WAR in the Media: Metaphors, Ideology, and the Formation of Language Policy

Eric Johnson
Arizona State University

Abstract

In 2000, the Arizona Proposition 203 campaign gained overwhelming public approval by claiming that Arizona's bilingual education programs impeded English-language learning of language-minority students. Established within a context of educational and social antipathy, it is necessary to look at the impetus for language policies like Proposition 203 and how they are promoted to the public. This project is based on Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) work with metaphor theory to uncover the rhetorical strategies applied in the media by the *English for the Children* campaign to position Proposition 203 in a favorable light. Grounded in Critical Discourse Analysis, Santa Ana's (2002) metaphor analysis model is applied here to unveil the most prominent metaphors used to degrade bilingual education in public discourse. While many metaphors were applied in this debate, this work concentrates on the multivalent metaphor PROPOSITION 203 AS WAR to expose the underlying ideology of Proposition 203 and its supporters. The metaphor of WAR was purposely implemented to construct a context of violence and heroism. This study exposes the rhetorical strategies used by opponents of bilingual education and highlights the nature of metaphor as a tool of persuasion.

Introduction

According to Ruiz (1984, 1990), language(s) can be seen in three ways: (a) language as a problem, (b) language as a right, and (c) language as a resource. This study aims to expose the core issues that underpin views of language as a problem and how they, in turn, result in the formation of policies that depict social communication patterns. Such issues will be depicted through

a Critical Discourse Analysis of the rhetoric used in the anti-bilingual education campaign in the months leading up to the 2000 vote in Arizona. Furthermore, Baker's (2000) argument that language use must be "studied in relationship to power structures, political systems, and basic social philosophies" (p. 153) establishes a conceptual framework for understanding the impetus behind such ethnically and linguistically insensitive discourses.

During the time period surrounding the 2000 elections, the Phoenix Metro–East Valley area media were saturated with multiple negative metaphors describing the state of bilingual education in Arizona (Johnson, 2005). Out of all the pejorative metaphors that appeared in the local newspapers, PROPOSITION 203 AS WAR surfaced as the most prominent and powerful. The metaphor PROPOSITION 203 AS WAR was strategically implemented by Ron Unz and the *English for the Children* organization to establish a combative context within the public discourse as a means of limiting language-minority students' access to the most appropriate language services. From this rhetorical platform, advocates of Proposition 203 were characterized in the media as a "heroic" military force sent in to battle "evil" bilingual programs. Such an attack on bilingual education illustrates that opponents of bilingual education view(ed) language (i.e., Spanish) as a problem. This example demonstrates how controlling the use of language is not just about regulating the way people speak; it is about subduing the people who use language.

Through a barrage violent images and negative language, supporters of the English for the Children cause were able to tap into the public's visceral understanding of WAR such that bilingual education was situated in a derogatory context. Drawing from Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) work on metaphor theory and Lakoff's (1993) description of *inheritance hierarchies*, the complex nature of the WAR metaphor is outlined to provide a clearer understanding of why it was so effective. Moreover, dissecting the constituent mappings of the WAR metaphor illuminates the deeply entrenched motives of those behind the anti-bilingual education movement. Finally, examples of such inherently negative rhetoric warrant a critical discussion of the underlying ideology of subtractive language policies like Proposition 203.

This type of critical analysis necessitates a brief outline of the sociopolitical context to which it is being applied. Caught in a landslide of confusing test scores, patriotic tropes, and ethnocentric lies, Arizona's voting public voted to restrict the educational services that language-minority students receive. At best, voters may not have realized that they were doing away with bilingual education and English as a Second Language programs in favor of the proposed monolithic methodology. A closer look at the program that was selected to replace traditional methods (see Crawford, 1999) causes one to question the public's understanding of their decision.

Starting in the 2001 school year, language-minority students were only allowed 1 year (180 school days) of *Sheltered English Immersion* (a term coined by the English for the Children movement) before being mainstreamed into the regular education classroom. Sheltered English Immersion is defined in Proposition 203 (2000) as:

> . . . an English language acquisition process for young children in which nearly all classroom instruction is in English but with the curriculum and presentation designed for children who are learning the language. Books and instructional materials are in English and all reading, writing, and subject matter are taught in English. Although teachers may use a minimal amount of the child's native language when necessary, no subject matter shall be taught in any language other than English, and children in this program learn to read and write solely in English. (Article 3.1, Section 15–751)

According to the guidelines of this program, students may be mixed by age and grade. In addition, teachers may be held personally liable to ensure that instruction is delivered in English. Within 1 school year, students are expected to attain a "good working knowledge of English" (Proposition 203, Section 15–752) so that they can be transferred to a mainstream classroom with native English-speaking children. In this context, the language-minority students are expected to comprehend the subject matter without any further language instruction. Not only does this methodology contradict the research on the most effective bilingual education methodologies and language-acquisition models (Krashen, 1998), but it is culturally insensitive and disregards the inherent value of bilingualism.

Inevitably, any discussion of language policy will lead to larger ideological issues. The methods used to promulgate Proposition 203 originate from a more profound desire to shape society through the control of language. This is an investigation of how rhetoric is formulated to distort and/or legitimate the social context of language use on multiple levels. On one level, language is examined as something that has been produced in public spaces for the purpose of persuading or dissuading others. In most cases, such discourse is presented in an ostensibly benign format (versus outwardly vicious slurs and accusations). Covertly biased insinuations often appear in the guise of informative statements or expert testimony. These statements pervade the media and embed themselves in the public conscious. On another level, language is analyzed as an *object* that is used to control and mold social relationships. This level of discourse is produced in a formal political arena and depicts how language can and cannot be used.

Theoretical Orientations

Since language is being analyzed as a tool for manipulating society, a Critical Discourse Analysis framework will examine the ideological issues intrinsically involved in these types of processes (Van Dijk, 1997). Next, Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) Metaphor Theory will be applied to delineate the profound cognitive meaning of the rhetoric found in the Proposition 203 campaign. The combination of these two approaches has given rise to the current Critical Metaphor Analysis approach (Johnson, 2003, 2005).

Discourse

In order to tease out the ideological issues embedded in language policies like Proposition 203, it is necessary to look at the public discourse in which they are disseminated. While the structural characteristics of discourse, such as syntax, semantics, and rhetoric, constitute an important part of this analysis, the social environment in which they are produced is equally as valuable. Henceforth, discourse comprises any use of language (i.e., verbal, written, and/or symbolic) as well as the social, political, and historical context that allows meaning to be derived from its use.

Van Dijk (1997) contends that language users accomplish social acts through dialogues. If dialogues are seen as instances of communicative or symbolic interaction, then social acts can be understood as elements that shape society. According to the heuristic that Johnstone (2002) provides for doing a discourse analysis:

1. Discourse is shaped by the world, and discourse shapes the world.
2. Discourse is shaped by language, and discourse shapes language.
3. Discourse is shaped by participants, and discourse shapes participants.
4. Discourse is shaped by prior discourse, and discourse shapes the possibilities for future discourse.
5. Discourse is shaped by its medium, and discourse shapes the possibilities of its medium.
6. Discourse is shaped by purpose, and discourse shapes possible purposes. (p. 9)

This heuristic provides the necessary insight to understand how to connect different forms of discourse with sound theoretical analyses. Discourse is a powerful force that frames social interaction and, at the same time, is framed by social interaction. It is important to remember that discourse is produced by agents who are inextricably bounded to the social context.

Closely aligned with Johnstone's (2002) heuristic of discourse, Van Dijk's (1997) application of Critical Discourse Analysis outlines the processes by which dominant social groups legitimate and reproduce their authority. Within

this ideological template, prominent linguistic issues, such as the context of language production, access to language-based structures, and power relationships, can be connected to support a Critical Discourse Analysis. Van Dijk's views of the broad linguistic patterns that undergird social power structures are reflected in the way that Blum-Kulka (1997) discusses the potential force of individual speech acts. Blum-Kulka employs Searle's (1975) and Austin's (1962) philosophies on speech acts to analyze the symbolic meaning of language. This theory stresses the notion that what a speaker literally says does not necessarily encode her or his intent. Thus, linguistic pragmatics and speech acts can be applied to look at the intended outcomes of certain statements (perlocutionary acts) versus the actual statement (locutionary act) and intended statement (illocutionary act) (Schiffrin, 2002). This notion is important when considering the true intent of metaphorical language.

Metaphor

To fully grasp the potential influence of the PROPOSITION 203 AS WAR metaphor, it is necessary to situate metaphorical language within a sound theoretical framework. A metaphor establishes a cognitive link between two entities in which the traits of a conceptually concrete source domain are mapped onto a conceptually abstract target domain (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980). Cognitive science has taught us that we think in terms of images; images are most efficiently produced through the use of metaphor (Santa Ana, 2002). As described by Lakoff and Turner (1989), metaphor "is indispensable not only to our imagination but also to our reason" (p. xi). According to this position, metaphors construct a cognitive framework of social knowledge and worldview.

In Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) model, metaphors comprise a concrete source domain and a conceptual target domain. In this description, the most salient characteristics of the source domain are mapped onto the abstract target domain to provide a profound cognitive image. Mappings, according to Lakoff (1993), "are not arbitrary, but grounded in the body and in everyday experience and knowledge" (p. 245). The source domain transfers ontological meaning onto the target domain such that the resulting metaphor produces a stream of entailments that formulates our understanding of the concept.

Metaphorical images are so effective due to the social and natural contexts in which we acquire or learn their meanings. Lakoff (1987) uses the notion of *conceptual embodiment* to describe that thought is inherently imaginative and our cognitive orientation is formed through our lived experiences. Contrary to the belief that concepts exist independent of bodily nature and lived experience, Lakoff explains that "the properties of certain categories are a consequence of the nature of human biological capacities and of the experience of functioning in a physical and social environment" (p. 12). Lakoff applies this model of embodied learning to the notion of conceptual categorization.

Central to the thesis of the current project, Lakoff draws on Wittgenstein's description of "family resemblances" (p. 16) to describe the cognitive process by which different conceptual entities are linked by common attributes. This idea explains how we make unconscious cognitive connections between ostensibly different entities.

Lakoff and Johnson (1980) clearly label the essence of metaphor as "understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another" (p. 5). While this association between separate entities permits a profound cognitive understanding of the target domain, the ensuing mental entailments establish a framework for understanding an extended number of related concepts. Entailing such information naturally, though, may also inhibit direct cognitive access to other points of view. Furthermore, the cognitive effects of this metaphor are two-sided. The fact that it feels real disguises the fact that it excludes constraints. Lakoff and Johnson describe this dual effect of metaphors as "highlighting and hiding" (p. 10). Constructing one concept in terms of another both highlights prominent features of the target domain and concurrently hides other features.

Once a major concept has been mapped onto a target domain, subsequent metaphors can be established to form a coherent system of conceptualization. Akin to Wittgenstein's *family resemblances*, this system of related metaphors has been called "metaphor coherence" (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p. 41). Coherent metaphors draw from the context established by a head metaphor, thereby bridging any apparent gaps between the different target domain concepts. Coherent metaphors fit together "by virtue of being subcategories of a major category and therefore sharing a common entailment" (Lakoff & Johnson, p. 44). This type of cognitive compatibility interrelates metaphors with different source and target domains.

Building on the notions of conceptual embodiment, family resemblances, and metaphor coherence, Lakoff (1993) outlines the hierarchical nature of metaphors. In his definition of inheritance hierarchies, Lakoff states that "Metaphorical mappings do not occur isolated from one another. They are sometimes organized in hierarchical structures, in which 'lower' mappings in the hierarchy inherit the structures of the 'higher' mappings" (p. 222).

The inheritance hierarchy assumes that the mappings of lower metaphors in a specific hierarchy are coherent with the mappings of all higher level mappings. Therefore, the concepts of inheritance hierarchies and metaphor coherence can be used to explain how multiple metaphors are understood in terms of other metaphors.

As a result of the ubiquity of metaphors and their ensuing cognitive effects, Lakoff and Turner (1989) place great emphasis on the influence of metaphorical language on our everyday thinking and reasoning abilities:

Metaphor is a tool so ordinary that we use it unconsciously and automatically, with so little effort that we hardly notice it. It is omnipresent; metaphor suffuses our thoughts, no matter what we are thinking about. It is accessible to everyone: as children, we automatically, as a matter of course, acquire a mastery of everyday metaphor. It is conventional: metaphor is an integral part of our ordinary everyday thought and language. And it is irreplaceable: metaphor allows us to understand ourselves and our world in ways that no other modes of thought can. (p. xi)

In the present example, PROPOSITION 203 AS WAR can be seen as such a powerful metaphor because it stems from the more culturally ingrained metaphor ARGUMENT IS WAR. According to Lakoff and Johnson (1980), English speakers naturally think of arguments in terms of WAR. People actually win or lose argument. The people who are arguing are opponents who attack each other's positions and defend their own. Many argument strategies are partially structured by the concept of war. The ARGUMENT IS WAR metaphor is one that structures the actions we perform in arguing and frames how we understand what we are doing when we argue. Lakoff and Johnson use the ARGUMENT IS WAR example to demonstrate how our concepts, activities, and language are all metaphorically structured.

When implemented strategically within the media, rhetoric imbued with negative metaphors can drastically sway public opinion (Santa Ana, 2002; Johnson, 2003, 2005). Santa Ana's analysis of metaphorical rhetoric used in the *Los Angeles Times* during the 1990s is an excellent example of how the media are used to influence the formation of public policy. A striking metaphor offered by Santa Ana is LANGUAGE AS A PRISON: "They consider *English fluency the key* to unlock the *handcuffs of poverty*, a key they themselves will probably never possess" (p. 201). Those who read such statements are apt to perceive the language-minority community as chained to poverty (and all coinciding notions that accompany impoverishment) by its inability to speak English. The ontology of the LANGUAGE AS A PRISON metaphor entails a dichotomous relationship between English and other languages. The ontology (i.e., the deeper understanding) of a PRISON is inherently negative. They are harsh places used to incarcerate bad people. Prisons are dangerous and hard to escape from. They do not allow growth, liberty, or happiness. The ontology of the source domain PRISON transfers to the target domain to produce a vivid understanding of LANGUAGE.

The above metaphor entails that languages other than English are bad: they keep speakers in poverty, and they inhibit progress and those who speak them are limited and unfortunate. On the opposite side of the spectrum, it implies that English is good: it is a tool to escape, and it is freedom and those who speak English are liberated from oppression. While all of these types of

associations might not be explicitly stated in a metaphor, their qualities are still understood through our previous experience or exposure to the concept of prisons. The receiver of the metaphor implicitly deduces entailments by extrapolating all tangible qualities of the source domain. These entailments allow us to rationalize the cause and effect of a given situation. Entailing such information naturally, though, may also inhibit direct cognitive access to other points of view.

An analysis of the metaphors used in public discourse can also illuminate the inherent social values being communicated. Santa Ana's (2002) empirical analysis shows how the media discourse is saturated with negative stereotypes designed to accomplish a specific group's social goals. He found that immigrants were described through the use of pejorative metaphors. Santa Ana provides the following specific examples of such metaphors: (a) IMMIGRATION AS DANGEROUS WATERS, (b) IMMIGRATION AS INVASION, (c) IMMIGRANTS AS ANIMALS, (d) IMMIGRANTS AS WEEDS, and (e) IMMIGRANTS AS ALIENS. These types of ubiquitous metaphors embed themselves in our social consciousness and construct biased perceptions of the language-minority community. The application of such harmful metaphors is used to mold the popular opinion of a community. Santa Ana found that it was used in California to legitimate the subjugation of languages other than English. As in California, these images fortified the Proposition 203 campaign and brought about crucial social and political changes in Arizona.

Method

To uncover the attitudes of those who supported Proposition 203, the following periodical materials were sifted through to find metaphorical excerpts: (a) *The Arizona Republic*, (b) the *East Valley Tribune*, and (c) the *Arizona Ballot Propositions & Judicial Performance Review Voter Information Pamphlet* (2000).

While reading through these materials, it quickly became evident that there was a strong undercurrent of "war" related rhetoric (e.g., references to battles, fights, targets, victims, etc.). To more concretely identify the metaphor PROPOSITION 203 AS WAR, the written materials listed above were scoured to find excerpts with any mention of "war-like" terminology. Once a list of excerpts containing images of war was compiled, the rhetoric was analyzed for different domain mappings. In this depiction, the familiar source domain WAR is mapped onto the more abstract target domain PROPOSITION 203. Due to the complexity, though, the WAR metaphor has been further delineated according to a hierarchy of constituent mappings. These individual mappings have been broken down and discussed according to their ontology and ensuing entailments.

The Arizona Republic and the *East Valley Tribune* were selected due to their wide circulation in the Phoenix Metro–East Valley area. Both periodicals covered the Proposition 203 bilingual education campaign extensively. Newspaper journalists, editors, and regular citizens all contributed to the articles covering the debate. Both newspapers were searched for articles covering bilingual education and/or Proposition 203 between January 2000 and November 2000. These months were chosen due to the timing of the election and the concentration of materials that were relevant to the debate. All articles that included information on bilingual education, language-minority students, and/or the English for the Children movement were selected for analysis.

Analysis

Some of the most harmful images are not necessarily the most blatant. Subtle insinuations through the use of negative metaphors can drastically sway public opinion (Santa Ana, 2002). In this case, the WAR metaphor was employed due to the overwhelming negative context that it represents. Conceptually, war constitutes one of the most awful human experiences. The notion of war encompasses every feasible means of death, destruction, and misery. Drawing from this inherent negativity, the entire context of the Proposition 203 campaign was most prominently described in terms of WAR. Specifically, PROPOSITION 203 AS WAR appeared as the single most dominant metaphor throughout the campaign.

PROPOSITION 203 emerged as the overall target domain because it encompassed the entire social, political, and educational context of the bilingual education debate. In this metaphor, the source domain WAR was employed throughout multiple thematic categories. A description of the ontology of WAR provides a conceptual framework for the varied applications of this metaphor.

Even though the concept of was is embodied differently according to an individual's experiences, all contexts in which it is discussed and experienced are inherently pejorative. War is a source of grave concern and preoccupation. While the acquisition of war for individuals in the military is especially real, images from history books, newspapers, and television have created an intricate social perception of war for everyone. Violence is the shared experience of all involved in the war. Conflict and fighting produces victims that must be rescued. Battles produce heat, misery, and agitation within a community. The side constituting the "enemy" threatens the freedom of the "good" or "friendly" side. Powerful weapons are used to destroy and disable the enemy. Military campaigns are planned out carefully and executed with conviction. Since the opposing side must be defeated to attain victory, enemies must be targeted and destroyed.

In the media, war was represented through the use of distinct and interrelated or overlapping mappings. These different images must be looked at individually to understand how they all stem from the WAR metaphor. To peel back the multiple layers of this metaphor, the various mapping components of PROPOSITION 203 AS WAR have been organized according to Lakoff's (1993) notion of inheritance hierarchies. Within this specific context, the WAR metaphor can be delineated in a hierarchical structure where the traits of the "higher" mappings are passed on and contribute to the "lower" mappings (Lakoff, p. 222). Below, the PROPOSITION 203 AS WAR metaphor has been organized such that the constituent mappings are hierarchically arranged followed by some of the most common target domains that were discussed in the media.

Mappings	Examples
WAR	Proposition 203
BATTLES	bilingual education debates, movements in other states,dialogues between different communities
MILITARY FORCE	English for the Children organization
OPPOSING FORCE	proponents of bilingual education, language-minority communities
TARGETS	bilingual education supporters, school districts, children, minority communities
VICTIMS	children, society, schools

This arrangement allows a group of seemingly different metaphors to be understood as derivatives of one overarching metaphor. In this example, the images produced by the higher mappings create cognitive space for the lower mappings. This can be understood by outlining the hierarchy: A WAR comprises multiple BATTLES; BATTLES are fought by a MILITARY FORCE that must fight an OPPOSING FORCE; WAR justifies the rescue of VICTIMS that have been TARGETS of the OPPOSING FORCE. As a result, this multilayered metaphor produces a combination of entailments.

War is inevitable because bilingual education has neglected its duty to care for language-minority students, "It's going to unleash *World War III*. It's going to be *Armageddon . . .*" (Montini, 2000). The magnitude of such a war entails that communities and schools are justified battlegrounds:

1. This is Leupp Public School, *an unintended battleground* of Proposition 203. (Shaffer, 2000)
2. New York is *the next battleground*. (Ruelas, 2000)

3. *A battle is brewing* over the future of bilingual education in Arizona. (González, 2000a)

4. A Forgotten *Battleground*: Navajos Unite in Shunning Prop 203 (Robb, 2000)

5. Her situation is common in Arizona, where parents and teachers are *battling* over how to teach an ever-increasing number of children who don't speak English. (de Isasi, 2000)

In this case, the WAR metaphor situated English for the Children as the MILITARY FORCE sent in to fight the OPPOSING FORCES of bilingual education, "Unz, meanwhile, has been crisscrossing the country, *marshaling forces to mount attacks on bilingual education* in other parts of the country . . ." (González, 2000e). A strong MILITARY FORCE consists of other allied forces, "*Unz and the fight against bilingual education* gained a *new ally* Thursday in Rep. Laura Knaperek, R-Tempe . . ." (Sherwood & Chiu, 2000). Savvy and tenacious leaders are needed to be successful in battle, "He was mocked, called names, *shouted down and vilified by a hostile crowd* Thursday during the hour-long debate on bilingual education. But *as he arose from this veritable lion's den,* Ron Unz was still all smiles . . ." (Ruelas, 2000). Unz, in this case, is portrayed to the public as a victorious gladiator.

Establishing bilingual education as the OPPOSING FORCE was crucial to the WAR metaphor. Opponents of Proposition 203 had to prepare to defend themselves against the MILITARY FORCE, "Supporters of bilingual education are *gearing up to fight* . . ." (González, 2000b). It takes a valiant effort to stand up to oppressive regimes, "*Battling the powerful bilingual* lobby within the public school system *is daunting* . . ." (Plugging the bilingual rathole, 2000). The English for the Children movement was projected as a determined and confident organization that was ready to battle to the end, "We know we are going to win . . ." (González, 2000b). To gain support, they labeled opponents of Proposition 203 as weak and underprepared for the BATTLE, "Why not *bring out the heavy artillery and blast* Ron Unz and his supporters with sound arguments, undeniable statistics and thorough studies. I suspect the reason why we won't see a battle is because *bilingual educators have little ammunition* . . ." (Brundage, 2000).

To win the WAR, the English for the Children organization focused on specific TARGETS. To pass Proposition 203, proponents needed to attack the credibility of bilingual education programs:

1. *Bilingual Schooling Targeted*: Drive to Put Issue on Ballot. . . . (González, 2000a)

2. It would be neat if people said, "There's the guy [Unz] who got *all those programs eliminated*." (Ruelas, 2000)

Since bilingual education programs are implemented across the country, future BATTLES needed to be planned. Bilingual programs in different states were discussed as TARGETS:

1. Ron Unz . . . *has set his sights* on other parts of the country. (González, 2000d)

2. . . . especially in New York City, *where bilingual education has increasingly come under fire*. (González, 2000e)

3. The campaign is being financed by millionaire Ron Unz of California, who after orchestrating the dismantling of bilingual education in his home state in 1998, has *shifted his focus to Arizona and elsewhere*. (González, 2000a)

Besides programs and locations for future BATTLES, English for the Children openly targeted Spanish (speakers) as the enemy, "Proponents of Proposition 203 have said that Indian-language programs could continue and that *only the use of Spanish by recent immigrants was being targeted . . .*" (González, 2000d).

In order to ensure that bilingual education was seen as a threat, language-minority students were described as VICTIMS of the WAR. This connoted a sense of urgency and peril, "*Many children of Arizona will suffer* because bilingual educators were so complacent that they forgot *to safeguard academic freedom . . .*" (Brundage, 2000). Stating that "Bilingual education has *destroyed countless lives of children* over the decades . . ." (Kossan, 2000) implies that bilingual education is extremely hazardous for both language-minority students and society. This view posits language-minority students as innocent children trapped in an oppressive dictatorship, "It's time *to rescue* non-English speaking students from the *academic Siberia of bilingual education . . .*" (Arizona Ballot Propositions, 2000, pp. 152–153).

From these entailments, it is easy to understand how the PROPOSITION 203 AS WAR metaphor contributed to the overwhelming voting results. Knowing that WAR induces visions of armed struggles and fighting for the good of society, this metaphor was used to portray Proposition 203 as a mission to "rescue" (Arizona Ballot Propositions, 2000, pp. 152–153) language-minority students from the perils of bilingual education. Now that the cognitive effects of the WAR metaphor have been outlined, it is necessary to examine the underlying impetus behind the use of such poignant rhetoric.

Discussion

The most general premise of this paper is that there exist ideologically driven forces in our society that promote specific types of language use. Aside from examining the profound cognitive aspects of metaphors, this project links the use of metaphorical language to ethnocentric political movements.

This critical view displays how Proposition 203 supporters used metaphors to shape the public's view of minority-based programs. The eradication of these types of programs serves to protect the hegemony of dominant-class values. Proposition 203 advocates used language in a way that contributed to the "general process of the production of meanings and ideas" (Williams, 1977, p. 55). Their rhetorical strategies not only reflected dominant-class interests and ideas, but also contributed to the reproduction and perpetuation of such ideas.

"As ideological constructs," asserts McCarty (2004), "language policies both reflect and (re)produce the distribution of power within the larger society" (p. 72). By describing policy and ideology as social constructs, McCarty contends that they reflect the interests of the dominant group(s) and serve to maintain unequal relationships of power and access within the larger society. One need not look very far to see manifestations of such overt demonstrations of ideology and power in social institutions such as education (Apple, 1990; Crawford, 1992, 1999, 2000; Cummins, 1996; Tollefson & Tsui, 2004). Cummins (1999) explains educational ideology as "coercive relations of power" that are realized in the everyday practices (i.e., acceptable language use) of the education system (p. 15). As vehicles of cultural preservation, schools "create and recreate forms of consciousness that enable social control to be maintained without the necessity of dominant groups having to resort to overt mechanisms of domination" (Apple, p. 3). Therefore, the covert goal of economic and cultural perpetuation can be masked in terms of educational opportunity and equality. When the voting public can be easily duped, using schools to assimilate groups becomes an efficient tool for those in positions of power. Unfortunately, this process of assimilation works against the maintenance of language and culture among minority groups.

While examining how linguistic boundaries are politically determined might illustrate larger issues of social hierarchies and inequities, uncovering the specific discursive strategies used to promote these policies can be difficult. From a social reproduction model, drawing on metaphorical representations used in public spaces demonstrates how culturally acquired stereotypes become common viewpoints via the constant bombardment of biased images (in the media as well as through interpersonal dialogues) (Van Dijk, 1987, 1993, 1997). Individuals and institutions reproduce social knowledge and galvanize popular conceptions through the conscious and unconscious manipulation of discourse (Van Dijk, 1987, 1993, 1997). Therefore, this is discussion not just about representations of bilingual education programs. It is about the use of power and influences to control broader social patterns of language use.

In the present work, the application of a critical metaphor analysis has been applied to help expose the profound symbolic nature of the language employed in the public discourse during the Proposition 203 campaign. This analytical approach was necessary to thoroughly outline the underlying

intentions of the (metaphorical) rhetoric used to promote these types of language policies. The analysis of PROPOSITION 203 AS WAR allows us to look at metaphors from three different perspectives. First, our culturally engrained concept of ARGUMENT IS WAR made it natural for the bilingual education debate to be structured in terms of a WAR. Second, the general complexity of metaphors is exemplified by the multiple mappings involved in this specific inheritance hierarchy. Taking into consideration that we perceive the world in terms of metaphorical language, it is obvious why this multivalent metaphor was so significant and effective.

From a sociolinguistic perspective, this project emphasizes the role of language within a highly politicized cultural context. Does it really matter if immigrant children retain their mother tongue? Language, in the semiotic sense, permits the interaction and proliferation of ideas that are essential for social cohesion and cultural identity. Addressing the link between language and identity, Vuolab (2000) eloquently affirms that "the mother tongue is a chain that binds us to our own history . . . by passing on our language, the mother tongue, to the next generation, we ourselves guarantee that life itself will continue into the future" (p. 13). Acknowledging that language is an important component in the structuring of an individual's perception of the world allows us to discuss how people view themselves within the world (Atkinson, 2003; Tollefson & Tsui, 2004). Focusing on the social and political depths of identity, language can be described as the foundation of both individual and group identity (Pease-Álvarez, 2003; Schmidt, 2000). Thus, inhibiting language use is a means of suppressing a group's culture, identity, and ethnicity (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000), a fact clearly recognized by supporters of bilingual education as well as its opponents: "Why do they want to keep them as prisoners in their culture and their heritage . . ." (González, 2000c).

Social communication, of all types, is imbued with ideological tensions that concurrently subordinate certain individuals and superordinate others. McCarty's (2002) description of a Navajo community's struggles with educational language policies exemplifies that "local meanings cannot be divorced from the larger network of power relations in which they reside" (p. xvii). To understand how networks of power and communication are maintained and cultivated, one must analyze specific examples of these phenomena. Through the language applied in the media, it has been made evident that, compared to English, minority languages are relegated to a lower status in American society. Sadly, if it is accepted that a language is part of a person's identity, then subordinating languages equates to subordinating identities. In terms of civil rights, language use is not always readily seen as an individual right (in spite of all the identity issues). The right to use a particular language "is not simply the right to speak it when and where one wants but also the right to be understood and to understand, and that is a constraint on interlocutors and affects their rights in turn" (Wright, 2004, p. 184).

Furthermore, Urciuoli (1998) concludes that when languages other than English are spoken in public contexts in the United States, the speakers are viewed as a threat to the essence of being "American." But why is that? From where does this view of other languages come? In spite of the myopic view that many Americans have concerning the threat of minority languages, the prominence of English is not being eroded by the ostensible growth of minority languages in the United States (see Crawford, 2000; Wiley, 2000). A quick glance at the most recent U.S. Census (2000) data will help situate the prominence of English in the United States. Of the 262,375,152 people over the age of 5 listed in the census, only 8.1% (21,320,407) of the total population is reported to speak English "less than very well." Noting that approximately 92% of the nation speaks English "very well," it is hard to substantiate any claim that English is in danger of being overtaken by minority languages. With a combined 8 million people (approximately 3% of the total U.S. population) admitting to speaking English "not well" or "not at all," it seems even more absurd to imagine that Spanish is considered by many as the main threat to English. Spolsky (2004) suggests that the xenophobic sentiments felt towards Latinos might have to do with the overall population in the United States. According to the 2000 census, there are approximately 35 million Latinos (over the age of 5) living in the United States, constituting approximately 10% of the total population. If Spolsky is correct, then restrictive policies like Proposition 203 can be viewed as nothing more than attempts at using language as a proxy for ethnicity or race.

On a national policy level, the current federal education policy also reflects apathy toward nurturing the native language skills of non-English speakers (Crawford, 2000). In 2002, Title VII (the Bilingual Education Act) was eliminated by the Bush administration as part of the new *No Child Left Behind* (NCLB) education reform. Under NCLB, Title III outlines the federal language policy for immigrant students (United States Department of Education, 2005). While the new Title III will continue to support the education of language-minority students, it places more emphasis on *rapid* English acquisition, accountability of schools on standardized assessment, stronger state control of resources, less focus on the development of native language skills, and funding for program development based on "scientifically based research" (Crawford). What is considered "scientific research" can easily be misconstrued to justify allocation of funds for culturally insensitive programs (e.g., submersion-based programs) and/or assimilationist-based language policies (e.g., California Proposition 227, Arizona Proposition 203, and Massachusetts Question 2). Pointing to the linguistic ignorance behind these movements, Schmidt (2000) poses the question, "just how strong would the statistical evidence need to be to convince a U.S. English activist that maintenance bilingual education programs are highly successful and should be implemented in every school district in the country" (p. 161).

Before concluding, it is only fair to address the emic/insider perspective of those who supported Proposition 203. To most people, it would seem obvious that a person would not purposely promote a law that oppresses people from her or his own ethnic background. While this speculation might be rather blunt, it can be assumed that not everyone who supported or voted for Proposition 203 did so with malicious intentions. Even though the fundamental ideology of Proposition 203 is fraught with bias, it is safe to say that many of the advocates and voters truly wanted to help the language-minority population. But is taking away a child's native language the most effective means of accomplishing this? Instead, looking at how first- and second-generation immigrant children integrate into the American school system provides a platform from which to analyze the primary factors that shape the students' future success or failure (Olsen, Bhattacharya, & Scharf, 2005). Addressing other factors (e.g., poverty, constraints on parental involvement in their children's education, or culturally different conceptions of education and schooling) can vastly facilitate the students' acclimation into schools (Portes & MacLeod, 1999; Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2001). Aside from language difficulties, the main problem confronting immigrant students is that "current standardized tests are inappropriate because they are designed around culturally specific content and normed to mainstream cultural groups, which presents problems for children from non-mainstream cultural and linguistic backgrounds" (Olsen et. al., p. 23). Moreover, Olsen et al. assert that because of NCLB, school districts and communities are facing increased pressures to prepare all students, "but without adequate resources to close achievement gaps" (p. 6). This type of top-down pressure further limits immigrant students' ability to apply on their own culturally appropriate knowledge to bridge the educational gap.

Finally, being integrated into a society that expects immigrants to immediately learn English can cause both educational failure as well as problems within the home setting (Olsen et al., 2005; Rumbaut & Portes, 2001). Due to the direct access to future generations of language users, the main target for groups that support an "English-only" ideology has most prominently focused on the education system (McCarty, 2004). Rumbaut and Portes contend that most immigrants believe that full assimilation into American society carries with it the promise of educational and future occupational success. While learning English is often seen as a precondition for such outcomes, "the loss of parental language fluency drives a wedge within immigrant families, reducing parental guidance and control at a crucial time in the lives of these adolescents" (Rumbaut & Portes, p. 301).

Olsen et al. (2005) remind us that if cultural differences in socialization and development are not understood and incorporated into education programs, children become viewed as deficient. By establishing a context of

"deficiency," the children's sense of identity may be damaged and early negative labeling and tracking can occur, thereby causing immigrant students to develop adverse perceptions of discrimination by others in the school (Zhou, 2001). Instead of merely filtering immigrant children through programs whose primary aim is to replace the native language with English, improving language-minority students' opportunities for educational and economic success must begin with erasing the deficit orientation and providing them with the resources necessary to succeed in school as well as at home.

References

Apple, M. (1990). *Ideology and curriculum*. New York and London: Routledge.

Atkinson, D. (2003). Language socialization and dys-socialization in a south Indiancollege. In R. Bayley & S. R. Schecter (Eds.), *Language socialization in bilingual and multilingual societies* (pp. 147–164). Buffalo: Multilingual Matters LTD.

Austin, J. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Arizona Ballot Propositions and Judicial Performance Review. (2000). Retrieved November 3, 2005, from http://www.azsos.gov/election/2000/info/pubpamphlet/cover.htm

Baker, C. (2000). *The care and education of young bilinguals.* New York: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Blum-Kulka, S. (1997). Discourse pragmatics. In T. Van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as social interaction* (pp. 38–63). London: Sage.

Brundage, C. (2000, October 24). Where are bilingual ed facts? *The Arizona Republic*, Chandler Community Section, p. 4.

Crawford, J. (1992). *Hold your tongue: Bilingualism and the politics of "English only."* New York: Addison-Wesley.

Crawford, J. (1999). *Bilingual education: History, politics, theory, and practice*. Los Angeles: Bilingual Educational Services.

Crawford, J. (2000). *At war with diversity: US language policy in an age of anxiety*. Buffalo: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Cummins, J. (1996). *Negotiating identities: Education for empowerment in a diverse society*. Los Angeles: California Association for Bilingual Education.

Cummins, J. (1999). *Rights and responsibilities of educators of bilingual-bicultural children*. Retrieved September 30, 2005, from http://www.iteachilearn.com/cummins/rightsresponsbilinged.html

de Isasi, C. (2000, May 20). Bilingual education is a hot issue. *East Valley Tribune*, p.A1.

González, D. (2000a, June 28). Bilingual schooling targeted: Drive to put issue on ballot. *The Arizona Republic*, p. A1.

González, D. (2000b, July 6). Group to fight English-only push. *The Arizona Republic*, p.B1.

González, D. (2000c, October 13). Indians protest push for English. *The Arizona Republic*, p. B1.

González, D. (2000d, November 9). Bilingual ed supporter: Defy Prop. 203. *The Arizona Republic*, p. A20.

González, D. (2000e, November 20). Arizona win encourages bilingual ed opponents. *The Arizona Republic*, p. A1.

Johnson, E. (2003). *Metaphorical (mis)representations: A critical metaphor analysis of Proposition 203.* Unpublished master's thesis, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona.

Johnson, E. (2005). Proposition 203: A critical metaphor analysis. *Bilingual Research Journal*, *29*(1), 69–84.

Johnstone, B. (2002). *Discourse analysis*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Kossan, P. (2000, October 29). Bilingual ed sparks a divisive debate: Few kids affected by Proposition 203. *The Arizona Republic*, p. A1.

Krashen, S. (1998). *Under attack: The case against bilingual education*. Culver City, CA: Language Education Associates.

Krashen, S. (2000, September 13). Bilingual ed foe used distorted facts. *East Valley Tribune,* p. A19.

Lakoff, G. (1987). *Women, fire, and dangerous things*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, G. (1993). The contemporary theory of metaphor. In A. Ortony (Ed.), *Metaphor and thought* (pp. 202–251). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, G., & Turner, M. (1989). *More than cool reason: A field guide to poetic metaphor*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

McCarty, T. L. (2002). *A place to be Navajo: Rough rock and the struggle for self-determination in indigenous schooling*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

McCarty, T. L. (2004). Dangerous difference: A critical-historical analysis of language education policies in the United States. In J. W. Tollefson & A. B. M. Tsui (Eds.), *Medium of instruction policies: Which agenda? Whose agenda?* (pp. 71–93). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Montini, E. J. (2000, June 15). Hasta luego, bilingual education. *The Arizona Republic*, p. B1.

Olsen, L., Bhattacharya, J., & Scharf, A. (2005). Ready or not? A California Tomorrow think piece on school readiness and immigrant communities. *California Tomorrow*. Retrieved October 20, 2005, from http://californiatomorrow.org/files/pdfs/readyornot.pdf

Pease-Álvarez, L. (2003). Transforming perspectives on bilingual language socialization. In R. Bayley & S. R. Schecter (Eds.), *Language socialization in bilingual and multilingual societies* (pp. 9–24). Buffalo: Multilingual Matters LTD.

Plugging the bilingual rathole. Editorial Board. (2000, February 2). *East Valley Tribune*, p. A14.

Portes, A., & MacLeod, D. (1999). Educating the second generation: determinants of academic achievement among children of immigrants in the United States. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, *25*(3), 373–396.

Proposition 203. (2000). Retrieved October 20, 2005, from http://www.ade.az.gov/asd/lep/PROPOSITION203.pdf

Robb, R. (2000, November 1). Prop. 203 workable as school policy, weak as 'law.' *The Arizona Republic*, p. B9.

Ruelas, R. (2000, October 27). Wondering what makes Ron run. *The Arizona Republic*, p. B1.

Ruiz, R. (1984). Orientations in language planning. *NABE Journal*, *8*(2), 15–34.

Ruiz, R. (1990). Official languages and language planning. In K. L. Adams & D. T. Brink (Eds.), *Perspectives on official English: The campaign for English as the official language of the USA*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Rumbaut, R. G., & Portes, A. (2001). Conclusion: The forging of a new America: Lessons for theory and policy. In R. G. Rumbaut & A. Portes (Eds.), *Ethnicities: Children of immigrants in America* (pp. 301–317). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Santa Ana, O. (2002). *Brown tide rising*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Schiffrin, D. (2002). *Approaches to discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Schmidt, R. (2000). *Language policy and identity politics in the United States*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Searle, J. (1975). Indirect speech acts. In P. Cole & J. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics 3: Speech acts* (pp. 59–82). New York: Academic Press.

Shaffer, M. (2000, November 1). A forgotten battleground: Navajos unite in shunning Prop 203. *The Arizona Republic*, p. B4.

Sherwood, R. and Chiu, L. (2000, September 22). Bilingual ed must go, Ariz. voters say in poll: English immersion programs favored. *The Arizona Republic*, p. A1.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2000). *Linguistic genocide in education or world-wide diversity and human rights?* London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Spolsky, B. (2004). *Language policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Suárez-Orozco, C., & Suárez-Orozco, M. M. (2001). *Children of immigration*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Tollefson, J. W., & Tsui, A. B. M. (2004). The centrality of medium-of-instruction policy in sociopolitical processes. In J. W. Tollefson & A. B. M. Tsui (Eds.), *Medium of instruction policies: Which agenda? Whose agenda?* (pp. 1–20). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

United States Census Bureau. (2000). *Ability to speak English*. Summary File 3, QT P17. Retrieved October 20, 2005, from http://www.census.gov/main/www/cen2000.html

United States Department of Education. (2005). *Title III—Language instruction for limited English proficient and immigrant students*. Retrieved October 20, 2005, from: http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/pg39.html

Urciuoli, B. (1998). *Exposing prejudice: Puerto Rican experiences of language, race, and class*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Van Dijk, T. (1987). *Communicating racism: Ethnic prejudice in thought and talk*. London: Sage.

Van Dijk, T. (1993). *Elite discourse and racism*. London: Sage.

Van Dijk, T. (Ed.). (1997). *Discourse as social interaction.* London: Sage.

Vuolab, K. (2000). Such a treasure of knowledge for human survival. In R. Phillipson (Ed.), *Rights to language: Equity, power, and education* (pp. 13–17). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Wiley, T. G. (2000). Continuity and change in the function of language ideologies in the United States. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *Ideology, politics, and language policies: Focus on English* (pp. 67–86). Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Williams, R. (1977). *Marxism and literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wright, S. (2004). *Language policy and language planning: From nationalism to globalism*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Zhou, M. (2001). Progress, decline, stagnation? The new second generation comes of age. In R. Waldinger (Ed.), *Strangers at the gates: New immigrants in urban America* (pp. 272–307). Berkeley: University of California Press.