“Feminism” and Feminism:  
A Rhetorical Criticism of Emma Watson’s Address to the U.N. 

Abstract

This analysis uses metaphor criticism to decipher how metaphors function in Emma Watson’s address to the UN. Metaphor criticism proves useful in this critique because it can be used to determine the rhetor’s motive, to evaluate the effectiveness of the message, and to decipher the rhetor’s perspective on a particular subject. This critique uncovers two types of metaphors: those that describe “gender stereotypes” and those that describe “feminism.” The first subgroup of metaphors describes gender stereotypes as evil, oppressing entities that can be overcome or defeated. The second, more complex subgroup of metaphors for feminism suggests the term “feminism” has a negative connotation; one that conflicts with the true definition of the term. In addition, Watson’s inconsistent use of the “fight” metaphor suggests she is hesitant to use “feminism” to describe gender equality. In attempt to make the feminist movement more inclusive of men, Watson resists using the term and instead replaces it with phrases such as “he for she.” Watson’s metaphors suggest she is an advocate for gender equality but that she recognizes the stigma behind the term “feminism” and thus she uses metaphors for “feminism” instead of using the term directly. Since her speech aims to galvanize men and boys for change, she may ultimately be trying to create a new label for gender equality that is inclusive of men.

1 I would like to thank Professor George F. McHendry Jr. for encouraging me to submit this rhetorical critique for publication and for mentoring me through the publication process. I also wish to express my gratitude to the anonymous peer reviewer whose time, thought, and feedback made this the best paper possible.
One of the most memorable contemporary speeches on gender equality is Emma Watson’s address to the United Nations (UN) that discusses the effects of gender stereotypes on men and women and invites men to join the movement toward equality of the sexes. In this speech, men and women are largely equals in terms of social class. Watson recognizes that both sexes struggle with gender stereotypes and must work together to achieve gender equality. Analysis of Watson’s use of metaphors for feminism and gender stereotypes supports her advocacy for gender equality but suggests she is uncomfortable using “feminism” to describe gender equality because the current idea of the term is dividing and negative. In this criticism, I begin by exploring Watson’s history as a humanitarian and as a UN Women Goodwill Ambassador. Then, I discuss the beliefs of current feminists and anti-feminists as well as the purposes and goals of the HeForShe movement. Exploring these elements allows me to familiarize myself with the context surrounding Watson’s UN speech. Next, I explain the process of metaphor criticism and shed light on the opportunities the method brings in analyzing Watson’s use of metaphor for “feminism” and “gender stereotypes.” Following discussion of the method, I apply metaphor criticism to Watson’s speech to discern how “feminism” and “gender stereotypes” function in the rhetoric and discuss the various implications these findings have on current feminist discourse and mainstream news.

Background

Emma Watson is a successful Brown University graduate, model, and actress best known for her role as Hermione Granger in the popular Harry Potter film series (UN Women, 2014c). Outside of the public spotlight, she is dedicated to humanitarian efforts. She previously traveled to Bangladesh and Zambia to promote girls’ education and served as an ambassador for Camfed International, a movement to educate girls in rural Africa (UN Women, 2014c). Watson was recently named a UN Women Goodwill Ambassador where she now works to empower women and promote gender equality. She is an influential voice for young people still forming opinions on gender equality and feminism because her previous role in the Harry Potter series gives her an “automatic in with female and male millennials” (Robinson, 2014). She is currently advocating for the HeForShe campaign, a “solidarity movement for gender equality developed by UN Women to engage men and boys as advocates and agents of change for the achievement of gender equality and women’s rights” (UN Women, 2014b, p. 3).

In September of 2014 Watson launched HeForShe with a widely discussed speech on feminism and gender equality. The speech challenges anti-feminist campaigns like “women against feminism,” a movement that began on Tumblr in the summer of 2013 and prides itself in the promotion of anti-feminism by depicting women with signs explaining why they refuse to identify as feminists. A few recurring themes among anti-feminists in this movement include the idea that “feminism conveys preferential for women at a loss to sons, brothers, fathers, and friends,” and the misconception that feminists cannot be pro-life or stay-at-home moms (Shire, 2014). In a Huffington Post/YouGov poll of 1,000 Americans, 20% identified as feminists, 8% as anti-feminist, and 63% said they were neither. Yet, when asked if they believed “men and women should be social, political, and economic equals,” 82% of respondents said “yes” (Swanson, 2013). Clearly, there is a discrepancy between the general public’s idea of feminism and the theory behind it. Watson recognizes this when she says that feminism is “the theory of the political, economic, and social equality of the sexes,” yet many choose not to identify as feminists in fear of being perceived as “aggressive, isolating, anti-men, and unattractive” (UN Women, 2014a).
In response to the negative and exclusive connotations associated with feminism, HeForShe is born as “the first campaign of its kind at the UN” (UN Women, 2014a). It invites men to join the cause, recognizes the struggle they have with gender stereotypes, and aims to create a uniting movement between the sexes. In her speech, Watson asks men and women to embrace the definition of “feminism” instead of the word itself in order to fight for gender equality. The purpose of this speech is to galvanize men and women for gender equality. She encourages working toward the widely accepted idea feminism stands for: equality of the sexes, while limiting her use of the term “feminism” (UN Women, 2014a).

The Method of Metaphor Criticism

Metaphor criticism is structured based on the idea that “metaphor is at the base of rhetorical invention,” or in other words, it is a significant means by which constructing reality occurs (Ivie, 1987, p. 166). Metaphors are seen as “constitutive of reality” instead of illustrative “because the constant deployment of the metaphor's imagery becomes the accepted way of viewing the subject” (Bates in Foss, 2004, p. 281). A metaphor is comprised of a tenor and a vehicle. The former is the term that is “continuous with the topic under discussion,” while the latter is discontinuous with said topic and used to explain the former. In a rhetorical sense, metaphors provide a way to comprehend one thing (the tenor) in terms of another (the vehicle) (Burkholder & Henry, 2009, p. 98).

The process of identifying metaphors within an artifact first requires the critic to become familiar with the artifact and the context in which it occurs. The latter is imperative for the critic to interpret “any particular selection of [the rhetor’s] discourse,” and better prepares the critic to “identify and interpret patterns of vehicles that reveal systems of conceptual metaphors” (Ivie, 1987, p. 167; Ivie, 1997, p. 74). Gathering “information from sources contemporaneous with the speaking [or written] event” like reviews of the audience’s reactions to the artifact or analysis of the speeches that occurred in response to it, for example, assists the critic in becoming familiar with the context of the artifact (Ivie, 1987, p. 167). Next, the critic identifies and isolates the metaphors present in the artifact, grouping the vehicles into “subgroups that share similar entailments of meaning” (Ivie, 1997, p. 74). Each subgroup represents one of what Lakoff and Johnson term the “metaphorical concepts” in the rhetoric, and the subgroups together loosely represent the rhetor’s “system of metaphorical concepts” (as cited in Ivie, 1987, p. 167).

In the last step of metaphor criticism the critic analyzes each subgroup and searches for patterns of usage that reveal how metaphor functions in a piece of rhetoric. According to Foss, the rhetor’s worldview or perception of a particular subject can be revealed through analysis of the metaphorical concepts present in the artifact because metaphors are a “basic way by which the process of using symbols to construct reality occurs” (Foss, 2009, p. 274 & 268). Ivie recognizes this as well when he says, “the value of locating underlying metaphors is in revealing their limits or untapped potential as sources of invention” (Ivie, 1987, p. 167). Foss recommends clustering metaphors by vehicle to reveal how a rhetor “conceptualizes a particular subject” because the tenor remains the same. If the critic is interested in the rhetor’s general worldview, however, then he or she should instead group the metaphors by tenor (Foss, 2009, p. 273-274). Metaphor criticism proves useful in analysis of Watson’s speech because grouping metaphors by vehicle allows for evaluation of Watson’s perception of “feminism” and “gender stereotypes,” two dominant subjects (or tenors) embedded in her speech.

Another function of metaphor criticism is its ability to determine what the rhetor does and does not understand about a subject. Since “metaphor is a basic way by which the
process of using symbols to construct reality occurs,” the repeated use of a metaphor suggests the rhetor has a clear perception of the tenor (Foss, 2009, p. 268). Alternatively, the use of several unrelated metaphors suggests the rhetor is undecided about how to describe the tenor. Analysis of the metaphors used to describe “feminism” and “gender stereotypes” in Watson’s speech allows for discerning whether she is or is not yet decided on how to perceive feminism in relation to its meaning, gender equality. In this way, metaphor criticism proves useful in the evaluation of Watson’s speech yet again.

Ivie illustrates how metaphorical concepts may be used to evaluate the effectiveness of a piece of rhetoric in his analysis of the savagery metaphor in Metaphor and the Rhetorical Invention of Cold War “Idealists.” In his critique, Ivie concludes that the rhetoric of Cold War “Idealists” was largely self-defeating because the savagery metaphor “attempted to ‘decivilize’ America’s image rather than the enemy’s” (Ivie, 1987, p. 178). Ivie explains how metaphor may reveal the rhetor’s exigence when he says, “literalized metaphor is another term for motive” (Ivie, 1997, p. 71). According to Ivie (1997), “we move from a perception of speaking metaphorically to a perception of speaking literally when we stop talking about one thing in terms of another and begin treating distinct terms…as if one were the other” (p. 72). Watson’s purpose in speaking on behalf of HeForShe is to galvanize men and boys as advocates for women’s rights, but why does she feel the need to do so if the definition of feminism is not currently exclusive of men? According to Ivie, analysis of her literalized metaphor will reveal that motive and allow for evaluation of the effectiveness of her invitation.

Since this critique is concerned with feminist rhetoric, it is pertinent to discuss the role feminist criticism, rhetoric, and theory plays in this critique. In her feminist critique Sheeler points out, “feminist critics are concerned with the idea of choice and self-determination, and the feminist method in rhetorical criticism works to uncover and eliminate oppression and domination that a patriarchal society creates” (Sheeler, 2007, p. 4). Though metaphor criticism is applied to Watson’s speech in this critique, this method allows for conclusions to be drawn about the oppression both genders experience in society as well as the effect of male domination in this patriarchal world. This critique is concerned with male and female self-determination and independence from gender stereotyped roles. Just as feminist criticism allows for identification of “if, how, and why gender systems are perpetuated and maintained,” metaphor criticism may reveal the rhetor’s perspective of a tenor, which in this case includes gender hierarchies and systems, that in turn allows for conclusions to be drawn about how these systems are perpetuated and maintained (Sheeler, 2007, p. 7). In a sense, metaphor criticism in this critique functions as a form of feminist criticism.

In discussing the methodology of addressing various “feminist challenges to the rhetorical traditions,” Krista Ratcliffe (1996) defines four steps that offer “tremendous potential for challenging our rhetorical traditions.” These are (1) recovering lost or “marginalized theories of rhetoric” and (2) rereading or revising pre-existing interpretations of these theories, (3) extrapolating non-rhetorical texts such as diaries and essays by treating them as theories of rhetoric, (4) and finally conceptualizing new theories of rhetoric (p. 2-5). The lattermost step is most relevant to Watson’s address to the UN. In her discussion of the fourth step, Ratcliffe asks “should feminists situate their theories within rhetorical traditions, or should we question any connection with such traditions?” which is to say either “new” rhetorical theories emerge from old ones or they are conceptualized from what already exists but had yet to be conceptualized (Ratcliffe, 1996, p. 5). This suggests Watson’s “new” take on feminism is really the result of an evolution of feminism that is no
more radical than the growth between, say, first and second-wave feminism. Ratcliffe (1996) states, “no space exists in which feminists may stand to begin totally anew… but because the dominant discourse is not static, it may be revised” (p. 5). This suggests that though Watson’s theory cannot be entirely original, it has the potential to change the dominant discourse from a “masculinist” language, for lack of a better term, to at least a neutral one. Ratcliffe notes that the historical and current language function is one in which the word “we” and “our” imply “men” and “men’s” (Aristotle in Ratcliffe, 1980, p. 21). She says feminists must “critique this concept of language to determine if, and how, it can be made more inclusive” in order to redefine women’s position in society (Ratcliffe, 1996, p. 21). Thus, it can be argued that rather than trying to convey feminist values in a masculinist language to spawn real change for women, Watson’s speech may be challenging masculinist language by attacking both male and female stereotypes in an attempt to make space for feminist language.

Addressing metaphors specifically, Ratcliffe states that, according to feminist activist and philosopher Mary Daly, metaphors not only perform a symbolic function, but they enable language to be used “to subvert the status quo” by clashing with the accepted logic to create a new logic that elicits change (Ratcliffe, 1996, p. 72). One of Watson’s strongest persuasive devices is her use of metaphor to expose male oppression in an attempt to convince men to advocate for gender equality. For example, she uses metaphors such as “imprisoned” and “evil,” discussed in further detail in the coming pages, to illustrate men as victims of gender stereotypes. These metaphors clash with accepted logic, that is the idea that men are the tough, powerful, and invincible sex, to create a new logic that exposes men’s shortcomings, which then elicits change (galvanizing men as advocates for gender equality). This function of metaphor is evident in Watson’s address, which implies Watson’s use of metaphor can engender real change for women. Ratcliffe (1996) adds that feminist writer Adrienne Rich stresses the importance of recognizing the imaginative function of language because “if a woman’s material existence is to be transformed, her consciousness must be able to break through the rhetoric of patriarchy” (p. 114). Watson’s use of metaphor to expose male oppression and illustrate men as victims of gender inequality is the means by which she “breaks through the rhetoric of patriarchy” so feminists can be heard in a primarily masculinist language (Ratcliffe, 1996, p. 114). Shifting the dominant discourse to make room for feminist language, altering the status quo to elicit change, and breaking through patriarchal rhetoric are all functions of metaphor that have historically been pertinent to feminist rhetoric. These functions also describe how metaphor can be used to convey feminist values in a primarily masculinist language, which suggests metaphor is an invaluable rhetorical device for Watson who needs to persuade her audience to join her cause.

Application of Metaphor Criticism to Watson’s UN Address

Watson’s speech contains two systems of metaphors: one subgroup of metaphors for “feminism,” and one for “gender stereotypes.” First, I will analyze the metaphors surrounding gender stereotypes because these best illustrate Watson’s perception of gender equality. Two metaphors Watson uses to describe how gender stereotypes function in society are “imprisoned” and “evil.” In contrast, Watson uses “free” and “make it better” (i.e. “heal”) to describe what the world may be like without these stereotypes. Together, these metaphors illustrate gender stereotypes as a disease, a widespread infectious problem, but one that can be overcome or healed.
Metaphor for Gender Stereotypes

One of Watson’s first statements regarding men’s struggle with gender stereotypes is “we don’t often talk about men being imprisoned by gender stereotypes but I can see that they are” (UN Women, 2014a). This imprisonment metaphor suggests gender stereotypes are not overcome without the help of the other gender (someone on the other side of the stereotype), since prisoners must be set free by someone outside of the prison cell. In this specific sentence, men need women to set them free from their oppression. This idea that both genders need the other to achieve equality is evident again when she says, “men - I would like to take this opportunity to extend your formal invitation [to join the gender equality conversation]” because at Hillary Clinton’s speech about women’s rights only thirty percent of the audience was male (UN Women, 2014a). Here, Watson is asking men to help women fight for their rights. In this way, Watson illustrates how both men and women need each other to overcome gender stereotypes. Watson continues the idea of being set free through an abundant number of claims including, “[when we] start defining ourselves by what we are, we can all be freer and this is what HeForShe is about. It’s about freedom,” “men and women should feel free to be sensitive…free to be strong,” “when they [men] are free, things will change for women as a natural consequence,” and “daughters, sisters, and mothers can be free from prejudice” (UN Women, 2014a). Watson’s use of “free” illustrates a world that might exist if society were to stop holding genders to their respective stereotypes. In doing so, Watson suggests this is a tangible future.

Watson uses the “evil” metaphor to express the urgency that exists to start fighting for equality when she quotes Edmund Burke, saying, “all that is needed for the forces of evil to triumph is for enough good men and women to do nothing” (UN Women, 2014a). “Evil” refers to oppression through gender stereotypes and this quote serves as an invitation to both sexes to start combating gender inequality. Since evil is an entity that society works to avoid, this metaphor also serves to instill distaste toward gender stereotypes. In response to this evil, Watson volunteers to be the first advocate for gender equality. She says, “all I know is that I care about this problem. I want to make it [oppression through gender stereotypes] better” (UN Women, 2014a). The phrase, “make it better” connotes healing from an illness or injury, something that is often impermanent if action is taken against it. This is another means by which Watson expresses her optimistic view that achieving gender equality is tangible and her act of volunteering as an advocate for change depicts her as the face of hope behind the HeForShe movement.

Watson’s use of “evil” and “imprisonment” to describe gender stereotypes is carefully countered by “heal” and “free” to suggest gender equality is a tangible future. The context in which she uses “evil” illustrates gender stereotyping as an entity to work against. Describing men as “imprisoned” by gender stereotypes rescinds the idea that men are impervious to oppression and suggests that both genders require the other to be “free” from gender stereotypes. This metaphor is reinforced by her invitation to men to join the conversation. Finally, her public announcement to volunteer as a “healer of the problem” depicts Watson as the image of hope these stereotypes can be overcome.

Metaphor for “Feminism”

Watson’s speech is predominantly directed toward inviting men to join the gender equality movement. This is evident in Watson’s use of “imprisonment” as a metaphor for gender stereotypes and continues as a theme illustrated through her use of metaphor for “feminism.” It is important to note that Watson’s metaphors for “feminism” describe the
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term itself and not the movement or definition behind the word. For the sake of clarity, this paper will refer to the term as “feminism” and the movement as feminism.

Two of the four metaphors for the term “feminism” present in Watson’s speech are “fight” and “man-hating.” Early in the speech, Watson says she realizes “fighting” for women’s rights has too often become synonymous with “man-hating” and that her views are seen as “too strong, too aggressive, isolating, anti-men, and unattractive” (UN Women, 2014a). Equating feminism with “man-hating,” and similarly describing her feminist worldview as anti-men, divides the sexes and contradicts the definition of “feminism.” It parallels the popular man-hating misconception that “Women Against Feminism” currently promotes and supports the unpopularity of the word. The fact that women’s rights have so far been something that requires fighting for (e.g. work and effort against an opposing force) gives feminism a negative connotation as well. Both metaphors depict “feminism” as an unpopular term whose accepted definition does not match the movement it describes. This conclusion is supported by Watson’s statement that “recent research has shown me that feminism has become an unpopular word” and through her tone when clarifying the actual definition of feminism: “for the record, feminism by definition is…” (UN Women, 2014a). At the same time, the use of the phrase “fighting for women’s rights” serves to rally supporters for the cause and depicts feminism as a strong movement with momentum behind it. Though the context surrounding this metaphor implies it is intended to work in favor of gender equality, the fact that it encourages negative connotations surrounding the term “feminism” suggests Watson is unsure of how to use “feminism” in relation to gender equality.

This claim is further supported by Watson’s lack of the use of “feminism” throughout the rest of her speech. In the beginning of the address Watson recognizes the unpopular history of the term but does not make a large effort to redeem it. She says equating feminism with man-hating has to stop and states, “for the record, feminism by definition is: ‘the theory that men and women should have equal rights and opportunities. It is the theory of the political, economic, and social equality of the sexes’” (UN Women, 2014a). She does not, however, continue to her attempt at redefining feminism and instead focuses on the idea of gender equality. In fact, she encourages society to ignore the word when she says, “if you still hate the word – it’s not the word that’s important but the idea and the ambition behind it,” and recognizes, “we are struggling for a uniting word” (UN Women, 2014a). She only mentions feminism one final time when she suggests that people who believe in equality “might be one of those inadvertent feminists I spoke of earlier” (UN Women, 2014a). She is careful with her use of “feminist” as is evident in the fact that she does not force feminism as an identity on her audience, she only suggests it (UN Women, 2014a). The analysis of the metaphors “man-hating” and “fight” suggest Watson is uncertain of how to use “feminism” to advocate for gender equality, but her lack of the use of “feminism,” and her careful use of the term at the end of her speech also suggest she may be purposefully avoiding the word for persuasive purposes.

Two additional metaphors for feminism are “he for she” (both as a title and as a metaphor within the speech) and “take up this mantle,” positive terms that align with Watson’s belief in gender equality. She concludes her speech by asking men “to be the he for ‘she’” and join the movement to advocate for women’s rights. She also calls her movement “HeForShe” in place of a more feminist title so that it is inclusive of men. This title also perpetuates the theme from the imprisonment metaphor earlier: that both genders need the other to overcome inequality. Since “he for she” is a term inclusive of men and used in place of “feminism” or a more feminist term, Watson is suggesting that “feminism”
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is once again a dividing term unsuitable for her movement if she is to galvanize men and women for her cause. Watson invites men to “to be the he for she” when she asks them to “take up this mantle [i.e. fight for gender equality]” so that “their daughters, sisters, and mothers can be free from prejudice but also so that their sons have permission to be vulnerable and human too” (UN Women). In the context of the speech, “mantle” is a metaphor for gender equality [i.e. feminism] and asking men to “take up this mantle” illustrates strong men coming together to join the fight for both men’s and women’s equality. Though this position of power illustrated by the metaphors mantle and he for she could suggest Watson is recreating the very same gender hierarchies she is attempting to destroy, Watson verbalizes the struggles men face in society including feeling the need to hide emotion and the underrated role of being a father in the latter part of her speech. She addresses men when she says, “gender equality is your issue too” and points out that when men feel free from gender stereotypes, “things will change for women as a natural consequence” (UN Women, 2014a). In order to avoid misinterpreting the HeForShe movement and her invitation to men to take up this mantle and fight for women’s rights as a call for a male hero to save the female damsel in distress, Watson makes sure to point out that men need gender equality just as much as women do. Further evidence that Watson is uncertain about how to use “feminism” to describe gender equality exists in her use of the “fight” metaphor implied here. In this case, “fight” is suggested through a positive metaphor for feminism, “take up this mantle,” and is thus another example of the inconsistent connotation of “fight” within this speech.

“Take up this mantle” and “he for she” are means by which men are included in the fight for gender equality, which benefits both genders, and invited to be advocates for women’s rights. Since these metaphors are uniting but the suggested metaphor within them is the contradicting metaphor “fight,” it is clear Watson is aware of the negative and dividing aspects of “feminism” and thus she is unsure how to use the term and gives preference to alluding to it rather than speaking directly about it. This conclusion is further supported by the fact Watson recognizes the association society makes between “feminism” and “man-hating.” After introducing the idea of gender equality, Watson avoids talking about feminism directly and even encourages working toward the idea of feminism without using the word “feminism” because society is “struggling for a uniting word” though it has “a uniting movement” (UN Women, 2014a).

Conclusions and Implications

Metaphor criticism reveals Watson’s support for gender equality primarily through her use of metaphor for gender stereotypes. The “evil” metaphor illustrates stereotypes as something threatening humankind and the “imprisonment” metaphor serves to unite the sexes by suggesting these stereotypes can be overcome with the help of both genders. The metaphor “free” serves to illustrate a society without stereotypes and foster hope while “heal” likens stereotypes to an illness or injury that can be overcome. These metaphors illustrate Watson’s concrete perception of gender stereotypes, namely that they work against gender equality and must be overcome through the work of both men and women in order to achieve gender equality.

Watson advocates for gender equality as illustrated through analysis of the metaphors for gender stereotypes and feminism, but metaphor for “feminism” also reveals her hesitancy in advocating for the term directly. Watson recognizes that a large portion of society associates “feminism” with “man-hating,” a negative term often used by anti-feminists to describe feminism. “Fight” connotes both positive and negative aspects of
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feminism and further suggests Watson is unsure about how to use the term. Thus, Watson’s use of metaphor for “feminism” upholds her advocacy for gender equality (the meaning of feminism), but the abundance of contradictory metaphor in this speech suggests Watson prefers to allude to the idea of equality of the sexes and avoid using the term “feminism.” One likely explanation for Watson’s hesitancy in using the word is that it may be, at least in part, a rhetorical strategy aimed at persuading her audience to join her cause, an idea that is suggested both by the fact she avoids using the term and through analysis of literalized metaphor. As noted earlier, Ivie discusses how analysis of literalized metaphor may reveal the rhetor’s motive and the effectiveness of a piece of rhetoric. In the discussion of the method of metaphor criticism I mentioned that the true definition of feminism is inclusive of men. If this is true, why does Watson feel the need to invite men to join the feminist movement and why does mainstream media treat her invitation to men as if it were a new, groundbreaking idea? As previously discussed, Watson’s illustration of gender stereotypes as something “imprisoning” that can be “healed” suggests gender equality is a tangible future that requires the work of both men and women. ‘He for she’ and “free” are literalized metaphors for “feminism” that are inclusive of men and continuous with the idea of gender equality. Analysis of these metaphors suggests Watson is an advocate for gender equality whose motive is to encourage the public, especially men, to support her cause. In fact, Watson verbalizes this when she says, “we want to end gender inequality— and to do that we need everyone to be involved” (UN Women, 2014a).

Watson has another motive, however, that is revealed through an observation she makes. She says, “the more I have spoken about feminism the more I have realized fighting for women’s rights has too often become synonymous with man-hating” (UN Women, 2014a). Watson’s inconsistent use of “fight” as a metaphor for “feminism” suggests she is hesitant to use the term to describe gender equality, but the context in which “fight” appears here suggests it is very likely Watson is avoiding “feminism” in an attempt to steer her audience’s focus away from the term itself. She is verbally recognizing that “feminism” is controversial because it is too often perceived as hostile to men. The fact that she avoids using “feminism” suggests her goal is not to clarify misconceptions about “feminism” but to render those misconceptions irrelevant and invite society to focus on achieving gender equality instead. By avoiding “feminism,” Watson shifts the focus from the term to the goal: gender equality. This more agreeable term, in theory, should help galvanize men and boys as advocates for change.

What these results also show is that Watson’s “speech about feminism” turns out to be less about “feminism,” the term, and more about gender equality, the idea behind the term, but the lack of “feminism” in her speech is not obvious and thus news articles head titles like Vanity Fair’s “Watch Emma Watson Deliver a Game-Changing Speech on Feminism for the U.N.” As a result, Watson’s likely purposeful elimination of the term “feminism” from her speech proves to be somewhat ineffective. Headlines concerning this speech might change if Watson’s hesitancy in using the term “feminism” were more obvious. This is not to say her address was ineffective as a whole, however, because metaphor in this speech serves to rhetorically dismantle gender stereotypes and encourage others to do the same. If the use of “metaphor is a basic way by which the process of using symbols to construct reality occurs,” then Watson’s rhetoric reflects her reality, that men and women are equals and should be treated as such, and she uses rhetoric to change women’s roles in society (Foss, 2009, p. 268). In other words, if metaphors shape the way we see the world and reflect how we interpret our environment, then the way we think about women in society is reflected in our physical reality. What this means for Watson’s audience is when
gender stereotypes and hierarchies are eliminated from our vocabulary, they become nonexistent in the world. Watson understands this and thus she is using rhetoric to encourage her audience to alter their mindset toward women so their role in society may change as a natural consequence.

Watson’s address to the UN introducing the “HeForShe” movement is constructed so as to unite the sexes to end gender inequality. Watson recognizes the impact gender stereotypes have on men and women and suggests both genders require the help of the other to achieve gender equality. In the speech, “He for she” and “take up this mantle,” used in the absence of “feminism,” serve to unite the sexes and suggest gender stereotypes can be overcome when both sexes work for it. Though these metaphors alone illustrate men as the heroes women need to overcome their strife, Watson describes the oppression men face in order to avoid recreating the gender hierarchies she is trying to dismantle. Watson’s use of metaphor for gender stereotypes suggests gender inequality is an evil but curable entity oppressing both men and women, however, the metaphors used for “feminism” reveal she is uncomfortable using that term. This hesitancy may not only be evidence of an insecurity within the effectiveness of the term, but may also be representative of a rhetorical strategy aimed at attracting as many supporters as possible, keeping in mind much of her audience is dissuaded by the term “feminism.” This conclusion is supported by the fact she verbally recognizes the distaste associated with “feminism” when she says, “my recent research has shown me feminism has become an unpopular word” (UN Women, 2014a). It is possible that in an attempt to unite the sexes for change, Watson purposely harnesses the idea of gender equality in the phrase “he for she” instead of a more feminist title (UN Women, 2014a). This tactic proves to be somewhat ineffective, however, due to the fact that her discomfort in using “feminism” is not obvious enough to make news headlines and instead of focusing on Watson’s attempt to galvanize men and women for gender equality, the media discuss “Watson’s speech on feminism.” Despite her hesitancy in using “feminism,” however, she is ultimately still an advocate for gender equality.
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