'Like an animal I was treated': anti-immigrant metaphor in US public discourse

OTTO SANTA ANA
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES

ABSTRACT. The contemporary framing in American public discourse on immigrants is examined through a data-driven metaphor analysis. The print media texts of the 1994 political debate and campaign in California over an anti-immigrant referendum, Proposition 187, is analyzed. An ongoing cataloguing of metaphors from hundreds of *Los Angeles Times* articles displays the discourse that reflects and informs California public opinion. The metaphors discerned include 'IMMIGRANTS ARE ANIMALS'. In so far as prose metaphors in the print media reflect public discourse, this study captures a public perception that dehumanizes immigrant workers. Additionally, alternative analyses of the framing of the discourse of Proposition 187 are compared to the present analysis.

KEY WORDS: *immigrants, immigration, Latinos, metaphor, metonymy, political discourse, print media, Proposition 187, public discourse, racism*

1. Setting and objectives

In this article, the metaphoric representations of immigrants to the US used in public discourse are identified. This is accomplished by systematically cataloguing the news reports and other columns on immigration published in the *Los Angeles Times* from August 1993, when the California Governor signaled the start of the most recent cycle of anti-immigrant public outcry with a call for Federal repayment of costs associated with undocumented immigrant services that are borne by the state, until the referendum was brought to a state-wide vote in November 1994. The *Los Angeles Times* was selected because it is the newspaper of greatest distribution in California. It is also the local newspaper of the most populous metropolitan area of California, and has substantial coverage of Chicano, Latino and Mexican topics.

Proposition 187, an anti-immigrant referendum, was approved overwhelm-

ingly by voters in spite of a great deal of pre-election controversy surrounding its provisions. It was enjoined within hours of its enactment and ultimately determined to be unconstitutional by state courts. Proposition 187 would have denied a range of public benefits, including education and non-emergency health care, to undocumented immigrants in California. It would also have made school administrators, health care workers, social service personnel, police and other state employees responsible for establishing the immigrant status of clients and for notifying the Immigration and Nationalization Service (INS) of suspected undocumented immigrants for deportation.

An examination of the metaphoric structures used in this type of public discourse will provide a reflection of the political language that 'frames' public opinion (Schön, 1979). The dominant immigrant metaphor used in the *Los Angeles Times* was IMMIGRANTS ARE ANIMALS. Since it has been argued that everyday metaphor embodies the common-sense world-view of its target domain (Gibbs, 1994), in this case undocumented immigrant workers, a picture is drawn of the way these individuals were characterized in public discourse during California's most recent period of xenophobia.

2. Background

It is generally taught in American public schools that the US is a nation of immigrants. However, American school children commonly do not know that at the time of the Mexican War, 1848, there were 80,000 Mexicans living in the Southwest (Kanellos, 1994). Moreover during the late 19th and early 20th century the political border between Mexico and the US was no restraint on the free movement of people to the north and south. In these respects Mexicans are not immigrants to the US. Thus it is particularly painful to witness the Janus-faced attitude of self-interest the US maintains toward Mexican and other immigrants. When the country is in the growth part of the economic cycle, cheap labor is at a premium. During these times US commerce promotes the virtues of America, and its 'American Dream' of the unbounded opportunity for the hardest worker, no matter who and from what circumstances. When Americans scorn essential labor, workers from other countries are procured for the lowest paid and least desirable work. The immigrants come, do the work, dream the Dream, and honor their commitment. For example, from 1880 to 1920 with a population much less than 100 million, the US accepted 24 million immigrants, most of whom were from Europe (Brownstein and Simon, 1993). However, as the economic cycle wanes, the second face is manifest toward the immigrants and their children (Hoffman, 1974). Then the immigrant is regaled as a burden and a menace (Brimelow, 1995). Evidence for this attitude abounds in American history. For example, between 1921 and 1924 Congress set up a restrictive immigration quota system which disfavored immigrants from Eastern and Southern Europe as well as Asia and Latin America (Higham, 1955). Between 1929 and 1935 authorities mobilized the US military to force the repatriation of 500,000 immi-

grants and their US-born children (Hoffman, 1974: 126), including my own mother.

In southern California, since the end of World War II the economic upswing has not wavered. Immigrants were recruited by business and industry to power an unparalleled period of economic growth. Middle-class families employed immigrants to do the gardening, house cleaning and to tend their children. With immigrant labor the middle-class achieved a higher standard of living than they otherwise could afford. Today, for example, it is rare to see Los Angeles suburban homeowners cut their own lawns on Saturday morning. Immigrant workers now do the job efficiently and cheaply. However, with the end of the Cold War in 1989 the expansion period of California's military-based economy also came to a close. Over 830,000 jobs were lost between 1990 and 1993, primarily in the defense sector. A ripple effect from the defense industry layoffs and cut-backs was felt throughout the economy. The economic recession led to reductions in state and local governmental incomes and created budgetary problems (Davis, 1995).

Another factor is more important. The demographic profile of California has changed in the last decades, becoming decidedly less 'Teutonic' and more multi-cultural.[1] While there is a general increase of the proportion of foreign-born residents in the US from 5 per cent in 1970 to 8 per cent in 1990, these figures (the highest since 1930) belie a skewed distribution of immigrant residence. Sikhs, Mexicans and Armenians are not settling in Idaho. Seventy-five per cent of foreign-born residents settle in seven states, with California at the top of the list. Nearly 25 per cent of all legal immigrants settled in California during the decade of 1980. And overall, California's foreign-born population is about 22 per cent of the population; in Los Angeles County it is 33 per cent. Los Angeles Unified School District now officially lists more than 80 mother tongues spoken in its kindergartens. While a plethora of cultures are represented, 85 per cent of legal immigration during the 1980s was from Asia and Latin America. Adding to an already very large population of Mexican-origin citizens, the browning of California is inevitable. Latinos now make up 30 per cent of the population of the state. They are projected to become a majority by 2040 (Brownstein and Simon, 1993). In Los Angeles the tendency is more pronounced since Latinos are projected to be the majority by 2007. For Californians who maintain an often-unreflective assumption that Anglo-American culture is and should remain dominant and preeminent, these demographic changes have been unnerving.

The present period of vocal anti-immigrant resentment began in 1993, when the Governor proposed that illegal immigrants be denied state benefits such as education and health care, as well as denying citizenship to children born in the US to undocumented immigrant parents. Immigration became an emotionally charged political issue, as it had been in the early 1920s, and the mood of the dominant constituencies has become perceptibly negative.

3. Method

3.1 HOW METAPHORS WORK

The observation that figurative language gives structure to humankind's mundane world-view has a long history. In a richly rewarding review Fernandez (1991: 4) describes figures such as Vico, whose 17th-century catch-phrase was *Homo non intelligendo fit omnia* (Man, without comprehending, makes his world). Purcell describes (1990: 36) a magnitude increase in the interest in metaphor in the 1970s. With the advent of Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) work, which is a milestone in contemporary theory of metaphor, even greater interest was stimulated as new avenues of thinking about metaphor opened, namely cognitive science studies about how metaphors shaped common-sense thinking.

Metaphor colors the poetic; more importantly it shapes the prosaic. Two-thousand years ago Cicero stated that metaphor occurs 'when a word applying to one thing is transferred to another, because the similarity seems to justify the transference' (Purcell, 1990: 39). To use the more current definition of Lakoff and Johnson, a metaphor is a conceptual mapping from one semantic source domain to a different semantic target domain. The source domains are often those things we as humans can easily think about, the parts of our physical world which are handy and familiar. The target domains are most frequently conceptual ones, hidden from our senses or otherwise unknown to us. We borrow the 'embodied' conceptual structure of the familiar (Lakoff, 1987) to make sense the target domains. Then we use the borrowed structure extensively or exclusively.

For example, Lakoff and Johnson cite a set of the conventionalized expressions or metaphors in English used to talk about the target domain of love (1980: 49), which they grouped in this example into three metaphors.[2] LOVE IS A PHYSICAL FORCE: *I could feel the electricity between us*; *There were sparks*; *The atmosphere was charged*; etc. LOVE IS MADNESS: *I'm crazy about her*; *She drives me out of my mind*; *He constantly raves about her*, etc. LOVE IS WAR: *She fought him off, then she fled from his advances*; *He is besieged by suitors, he has to fend them off*, etc. These and many more can be analyzed and hierarchized with knowledge of English and American culture to delineate for Lakoff and Johnson a cognitive model of the target domain, LOVE, of which all these linguistic expressions form a part. A central metaphor characterizes the physiological effects pertinent to the prototypical model, or scenario.

For Lakoff and Johnson such metaphoric mappings are a major process of human understanding.[3] Such a claim, of course, is interesting as a claim in the theory of cognitive science. Moreover, it has important social implications. In his Invariance Hypothesis, Lakoff (1987, 1993) ventures that when we borrow the conceptual structure of one domain (for example MADNESS) to apply to a second domain (in this case LOVE), the sum total of structural components of the source conceptual scheme is transferred to the target domain. The entailments that are part of the source domain structure are imported but remain underspecified. Thus an entailment of insanity (such as to be insane is to have no restraint over

one's own action) becomes an unspecified part of our understanding of what it is to be in love, until people make use of it, as in a statement '*I can't control myself when you're around*'. Thus, in addition to a structure to allow thinking about the target domain, a stock of entailments are available for further inferences that without the association of the source domain would not be made. Understanding the target domain is made easier by the ready association with the source domain. Put another way, both individual and public understanding are co-opted when human conceptual creativity is not individually exercised.

The present study of the public discourse on immigrants to California centers on the types of metaphor that were used to characterize immigrants, as part of the public discourse published by the print media during a politically tumultuous time in California. As follows, this investigation involves at least one more field of study, political discourse.

3.2 HOW METAPHORS WORK IN POLITICAL DISCOURSE

Paul Chilton (1985, 1994, 1996) and his collaborator (Chilton and Ilyin, 1993) suggest that metaphor in political discourse does not entirely consist of frozen conventionalizations, as say our common-place acceptance that GOOD IS UP and DOWN IS BAD (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980: 14). Rather, political discourse is constructed interactively, over time and across interlocutors. In the present setting, the use of metaphor on a daily basis in public/political discourse permits the creation of common ground by appeal to a shared cultural frame (e.g. Woolard, 1989; Voss et al., 1992). Metaphor can also be used creatively by political parties (Chilton, 1994), public officials and others with preferential access to the mass media (Van Dijk, 1993) as a heuristic for exploring new conceptualizations of political semantic domains. In these functions metaphors are conceptual instruments that embody otherwise amorphous or remote concepts in ways that the public can readily understand.

Metaphors of political domains operate in the same way that they do in matters of LOVE. They facilitate listeners' grasp of an external, difficult notion of society in terms of a familiar part of life. In the case of rapidly changing political events, metaphors are subject to negotiation. In the case of the disruption of a long-standing political order, the establishment of new metaphors facilitates the replacement of existing conceptual frames of reference. Thus Chilton and Ilyin (1993) describe the role of metaphor in various efforts to redefine Europe's international relations. Old metaphors, such as the *Iron Curtain*, which Winston Churchill coined 50 years ago, can no longer organize thinking about international relations in a dichotomized world view of Soviet-bloc and western-bloc alliances.

The work of Chilton (with his co-author) is an ideal place to start the present research in so much as they develop an explicit linkage of cognitive model of metaphoric processes to interactional discourse modeling as well as build in the potential for conceptual change of our political world views. Beginning with Lakoff's (1987) previously mentioned hypothesis that all structural components

of the source conceptual scheme are transferred to, but not specified in the target domain, they state that through interaction entailments are drawn out and particular options are available to interlocutors. They argue that interlocutors make 'more or less conscious' strategic choices of discourse when they articulate particular entailments. Only when specified can these entailments be contested or accepted.

In this view metaphors are instruments of social control for political organizations, mass media and other institutions (Fairclough, 1989: 36–7). In media discourse the use of metaphors is an important part of making problematic political and moral concepts, such as the political and economic nature of international migration forces and host country ethical responsibilities to its workers, readily accessible for evaluation to the voting public.

3.3 METHODOLOGY

The use of metaphor in media discourse to characterize the semantic domain of undocumented immigrants was investigated in texts published in the *Los Angeles Times* over a period of 2 years. One goal was to develop and conduct a text-based analysis that could be replicated for verification. Consequently an independently created and comprehensive database was used as the basis for a strongly data-driven analysis. Efforts were made to avoid biased sampling, and other pitfalls of rationalist analyses. The total of 107 articles were examined for examples of metaphor and other figurative language in this article. Over 1900 instances of metaphor were catalogued.[4] The present article is a report based on approximately 10 per cent of the total database, focusing on tokens for which the target concept is the immigrant.[5]

4. Immigrants are animals

4.1 PRELIMINARIES

In the preceding section a summary was provided of the claims of theories which take metaphoric thinking to be a major process by which we construct an understanding of our world. An empirical study of metaphor use in the public discourse on immigrants should therefore furnish a principled analysis of how immigrants are conceptualized in contemporary America. The tropes used to describe immigrants in the public discourse presented in the *Los Angeles Times* describe these individuals as a group with a distinct bias. There was a strong antipathy articulated metaphorically in several different ways, as illustrated here:[6]

(1)
*For some, the reaction of Valley residents is a natural outgrowth of **onerous burdens** – including budget-**busting** social service, education and criminal-justice costs – thrust upon Southern California by the nation's **porous** immigration laws* (1 August 1993: A–1)

(2)
an Orange County Grand Jury called for a nationwide, three-year moratorium on all

immigration to the United States in an attempt to ease the **drain** *on government programs* (17 June 1993: B–1)

(3)

the problem [of immigrant clients] *is significant, because it has* **placed added strain** *on the state's public hospitals and has cost programs such as Medi-Cal many millions of dollars* (1 September 1993: A–1)

(4)

'We now have a **runaway situation** *of undocumented aliens coming into this country. We have to stop it . . .'* (10 June 1993: J–1)

One often-commented upon aspect of the political debate centered on the fiscal costs associated with an apparent increase of immigrants, particularly undocumented immigrants, in southern California. The cause of anger and outrage, Proposition 187 supporters repeatedly claimed, was the economic expense incurred by American society due to undocumented immigrants. Excessive fiscal costs with minimal returns were cited by California's Governor as an abuse borne by the Californian taxpayer. When countered with alternative economic analyses which disputed the Governor's claims, however, the public debate did not focus on the comparative validity of the contending reports.[7] Had the public discussion emphasized economic analysis, then one could argue that indeed economics was the root of the outrage. In terms of metaphors, there was some focusing of the political debate over immigration costs, as expressed in tokens (1–4), which are later discussed. In terms of the metaphoric record, however, California's economic condition may have been a catalyst, but its role is quite secondary. The characterization of immigrants, as a group or as individuals, does not primarily revolve around their net contribution or cost to California and the country.

4.2 DISTRIBUTION

When all the tokens with immigrants as their target domain is examined, strong patterns appear. However, certain details must be noted before turning to the overall distribution of metaphors. For one, there are significant classes of metaphors which overwhelmingly are used to characterize the immigrant in a negative light, in contrast to those which are used primarily to present potentially positive images of the immigrant. An important observation of text-based metaphor analysis was noted by van Teeffelen (1994). Each particular token of a metaphor must only be interpreted in context; the social judgment force of tokens of a kind were not predictable. In the present analysis, a positive, negative or neutral force of each token was carefully catalogued in its full news article context. In contrast to van Teeffelen, however, it was found that tokens of a particular source domain were associated with either an overall negative or positive evaluation. The difference in van Teeffelen's finding and the present finding might be attributed to distinct kinds of genre. Popular fiction is the genre of van Teeffelen's data, and there seems to be a good deal more variation of metaphor in popular fiction. This genre is composed by a very few creative writers purposely seeking to create mem-

orable imagery. In contrast, the data source for public discourse reported here is a mix of newspaper genres written by scores of news writers, column writers, their editors and the writing public. The figures of speech noted in newsprint are less diverse and more prosaic than those of the fiction genre that van Teeffelen discusses. Further, although the creation of newsprint is a social construction and certainly not a privileged rendering of reality, newspaper reports are not written to be read as creative fiction. They are taken by the reading public as more-or-less factual descriptions of the political and social events and statements of the day. Thus it remains appropriate to classify the metaphor classes as a whole as either elevating or denigrating the immigrant.

The other consideration is the distribution of types of metaphors. Among the metaphors targeting immigrants, tokens that share a source domain appear in two patterns of usage: dominant and secondary distributions. This frequency classification empirically confirms Chilton's (1996) distinction between 'major' and 'minor' metaphors in a text. The dominant metaphor class are tokens with a similar source that occur relatively frequently and appear in a great variety of forms. In the *Los Angeles Times* data sampled each of these dominant metaphors comprise over 20 per cent of all tokens characterizing immigrants. These contrast with tokens of secondary semantic source domains which appear much less frequently, and with less variety of expression. As shown in Table 1, there are three types of secondary metaphors. Some secondary metaphors have multiple linguistic expressions. More frequent secondary metaphors blend into a number of (what is here called) occasional metaphors. The occasional metaphors are expressed only once or a few times, and do not seem at the present time to be associated with other more prevalent source domains. Most occasional metaphors in this sample are single instance tokens of a source domain. Lastly in these data there appears to be a metaphor of a distinct type. It is instantiated not by many different words, but by a single lexical item, which may have a distinct effect in the texts. Table 1 summarizes the findings.

When the total set of metaphors that characterize immigrants is examined, one dominant metaphor appears, IMMIGRANTS ARE ANIMALS. Less frequent is a set of secondary metaphors including IMMIGRANTS ARE DEBASED PEOPLE, WEEDS, COMMODITIES, and so on. These metaphors generally disparage immigrants. On the positive side, there is a biblical metaphor which consistently affirms the dignity of immigrants as human beings.

It is important to note that the focus of this article are the metaphors used in public discourse to conceptualize the immigrant, as an individual who has crossed the US political border in search of a better life. In many instances in the *Los Angeles Times* data the immigrant (an individual) is used as proxy for immigration (the process).

When a linguistic expression of the immigrant 'stands in for' another more encompassing concept, this is a metonym. Metonyms are instances of figurative language that utilizes a part of a concept to stand in place of that same concept. The relations that metonyms serve include: PART FOR THE WHOLE, e.g. *We hate bag-*

TABLE 1. *Immigrant domain metaphors and metonyms published during the 1994 California Proposition 187 campaign*

Type	Source domain	Sums	Subset %	Overall %
Metaphor				
Negative				
Dominant	ANIMAL, e.g. *hunted*	36	48.0	20.6
Secondary	DEBASED PERSON, e.g. *criminal*; PLANT, e.g. *weed*; COMMODITY; etc.	26	34.7	14.9
Occasional	e.g. *instrument*	13 (total 75)	17.3	7.5
Positive	BIBLE*	(27) 100 total metaphors		
Metonymy				
Negative	US AS BODY, e.g. *burden, disease*	20	27.0	11.5
	US AS HOUSE, e.g. *dirt*	11	14.9	6.3
	• DANGEROUS WATER, e.g. *floods, tide*	14	18.9	8.0
	• WAR, e.g. *army*	29 (total 74)	39.2	16.6
Positive		0 positive (74 Total Metonyms)		
Grand total		174		

Source: 107 *Los Angeles Times* articles published June 1992–December 1994. The table accounts for the tropes that target IMMIGRANTS, as people. It excludes tropes targeting IMMIGRATION, the demographic process (21 tokens of the total 25 Bible metaphor involved *scapegoat* tokens).

gies around here (clothing stands in for the person); OBJECT FOR THE USER, e.g. *The Uzi killed his enemy* (weapon stands in for the person); INSTITUTION FOR THE PEOPLE RESPONSIBLE, e.g. *The Army wants a few good men*; etc. (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980: 38–9). Such non-metaphoric mappings are quite frequent in the *Los Angeles Times* data source. In much the same way that we use metaphoric thinking to give structure to our social environment, so we use metonymy as a cognitive means by which we understand aspects of our world, in this case as part-to-whole and similar relationships.

In this article the immigrant metonyms are part-to-whole relationships in which the immigrant stands as a part to the US as whole. These metonyms are linked as parts of two metaphors which are commonly used to conceptualize the US. In the first of these, the NATION AS BODY metaphor, the immigrant is characterized as a *disease* afflicting the body or as a *burden* on the body. In the second, very productive nation metaphor, NATION AS HOUSE, the immigrant is characterized as,

for example, *dirt* to be *swept out*. Both NATION AS HOUSE and NATION AS BODY were previously noted in Chilton (1996).

Two important metonyms are also linked to the NATION AS HOUSE metaphor. Both implicate the immigrant as a threat to the US (as house or an extension of house). In these metonyms the individual immigrant stands in a part to a whole relationship to the nation, as representative of the aggregate of immigrants, or as a representative for the process of immigration. These negative tropes are the IMMIGRANT AS DANGEROUS WATERS and IMMIGRANT AS ARMY metonyms. All these classes of metaphor and metonyms were found in the *Los Angeles Times* data source to disparage the immigrant. There are no immigrant-affirming metonyms. These metonyms are discussed in Section 4.5.

4.3 THE DOMINANT METAPHOR

The dominant immigrant metaphor used in the *Los Angeles Times* was IMMIGRANTS ARE ANIMALS. Immigrants are seen as animals to be lured, pitted or baited, whether the token was intended to promote a pro-immigrant or an anti-immigrant point of view:

(5)
[Governor] *Wilson said he believed public benefits are a **lure** to immigrants and his intent was to discourage illegal immigration by denying them access to health care, education and welfare programs* (22 August 1993: A–1)

(6)
*In a fiery speech to teachers union supporters Sunday, Democrat Kathleen Brown branded Republican Pete Wilson as a cynical career politician who will do anything to get reelected: 'We're not going to play into those games of **pitting workers against each other**'* (3 November 1994: D–1)

(7)
*Once the electorate's **appetite** has been **whet** with **the red meat** of deportation as a viable policy option, the slope toward more aggressive ways of implementing that policy is likely to get slippery* (4 June 1995: M–2)

In (6) the verb *pit* evokes the brutal blood sport of placing enraged animals, such as dogs with bears or gamecocks, in a pit to destroy one another for the enjoyment of spectators. In the following tokens immigrants are seen as animals that can be attacked, and hunted:

(8)
Beaten-down [INS] *agents, given only enough resources to catch a third of their **quarry**, sense the objective in this campaign is something less than total victory* (5 July 1992: A–3)

(9)
the I–5 [freeway], *where the agents now must **quit the chase*** (5 July 1992: A–3)

Immigrants are seen as animals to be eaten, by American industry, by the INS[8] or its agents, and by the anti-immigrant Proposition 187 supporters:

(10)

*The truth is, employers **hungering** for really cheap labor **hunt out** the foreign workers* (9
June 1992: D–3)

(11)

*'187 backers **devour the weak and helpless**'* (6 September 1994: B–4)

This can also be noted in (7). At times immigrants are considered, as in the fol-
lowing case, to be like rabbits:

(12)

*The rapid increase comes at a time when many state and federal officials are calling for beefed-up
border patrols to **ferret out** illegal immigrants* (30 November 1993: A–1)

As it happens ferrets prey on rabbits and other small animals. More often,
immigrants are characterized as pack animals:

(13)

*the specter . . . has **spurred** an exodus* (31 August 1992: A–1)

(14)

*Those who want to sharply **curb** illegal immigration include conservatives, liberals and most
unions* (*curb* = a metal mouthpiece used to control animals, 9 June 1992: D-3)

The connotations of IMMIGRANTS ARE ANIMALS should be abundantly clear. In the
west a purported 'natural' hierarchy has been articulated since the time of
Aquinas to justify social inequity. In its full extension it subordinates other living
creatures to human beings, and ranks the inherent quality of humans from more
base to more noble. In its elaborated form, it has been called the 'Great Chain of
Being' (Lovejoy, 1936). Lakoff and Turner provided an extended discussion of the
pervasiveness of the Great Chain of Being metaphor in western thinking (1989:
170–89). This 'moral ordering' (Lakoff, 1996: 81) has been used to justify deni-
gration of certain groups of people in the US for two centuries. Gould quotes
Gunner Myrdal on Americans' complacent use of biological determinism to
maintain social advantage over people of color:

> 'Under their long hegemony, there has been a tendency to assume biological causa-
> tion without question, and to accept social explanations only under the duress of a
> siege of irresistible evidence' . . . Or as Condorcet said more succinctly a long time ago:
> they 'make nature herself an accomplice in the crime of political inequity'. (Gould,
> 1981: 21)

More recently Gould has stated that the notion of 'progress' as the source of
natural evolution to hierarchize living things, and social determinism to demean
people, is anachronistic because it long ago bankrupted its scientific credentials.[9]
As an evolutionary biologist, his rejection of evolutionary progress reflects one
strong current of contemporary thinking about evolution, yet flies in the face of
common-sense understanding. These antiquated beliefs of a hierarchy of
humans are reproduced each time the metaphor IMMIGRANTS ARE ANIMALS is used.
Gould's statement will undoubtedly be a surprise to many educated readers.[10]

When characterized as animals, immigrants are portrayed as less than human, which sets up unmistakable divisions of expectations. Actions that are natural for both humans and animals are lexically distinguished:

(15)
*This woman said she was upset about something else: why the offspring of women who 'come across the border and **drop their babies**' are granted American citizenship.* (10 June 1993: J–1)

Thus the different verbs *give birth* and *drop* distinguish identical human and non-human actions. Further, civil rights and human rights only exist for humans. Other irrevocable divisions ensue. The value of life is highest for humans. Slavery has been outlawed for humans but still is acceptable and legal with respect to animals, although it is not called slavery. Note that animals are owned, and the same terminology is used for animals as was used for slaves. Animals are said to be wild by nature. At times animals can be domesticated, but due to the life hierarchy based on progress, they can never be human. When animals are wild, which is to say, uncontrolled by humans, they may be appropriately feared by humans, and are justifiable targets for human hunters. Certain animals become valuable to humans only when domesticated, either as beasts of burden or as sources of food for humans.

What is the principle that governs the patterns of inference use of linguistic expressions of animals for immigrants? As Lakoff notes in matters of LOVE (1993: 206), metaphor is more than a matter of lexicon or grammar. It is a part of the conceptual system shared in large part by speakers of English and encoded in part in the ways Americans use English. Metaphor permits a shared understanding of the domain of immigrants in terms of the domain of animals. Following Lakoff's (1993) formula to present these patterns, the principle is first presented in terms of a scenario, or in this case a contrasting dichotomy:

> On the hierarchy of living things, immigrants are animals. Citizens, in contrast, are humans. This hierarchy of life subordinates immigrants to citizens. Human beings are vested by birthright with privileges, such as 'human rights' and 'human dignity'. Animals have no such privileges and are not equal to humans in the estimation of social institutions. Animals can never become humans by legislation or fiat. Their inferiority is inherent. Humans have full control over animals, from ownership to use as a food source. Animals are either domesticated, that is to say, owned by humans, or are wild and consequently are outside of the dominion of human society, and can be hunted.

Narrative of the Immigrant versus the Citizen

The *Los Angeles Times* documents many statements that demonstrate that immigrants are aware of the widespread racist attitude and behavior that they encounter in the US. Two are repeated here. In the following excerpt a Guatemalan mother of three expressed shock that state and federal legislators, one of whom is quoted here, denied assistance to undocumented immigrants following a major earthquake:

(16)

Illegal and legal immigrants 'are both human beings . . . regardless of what papers they carry . . .
We all felt the earthquake the same,' added Ramirez, a tent city resident who said she is
undocumented (2 February 1994: A–14)

The second is the description of treatment that a Los Angeles soccer fan said
police officers meted out at a Rose Bowl game, including beating him, dragging
him down stairs, uttering racist slurs and knocking him out:

(17)

*'Like an **animal** was the way I was treated,' Aguilar said. 'It was racist. Most everyone there*
was Hispanic' (3 May 1996: B–5)

A metaphor is a tightly structured conceptual correspondence mapping the
structure of the source domain, animal, onto a very different target domain, immi-
grant. The ontological mapping of metaphor labeled IMMIGRANTS ARE ANIMALS follows:

Immigrants correspond to citizens as animals correspond to humans

The correspondence allows American public discourse to use the same frame of
reference to reason about immigrants that is commonly employed to reason
about animals. In this manner speakers and listeners apply our framework of
thinking about animals to immigrants. The power of such metaphoric mappings
is fundamental, since mappings are conceptual and are not limited to a finite set
of linguistic phrases. Many metaphoric mappings are more or less conventional
and unchanging (Lakoff, 1993: 208–9; Lakoff and Turner, 1989: 55). For a pol-
itical metaphor which is debated and negotiated, the mapping is a less fixed part
of our conceptual system (Chilton and Ilyin, 1993). However, as frequently and
as exclusively as the mapping is used in daily discourse, the dominant ANIMAL
metaphor persists as the major productive way to conceptualize immigrants.

This is a sobering finding. Its implications are discussed in the final section of
this article. In the following section the other mappings are described, although
not in detail of the ANIMAL metaphor. In Section 5 a counterargument to the force
of this major finding is tested and rejected. A set of alternative framings of the
public discourse on Proposition 187 is be considered in Section 6. After these con-
siderations, commentary on the implications can be made.

4.4 SECONDARY MAPPINGS

The metaphor labeled IMMIGRANTS ARE ANIMALS is not the only mapping used in the
Los Angeles Times. A few non-animal metaphors for immigrants follow here. A
widely varied mapping, which in the light of the foregoing can be understood to
reinforce the dominant ANIMAL metaphor, has been tentatively labeled IMMIGRANTS
ARE DEBASED PEOPLE, includes all classes of people who are denied their intrinsic dig-
nity and worth as humans:

(18)

'I recently had some tourists say that the problem with today's immigrants is that they're so
***bizarre** and unpredictable,' says O'Donnell* (3 October 1993: E–1)

(19)

*A middle-aged woman tells of the '**marauders**' who take over the streets at night* (6 September 1993: A–1)

Another metaphor that is used is IMMIGRANT AS WEED:

(20)

take children [of immigrants] *and their dream hostage in a crude scheme to **uproot** their parents* (27 September 1994: B–7)

(21)

*And while 33% said they believed **the new crop** of immigrants have inferior job skills and education than did their predecessors* (27 January 1996: 7a)

(22)

***spring up** among us a generation of ignorant and troubled children who, lacking our common language and political and social ideals, will evolve into a huge, parallel underclass* (1 August 1993: A–1)

(23)

*'We see it as our responsibility to **weed out** illegal aliens'* (16 May 1992: A–30)

In (21) the term *crop* associates immigrants not with the productivity and wealth that they bring to the country but with undesirable attributes. These and other secondary mappings degrade the immigrant. A single source domain that inherently affirms the humanity of immigrants is discussed in Section 4.6. However, a trope other than metaphor which is used quite frequently in the *Los Angeles Times* is taken up in the next section.

4.5 METONYMY

The focus in this article is on metaphor, in which a source semantic domain is linked to a distinct semantic domain. In the *Los Angeles Times* another kind of trope, metonymy, was also found to be a common type of figurative language used in public discourse genres. Metonymy has in recent years been the focus of a number of studies in semantics and cognitive linguistics, and has been formally characterized in contrasting ways (Croft, 1993; Fauconnier, 1985; Langacker, 1987; Nunberg, 1987). As distinct from metaphor, which links one conceptual domain with a separate target domain, metonymy involves only one conceptual domain and expresses 'contiguous relations between objects, such as part–whole, cause–effect, and so on' (Gibbs, 1993: 258). Again, the relations that metonyms map include PART FOR THE WHOLE and OBJECT FOR THE USER, as well as others. While the structure of the metonymy is formally distinct from metaphor, what is important in the present occasion is to note that 'metonymic concepts allow us to conceptualize one thing by means of its relation to something else' and to 'structure not just our language but our thoughts, attitudes and actions' (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980: 39). Metonymy thus serves similar cognitive functions as metaphor, namely conceptualizing target semantic domains, in this case, immigrants to the US.

A report of the metonymic representations of immigrants will supplement the *Los Angeles Times* sample of metaphoric representations in public discourse. In the texts immigrants (as individuals) were frequently found standing in for the collective movement of people, immigration, as exemplified below. One of the two dominant metaphors for the US is NATION AS BODY:

(24)
*This is a big country with a very small **heart*** (10 November 1994: A–1)

There are literally scores of tokens characterizing the US as a human body. This is particularly true of the economy of the US.[11] Lakoff (1991) has discussed this metaphor, in the context of an interpretation of American acceptance of the Gulf War. The immigrant is metonymically characterized by the advocates of Proposition 187 to be a *burden* on the *body* of the economy and a *load* on the *back* of taxpayers. Calavita (1996: 290) notes that proponents of Proposition 187 emphasized the fiscal impact of immigrants with comparable silence on the economic contribution that immigrant labor makes to many major industries of California, such as garment making and agribusiness, and to large and small commercial enterprises throughout the state.

(25)
*Pete Wilson's Administration has done a poor job of reducing the **state's financial burden** caused by illegal immigrants* (13 August 1993: A–3)

(26)
A poll of Orange County Latinos conducted recently by The Times *found that 47% of the county's Latinos believe that 'new Latino immigrants' are **a burden on the economy***. (9 September 1993: A–22)

Other IMMIGRANT AS BURDEN tokens were (1) and (3), cited earlier. Another set of metonyms of the metaphor NATION AS BODY are the IMMIGRANT AS PARASITE or DISEASE type:

(27)
*If illegal immigration was a **disease**, Prop. 187 was the wrong medicine* (26 October 1994: A–3)

(28)
*The report – which recommended a three-year moratorium on immigration nationwide and linked illegal immigration to a **host of society's ills** – has been branded by Latino and Asian leaders as insensitive and one-sided* (29 June 1993: B–1)

As stated, many linguistic expressions characterize immigrants in terms of another metaphor for the nation. The NATION AS HOUSE metaphor is quite extensive.

(29)
*'That's like saying, "I've got **this great house, but it's on fire, it's built on a fault and the bank is moving in to repossess it," '*** (16 June 1993: A–1)

Another associated metaphor is the extension NATION AS CITY, which has been used by master politicians with very affirmative overtones:

(30)

*a tall proud city . . . and if there be city walls, **the walls and doors and the doors were***
***open** to anyone with the will and the heart to get here. – Ronald Reagan, 1989* (7 October
1994: B–7)

It should be noted that former President Reagan was articulating what
amounted to a pro-immigrant stance.[12] More permanent is the very frequently
invoked metonymic relationship in which the immigrant is a part of the US as
house. Here immigrants are seen as threats to the NATION AS HOUSE, such as *flood-*
waters:

(31)

*The **influx** of illegal immigrants is also blamed for the country's 'failure to win the war on*
drugs' (19 June 1993: A–3)

(32)

Unlike the immigration boom at the turn of the century, more than 90% of the latest
***immigrant tide** comes from the Third World.* (6 September 1993: A–1)

(33)

*the **flood** of legal and illegal immigrants streaming into the country* (7 September 1993:
A–1)

(34)

*Wilson turned his fire on President Clinton for failing to **stem the flow of illegal***
***immigrants** into California as he has into Florida and Texas* (14 September 1994: A–3)

(35)

*Meanwhile, politicians vow to **seal** US borders and halt the **flood** of newcomers* (3 October
1993: E–1)

The NATION AS HOUSE is quite readily extended to NATION AS CASTLE, with all the
entailments of a fortress:

(36)

*There are extremists – those who would build an **alligator-filled moat**, and those who would*
swing the door open (5 July 1992: A–3)

The advocates of Proposition 187 frequently invoked the entailments associ-
ated with the metaphor NATION AS CASTLE, a metaphoric threat of war. Thus the
hardworking peaceable immigrants, also by extension, are characterized as
invading soldiers.[13] The immigrant was habitually portrayed as a fighter, an
aggressor, an enemy of good people, and a party to the conquest of California:

(37)

Californians who despair that we've lost control of the border, who regard illegal immigrants as
*job-taking, tax-wasting **invaders**, can be proud of the latest Border Patrol innovation* (5 July
1992: A–3)

(38)

*immigrants who become **foot soldiers** in these criminal organizations* (13 June 1993: 12)

(39)

*'We have an **invasion** going on and it has to stop,' said a Bakersfield man* (13 August 1993: A–3)

(40)

*'I support immigration, but I'm damned, I mean, tired of illegal aliens **overrunning** us'* (10 October 1994: B–3)

(41)

*increasingly many see an **immigration apocalypse** born of neglect* (6 September 1993: A–1)

The frequency and diversity of metonymic threats to the NATION AS HOUSE, as indicated in Table 1, demonstrates that it was a prevalent manner to impugn the intent and character of immigrants to the US.[14,15]

4.6 IMMIGRANT-AFFIRMING METAPHOR

No immigrant-affirming metonyms were found to offset the metonyms that depicted immigrants in deprecatory terms. In contrast, there was one class of metaphor that may be analyzed as affirmative. It has a biblical domain as its semantic source. Unlike other metaphor mappings which display a variety of linguistic expressions, in this case only a single term, *scapegoat*, accounts for 84 per cent of the total. Because there is less creative use of the biblical metaphor, it may be that this item may retain less metaphoric force and is more lexicalized.[16] In (43) one of the other non-*scapegoat* tokens based on biblical source domain:

(42)

*'We feel the Republican Party is trying to **scapegoat** the Latino and immigrant community for their own political gain, and that's immoral'.* (9 December 1994: B–1)

(43)

*invoking the Bible: 'Welcome strangers, for by doing this, some people have entertained **angels** without knowing it.'* (3 October 1994: A–1)

4.7 CAVEAT

The vast number of metaphors and metonyms of immigrants used in public discourse are anti-immigrant. However it should be emphasized that the *Los Angeles Times* news writers were not overtly racist in their writing on immigrants. Following commonly accepted practices (Krippendorff, 1980), a content analysis was undertaken on all the *Los Angeles Times* articles on immigrants and immigration for a 6-week period (1 January–14 February 1994) in order to compare its metaphor use to its content. Three of a total of 42 articles were structured and phrased in such a way to produce a distinctly anti-immigrant political slant. On the other hand, several articles might be characterized as maintaining a pro-immigrant slant. The majority could be described as balanced with regard to standard measures of journalistic 'objectivity' in the representation of undocumented immigrants.

Conscious efforts were clearly made on the part of the news writers to main-

tain a balanced perspective. This was particularly effective in their reports on various legislative debates, where spokespeople representing different positions were more readily available to the reporters. A balanced representation was less likely for news stories that did not involve governmental topics. It should be noted, however, that the metaphors in this subsample were similar in frequency and type to the full corpus.

5. Testing the force of 'Immigrants are Animals'

It could be argued that animal metaphors are used to discuss all kinds of people in many situations in daily discourse. A skeptic might argue that Americans use animal metaphors commonly and frequently in reference to all types of people: '*You dog!*', '*I smell a rat*', '*Don't be so catty*', and so forth. Accordingly the argument of the skeptic would be that animal metaphors are not used to any greater degree to characterize immigrants than, for example to characterize business people or sports figures. Certainly, following the skeptic's line of thinking, business people are often characterized in negative and unflattering terms. '*It's a dog-eat-dog world*' is a cliché for the business milieu. Likewise, sports figures are no longer revered as they might have been in a nostalgic past. They are now portrayed as selfish and at times brutish. If the use of animal metaphors to characterize business people and sports figures is similar to the patterns used to characterize immigrants, so the skeptic's argument goes, then the deprecation of immigrants with animal metaphors is not special and should not be overemphasized.

In order to test this hypothesis all the metaphors that characterized sports figures in a month of the *Los Angeles Times* sports section were catalogued.[17] An equivalent amount of text was catalogued, in terms of word count, in the business section of the *Los Angeles Times* from the same period. The discourse of these kinds of people was selected since American newspapers commonly have separate sections devoted to sports and business, which permits straightforward comparison. The skeptic would predict that the animal metaphor, SPORTS FIGURES AND BUSINESS PEOPLE ARE ANIMALS, is quite generally used. Consequently the skeptic would state that IMMIGRANTS ARE ANIMALS mapping is only part of a broader metaphor, and does not single out immigrants.

In the sample, 18 sports articles were reviewed (November 1995) totaling 13,000 words. The writing in sports is much more playful, with more creative use of description than the writing on immigration. Remarkably, no metaphors of sports figures in this sample have animal source domains:

(44)
'*Heather is our defensive **catalyst** and Katie is our offensive **catalyst**'* (30 November 1995: C6)

(45)
*Tyson gets his **tune-up*** (25 November 1995: C7)

(46)
*Holmes has been a **godsend*** (25 November 1995: C10)

(47)

Franson is a blue-collar big man (24 November 1995: C6)

As for the business section, there is a great deal more written on a typical day on business topics than on sports in the *Los Angeles Times*. One day (30 November 1995) yielded 31 business articles, totaling 14,500 words. In contrast to metaphor use on immigration and immigrant topics, a relatively limited use of metaphor in the business section was noted. Newspaper descriptions of business people tend to follow a formula. They usually are limited to a title, or a title with a qualifying clause:

(48)

Blue Cross Chairman Leonard Schaeffer (30 November 1995: D2)

(49)

Analyst Harold Vogel with Cowen and Co. (30 November 1995: D2)

(50)

Barry Diller, the Home Shopping Network chairman who is trying to build a TV network from scratch (30 November 1995: D2)

Most of the metaphors of business people did not have an animal source domain:

(51)

*cost-**cutter** Sanford I. Weill* (30 November 1995: D1)

However, there were a total of two metaphors of business people that have animal source domains:

(52)

*'The market is going crazy, the foreigners are the ones that appear most **bullish**' a trader said* (30 November 1995: D4)

(53)

*'I'm looking forward to **squishing** Rupert like a **bug**' Turner said.* (30 November 1995: D2)

In the latter examples, there are special circumstances to note. Both of the latter tokens are direct quotes taken from individuals, rather than the business writer's text. In the lead sentence of the article, as written by the news writer, a second token of the *bug* metaphor is rephrased to redirect the metaphor away from the business person, and toward the business enterprise.

(54)

*Ted Turner said Wednesday he will **squash** 'like a **bug**' an all-news TV network media magnate Rupert Murdoch hopes to launch to compete with Turner's 24-hour Cable News Network.* (30 November 1995: D2)

Thus the quote which attributes the animal metaphor to a business person was clearly reapportioned in the lead sentence of the *Los Angeles Times*, the part of the story that would most likely be read. From this limited sample it might be concluded that business people indeed use animal metaphors in reference to col-

leagues and competitors. At the same time it demonstrates that *Los Angeles Times* business writers de-emphasize the linguistic practice of using animal metaphors to refer to business people, presumably to uphold their dignity.

Business news writers tend not to use metaphor to characterize business people, but contrastingly they often cast non-human elements of the business world in anthropomorphic metaphors:

(55)
*'This market is like **an old soldier** that just doesn't give up'* (30 November 1995: D3)

(56)
*Stocks **sprinted** higher Wednesday. . . . Broad market indexes **broke records** as well* (30 November 1995: D3)

(57)
*Bank mergers are **vulnerable** to protests filed under the . . . Act* (30 November 1995: D2)

A total of two expressions of animal metaphor were found in the sample of articles on business people. This and the null results for individuals referenced in the sports section do not constitute significant use of the animal metaphor for either business or sports figures. There is very limited support for the skeptic's hypothesis. Nevertheless, the skeptic's hypothesis was explored further.

A sampling of articles on two individuals of particular public notoriety in sports and business was tested, with the goal of discovering what the distribution of animal metaphors is in this text medium. Again the skeptic predicts that animal metaphors are used to characterize business people and sports figures no more nor less than they are used to characterize immigrants. Note, however, that the skeptic's original claim is already significantly weakened since notoriety (rather than normalcy) marks the individuals whose metaphors will be studied. Mike Tyson was selected as a boxer who has been as praised for ferocity in the ring as he is rebuked for his criminality outside of the ring. A financier, Charles Keating, was chosen to represent unscrupulous business people. Keating was convicted of bilking small investors out of millions of dollars through his institution, Lincoln Savings & Loan. As an infamous white-collar criminal, the likelihood that animal metaphors are used to characterize Keating is much greater than it being used about the average business person.[18]

A number of articles on each person were drawn from the *Los Angeles Times* archives using the computerized topic selection function to select a set of articles that would provide approximately similar numbers of words. Seven articles were sampled on Tyson (July–November 1989, totaling 5750 words). Five articles were sampled on Keating (April–May 1990; $n = 5710$ words).

Animal metaphors were used for Tyson. However, the boxer is portrayed as a particular kind of animal. In this sample he was characterized as a predatory carnivore, as illustrated:

(58)
*'. . . into the **lion's** den and take the meat out of the **lion's** mouth'* (21 July 1989: C–1)

(59)
*a man who keeps the **tiger** at bay with a long, strong left jab* (21 July 1989: C–1)

This sports figure is metaphorically characterized as an animal at the very top of the non-human hierarchy of living things. These 'noble' animals are used as emblems for nations. The lion and tiger, for example, respectively symbolize Great Britain and India. In the US, only the bald eagle tops the lion in this hierarchy. Among the sampled sports writers, there is always respect in the words used to speak about Tyson. His sports prowess is never deprecated, and for his skills he is respected by the *Los Angeles Times* sports writers. It was fully expected at this phase of testing that Tyson would be denigrated with animal metaphors, because of his profession, criminality, antipathies and race. This expectation was not met. Nevertheless, it should not be concluded that the animal metaphors used to describe Tyson are similar to those used to describe the immigrants, since the animals linked to immigrants are not symbolically noble creatures, but beasts of burden or 'lower' creatures.[19]

As for the other ill-famed news figure, the case of the felonious businessman is unequivocal. In the sample of news reports catalogued Keating was not characterized as an animal:

(60)
Midas-touch businessman (8 April 1990: D–3)

(61)
the villain, the man in the black hat (8 April 1990: D–3)

There were no animal metaphors used in reference to Keating. The metaphors used by the news writers tend to focus on his successes, rather than his failings. His political and legal enemies, not the newspaper's business writers, call him a '*crook*' and a '*scam artist*'. Throughout these descriptions there is no denigration of the human being as a man in the texts sampled.

Although the samples of articles on Tyson and Keating are limited, these infamous individuals are not characterized in metaphors as inferiors. For the larger samples of articles on sports figures no animal metaphors were located. For business people, two animal metaphors were found. Both of these tokens were direct quotes attributable to business people, rather than text written by the *Los Angeles Times* writers. These results do not provide evidence that animal metaphors are commonly used in news print to describe these types of citizens, as the skeptic predicted, although there was some reason to expect such characterizations. Consequently there is strong support for the original finding, lamentably, that the ANIMAL domain is uniquely associated with immigrants. Animal metaphors are not generally used in the *Los Angeles Times* to characterize other types of people, even infamous individuals.

6. Complementary analyses

Analysts with diverse disciplinary backgrounds have proposed alternative accounts of what amounts to the metaphoric framing of the political events surrounding Proposition 187. From the present theoretical position which emphasizes the metaphoric understanding of social events, a comparison of their views is thus warranted. In a recent article in this journal Hugh Mehan argues that the proponents of Proposition 187 utilized an IMMIGRANT AS ENEMY discourse strategy (Mehan, 1997). By discourse strategy (Gumperz, 1983), Mehan refers to generally unconscious linguistic means to achieve social constitutive objectives, that is, efforts to frame a particular view of the world. Mehan uses the ENEMY metaphor as the cover term for the anti-immigrant discourse strategy which includes the use of deixis to split American society into the in-group, Us, from the Other. The term *deixis* refers to the use of words such as *that*, *this*, *them*, *those*, *here* and *there*, among others, for purposes of 'pointing out' things in the world. As illustrated here, deixis reinforces the differences that are entailed in the dominant metaphor IMMIGRANT AS ANIMAL, and hence is not like us (Johnson, 1994):

(62)
'There are so many more of **them**, so many more of **them** in **our** schools. **Their** parents won't speak **our** language, and **they** don't seem to try to improve **their** lifestyles. There are exceptions, but most of **them** don't' (26 June 1993: B–3)

(63)
'**They** create problems for jobs. . . . If **they** can go to school and get health care **we're** allowing **them** to be here' (22 August 1993: A–1)

(64)
'**We** can't even take care of **our own** and **we're** letting more in. **They** should be taking care of **themselves** and not draining **our** pocketbooks' (22 August 1993: A–1)

A second part of the discourse strategy is the difference in the rhetorical style of the proponents of Proposition 187, who use compelling anecdotes rather than scientific discourse to articulate their economic arguments to the electorate. Reliance on anecdotes is associated with what Mehan considers a third part of the discourse strategy, namely the deliberate disregard of traditional authorities who were opposed to Proposition 187, including several prominent right-wing politicians, a conservative former US cabinet member, the president of the country, the Los Angeles Catholic archbishop, an ecumenical set of clergy, and diverse public health, law enforcement and educational officials. According to Mehan, the fourth element of their discourse strategy was a penurious appeal to self-interest rather than to the greater public good and human rights. Of course Mehan's cover term is copiously instantiated in the metonym IMMIGRANT AS ARMY, and so he can count on a good deal of independent confirmation of his analysis.

Somewhat surprisingly, Mehan is critical of three other analysts of the Proposition 187 phenomenon. Suárez-Orozco and Suárez-Orozco state that Proposition 187 is a 'catharsis . . . that does not necessarily cure the underlying

pathology' (1995: 193). The pathogen is not the immigrant in their analysis, but the California public's anxiety that has arisen with a seemingly unending series of natural disasters, rage at the videotaped police brutality committed against African American Rodney King, the Los Angeles riots that followed the verdict acquitting the police of wrongdoing, as well as the other factors discussed in Section 2. This public uneasiness has been channeled into the creation of an Other, the immigrant, to 'contain overwhelming anxieties and focus their rage' (1995: 196), in particular in the void left by the 'Evil Empire' of the communist Soviet Union. While Mehan does not accept the psycho-cultural analysis of Suárez-Orozco and Suárez-Orozco (1995) which for him ignores 'the elite's use, indeed cynical manipulation of the immigrant-as-enemy construct in public discourse' (Mehan, 1997: 267), one can readily locate reflections of their analysis in the public discourse sampled in the *Los Angeles Times*. Indeed the IMMIGRANT AS DISEASE and IMMIGRANT AS CRIMINAL are quite salient metaphors in the present sample of text.

The third commentator, Kitty Calavita, asks why the present period is 'focused almost single-mindedly on IMMIGRANTS AS A TAX BURDEN, a focus that is unusual, if not unique in the history of US nativism' (1996: 285, my emphasis). Calavita's answer focuses on the economics of the phenomenon. This economic analysis is framed in terms of ideology:

> With the [federal] deficit seemingly out of control, increased economic uncertainty for all but the most affluent, and the safety net shrinking, frustrated and anxious voters are predisposed to place the blame on excessive government spending and the poor who are seen as the major cause of such spending. Immigrants are one among several targets consistent with this balanced-budget ideology and the scapegoating of the marginalized 'other' that it spawns. . . . Those who are not even citizens – indeed, are not legal residents – are the ideal target of blame, more undeserving even than the traditional 'undeserving poor'. (1996: 296)

She cites 'balanced-budget conservatism' as the framework of political values underlying California's Proposition 187. This is Plotkin and Scheureman's (1994, quoted in Calavita, 1996: 187) term for the general ideology response displayed in American politics to the ongoing crisis of Fordism (reduced industrial profitability of American capitalism of the last 20 years). At a time when wages have been cut so much that 14 million full-time workers earn less than the official poverty level, when non-permanent workers now comprise 30 per cent of the entire US workforce, and when the social safety net is being cut, Calavita notes that there has been an ideological assault on the public sector, not the economic sector. Rather than drawing attention to the massive industrial and capital restructuring 'designed to make the workers pay' (Piven and Cloward, 1993, quoted in Calavita, 1996: 294), public outrage has been redirected toward the federal deficit and rising taxes. Anti-government rhetorical attacks and expressed contempt and hostility towards the poor are hallmarks of the budget-balancing conservative ideology. In contrast to Mehan's ENEMY metaphor, Calavita focuses on the IMMIGRANT AS BURDEN. Again there is a great deal of support for Calavita's

analysis in *Los Angeles Times* public discourse sampling. Her metaphor of choice is linked to the more encompassing NATION AS BODY metaphor.

George Lakoff, whose theoretical research over the past 15 years brought metaphor to prominence, has also used metaphor analysis to study the nature of politics in American society (Lakoff, 1996). Based on personal observations of American political life and backed by instantiations he and his collaborators generated as they conducted cognitive linguistics research on metaphor, Lakoff claims that the major division in American politics between liberals and conservatives is systematically based on dichotomous models of what ideal families should be. Evidence of this division should be found in differential use of similar metaphors by the different groups. The conservative view of politics is based on what Lakoff calls the Strict Father model of the family. The liberal view of politics is based on the Nurturing Family model. Within this analysis he addresses the politics of immigration in the US. He claims both conservatives and liberals base their different political judgments on distinct forms of a NATION AS FAMILY metaphor. For the conservatives, immigrants are first and foremost lawbreakers who should be punished. That is why they are called 'illegal'. Speaking from the point of view of conservatives:

> They are not citizens, hence they are not children in *our* family. To be expected to provide food, housing, and health care for illegal immigrants is like being expected to feed, house, and care for other children in the neighborhood who are coming into our house without permission. They weren't invited, they have no business being here, and we have no responsibility to take care of them. (1996: 187–8, Lakoff's emphasis)

Numerous statements can be cited in the *Los Angeles Times* that corroborate this conservative point of view when referring to actual children, including the following statement by California's Governor:

(65)
'*We cannot educate every child from here to Tierra de Fuego.*' (16 September 1994: A–1)

In contrast, for Lakoff the NATION AS FAMILY metaphor that maps the politics of liberals characterizes immigrants as powerless people with no immoral intent. Consequently within the metaphor they are seen as:

> innocent children needing nurturance. . . . Through the NATION AS FAMILY metaphor, they are seen as children who have been . . . brought into the national household and who contribute in a vital way to that national household. You don't throw such children out onto the street. It would be immoral. (1996: 188–9)

Again there are quite clear statements in the *Los Angeles Times* that corroborate the liberal point of view, particularly when addressing the actual children of immigrants:

(66)
How dare we deny education to the children of women who clean our home and raise our children? How dare we deny medical care to those who harvest our crops, clip our lawns and golf courses, bus our dishes, wash our cars and every night leave spotless the very office towers

whose top executives support the governor behind this mean proposal. (27 September 1994: B–7)

For Lakoff, metaphoric references to children are an entailment, IMMIGRANT AS CHILD, that emerges from within the mapping of family value to political value in NATION AS FAMILY. Since his analysis is dazzling, one would expect to find an empirical reflection of the IMMIGRANT AS CHILD in the *Los Angeles Times*. However, only a total of two tokens of immigrant metaphors which makes reference to immigrants as children. Both are instantiated in a news report of a press conference called by Representative Dana Rohrabacher to announce the passage of a bill which denied emergency earthquake relief to undocumented immigrants:

(67)
*For Rohrabacher, of Huntington Beach, the legislative victory gave flight to his more visceral kind of rhetoric. 'This will have a real impact on federal agencies' ability to put out a flyer, saying (to illegal immigrants), 'Come on in and get the money.' **We're all part of the same family**, of all racial backgrounds. When you're in an emergency situation, what kind of person takes limited emergency resources from his own **family** and gives it to a stranger? We cannot afford to supply benefits for illegals without hurting our citizens and legal residents.'* (3 February 1994: A–1)

Recall that this inhumane legislative action was commented on by an immigrant in (16). In (67) the use of the family source domain may be interpreted to be a sarcastic comment. There is minimal confirmation of the IMMIGRANT AS CHILD entailment in the *Los Angeles Times* data set. It is understandable why Lakoff would expect Americans to speak about immigrants as children. Such a metaphor is a humane representation of the immigrant. Unfortunately, the dominant ANIMAL metaphor in the public discourse on immigrants, as evidenced in the *Los Angeles Times*, does not entail the human birthright of immigrants, and consequently it denigrates them. In the hierarchy of living things held by Americans as expressed in metaphor, immigrants are not human children; they are held to be lower life forms.[20]

Each of these alternative analyses of the rise of anti-immigrant sentiment and its political expression in Proposition 187 is exemplified in the present sample of the metaphors of public discourse. However, each is only a partial analysis of the public discourse sampled. As the theorist, Lakoff aims to capture the big picture. The discourse analyst, Mehan, apprehends the fullest picture and focuses on the IMMIGRANT AS ENEMY, while Suárez-Orozco and Suárez-Orozco draw a psychoanalytic portrait centering on the IMMIGRANT AS DISEASE and AS CRIMINAL. Calavita brings economics to the forefront with the IMMIGRANT AS BURDEN metaphor. What seems to be the case is that particular interpretations are most germane to the disciplines from which the analysts operate, focusing on some aspects of the immigration debate and passing over others. Yet an empirically based analysis of the public discourse on immigration captured all themes emphasized in the other analyses. Public discourse encompasses the scope of ideology, and that empirical metaphor analysis of public discourse has substantial analytic power to reveal it – which is of central interest to critical discourse analysis (Van Dijk, 1993).

In spite of their acuity there is one gap common to the alternative analyses reviewed in this section. The most virulent and frequent metaphor was not noted by these analysts. Turning now to the implications of the IMMIGRANT AS ANIMAL metaphor, one must ask what it is that makes this metaphor transparent to the researchers' scrutiny.

7. Implications and conclusion

The conceptual correspondence IMMIGRANTS ARE ANIMALS is racist. It belittles immigrants as it separates non-citizens and citizens, since it assigns them a less-than-human standing. This finding confirms previous research that also investigated racism and metaphor. Van Teeffelen (1994), in a study of political metaphor in popular literature, states:

> in its metaphoric meaning racism compares and contrasts the domains of the self and the other. . . . When applied skillfully, metaphors can have a strong impact due to their 'literary' quality and visual concreteness. This rhetorical thrust allows them to emphasize particular elements and linkages, and simultaneously to de-emphasize others. Since they organize the understanding of cause and effect, symptom and essence, and especially praise and blame, metaphors can be employed to serve political aims or interests. When thus used as ideological devices, they privilege, and when turning into common sense, naturalize particular accounts of reality. (1994: 384–386)

The charge of racism can be made on the basis of standard definitions. For example, Miles (quoted in Wetherell and Potter, 1992) defines *racism* from a political economics perspective as postulating natural divisions among people which are in fact not natural, with the consequent false assignment of individuals to groups of people on the basis of such so-called natural traits, which leads to the categorization of people into a false hierarchy. In this way of thinking racism attributes meaning to:

> . . . human beings in such a way to create a system of categorization, and by attributing additional (negatively evaluated) characteristics to the people sorted into those categories. This process of signification is therefore the basis for the creation of a hierarchy of groups, and for establishing criteria by which to include and exclude groups of people in the process of allocating resources and services. (Miles, 1989, quoted in Wetherell and Potter, 1992: 15–16)

This definition can be criticized for its essentialism. Nevertheless the concept should be clear. By the foregoing criteria, racists characterize the Other as an inferior person, and not the equivalent of horses and dogs as the ANIMALS metaphor expresses.

Moreover, the metaphoric mapping IMMIGRANTS ARE ANIMALS is an element of *racist discourse*. The present finding thus reaffirms the research of Van Dijk (1987, 1991) in which he demonstrated that racist discourse is replete with animal themes. A definition of racist discourse which does not invoke intrinsic properties follows:

> Racist discourse, in our view, should be seen as discourse (of whatever content) which has the effect of establishing, sustaining and reinforcing oppressive power rela-tions. . . . Racist discourse . . . justifies, sustains and legitimates those practices which maintain . . . power and dominance. (Wetherell and Potter, 1992: 70)

Sustaining a discourse practice is the root power of prose metaphor. It most effectively influences its audience when it does not draw attention to itself; when it routinely and transparently invokes and reassigns the cognitive structure of a source semantic domain to its target. When an original, truly novel metaphor is used, the reader of the turn of phrase is prompted by its novelty to evaluate the metaphor for its appropriateness, creativity and utility. The mindful reader can choose to reject the linkage. If, however, the metaphor does not draw attention to itself, then the reader is most often unaware that a conceptual linkage has been reproduced and is being reinforced. Moreover, the logical and cultural entail-ments of the conceptual correspondence are also being automatically transferred and reinforced. IMMIGRANTS ARE ANIMALS is a metaphoric mapping that reproduces a view, with all the entailments, and most importantly the political and social consequences to disparage human beings. Its dominant use thus sustains the racist world-view.

As for explicitly legitimating a racist discourse, 'there can be little doubt that of all forms of printed text, those of the mass media are most pervasive, if not most influential, when judged by the power criteria of recipient scope' (Van Dijk, 1989: 42). While the *Los Angeles Times* news writers are not overtly racist, their con-tinued use of the metaphor contributes to demeaning and dehumanizing the immigrant worker. Given the newspaper's privileged role as a major vehicle for political discourse in California, IMMIGRANTS ARE ANIMALS was continually rein-forced when this dominant metaphor is part of the *Los Angeles Times* established language practice.

On the other hand, in defense of the newspaper, contemporary metaphor theory claims that everyday metaphor structures the fundamental world-view of everyday life. Rather than explicitly legitimating racist practices and power relationships, in these political contexts the newspaper merely reflects the embod-ied basic values of the dominant political order that subjugates immigrants to other citizens. Since 'media practices usually remain within the boundaries of a flexible, but dominant consensus, even when there is room for occasional dissent and criticism . . . [f]undamental norms, values, and power arrangements are seldom explicitly challenged in the dominant news media' (Van Dijk, 1989: 43). Thus the foundational racism of American society is mirrored in the *Los Angeles Times*' language practice.

In sum, three cognitive science tenets about metaphor are the basis of this study. One is that metaphor is ubiquitous in everyday communication. Second, that metaphor is not merely a figurative linguistic expression; it is a conceptual framework. Third, everyday metaphor embodies the world-view of those who unthinkingly use metaphor, that is to say all of us. A replicable data-driven method was developed to discern the actual typologies used in public discourse as

promulgated by an influential media source, the daily publications of the *Los Angeles Times*. With it a picture of the way undocumented immigrant workers were represented in the print media during California's most recent nativist cycle. It also documents how they were conceptualized during this period of xenophobia, which climaxed with the passage of the anti-immigrant referendum, Proposition 187.

The IMMIGRANTS ARE ANIMALS metaphor is unquestionably racist. This racism is constructed in public discourse via the use of the metaphor. This is a different kind of racist language than the public is generally used to talking about. Racist language is commonly understood to be the blatant invectives and slurs that were common in the US over most of its history, when it was an openly racist society. These expletives are no longer tolerated in most polite settings. They are no longer common currency in political discourse. However, the conceptual foundation of racism continues to be expressed via the metaphors most commonly utilized in the public discourse on immigrants, through what in this article has been called the dominant metaphor (Scheurich and Young, 1997).

This discursive construction of racism is subtle and deprecating. Immigrants are not referred to in a patronizing but humane manner, as children. While there were other metaphoric mappings evident in the database, such as IMMIGRANT AS WEED, all but one of these were pejorative. The absence of positive dominant metaphors for immigrants supports the thesis that the public discourse on immigrants is racist. The metaphoric element of discursive racism is particularly insidious, when the metaphors remain transparent. These metaphors are manifestations of deeply-held concepts of *what* (not who) immigrants are. Such a world-view precludes any presumption that they are vested by birth with the same human rights as citizens, and that they should be shown due respect for the difficult and ill-paid work they provide for American society.

On a final note of hope, while it has been shown here that racism undergirds America's everyday discourse about immigrants, the dominant metaphoric representations of immigrants are not as fixed as the orientational metaphors that give us prepositions such as *over* and *under*. The latter are impervious to change. Political and social metaphors on the other hand are negotiable. In contrast to highly conventionalized domains such as LOVE, political domains are openly debated and discussed, hence the underlying structure of these domains can change. As a function of the debate, competing underlying views of the world are engaged. Because of social implications that follow from the use of racist political metaphors and the world-views involved, the dominant mappings of political issues can and should be contested. Exposing and contesting these discursive practices will lay bare the false and dehumanizing conceptualizations embodied in racist metaphor.

NOTES

1. 'Teutonic' was the 19th-century term for the preferred 'race' of European immigrant, with 'Alpine' and 'Mediterranean' respectively lower on a 'purity' scale (Higham, 1955: 155).

2. Lakoff (1993) reiterates a distinction between the labels of metaphoric mappings and the mappings themselves. The labels, such as LOVE IS MADNESS, are short-hand ways of talking, mnemonic names for a set of mappings of conceptual correspondences between a source domain and a target domain (1993: 207). An analysis of such mappings is presented in this article, that is to say a hypothesis of what the conceptual correspondences between the entities of the source domain which are mapped onto the target domain, immigrants. The actual tokens of metaphors, the linguistic expressions of these metaphors, as located in the *Los Angeles Times* texts are presented here in *italics*, and the central metaphoric expression of each token are further **bold-faced**. The mnemonic labels of the mappings are presented in SMALL CAPITALS, following the convention of contemporary metaphor theory. Please note that by convention and for convenience the names of mappings are often called the metaphor.

3. Alternative analyses of metaphor within the cognitive linguistics paradigm included Langacker's (1987). Croft's review of various theories (1993) suggests, for the present purposes, that Lakoff and Johnson's account and Langacker's account are equivalent. More distant are the structural semantic analyses, which in contrast to cognitive analyses presume that literal linguistic expressions comprise the central task of semantics, and hence metaphor and its kin as non-literal expressions are derivative of literal expressions and are to be treated as special cases. Some cognitive accounts, in contrast, maintain that literal linguistic expressions are for the most part fictive.

4. An independently created data source of *Los Angeles Times* texts was used. The newspaper is now commercially archived on compact discs (*CD-News*), which allows for computer-aided selection and extraction of complete news texts. The archived articles are purchased fully indexed. This permits the retrieval of every article published for a given period that was indexed under a heading, such as 'illegal alien' or 'immigration'. Thus the data-gathering is systematic, not ad hoc, since the texts to be studied were selected on the basis of an independently derived index. The computer-files of each article were then read by different people and coded for metaphorical and other information to provide for intersubjective assessment of the metaphor tokens. Each token was inputted into a computerized database with 21 pieces of journalistic, metaphorical and contextual information. When a source and target domain was first assigned to individual tokens, it should be noted that the names given to the semantic domains were in no way restricted or in any conscious way predetermined. The only mandate was to try to specify the source and target domains. Thus there was a great deal of variation in the initial inputting. The next step was to edit the database. Alphabetic sorting of the database on the source domain placed all tokens with similar source domains together. The wording used to characterize similar source domains was then

regularized so that, with the next alphabetic sorting, similar tokens would group together. This cycle of sorting and editing was repeated until all the tokens were arranged systematically. Through this procedure the research team became familiar with the database, and the major typological dimensions of the source conceptual domains became clear. This procedure was remarkably enlightening since the patterns of usage became quite clear. The same cyclic procedure was followed for the target domain, in order to organize and come to understand the conceptual dimensions of the database. Through these 'sort' and 'edit' cycles, the source and domain labels were clarified, one token at a time in full context. No particular conclusion was forced, although clear patterns emerged.

5. In this article I limit discussion to the metaphoric characterizations of the immigrant and immigrants, as individuals, excluding analysis of immigration, the demographic process (Santa Ana, with Morán and Sánchez, 1998). Centering on the representations of persons rather than the demographics focuses on the recurrent imagery used to refer to human beings. A full discussion is presently being elaborated of the processes and the people involved in the representation not only of immigrants, but of Latinos in public discourse in general (Santa Ana, in preparation).

6. The tokens are followed by the *Los Angeles Times* publication date and article page number in parentheses.

7. At the time of the political debate, the studies that contended that immigrants were a net loss to the economy included the 1992 Parker and Rea studies, a San Diego County survey, and the 1993 Huddle studies. Those which indicated that the immigrants were a net gain to the economy included the 1992 Los Angeles County study, a 1993 Urban Institute study, and a 1991 Federal Reserve Bank study (G. Miller, 1993; Simon, 1993; A. Miller, 1993a, 1993b; Lee, 1993). See Vernez and McCarthy (1996) for a meta-analysis of these contending reports, and Hinojosa and Schey (1995) for an accessible critique of the net loss studies.

8. The INS (Immigration and Naturalization Service) is the federal agency responsible for policing immigration.

9. Gould does not equivocate: 'There is no progress in evolution. The fact of evolutionary change through time doesn't represent progress as we know it. Progress is not inevitable. Much of evolution is downward in terms of morphological complexity, rather than upward. We're not marching toward some greater thing. The actual history of life is awfully damn curious in the light of our usual expectation that there's some predictable drive toward a generally increasing complexity in time. If that's so, life certainly took its time about it: five-sixths of the history of life is the story of single-celled creatures only. I would like to propose that the modal complexity of life has never changed and it never will, that right from the beginning of life's history it has been what it is; and that our view of complexity is shaped by our warped decision to focus on only one small aspect of life's history' (1995: 52).

10. It is not hard to document the blatant racism premised on evolutionary progress, even among people in high positions in public education. The recent words of a California senator testify. While presiding over a 1993 meeting of the Special Committee on [US–Mexico] Border Issues, W.A. Craven (Republican of Oceanside, CA) disputed the right to public education of children of undocumented immigrants when these children provide proof of residency. He is officially on record as saying: '*It seems rather strange that we go out of our way to take care of the rights of these individuals who are perhaps on the lower scale of our humanity . . .*' Latino professors and staff at California State University San Marcos (CSUSM) insisted on a retraction of the Senator's comments. None was forthcoming. Rather, the local media excoriated the Latino faculty.

Ranking CSUSM administrators publicly defended the senator. That same year the main CSUSM administration building was named in Craven's honor (González et al., 1995).

11. This is a modern-day reflex of 19th-century scientific metaphors of the nature of economics that persist (Gibbs, 1994: 170). Similarly Wetherell and Potter (1992) discuss how hoary 19th-century scientific theories of race are presently accepted and spoken about as common sense by lay people.

12. Reagan makes reference to the celebrated image of the US that was originally associated with Puritan New England. John Winthrop and 21,000 of his Puritan followers left England for Massachusetts Colony in what is called the 'Great Migration' of the 1630s. In a sermon before he left Winthrop said: 'We shall be as a City upon a Hill. The eyes of all people are upon us'. For the Puritans the migration to Massachusetts was not only a religious covenant similar to that of Old Testament Israelites, but as Winthrop himself stressed, it was also a search for greater economic opportunity (Bremer, 1995: 43–5).

13. US public discourse is not unique in this regard. Contrasting metaphors, OPEN DOOR EUROPE versus FORTRESS EUROPE, presently compete to become the dominant metaphor for post-cold war Europe, as national governments maneuver to gain an advantage in the development of the European Union following the Maastrich Treaty negotiations. These negotiations will affect the lives of 1.7 million so-called 'third country nationals', i.e. immigrants and their children. Europe is struggling with a 'novel, unprecedented, imperfect and evolving' notion of extranational European citizenship for these people (Preuß, 1996).

14. *Apocalypse* popularly refers not only to the prophecy about the events of the end of the world, as outlined in the Book of Revelation. This prophecy discusses Armageddon, the conclusive battle between the forces of good and evil. An apocalypse is commonly taken to refer to a final battle.

15. An alternative to this metonymic analysis was suggested by Paul Chilton. Instead of metonymic relations, the conceptual linkages between NATION AS BODY and IMMIGRANT AS DISEASE, these connections can be strictly taken to be entailments, namely if US is a body, then it can have a disease, bear burdens, etc. In my estimation both analyses are inferentially sound, since metaphor and metonymy both establish 'stand for' relations among conceptual domains. The entailment analysis has the advantage of conceptual simplicity, and thus provides a more direct exposition. The united metaphor and metonymy analysis may indeed be susceptible to Occam's razor, but it emphasizes the hierarchical relations between the immigrant and nation, as expressed by metaphors. The goal is to elucidate the cohesive ideological frame of reference which constructs and justifies inhumane social relations. The power to persuade otherwise fair-minded and tolerant citizens to accept the anomalous IMMIGRANT AS DISEASE metaphor may be better understood with reference to its encompassing NATION AS BODY metaphor.

16. An alternative analysis which occurred to several of various readers of the newstexts is far less charitable. Here *scapegoat* is principally understood and associated with the ANIMAL metaphor.

17. I thank my colleague Guillermo Hernández for his acute and creative critique which led to a much more thorough analysis in this section.

18. In 1996 a federal judge ruled that Keating's 1993 federal conviction was null and void. 'That means Keating is no longer a criminal in the eyes of the law – but he is a deadbeat. He still faces roughly $5.2 billion in civil judgments against him stemming from Lincoln's collapse. All his identifiable property, including his home, was long ago auctioned off by the government' (Zagorin, 1997).

19. This metaphor analysis was made of news reports published prior to Tyson's 1997 fight with Evander Holyfield. In that fight Tyson was disqualified for twice biting Holyfield's ear, which was followed by a spate of sports commentaries which capitalized on TYSON AS CARNIVORE metaphors.

20. The lack of empirical confirmation in the *Los Angeles Times* of child metaphors does not repudiate Lakoff's major assertions that morality is embodied in the commonly used metaphors of political discourse. There simply is minimal empirical confirmation of the NATION AS FAMILY metaphor. Further study is being undertaken to determine the fit between Lakoff's system of political morality metaphors and empirical data gathered from this and other media discourse sources (Santa Ana, in preparation).

REFERENCES

Bremer, F.J. (1995) *The Puritan Experiment: New England Society from Bradford to Edwards.* Hanover, NH: University Press of New England.

Brimelow, P. (1995) *Alien Nation: Common Sense about America's Immigration Disaster.* New York: Random House.

Brownstein, R. and Simon, R. (1993) 'Hospitality Turns to Hostility. California has a Long History of Welcoming Newcomers for their Cheap Labor – Until Times Turn Rough', *Los Angeles Times* (14 Nov.): A-1.

Calavita, K. (1996) 'The New Politics of Immigration: "Balanced-Budget Conservatism" and the Symbolism of Proposition 187', *Social Problems* 43(1): 284–305.

Chilton, P.A. (1985) 'Words, Discourse and Metaphors: The Meanings of *Deter, Deterrent, and Deterrence*', in Paul A. Chilton (ed.) *Language and the Nuclear Arms Debate.* London: Pinter.

Chilton, P.A. (1994) ' "La plaie qu'il convient de fermer . . ." Les métaphores du discours raciste', *Journal of Pragmatics* 21: 583–619.

Chilton, P.A. (1996) *Security Metaphors: Cold War Discourse from Containment to Common House.* New York: Peter Lang.

Chilton, P.A. and Ilyin, M. (1993) 'Metaphor in Political Discourse: The Case of the "Common European House" ', *Discourse and Society* 4(1): 7–31.

Croft, W. (1993) 'The Role of Domains in the Interpretation of Metaphors and Metonymies', *Cognitive Linguistics* 4(4): 335–70.

Davis, M. (1995) 'The Social Origins of the Referendum', *NACLA Report on the Americas* XXIX(3): 24–8.

Fairclough, N. (1989) *Language and Power.* London: Longman.

Fauconnier, G. (1985) *Mental Spaces.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Fernandez, J. (1991) 'Introduction: Confluents of Inquiry', in James Fernandez (ed.) *Beyond Metaphor: The Theory of Tropes in Anthropology*, pp. 3–13. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Gibbs, R. (1993) 'Process and Products in Making Sense of Tropes', in Anthony Ortony (ed.) *Metaphor and Thought*, 2nd edn, pp. 252–76. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Gibbs, R. (1994) *Poetics of the Mind: Figurative Thought, Language and Understanding.* Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

González, G.M., Ríos, F.A., Maldonado, L.A. and Clark, S.T. (1995) 'What's in a Name? Conflict at a University for the 21st Century', in Raymond V. Padilla and Rodolfo Chávez Chávez (eds) *The Leaning Ivory Tower: Latino Professors in American Universities*, pp. 165–87. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Gould, S.J. (1981) *The Mismeasure of Man.* New York: W.W. Norton and Co.

Gould, S.J. (1995) 'The Pattern of Life's History', in John Brockman (ed.) *The Third Culture*, pp. 52–64. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Gumperz, J. (1983) *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Higham, J. (1955) *Strangers in the Land*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Hinojosa, R. and Schey, P. (1995) 'The Faulty Logic of the Anti-Immigration Rhetoric', *NACLA Report on the Americas* XXIX(3): 18–23.

Hoffman, A. (1974) *Unwanted Mexican Americans in the Great Depression: Repatriation Pressures, 1929–1939*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Johnson, D.M. (1994) 'Who is We? Constructing Communities in US–Mexico Border Discourse', *Discourse and Society* 5(2): 207–31.

Kanellos, N. (1994) *The Hispanic Almanac*. Detroit, MI: Visible Ink Press.

Krippendorff, K. (1980) *Content Analysis: An Introduction to its Methodology*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Lakoff, G. (1987) *Women, Fire and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal About the Mind*. Chicago, IL: Chicago University Press.

Lakoff, G. (1991) 'Metaphor and War: The Metaphor System Used to Justify War in the Gulf', in Brian Hallet (ed.) *Engulfed in War: Just War and the Persian Gulf*, pp. 95–111. Honolulu: Matsunaga Institute for Peace.

Lakoff, G. (1993) 'The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor', in Anthony Ortony (ed.) *Metaphor and Thought*, pp. 202–51, 2nd edn. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Lakoff, G. (1996) *Moral Discourse: What Conservatives Know that Liberals Don't*. Chicago, IL: Chicago University Press.

Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. (1980) *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago, IL: Chicago University Press.

Lakoff, G. and Turner, M. (1989) *More than Cool Reason: A Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor*. Chicago, IL: Chicago University Press.

Langacker, R.W. (1987) *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar. Vol. I: Theoretical Prerequisites*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Lee, P. (1993) 'Studies Challenge View that Immigrants Harm Economy', *Los Angeles Times* (13 Aug.) A–1.

Los Angeles Times (June 1992–December 1994) *CD-News*. New Canaan, CT: News Bank.

Lovejoy, A.O. (1936) *The Great Chain of Being: A Study of the History of an Idea*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Mehan, H. (1997) 'The Discourse of the Illegal Immigration Debate: A Case Study in the Politics of Representation', *Discourse & Society* 8(2): 249–70.

Miller, A.C. (1993a) 'Outcry Against Immigration is Loud in Valley', *Los Angeles Times* (1 Aug.): A–1.

Miller, A.C. (1993b) 'Data Sheds Heat, Little Light, on Immigration Debate Studies. The Number of Illegal US Residents is Elusive. Their Impact on Jobs, Public Services is at Best Ambiguous', *Los Angeles Times* (21 Nov.): A–1.

Miller, G. (1993) 'Immigrant Costs Overstated, Study Finds', *Los Angeles Times* (3 Sep.): B–1.

Nunberg, G. (1987) 'The Nonuniqueness of Semantic Solutions: Polysemy', *Linguistics and Philosophy* 3: 143–84.

Preuß, U.K. (1996) 'Two Challenges to European Citizenship', *Political Studies* 44(2): 534–53.

Purcell, W.M. (1990) 'Tropes, Transsumptio, Assumptio, and the Redirection of Studies in Metaphor', *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity* 5(1): 35–53.

Santa Ana, Otto (in preparation) *Brown Tide Rising: Metaphoric Representations of Latinos in Contemporary America*.

Santa Ana, Otto, with Juan Morán and Cynthia Sánchez (1998) 'Awash Under a Brown Tide: Immigration Metaphors and Print Media Discourse', *Aztlán* 23(2): 137–76.

Scheurich, J.J. and Young, M.D. (1997) 'Coloring Epistemologies: Are our Research Epistemologies Racially Biased?', *Educational Researcher* 26(4): 4–16.

Schön, D.A. (1979) 'Generative Metaphor: A Perspective on Problem Setting in Social Policy', in Anthony Ortony (ed.) *Metaphor and Thought*, pp. 137–63. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Simon, R. (1993) 'Activists for Immigrant Rights Battle Erosion of Public Support Politics. They are up Against Polls Showing Negative Attitudes about Newcomers. Advocates' Counteroffensive Cites Economic Contributions and Calls for Compassion', *Los Angeles Times* (24 Nov.): A–24.

Suárez-Orozco, C. and Suárez-Orozco, M. (1995) *Transformations: Immigration, Family Life, and Achievement Motivation among Latino Adolescents*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Van Dijk, T.A. (1987) *Communicating Racism: Ethnic Prejudice in Thought and Talk*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Van Dijk, T.A. (1989) 'Structures of Discourse and Structures of Power', *Communications Yearbook* 12: 18–59.

Van Dijk, T.A. (1991) *Racism and the Press*. London: Routledge.

Van Dijk, T.A. (1993) 'Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis', *Discourse & Society* 4(2): 249–83.

Van Teeffelen, T. (1994) 'Racism and Metaphor: the Palestinian–Israeli Conflict in Popular Literature', *Discourse & Society* 5(3): 381–405.

Vernez, G. and McCarthy, K.F. (1996) *The Costs of Immigration to Taxpayers: Analytical and Policy Issues*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.

Voss, J.F., Kennet, J., Wiley, J. and Schooler, T.Y.E. (1992) 'Experts at Debate: The Use of Metaphor in the US Senate Debate on the Gulf Crisis', *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity* 7(3–4): 197–214.

Wetherell, M. and Potter, J. (1992) *Mapping the Language of Racism*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Woolard, K.A. (1989) 'Sentences in the Language Prison: the Rhetorical Structuring of an American Language Policy Debate', *American Ethnologist* 16(2): 268–78.

Zagorin, A. (1997) 'Charlie's an Angel?', *Time* 149(5): 36.

OTTO SANTA ANA (PhD, University of Pennsylvania) is Assistant Professor and a founding faculty member at the César Chávez Center for Chicana and Chicano Studies at the University of California Los Angeles. He was born in Arizona to a family with deep roots in the Southwest. His other research interests include ethnic dialect and community formation, language contact, education policy as it is related to linguistic minority students. Santa Ana has written on various sociolinguistic aspects of Chicano English and Mexican Spanish, and is presently developing a book-length study of the representation of Latinos in public discourse. ADDRESS: César Chávez Center for Chicana and Chicano Studies, University of California, Los Angeles, Box 951559 Los Angeles, CA 90095, USA, [email.otto@ucla.edu]