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General Introduction

You have got a swarm of people coming across the Mediterranean, seeking a better life, wanting to come to Britain because Britain has got jobs, it's got a growing economy, it's an incredible place to live. But we need to protect our borders by working hand in glove with our neighbours, the French, and that is exactly what we are doing.

On July 30th, 2015, during an interview on ITV news, David Cameron portrayed immigrants as a “swarm”. His words were immediately criticised by human rights organisations such as Refugee Council, which tweeted on the same day that the language used by the Prime Minister was “awful” and “dehumanising”, as the noun “swarm” is defined by the Oxford English Dictionary as “a large group of insects, especially bees, moving together in the same direction”. This metaphor was probably regarded as “dehumanising” by charities since bees are usually considered dangerous because of their stings; thus, the derogatory connotations of this description were probably criticised. Such misleading images are quite commonly used by contemporary politicians; however, it should be noted that this is not a new trend and that immigration has always been described with metaphors. For example, in an article published after World War I in The Washington Post, it was written that the U.S. was threatened by “a flood of undesirables inoculated with the virus of Bolshevism and Communism” [O’Brien 2003: 37]. Thus, this synchronic study, which is divided into three parts, will focus on what is hidden behind these immigration metaphors, which are frequently used in political discourse. In other words, why do politicians need to resort to such metaphors today? What ideas do they want to convey? To what

1 https://twitter.com/refugeecouncil.
extent can these metaphors manipulate the audience? Why are they deeply ingrained in people’s minds? Are there cultural differences or similarities? Are there differences between political parties? These questions were all raised by the 2014 Syrian refugee crisis, which coincides with the rise of far-right political parties in the Western world, such as UKIP in the U.K., the Front National in France or political figures such as Donald Trump in the U.S. In addition, the constant growth of media hype sometimes leads politicians and journalists to sensationalise reality so as to catch the audience’s attention, which raises the question of the potential dangers of metaphors, especially when it comes to sensitive issues such as immigration. Furthermore, since politicians have the floor in order to express their ideas regarding this matter, we may wonder to what extent they resort to metaphor to talk about it.

The aim of the first two parts is to provide an overview, based on the framework of Cognitive Linguistics, regarding, respectively, the different theories of metaphorical language and political discourse. The purpose of the first part is to give a general definition of metaphor and see its different functions in regard to political discourse. This leads me to define, in the second part, political discourse itself. The third part consists of my corpus study; it includes the analysis of immigration metaphors in contemporary American, British and French political discourse between 2013 and 2018, in order to compare the use of immigration metaphors between the different political parties, between the different cultures and also between French and English during a period predominantly marked by the 2014 Syrian migrant crisis.
Part I: Theories of metaphorical language\textsuperscript{2}

\textsuperscript{2} By metaphorical language, we mean both the metaphorical linguistic expressions and the conceptual metaphors.
Introduction

The aim of this first part is to give a general overview concerning the different theories of metaphors and more particularly of metaphors in the framework of Cognitive Linguistics. The Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT) developed by Lakoff and Johnson will be essentially tackled in this study. First, various definitions of metaphors and their concepts will be presented. Then, the different functions of metaphors will be listed and finally, this will lead me to focus on the potential dangers and consequences of this paradoxical rhetorical device, which enables the speaker to highlight some elements of reality while hiding others.

1. General definition and features of metaphor

1.1. Definition and history

“Metaphor is the application of an alien name by transference either from genus to species, or from species to genus, or from species to species, or by analogy, that is, proportion” [Poetics: 73, 1457b]. This Aristotelian definition was one of the first descriptions of metaphor. It conveys the idea that metaphors consist of the use of an unsuitable or inappropriate term (in other words a term which comes from a totally different domain), which is being applied to what is being described, creating parallels and similarities between the “alien name” and the subject, as according to Aristotle, a good metaphor “implies an eye for resemblances” [Poetics: 81, 1459a]. Like euphemisms and hyperboles, metaphors are considered significant structures of political rhetoric. Metaphor can be regarded as an analogical process which enables
the speaker to mention something indirectly, highlighting the differences or similarities between two different domains and partially merging them. They are different from similes as they create a real fusion between two domains without resorting to *as* or *like* as comparative devices; indeed, they do not only compare two distinct spheres but make them merge. For Aristotle [*Rhetoric*: 367, 1407a], a simile is a metaphor but with a small difference; he then gives the example of the simile “Achilles rushed on like a lion”, which is different from the metaphor “Achilles is a lion”. In the metaphor, Achilles is called a lion and a transfer of meaning is made since both the lion and Achilles are brave. The definition has evolved since then, as Aristotle thought that metaphors and similes differed only by the addition of a comparative word [*Rhetoric*: 397, 1411a].

Knowles and Moon [2006: 3] say that by the term “metaphor”, we mention the ability to use language in order “to refer to something other than what it was originally applied to, or what it ‘literally’ means”. One key characteristic that must be kept in mind is that metaphors are based on associations and connections between two domains. Lakoff and Johnson [2003: 2] explain that in cognitive linguistics, a metaphor is a “mapping between a *source* domain and a *target* domain”, insisting on the fact that these two domains have nothing in common or at least that it is difficult to find the existence of a coherent, logical link between them at first sight. Ritchie [2013: 9] defines the term “mapping” as “a process in which particular words are connected with meanings”. In addition, Simpson and Mayr [2010: 43] explain that “the target domain is the topic that you want to describe through the metaphor while the source domain refers to the concept that you draw upon in order to create the metaphorical construction”. In other words, the *target* domain is *what* is being talked about. For example, on May 21st, 2015, after his re-election as Prime Minister, David Cameron
uttered the following metaphor: “Poles fought with us in the Battle of Britain.” In this case, David Cameron wants to describe the general elections, thus they belong to the target domain and he creates a metaphorical construction thanks to words such as “fight” and “battle” belonging to the source domain. Moreover, words are not chosen for their literal meaning and in David Cameron’s metaphor, the word “battle” does not refer to an armed confrontation or a fight. In fact, by using this metaphorical term he wants to highlight the huge turn-out of British people for the election day and the difficulties of the political campaign. This metaphor is represented hereafter [Figure 1] according to its source and target domains:

![Figure 1: Representation of David Cameron’s metaphor: “Poles fought with us in the Battle of Britain”](image)

Though the terms source and target will be chosen, it should be noted that the terminology is sometimes different; for instance, Knowles and Moon [2006: 9] resort to other terms to describe metaphors. According to them three different elements have to be considered in the analysis: the vehicle, which is the metaphor itself, the topic, which is the meaning and, finally, the grounds, which are the connections between the first two elements. For example, during the third American debate on October 19th, 2016, Hillary Clinton said that Putin “would rather have a puppet as president of the United States”. In this case, the vehicle is “the American president is a puppet”, the topic

---

3 I.A. Richard [1981: 49] first defined the target domain as the tenor and the source domain as the vehicle.
is the fact that Putin would like to have power over the American president and the grounds consists in the idea that there is a sort of hierarchy in politics and that some political leaders want to manipulate others and make them do what they want, like a puppeteer would manipulate a puppet.

1.2. Types of metaphor

Three main different types of metaphors exist: vivid, conventionalised and dead metaphors. These three corresponding categories have been called creative, semi-lexicalised and lexicalised\(^4\) by Chamizo Domínguez [1998: 47-70] since they can be placed on the continuum of lexicalisation, as represented hereafter [Figure 2]:

![Figure 2: Representation of the types of metaphors according to their degree of lexicalisation](image)

Dead metaphors are used every day and the speaker is not even aware that she/he is using a metaphor. They are lexicalised and belong to the literal language since they can be found in dictionaries. Punter [2007: 146] describes them as: "Metaphors which have been used so often that they barely stand out as metaphor at all and have descended to the level of cliché." For example, as Michael Marks [2004: 166] explains, the phrase “the body of an essay” is a dead metaphor. The noun "body" does not refer

\(^4\) This terminology has been preferred as it clearly indicates the degree of lexicalisation of the metaphors.
to the “human anatomy”, but to the central and major part of an essay; in fact, this is a case of polysemy, as the term “body” has got several meanings. This expression became a “literal statement” and got recorded in dictionaries; that is why it is considered a dead metaphor as it is deeply lexicalised. The term “body” also fills in a lexical gap and has been chosen to talk about the main part of a text because it could not possibly be differently referred to; for that reason, a term has been borrowed from another domain. The listeners do not picture a real human body, but directly understand that it refers to the main part of the essay without thinking of the metaphor. In other words, we can say that this type is entirely “frozen” since it is fixed in language. Orwell [1968: 130] wrote in his essay Politics and the English Language that dead metaphors were “ordinary words”.

Dead (lexicalised) metaphors are opposed to vivid (creative) metaphors, which are used deliberately by the speaker. The latter create a real effect of surprise for the audience since they are most of the time entirely invented and shaped by the speaker him/herself for a specific situation; therefore, this type of metaphor is not lexicalised. A vivid metaphor is likely to evolve all along the discourse and is absolutely not fixed in language. It is much more powerful than a dead metaphor as it creates astonishment and this is perhaps the reason why they are useful to persuade and convince the audience, especially in political discourse, where they enable politicians to support their arguments with new images that will be more easily recognised and remembered by the listeners. For instance, in Islamabad on October 21st, 2011, Hillary Clinton delivered a speech in which she explained that Pakistan should collaborate with the U.S. to fight terrorism, she used the metaphor of the “snake” to describe terrorists:

---

5 The Taliban Haqqani network in this case.
“You can’t keep snakes in your backyard and expect them only to bite your neighbors. You know, eventually those snakes are going to turn on whoever has them in the backyard.” This metaphor is vivid since it is not lexicalised and because it cannot be understood without the context; in other words, one would not know what Clinton is referring to, had the listeners not been provided with the necessary information.

Conventionalised (semi-lexicalised) metaphors are placed between dead and vivid metaphors if we consider their degree of lexicalisation. Though conventionalised metaphors are not lexicalised and are most of the time effortlessly understood by the audience, they are sometimes considered clichés and often involve shared knowledge between the utterer and the audience. For example, in Philadelphia on March 18th, 2008, Barack Obama delivered a speech in which he used the following vivid metaphor: “Black families can write their own destiny”. Even if he uses the verb “write”, the audience does not mentally picture someone writing; however, they do understand that Barack Obama means that Black families have the right to decide for their own future. Though the expression “write one’s destiny” is quite frequent in English, this metaphor is semi-lexicalised as the speaker is aware that he is using a metaphor.

These three different types are particularly significant because they determine the metaphors that are likely to remain in a language. Punter [2007: 102] explains that their longevity in a given culture has to be taken into account: “The recognition of metaphor becomes not only a sign of power but also a powerful marker of cultural instability; metaphors need to be considered not only in terms of their endurance but also in terms of their passing away”. Metaphors can thus be studied in accordance with their degree of lexicalisation in order to illustrate the potential political or cultural changes in a diachronic analysis.
Besides, metaphors can fall into two other categories: *simple* metaphors, which are used in one sentence only, are opposed to *extended* metaphors which are expanded all along a specific text. Punter [2007: 146] explains that they are “metaphors developed throughout a text, or throughout significant proportion of it”. In other words, the same conceptual metaphor is developed all along the discourse but with different linguistic forms. For example, in Toledo on September 3rd, 2012, during the campaign for presidency, Barack Obama and Mitt Romney used the extended metaphor of “football”. President Obama described Mitt Romney as “a losing coach”, which constitutes the first metaphor. Then, this metaphor is extended as Mitt Romney replies that he is “going to be the coach who leads America to a winning season”.

2. Cognitive approach and Conceptual Metaphor Theory

In *Metaphors We Live by*, published in 1980, Lakoff and Johnson paved the way for the Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT), in which they assumed that metaphors were part of our everyday life not only in language but also in our “thoughts and actions” [1980: 3]. Their main claim is that we mostly think metaphorically since the way we interact with our environment is based on concepts: “most of our conceptual system is metaphorically structured” [1980: 61]. In other words, metaphors play a central role in our ability to understand the world and therefore in our ability to explain it to others, that is to say, in our capability to communicate. As language is what differentiates human beings from animals and as it is largely metaphorical, metaphors
are somehow essential to civilisation itself and cannot be considered only an aesthetic ornament anymore.

2.1. Highlighting-hiding principle

One of the main principles CMT relies on is the *hiding and highlighting principle*, which is described by Lakoff and Johnson [1980: 10] as follows:

> The very systematicity that allows us to comprehend one aspect of a concept in terms of another will necessarily hide other aspects of the concept. In allowing us to focus on one aspect of a concept, a metaphorical concept can keep us from focusing on other aspects of the concept that are inconsistent with that metaphor.

By creating a metaphor and therefore a mental picture, the speaker systematically highlights some elements of the target domain, making other parts disappear. To put it differently, certain elements of the target domain are highlighted while others are hidden at the same time by the choice of the source domain. Following this idea, Evans and Green [2006: 304] give the example of the metaphor **ARGUMENT IS WAR**. They say that metaphors such as *He won the argument, I could not defend that point* “highlight the adversarial nature of argument but hide the fact that argument often involves an ordered and organized development of a particular topic”. As we will see, this principle is predominantly noticeable in political discourse and more particularly in discourse about immigration where the quantity of refugees is often highlighted while the individuality is completely hidden by the metaphors at stake. Katz [1998: 33] explains that a “metaphor not only illuminates, it conceals. A good metaphor emphasizes similarity relations and deemphasizes the dissimilarities.” For
that reason, the *highlighting-hiding principle* is also deeply related to the problem of truth, which will be developed later on.

2.2. Structural, orientational and ontological metaphors

According to Lakoff and Johnson [1980: 22], the metaphors we use are culture-dependent since “the most fundamental values in a culture will be coherent with the metaphorical structure of the most fundamental concepts in the culture”. The metaphors one culture uses are thus partly shaped by the concepts, the experiences and the history of this specific culture. In the light of this assertion, Lakoff and Johnson [1980: 14-32] distinguish three different types of conceptual metaphors: *structural*, *orientational* and *ontological* metaphors.

*Structural* metaphors enable the speaker to describe an abstract concept which is difficult to explain (feelings, emotions, ideologies) in terms of another concept which is based on experience and which is easier to picture. Lakoff and Johnson write [1980: 61] that structural metaphors “allow us to use one highly structured and clearly delineated concept to structure another”. For example, *LOVE IS A JOURNEY* is a structural metaphor since *LOVE* is an abstract concept and *A JOURNEY* is a more concrete and structured one, as it is based on experience and knowledge.

*Orientalional* metaphors are based on directions [1980: 14]: *up-down, on-off, in-out, front-back*, etc. These metaphors rely on our spatial environment and the way we physically relate to it; for instance, *MORE IS UP* and *LESS IS DOWN* are orientational metaphors such as the following example: “The discounted rate for students and those on the youth mobility scheme will go *up* from £150 to £300” [The Guardian, “Annual
charge paid by migrants for using the NHS to double”, Rajeev Syal, February 5th, 2018]. As we will see, orientational metaphors are particularly used to describe immigration as they indicate movement, usually describing refugees coming into or going out (of) the host country. In addition, Radden and Dirven [2007: 278] explain: “Motion attracts our attention more than anything else. Even a new-born baby reacts to an object moving across its visual field. It is not surprising, therefore, that many domains are metaphorically conceptualized in terms of motion.”

*Ontological* metaphors (like *structural* metaphors) are also used to talk about an abstract concept but in terms of a physical object as “our experience of physical objects and substances provides a further basis of understanding” [1980: 25]. Lakoff and Johnson give the example of *the mind* which is seen as a *machine*, for instance with the following metaphor: “we still trying to *grind out* the solution to this equation”. They also explain that container metaphors are ontological since a container is a physical object related to our physical experience. This type of metaphor is largely used to define countries or territories (especially the host country as far as immigration is concerned) since it relies on basic instincts, as described by Lakoff and Johnson [1980: 29]:

“We are physical beings, bounded and set off from the rest of the world by the surface of our skins, and we experience the rest of the world as outside us. Each of us is a container, with a bounding surface and an in-out orientation. We project our own in-out orientation onto other physical objects that are bounded by surfaces. Thus, we may also view them as containers with an inside and an outside. […] But even where there is no natural physical boundary that can be viewed as defining a container, we impose boundaries-marking off territory so that it has an inside and a bounding surface-whether a wall, a fence, or an abstract line or plane. There are few human instincts more basic than territoriality.
3. Functions of metaphor

3.1. Cognitive dimension

As explained by Orwell [1968: 134]: “The sole aim of a metaphor is to call up a visual image”. The very first goal of a metaphor is to create understanding through a new, original mental picture; therefore, the cognitive dimension is the primary function which is found in all metaphorical occurrences, as metaphors deal with concepts and notions that are fixed in the listeners’ minds. In fact, the use of a metaphor is the use of a kind of “code” and as David Punter [2007: 74] says, metaphors are “the opposite of concrete things” and everything has a metaphorical dimension as every word can create a “code”, that is to say, a mental picture which must be deciphered by the listener. Following this idea, Elena Semino [2008: 6] explains that:

Cognitive metaphor theorists emphasize that target domains typically correspond to areas of experience that are relatively abstract, complex, unfamiliar, subjective or poorly delineated, such as time, emotion, life or death. In contrast, source domains typically correspond to concrete, simple, familiar physical and well-delineated experiences, such as motion, bodily phenomena, physical object and so on.

Thus, a metaphor not only merges two domains (the source domain and the target domain), but also makes a cognitive link between an abstract and a concrete world in order to be understood, as previously explained with ontological and structural metaphors. Its cognitive dimension is essential, Gibbs [1999: 156] explains: “The inseparability of mind, body, and world, and cognitive and cultural models, points to the important idea that metaphor is an emergent property of body-world interactions”. According to him, metaphor is what enables us to relate our body or
mind to our environment; for that reason, the cognitive dimension of metaphor is crucial in our everyday life, as it enables us to decipher the world. As Radden and Dirven [2007: 1] explain, cognitive linguistics is “usage-based” and consists in studying the choices a speaker can make and the reasons of her/his choice. This approach will be applied to the corpus study to see the motivations and cognitive implications behind each political speech.

Goatly [1997: 14] explains how communication works in order to “understand the continuum between metaphorical and literal language” – his model is represented hereafter [Figure 3]:

![Figure 3: Goatly's model of linguistic communication in five steps](image)

He supposes that a speaker is describing a physical object to a listener. (A) is the starting point, the physical object which already exists in the real world. (1) is the process of perception and cognition; it consists of the speaker’s mental picture (thought), which is only accessible to the speaker her/himself. This process enables the speaker to go from the physical object (A) to the mental picture (B). The speaker carries on the cognitive process (2) to create a description (proposition) (C), which has to be as close as possible to her/his thought. Then, to deliver this mental description, the speaker must use a code (3). (D) is the physical text that has been created, it can be written or spoken. Finally, the listener perceives the text and
deciphers it with a mental process (4) to create another mental proposition (C), which is only accessible by the listener. She/He must try and understand what was the speaker’s thought (B) via another cognitive decoding process (5). This model shows how the physical world and the mind are interrelated with communication and how both metaphorical linguistic expressions and conceptual metaphors work since their primary function is cognitive.

3.2. Didactic dimension

Another major function of metaphor is to clarify complex notions in order to be understood. According to Kristen Osenga [2013: 31]:

To create the best discourse community, the participants must understand the science and the policy components, as well as the relationship between the two. Essentially, metaphors can be used to educate the public about science while framing it within the debate.

To put it differently, one of the main roles of a metaphor is to be educational, especially in specialised domains (such as science, economy, philosophy, etc.) in order to simplify complex concepts and to teach those very concepts to an audience which is known as less experienced in a given domain. For example, in chemistry, a chemical reaction called the “metathesis” is explained with the use of a metaphor so that students can directly picture the reaction and understand how it works; as a consequence, chemists usually say that a “metathesis” is a “dance” where the molecules “change partners”. The goal is thus to teach something in a simpler way thanks to the didactic dimension of metaphor which offers a new vision and therefore a new mental picture to the listeners who are being taught. As I will develop in the corpus analysis, this educational
function is particularly found in far-right discourse since nationalist ideas need to be clarified as they are not seen as “mainstream” [Delouis 2014: 1].

Besides, this function is all the more important when people who belong to different cultures are trying to communicate. According to Lakoff and Johnson [1980: 231], though the understanding can be problematic when cultures and values are not necessarily common, it is possible for two strangers to share their experiences thanks to metaphors; for that reason, the social dimension is essential.

3.3. Social and rhetorical dimensions

Especially in political discourse, the role of metaphor is also to convince and/or persuade the public. As Kristen Osenga [2013: 30] writes: “A metaphor is often the primary tool the general public uses to understand information policy.” It is most of the time based on shared knowledge between the utterer and the audience, to convince listeners and to make them vote for the speaker’s ideas. In fact, metaphors create a social link between the utterer and the audience, they generate a community feeling since the speaker and the listeners become one group. In the same vein, Kristen Osenga [2013: 39] explains:

[...]

Moreover, metaphors can also influence the audience thanks to their persuasive function. Thus, they enable politicians to shape the voters’ opinions and
values with emotions [Charteris-Black 2005: 13]. Consequently, metaphors have to be chosen judiciously by the speaker since they can have a huge impact on the audience’s understanding and therefore on the audience’s political choices, as it will be developed in the corpus analysis.

3.4. Aesthetic and ornamental dimension

Though it is rarer than the others and almost never found in political discourse, the ornamental role of a metaphor is another function we instantly think of. Its goal is to create a beautiful, artistic mental picture to describe the subject. This aesthetic function is particularly used in art, be it visual art or literature; most of the time, such metaphors aim to turn something particularly unpleasant into something else which is more attractive and creative. For example, the novelist Michele Roberts [1998: 4] describes cancer with an ornamental metaphor in *Impossible Saints*:

Josephine had been ill for some months with cancer. The doctors had not diagnosed it until too late. But, in any case, they did not know how to cure this disease *which flourished in secret like mushrooms sprouting in the dark woods, coming up through the layers of fallen leaves.*

3.5. Catachretic function

As previously mentioned with the lexicalised metaphor “the body of a text”, metaphors are also frequently used to fill in a lexical gap. They enable the speaker to name an object or a concept that would have been described with a periphrasis otherwise; in other words, catachresis is at stake since the original meanings of words are distorted. These concepts or objects are generally new and frequently belong to
domains like new technologies or journalism; for instance, Goatly [1997: 149] gives the example of the mouse of a computer: “These occur when there is no adequate T-term in existence, so that extension or transfer of the reference of an existing word-form plugs the gap. For instance, the mouse of a computer.” In the light of this example, the new technological object is described in terms of an animal, though the electronic device and the rodent belong to two really distinct domains; however, because of the lexical gap, the similar shapes need to be highlighted (the tail of the animal becoming the wire and the body the pointing device). Goatly [1997: 83-86] explains that the word-class which is used metaphorically is most of the time that of the nouns. He writes: “When language maps experience in the most straightforward or congruent way, nouns represent things, adjectives the properties of things, verbs realize states and processes adverbs the properties of processes, and prepositions the relationships between things.” According to him, nouns are most likely imaginable by the audience because they usually refer to physical objects with spatial dimensions [1997: 83]. He carries on with this idea [1997: 86] and explains that the metaphorical use of verbs is indirect, as we have to picture the “thing” before picturing the “process”; he says: “we cannot imagine kicking without imagining a foot.” The same phenomenon occurs with adjectives and adverbs, as “we can rephrase” the metaphors with a reference to the noun. For example, in Phoenix on August 31st, 2016, Donald Trump said: “It is our right as a sovereign nation to choose immigrants that we think are the likeliest to thrive and \textit{flourish} here.” The metaphor is carried by the verb “flourish” and could have been rephrased, for example, with the expression “grow like a flower”.

Clearly then, metaphors have three predominant functions: cognitive, didactic and social. However, they are sometimes also used to fill some lexical gaps or to bring
an aesthetic element to a creation. In addition, metaphors can either be used to soften reality or to exaggerate it with euphemisms or dysphemisms.

3.6. Euphemistic and dysphemistic function

As metaphors hide some parts of reality while highlighting others, they are very often either dysphemistic or euphemistic; as a result, they frequently show an intensification or an attenuation of reality. On the one hand, Allan and Burridge [1991: 11] define euphemism as “an alternative to a dispreferred expression, in order to avoid possible loss of face: either one’s own face or, through giving offense, that of the audience, or of some third party.” Thus, they see euphemisms as a means not to offend someone or not to be seen as offensive when talking about a sensitive subject. As we will see in the corpus analysis, this strategy is particularly used by right-wing politicians to talk about eviction, which can be considered a taboo subject. For instance, as we will see more particularly in French speeches, the verb “reconduire” is sometimes preferred to the term “expulser”. George Orwell [1968: 136] explains that political speeches largely consist in “the defence of the indefensible”; for that reason, politicians resort to euphemisms and vagueness to talk about shocking events such as atomic bombs, deportation or, in our case, immigration. He carries on and writes that euphemisms are needed “if one wants to name things without calling up mental pictures of them”. This means that the consequences of a euphemism or a more neutral expression are the same, except the mental picture in the listener’s minds, which is less violent or even completely different with a euphemism. On the other hand, Allan and Burridge write that a dysphemism is “an expression with connotations that are offensive either about the denotatum or to the audience, or both, and it is substituted
for a neutral or euphemistic expression for just that reason” [1991: 26]. In other words, especially in politics, dysphemisms are used to emphasise derogatory connotations rather than neutral ones and are particularly at stake to talk about one’s opponent. For example, during the final debate of the French presidential election on May 3rd, 2017, Emmanuel Macron used the dysphemistic term “parasite” to describe his opponent Marine Le Pen; he said: “Vous êtes la coproduction du système que vous dénoncez, parce que vous en vivez. Vous êtes son parasite.” The noun “parasite” refers to an insect which exploits other species’ nutrients; thus, the connotations of this dysphemism are clearly derogatory and Macron accuses Le Pen for thriving on the crisis. In addition, Crespo-Fernandez [2008: 98] defines euphemism and dysphemisms in accordance with their degree of lexicalisation. First, according to him, lexicalised euphemisms or dysphemisms are those in which the metaphorical meaning is seen as the literal meaning; then, with semi-lexicalised terms, “the substitute is associated with the taboo because of its inclusion in a conceptual domain traditionally tied to the forbidden concept”; and finally, creative dysphemisms and euphemisms consist of a completely new association, which is context-dependent, between the source and target domains and which is created by the speaker.

4. Consequences and dangers

4.1. Metaphor and truth

Since politicians largely resort to metaphors and metaphors can hugely influence the audience, the problem of reliability is to be questioned; to put it
differently, what is being hidden or highlighted by metaphors must be studied carefully. Saul [2016: 2] explains that metaphors and non-open linguistic tools\(^6\) are “one of the most powerful forms of political speech, allowing people to be manipulated in ways that they would resist if the manipulation was carried out more openly, often drawing on racist attitudes that are consciously rejected”. In other words, metaphors can be dangerous as they carry powerful subliminal ideas that could probably have been rejected by the listeners, had they known what was hidden behind those “non-open tools” in the first place. For that reason, the *hiding-highlighting principle*, where metaphors rely on, must always be taken into account when analysing political metaphors so as to prevent politicians from manipulating the audience, as Lakoff and Johnson [1980: 236] explain:

Like other metaphors, political and economic metaphors can hide aspects of reality. But in the area of politics and economics, metaphors matter more, because they constrain our lives. A metaphor in a political or economic system, by virtue of what it hides, can lead to human degradation.

For them, what is hidden by a political metaphor prevents voters from being fully aware of the ideas they are voting for; thus, their choices are partly biased and for that reason, a metaphor can be hazardous. In the same vein, Semino [2008: 100] gives the example of the *war* source domain which is largely used in English to refer to any other domain concerning complications, threats, struggles, difficulties or indeterminate results; thus, this phenomenon is problematic as this source domain can either be used to talk about “the war against drugs” or “the war against immigration”. The effect will obviously not be the same for the two metaphors and for

\(^6\) Also called “dogwhistles”.
that reason, some metaphors can be considered an illusion, as explained by Lakoff and Johnson [1980: 191]: “Words are viewed as having “proper senses” in terms of which truths can be expressed. To use words metaphorically is to use them in an improper sense, to stir imagination and thereby the emotions and thus to lead us away from the truth and toward illusion”. Partly because of the hiding-highlighting principle, metaphors always erase some parts of the truth. Punter [2007: 73] goes even further and considers metaphor a lie; he writes:

In this mindset there is no room for metaphor; to say that one thing is another thing is akin to lying. It follows that since such a lying may be perceived under psychotic conditions as volitional on the part of the liar, persons who, or speech acts which, use metaphor may be perceived as willful deceivers or deceptions.

4.2. Appropriate metaphors

Especially in political discourse, metaphors have to be chosen carefully by the speakers so as not to lead voters toward misunderstanding. In order to avoid this problem of misleading metaphors, Osenga [2013: 42] describes five different points to follow to create a “good” metaphor, in other words, a “metaphor which is appropriate for educating the public”:

1- The metaphor must resonate with the audience. It must be based on experiences common to the audience and be sufficiently interesting to capture its attention.

2- The metaphor must take the abstract concrete. It must be subject to a limited range of interpretations, such that each individual in the audience understands it to mean essentially the same thing.
3- The metaphor must be concise. The longer the metaphor, the less useful it becomes in capturing the audience’s attention.

4- The metaphor must be accurate for the purpose for which it is being offered.

5- The metaphor must be neutral with respect to the issue for which it is being offered.

In other words, a good metaphor must be based on shared-knowledge, the audience must be able to know directly what the politician is referring to. The source domain has to be tangible so that each listener interprets the metaphor in the same way. According to Osenga, a good metaphor should be as succinct as possible, which raises the question of extended metaphors: are they more or less powerful than simple metaphors? Finally, a good metaphor should be adequate and objective, it should neither be euphemistic nor dysphemistic; however, because of the hiding-highlighting principle and because the very existence of a euphemism is context-dependent, this last point seems difficult to achieve. Furthermore, Osenga’s second point must be seen in the light of what I.A. Richards [1936: 9] explains concerning the polysemous characteristic of words we tend to forget; thus, misunderstanding appears because of the common belief that words are independent entities that have only one meaning and metaphors cannot possibly be understood the same way by everyone, as the utterances are not compositional in a discourse:

To account for understanding and misunderstanding, to study the efficiency of language and its conditions, we have to renounce, for a while, the view that words just have their meanings and that what a discourse does is to be explained as a composition of these meanings, as a wall can be represented as a composition of its bricks.

I.A. Richards [1936: 10] explains that most words change their meanings when they pass from one context to another. According to him, though we are most of the
time able to recognise these changes, sometimes “our skill fails” and that is when misunderstanding appears. Therefore, since politicians have the floor, it is their responsibility to choose appropriate metaphors so as to avoid those misinterpretations.

Conclusion

In the light of their various functions and definitions, metaphors seem to be clearly powerful in political speeches and in language in general. They are not only a rhetorical device but also what shapes our everyday conceptual system. Metaphor seems exceptionally influential as it has the ability to control the listeners without them being aware of it; furthermore, it appears that, most of the time, the listeners accept an idea conveyed by a metaphor that they would have rejected, had it been presented more explicitly. As political metaphors “can lead to human degradation” [Lakoff and Johnson, 1980: 236] and as political speeches are seen as the “defense of the indefensible” [Orwell, 1968: 136], we may wonder how politicians use metaphorical language to defend their arguments. This leads me to present some theories of political discourse in the next part to try and see how metaphor and politics are interrelated.
Part II: Theories of political discourse
Introduction

The purpose of this second part is to provide an overview of political discourse. A general definition of political discourse will first be given; then, I will develop the different cognitive strategies these discourses may include. Finally, I will focus on the contextual and multimodal dimensions of political discourse.

The first thing to keep in mind is that language is used as a work tool by politicians, as the latter aim to convince and/or persuade potential voters with their discourses. They select words on purpose and their speeches are always motivated; as a result, political speeches rely on Jakobson’s conative function of language, which consists in influencing the listener. Jakobson [1963: 213] describes six different functions in communication (represented hereafter [Figure 4] with their factors), the conative function associated with the addressee being the one politicians are mostly interested in:

![Figure 4: Jakobson's six functions of language](image)

Firstly, the referential function is associated with the context, it enables the speaker to describe a specific situation in a certain context with deictic elements. To put it differently, this function refers to who is speaking, who is addressed, when and where
the events take place. Then, the emotive (expressive) function relates to the addressor and enables the latter to share more information with the listener, usually using paralinguistic vocal features. For example, the speaker can murmur, whisper, shout etc., to express her/his emotions. The very shape of the message is associated with the poetic function, which is particularly noticeable in literature or headlines. This message is set up and maintained by a contact, a connection, which is represented by the phatic function, enabling the speaker to keep the communication going so that the contact between the addressor and the addressee never ends. For instance, this function is particularly at stake with politeness. The message requires a code, which is more or less shared by the speaker and the listener; in addition, the metalinguistic function is associated with this code and consists in using language to describe language itself. Finally, the conative function, as already mentioned, aims to influence the addressee, resorting to grammatical devices, such as imperative clauses or metaphors, to make the receiver think or act in a certain way; for that reason, the conative function is essential in political speeches.

1. General definition and configuration of political discourse

First, what do we mean by discourse? Brown and Yule [1983: 1] explain that the analysis of discourse is the analysis of language in use. In other words, the term discourse refers to the way we communicate in everyday life. Widdowson [2007: 6] writes that the speaker’s goal is to convey a message, to “express ideas and beliefs, to

---

7 The conative function is opposed to the expressive function and is sometimes called the "impressive" function in French. Thus, it indicates that there is a movement from the outside to the inside and that the message permeates the receiver before influencing her/him.
explain something, to get other people to do certain things or to think in a certain way. We can refer to these complex communicative purposes as the discourse that underlies the text and motivates its production in the first place”; therefore, each discourse accounts for meaning. Widdowson [2007: 7] carries on with the idea that a discourse both consists of the message the speaker wants to convey and of what it means to the listener.

Political discourse can therefore be regarded as devices enabling the speaker to share ideas with the listener. However, we mistakenly think that only politicians resort to political discourse, whereas Simpson and Mayr [2010: 42] write that “even the most everyday decision can be called political”, as the main goal of any speaker is to convince (insisting on reason) and/or persuade (insisting on emotions) a wide audience. Chilton [2004: 1] reminds us that the Greco-Roman tradition had already defined humans as beings both able to speak and to live together in groups. These two characteristics of human beings are at the heart of political discourse since politicians usually have the floor in order to share ideas that could potentially improve the audience’s life in groups. This idea refers to Aristotle’s Politics [1253a] in which he explains that human beings are political animals because they are able to speak, unlike other animals. However, it should be noted that the adjective political is only “connected with the state, government or public affairs” according to the Oxford English Dictionary.

Political discourse can be described in six different points, as explained by Levinson [1983: 239] hereafter:

1- The speaker makes a declaration about a future occurrence of which she/he is the agent.
2- The speaker honestly means to accomplish the occurrence.
Donald Trump’s Presidential Announcement Speech in New York on June 15th, 2015 has been chosen to illustrate the previous description. The Republican candidate explains his project to build a wall between the U.S. and Mexico in order to prevent illegal immigrants from entering the country and says: “I would build a great wall, and nobody builds walls better than me, believe me, and I’ll build them very inexpensively, I will build a great, great wall on our southern border. And I will have Mexico pay for that wall. Mark my words.” In the first sentence, Donald Trump makes a declaration of which he is the agent with the use of the personal pronoun “I”. The audience is aware he is talking about a future, hypothetical event with the use of the modal “would” (1). Then, Trump honestly means to build a wall and believes he is able to build it by himself, saying he is the best person to do so (2) (3). The occurrence is not believed to be likely to happen (4), as he is not a bricklayer and as Mexico will probably not spend money for the construction of an American wall. From this point, the listeners want the occurrence to become true (5) and want their candidate to build a wall; they clap their hands and shout “yes” to show their support. Finally, Trump proposes himself under the obligation to build this wall, saying “mark my words” (6). Therefore, we may wonder how Jakobson’s conative function can trigger the fifth step off and make the speaker influence the audience with her/his discourse.
2. Cognitive approaches and strategies

2.1. How to influence people’s minds?

What leads the receivers from the fourth to the fifth step clearly is the conative function. Van Dijk [2008: 70] explains that the speaker controls indirectly people’s minds via political discourses; in other words, the listeners are influenced and their future actions are determined by the messages conveyed by political speeches and, thus, by politicians themselves. Several cognitive factors must be taken into account in what Van Dijk [2008: 11] calls “Mind Control”; firstly, the speech has to be perfectly understandable by the audience and must be built on “personal and social knowledge”. To influence the voters, political discourse ought to be based on shared knowledge and real experience, so that everyone can picture the situation more easily. Then, Van Dijk [2008: 11] writes that to defend ideological ideas, and more particularly xenophobic ideas, the strategy is to create a clear-cut cognitive dichotomy between two groups. Van Dijk refers to this specific dichotomy as the “in-group out-group polarization” and explains that this approach is commonly used in sexist or racist discourses since it enables the speaker to create two opposed categories (men vs. women, strangers vs. citizens, the rich vs. the poor etc.) in which a person can either belong or be rejected, according to certain criteria. To illustrate this idea, Widdowson [2007: 71] gives the example of the metaphor “An army of immigrants” and questions the lexical choice of the term army instead of crowd. Why would a politician use the word army to describe families of refugees with babies and children? The purpose of this metaphor is thus to

---

8 For instance, on February 2nd, 1989, The Sun published an article entitled “Britain Invaded by an Army of Illegals”, this example was also used by Van Dijk [2008: 80].
create a dichotomy between refugees and citizens of the potential host country; on the one hand, it conveys the idea that immigrants are armed, well-organised and dangerous. On the other hand, the word *army* presupposes that the speaker and his/her group are the victims searching for peace. Van Dijk [2008: 9] carries on and writes that, in such speeches, politicians usually emphasise the positive aspects of her/his own group (what he calls “self-glorification”) and the negative aspects of the “out-group”, so as to make the audience cognitively picture the out-group with derogatory images. This strategy is clearly denounced by Van Dijk who thinks that this is an abuse of power, which leads to “social inequality and injustice” [2008: 1].

One thing that must be kept in mind is that politicians are the leaders of their own speeches since they can choose to give either many or few details when supporting their arguments to influence their listeners in a certain way. As Chilton [2004: 62] explains, it can be a political strategy to offer “less rather than more information”. For that reason, presuppositions in political discourse are to be questioned, as they enable the speaker to mention things indirectly in order to get around taboos. According to Simpson and Mayr [2010: 43], the use of presupposition is a deliberate device, which delivers facts obliquely and “leaves it to the hearer to deduce meaning and make assumptions”. Thus, the listeners become the agents since presuppositions enable them to imagine what the speaker means, while the latter disclaims her/himself from any liability.
2.2. Legitimation and political discourse

For that reason, legitimation in political discourse is to be questioned. According to Simpson and Mayr [2010: 47], the authority of politicians must be legitimated so that the audience follows their ideas, they write: “[politicians’] only source of power is their capacity to mobilize support on the basis of legitimacy”. In fact, legitimation leads to comparisons, be they positive or negative. As previously mentioned and as it will be developed in the corpus analysis, the most recurrent pattern in political discourse about immigration is to show a positive self-presentation, which often presupposes a negative presentation of “the other”. Once again, Van Dijk [2008: 98] describes the cognitive dichotomy, saying that politicians often associate the community of “Us” with the “civilized” group and the “Others” with “the Barbarians”. According to him: “Social conflict is thus cognitively represented and enhanced by polarization, and discursively sustained and reproduced by derogating, demonizing and excluding the Others from the community of Us, the civilized.” In other words, the mental picture that is created by political discourse can thus be found in society itself, as the two cognitive categories become physical groups in the “real world” because of the rejection of the others.

2.3. How do political speeches shape society?

Hart and Lukeš [2007: 85] explain that cognition makes the link between discourse structures and societal structures; as a result, thanks to cognition, political discourses have a great impact on people’s mental conceptions and, thus, on society itself, as these cognitive concepts are usually reproduced by actions. For instance, as
mentioned previously, if one person mentally pictures two separate groups, she/he will tend to recreate this separation in the “real world”, rejecting people who do not correspond to the criteria established in the first place, which sometimes leads to communitarianism.

To understand this phenomenon, Hart and Lukeš [2007: 86] describe cognition and divide it into four different categories, which all play a role in political discourse’s influence upon society. The first category consists of beliefs and goals, the second category is composed of representations and processes in discourse, the third one consists of mental and memory structures and the final one is composed of evaluations and emotions, as represented hereafter [Figure 5]:

![Figure 5: The components of cognition by Hart and Lukeš](image)

For Hart and Lukeš, these four components are already shaped by society; furthermore, they consist of mental models [2007: 87], which are seen as “the basis of discourse production and comprehension. In the former, they represent the starting point. In the latter, they represent the goal”, as shown in the figure hereafter [Figure 6]:

![Figure 6: The components of cognition by Hart and Lukeš](image)
Figure 6: Mental models: an interface between discourse and society by Hart and Lukeš

As represented in this model, ideology has a real impact on discourse production since a discourse is always motivated; in addition, its shape clearly depends on what is being claimed. Firstly, ideology influences social behaviours, which are illustrated by personal opinions and are characterised by mental models, controlling the discourse production; as a result, a discourse depends on society and reciprocally. Thus, on the one hand, our ideas are shaped by the words we hear every day, while, on the other hand, we communicate by selecting words that correspond to our ideas. This approach is particularly developed in the studies about Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), where language is seen as a means to show political power. Widdowson [2007: 69-70] explains that producing a text is not only related to basic communication but also to wider ideological or social beliefs: “A language will always provide the resource for alternative wordings: there will always be different grammatical structures and different lexical items available for referring to the ‘same’ thing in a variety of ways.” Therefore, Critical Discourse Analysts claim that words are never chosen randomly but always judiciously selected by the speaker.

For instance, the latter can play on memory, which is a major component of cognition, to influence the audience. Two different types of memory must be distinguished; first, there is Long-Term Memory (LMT), which is composed of both the
Episodic Memory, based on personal knowledge and experience and the Semantic Memory, which relies on language itself. Then, there is the Short-Term Memory, which is described by Chilton [2004: 51] as follows: “Short-Term Memory deals ‘online’ with ongoing processes of discourse production and understanding, generating mental models of content and context. That is to say, representations are both stored and generated.” The role of memory is extremely important in cognition since it is the component that enables the receivers not only to remember occurrences and promises made in a discourse but also to create links between one’s own experiences and what is being said. Thus, thanks to an identification process, the listener can easily be influenced by political discourse.

2.4. Conceptual Blending Theory

The Conceptual Blending Theory was developed by Fauconnier and Turner. The aim of this theory is to clarify what concepts are created in the receivers’ minds when listening to a speech. It consists of four mental spaces: two input spaces, a generic space and a blend. Some links are made between the two different input spaces and their role is to associate one element in one input space (input space 1) to its corresponding item in the other input space (input space 2). Moreover, the elements that are considered common to those two input spaces can be found in the generic space and are often described with hyperonyms. Besides, the blend (or blended space) is the combination of the two input spaces and makes new ideas\(^9\) appear. To illustrate this theory, Hart and Lukeš [2007: 114] take the example of a metaphor published in

\(^9\) These “new ideas” are also called the “emergent structure” by Hart and Lukeš [2007: 111].
the British National Party’s manifesto in 2005, where it was written: “We will do what is required and we have firm plans as regard our policy on ending illegal immigration immediately, and reversing the tide of immigration in the longer term.” For example, the theme is one element of the generic space, it corresponds to the ocean in the first input space and to people in the second input space, as represented hereafter [Figure 7] in the Conceptual Blending network of this metaphor:

![Figure 7: Conceptual Blending network for “reversing the tide of immigration” by Hart and Lukeš](image)

3. Deictic elements

To understand how political discourses work, deixis must be considered; indeed, time, space, social distance and modality are essential to communicate. Chilton
[2004: 58] represents these deictic dimensions with three different continuums, as shown in the figure hereafter [Figure 8]:

![Figure 8: Dimensions of deixis by Paul Chilton](image)

As suggested by Chilton, this model shows that politicians can always be placed in accordance with a specific time, place and social group and it emphasises the fact that political speeches are always context-dependent. Thus, the words used may depend on the audience, the speaker as well as the topic, the date, the place, etc. The first axis described by Chilton is time (t), it enables the speaker to refer to different moments, such as: today, last year, tomorrow, ten years ago, etc., and is also known as the temporal deixis. The second axis represents space (s), the speaker can thus create geographical, metaphorical or ideological distances; for instance, the audience is often placed near the speaker while the opponent is usually situated far away. The third axis characterises modality (m) and deals with degrees of certainty, permission and obligation. The point of concurrency of those three dimensions is called the deictic centre, which represents the self (I), the place where the speaker is (here) and the moment of the discourse (now). Thus, language enables the speaker to convince the listeners by moving the cursor along those three lines. For example, in Philadelphia on March 18th, 2008, Barack Obama delivered a speech in which he said: “If we simply
**retreat into our respective corners**, we will never be able to come together and solve challenges.” First, the orientational metaphor “retreat into our respective corners”, shows the importance of space, insisting on the fact that people should stay united and that social distance must be erased. Then, Obama uses the modal *will* to describe the consequences that might happen in the future if voters do not follow his advice in the present. Finally, Obama uses the pronoun *we* to create a sense of in-groupness and proximity with his listeners, playing on the spatial dimension, as this pronoun includes both himself and his audience.

Simpson and Mayr [2010: 44] explain that the inclusive *we* is extremely useful to share the responsibility of ideas that are particularly debatable. This echoes Van Dijk’s concept of “in-group outgroup polarization”, previously mentioned. Though the pronoun *we* is, most of the time, inclusive, it can sometimes be exclusive and, thus, create a dichotomy between *us* and *them*, especially in xenophobic or sexist discourse, insisting on the existence of two different groups. For example, Donald Trump frequently uses the pronoun *we* to refer to American citizens and show the superiority of the U.S., such as in one of his speeches in Phoenix, on August 31st, when he says: “*We* will ensure that other countries take *their* people back when *we* order *them* deported.” Trump clearly opposes the U.S. to the other countries since *we* is opposed to *they*; in fact, the pronoun *we* represents America and is the subject performing the actions while the “other countries” have to comply.

All these deictic elements take part in Jakobson’s referential function, as they all provide the listeners with contextual information. They are essential for communication since they enable the receivers to understand the discourse and to make appropriate links between what is being said and their own experiences, putting
those elements back in the appropriate context. Moreover, spoken discourse is often accompanied with body language and gestural communication. The gestures can enable the speaker to give more information or to make her/him stress what she/he is saying, so as to influence the audience even more.

4. Multimodal analysis

4.1. Types of discourses: spoken vs. written language

As Widdowson [2007: 7] explains, the term “discourse” can both refer to what a speaker/writer means by a text and what a text means to the listener/reader. Written and spoken texts must be studied differently since spoken texts are “ephemeral, and disappear as soon as they are produced to serve their immediate discourse purpose”; besides, the speaker produces the text as she/he goes along and according to Brown and Yule [1983: 5] the circumstances of the production of a spoken text are much more demanding than those of a written text. They make the following statement:

The speaker must monitor what it is that he has just said, and determine whether it matches his intentions, while he is uttering his current phrase and monitoring that, and simultaneously planning his next utterance and fitting into the overall pattern of what he wants to say and monitoring, moreover, not only his own performance but its reception by his hearer.

However, these characteristics must be questioned since political speeches that are delivered by politicians nowadays are almost always prepared in advance and recorded. In that sense, they are similar to written texts, as they are usually organised and prearranged to influence the audience. The writer can change the structure of
her/his discourse, while the speaker is not able to modify the sentences she/he has just said. Brown and Yule [1983: 5] write:

The writer [...] may look over what he has already written, pause between each word with no fear of his interlocutor interrupting him, take his time in choosing a particular word, even looking it up in the dictionary if necessary, check his progress with his notes, reorder what he has written, and even change his mind about what he wants to say.

Nevertheless, Brown and Yule [1983: 5] carry on and say that the speaker can observe the interlocutor’s reaction and “modify what he is saying to make it more accessible or acceptable to his hearer”; moreover, the speaker can resort to paralanguage, that is to say to different tones of voice, stresses, pauses as well as facial expressions or gestures, which will provide multimodal elements [Widdowson 2007: 8]. Brown and Yule [1983: 4] explain: “The speaker has available to him the full range of ‘voice quality’ effects (as well as facial expression, postural and gestural systems). Armed with these he can always override the effect of the words he speaks.” According to them, this paralanguage is as meaningful as words and can sometimes even be more powerful. They give the example of a speaker who says, “I’d really like to”, leaning forward, smiling with a “warm, breathy” voice quality, and explain that these paralinguistic features are “much more likely to be interpreted as meaning what he says, than another speaker uttering the same words, leaning away, brow puckered, with ‘sneering, nasal’ voice quality”. Widdowson [2007: 8] carries on and defines multimodality as the use of other modes of communication. As for written discourse, they can be multimodal as long as they include images, tables, graphs, colours, etc.
4.2. What is a mode?

According to the *Oxford English Dictionary*, a *mode* can be defined as “a particular way of doing something”. Thus, it could be seen, in our case, as a particular way of conveying meaning. Forceville [2009: 22] says that a *mode* is complicated to define and makes the following statement:

What is labeled a mode here is a complex of various factors. As a first approximation, let us say that a mode is a sign system interpretable because of a specific perception process. Acceptance of this approach would link modes one-on-one to the five senses, so that we would arrive at the following list: (1) the pictorial or visual mode; (2) the aural or sonic mode; (3) the olfactory mode; (4) the gustatory mode; and (5) the tactile mode.

To put it differently, there would be five different modes, each mode relying on one of the five senses: sight, sound, smell, touch and taste. However, Forceville [2009: 22] carries on, writing that this classification is problematic since it focuses on perception only; for example, both gestures and written texts would belong to the same mode; an equal phenomenon would occur for the aural mode, which would include “non-verbal sounds”, “music” as well as “spoken language” on the same level. For that reason, Forceville [2009: 23] assumes the existence of nine different modes, belonging to nine distinct sign systems: (1) pictorial signs; (2) written signs; (3) spoken signs; (4) gestures; (5) sounds; (6) music (7) smells; (8) tastes; (9) touch. Then, this new classification enables him to define what a multimodal metaphor is. He [2009: 24] explains that, contrary to monomodal metaphors, the source and target domains of multimodal metaphors are predominantly characterised by different modes. For instance, posters that are created for political campaigns usually show multimodal metaphors, which both rely on written signs (2) (with the slogan or the title of the
poster) and on pictorial signs (1) (with the use of pictures or images) as illustrated in the following Conservative poster [Figure 9]:

![Conservative Party Poster](image)

**Figure 9: Conservative Party Poster, “Let’s stay on the road to a stronger economy”, January 2nd, 2015**

The metaphor of the road is multimodal in this poster since, on the one hand, a real road has been photographed for the background and represents the pictorial sign (1), and on the other hand, the title, representing the written sign (2), indicates that thanks to the Conservative Party, Britain is now on the right way to a strong economy. It implies that if British citizens want to have their economy growth sustained, they must vote for the Conservative party.

4.3. Gestures

In political speeches, multimodality often oscillates between spoken signs (3) and gestures (4). By *gesture*, Müller and Cienki [2009: 301] mean the movement of the hands and forearms of the speaker. Though they are sometimes quite meaningful, foot, head and eye movements, as well as body shifts and shoulder shrugs are not regarded as *gestures* by Müller and Cienki. Furthermore, they do not take into account “self-
adjustment” movements (for instance, the adjustment of a bow tie) or “object manipulation” (for instance, “lifting a cup to take a drink”). Müller and Cienki [2009: 302] write that “we often find the use of metaphoric verbal expressions without co-occurring metaphoric gestures”. As we will see in the corpus analysis, this statement has been confirmed since the speakers rarely mimic what they are saying with gestures; however, when this phenomenon does occur, that is to say, when the two modes (spoken signs and gestures) are used at the same time, the same source domain is represented both by the linguistic expression and the gestures, which is often the case in Donald Trump’s speeches. Gestures can not only be seen as a means to attract the listeners’ attention but also as a device, enabling the speaker to clarify her/his discourse; following this idea, Müller and Cienki [2009: 313] write:

> It is well known that many gestures present abstract ideas, which are being mentioned in the speech, as concrete entities in front of the speaker: the gestures indicate particular spaces and locations for the idea, or the hands appear to hold an idea, as if it were an object.

In addition, Müller and Cienki [2009: 313] explain that gestures enable the speaker to describe the proportions and characteristics of her/his ideas. The size of abstract notions will, thus, be relatively imagined both by the speaker and the listeners; for example, in an interview on BBC, on August 5th, 2011, Louise Cooper said, with open arms, that the E.U. was facing “a mountain of debt”. As a result, the speaker uses both the space in front of her/him and her/his arms to show the scale of the notion described. Moreover, Müller and Cienki [2009: 313] carry on, saying that conceptual metaphors that indicate evaluations, such as **UP IS GOOD** or **DOWN IS BAD**, can easily be conveyed by gestures “in high or low space”.


Conclusion

In this overview of political discourse, general configurations and definitions were presented. Jakobson’s functions of communication as well as the different components of cognition were introduced to explain how politicians can influence their voters thanks to language. CDA’s main claim that the speaker selects carefully the words she/he wants to use has also been mentioned; as a result, politicians usually make linguistic choices to make their voters act in a specific way. The differences and similarities between spoken and written language were developed, to show that these two distinct types of discourse frequently resort to other modes, such as pictures, sounds, gestures, etc. The fact that discourses are always context-dependent must be kept in mind; furthermore, visual metaphors, like linguistic metaphors, also depend on the culture. For example, the colours, gestures or symbols can be interpreted differently by observers who do not share the same culture. The framework studied in this part has also shown that the main strategy to defend xenophobic or racist ideas was to create a dichotomy between two groups [Van Dijk 2008: 11]. For that reason, the next part will be based on different political speeches to see if immigration metaphors nurture this dichotomy.
Part III: Corpus analysis: immigration metaphors in political discourse
1. Presentation of the corpus

The corpora used for this analysis include American, British and French political immigration speeches delivered between September 2013 and January 2018. They mostly consist of official speeches, debates and interviews but also contain a few posters and membership forms published for the corresponding elections, screenshots of politicians when they deliver their speeches and the political parties’ websites. This specific period has been chosen because of the major political campaigns that took place in the three corresponding countries: the 2016 American and 2017 French presidential elections, the 2015 French regional elections, the 2015 and 2017 British general elections and the 2016 Brexit referendum. In addition, these events coincided with the migrant crisis partly due to the war in Syria. For the American and French corpora, the political communications of the top-two candidates were chosen; two debates and five immigration speeches were selected for each candidate in each country (Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump for the U.S. and Marine Le Pen and Emmanuel Macron for France). As several general elections occurred in the U.K. during the period under study, the British corpus includes five speeches from far-right politician Nigel Farage and five speeches from Prime Minister Theresa May. The spoken sources thus include thirty speeches and four debates while the visual corpus contains six screenshots and seven posters or pictures, the sampling being done according to the productivity of terms linked with immigration. This corpus has been chosen to compare the use of immigration metaphors between different political parties, between different cultures but also between two languages in a period particularly marked by a migrant crisis.
2. Methodology

The purpose of this corpus study is to answer the following questions: Are the source domains of immigration metaphors different or similar between political parties, cultures and languages? What are the types of metaphors? Are they vivid, semi-lexicalised or lexicalised? Are they more dysphemistic or euphemistic? What are their frequencies? To what extent can metaphors influence and convince an audience? Why are immigration metaphors deeply ingrained in people's minds? Once the corpus established, terms such as “immigration”, “migrant” or “refugee” were searched in the transcripts of the speeches. Then, metaphors about immigration were targeted and classified in accordance with the ideas they conveyed, their source domains, their etymology and the conceptual metaphors they belonged to, in order to highlight potential tendencies. When available, the videos of the speeches were also analysed to see if the linguistic metaphor was accompanied with specific gestures; in addition, political posters were studied when the visual immigration metaphor corresponded to a source domain previously targeted in the spoken sources.\(^\text{10}\)

\(^{10}\) It should be noted that, in this part, the metaphors I will refer to will be in bold and italicised in the quotations; besides, when the speaker specifically stresses a word, the latter will be typed in bold, italics and capital letters.
3. American political discourse

3.1. Historical context

Immigration is deeply rooted in American history. Since Christopher Columbus’s discovery in 1492 and the arrival of British colonists in the 17th century the “New World” has never stopped witnessing people coming to its shores. Much more recently in the United States, Republican candidate Donald Trump unexpectedly won the race to the White House against Hillary Clinton on November 8th, 2016, putting immigration issues at the centre of his campaign. The business man’s main goal was to stop migrants and prevent them from entering the country.

Not only during the campaign but also as President of the United States, has immigration always been his spearhead and his speeches have always been filled with metaphors to talk about this very topic. Even when it seems quite inappropriate to mention immigration, for instance in a speech after the terrorist attack at the Pulse nightclub on June 12th, 2016 in Orlando, Florida, Donald Trump focuses on immigration, playing the political appropriation card. The murderer who killed 49 people was born in the United States, nevertheless we can notice 32 occurrences of words such as immigration, immigrated, immigrants and refugee in the Republican candidate’s Orlando speech, whereas Hillary Clinton’s speech about this dreadful attack contains absolutely no occurrence of those terms. Therefore, this clearly shows that Trump puts immigration at the heart of his policy.

Furthermore, metaphors about immigration prevail in Trump’s discourse, be they in speeches about foreign affairs, home affairs or even the economy. According to Delouis [2014: 1], anti-immigration politicians perhaps need to use more metaphors
than their pro-immigration opponents because they consider their own ideas as tremendously distinct from conventional and politically correct views. This very assertion has been confirmed quantitatively by the study of my corpus where Donald Trump's speeches and xenophobic ideas show almost four times as many metaphors as Hillary Clinton's discourse [Figure 10]:

![Figure 10: Repartition of immigration metaphors between Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton.](image)

Thus, Clinton uses far fewer immigration metaphors than Trump; moreover, we shall see that when she does use them, it is very often either to quote her adversary's words or to rephrase them with a negation. Sometimes, she uses the same metaphors as her opponent but with very different target domains. In this campaign, her goal was clearly to reunite the country and to offer a welcoming and tolerant policy that would allow people in need to come to the United States whereas Trump's was more about stopping immigration. In this part, we shall see the differences and similarities between the two candidates when they speak metaphorically about immigration to express severely

---

11 Study carried out on a total of 170 metaphors about immigration.
opposed ideologies. The metaphors analysed in this corpus study have been given special attention due to their efficiency and frequency.

As previously shown, the current president of the United States is used to employing immigration metaphors to a much greater degree than his Democratic opponent. All his metaphors are extremely diverse and belong to all sorts of categories: *dead*, *semi-lexicalized* and *lexicalized* and we will see if one of these types prevails. We will also see that they are, as expected, very often dysphemistic. We will try to find out if there are differences between a tense situation and a more diplomatic one and between Donald Trump as candidate and as president. He very often resorts to metaphors portraying immigrants as uncivilised, dangerous and violent people, emphasising the idea that immigrants are unknown, considering immigration a subterfuge as well as an economic problem. The 45th president of the United States also creates a clear dichotomy between immigrants and American citizens, describing foreigners as criminals and Americans as victims.

3.2. Immigrants are uncivilised

We don’t take care of our veterans. We take care of illegal immigrants, people that come into the country illegally, better than we take care of our vets. That can’t happen. Our policemen and women are disrespected. We need law and order, but we need justice, too. *Our inner cities are a disaster. You get shot walking to the store. They have no education. They have no jobs.* [Donald Trump, "Third and Final Presidential Debate", October 19th, 2016]

Many of the metaphors Trump uses in his speeches depict immigrants as uncivilised such as in the example above. He clearly wants to make them appear as
barbaric, violent or even dirty sometimes. He emphasises the idea that they do not
have the same values and that their ideologies and habits are unquestionably different.
Indeed, according to him, immigrants are not civilised as they have “no education” and
“no jobs”; moreover, he does not qualify his judgement as he employs the pronoun
“they”, including all immigrants, which is, in this case, more a metonym as he talks
about all of them instead of some of them. He says that American cities have become
“a disaster” because of immigration, and this very metaphor conveys the idea that
these cities are disordered as it etymologically means that there is an inauspicious
location of the stars in the universe.

3.2.1. Dirt and disorder

To highlight the dichotomy civilised vs. uncivilised, Trump uses the two
following conceptual metaphors: IMMIGRANTS ARE DIRTY OBJECTS and IMMIGRANTS ARE A
MESS. According to him, people who are immigrating to the United States are those who
have been rejected from their home countries. For instance, in a speech at the FBI
National Academy Graduation Ceremony in Quantico, Virginia, on December 15th,
2017, as President, he used the metaphor IMMIGRANTS ARE DIRTY, saying that immigrants
who were coming were so “bad” that they were put in a bin in their own countries.
Thus, he sees migrants as garbage as if their lives were disposable: “Do you think they
are giving us their best people? No (laughter). They give us their worst people, they
put them in a bin”. This metaphor of the bin is obviously a dysphemism, it refers to
many derogatory characteristics and portrays immigrants as dirty waste.
Furthermore, Trump’s body language and paralinguistic vocal features show
disrespect to refugees. First, the laughter indicates that he does not really take the
issue seriously and, then, he accompanies his verbal metaphor by gestures mimicking someone throwing something in a bin and closing the lid with his right hand as shown in the screenshot hereafter [Figure 11]:

![Figure 11: Donald Trump, “They put them in a bin”, Quantico, Virginia, December 15th, 2017](image)

This metaphorical gesture, which goes with a co-occurring verbal metaphor, deeply emphasises Trump’s point of view. The audience has to cognitively resort to two of the five different senses of the human body: hearing and sight. Therefore, his message becomes twice as powerful and it probably becomes easier to remember, especially for some listeners who also become eye-witnesses. The target domain which is IMMIGRATION and the source domain which is DIRT for both the verbal and gestural metaphor are exactly the same, thus, the gesture is only reinforcing and stressing what is being said so as to support its effect. Furthermore, Trump’s right hand is not static and “motion attracts our attention more than anything else. Even a new-born baby reacts to an object moving across its visual field” [Radden and Dirven 2007: 278]. Therefore, this multimodal metaphor is likely to have a bigger impact on the audience and to be memorised more easily than a monomodal one.
Hillary Clinton also uses this type of metaphor portraying immigrants as garbage in order to precisely condemn these kinds of ideas. For instance, she said in her speech at the Democratic National Convention in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, on July 28th, 2016: "We have to heal the divides in our country. [...] So, let's put ourselves in the shoes of young black and Latino men and women who [...] are made to feel like their lives are disposable." This metaphor clearly condemns people who think immigrants are inferior and its aim is to show that her opponent is cruel. With this example, comparing human life to an object as disposable as a diaper or a tissue, Hillary Clinton wants to show her voters that Donald Trump has xenophobic ideas.

A similar metaphor, employed by Trump is the following: IMMIGRANTS ARE A MESS. It also depicts immigrants as uncivilised people, as in the following example pronounced by Trump in his “immigration speech” in Phoenix, Arizona, on August 31st, 2016, where he said: "And now, finally, we will turn the tables and law enforcement will be allowed to clear up this dangerous and threatening mess". On the one hand, the verb “clear” definitely means that immigration is considered a disorder and a deviation from the norm. Moreover, from the 14th century, according to the Online Etymology Dictionary, this verb meant: “to make clean, cleanse, purify; clarify (a liquid), remove what clouds or diminishes brightness or transparency”. Therefore, these metaphors refer once again to Trump’s idea that immigrants are not pure and clean, which is reinforced by the use of the noun “mess” indicating that immigration is synonymous with chaos and dirt.
3.2.2. Violence and Criminality

While Hillary Clinton clearly wants to highlight the idea that immigrants are mostly composed of peaceful families, the Republican candidate makes them appear as dangerous as possible in his speeches. He even tells lies about real facts, for instance in an interview on ABC on November 22nd, 2015, Donald Trump said: “When I look at the migration and the lines and I see all strong, very powerful looking men, they’re men and I see very few women, I see very few children, there’s something strange going on”, to which the journalist George Stephanopoulos replied: “Just for the record, though, the statistics do show the majority of the refugees coming in are women and children”. This strategy proves that Trump’s aim is to make migrants look dangerous with the use of adjectives such as “strong” or “powerful” although those words do not describe reality, which is perhaps the reason why he uses so many metaphors, compared to his opponent, as they enable him to hide some parts of the truth more cunningly thanks to the highlighting-hiding process. Indeed, he very often wishes to highlight the idea that migrants are powerful and dangerous while hiding the fact that they are most of the time women and children.

To convince his voters that immigration is something that should stop or at least be more controlled in the US, Trump does not only portray migrants as dirty and messy but also as violent criminals and very often associates two distinct topics: immigration and terrorism, making them appear as only one big issue. For instance, as previously mentioned, even when he is supposed to talk about terrorism, his speeches turn into anti-immigration discourse such as in Orlando where he pronounced the words (im)migration/im(migrants) as many times as words such as terrorism/terrorist (32 occurrences each). Furthermore, to emphasise the idea of
danger, he said in the same speech: “The killer, whose name I will not use, or ever say, was born in Afghan, of Afghan parents, who immigrated to the United States.” Trump clearly highlights the foreign origin of the terrorist – although he was born in the U.S. – with the repetition of “Afghan” and the use of the principle of end-focus which puts the most important information at the end of the sentence. Therefore, the Republican candidate focuses on the fact that the killer was not American. For him, the main information in this sentence is that the killer’s parents were not born in the U.S. but “immigrated”. On the contrary, Hillary Clinton’s goal is to dissociate the attack from the foreign origin of the killer. During the final presidential debate on October 19th, 2016 in Las Vegas, she even insisted on the fact that the terrorist was born in the U.S.: “In fact, the killer of the dozens of people at the nightclub in Orlando, the Pulse nightclub, was born in Queens, the same place Donald was born. So, let’s be clear about what the threat is and how we are best going to be able to meet it.” Thus, the Democratic candidate clearly wants to make the distinction between terrorism and migration while the pattern associating criminality and immigration becomes a sort of routine in the business man’s addresses. For example, in his speech in Phoenix, each time he refers to a crime, he systematically mentions that the person who committed the crime was an immigrant as in the following examples:

The man who killed her arrived at the border, entered federal custody, and then was released into a U.S. community under the policies of this White House. [...] Also among the victims of the Obama-Clinton open borders policies was Grant Ronnebeck, a 21-year-old convenience store clerk in Mesa, Arizona. He was murdered by an illegal immigrant gang member. [...] Another victim is Kate Steinle, gunned down in the Sanctuary City of San Francisco by an illegal immigrant deported five previous times. [...] Then there is the case of 90-year-old Earl Olander, who was brutally beaten and left to bleed to death in his home. The
perpetrators were illegal *immigrants*. [...] In California, a 64-year-old Air Force Veteran, Marilyn Pharis, was *sexually assaulted and beaten to death* with a hammer. Her killer had been arrested on multiple occasions, but was never *deported*.

The way Trump builds this series of parallelism profoundly emphasises the conceptual metaphor: IMMIGRANTS ARE KILLERS. He methodically links some criminal acts to immigration and vice versa to create a general rule so that his audience associates immigration with violence and thus, with something dangerous for the country. Furthermore, he thinks that crime is always the consequence of immigration, using the metaphor of “the result” as if this phenomenon was mathematical, such as in the following example:

> What we do know, despite the total lack of media curiosity, is that Hillary Clinton promises a radical amnesty combined with a radical reduction in immigration enforcement. *The result* will be millions more *illegal immigrants*, thousands more violent *crimes*, and total *chaos* and *lawlessness*. [Donald Trump, Phoenix, August 31st, 2016]

This metaphor shows once again that he systematically sees immigrants as criminals and brutal people. After the attack in Orlando he said that a majority of immigrants had violent and barbaric ideologies, using a synecdoche and its part-whole relationship: “We cannot continue to allow thousands upon thousands of people to pour into our country same thing *many of whom* have *the same thought process as this savage killer*.” With the use of the quantifier “many”, Trump indicates that there is a large quantity of migrants who have all the attributes of murderers. In this example, the speaker’s goal is to create a general rule from only one specific example, a part becomes the whole, so that in return his voters believe that immigration is dangerous and that all refugees are uncivilised. Moreover, this metonymic aspect is very frequent in Trump’s discourse as he frequently uses the expression “illegal immigrants” (24
occurrences in the Phoenix speech only) to talk about immigrants in general which is
dysphemistic and underlines that they are against the law.

This idea of danger is also extremely present when Trump talks about Muslims.
According to him, mosques are “hot spots”, as he said in an interview on the phone
with ABC channel on November 22\textsuperscript{nd}, 2016:

\begin{quote}
I want to surveil mosques. I want mosques surveilled. We were doing it
New York City for a while until the worst mayor that New York City has
ever had got elected --De Blasio, which was a fluke. Certainly, there are
certain hot spots and everybody knows they're hot spots.
\end{quote}

Firstly, he wants these places of worship to be monitored, which means that he
clearly thinks they are unsafe as if he were watching and spying an enemy during a
war. Then, to reinforce this dimension of danger, he uses the “hot spot” metaphor as
he compares some mosques to something hot which underlines the idea that one can
get burnt, emphasising once again the danger of the Muslim place, the target domain
being danger and the source domain being heat. On the contrary, Hillary Clinton
highlights the fact that Muslims are not violent as in the following examples:

(1) Millions of peace-loving Muslims live, work and raise their families
across America. And they are the most likely to recognize the
insidious effects of radicalization before it's too late, and the best
positioned to help us block it. [Hillary Clinton, Cleveland, Ohio, June
13\textsuperscript{th}, 2016]

(2) We are not at war with Islam. And it is a mistake and it plays into
the hands of the terrorists to act as though we are. [Hillary Clinton,
Second Presidential Debate, October 9\textsuperscript{th}, 2016]

(3) Let's be clear, though, Islam is not our adversary. Muslims are peaceful
and tolerant people, and have nothing whatsoever to do with
terrorism. The obsession in some quarters with a clash of civilization,
or repeating the specific words radical Islamic terrorism isn't just a
distraction, it gives these criminals, these murderers more standing
than they deserve. *It actually plays into their hands* by alienating partners we need by our side. [Hillary Clinton, Council on Foreign Relations, November 19th, 2016]

In examples (2) and (3) she uses some forms of negations with repetitions of words such as “nothing” or “not” to show that the relationship between Muslim immigration and terrorism, advocated by her opponent, is absolutely wrong. For her the very existence of the conflation associating Islam and terrorism must be dismantled. Moreover, she even goes further in these two examples saying that linking Islam and ISIS is serving terrorism itself. To make her point, she employs the metaphorical idiom “play into somebody’s hands”, comparing the situation to a game, the Game being the source domain and Politics the target domain of the metaphor. This means that those kinds of thoughts actually give advantage to terrorists, they are offering them what they precisely expect and need. This pattern is very frequent in the Democratic candidate’s speeches and during the Second Presidential debate Hillary Clinton even used the metaphor of the gift to describe Trump’s ideas, saying: “[What Trump says] is *a gift* to ISIS and the terrorists, violent jihadist terrorists.” Once again, this very metaphor underlines that the association of Muslim immigration to terrorism is wrong and effectively offers a beautiful present to terrorists. In examples (1) and (3) she highlights the non-violent aspects of Islam, using the semantic fields of love and peace to describe Muslims in order to contrast with Trump anti-immigrant and anti-Muslim policy, which portrays refugees and foreigners as violent people.
3.2.3. Us vs. them: dichotomy and unity

One of the great differences between the two American candidates concerns the idea of unity. While Clinton wishes to gather and welcome everyone, Trump's main goal is to give priority to American citizens. Moreover, to make immigrants appear as violent persons, Trump insists on the need to protect the U.S. as if the country were at war. He often portrays American citizens as the victims who need to be saved from dangerous immigrants, creating a real distinction between the two groups. As previously mentioned, this polarisation frequently generates two different categories: “the civilized” and “the uncivilized”. First, the Republican candidate constantly uses the metaphor of the “protection” to emphasise this dichotomy such as in the following examples:

We have a dysfunctional immigration system, which does not permit us to know who we let into our country, and it does not permit us to protect our citizens properly. [...] [The immigration laws of the United States give the president powers to suspend entry into the country of any class of persons] and I will use this power to protect the American people. [...] Each year the United States permanently admits 100,000 immigrants from the Middle East and many more from Muslim countries outside of the Middle East. Our government has been admitting ever-growing numbers, year after year, without any effective plan for our own security. [...] When I’m president I pledge to protect and defend all Americans who live inside our borders. [...] America will be a tolerant and open society. America will also be a safe society. We will protect our borders at home. [...] We will ensure every parent can raise their children in peace and safety. [Trump, Orlando, June 13th, 2016]

It’s time to support our police, to protect our families, and to save American lives. [Trump, “Meeting with Immigration Crime Victims”, Washington, June 28th, 2016]
With these examples, Trump wants to highlight that the United States needs protection and that immigration is to blame for the lack of protection. As he sees immigrants as dangerous people, it becomes necessary for him to defend his country against immigration. Indeed, as he deeply insists on this idea of protection, he acts as if immigrants were attacking the U.S., creating the following conceptual metaphor in his voters’ minds: IMMIGRANTS ARE SOLDIERS. Therefore, people who witness these kinds of speeches picture the U.S. as a country that has to be defended against only one danger: immigration. Thus, the opposition is created, splitting apart innocent Americans and violent foreigners. Furthermore, the dichotomy is complete as Trump frequently uses either the adjective “American” or the possessive determiner “our” to show that American citizens are his priority and, as previously mentioned, even though this possessive determiner seems inclusive as it refers to the speaker and his listeners, it is in fact quite exclusive in this case as it underlines his “America First” policy, rejecting other nationalities. Furthermore, he very often vocally stresses this type of pronouns, reinforcing the ideological dichotomy, such as in his immigration speech in Phoenix when he said: “The fundamental problem with the immigration system in our country is that [...] it doesn’t serve YOU the American people. Our greatest compassion must be for OUR American citizens.”

Hillary Clinton’s strategy is entirely different. Her main goal is to avoid this dichotomy and to welcome immigrants, using metaphors that give a sense of unity to the country. On her official website http://hillaryclinton.com, it is written:

Hillary has been committed to the immigrant rights community throughout her career. As president, she will work to fix our broken immigration system and stay true to our fundamental American values:
that we are a nation of immigrants, and we treat those who come to our
country with dignity and respect—and that we **embrace immigrants**.

The verb “embrace” is used metaphorically as it literally means taking
somebody in one’s arms. In this case, this is a *semi-lexicalised* metaphor as readers do
not picture people hugging immigrants; though, they do understand that it means
welcoming them, this metaphor clearly shows that contrary to Trump she does not
want to separate immigrants from American citizens but to include them. This pattern
of unity and gathering was very frequent in Clinton’s campaign, such as in her speech
in Reno, Nevada, on August 25th, 2016, where she preached for diversity and inclusion:

> And I promise you this: with your help, I will be a President for
Democrats, Republicans, and Independents. For those who vote for me
and those who don’t. For all Americans. Because I believe we are
stronger **TOGETHER**. It’s a vision for the future rooted in our values and
reflected in a rising generation of young people who are the most open,
diverse, and connected we’ve ever seen. And you look at the **diversity** of
our athletes. Just look at our fabulous Olympic team representing the
**UNITED** states of America. Like Ibtihaj Muhammad, an African-American
Muslim from New Jersey who won the bronze medal in fencing with
grace and skill. Would she even have a place in Donald Trump’s America?

This example is quite telling as she clearly emphasises the idea of unity thanks to the
inclusive determiner “all” and the adverb “together”. Those words are used as
metaphors as they are referring to abstract notions here. “All Americans” cannot
possibly work “together” but it is a way to express ideas of solidarity and inclusion, the
metaphor is *lexicalised*, speakers are not even aware she is using a metaphor.
Moreover, she stresses the words “together” and “united” in her speech, pronouncing
them more loudly than the others. On top of that, she accompanies her words with
gestures, which is very rare in Hillary Clinton’s body language as she always stays
extremely calm when she speaks, never moving her hands. However, in this speech,
when she pronounces the word “together”, she puts her right hand on her heart in order to show this is important for her, as shown in the screenshot hereafter [Figure 12]:

Figure 12: Hillary Clinton, “We are stronger TOGETHER”, Reno, Nevada, August 31st, 2016

This hand on her heart does not describe what she is saying but what she feels; thus, her gesture plays on emotions, which is also a cognitive strategy as it enables her to persuade her audience with feelings. In this case, the verbal and the gestural metaphors do not have the same source and target domains as the gesture is only there to reinforce the candidate's honesty as if her hand meant: “Believe me, I am being honest with you.” This gesture could be compared to a metalinguistic feature, indicating how to interpret what she is saying. Therefore, her words and her body language have two complementary but different meanings as her gesture cannot be seen as a direct representation of what she is saying.

To reinforce this idea of solidarity, she also stresses the word “united” when she talks about the United States. Furthermore, she clenches her fist to show her determination and perhaps also to represent the idea of unity she wants to convey, keeping the fingers in her right hand all together in an energetic gesture, as shown in the following screenshot [Figure 13]:
In this example, Hillary Clinton refers to the variety of the American Olympic team, which is composed of athletes with different backgrounds. According to her, this team is a real symbol of unity and it represents the values of the country. She wants to oppose Donald Trump’s polarised vision of the United States, offering a totally different idea, which is based on inclusion. The past participle “united”, used as an adjective, is in a way stressed twice; both with her voice and with her gesture. Her clenched fist is also figurative, with the five different fingers tight together, and is a representation of the verbal metaphor, which emphasises unity. This idea exists in almost all her speeches, for instance when she accepted the nomination as a candidate for the Democratic party, on July 28th, 2016, she declared: “Our country’s motto is *e pluribus unum*: out of many, we are one.”

3.3. Container and Content

One of the metaphors that the two American political parties often use is the ontological metaphor THE U.S. IS A CONTAINER. It enables them to describe the United
States as an entity with an inside, an outside and clear borders. This container is able to receive contents (immigrants) that are often depicted as water.

3.3.1. Container

Radden and Dirven [2007: 16] explain that orientational metaphors are really effective and very common in discourse because they cognitively rely on basic spatial aspects linked with our physical world. They write that these metaphors “make particularly good source domains because they have developed from our earliest bodily and spatial experiences and hence are immediately meaningful to us”. That is why people tend to understand very easily CONTAINER metaphors as they resort to the image of the “interior” and the “exterior” of things, exactly like what they experience every day with their own bodies. This is all the more true in political discourse and more particularly in discourse about immigration that describes the host country as a HOUSE and the borders as the DOORS of this house so that listeners can easily picture the political issue. For example, in a speech at the Council on Foreign Relations in New York City on November 19th, 2015, Hillary Clinton uttered the following sentence: “Turning away orphans, applying a religious test, discriminating against Muslims, slamming the door on every Syrian refugee, that is just not who we are. We are better than that.” This metaphor is semi-lexicalised as the listener does understand that it means rejecting migrants and preventing them from entering the U.S. although they do not picture somebody brutally closing a door. However, the negation in the last part of Clinton’s sentence shows that this idea is wrong. Thus, the U.S. becomes a HOUSE and the borders the DOORS of the house, which means there are two different conceptual metaphors: AMERICA IS A HOUSE and AMERICAN BORDERS ARE DOORS. The HOUSE clearly shows
the idea of comfort; it implies that American citizens are the owners of this house and that they should be able to decide who can enter it. The same metaphor is also frequently found in Trump’s discourse who denounces an “open-border immigration system”, as in the following example:

Immigration law doesn’t exist just for the purpose of keeping out criminals. It exists to protect all aspects of American life – the worksite, the welfare office, the education system and much else. That is why immigration limits are established in the first place. If we only enforce the laws against crime, then we have an open border to the entire world. [Trump, Phoenix, Arizona, August 31st, 2016]

The metaphor THE U.S. IS A HOUSE has been represented according to Turner’s Conceptual Integration Theory hereafter [Figure 14]. The two agents of this metaphor are characterised by American citizens and immigrants in the first input space representing the country; they respectively correspond to the owners and the guests of a house in the second input space. The limits of the country are the borders and they are equivalent to the doors of the house. Those borders and doors define a comfortable zone where people are safe. As Charteris-Black [2006: 577] explains, container metaphors are quite positive if we consider the agent who is in control (in this case American citizens who welcome refugees) but rather negative when it refers to people who need help (immigrants). As the source domain of the container involves an inside and an outside, the “them” enters the “us” [Van Dijk 2008: 98] and the idea of violation and a sense of incursion are created. Thus, the blended area becomes: immigration is an invasion. This clearly shows the potential dangers of metaphors in political discourse and more particularly in anti-immigration speeches.
The **container** source domain also enables politicians to control immigration, arguing that this container is too small to welcome more refugees and that it is about to burst. According to Charteris-Black [2006: 577] this type of metaphor refers to “pressures on the container from the inside”. Such pressures require limits, as Trump said in his speech in Phoenix: “Those who have left to seek entry under this new system will not be awarded surplus visas, but will have to enter under the **immigration caps** or limits that will be established.” The noun “caps” is used to refer to the lid of a bottle. This metaphor portrays once again the host country as a container and immigration as its content.

3.3.2. Content

This content is very often composed of liquids and especially water. As previously mentioned, immigrants are portrayed as water by far-right politicians as
this metaphor refers to natural catastrophes such as floods or tsunamis, underlining their dangerous dimension thanks to the highlighting-hiding principle. Behind it, the following conceptual thought process is hidden: (1) IMMIGRANTS ARE WATER, (2) WATER IS A DANGEROUS ENTITY, therefore (1)+(2) IMMIGRANTS ARE DANGEROUS ENTITIES. This is very frequent in Trump's discourse, such as in the following examples:

(1) We have to stop the tremendous flow of Syrian refugees into the United States. [Trump, Orlando, Florida, June 13th, 2016]

(2) But we now have an obligation to control future immigration – following previous immigration waves. [Trump, Phoenix, Arizona, August 31th, 2016]

(3) She wants open borders. People are going to pour into our country.
[Trump, Third Presidential Debate, Las Vegas, Nevada, October 19th, 2016]

In examples (1) and (2), immigrants are compared to water that comes from a river or the ocean; moreover, the lexicalised metaphor of the “flow” is emphasised by the adjective “tremendous” in example (1), while in example (3), the verb “pour” refers to a heavy rain and echoes drops of water coming from the sky. Thus, the WATER source domain does not only refer to the dangerousness and power of the liquid but also to its directional dimension as it is able to come from all sides. Trump particularly likes to use the verb “pour”, probably because it strengthens the uncontrollable dimension of immigration; indeed, it is possible to stop water coming from the ocean or a river by building a dam or a ditch; however, it becomes almost impossible to stop water coming directly from above. In addition, as the verb “pour” illustrates a descending movement, it refers to the conceptual metaphor DOWN IS BAD. These examples all convey the conceptual metaphor IMMIGRATION IS A NATURAL DISASTER and according to Charteris-Black [2006: 572] they are also deeply linked with the conceptual metaphor CHANGE IS MOVEMENT as they rely, as previously mentioned, on up-down and right-left
relationships. The concept of **natural catastrophe** is quite productive as it shows universality; everywhere in the world human beings experience floods, drought, tides, earthquakes, etc. Those experiences very often echo unusual phenomena that are literally *ab-normal*, therefore water metaphors depict immigration as something *deviating* from the norm in far-right political discourse which is dysphemistic.

For Hillary Clinton, the source domain is the same (*water*) but the target domain is different, it can be one of the following domains: terrorism, far-right ideas or Donald Trump himself. For instance, in a speech in Reno, Nevada on August 25th, 2016, she said:

> In 2015, Trump launched his own campaign for President with another racist lie. He described Mexican immigrants as rapists and criminals. [...] Since then, there’s been a steady *stream* of bigotry (1). We all remember when Trump said a distinguished federal judge born in Indiana couldn’t be trusted to do his job because, quote, “He’s a Mexican.” [...] Ever since the Pilgrims landed on Plymouth Rock, America has distinguished itself as a *haven* (2) for people fleeing religious persecution. [...] Today, there is a *rising tide* of hardline (3), right-wing nationalism around the world.

In examples (1) and (3), she uses the source domain of *water* to highlight the dangerousness of racism and far-right ideology; xenophobia becomes as risky as a torrent or a tide. Thus, Hillary Clinton employs the same metaphor as her opponent but with a totally different target domain. In the second example, she compares the United States to a harbour to emphasise the welcoming characteristic of the country, hence the source domain of *water* remains.

During her speech in New York, on November 19th, 2015, after the Paris attacks, she also used the conceptual metaphor of *water*, but this time to highlight the danger of terrorism, comparing the fighters to *water*:
Our strategy should have three main elements. One, defeat ISIS in Syria, Iraq and across the Middle East; two, disrupt and dismantle the growing terrorist infrastructure that facilitates the *flow of fighters*, financing arms and propaganda around the world [...].

Therefore, the use of the *water* metaphor clearly seems to refer to something threatening for the two political parties, as only the target domain changes; nevertheless, they do not see danger coming from the same issues. For Trump, immigration is the threat while Clinton portrays Trump’s ideas as the incarnation of danger which is summarised in the illustration hereafter. In other words, they both highlight the uncontrolled, dangerous and powerful characteristics of water but to talk about different topics, as Trump compares immigration to water while Clinton uses this specific source domain to define far-right policies, terrorism of even Trump himself [*Figure 15*]:

![Figure 15: Same source domain (water) for both candidates to talk about different target domains](image)

3.3.3. Motion: from the outside to the inside

As previously mentioned, both the *container* and *water* metaphors rely on the main conceptual metaphor *change is motion*. The *container* sets the borders of the host
country defining an inside and an outside while the water source domain indicates that there is a movement from the outside to the inside. Radden and Dirven [2007: 274-275] give the example of the deictic verb go, which refers to a movement away from the speaker. This is illustrated by Donald Trump's gesture in his speech in Phoenix [Figure 16] when he says he wants to expel illegal immigrants as in the following example: “Number Two: we are going to end catch-and-release. We catch them, oh go ahead. We catch them, go ahead.” When he says; “go ahead”, his right hand goes up as if he were getting rid of a mosquito:

Figure 16: Trump, “We catch them, oh go ahead”, Phoenix, Arizona, August 31st, 2016

This gestural metaphor clearly represents a movement away from the speaker. Donald Trump's goal is to show that he will dispel immigrants away from the United States just as he is dispelling his own hand away from him. In the same speech [Figure 17], he also said that expelling those immigrants would be his priority: “Day one, my first hour in office, those people are gone.” When he utters the word “gone”, he moves his right hand pointing to the back of the room to show the movement from the inside to the outside:
These directional, *lexicalised* metaphors are predominant in Trump's discourse about immigration as they indicate movement. They either refer to refugees entering or leaving the U.S. These metaphors are productive because they rely on spatial experiences that are easily understood by the audience. Phrasal verbs are very often employed by English speakers and this is all the more confirmed in immigration discourse. The metaphor is usually carried by the adverb of the phrasal verb, which is called the particle. For instance: “They go *out*, and they go *out* fast” [Trump, Phoenix, Arizona, August 31st, 2016]. In this example, the particle “out” metaphorically describes a movement from the U.S. (A) to the immigrants’ home country (B). Some prepositional verbs also enable the speaker to focus on the opposite movement, such as: “They’re coming *in*, [...]. People are coming *into* our country like we have no idea who they are, where they are from, what their feelings about our country is, and she wants 550 percent more.” [Trump, Second Presidential Debate, October 9th, 2016]. The two prepositions “in” and “into” carry a metaphor also indicating movement, but this time immigrants are going from (B) to (A). Furthermore, the use of “into” and “in” by the Republican candidate highlights the fact that refugees are not only coming to but
staying in the U.S., which is not a temporary situation. Only one occurrence describing an upward movement has been found in the American corpus: “We’re getting them out as fast as we can get them out, and we’re freeing up towns.” [President Trump, Washington, June 28th, 2017]. In this example, the verb “free” and the particle “up” are used metaphorically. They clearly give the image that immigration is synonymous with oppression and that Americans cities have to be liberated. In this case, the conceptual metaphor UP IS GOOD is highlighted.

These directional metaphors are not frequently used by Hillary Clinton to talk about immigration. Only two occurrences have been found; during the third and final presidential debate on October 19th, 2016, she said: “Now, what I am also arguing is that bringing undocumented immigrants out of the shadows, putting them into the formal economy will be good, because then employers can’t exploit them and undercut Americans’ wages.” The preposition “out” is associated with the metaphor of “the shadow”, which means she wants immigrants to work legally for the United States. In this case, the shadow is synonymous with black market. Legality is metaphorically associated with light and illegality with darkness. Thus, Hillary Clinton wants immigrants to leave illegality and join the official economic system of the country: the movement is from darkness to light. Then, on her official website, it is written: “[The immigration reform] will treat every person with dignity, fix the family visa backlog, uphold the rule of law, protect our borders and national security, and bring millions of hardworking people into the formal economy.” With this example readers do not picture refugees coming from their home country to the U.S. at all, as Clinton’s metaphors underline the economic dimension of immigration. Refugees are not called immigrants anymore but “hardworking people” and they do not enter the United States but a prolific economic system.
3.3.4. Immigration: inside or outside the economy

And we’ll build a path to citizenship for millions of immigrants who are already contributing to our economy! [...] Comprehensive immigration reform will grow our economy keep families together - and it’s the right thing to do. [Hillary Clinton, Democratic National Convention, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, on July 28th, 2016]

When politicians talk about immigration reform, they usually mean the following: amnesty, open borders, and lower wages. [...] On top of that, illegal immigration costs our country more than $113 billion dollars a year. For the money we are going to spend on illegal immigration over the next ten years, we could provide one million at-risk students with a school voucher. [...] Hillary Clinton has pledged amnesty in her first 100 days, and her plan will provide Obamacare, Social Security and Medicare for illegal immigrants – breaking the federal budget. [...] For the price of resettling 1 refugee in the United States, 12 could be resettled in a safe zone in their home region. [...] And let’s get unemployed Americans off of welfare and back to work in their own country. [Donald Trump, Phoenix, Arizona, August 31st, 2016]

As shown in the previous examples, the economic dimension is often used as a source domain by the two political parties. Immigration is either seen as something positive for the American economy by Clinton or as something negative by Trump. For Hillary Clinton immigration is “contributing” to the economy of the U.S. and is considered an advantage while the businessman focuses on the “price” of keeping immigrants in the country. Indeed, his main claim both during the campaign and as President is that immigrants are taking the jobs of American citizens. Using words such as “price” or “cost”, he metaphorically portrays refugees as expensive merchandise, who must be sent back. The conceptual metaphor IMMIGRATION IS AN ECONOMIC FAILURE, is also largely
used as a visual metaphor on the White House’s official website, such as in the picture hereafter [Figure 18]:

**Figure 18: IMMIGRATION IS AN ECONOMIC FAILURE, [https://www.whitehouse.gov/articles/time-end-chain-migration/](https://www.whitehouse.gov/articles/time-end-chain-migration/), December 15th, 2017**

This text has been organised so that viewers directly see the figure written in capital letters and the dollar sign; moreover, the background is dark to highlight the idea of an economic catastrophe and its serious dimension. However, the rest of the text is quite vague and has been written with a smaller typography. The number has been given by “one study”, the determiner “one” indicates that one study has been extracted amongst a group of other studies, the name of the research institute is not even mentioned, it is impossible to know who carried out this study and the only information provided is that it confirms a “general agreement”. Clearly then, the idea of this picture, which has been created for the White House’s website, is to make American citizens focus on money and see the economic deficit as a direct consequence of immigration.
3.4. Trump’s Immigration in disguise

3.4.1. Immigration as a ruse

To highlight his anti-immigrant policy, Trump focuses on the unknown. One of his strategies is to claim that it is impossible to check the identity and origin of a refugee; it is impossible to know who she/he is and what she/he thinks. During the campaign, he employed the Trojan horse metaphor at least once in each immigration speech, referring to the Greek legend. This tale concerns a military ruse; the Greeks built a wooden horse and soldiers were hidden in it to enter the city of Troy in disguise. This metaphor is a cultural one as it relies on shared knowledge, the audience must know the legend to understand the metaphor. It is *semi-lexicalised* as it meant “ambush-from-within” in Roman times, according to the *Online Etymology Dictionary*, but Trump is the only one who uses it to describe immigration. Today, this specific metaphor also describes a computer virus and the source domain is the same: a subterfuge. If we think of the *highlighting-hiding principle*, the conceptual metaphor *immigration is a Trojan horse* highlights once again the dangerous aspect of immigration, comparing refugees to terrorists in disguise while hiding the fact that most of them are women and children such as in the following examples:

(1) *We have no idea who these people are.* When the Syrian refugees are going to start pouring into this country, we don’t know if they’re ISIS, we don’t know if it’s a *Trojan horse*. [Trump, ABC interview, New York City, New York, November 22nd, 2015]

(2) People are coming into our country like *we have no idea who they are, where they are from, what their feelings about our country is,* and she wants 550 percent more. This is going to be the great *Trojan horse* of all time. [Trump, Second Presidential Debate, St. Louis, Missouri, October 9th, 2016]
This metaphor clearly means that according to the Republican candidate, immigration is a trick that enables killers undercover to enter the U.S. and attack the country from the inside. He portrays immigration as something as unwanted and as dangerous as a computer virus. Moreover, to emphasise this idea of the unknown and thus create a sense of paranoia, the Trojan horse comparison is frequently accompanied with expressions such as: “we have no idea who these people are” or “we have no idea who’s being sent in here”. Besides, in example (1), Trump points at immigrants, using the definite article “the” to talk about Syrian refugees, which creates a clear-cut category and which highlights once again the dichotomy between “us” and “them” Trump is willing to nurture.

3.4.2. Aliens

Cunningham-Parmeter [2011: 1556] explains: “The metaphor IMMIGRANTS ARE ILLEGAL ALIENS, for example, highlights the criminal characteristics of some immigrants (the target domain), while ignoring the fact that most immigrants reside legally in the United States.” This dead metaphor is frequently used by Donald Trump in his speeches, for instance during his meeting with the “immigration crime victims” on June 28th, 2017, he said: “The No Sanctuary for Criminals Act [...] will cut federal grant money to cities that shield dangerous criminal aliens from being turned over to federal law enforcement.” According to the Oxford English Dictionary, the term “alien” means “belonging to a foreign country”. However, this term comes from the Latin word alienus which means strange or other. In other words, this metaphor can be considered a dead metaphor as it is used every day but the speaker is not even conscious of the etymology, and the definition which has been given is lexicalised.
This type of expressions may be extremely hazardous because, through the dead metaphor, the audience may take a shortcut and associate the domain of foreignness with the domain of strangeness and thus, replace the notion of otherness by the notion of danger. The term “alien” seems to be more popular in Republican speeches than in Democratic speeches. For instance, it is largely used on Ted Cruz’s official website, one of the other Republican candidates who describes his immigration plan and writes on tedcruz.org: “We must reverse President Obama’s enforcement “priorities,” which allow a large number of criminal aliens to unlawfully remain in the United States”. Especially in immigration discourse, dead metaphors like this one can be particularly dangerous as they contain implicit connotations, thus, voters are not aware of them and that is why they are more likely to agree with far-right candidates than they would have been, had the anti-immigration idea been presented in a more explicit and direct way.

3.5. President Trump and immigration metaphors

In this subpart, only Trump’s speeches as President of the United States have been taken into account. Two major new key conceptual metaphors appeared in the businessman’s discourse about immigration when he joined the White House: IMMIGRATION IS A CHAIN and IMMIGRATION IS LOTTERY. Those latter were never used during the campaign but became omnipresent in the president’s speeches and even on the White House’s official website.

---

12 No occurrence was found in our corpus.
3.5.1. Chain Migration

One of the metaphors that appeared only after the presidential campaign is the metaphor of the chain. According to the 45th president of the U.S., immigration can be compared to a chain as one refugee will bring with him/her two other refugees from his/her family, who will in return bring two members of their families and so on. The White House website even gives a definition of chain migration as follows:

Chain Migration: The process by which foreign nationals permanently resettle within the U.S. and subsequently bring over their foreign relatives, who then have the opportunity to bring over their foreign relatives, and so on, until entire extended families are resettled within the country. Chain migration is a process that can continue without limit.

This metaphor is used many times by President Trump, such as at the FBI National Academy Graduation Ceremony in Quantico, Virginia on December 15th, 2017: “Terrorists have struck in the streets and subways of New York City twice in a few months. Both terrorists came to our country through the dysfunctional immigration system that we are correcting, and rapidly. And one came through chain migration.” The reason why he does not say “chain immigration” is possibly due to the difficult pronunciation of the latter.

The White House’s internet page about immigration contains a series of graphics and illustrations that are meant to explain the damage of chain migration; two of them are shown hereafter [Figure 19]:

---

**Figure 19:**

[Diagram showing chain migration process]

---
In the first illustration (1), the visual metaphor of the CHAIN is found, relationships between immigrants are represented by a sort of family tree, the lines between the figures are the links of the chain and show the “large number” (as written in the title) of refugees entering the U.S. If this schema is taken into account, two refugees are supposed to bring six relatives; nevertheless, in the second representation (2), this information is at variance with the first one as it indicates that two immigrants bring seven additional relatives. Besides, in example (2), the conceptual metaphor THE U.S. IS A CONTAINER is also represented as there is a map of the United States in the background where all the figures do not particularly fit, the inside and the outside are also well delimited as the bordering countries have been erased. Furthermore, immigrants are a bit dehumanised by those illustrations as they are only represented by a composition of simple dark geometric shapes. In illustration (2), the chain is less explicit than in the
first schema; indeed, the links between the figures are not represented, immigrants are just put side by side.

3.5.2. A lottery system

The other key metaphor Trump started to use after the election day is: THE IMMIGRATION SYSTEM IS LOTTERY. This metaphor is largely developed on the White House website as well as in President Trump’s speeches about immigration, such as in the following example:

You pick people. Do you think the country is giving us their best people? No. (Laughter.) What kind of a system is that? They come in by lottery. They give us their worst people, they put them in a bin [...]. Congratulations, you’re going to the United States. Okay. (Laughter.) What a system — lottery system. We’re calling for Congress to end chain migration and to end the visa lottery system, and replace it with a merit-based system of immigration. [Trump, FBI National Academy Graduation Ceremony, Quantico, Virginia, December 15th, 2017]

When President Trump employs this metaphor, he wants to emphasise the idea that immigration is not controlled. To him, refugees are chosen as randomly as the numbers of a lottery and it would be better for the country to select them on a “merit-based system”. This metaphor is a semi-lexicalised one, which has been created by Donald Trump himself for this specific topic; the source domain is CHANCE.

Once again, the former businessman accompanies his words with a gesture mimicking what he is saying, as shown in the screenshot hereafter [Figure 20]:

84
His gestural metaphor is mimetic as he acts as if he were the presenter of a lottery on TV, holding the handle of the lottery machine. As the verbal and visual metaphors are strictly the same, they also have the same target and source domains; respectively the **IMMIGRATION SYSTEM** and **CHANCE/RANDOMNESS**. As mentioned previously, this multimodal metaphor is quite effective as it relies on two of the five senses (hearing and sight); thus, it becomes easier for the audience to have a mental picture of this metaphor and, therefore, to memorise the idea behind it and agree with the speaker.

3.6. Conclusion

This corpus analysis on the United States has mainly focused on the Republican candidate as he uses almost four times as many immigration metaphors as his Democratic opponent (79% for Trump, 21% for Clinton). Those metaphors clearly highlight the dichotomy between “us” and “them” and usually portray immigrants as dangerous, inferior and uncivilised people as shown in the White House website page on immigration hereafter [*Figure 21*]:

---

*Figure 20: Trump, “they come in by lottery”, Quantico, Virginia, December 15th, 2017*
This is the first photograph we can find on the homepage concerning immigration. It summarises Trump’s ideas about this issue as it illustrates the dangerous dimension of immigration. The title of the page is “immigration” but there is no refugee in the photograph, only armed policemen and members of the border patrol, which highlights the superiority of the United States. Immigration metaphors used by the Republican candidate are most of the time dysphemistic, Trump uses them to create a sense of fear and to make his audience reject immigrants. Many of them are vivid as they are shaped by the businessman himself. Concerning the number of metaphors, there are no differences between a “tense” speech (after a terrorist attack) and a “neutral” one; however, the politician mentions as much immigration as terrorism in “tense” speeches, to make refugees appear as terrorists and vice-versa.

On the contrary, Hillary Clinton wants unity and insists on inclusion. She either uses totally different metaphors with different source domains to emphasise union or she uses the same source domains as Donald Trump but with target domains that do not concern immigration. With this strategy she does not portray refugees but far-
right ideas as dangerous (for instance as a “rising tide”). She also often employs another subterfuge to defend her ideas, quoting her adversary while adding a negation with expressions such as “I will not do this”, “This is not who we are”, etc. The most meaningful example being: “slamming the door on every Syrian refugee, that is just not who we are.” She uses the metaphor of the HOUSE but with a negation. Concerning their gestures, Hillary Clinton is much more in control of her body language than Donald Trump. She never mimics the metaphors she utters and very rarely stresses what she says with gestures, unlike Donald Trump who has a particularly expressive body language, which enables him to reconstruct his verbal metaphors by visual ones, replicating his words with gestures. Thus, this is perhaps the reason why his discourse becomes more powerful. As for the source domains, the HOUSE seems to be mainly used and is closely followed by the WATER source domain, as represented hereafter [Figure 22]:

![Figure 22: Representation of American immigration metaphors according to their source domains](image)

---

13 Study carried out on forty-eight recurrent immigration metaphors.
4. French political discourse

4.1. Context

The way politicians talk about immigration is also quite meaningful in France, especially during a presidential election. In this part, the two final candidates’ discourse during the 2017 campaign will be examined; some posters and leaflets will also be occasionally studied to supplement a multimodal analysis. On May 7th, 2017, Emmanuel Macron and his new centrist political party En Marche! won the election against Marine Le Pen the far-right leader of the Front National; this campaign was deeply marked by events such as the migrant crisis due to the conflict in Syria or the terrorist attacks that occurred in France in 2015. Though those two facts have nothing in common and are absolutely independent, Marine Le Pen and her nationalist party’s main strategy is to link those crises in order to prevent migrants from entering the country. Like her American right-wing counterpart Donald Trump, she makes immigration and national identity the centre of her policy and wishes to “protect” her country. Thus, the same patterns are mostly found in the two different languages as Le Pen’s far-right discourse contains many more immigration metaphors than Macron’s discourse. This is not surprising at all and it confirms that anti-immigrant ideas probably need to be expressed metaphorically so that the audience understands more easily these unconventional concepts. It should also be noted that both languages very often use the same source domains, which are predominantly WATER and CONTAINER; however, fewer orientational metaphors are found in French than in English. Such a phenomenon is probably due to the large use of phrasal verbs in English which do not exist in French. All particles contained in phrasal verbs about immigration carry lexicalised metaphors indicating directions and movements from A to B and are very
frequent in English and in Germanic languages in general (for example, *come in*, *go out*, *go ahead*, *fall apart*, etc.); this motif is totally absent in French which is explained by the existence of a real lexical and syntactic gap.

As far as the differences between the two French candidates are concerned, Le Pen uses many dysphemistic metaphors contrary to Macron who potentially tries not to hurt anyone with the use of euphemisms or *lexicalised* metaphors while he tries to lead a hard-line policy at the same time. The 25th French president sometimes even uses the same source domains as his opponent to talk about immigration, for instance *WATER*.

4.2. Natural elements

4.2.1. Water

One of the main source domains that characterises immigrants both in French and in English appears to be *WATER* as shown in the representation hereafter [Figure 23]. Cunningham-Parmeter [2011: 1580] explains that metaphors that compare immigrants to *WATER* elements include three separated features of immigration: direction, proportions, and strength. Most of the time, these metaphors describe overpowering water in terms of *stream*, *tide*, *flow*, *wave* as previously mentioned in the part concerning the U.S., and this is also the case in French. Cunningham-Parmeter [2011: 1580] adds that this kind of metaphor refers to “great floods [that] have devastated societies throughout human history”. Thus, metaphors related to *WATER* can be defined as cultural because they rely on shared knowledge and history. The
three countries under study are all surrounded by seas and oceans and migrants usually have to cross those stretch of water to reach the coasts of the host nation. Besides, these metaphors perhaps also act as metonymies, as they not only refer to directions and power but also to the way migrants are coming and this is perhaps for that reason that water metaphors are particularly productive in American, British and French far-right political discourse, because water is the means.

Figure 23: Representation of the metaphor: Migrants are water

With the use of such a source domain, the goal of politicians is often to emphasise the uncontrollable aspects of immigration. The semantic field of water is omnipresent in Marine Le Pen’s speeches with terms such as “flux”, “vague” or “flots” to characterise immigration as shown in the following examples:

(1) Certains pays, non soumis comme le nôtre à l’idéologie mortifère de l’ouverture totale des frontières et de la libre-circulation, ont réussi à endiguer les flots d’immigrants arrivant notamment par la mer. [Marine Le Pen, Paris, May 1st, 2015]

(2) Le 13 novembre 2015, neuf hommes ont commis un nouvel attentat, inédit sur le territoire français, un acte de guerre qui aura enlevé la vie à 130 de nos compatriotes en en blessant 351. [Si] on regarde le problème côté immigration, on constate que quatre terroristes sur les neuf du 13 novembre n’étaient pas Français, qu’ils ont profité de l’emballement des vagues migratoires que le continent européen connaît depuis un an. [...] Il faut être maître de notre destin. Être maître de ses frontières pour maîtriser les flux de migration. [Marine Le Pen, Paris, May 1st, 2016]
Words in examples (1) and (2) indicate movement, the noun “flot” comes from Latin *fluctuare*, which designates a rising tide according to *Le Robert : Dictionnaire Historique de la langue française*. The French term “vague” comes from the Proto-Indo-European root *wegh-* which expresses movement; indeed, this pattern is also found in Germanic languages and especially in English with, for instance, verbs such as wag or wiggle that also designate motion. The noun “flux” comes from Latin *fluxus* which refers to the run off of a liquid, indicating movement once again. This very term is also used by Emmanuel Macron to talk about immigration in his speeches, for instance in Calais on January 16th, 2018, he said: “Les missions liées à la régulation des *flux migratoires* sont des missions républicaines. Elles sont au cœur du contrat démocratique.” However, the leader of the Front National goes further and does not only highlight motion but also the idea that immigrants represent too large a quantity of people, which respectively corresponds to too large a quantity of water in the metaphor, such as in the following example:

Pourquoi personne, à part nous une fois encore, n’est là pour entendre ce cri d’alarme des Français devant ce qu’il faut bien qualifier aujourd’hui de *submersion migratoire* et de destructuration avancée de l’identité nationale. [Marine Le Pen, Marseille, September 6th, 2015]

The noun “submersion” is composed of the prefix *sub-* meaning under and the Proto-Indo-European root *merg*, which means plunge or sink. Besides, it comes from Latin *submergere* which figuratively meant erase. In addition, it also refers to the conceptual metaphor DOWN IS BAD. Thus, this metaphor is vivid and underlines Le Pen’s idea that there are so many refugees coming to France that French people are sinking. The metaphor of the “submersion”, which is tougher than the others (“flux”, “flots”, “vagues”), and which is not lexicalised, is very frequently used in her speeches and on
the leaflets of the party such as in the following one where refugees are represented as densely packed men [Figure 24]:

![Front National's leaflet, “Stop! À la submersion migratoire”, September 17th, 2015](image)

**Figure 24: Front National’s leaflet, “Stop! À la submersion migratoire”, September 17th, 2015**

The title and the visual metaphor do not have the same source domain, as water is not represented in the photograph. Though there is no water in the photograph, “submersion” is still depicted by the dark colours (black and grey) chosen for the frame of the handout, highlighting danger and opacity. Moreover, this idea is emphasised by the presence of men only and of a man with a headscarf in the foreground so that his face cannot be seen, erasing his identity and showing, once again, the opacity of the situation so as to make voters feel like they are overwhelmed by immigration.

Those simple metaphors used by Le Pen to talk about refugees are frequently extended to designate problems related to immigration; for instance, she uses the adjective “abyssal”, extending the water metaphor, to define the issue as a very serious problem: “On découvre cruellement que plus de la moitié des terroristes du 13 novembre, cinq sur neuf exactement, étaient enfants d’immigrés de seconde ou
troisième génération et ont voulu déclencher une guerre civile entre Français. Le problème est *abyssal.*” [Marine Le Pen, Paris, May 1st, 2016]. The adjective “abyssal” is normally used to literally refer to the depths of the ocean but in Le Pen’s speeches it metaphorically indicates that immigration is a “deep” problem, an issue which is almost impossible to measure. She also very often defines metaphorically the French social system as a “water pump”; according to her, medical care and financial aid appeal to refugees just like a pump would vacuum water up. She even used this metaphor during the first presidential debate on March 20th, 2017: “Il faut couper toutes *les pompes aspirantes* de l’immigration : l’aide médicale d’état, l’accession au logement, les subventions.” This expression does not directly portray immigrants as water although the conceptual metaphor remains behind it; indeed, as migrants are supposedly attracted by subventions and since subventions become water pumps, thus, migrants themselves become water. As for Macron, he uses this source domain to create extended (but *lexicalised*) metaphors as well, for instance when he describes not migrants but human trafficking, which is due to migration, as a “débordement”:

> Je veux dire ici que ce plan d’action de court terme, très rapide, que nous avons mis en œuvre, c'est, me semble-t-il, la réponse la plus immédiate, la plus efficace à ce à quoi nousassistons depuis plusieurs mois et qui est intolérable ; le fait que certains groupes de trafiquants qui sont les trafiquants d’armes, les trafiquants de vies humaines, de drogue et les groupes liés au terrorisme et qui ont fait du désert en Afrique un cimetière et de la Méditerranée, un cimetière. [...] C’est ensuite une action de coopération en matière de sécurité, de justice, parfois de présence militaire sur le terrain que nous avons décidé d’acter, nous, pays européens, avec le Niger et le Tchad, pour prévenir d’autres débordements. [Paris, Mini-sommet euro-africain, August 29th, 2017].

He does not extend the water metaphor to talk about immigration itself but to underline collateral issues which he does think are dangerous.
4.2.2. Air

A natural element which has only been found in French immigration metaphors is air. Like water, air is a source domain to talk about immigration; it refers to directions, scope and power. Once again, the uncontrollable aspect of such a phenomenon is at the centre of these metaphors. The FN is used to publishing communiqués with striking metaphors in their titles, such as: “Paris sans migrants : arrêtons l'appel d'air migratoire” [Wallerand de Saint Just and Aurélien Legrand, September 26th, 2017]. In this example, the idea which is developed is exactly the same as in the metaphor of the “pompe aspirante” previously studied; according to the members of the FN, constructions of accommodation centres for asylum-seekers attract more and more refugees as if those buildings acted like in-draft air transfers. Because of a lexical gap, this specific expression, which is used to designate an air depression, does not really exist in English and there is no literal translation for it. Le Pen went back over this metaphor during the final presidential debate against Macron when she said in her conclusion: "Moi j’aime la France, avec sa langue, sa culture et ses frontières. Car s’il n’y a pas de frontières il n’y a pas, en réalité, de pays libre et indépendant. Vous, vous voulez une France ouverte à tous les vents”. In this example, she uses air as a source domain, comparing migration to winds, to reproach Macron for wanting an open-border policy\textsuperscript{14}. Besides, the reference to air is also used by the French president; for instance, he explains that: “L’accroissement des flux [migratoires] viendrait gonfler des camps de migrants déjà saturés” [Emmanuel Macron, Paris, August 29th, 2017]. The French verb "gonfler" comes from the Proto-Indo-European root *bh₁-, which expresses the idea of “blowing”, according to Le

\textsuperscript{14} In addition, she uses possessive adjectives such as "sa" or "ses" which, once again, creates conceptual dichotomies.
Robert : Dictionnaire Historique de la langue française. Then, it gave the Latin verb *conflare* meaning “blow up”. Thus, as refugees are going to “inflate” camps, they are compared to *air* in order to emphasize the difficulty to control both their entries and their quantity.

4.2.3. IMMIGRANTS ARE PLANTS

Another natural element which is sometimes used as a source domain to talk about immigration is the idea of plants or weeds. Migrants are almost portrayed as stinging nettles one has to get rid of. Marine Le Pen sometimes describes immigration as a fertile ground for terrorism. For her, immigration leads to communitarianism, which leads to terrorism: “Je pense que l’immigration massive a été le *terreau* du communautarisme et que le communautarisme est le *terreau* du fondamentalisme islamiste.” [Le Pen, France 24, October 18th, 2016]. According to her, terrorism is able to grow thanks to immigration, as if the latter were the compost for a plant, as represented hereafter [Figure 25]:

![Figure 25](image)

*Figure 25: Representation of the metaphor IMMIGRATION IS A FERTILE GROUND (FOR TERRORISM)*
Emmanuel Macron clearly describes the issue as a plant with roots and says: “À l’illusoire efficacité présentée par l’idée de retour aux frontières nationales, nous préférons le renforcement de l’action européenne et le traitement à la racine des causes de départ dans les pays d’accueil” [EnMarche! Website, https://en-marche.fr/emmanuel-macron/le-programme/immigration-et-asile]. With those comparisons to plants, their goal is to underline both the uncontrollable aspect of immigration and the idea that it a potential never-ending process, as the number of migrants keeps growing. This pattern has also been found occasionally in Trump’s discourse with the verbs “thrive” and “flourish”, for instance when he says: “It is our right as a sovereign nation to choose immigrants that we think are the likeliest to thrive and flourish here.” [Phoenix, Arizona, August 31st, 2016]. According to the Online Etymology Dictionary, the term “flourish” comes from Latin florere meaning “blossom” which was derived from the Proto-Indo-European root *bhel- meaning “blooming”. Thus, those metaphors advocate that the host country has to be seen as a fertile ground where refugees are able to bloom and prosper like plants. Clearly then, those natural elements (be they water, air or even plants) all convey the notions that immigration is possibly out of hand and that refugees who come are as numerous as drops in the ocean, oxygen molecules in the air or weeds in the soil.

4.3. Pressure from the inside: a container about to explode

Container metaphors are also very common in French; they usually enable the speaker to compare the host country to a house, the border being the doors of the house, as previously mentioned. However, Macron refuses to compare French borders to doors and says: “Calais n’est pas une porte d’entrée dérobée vers l’Angleterre”
Thus, he uses the metaphor of the door with a negation. Besides, Le Pen works on creating extended metaphors related to the idea that borders are doors as French citizens should have the “key” of those doors; during the final presidential debate of the campaign she said: “Vous ne voulez pas que les Français aient la clé de ces frontières.” Behind this figure of the “key” she highlights the concept that French people should have the right to welcome or reject refugees just as they should have the right to open or lock the doors of their own houses, emphasising her nationalist and populist policy. Moreover, as Charteris-Black [2006: 577] explains, container metaphors about immigration usually imply pressures from the inside. This has been confirmed by Macron’s discourse, who clearly defines migratory pressure, and by Le Pen who goes even further and talks about explosions.

On the one hand, Emmanuel Macron very often points out the large number of migrants staying in Calais in terms of pressure, he says that: “Calais connaît depuis vingt ans des phases de pressions migratoires” [Macron, Calais, January 16th, 2018]. Therefore, this metaphor indicates that refugees are putting pressure on French borders, the conceptual metaphor still being France is a container; it has been found not only in oral speeches but also on the En Marche! website, in the very introduction of the immigration page copied hereafter:

Les désordres mondiaux, la violence des conflits au Proche-Orient, la complexité de la situation économique et politique dans la zone sahélienne, l’effondrement de l’Etat libyen et les écarts de richesse entre le Nord et le Sud concourent à une pression migratoire très importante sur les pays de l’Union européenne. [https://en-marche.fr/emmanuel-macron/le-programme/immigration-et-asile]

On the other hand, Marine Le Pen clearly goes further with the same idea, but this time the pressure becomes so strong that it leads to an explosion and the borders
of the container do not exist anymore, as she said in her speech on May 1st, 2015: “Il y a ensuite l’immigration clandestine, qui *explode* littéralement et dont nous voyons ces derniers temps les conséquences les plus tragiques.” The French verb “exploser” clearly indicates a movement from the inside to the outside with the Latin prefix *ex*-. Thus, according to the FN, France is blowing up to pieces because of the pressure caused by immigration, which is also frequently developed in their posters or membership forms to illustrate anti-immigrant ideas, such as in the following one [Figure 26]:

![Figure 26: Front National’s membership form, “Explosion de l’immigration”, April 24th, 2015](image)

This representation is particularly telling as the metaphors in both the title and the picture refer to the same source domain: *explosion*. Thus, the meaning becomes twice as powerful. The picture is the representation of France on a bomb about to explode and the fuse is being lit by a lighter with the colors of the E.U. flag and the initials of the French right and left-wing parties. The lighter lies on an accumulating pile of residence visas while the background has been filled, as a wallpaper, with the words “titre de séjour”. As for its aim, the FN’s main goal with this striking visual metaphor is
to blame the other political parties for accepting migrants and leading France to an explosion with their policies. It should be noted that this illustration was in a membership form, so as to make people join the FN and portray the other parties as bad choices. Once again, this dysphemistic visual metaphor has potentially been chosen to reinforce what is usually being said out loud by Marine Le Pen in her speeches, to make the message easier to understand and memorise for the audience, always emphasising the potential accumulation of asylum seekers who put pressure on French borders from the inside according to her. This confirms the phenomenon described by Charteris-Black [2006: 578]: “While right-wing discourse generally exploits the emotional potential of a metaphor schema in which there is a buildup of pressure within a container, it is only more extreme right-wing or racist discourse that refers to the concepts of reaching a critical point and indeed bursting […].” This statement is particularly true in French discourse where Macron talks about “pressure” while Le Pen goes further and uses the term “explosion”.

4.4. Pressure from the outside: IMMIGRATION IS A BURDEN

If the reference to pressure coming from the inside is omnipresent in French far-right discourse about immigration, the concept of pressure coming from the outside and flattening the country is also very common. Marine Le Pen very often depicts immigration in terms of weight, as for her, there is an “immigration de masse” or an “immigration massive” [Paris, May 1st, 2015]. She clearly wants to highlight the idea that France is being pressed by refugees and frequently uses the conceptual metaphor IMMIGRATION IS A BURDEN, such as in Marseille on September 6th, 2015, where she said: “L’immigration n’est pas une chance c’est un fardeau. […] Alors oui, envers
et contre tout, bien souvent malheureusement contre tous aussi, nous devons parler du fardeau migratoire.” This metaphor is also dysphemistic and is very often extended in the FN’s discourse, which frequently uses the semantic field of heaviness to talk about immigration. Thus, with those metaphors, the pressure is depicted as coming from the outside and squeezing the country. For instance, another example being the title of a FN communiqué published on May 27th, 2015, which was: “Plan de répartition des migrants : la France écrasée”. The past participle “écrasée”, which is used as an adjective to qualify France, comes from Middle English crasen meaning “crushing”, therefore, the idea that pressure is being applied to France is developed with this metaphor. Furthermore, in the introduction of the same communiqué, the conceptual metaphor IMMIGRATION IS A BURDEN is reinforced by the use of the French adverb “lourdement” and the noun “charge”, underlining the weight:

La Commission européenne vient de rendre public son plan scandaleux de répartition des migrants arrivés ces dernières semaines en Europe, dans lequel la France est, juste après l’Allemagne, le pays le plus lourdement affecté. En plus de tous ceux qui arrivent par milliers sur son territoire, notre pays devra ainsi prendre à sa charge plus de 9000 migrants supplémentaires en deux ans.

Those two terms insist, once again, on heaviness and convey the idea that refugees are putting pressure on France as if they were mashing or pressing the country; they coincide with the DOWN IS BAD conceptual metaphor. As for Macron, he refutes this conceptual metaphor; according to him, immigration should not be seen as a burden but as an opportunity for the country; he says:

Notre société de la compétition et de l’efficacité est menacée à chaque instant de perdre son humanité, de perdre son âme. Pourquoi ? simplement parce qu’elle est portée à considérer les personnes non selon leur dignité intrinsèque, mais selon leur utilité sociale, et de manière tout
aussi grave, en sous-estimanl l’utilité sociale qu’elles peuvent avoir. Ainsi les plus jeunes sont mis indéfiniment à l’épreuve, les plus âgés, au rebut. Les chômeurs sont pointés du doigt. Mais ce sont aussi les réfugiés, vus comme un *fardeau et non comme une chance*. [Macron, Versailles, July 3rd, 2017]

For him, refugees are considered a burden by his opponent and because of this very misconception, our society is about to lose its humanity. His strategy is to reutilise Marine Le Pen’s specific terms and metaphors to contradict her and show the flaws of her plan for the country.

Thus, for those last four years, French political discourse about immigration has metaphorically been focusing on pressures that refugees could put on the country; be they pressures from the inside or from the outside. Though those metaphors can be found in speeches of both political parties, they seem to be much more common and to go further in far-right discourse, where they are less lexicalised.

4.5. Safety and military invasion

As Cunningham-Parmeter [2011: 1582] explains:

Human beings instinctively fear outside physical threats. Throughout recorded history, nations have built walls and raised armies in response to real and perceived enemies. [...] Drawing on this social, historical, and cultural knowledge, we often explain foreign concepts in terms of battle.

Thus, concepts such as war, safety, protectionism or fight are also frequently developed in French immigration discourse because those metaphors rely on a shared cultural knowledge and on historical facts that are most of the time ingrained in the listeners’ minds. They enable politicians to speak about protection and defense as if
the host country were at war with immigrants. This strategy is particularly used by Donald Trump but is also very often found in far-right French discourse. For instance, in her conclusion of the first presidential debate, on March 20th, 2017, Marine Le Pen said:

Vous, Français, vous avez le droit de vous protéger, vous avez le droit de vous protéger contre l’insécurité qui est la conséquence de l’ouverture totale de nos frontières que ce soit sur le plan économique ou que ce soit sur la circulation des Hommes. Il est temps de retrouver la protection de la nation.

As she sets the need of a protection, she portrays migrants as enemies, as if France were at war and did not make the distinction between migrants and terrorists, which makes refugees appear as soldiers. For example, in a speech on May 1st, 2015, she said: “En 2012, j’avais eu cette interrogation pleine de bon sens : « Combien de Mohamed Merah dans les bateaux, les avions, qui chaque jour arrivent en France remplis d’immigrés ? ». Oui, combien ? !” In this example, she uses a metonymy to convey the idea that some refugees may be terrorists, she associates the proper noun of a terrorist to migrants. She uses a historical fact, as she refers to the terrorist Mohamed Merah who killed seven people in Toulouse in March 2012, to talk about terrorists in general and, thus, emphasise the potential dangers of immigration. This misconception, which creates a dichotomy between French citizens and migrants or between French Muslims and French non-believers is denounced by Macron in the same first debate, where he said:

Le piège dans lequel vous êtes en train de tomber Madame Le Pen, par vos provocations c’est de diviser la société, c’est de faire que les plus de 4 millions de Françaises et de Français dont la religion est l’Islam et qui ne sont, pour la très grande majorité, absolument pas dans le
Macron blames Le Pen for portraying Muslims as enemies, and wants to denounce her strategy, which consists in speaking about ethnic minorities in terms of war or battle. Moreover, the leader of the FN extends the metaphor and does not only portray migrants as war enemies but also makes French citizens appear as prisoners just like Donald Trump makes Americans appear as victims. In a speech in Poitiers, on October 1st, 2017, she said: “L’Europe de M. Macron se veut libre, mais partout [les Français sont] enchaînés comme les Calaisiens ou les Mentonnais qui voient leurs villes submergées par des flux incessants qu’aucune frontière n’a plus le droit d’arrêter.” According to this metaphor, French people are chained because of immigration; thus, she portrays them as prisoners of war. The war source domain is also used by Macron but, this time, only to describe what refugees have to endure during their journeys, calling them “combattants de la liberté” [Orléans, July 27th, 2017].

4.6. Macron and euphemisms

While Marine Le Pen’s metaphors about immigration are dysphemistic, for example when she talks about this topic in terms of explosion, submersion or burden, Emmanuel Macron’s recent strategy seems to rely more on euphemisms concerning this issue. For instance, he chooses very specific verbs in order to soften what he says, especially about the eviction of refugees, and never declares that these people will be evicted or expelled but that some of them will be driven or taken away. He clearly plays on some subtle differences that exist between those verbs in order to remain politically correct. This fact is particularly illustrated in a speech for a “cérémonie de
naturalisation” in Orléans, on July 27th, 2017, where the verb “reconduire” is used as a euphemism:

Je ne veux plus de femmes et d’hommes dans les rues. Mais partout, dès la première minute, un traitement administratif qui permet de déterminer si on peut aller vers une demande d’asile ou non. Et derrière, une vraie politique de reconduite aux frontières. [...] A chaque fois, on met au mauvais endroit la volonté d’efficacité et les bons sentiments. Ça n’est pas un bon sentiment quand quelqu’un n’a pas les titres et doit être reconduit à la frontière de le garder sur le territoire français.

The French verb reconduire comes from Latin conducere (cum + ducere) which literally means “leading with” which could be translated into “seeing somebody somewhere”. The Latin prefix cum- (with) is central in this euphemism as it highlights that the French government is taking care of immigrants while it hides the fact that they are pushed away to their home country, which seems to be a taboo subject. This political strategy is also characterised by the use of the euphemistic noun “éloignement” instead of “expulsion”. Emmanuel Macron does not choose the latter as the term comes from Latin expulsare which means “pushing somebody violently”, and prefers using the far less violent verb “éloigner”, he says: “Moins de 40% des demandes sont en effet acceptées, et l’Éloignement du territoire n’est que peu appliqué pour ceux qui n’obtiennent pas de titre de séjour.” [EnMarche! Website, https://en-marche.fr/emmanuel-macron/le-programme/immigration-et-asile]. This euphemism is also employed by Gérard Collomb, the French Home Secretary, especially in his communiqués about immigration; he talks about this taboo subject as follows: “26 000 personnes ont été éloignées du territoire français l’an dernier” [Collomb, Paris, Agence France-Presse, January 8th, 2018]. This softened version of the term expulser aims to erase the violence of sending refugees back to their country; however,
though the means can be perceived as less cruel, the result remains the same and some migrants are still driven back to their countries. In other words, though the action depicted is exactly the same (refugees are expelled from France), the mental picture created by such euphemisms is different in the listener’s minds as they do picture a movement (from France to another country) but do not necessarily see the brutality they could have imagined for instance with the term *expulser*.

4.7. Conclusion

As one could expect, more metaphors have been found in the Front National’s discourse, partly because immigration remains at the heart of their policy (909 communiqués, speeches and interviews concerning only this topic on their website\textsuperscript{15} against only 31 on the Elysée’s website\textsuperscript{16}, which is almost thirty times as many). Though Macron and Le Pen sometimes use the same source domains to create their immigration metaphors, the far-right candidate seems to go further each time and to extend her metaphors, most of the time using dysphemisms and hyperboles in order to amplify the consequences and potential dangers of immigration. This type of metaphors (be they uttered in her speeches or visually represented in posters) enables her to exaggerate facts and create violent mental pictures that will remain more easily ingrained in her voters’ minds. The current French president very often refutes what his opponent says about immigration, using the same source domains but with a negation (a pattern that had also been noted for Hillary Clinton towards Donald Trump), reutilising the very words of the Front National to oppose their ideas, and

\textsuperscript{15} http://www.frontnational.com/page/13/?s=immigration\textsuperscript{16} http://www.elysee.fr/rechercher-sur-le-site/?input-search=immigration&search_index=3
frequently resorting to euphemisms to mention that some migrants have to be driven away to their home countries and to justify his immigration policy. As for the frequency of the source domains, WATER is clearly predominant in contemporary French immigration discourse, as shown hereafter [Figure 27]:

Figure 27: Representation of French immigration metaphors according to their source domains

5. British political discourse

5.1. Context

Between 2015 and 2017, British people have witnessed three major political events each year: the general election on May 7th, 2015, the Brexit referendum on June 23rd, 2016, and a snap election on June 8th, 2017. The three campaigns related to those votes have been mainly centred on the choice British citizens made to leave the European Union. One of the main claims by pro-Brexit politicians was that the exit from the E.U. would help the country cut immigration rates. The far-right political

17 Study carried out on fifty-seven recurrent immigration metaphors.
party (UKIP), which particularly advocates this idea, clearly emerged during this period of time and saw an increase of more than ten percent of votes between 2010 and 2015. In this part, Nigel Farage’s and Prime Minister Theresa May’s speeches will be taken into account to analyse how these political figures resort to immigration metaphors under those peculiar circumstances. Following what has been done for American and French discourses and as Delouis [2014: 1] explains, British far-right speeches contain more metaphors than British “mainstream” speeches, as politicians who are against immigration or who support xenophobic ideas have to explain their views very clearly. To put it differently, the didactic function of metaphor seems fundamental in this case, as it enables politicians to describe dangerous and unusual ideas in a simpler way. The same source domains as in the American or French speeches can be listed; notably water, weight, violence, container or economy. Yet, two other metaphors, which involve disease, and colonisation, seem to be more frequent in British discourse.

5.2. Common source domains

5.2.1. Immigration is water

The water source domain is also frequently used both by Nigel Farage and Theresa May in their speeches about immigration. Farage often talks about immigration in terms of “wave” and “tide”, as in the corresponding examples: “If the

---

19 Leader of UKIP from 2006 to 2016.
The eurozone goes as badly over the next few years as I still believe that it will, we face the prospect of the largest migratory wave that has ever come to this country […]” [Torquay, UKIP spring conference, February 28th, 2014], “What Europe has done with the migrant tide that is now coming across the Mediterranean is that now anyone who lands in Greece or Italy can stay.” [London, BBC news interview, duplex, July 29th, 2015]. In the same way as in the French or American speeches, this specific source domain not only insists on movement, proportion and power but perhaps also on the fact that Great Britain is an island and that immigrants usually travel by boat to reach Dover. Consequently, the metaphor and the metonymy are maybe correlated; the means (WATER) becomes possibly substituted for the agents (refugees). In the light of this source domain, UKIP emphasises the fact that refugees have to cross the Channel to enter England; what they see first being the cliffs of Dover, as illustrated in one of their posters for the 2015 campaign [Figure 28]:

![UKIP's poster, "Immigration is three times higher than the Tories promised", April 2015](image)

This poster represents the beach of Dover and, not one, but three escalators climbing up the cliffs in the foreground. In the background, the peaceful English countryside, with trees, grass and little houses is depicted while the three straight escalators highlight a certain fierceness. The source domain of WATER is not used in this poster;
however, the visual metaphor of the escalators symbolises the three aspects that are usually underlined with water metaphors: quantity (3 long escalators), strength (technology opposed to nature) and direction (from the beach to the top of the cliff). Migrants are not represented but the goal of this poster is clearly to frighten potential voters so as to make them think it is as easy to come to England as riding an escalator. Thus, the means is not the sea but something much more direct and far less dangerous, the difficulty of migrants’ journey is completely hidden with this poster.

water as a source domain is also very often used by Theresa May, for instance when she says: “The Council recommitted to a comprehensive approach to the crisis. That means dealing with the drivers of migration while also doing more to stem the flow of migration.” [London, 10 Downing Street, June 23rd, 2017]. In this metaphor, she compares refugees to water, with the noun “flow”. Some of her spokesmen often go back over this type of metaphor and extend it, as in the following example after Theresa May held a meeting with the Italian Prime Minister: “A team from Home Office and DFID will travel to Italy to offer expertise on processing papers and other documents to allow migrants to be returned to their source country. They also committed to work together to tackle the problem upstream.” [London, 10 Downing Street, spokesman, July 7th, 2017]. The first metaphor, “source”, does not directly portray migrants as water but makes listeners consider the refugees’ home countries a “source”; this noun comes from Old French sourse, which could be defined as “a beginning, fountainhead of a river or stream”, according to the Online Etymology Dictionary. As for the noun “upstream”, it directly portrays immigration as a flow and clearly indicates that there is a movement from A to B.
5.2.2. **The U.K. is a House**

If the water source domain seems to be the most frequent in immigration metaphors, it is always closely linked to the ontological container source domain, as water has to be confined somewhere. British speeches do not infringe this rule, as Britain is often seen as a comfortable house, where everyone would like to be, as illustrated in the previous UKIP poster with the green grass, the trees, the beautiful sky and the little houses on the cliff. The metaphor of the house clearly compares immigration to an intrusion, as mentioned for the French and American speeches. The source domain of the house has several connotations; first, there is the idea that it is a private area where only the owners have the right to choose who can enter. If someone who is not welcome penetrates the house, they will automatically be considered criminals for doing so. For that reason, both Farage and May talk about “open-door migration”, as in the following corresponding examples:

1. *We opened up the door* unconditionally to ten former communist countries. *We have an open-door* to half a billion people. [Farage, London, March 4th, 2015]
2. *It’s often said – usually by advocates of open-door immigration –* that Britain is by definition a country of immigrants. In fact, compared to the countries of the New World and compared to the countries of Europe with their shifting land borders, we have until recently always been a country of remarkable population stability. [May, Manchester, Conservative Party Conference, August 25th, 2016].

With these two examples, the U.K. is seen as a container and more particularly a house. As previously explained, this kind of metaphor also describes the borders of the country as doors. The goal of those metaphors is to demarcate a specific area with its outside and its inside, so as to portray the movement from the outside to the inside.
as an invasion. In the first example, Farage uses a gradation, as he first says that the U.K. has welcomed people from “ten countries” and ends with a more specific figure “half a billion”, in order to insist on quantity. Moreover, he uses both the phrasal verb “open up” and the adverb “unconditionally” to clearly intensify the fact that British borders have been fully opened. In the second example, Theresa May denies pro-immigration strategies and explains that it is wrong to characterise Britain as a “country of immigrants”.

The container source domain is also deeply linked with the idea that pressure is being put by immigrants from the inside of this container. British immigration discourse confirms what Charteris-Black [2006: 578] explains; extreme right-wing politicians (such as Farage) often talk about a “critical point” of immigration, as illustrated in one of UKIP’s posters for the Brexit campaign shown hereafter [Figure 29]:

![Figure 29: Photograph: “Breaking Point”, Nigel Farage with the poster. Mark Thomas/Rex/Shutterstock. The Guardian, June 16th, 2016](image)

This poster shows refugees who are waiting in line, densely packed, while the title, which is written in red capital letters, says “breaking point”. This metaphor indicates that pressure is at its height and that the container is about to burst; furthermore, the
red colour can symbolise a case of emergency to show that the “critical point” has been reached, in order to frighten voters.

5.2.3. Economic issue

As previously mentioned, economy is one of the main arguments developed by anti-immigration politicians and this can be seen in Farage’s speeches as he very often declares that British citizens are unemployed or that they have low incomes because of immigration. According to him, British citizens suffer from “wage compression”, as shown in the following example: “What’s being felt by ordinary decent working families is wage compression.” [London, March 4th, 2015]. This economic dimension is sometimes represented in UKIP’s posters such as the following one [Figure 30]:

![Image](image)

**Figure 30: Poster for the European Parliament Election, UKIP, 2014**

The strength of this poster relies on a shared and cultural Anglo-Saxon knowledge; it echoes the British 1914 poster “Lord Kitchener Wants You”, which inspired the more famous American 1917 poster “I want you for U.S. army”. Both showed a pointing finger and were used to recruit soldiers during World War I. UKIP plays on the impact these posters had at the time and then readjusts its meaning. The metaphor hidden behind this pointing finger is quite violent, not only because it refers to a war
recruitment but also because the spectator is involved as soon as she/he looks at the picture; in addition, this poster also contains a dysphemism indicating that twenty-six million people in Europe potentially want to take over British jobs, which can be also extremely frightening for the observer and lead her/him to vote for such political parties. Not to mention Theresa May who uses the economic argument, in a perhaps more neutral way, in order to show immigration costs money. She uses the noun “price” to explain that welcoming refugees is expensive for the country, only highlighting practical aspects of immigration, as in the following example: “Not all of the consequences [of immigration] can be managed, and doing so for many of them comes at a **high price**. We need to build 210,000 new homes every year to deal with rising demand.” [Manchester, Conservative Party Conference, August 25th, 2016]. Though economic metaphors seem to be a bit less figurative and more down-to-earth, they still enable politicians to make voters fear losing money because of immigration.

5.2.4. IMMIGRATION IS A BURDEN

As seen in the French speeches, immigration is often depicted as pressure coming from the outside, especially in Farage’s speeches, as if immigration were crushing the U.K.; for instance, he said on September 20th, 2013 at the UKIP conference in London:

Ten thousand a week. Half a million a year. Five million economic migrants in ten years coming to this country. Unprecedented. Never happened before. The effects are obvious. In every part of our national life. The **strain** these numbers are putting on public services. Schools. The shortage of school places in primaries and secondary schools. The
First, the opening of this quotation consists of an obvious gradation of the three figures given by Farage. In the first segment he gives the migratory rate per week, then he gives it per year to finish with another scale: the decade. Thus, as the scale is increased, the figures mentioned cannot but be bigger each time. In addition, only figures are given in the first two parts of this gradation and the listeners do not know what Farage is talking about until the end, in the third section, where the principle of end-focus puts the new and most important information “migrant” to the climax of the enumeration. This strategy shows the size of immigration while the conceptual metaphor IMMIGRATION IS A BURDEN is given by the nouns “strain” and “weight” that clearly give a sense of heaviness. According to the Online Etymology Dictionary, the noun “strain” comes from the Proto-Indo-European root *streig- meaning “press”; moreover, the noun “weight” comes from Proto-Germanic *wihti-, which describes “the downward force of a body”. Therefore, the idea is to make immigration appear as something painful and difficult to carry. In an interview on BBC News on August 24th, 2015, Farage even said that the U.K. had had a debate about “burden-sharing within the E.U.” to describe immigration. Those metaphors are obvious dysphemisms and enable the politician to portray refugees with derogatory terms as they refer to a descending movement, which is clearly negative in the framework of Cognitive Linguistics, since UP IS GOOD and DOWN IS BAD. Theresa May uses this idea of heaviness as well but wants to be more politically correct than Farage, as she only talks about “mass immigration”, such as in the following example: “We have shown once again how Britain will continue to play a leading role in Europe long after we have left the EU. In particular, through our contribution to the challenge of managing mass migration”. [London, 10
As mentioned previously for the French speeches, the lexicalised term “mass” indicates that a huge pressure is being applied onto the host country.

5.3. Peculiar immigration metaphors

5.3.1. Disease

Though it is rare, immigration is sometimes considered a disease and relies on the conceptual metaphor THE ENEMY IS DIRT, pointed out in British far-right discourse by Delouis [2014: 8], as previously explained for instance when Donal Trump compares immigrants to garbage. The source domain under study in this subpart is slightly different as it implies that immigrants are the conveyors of infections. For example, in a speech at the UN assembly, on September 19th, 2016, Theresa May said:

*We cannot simply focus on treating the symptoms of this crisis, we need to address its root causes too. While we must continue our efforts to end conflict, stop persecution and the abuse of human rights, I believe we also need a new, more effective global approach to manage migration.*

She uses the noun “symptom”, which is a lexicalised metaphor to describe the consequences of a problem, originally used to talk about the signs of a disease. Even though Theresa May is probably not aware she is using a metaphor, the etymology of this term and its derogatory connotations highlight the idea that refugees disseminate infections. This type of metaphor has also been used by Marine Le Pen in 2015; however, it should be noted that she denied it afterwards and pleaded a printing
mistake\(^{20}\). This metaphor had been used by Marine Le Pen in a contribution for the French regional newspaper *La Voix du Nord* on November 10\(^{th}\), 2015, the measure about health was written as follows: “Dénoncer et éradiquer toute *immigration bactérienne* : Les centres hospitaliers font face à la présence alarmante de maladies contagieuses non européennes, liées à l'afflux migratoire. Nous refusons cette mise en danger de la santé de nos compatriotes.” This example is a clear dysphemism and is once again deeply derogatory as it associates immigration with dangerous bacteria. The goal of such metaphors is to create a dichotomy between the citizens of the host countries who are supposedly healthy and refugees who would supposedly bring germs with them.

5.3.2. Colonisation and conquest

One of the conceptual metaphors which describes immigration in terms of colonisation or conquest is *immigration is a military invasion*. This type of metaphor very often highlights the misconception that refugees are mostly men and portrays them as soldiers. As Delouis [2014: 7] wrote, if refugees are considered the “new colonisers”, British people become the “indigenous people” who need to be protected from these conquerors. Violence is frequently associated with immigrants while the necessity to protect British citizens is highlighted; for example, Farage said in a speech in Strasbourg, at the European Parliament, on April 29\(^{th}\), 2015: “I fear we face a direct *threat* to our civilisation if we allow large numbers of people from that war-torn region [Syria] into Europe.” The noun “threat” comes from the Proto-Indo-European

root *treud* which means “push, press or squeeze”, according to the *Online Etymology Dictionary*. Thus, the derogatory idea of oppression and domination can be noted thanks to the etymology. On April 25th, 2016, in London, Theresa May said:

> The fact that we are not part of Schengen [...] means we have avoided the worst of the migration crisis that has hit continental Europe over the last year. [...] Let’s work to ensure the countries of Europe can protect their borders from illegal immigrants, criminals and terrorists.

In this example, though the metaphors at stake are lexicalised, they are connoted and, if a protection is needed, it means that Europe is probably being attacked. In addition, the verb “hit”, which is frequently associated with the strike of a missile, is used in this case to talk about the “migration crisis” which, once again, conveys a sense of violence. Nigel Farage goes further and uses the vivid metaphor of the “foreign land”, describing his own experience on a train and saying that Britain does not look like Britain anymore and that people do not speak English anymore:

> Do I think parts of Britain are a foreign land? I got the train the other night, it was rush hour, from Charing Cross. It was a stopper going out and we stopped at London Bridge, New Cross, Hither Green, it was not until we got past Grove Park that I could hear English being audibly spoken in the carriage. Does that make me feel slightly awkward? Yes, it does. I wonder what is really going on. [Torquay, UKIP Spring Conference, February 28th, 2014]

For him, the “colonisation” is complete, as English is not the language spoken; moreover, he asks rhetorical questions and talks about his own feelings to persuade his audience some parts of Britain do not belong to British people but to foreigners. According to Delouis [2014: 8], the conceptual metaphor “IMMIGRATION IS COLONISATION appears to be a truly historical metaphor”. She explains that those metaphors probably resort to events that occurred in the past, such as the Islamic conquest in the Middle
Ages and that they “transfer the distinctive features of these periods to present-day Britain”. Therefore, the fear to be colonised by foreign countries seems to be ingrained in people’s minds and to be used as an argument against immigration.

5.3.3. Metaphors based on shared knowledge

Nigel Farage resorts to two different metaphors which can also be seen as historical metaphors or which are at least based on a cultural shared knowledge. First, he very often refers to the Biblical Exodus to talk about the recent migratory crisis:

We are beginning to see a sort of biblical exodus of people crossing the Mediterranean. [London, BBC interview, duplex from Westminster, August 24th, 2015]

I now genuinely believe that my prediction that we will see a flow of people coming into Europe, of Biblical proportions will come true. [Strasbourg, European Parliament, September 9th, 2015]

This metaphor is cultural as it is based on the episode of the Hebrew people’s departure from Egypt with Moses. According to the Online Etymology Dictionary, the noun “exodus” comes from Greek exodos which can be defined as “a military expedition or a solemn procession”; it is composed of the prefix ex- meaning “out” and the word hodos which means “a path”. Farage uses this lexicalised metaphor to highlight the great quantity of immigrants, as if one entire people was coming to Europe, leaving their country like the Israelites left Egypt around 1580 BC.

Besides, Nigel Farage used a more recent example, also based on shared knowledge, which referred to the Australian immigration policy; for instance, he said respectively in London on March 4th, 2015 and in Strasbourg on April 29th, 2015: “We
want an *Australian-style* point system to decide who comes to live, work, and settle in this country” and “Let us follow the example of Australia”. The Australian system Farage is referring to, relies on points\(^1\) that are awarded to people coming to Australia according to their age, their level of English, their education and their skills, in order to select who is entering the country. UKIP’s leader wants the same point-based system for the U.K. and considers Australia the example that should be followed. The expression “let us follow the example of Australia” acts as a metonymy as this is not the country itself which is the “example” but more the migratory policy, which has been voted by the Australian parliament\(^2\).

Both the metaphor of the exodus and the metonymy of Australia are based on shared-knowledge and involve knowing the events that they are referring to, in order to be understood. For that reason, they are more rarely used by politicians (only two occurrences for each) who want to convince as many people as possible and especially those who do not necessarily have this kind of references in mind.

5.4. Conclusion

Immigration metaphors in British discourse seem to be a bit less derogatory and more lexicalised than in the American or French speeches. Indeed, the source domains are very often similar for the three countries and only seem to be punctually extended by Nigel Farage; for instance, when he asserts that some parts of Britain have

---

\(^1\)https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2016/jun/01/what-is-australia-points-based-immigration-system-brexit.

\(^2\) This example is also used by Marine Le Pen, such as on RMC in September 2015, when she said: « Il faut mettre en place une politique dissuasive d’immigration, couper toutes les pompes aspirantes, faire ce que fait l’Australie […] c’est-à-dire lancer un signal : nous ne vous accueillerons pas ». 
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become “a foreign land”, which relies on the offensive conceptual metaphor IMMIGRATION IS COLONISATION. In addition, if Farage’s speeches seem to be a bit more controlled and politically correct than Donald Trump’s and Marine Le Pen’s speeches; it should be noted that UKIP’s posters about immigration, which were created between 2014 and 2017, are particularly dysphemistic and sometimes disparaging. Since a picture does not depict reality but is a representation of this reality and is always biased and influenced by the person who creates it, this phenomenon can be explained. To a lesser degree, this is also the case with language, as the speaker is the one who chooses their own specific words to express one point of view; however; this distortion of reality is perhaps more striking with pictures, whose goal is to convey a message in a very short time and to catch the audience’s attention as quickly as possible, the purpose of the image being to make the observer understand ideas that have been schematised. It should also be noted that contrary to the American and French speeches where far-right politicians use many more metaphors than their opponents, the tendency has not been confirmed with the British speeches where immigration metaphors seem to be equally shared (45% for May and 55% for Farage\textsuperscript{23}). As for the source domains, no tangible tendency can be noted, as illustrated hereafter [Figure 31]:

\textsuperscript{23} Study carried out on forty immigration metaphors.
Figure 31: Representation of British immigration metaphors according to their source domains

Conclusion

First, immigration metaphors are not necessarily derogatory but almost always hyperbolic, as they enable politicians to insist on quantity in order to prove that every refugee cannot be welcomed because of a lack of space. It should be noted that far-right politicians frequently use *vivid* metaphors, which they invent themselves, while their political opponents resort to metaphors that are more *lexicalised* and perhaps less dysphemistic; for instance, hyperbolic words like “flow” are used by Clinton, May and Macron while Le Pen, Farage and Trump use terms such as “tide”, “wave”, “pour” or “submersion”. Both the source and target domains remain the same but far-right discourse goes further, usually with *vivid* metaphors. Two other linguistic strategies must be noted; pro-immigration politicians either use the same metaphor as their opponents but with a negation, or totally modify the target domain, which becomes their very opponents’ policy while keeping the same source domain. Between languages and cultures, very few differences have been found; however, orientational metaphors are rarer in French because of a lexical gap: the lack of phrasal verbs. In addition, British politicians seem to resort to immigration metaphors more rarely than...
their American and French counterparts. As for the differences between source domains, WATER, CONTAINER (HOUSE) and HEAVINESS are the three main ones for the three different countries, though HEAVINESS has not been found in American discourse and WATER seems to be more frequent in French discourse, as shown in the histogram hereafter [Figure 32]:

![Comparison of the main source domains between the U.S., France and the U.K.](image)

**Figure 32: Comparison of the main source domains between the U.S., France and the U.K.**
General Conclusion

As seen in the first part of this study, metaphors are not only rhetorical devices but also the cement of all our conceptual system [Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 3]. For that reason, the use of metaphors in political discourse is not trivial since, by extension, society itself can be shaped thanks to metaphors and their cognitive function, which is the primary function found in all metaphorical occurrences. Voters must be aware that metaphors always rely on the hiding and highlighting principle, which means that one of the metaphors’ essential purposes is to withhold some parts of reality while underlining others. Moreover, voters must be all the more careful regarding metaphors in political discourse, as political speeches can sometimes be seen as devices enabling the speaker to defend the “indefensible” [Orwell, 1968: 136], especially in xenophobic, sexist or racist discourses that create dichotomies between two groups [Van Dijk 2008: 11]. These ideas are summarised by Musolff [2012: 303] who writes:

The dominant nonchalant attitude to the meaning value of metaphors allows speakers to express and insinuate even the most extreme views under the guise of ‘subjectively’ coloured figurative speech. This opportunity is of course not restricted to racist extremism- even though it has had some of its greatest and most devastating impact in that field (as the historical record shows)- but it pertains to all fields of public, especially political discourse. Being a competent political speaker/writer implies the expert use of metaphors to promote potentially problematic political concepts without incurring the risk of being held legally or socially responsible.

The fact that far-right politicians need to resort to metaphors more frequently than their opponents has been confirmed by the corpus analysis, where anti-
immigration discourse shows up to four times as many immigration metaphors as neutral or pro-immigration discourse. This phenomenon is explained by Delouis [2014: 1] who writes that nationalist politicians have to use many metaphors so as to make people understand their ideas, which are usually not regarded as conventional. The multimodal analysis has also partially confirmed this statement; for instance, many metaphorical gestures are used by Donald Trump, who usually mimics what he says, while the Front National and UKIP’s immigration posters frequently consists of dysphemistic visual metaphors. In other words, anti-immigration politicians use multimodal metaphors so as to target at least two of the five senses of their audience; as a result, the speaker’s ideas may become twice as much ingrained in the voters’ minds thanks to this strategy.

This study also shows that immigration metaphors are often hyperbolic and sometimes dysphemistic, especially in far-right discourse where metaphors are often extended. Few euphemisms were found, except in Macron’s recent speeches. The main source domains regarding immigration are WATER, THE HOUSE and HEAVINESS, though they are not used in the same proportion in the three countries. This is not surprising since all these domains rely on universal experience. Vivid metaphors seem to be preferred in anti-immigration discourse, while lexicalised metaphors are frequently chosen by more neutral or pro-immigration politicians.

Only speeches that were delivered between the end of 2013 and the beginning of 2018 were included in the corpora, which enabled me to lead a synchronic analysis and to focus on the differences between political parties and cultures. However, it could be interesting to focus on a diachronic analysis in order to show the temporal transformations of immigration metaphors in a given country.
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