.

Cowen, Deborah, and Emily Gilbert. "Citizenship in the Homeland: Families at War." *War, Citizenship, Territory*, edited by Deborah Cowen and Emily Gilbert, Routledge, 2008, pp. 261-280.

Cox, John, and Allen Forkum. *Black & White World: Editorial Cartoons*. Nashville, TN: Cox and Forkum, 2002.

---. "Image Problems." 31 Jan. 2006, www.coxandforkum.com/archives/000768.html. Accessed 7 Oct. 2018.

"Crazy Stories on 'Nip/Tuck' from Real Life: Actress." *CTV News*. 2 Feb 2008, www.ctvnews.ca/crazy-stories-on-nip-tuck-from-real-life-actress-1.274393. Accessed 14 Oct. 2018.

Crawford, Neta C. "Update on the Human Costs of War for Afghanistan and Pakistan, 2001 to Mid-2016." *Watson Institute*, Aug. 2016, watson.brown.edu/costsofwar/files/cow/imce/papers/2016/War%20in%20Afghanistan%20and%20Pakistan%20UPDATE_FINAL_corrected%20date.pdf. Accessed 26 Aug. 2018.

Crisp, Terri, and Cynthia Hurn. *No Buddy Left Behind: Bringing U.S. Troops' Dogs and Cats Safely Home from The Combat Zone*. Rowman and Littlefield, 2012.

Crosley Coker, Hillary. "US Military Has Killed Over 1,200 Service Dogs." *Jezebel*, 18 June 2014, jezebel.com/us-military-has-killed-over-12-000-service-dogs-1592612666. Accessed 13 Jan. 2015.

Curtis, Colleen. "First Lady Michelle Obama: Support Our Military Families." 6 Sept. 2011, www.whitehouse.gov/blog/2011/09/16/first-lady-michelle-obama-support-our-military-families. Accessed 16 June 2016.

Dagher, Sam. "In Hard-Bitten Baghdad, Tough Tactics on Strays: Newly Calm City Now Finds Dogs a Threat." *New York Times*, 15 Mar. 2009, p. 8.

Daily Mail Reporter. "Target, the Dog Who Survived Afghan War and Melted Hearts on Oprah, Mistakenly Put Down at Arizona Animal Shelter." *Mail Online*, 17 Nov. 2010. www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1330088/Afghanistan-dog-hero-mistake-Arizona-animal-shelter.html. Accessed 5 Feb. 2014.

Damon. "If You Love Your Dog, Feed Him Iams Dog Food and Have Sex with Him." *I Will Have Told You So*, 13 May 2013, www.iwillhavetoldyouso.com/2013/05/if-you-love-your-dog-feed-him-iams-dog-food-and-have-sex-with-him/Accessed 23 Dec. 2013.

Damon, Arwa. "Stray Dogs Being Killed in Baghdad." *CNN.com*. 12 Feb. 2009, edition.cnn.com/2009/WORLD/meast/02/12/baghdad.dogs/index.html. Accessed Oct. 4, 2018.

Dayan, Colin. *The Law Is a White Dog: How Legal Rituals Make and Unmake Persons*. Princeton UP, 2011.

Deckha, Maneesha. "Toward a Postcolonial, Posthumanist Feminist Theory: Centralizing Race and Culture in Feminist Work on Nonhuman Animals." *Hypatia,* vol. 27, no. 3, 2012, pp. 527-545.

---. "Welfarist and Imperial: The Contributions of Anticruelty Laws to Civilizational Discourse." *American Quarterly,* vol. 65, no. 3, 2013, pp. 515-548.

Deluca, Ashleigh. "Billions Have Been Spent on Technology to Find IEDs, but Dogs Still Do It Better." *National Geographic,* 9 Nov. 2014, news.nationalgeographic.com/news/2014/11/141107-war-dogs-military-hero-ied-animals-american-veterans-day/. Accessed 12 Feb. 2015.

Denger, Laurie. "Robby's Law is Working for Military Dogs." *Dayton Daily News,* 22 Apr. 2001, p. 2E.

Department of the Army. “General Order 1A: Prohibited Activities for U.S. Department of Defense Personnel Present Within the United States Central Command (USCENTCOM) AOR.” 19 Dec. 2000, cdn.factcheck.org/UploadedFiles/2013/08/GeneralOrderGO-1A.pdf. Accessed 3 Mar. 2016.

Derrida, Jacques. “‘Eating Well’ or the Calculation of the Subject: An Interview with Jacques Derrida.” *Who Comes After the Subject?* Edited by Eduardo Cadava, Peter Connor, and Jean-Luc Nancy. Routledge, 1991, pp. 96-119.

---. *The Animal That Therefore I Am*. Edited by Marie-Louis Mallet, translated by David Wills. Fordham UP, 2008.

---. *The Beast and the Sovereign*. Translated by Geoffrey Bennington. U of Chicago P, 2009.

“Disgusting Iams Dog Food Commercial.” *WhyIHateDogs*, www.whyihatedogs.com/2012/12/disgusting-iams-dog-food-commercial/. Accessed 15 Oct. 2018.

“Dog Handler Guilty of Abuse.” *The Australian,* 23 Mar. 2006, docs.newsbank.com.proxy.library.ucsb.edu:2048/s/InfoWeb/aggdocs/AWNB/1108582EA7C117F0/0D0CB57AD31233F5?s_lang. Accessed 7 June 2013.

“Dogs on Deployment.” *Dogs on Deployment*, dogsondeployment.org/. Accessed 3 Jan 2014.

“Dogs on Deployment Reunites Soldier's Dog on the Queen Latifah Show.” 1 Oct. 2013. *YouTube*, uploaded by Queen Latifah, www.youtube.com/watch?v=TGJdO_BNSRw. Accessed 8 Aug. 2018.

“Dogs’ Day: Congress Considers Allowing Aging Canines Working for Military to be Adopted.” *Dallas Morning News,* 16 Oct. 2000, p. 2A.

“Dogs Ivy and Nugget with Terri Crisp on CNN Headline News.” *CNN*, *YouTube*, uploaded by SPCA International, 14 Mar. 2011, www.youtube.com/watch?v=THbIpdOKXyA&feature=youtube_gdata_player. Accessed 28 Mar. 2014.

DogTime Staff. “Military Working Dogs Still Considered Equipment.” *Dog Time,* 24 May 2013, dogtime.com/trending/17767-military-working-dogs-still-considered-equipment. Accessed 25 June 2015.

Dove, Jane K. “Vista Native Rescues Dog from War Zone.” *The Lewisboro Ledger*, 25 Apr. 2013, p. 1A.

Dowling, Mike. *Sergeant Rex: The Unbreakable Bond Between a Marine and His Military Working Dog.* Simon and Schuster, 2013.

Drury, Ian. “The Four-Legged Army Recruits Which Will Endure Tough Training Regime to Detect Hidden Taliban Bombs and Weapons.” *Daily Mail,* 18 May 2013, www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2326428/Dogs-war-The-legged-army-recruits-detect-hidden-Taliban-bombs-weapons.html. Accessed 29 May 2013.

El Fadl, Khaled Abou. “Dogs in the Islamic Tradition and Nature.” *Encyclopedia of Religion and Nature.* Continuum International, 2004, pp. 498-500.

Elder, Glen, Jennifer Wolch, and Jody Emel. “Race, Place, and the Bounds of Humanity.” *Society and Animals*, vol. 6, no. 2, 1998, pp. 183-202.

Elliot, Dan. “Cpl. Kory Wiens And His Military Dog Cooper, Both Killed in Iraq, to be Honored by Fort Carson Dog Park Naming.” *Huffington Post*, 28 Dec. 2011, www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/10/28/colo-army-post-honors-sol_n_1063387.html. Accessed 9 June 2015.

Ellis, Samantha. “War Hero Dogs Brought to U.S. by Loving Soldiers.” *Global Animal*, 6 May 2011, www.globalanimal.org/2011/05/06/hero-dogs-brought-to-u-s-by-loving-soldiers/23527/. Accessed 14 Oct. 2018.

Eowyn, D. “Hero Dog Survived Afghan War but Not US Government.” *Fellowship of the Minds*, 19 Nov. 2010, fellowshipoftheminds.com/2010/11/19/hero-dog-survived-afghan-war-but-not-us-government/. Accessed 5 Feb. 2014.

Eskow, Richard. “Muslim Haters, Fun with Numbers, and Sex with Animals.” *Huffington Post,* 25 May 2011, www.huffingtonpost. com/rj-eskow/muslim-haters-fun-with-nu_b_16326.html. Accessed 9 Oct. 2018.

Espinoza, Ambar. “St. Cloud Muslims Fearful and Angry After Racist Incidents.” 27 Jan. 2010. *MPR News*, www.mprnews.org/story/2010/01/27/meeting-on-anti-islamic-images. Accessed 6 Oct. 2018.

“Execution.” *Merriam-Webster*, www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/execution. Accessed 8 Jan. 2014.

“Euthanasia.” *Merriam-Webster*, www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/euthanasia. Accessed 15 Jan. 2014.

“Fact Check: Peanut Butter Dog.” *Snopes.com*, 23 Apr. 2008, www.snopes.com/fact-check/the-lap-dog/.

Fears, Darry. “USDA’s Wildlife Services Killed 4 Million Animals in 2013.” 7 June 2014, *The Washington Post*, www.washingtonpost.com/national/health-science/governments-kill-of-4-million-animals-seen-as-an-overstep/2014/06/06/1de0c550-ecc4-11e3-b98c-72cef4a00499_story.html. Accessed 4 Oct. 2018.

Feldman, Josh. “CNN Reporter Confronts Woman Running Military Dog Charity Scam: ‘CNN Feels Like We Were Lied To.’” 13 July 2012, www.mediaite.com/tv/cnn-reporter-confronts-woman-running-military-dog-charity-scam-cnn-feels-like-we-were-lied-to/. Accessed 28 Nov. 2014.

“Finalists Chosen for American Hero Dog Awards.” *Newsok*. 11 July 2012, newsok.com/article/3691562/finalists-chosen-for-american-hero-dog-awards. Accessed 18 Aug. 2015.

Fitzpatrick, David, and Drew Griffin. “Little of Charity's Money Going to Help Animals.” *CNN*, 15 June 2012, edition.cnn.com/2012/06/14/us/animal-charity-investigation/index.html. Accessed 12 Oct. 2018.

Fitzgerald, Hugh. “Why Do So Many Muslims Hate Dogs?” 15 Mar. 2017, www.newenglishreview.org/blog_direct_link.cfm?blog_id=65897. Accessed Oct. 4, 2018.

Flanders, Julie. “Help Both Soldiers and Animals with Operation Baghdad Pups.” *Cincinnati*

Examiner, 24 May 2012, docs.newsbank.com.proxy.library.ucsb.edu:2048/s/InfoWeb/aggdocs/AWNB/13F6E44B1A9B2840/0D0CB57AD31233F5?s_lang. Accessed 2 June 2013.

"Flashback: Charlie's Homecoming in 2008." *YouTube*, uploaded by *SPCA International*, 16 May 2012, www.youtube.com/watch?v=69kSDHqwF3c&feature=youtube_gdata_player. Accessed 29 May 2013.

Foreign Mail Services. "Baghdad to Cull a Million Stray Dogs as Rogue Canine Population Soars." *Daily Mail Online*, 10 June 2010, www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1285763/Baghdad-cull-million-stray-dogs-rogue-canine-population-soars.html. Accessed 26 Jan. 2015.

Forsyth, Jim. "U.S. Military Dedicates First National Monument to Combat Dogs." *Reuters* 28 Oct. 2013, www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-military-dogs/u-s-military-dedicates-first-national-monument-to-combat-dogs-idUSBRE99S00120131029. Accessed 11 Oct. 2018.

Foucault, Michel. *History of Sexuality: Volume One*. Translated by Robert Hurley, Vintage, 1990.

---. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Translated by Alan Sheridan. Vintage, 1995.

---. *"Society Must Be Defended": Lectures at the Collège De France, 1975-1976*. Translated by David Macey, Penguin, 2003.

---. *Abnormal: Lectures at the Collège De France, 1974-1975.* Translated by Graham Burchell, Picador, 2004.

---. *Security*, *Territory*, *Population*: *Lectures at the College De France, 1977 - 78*. Translated by Graham Burchell, edited by Michel Senellart, Picador, Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

Frankel, Rebecca. "War Dogs: Photo Essay." *Foreign Policy*, 4 May 2011, www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/05/04/war_dog?page=0,4,. Accessed 8 June 2011

---. “Dogs at War: Left Behind in Vietnam.” *National Geographic*, 19 May 2014a, news.nationalgeographic.com/news/2014/05/140519-dogs-war-canines-soldiers-troops-military-vietnam/. Accessed 28 Fab. 2015.

---. *War Dogs: Tales of Canine Heroism, History, and Love.* Palgrave Macmillan, 2014b.

Freccero, Carla. “Carnivorous Virility; or, Becoming-Dog.” *Social Text*, vol. 29, no. 1, 2011, pp. 177–195.

---. “Gender and September 11: A Roundtable: “They are all Sodomites!” *Signs,* vol. 28, no. 1, 2002, pp. 461-463.

Freccero, Carla, and Claire Jean Kim. “Species/Race/Sex.” *American Quarterly* vol. 65, no. 3, 2013.

Frommer, Frederick. “Operation Ratchet -- Army's Puppy Love.” *The Daily Telegraph* [Sydney, Australia], 15 Oct. 2008, p. 25.

---. “Soldier’s Iraqi Puppy Arrives in US, Tail Wagging.” *Daily Breeze* [Torrance, CA], 21 Oct. 2008, docs.newsbank.com.proxy.library.ucsb.edu:2048/s/InfoWeb/aggdocs/AWNB/123F6E61982D21F8/0D0CB57AD31233F5?s_lang. Accessed 2 June 2013.

“Gabe-Military.” *American Humane Hero Dog Awards*, herodogawards.org/dog/gabe/. Accessed 28 Aug. 2018.

Gaboman, “4x04 – ‘Shari Noble’ - Nip/Tuck.” *InReview*, www.inreview.com/topic-38862.html. Accessed 23 Apr. 2014.

Gamel, Kim. 2008. “It's Homeward Bound for Iraq Soldier's Puppy.” *ABC News*, 20 Oct. 2008, abcnews.go.com/US/story?id=6070407. Accessed 13 Oct. 2018.

Garber, Marjorie. *Dog Love*. Touchstone, 1997.

Gaskell, Stephanie. “Doggin’ It from Iraq.” *New York Daily News*, 19 Oct. 2008, www.nydailynews.com/news/world/operation-baghdad-pups-flies-puppy-rescued-soldier-u-s-reunion-article-1.302750. Accessed 27 Dec. 2015.

---. “Operation Baghdad Pups Flies Puppy Rescued by Soldier to U.S. for Reunion.” *New*

York Daily News, 19 Oct. 2008, www.nydailynews.com/news/world/operation-baghdad-pups-flies-puppy-rescued-soldier-u-s-reunion-article-1.302750. Accessed 8 Feb. 2014.

Gaudiosi, John. "How Technology Is Helping to Save U.S. Soldiers' Adopted Canine Friends from An Uncertain Fate." *Forbes*, 4 Apr. 2013, www.forbes.com/sites/johngaudiosi/2013/04/04/how-technology-is-helping-save-us-military-working-dogs-from-certain-death/#6c26dfa038cf. Accessed 13 Oct. 2018.

Giffers, Mof. "Commercial Break: Iams is the Simply the Best(iality)." *BitterWallet*, 4 Nov. 2013, www.bitterwallet.com/commercial-break-iams-is-the-simply-the-bestiality/69539. Accessed 23 Dec. 2013.

Gillespie, Katherine, and Rosemary-Claire Collard, eds. *Critical Animal Geographies: Politics, Intersections, and Hierarchies in a Multispecies World*. Routledge, 2015.

Gilmore, Ruth Wilson. "Race and Globalization." *Geographies of Global Change: Remapping the World*, edited by R. J. Johnston, Peter J. Taylor, and Michael J. Watts, 2nd ed., Blackwell, 2002.

---. *Golden Gulag: Prisons, Surplus, Crisis, and Opposition in Globalizing California.* U of California P, 2007.

"Group Urges Humane Dog Killing in Iraq." *The Star*, 26 Nov. 2008, www.thestar.com/news/world/2008/11/26/group_urges_humane_dog_killing_in_iraq.html. Accessed Oct. 4, 2018.

Glenney Boggs, Colleen. *Animalia Americana: Animal Representations and Biopolitical Subjectivity*. Columbia UP, 2013.

Goodavage, Maria. *Soldier Dogs: The Untold Story of America's Canine Heroes.* Center Point Publishing, 2012.

---. *Top Dog: The Story of Marine Hero Lucca.* Dutton, 2015.

Goosenberg-Kent, Ellen. *No Dog Left Behind.* 15 Nov. 2009, *YouTube*, uploaded by *American Heroes Channel*, 6 Nov, 2009, www.youtube.com/watch?v=lM0DEGMT4ds. Accessed 4 Dec. 2018.

Goree, Janet. “Tragic Ending for Target.” *Albany Examiner*, 3 May 2011, infoweb.newsbank.com/resources/doc/nb/news/13703F3912C4A448?p=AWNB. Accessed 21 Dec. 2015.

Gossett, Che. “Blackness, Animality, and the Unsovereign.” *Verso*, 8 Sept. 2015, www.versobooks.com/blogs/2228-che-gossett-blackness-animality-and-the-unsovereign. Accessed 15 Oct. 2018.

Graham, Tim. “Bozell Column: Little House of Bestiality?” *NewsBusters,* 30 Sept. 2006, newsbusters.org/node/7998. Accessed 23 Apr. 2014.

Grewal, Inderpal. *Saving the Security State: Exceptional Citizens in Twenty-First-Century America.* Duke UP, 2017.

---. “Transnational America: Race, Gender and Citizenship after 9/11.” *Social Identities: Journal for the Study of Race, Nation and Culture*, vol. 9, no. 4, 2003, pp. 535-561.

Gruen, Lori. *Entangled Empathy: An Alternative Ethic for Our Relationships with Animals*. Lantern Books, 2014.

“Guardians of Rescue.” *Guardians of Rescue*, guardiansofrescue.org. Accessed 13 Oct. 2018.

Halberstam, J. Jack. *The Queer Art of Failure*. Duke UP, 2011.

Haraway, Donna J. *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*. Routledge, 1991.

---. *The Companion Species Manifesto: Dogs, People, and Significant Otherness.* Prickly Paradigm, 2003.

---. *When Species Meet*. U of Minnesota P, 2008.

Harnden, Toby. “Apology for ‘Gay Slur’ on Bomb.” *The London Daily Telegraph* [London, England], 20 Oct. 2001, p. 15.

Haritaworn, Jinthana. “Sexualising the ‘War on Terror.’” *Thinking Through Islamophobia: Global Perspectives,* edited by S. Sayyid and A. Vakil. Columbia UP, 2010.

---. “Decolonizing the Non/Human.” *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies*, vol. 21, no. 2, 2015, pp. 210-213.

Harris, Gardiner. “To Serve and Protect, and Sniff Out Trouble, an International Dog of Mystery.” *The New York Times,* 5 May 2011a, p. A16.

---. “Who’s the Dog Hero of the Raid on Bin Laden?” *The New York Times.* 5 May 2011b, www.nytimes.com/2011/05/05/science/05dog.html. Accessed 29 Dec. 2014.

Hartocollis, Anemona. “Rabid Pet is Among Dogs Flown Here from Iraq.” *New York Times,* 2 Oct. 2008, www.nytimes.com/2008/10/03/nyregion/03rabies.html. Accessed 12 Oct. 2018.

Hediger, Ryan. “Dogs of War: The Biopolitics of Loving and Leaving the U.S. Canine Forces in Vietnam.” *Animal Studies Journal*, vol. 2 no. 1, 2013, pp. 55-73.

“Help Military Pet Owners.” dogsondeployment.org/. Accessed 14 Oct. 2018.

“Helping the Troops.” *SPCA International*, 2012, www.spcai.org/index.php/2012-04-13-18-21-42/helping-the-troops.html. Accessed 24 Dec. 2013.

“Hero Dog from Afghanistan Mistakenly Killed.” *NBC News*, 16 Nov. 2010, www.nbcnews.com/id/40214260/ns/health-pet_health/t/hero-dog-afghanistan-mistakenly-killed/#.XA1rLK2ZPaY. Accessed 9 Aug. 2018.

“Hero Afghanistan Dog Target Mistakenly Euthanized in Arizona.” *Global Animal,* 17 Nov. 2010, www.globalanimal.org/2010/11/17/hero-afghanistan-stray-dog-euthanized-in-arizona-pound/23466/. Accessed 7 June 2011.

Hinshaw, Dorothy. *Dogs on Duty: Soldiers Best Friends on the Battlefield and Beyond.* Bloomsbury, 2012.

Hoffman, Lisa. “Semper Fido.” *Scripps Howard News Service*, 12 Sept. 2000, docs.newsbank.com.proxy.library.ucsb.edu:2048/s/InfoWeb/aggdocs/AWNB/0EB7890066A7E717/0D0CB57AD31233F5?s_lang. Accessed 2 Jun 2013.

Holloway, Nora. “War Dogs: K9 Storm Armor Protects Canine Soldiers.” *Military Gear News*, 17 May 2011, news.militarygear.com/war-dogs-k9-storm-armor-protects-canine-soldiers/. Accessed 29 May 2013.

“Home1.” *AdFibs.com*, 25 Feb. 2014, www.adfibs.com/iams-rocky-the-dog-and-dawn-the-soldier/. Accessed 28 Mar. 2013.

"Honoring Service Dogs." *Natural Balance Pet Foods*, www.naturalbalanceinc.com/honoring-service-dogs.aspx. Accessed 13 June 2014.

Hurley, Andi. "Are Military Working Dogs Being Euthanized?" *Military.com*, 12 Jan. 2012, www.military.com/spousebuzz/blog/2012/01/are-military-working-dogs-being-euthanized.html. Accessed 11 Oct. 2018.

"Iams Dog Food Commercial: Keep Love Strong - Welcome Home." *Iams, YouTube*, uploaded by *Iams* 28 Nov. 2013, www.youtube.com/watch?v=LVeBHwRbXB0&feature=youtube_gdata_player. Accessed 29 May 2013.

"Iams – Rocky the Dog and Dawn the Soldier." www.AdFibs.Com. www.adfibs.com/iams-rocky-the-dog-and-dawn-the-soldier/. Accessed 14 Oct. 2018.

"Iams Launches New Campaign Inspired by Real Stories." *Iams*, news.iams.com/press-release/iams-company/iams-launches-new-campaign-inspired-real-stories-showcase-emotional-bond-. Accessed 14 May 2015.

Ioanide, Paula. *The Emotional Politics of Racism: How Feelings Trump Facts in an Era of Colorblindness.* Stanford UP, 2015.

"Iraq Vet and His Canine Colleague Were Reunited at Airport, and Their Joy is Absolutely Contagious." *Huffington Post*, 5 May 2014, www.huffingtonpost.com/2014/05/05/veteran-reunited-with-dog-iraq_n_5268697.html?ncid=fcbklnkushpmg00000023. Accessed 16 Oct. 2018.

"Iraqi Dog Ratchet, Spc. Beberg Reunited." *The North County Gazette*, 19 Jan. 2009, www.northcountrygazette.org/2009/01/19/ratchet_reunited/. Accessed 8 Feb. 2014.

"Irish Wolfhound." *American Kennel Club*, www.akc.org/dog-breeds/irish-wolfhound/. Accessed 15 Oct. 2018.

Jackson, Zakiyyah Iman. "Animal: New Directions in the Theorization of Race and Posthumanism." *Feminist Studies*, vol. 39, no. 3, 2013, pp. 669-685.

Jasper, Adam, and Sianne Ngai. "Our Aesthetic Categories: An Interview with Sianne Ngai." *Cabinet Magazine*, no. 42, 2011,

www.cabinetmagazine.org/issues/43/jasper_ngai.php. Accessed 14 Oct. 2018.

Jeon, Arthur. "German Shepherd? Belgian Malinois? Navy SEAL Hero Dog Is Top Secret." *Global Animal*. 11 Oct. 2011a, www.globalanimal.org/2011/05/05/german-shepherd-belgian-malinois-bin-laden-hero-dog-is-top-secret/38799/. Accessed June 15, 2013.

Johnston, G. "Awwww: A War Dog Helped Take Out Osama." *Gothamist,* 4 May 2011, gothamist.com/2011/05/04/awww_a_war_dog_helped_take_out_osam.php. Accessed 11 Oct. 2018.

"Joining Forces." *The White House,* obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/joiningforces. Accessed 14 Oct. 2018.

Jones, Walter. "Jones Statement on Dedication of U.S. Military Working Dog Teams National Monument." 23 Oct. 2013, jones.house.gov/press-release/jones-statement-dedication-us-military-working-dog-teams-national-monument. Accessed 18 Dec. 2014.

Juhi, Bushra. "Tens of Thousands of Stray Dogs Shot, Poisoned in Baghdad Cull." *Los Angeles Times,* 12 July 2010, latimesblogs.latimes.com/unleashed/2010/07/tens-of-thousands-of-stray-dogs-shot-poisoned-in-baghdad-cull.html. Accesses 4 Oct. 2018.

---. "Baghdad Kills 58,000 Stray Dogs in 3-Month Span." *Salon.com*, 12 July 2010, www.salon.com/2010/07/12/ml_iraq_stray_dogs/. Accessed Oct. 4, 2018.

Kami, Aseel. "In Security, Baghdad Tackles 1 Mln Stray Dogs." *Reuters*, 10 June 2010, www.reuters.com/article/us-iraq-dogs/in-security-baghdad-tackles-1-mln-stray-dogs-idUSTRE6592NA20100610. Accessed 14 Oct. 2018.

Kaplan, Amy. "Violent Belongings and the Question of Empire Today: Presidential Address to the American Studies Association, October 17 2003." *American Quarterly*, vol. 56, no. 1, 2004, pp. 1-18.

Kareem, Ali. "Stray Dogs a Problem in Baghdad." *Desert News,* 25 July 2010, www.deseretnews.com/article/700050193/Stray-dogs-a-problem-in-Baghdad.html. Accessed Oct. 4, 2018.

Kaveney, Roz, and Jennifer Stoy. *Nip/Tuck: Television That Gets Under Your Skin*.

I.B.Tauris, 2011.

Kaye, Randi. “Firestorm Grwos Over Islamic Center Near Ground Zero.” *Anderson Cooper 360°, CNN,* 17 Aug. 2010. transcripts.cnn.com/TRANSCRIPTS/1008/17/acd.01.html. Accessed 7 Oct. 2018.

Kiefaber, Adam. “Soldier Reunited with Afghan Puppies.” *USA TODAY,* 6 Sept. 2013, p. ARC.

---. “Soldier Reunited with Afghan Puppies.” *The Cincinnati Enquirer,* 6 Sept. 2013, www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation/2013/09/06/soldier-reunited-with-afghan-puppies/2778659/. Accessed 21 Dec. 2015.

Kiehl, Stephen. “Trial Opens with Claim of ‘Rogue’ Acts by Guard.” *The Baltimore Sun*, 14 Mar. 2006, articles.baltimoresun.com/2006-03-14/news/0603140273_1_ghraib-prison-military-working-smith. Accessed 4 Oct. 2018.

“Killing Spree.” *The Free Dictionary*, www.thefreedictionary.com/Killing+spree. Accessed 9 Oct. 2018.

Kim, Claire Jean. “Slaying the Beast: Reflections on Race, Culture, and Species.” *Kalfou*, vol. 1, no. 1, 2010, pp. 57–79.

---. *Dangerous Crossings: Race, Species, and Nature in a Multicultural Age*. Cambridge UP, 2015.

Kristeva, Julia. *Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection*. Columbia UP, 1982.

Lacey, Marc. “Surviving Afghanistan Only to Die in a Shelter - Hero Dog is Euthanized by Mistake after Escaping from Yard in Arizona.” *The Bulletin* [Bend, OR], 19 Nov. 2010.

Lade, Diane. 2008. “Help Bring War Dog Ratchet to the US.” *South Florida Sun-Sentinel*, 17 Oct. 2008, docs.newsbank.com.proxy.library.ucsb.edu:2048/s/InfoWeb/aggdocs/AWNB/123E75ADDDD1B678/0D0CB57AD31233F5?s_lang. Accessed 2 June 2013.

Larsen, Kate. “City Council Approves Trapping, Killing Coyotes in Seal Beach.” *NBC Los Angeles*, 23 Sept. 2014, www.nbclosangeles.com/news/local/City-Council-to-Vote-

on-Possibly-Trapping-Killing-Coyotes-in-Seal-Beach-276013841.html. Accessed 28 Fab. 2015.

Liliequist, Jonas. "Peasants Against Nature: Crossing the Boundaries Between Man and Animal in Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century Sweden." *Journal of the History of Sexuality*, vol. 1, no. 3, 1991, pp. 393–423.

Little, John. "Interview: Cox and Forkum." *Blogs of War*, 9 Aug. 2003, web.archive.org/web/20110809084955/blogsofwar.com/2003/08/09/interview-cox-forkum/. Accessed 5 Oct. 2008.

Livingston, Julie, and Jasbir Puar. "Interspecies." *Social Text*, vol. 29, no. 1, 2011, pp. 3-14.

Lopez, Patricia J., and Kathryn A. Gillespie, eds. *Economies of Death: Economic Logics of Killable Life and Grievable Death*. Routledge, 2015.

Lutz, Catherine. *Homefront: A Military City and the American Twentieth Century*. Beacon, 2002.

Lyle, Amaani. "Adoption Program Lets Working Dogs Become Pets." *Department of Defense News*, 31 Aug. 2009, archive.defense.gov/news/newsarticle.aspx?id=55678. Accessed 11 Oct. 2018.

Magnier, Mark. "Afghans Unapologetically Cheer on Dogfights." *Los Angeles Times*, 20 Sept. 2011, infoweb.newsbank.com/resources/doc/nb/news/139E683D31E6CBA8?p=AWNB. Accessed 21 Dec. 2015.

Mail Online Reporter. "Campaign Against 'Fatal Attacks on Humans' by Strays Sees 58,000 Dogs Killed in Baghdad in THREE Months." *Daily Mail Online*, 10 July 2010, www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1293606/Campaign-fatal-attacks-humans-strays-sees-58-000-dogs-killed-Baghdad-THREE-months.html. Accessed 4 Oct. 2018.

Mahmood, Saba. "Religious Reason and Secular Affect: An Incommensurable Divide?" *Critical Inquiry*, vol. 35, no. 2, 2009, pp. 836-862.

Manning, Sue. "Military Service Dogs Get 1st-Ever National War Monument." *Huffington Post*, 30 Oct. 2012, www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/10/30/military-service-dogs-

honored_n_2044021.html. Accessed 10 June 2015.

“Marines Outraged by Puppy-Throwing Video; Investigation Heats Up.” *FOX*, 4 Mar. 2008, www.foxnews.com/story/marines-outraged-by-puppy-throwing-video-investigation-heats-up. Accessed 14 Oct. 2018.

“Massacre.” *Dictionary.com*, dictionary.reference.com/browse/massacre. Accessed 9 Oct. 2018.

Max. Directed by Boaz Yakin, Warner Brothers Pictures, 2015.

May, Elaine Tyler. *Homeward Bound: American Families in the Cold War Era*. Basic Books, 2008.

Mbembe, Achille. *On the Postcolony*. U of California P, 2001.

---. 2003. “Necropolitics.” *Public Culture*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 11–40.

McClintock, Anne. *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender, and Sexuality in the Colonial Conquest*. Routledge, 1995.

McClure, Rosemary. “Puppy Rescue Mission.” *Los Angeles Times*, 18 June 2008, infoweb.newsbank.com/resources/doc/nb/news/12165DDB00DB92F0?p=AWNB. Accessed 21 Dec. 2015.

McDaniel, Mike. “Another Jaw-Dropping Episode of Nip/Tuck.” 27 Sept. 2006, blog.chron.com/tubular/2006/09/another-jaw-dropping-episode-of-niptuck/. Accessed 1 Apr. 2014.

McHugh, Susan. *Dog*. Reaktion Books, 2004.

McKittrick, Katherine, ed. *Sylvia Wynter: On Being Human as Praxis*. Duke UP, 2014.

Megan Leavey. Directed by Gabriela Cowperthwaite, LD Entertainment, 2017.

“Military Working Dogs.” *Airman Heritage Foundation*, myairmanmuseum.org/military-working-dogs/. Accessed 16 June 2014.

“Mission.” *Dogs on Deployment*, www.dogsondeployment.org/page/mission. Accessed 15 Oct. 2018.

Morgan, Jennifer L. *Laboring Women: Reproduction and Gender in New World Slavery.* U of Pennsylvania P, 2004.

Mount, Mike. "Puppy-Throwing Marine is Removed from Corps." *CNN.com*, 13 June 2008, www.cnn.com/2008/US/06/12/marine.puppy/index.html?iref=24hours. Accessed 28 Fab. 2015.

Muñoz, José Esteban. "Theorizing Queer Inhumanisms: The Sense of Brownness." *GLQ*, vol. 21, no. 2, 2015, pp. 209-120.

Nagel, Joane, and Lindsey Feitz. "Deploying Race, Gender, Class, and Sexuality in the Iraq War." *Race, Gender and Class*, vol. 14, no. 3/4, 2007, pp. 28-47.

Narayan, Uma. *Dislocating Cultures: Identities, Traditions, and Third-World Feminism.* Routledge, 1997.

Nast, Heidi. "Critical Pet Studies?" *Antipode* 38, 2006, pp. 894–906.

---. "Loving....Whatever: Alienation, Neoliberalism and Pet-Love in the Twenty-First Century." *ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies*, vol. 5, no. 2, 2006b, pp. 300-327.

"National Military Working Dog Teams Monument, Virginia." 28 Jan. 2008. Accessed 9 Aug. 2018.

Neff, Andrew. "Mainer's Mission Gives War Zone Dogs a Home." *Bangor Daily News,* 30 June 2010, p. 1A.

Ngai, Sianne. *Our Aesthetic Categories: Zany, Cute, Interesting*. Harvard UP, 2012.

"Nip/Tuck Forums." *TV.com*, 27 Sept. 2006, www.tv.com/shows/niptuck/forums/official-discussion-thread-4x04-shari-noble-spoilers-8290-509920/?page=1. Accessed 17 Apr. 2014.

"Nip/Tuck 'Snip Snip Sweetheart.'" *EPGUIDE*, niptuckfans.com/epguide/4x04.php. Accessed 24 Apr. 2014. "Nip/Tuck Fan Forum" NipTuckFans, www.niptuckfans.com/forum/show.php?f=6&topic=20060926190821. Accessed 3 Sept. 2015.

Norton, Anne. “On the Muslim Question.” *Democracy, Religious Pluralism and the Liberal Dilemma of Accommodation,* edited by Monica Mookherjee, Springer, 2011.

“Not Easy Being a Dog in Afghanistan.” *The Denver Examiner*, 8 Dec. 2014, infoweb.newsbank.com/resources/doc/nb/news/1521AE12022BFFF0?p=AWNB. Accessed 21 Dec. 2015.

“Not So Fast: Women on Frontlines ‘Distracting,’ Say Critics.” *U.S. News*, 24 Jan. 2013, usnews.nbcnews.com/_news/2013/01/24/16680097-not-so-fast-women-on-frontlines-distracting-say-critics. Accessed 14 Oct. 2018.

“Nowzad: Winning the War for Animals.” *Nowzad*. www.nowzad.com. Accessed 14 Oct. 2018.

Ohmidog! “The Osama Bone Laden Chew Toys for Dogs.” 10 May 2011, www.ohmidog.com/2011/05/10/osama-bone-laden/. Accessed 18 Aug. 2018.

Oliver, Kelly. “Ambivalence toward Animals and the Moral Community.” *Hypatia*, vol. 27, no. 3, 2012, pp. 493-498.

“Operation Baghdad Pups.” *SPCA International*, www.spcai.org/index.php/news-and-blog/blog/tags/tag/operation-baghdad-pups.html. Accessed 29 May 2013.

“Operation Baghdad Pups.” *YouTube*, uploaded by SquareWon, 19 Nov. 2011, www.youtube.com/watch?v=kWXYPWvCNLE&feature=youtube_gdata_player. Accessed 28 Mar. 2013.

“Operation Baghdad Pups Dec. 2008 Update.” 16 Feb. 2009, *YouTube*, uploaded by *SPCA International*, www.youtube.com/watch?v=VArL3zZXTdE&feature=youtube_gdata_player. Accessed 28 Mar. 2013.

“Operation Baghdad Pups: Helping Soldiers’ Pets.” *SPCA International,* www.spcai.org/baghdad-pups.html. Accessed 7 June 2011.

“Operation Baghdad Pups 2012 Photos.” *SPCA International*, www.spcai.org/index.php/video/photos/obp-2012.html. Accessed 24 Dec. 2013.

“Operation Bagdad Pups - Saving ‘Bandit’ and 16 Others from Iraq.” *YouTube*, uploaded by

SPCA International, 25 Jan. 2012, www.youtube.com/watch?v=VD8z4--jW9I&feature=youtube_gdata_player. Accessed 28 Mar. 2014.

"Operation Baghdad Pups - Success Stories." *SPCA International*, www.spcai.org/index.php/2012-04-13-18-21-42/success-stories.html. Accessed 24 Dec. 2013.

"Operation Baghdad Pups to the Rescue." *YouTube*, uploaded by *SPCA International*, 25 May 2010, www.youtube.com/watch?v=vIctS-UdZgs&feature=youtube_gdata_player. Accessed 29 May 2013.

"Operation Baghdad Pups: Where Your Money Goes." *SPCA International*, www.spcai.org/index.php/2012-04-13-18-21-42/where-your-money-goes.html. Accessed 24 Dec. 2013.

"Osama bin Laden Becomes 'Bone-Laden' Dog Toy." *Global Animal*, 3 May 2011, www.globalanimal.org/2011/05/03/osama-bin-laden-becomes-bone-laden-dog-toy-poll/. Accessed 18 Aug. 2018.

"Our History." *Puppy Rescue Mission*, www.puppyrescuemission.com/about-prm/history/. Accessed 22 Dec. 2015.

"Our History." *SPCA International*, www.spcai.org/about-spcai/our-history/. Accessed 13 Oct. 2018.

"Pamela Geller." The Southern Poverty Law Center, www.splcenter.org/get-informed/intelligence-files/profiles/pamela-geller. Accessed 5 Oct. 2018.

Panayiotopoulos, Prodromos Ioannou. *Immigrant Enterprise in Europe and the USA*. Routledge, 2006.

Paster, Pablo. "650 Dogs Killed in Baghdad Every Day." *TreeHugger*, 13 July 2010, www.treehugger.com/corporate-responsibility/650-dogs-killed-in-baghdad-every-day.html. Accessed Oct. 4, 2018.

Patai, Raphael. *The Arab Mind.* Scribner, 1983.

Paul. "Disgusting Iams Dog Food Commercial." *Why I Hate Dogs*, 11 Dec. 2012, www.whyihatedogs.com/2012/12/disgusting-iams-dog-food-commercial/.

Pavia, Will. "Frontline Hero Dog Saved from War is Killed by Mistake." *The Times* [London, England], 17 Nov. 2010, p. 29.

Pennacchio, Joseph. "The Senate and General Assembly for the State of New Jersey Joint Legislative Resolution on K9 Veterans Day." www.jbmf.us/legal-cert.aspx. Accessed 25 May 2015.

"Perversion in Commercial ~Dog Food." *Christian Chat Rooms and Forums*, 12 Apr. 2013, christianchat.com/miscellaneous/76926-perversion-commercial-dog-food-5.html. Accessed 23 Dec. 2013.

"Pet Statistics." *ASPCA*, www.aspca.org/about-us/faq/pet-statistics. Accessed 14 Aug. 2016.

Petco PR News Wire. "Petco™ and Natural Balance® Pet Foods Commemorate National Service Dog Month with Fundraiser and Monument." *PR News Wire*. 6 Sept. 2012, www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/petco-and-natural-balance-pet-foods-commemorate-national-service-dog-month-with-fundraiser-and-monument-168730786.html. Accessed 1 June 2013.

"Pets by the Numbers." *The Humane Society*, 30 Jan. 2014, www.humanesociety.org/issues/pet_overpopulation/facts/pet_ownership_statistics.html. Accessed 19 Feb. 2015.

Peyser, Andrea. "Mosque Madness at Ground Zero." *The New York Post*, 13 May 2010, nypost.com/2010/05/13/mosque-madness-at-ground-zero/. Accessed 8 Oct. 2018.

"Photo Album." *Combat Tracker Team*, www.combattrackerteam.org/photo%2020K%20test.htm. Accessed 11 Oct. 2018.

"Please Help Us to Bring Charlie Home! The Full Interview." 5 Dec. 2007, *YouTube*, uploaded by *SPCA International*, www.youtube.com/watch?v=wkPMehacyh8&feature=youtube_gdata_player. Accessed 28 Mar. 2014.

Prividera, Laura C., and John W. Howard. "Masculinity, Whiteness, and the Warrior Hero: Perpetuating the Strategic Rhetoric of U.S. Nationalism and the Marginalization of Women." *Women and Language*, vol. 29, no. 2, 2006, pp. 29-37.

Propp, Vladimir. *Morphology of a Folktale*. U of Texas P, 2009.

Puar, Jasbir K. *Terrorist Assemblages: Homonationalism in Queer Times*. Duke UP, 2007.

Puar, Jasbir K., and Amit Rai. “Monster, Terrorist, Fag: The War on Terrorism and the Production of Docile Patriots.” *Social Text,* vol. 20, no. 3, 2002, pp. 117–148.

“Puppy Rescue Mission.” *Puppy Rescue Mission*, www.puppyrescuemission.com/. Accessed 22 Dec. 2015.

Queen Latifah. “Dogs on Deployment.” *The Queen Latifah Show*, 24 Sept. 2013.

“Rabies in a Dog Imported from Iraq.” *Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*, 3 Oct. 2008, www.cdc.gov/mmwr/preview/mmwrhtml/mm5739a3.htm. Accessed 13 Oct. 2018.

Raeke, Deanne. “What a Reunion! Ratchet and Gwen Beberg Together Again.” *For the Love of Dogs,* 19 Jan. 2009, fortheloveofthedogblog.com/news-updates/what-a-reunion-ratchet-and-gwen-berberg-together-again. Accessed 8 Feb. 2014.

Rai, Amit. “Of Monsters: Biopower, Terrorism and Excess in Genealogies of Monstrosity.” *Cultural Studies* vol. 18, no. 4, 2004, pp. 538–570.

Riley, Bob. “Proclamation by the Governor of Alabama: Military Dog Handler Day,” 18 Nov. 2005.

Ritland, Mike, and Gary Brozek. *Trident K9 Warriors: My Tale from the Training Ground to the Battlefield with Elite Navy SEAL Canines.* St. Martin’s Paperbacks, 2015.

Rivezzo, Charles V. “A Homecoming Like No Other.” *Airforce Print News Today*, 17 Apr. 2013. www.acc.af.mil/news/story_print.asp?id=123344623. Accessed 2 Feb 2016.

Roberts, Hanna. “Disturbing Video that Shows U.S. Soldiers ‘Blowing Up a Dog in Iraq.’” *Daily Mail Online,* 21 Dec. 2011, www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2080702/Horror-U-S-soldiers-blow-dog-Iraq-film-it.html. Accessed 28 Fab. 2015.

---. “Horror as U.S. Soldiers Blow up a Dog in Iraq (and Film It).” *Daily Mail Online*, 31 Dec. 2011, www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2080702/Horror-U-S-soldiers-blow-dog-Iraq-film-it.html. Accessed 28 Fab. 2015.

Robinson, Andrew. "Iams' Keep Love Strong Commercial – 'Welcome Home.'" 3 Dec. 2012, www.andrew-robinson-online.com/iams-keep-love-strong-commercial-welcome-home/#sthash.zHtJPjcF.dpuf. Accessed 5 July 2015.

Rockhill, Rick. "Natural Balance Canine with Courage Rose Parade Float." *Things to Ponder,* 1 Jan. 2013, rickrockhill.blogspot.com/2013/01/natural-balance-canines-with-courage.html. Accessed 14 Apr. 2014.

Rogak, Lisa. "Dogs of War: Photos Remembering the Military's Canine Heroes." *The Huffington Post.* 28 May 2012, www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/05/28/military-dogs-war-memorial-day_n_1545926.html. Accessed 11 Oct. 2018.

Rovers, Ronald. "The Silencing of Theo van Gogh." *Salon*, 24 Nov. 2004, www.salon.com/2004/11/24/vangogh_2/. Accessed 13 Fab. 2015.

Rydström, Jens. *Sinners and Citizen: Bestiality and Homosexuality in Sweden, 1880-1950*. U of Chicago P, 2003.

"Sacrifice." *Oxford English Dictionary*, 2014, www.oxforddictionaries.com/us/definition/american_english/sacrifice. Accessed 1 Nov. 2014.

Said, Edward W. *Orientalism*. Pantheon, 1978.

Samuel, Stacey. "Hometown Heroes of Different Breeds are Honored for their Military Service." *CNN,* 7 Nov. 2011, www.cnn.com/2011/11/07/us/military-dogs/index.html. Accessed 24 Aug. 2018.

Sanchez, Michael S. "A Joint Memorial 'Commending the Courage of Heroism and Sacrifice of War Dogs." The Legislature of the State of New Mexico 48th Legislature First Session, 2007.

Savage, Zeinab. "Orphaned by War, Dog Finds a Home with Local Family." *StarNews*, 23 Oct. 2013, infoweb.newsbank.com/resources/doc/nb/news/149A8FA5A42EE4C8?p=AWNB. Accessed 12 Dec. 2015.

Scripps Howard News Service. “Dog’s Day - Congress Considers Allowing Aging Canines Working for Military to be Adopted.” *The Dallas Morning News,* 16 Oct. 2000, 2A.

“Senate Joint Resolution 05-008.” State of Colorado, 2005, www.jbmf.us/legal-cert.aspx. Accessed 25 May 2015.

Shadid, Anthony and Kevin Sullivan. “Anatomy of the Cartoon Protest Movement.” *The Washington Post*, 16 Feb. 2006, www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/02/15/AR2006021502865.html. Accessed 14 Oct. 2018.

“Shari Noble.” *Nip/Tuck*, Season 4, Episode 4. Directed by Nelson McCormick, written by Ryan Murphy and Jennifer Salt, 26 Sept. 2006.

Shukin, Nicole. *Animal Capital: Rendering Life in Biopolitical Times*. U of Minnesota P, 2009.

---. “Security Bonds: On Feeling Power and the Fiction of an Animal Governmentality.” *English Studies in Canada*, vol. 39, no. 1, 2013, pp. 177-198.

Silverman, Adam. “Rescued from War: Tales of Puppy Love - Operation Baghdad Pups Reunites Stray Canines with Troops Once Back in the USA.” *USA* TODAY, 25 Mar. 2008, p. 3A.

Silverman, Michael. “Intelligent Pro-American Editorial Cartooning.” *Amazon*, 29 Mar. 2004, www.amazon.com/gp/product/0972456902/ref=dbs_a_def_rwt_hsch_vapi_taft_p1_i0 Accessed 6 Oct. 2018.

Slater, Paula. “US Military Working Dog Teams National Monument.” *Paula Slater Website*, paulaslater.com/sculpture/u-s-military-working-dog-teams-national-monument/. Accessed 11 Oct. 2018.

“Slaughter.” *Dictionary.com,* dictionary.reference.com/browse/slaughter. Accessed 9 Oct. 2018.

“Slumdog.” *Urban Dictionary*, www.urbandictionary.com/define.php?term=Slumdog. Accessed 20 Jan. 2014.

Smetanka, Mary Jane. “No Place Like (a New) Home for Ratchet.” *The Star Tribune*, 23 Oct.

2008, www.startribune.com/ratchet-the-iraq-pup-is-right-at-home-in-minnesota/32489589/. Accessed 13 Oct. 2018.

Smith, Jodi. "Every Law Names After a Victim and What It Does." *Ranker*, www.ranker.com/list/us-laws-named-after-victims/jodi-smith. Accessed 10 Oct. 2018.

Smith, Katlyn. "Restoring a 'Sense of Being Home' Suburban Volunteers Reunite - Soldiers, Dogs." *Daily Herald,* 24 Dec. 2014, p. 1.

"Soldier Reunites with Dog." *ABC5*, *YouTube*, uploaded by RascalsPlace, 25 Mar. 2009, www.youtube.com/watch?v=5T-sLDb7YBw&feature=youtube_gdata_player. Accessed 1 Jan. 2014.

"Soldier Reunites with Dog On TV!!!" *The I Love Dogs Site*, theilovedogssite.com/soldier-reunites-with-dog-on-live-tv/. Accessed 25 Feb. 2014.

Solomon, Cori. "Canines with Courage: Natural Balance Pet Food Honors Our Military Dogs." *Los Angeles Examiner*. 4 Jan. 2013, docs.newsbank.com.proxy.library.ucsb.edu:2048/s/InfoWeb/aggdocs/AWNB/1439FA359CB48E78/0D0CB57AD31233F5?s_lang. Accessed 14 May, 2014.

"SPCA International Rescues Iraqi Puppy." *The Examiner*, 20 Oct. 2008, www.examiner.com/article/spca-international-rescues-iraqi-puppy. Accessed 8 Feb. 2014.

Spivak, Gayatri. "Can the Subaltern Speak?" *Marxism and the Interpretations of Culture*, edited by Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg, Macmillan, 1998, pp. 66-111.

Stanescu, James. "Species Trouble: Judith Butler, Mourning, and the Precarious Lives of Animals." *Hypatia*, vol. 27 no. 3, 2012, pp. 567–582.

"State of Maine Proclamation." Members of Senate and House of Representatives, 11 Aug. 2005, www.jbmf.us/legal-cert.aspx. Accessed 25 May 2015.

Stilt, Kristen. *Animal Welfare in Islamic Law.* 2008. www.animalpeoplenews.org/special/STILT/stilt.islamicLawEN.pdf. Accessed 8 June 2015.

Steuver, Hank. "The Bomb with a Loaded Message." *The Washington Post,* 27 Oct. 2001, (p. C1).

Stokes, Susan. "Guardians of Rescue Ask for Community Support to Save Afghan Pups." *The Examiner*, 26 Aug. 2013, infoweb.newsbank.com/resources/doc/nb/news/148715F8F3752C08?p=AWNB. Accessed 21 Dec. 2013.

Stoneburner, Melissa. "GOR Helps Rescue Two Puppies." *Family and Home Examiner*, 22 July 2014, infoweb.newsbank.com/resources/doc/nb/news/14F3DC62AEB11448?p=AWNB. Accessed 12 Oct. 2018.

Sturken, Marita. *Tangled Memories: The Vietnam War, the AIDS Epidemic, and the Politics of Remembering*. U of California P, 1997.

Sullivan, Christine. *Saving Cinnamon: The Amazing True Story of a Missing Military Puppy and the Desperate Mission to Bring Her Home*. St. Martin's, 2009.

"Sunday Rescue-Puppy Rescue Mission and Second Chance Rescue." *BlogTalkRadio*, 13 April 2014, www.blogtalkradio.com/petradioshow/2014/04/13/sunday-rescue-puppy-rescue-mission-and-second-chance-rescue. Accessed 15 June 2016.

"Supporting our Military, Veterans and Their Beloved Pets." *Guardian Angels for Soldiers' Pets*, guardianangelsforsoldierspet.org/. Accessed 3 Jan. 2014.

Susman, Tina. "Iraq: Iraq Security Forces Take Aim at Stray Dogs." *Los Angeles Times Blogs - Babylon and Beyond* (blog), 27 Nov. 2008, latimesblogs.latimes.com/babylonbeyond/2008/11/iraq-iraq-secur.html. Accessed 14 Oct. 2018.

Taylor, David. "Dog Shelter Puts Down War Hero-Blunder Kills Pooch Who Saved 50 US Troops." *Daily Record, Sunday Mail* [Glasgow, Scotland], 17 Nov. 2010.

Terry, Jennifer. "Significant Injury: War, Medicine and Empire in Claudia's Case." *Women's Studies Quarterly*, vol. 37, no. 1 and 2, 2009, pp. 200-225.

Thomas, Francis C., and Nevers, Ben. "A Concurrent Resolution to Commend and

Recognize Combat Veteran Dog Handlers and Their Dogs on Their Commitment and Service to the United States of America." Legislature of Louisiana SCR26 Regular Session, 28 Sept. 2011. www.jbmf.us/legal-cert.aspx. Accessed 25 May 2015.

Thomas-Laury, Lisa. "Operation Baghdad Pups." *ABC7 News*, 1 May 2008, abc7news.com/archive/6115518/. Accessed 30 July 2010.

Todd, Betty Nguyen, T. J. Holmes, Reynolds Wolf, Morgan Neill, John Zarrella, and Brooke Anderson. "Castro Steps Down - Presidential Campaign Spat - Operation Baghdad Pups - Recession-Proof Your Life." *CNN*, 24 Feb. 2008, docs.newsbank.com.proxy.library.ucsb.edu:2048/s/InfoWeb/aggdocs/AWNB/11F0ACA5A9ED3720/0D0CB57AD31233F5?s_lang. Accessed 2 Jun 2013.

Tomlinson, Barbara. *Feminism and Affect at the Scene of Argument: Beyond the Trope of the Angry Feminist*. Temple UP, 2010.

Uddin, Lisa. "Canine Citizenship and the Intimate Public Sphere." *Invisible Culture: An Electronic Journal for Visual Culture* (6) 2003. www.rochester.edu/in_visible_culture/Issue_6/uddin/uddin.html. Accessed 22 Jun. 2015.

"Update: Ratchet the Iraqi Dog." *SPCA International,* www.spcai.org/index.php/news-and-blog/spcai-news/item/137-update-ratchet-the-iraqi-dog.html. Accessed 8 Feb. 2014.

"U.S. Sailor and Dog Reunite." *YouTube*, uploaded by *SPCA International*, 14 Feb. 2009, www.youtube.com/watch?v=cgQZG6TBTsk&feature=youtube_gdata_player. Accessed 28 Mar. 2014.

"U.S. Soldier Shoots a Dog and Watches the Dog Die (Iraq)" 29 Oct. 2011, www.youtube.com/watch?v=HGzFaW_MdtY. Accessed 9 Feb. 2013.

Utah State Legislature "Official Citation Honoring America's Military War Dogs," 22 Feb. 2006. le.utah.gov/~2006/bills/sbillint/SCR003.zip

Vallis, Mary. "More than 58,000 Iraqi Dogs Killed in Baghdad." *National Post*, 12 July 2010, nationalpost.com/news/more-than-58000-iraqi-dogs-killed-in-baghdad. Accessed 4 Oct. 2018.

van Gogh, Theo. *Allah Weet Het Beter.* Netherlands: Xtra, Uitgeverij, 2003.

"Vector." California Health and Safety Code Section 2002. codes.findlaw.com/ca/health-and-safety-code/hsc-sect-2002.html. Accessed 8 Aug. 2018.

"Video Appears to Show Marine Abusing Puppy." *CNN.com,* 4 Mar. 2008, articles.cnn.com/2008-03-04/us/puppy.marine_1_lance-corporal-marines-and-civilians-video?_s=PM:US. Accessed 10 June 2011.

Volpp, Leti. "The Citizen and the Terrorist." *September 11 in History: A Watershed Moment?* edited by Mary L. Dudziak. Duke UP, 2003, pp. 147–162.

"Waif." *Oxford English Dictionary.* www.oxforddictionaries.com/us/definition/american_english/waif. Accessed 14 Oct. 2018.

War Dogs: A Soldier's Best Friend. Directed by Deborah Scranton, *HBO*, 2017.

Watson Institute for International Studies. "Costs of War Executive Summary." 2015, watson.brown.edu/costsofwar/files/cow/imce/Costs%20of%20War%20Executive%20Summary.pdf. Accessed 7 July 2016.

Watson, Julie, and Sue Manning. "Demand for Adopting Retired Military Dogs Soars After SEAL Raid." *The Toronto Star* [Toronto, Canada], 27 May 2011, www.thestar.com/news/world/2011/05/27/demand_for_adopting_retired_military_dogs_soars_after_seal_raid.html. Accessed 29 May, 2013.

Weaver, Harlan. "'Becoming in Kind': Race, Class, Gender, and Nation in Cultures of Dog Rescue and Dogfighting." *American Quarterly*, vol. 65, no. 3, 2013, pp. 689–709.

Weheliye, Alexander. *Habeas Viscus: Racializing Assemblages, Biopolitics, and Black Feminist Theories of the Human*. Duke UP, 2014.

Weinstein, Adam. "Iraq's Slumdog Massacre: One Million Dogs Face Death." *Mother Jones*, 18 June 2010a, www.motherjones.com/politics/2010/06/iraq-kbr-one-million-dogs-death. Accessed 26 Jan. 2015.

---. "The Dogs and Cats of War." *Mother Jones*, 18 June 2010b, www.motherjones.com/slideshows/2010/06/dogs-and-cats-war-iraq-soldiers/melissa.

Accessed 26 Jan. 2015.

"Welcome Home." *Iams, Facebook*, 2013, www.facebook.com/Iams/videos/10152301294405454/. Accessed 19 Dept. 2014.

"Which Animals Does the Bible Designate as 'Clean' and 'Unclean'?" United Church of God, www.ucg.org/booklet/what-does-bible-teach-about-clean-and-unclean-meats/which-animals-clean-or-unclean/. Accessed 23 June, 2015.

White, Houston. "General's Gift to Squadron Lifts Spirits, Boosts Morale." *Third Marine Airforce Wing*, 4 May 2004, www.3rdmaw.marines.mil/News/News-Article-Display/Article/548234/generals-gift-to-squadron-lifts-spirits-boosts-morale/. Accessed 15 Oct. 2018.

Wiegman, Robin. "Missiles and Melodrama: Masculinity and the Televisual War." *Seeing Through the Media: The Persian Gulf War*, edited by Susan Jeffords and Lauren Rabinovitz, Rutgers UP, 1994, pp. 171-187.

Woestendiek, John. "Woof in Advertising: Rocky and Dawn." 8 Nov. 2013, www.ohmidog.com/2013/11/08/woof-in-advertising-rocky-and-dawn/. Accessed 15 Oct. 2018.

Wolfe, Cary. *Animal Rites: American Culture, the Discourse of Species, and Posthumanist Theory*. U of Chicago P, 2003.

Wortham, Jenna. "Puppy Torture Video Sparks Outrage, Military Investigation." *Underwire,* 4 Mar. 2008, www.wired.com/underwire/2008/03/puppy-torture-v/. Accessed 10 June 2011.

Wynter, Sylvia. "Unsettling the Coloniality of Being/Power/Truth/Freedom: Towards the Human, After Man, its Overrepresentation--An Argument." *CR: The New Centennial Review*, vol. 3 no. 3, 2003, pp. 257-337.

Xia, Rosanna. "Rose Parade Float Represents Military Dog Monument." *Los Angeles Times*, 28 Dec. 2012, articles.latimes.com/2012/dec/28/local/la-me-rose-parade-dogs-20121229. Accessed 13 June 2013.

Xiong, Chao. "Third Time's the Charm for Minnesota Soldier's Dog." *Star Tribune:*

Newspaper of the Twin Cities, 20 Oct. 2008, docs.newsbank.com.proxy.library.ucsb.edu:2048/s/InfoWeb/aggdocs/AWNB/124040EAF742C638/0D0CB57AD31233F5?s_lang. Accessed 27 Jul. 2016.

Young, Iris Marion. “The Logic of Masculinist Protection: Reflections on the Current Security State.” *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, vol. 29, no. 1, 2003, pp. 1-25.

Zellerman, Caren. “Stop Killing Dogs in Iraq.” *Change.org*, www.change.org/p/stop-killing-dogs-in-iraq. Accessed 28 Feb. 2015.