2008

# Post-September 11th representations of Latin American immigrants in political discourse: An analysis of metaphor

Nick James Romerhausen

POST-SEPTEMBER 11<sup>TH</sup> REPRESENTATIONS OF LATIN AMERICAN

IMMIGRANTS IN POLITICAL DISCOURSE: AN ANALYSIS OF METAPHOR

by

Nick James Romerhausen

Thesis

Submitted to the Department of Communication and Theatre Arts

Eastern Michigan University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

in

Communication

Thesis Committee:

Michael Tew, Ph. D., Chair

Raymond Quiel, Committee Member

Doris Fields, Ph. D., Committee Member

March 13, 2008

Abstract

This study analyzes the types of metaphorical labels that the United States House of Representatives uses in post-September 11th resolutions to label and describe Latin American immigrants.  The rhetorical philosophy of Kenneth Burke, Haig Bosmajian's *The Language of Oppression,* and a study conducted in 1999 by Otto Santa Ana provide the framework for analyzing the power of the dominant and secondary metaphors found in these documents.  Furthermore, this paper examines the connection between metaphorical labels and social and political attitudes toward Latin American immigration in contemporary discourse.

Table of Contents

Introduction

The rhetoric surrounding immigration and the Latino community in the United

States is a quite broad subject, yet many themes concerning this topic emerge as

important ones because of media attention the Latino population has received

concerning the subject of immigration in the past several years.  Latino immigration

to the United States has surged in recent years due to economic incentives the United

States offers, which countries in Latin America cannot similarly provide.  As of

March 2006, an estimated 11.5 million illegal Latino immigrants lived in the United

States, and the number continues to rise. Regardless of helping to provide cheap labor

and performing work, which many American-born citizens no longer perform in large

numbers, recent surveys assert that 52% of the American population believes that

immigrants put a burden on the country and only 41% believe that immigrants

strengthen the country (Pew Hispanic Center, 2006).

As the subjects of both legal and illegal immigration have grown in recent years,

American politicians have responded.  In December of 2005, the House of

Representatives passed legislative reform that increased border enforcement in the

United States.  This legislation, among others, became the interest of the Senate in the

spring, and immigration advocates protested in streets around the country.  Still

debated in the House and Senate are topics of fences, militia persons patrolling the

border alongside agents, emergency healthcare, and a variety of other issues.  While

all of these topics are debated in political chambers, in social discourse, "A

significant majority of Americans see illegal immigration as a very serious problem and most others see it at least as a serious problem" (p. 1).

Considering the vitality of this topic in contemporary politics and society, study concerning immigration has been limited in the communication field yet is much broader in other social science disciplines. In rhetorical studies, scholarship on discourse surrounding U.S. immigration in the past decade has focused on the issues of the immigrant and media coverage of illegal immigration (Demo, 2005). Considering that immigration laws have been implemented in the United States to sort out people of certain races ethnicities for preference over others (Yelvington, 2001), the topic of rhetoric surrounding immigration in contemporary media, politics, and society warrants a need for investigation and study concerning Latino immigration.

Literature Review

*Latino Identity*

Predominant understandings of what it means to be Latin American come from both mass media and scholars in the United States.  The U.S. constructed perception is slightly biased and creates a discrepancy for people and the media to culturally and geographically understand this area and its inhabitants.  Defining Latin America and what makes a person Latin American are questions that are puzzling to many scholars because no concrete definitions exist (Hillman, 2001).

> Some definitions are based on geopolitical and strategic concerns, others on common languages and cultures.  Some include only Hispanic countries, excluding the Anglo-Caribbean, the Francophone countries, and Brazil; whereas others include these areas as well as French Canada, part of Louisiana, and Southern Florida, and the Southwestern United States because of their 'Latin' influence and cultural connections. (p. 1)

Some scholars define Latinos through physically geographical differences, and others use linguistic and ethnic ways of classifying Latin America.  Because most Western scholars who do not reside in Latin America cannot agree, and different fields of research have provided definitions of what it means to be Latin American or Latino, a concrete identity of Latin Americans has not been constructed in contemporary scholarly work.

Since U.S. scholars have not substantially defined what it means to be Latin American, perceptions amongst non-Latino Americans have become extremely distorted. The U.S. Census (2000) estimated that the "Hispanic" population was

nearly 12.5% of the total U.S. population, or roughly 35.3 million people. However, the term *Hispanic* has been criticized by scholars in recent years as a means of defining Latino identity. Although the word *Hispanic* is used interchangeably with *Latino*, the two terms are very different in their true origins and meanings (Rodriguez, 2004). According to Rodriguez, "The term *Hispanic* was introduced into the English language and into the 1970 census by government officials who were searching for a generic term that would include all who came from, or who had parents who came from, Spanish-speaking countries" (par. 3).

There is a large continuous debate concerning which is correct, because in government data a person from Spain would be considered Hispanic while a resident of Brazil would not. According to some scholars, the use of the term *Hispanic* is incorrect because the word allows racially white majority citizens to be categorized in the minority population (Gimenez, 1992). In the late 1980s, the Census slightly changed their method of data collection to allow residents to include their country of origin, yet still held an all encompassing category of "Hispanic" for statistical purposes (Rodriguez, 2004). While contemporary U.S. scholars cannot find a means to fully agree about what it means to be Latin American, the United States government has provided a solution with its use of the word *Hispanic*, albeit arguably an incorrect term. Because scholars and the Census have come into conflict concerning the nature of what it means to be Latino, no trends in literature are helpful in defining this undefined group of individuals.

*Literature focusing on Mexican-Americans*

Some scholars who focus on immigration studies have chosen to specifically study Mexican immigration because by the year 1990, more people had legally emigrated from Mexico than any other country (Suarez-Oroco, 1998).

> Talk of 'the new immigration' refers largely to immigration from Latin America, the Caribbean, and Asia. Mexican immigration has come to dominate the new immigration to the United States. In the rapidly growing area of immigration studies, Mexican immigration is where some of the most important basic research and theory is now taking shape. (p. 7)

Scholars David R. Maciel and Maria Herrera-Sobek (1998) agree because Mexican immigration to the United States has taken place for centuries, and this history is among the reasons why so many scholars focus on subjects like Mexican and Chicano studies. Moreover, the political disputes of the border are a problem facing both the United States and Mexico, making research into U.S. and Mexican relations a significant subject for study.

Scholars do not mention the vast discrepancy of literature between Mexico and other countries but rather discuss the vitality for studying immigration issues facing Mexican-Americans. Xenophobia of both legal and illegal immigrants continues to grow and focuses mostly on Mexican-Americans (Gonzales, 1999). Mexico's recent economic depressions and social class gaps have caused more illegal immigration to the United States than any other country (Suarez-Oroco, 1998). The number of Mexican-Americans who make up the total of the Latino population is nearly 58.5% (Rodriguez, 2004). The trend of growing scholarly literature surrounding Latinos

and immigration reflects the demographic emigration trend of immigrants. More works are focused on Mexican-American immigrants more than any other country south of the United States in the Western Hemisphere.

Most important, because of booming collectives of Mexican-Americans in the United States, immigrants from this country attempt to preserve their identity in connection to their native state. Mexican immigrants have been the proponents of the process of cultural preservation and promotion of the Spanish language in American society (Maciel & Herrera-Sobek, 1998). The authors further assert, "Mexican immigrants have shown a marked tendency not to conform to the classical assimilation model traditionally employed by U.S. immigration studies" (p. 7). A preservation of Mexican identity by Mexicans themselves has allowed scholars to study immigrants from Mexico with greater accessibility than other people from Latin America because of an in-group desire to preserve a shared heritage and culture.

Slight exceptions to this assertion include Cubans and Puerto Ricans; who are the 2nd and 3rd largest Latino groups categorized by country of origin in the United States. Clara Rodriguez (2004) asserts that there have been important regional distributions of these groups, such as the high number of Cubans in Florida, Puerto Ricans who reside in the Northeast, and Mexican-Americans who populate the Southwest and California. She contends, however, countries of origin are becoming less significant in a wake of heterogeneity of different Latin American peoples in these areas of the country. Large cities and suburban areas are seeing mixed populations of Mexicans, Cubans, Puerto-Ricans, Dominicans, Columbians, and other Latino immigrants. While this notion conflicts with David R. Maciel and Maria

Herrera Sobek's (1998) assertions, Rodriguez's claim is six years more recent and if her conclusion is true, heterogeneity may prove a threat to the future of scholarly literature surrounding Mexican-Americans. More assimilation amongst Latinos of different countries of origin is likely to occur as more second and third generation Mexican-Americans encounter the economic drawbacks of preserving their national heritage in a country with public sentiment that opposes the preservation of Latino language and culture (Martinez, 2004).

*Presence of Latino Immigration in Communication Scholarship*

Few communication articles have been mentioned in this literature review thus far. Most of the previously cited works have been from scholars in the fields of sociology, anthropology, and Latin American studies. The amount of research in the communication field concerning Latin American identity, culture, and politics is less than adequate in quantity, and themes concerning these issues are quite narrow in topic choices. Although research surrounding Latinos and immigration exists, most concerns the ways Latinos interact with the white majority or the obstinate U.S. government. This trend has been criticized in the field of communication and particularly intercultural communication for similar reasons (Martin & Nakayama, 2006). When discussing the issue, several intercultural communication scholars argue, "The most glaring shortcoming in intercultural contact literature is the predominant focus on majority (or white/European groups) attitudes toward interacting with minority groups" (Halualani et al., 2004, p. 274)

*Latinos and the Media.`*

One area of communication that has been well-covered by scholars has been the portrayal of Latin American immigrants in various forms of mass media. Oversight in other research areas can be attributed to a heavy emphasis placed on news frames that construct public perceptions concerning illegal immigrants (Demo, 2006). This type of research generally has asserted that mass media, and particularly the news, are the proponents responsible for negative perceptions of both legal and illegal Latino immigrants. "Scholarship that adopts this type of approach has well established not only the dominant modes of demonizing Latino immigrants but also how dominant and vernacular media accounts undermine affirmative arguments" (p. 292).

Otto Santa Ana's (1999) studies concerning media generated perceptions are essential to practically understand how communication research approaches the relationship between immigrants and the media. He concludes that representations of immigrants in U.S.-public discourse are "unquestionably racist." His study reveals an important ideal surrounding immigrants for almost a decade. Immigrants are negatively portrayed in dominant media, and this notion is supported by the United States government and public. Other scholars such as Leo Chavez, Robert Chang, and Keith Aoki have similarly investigated perceptions of both Latinos and immigrants in the U.S. media (Demo, 2006).

*English-only movement.*

Among the oldest subjects covered in the communication field concerning Latinos and immigration is the English-only movement and its impacts in both the political and public spheres. In the 1980s, initiatives to make English the official and

dominant language highly concerned Anglo-Americans about the future of relations with minority groups (Barker & Giles, 2005). Even before this decade when English-only legislation became introduced, Giles et al. (1977) conducted research concerning English, foreign languages, and intergroup relations in the United States.

English is a characteristic of mainstream American culture, and many citizens who do not speak another language do not respond well to the idea of a multilingual culture. In the state of California, "Proposition 227 banned bilingual education in elementary schools" (Stefancic, 1997, p. 5). The legislation was put into law in 1994 and was preceded by Proposition 63 in 1987. This bill, which fought to make English the official language of the United States, was first introduced at a national level in 1982 and failed. California was the first state five years later to pass the proposition at the state level.

English-only legislation has spawned scholarly interest regarding the relationship between language, culture, and public policy.

> There is no better time for us to take up the challenge of explicating the communicative antecedents and consequences of English-only and other ethnocentric movements…It would be hard to find a topic where communication can serve the public interest better than in understanding the impact of language on identity and its negotiation through communication. (Gallois, 2001, p. 4)

Reponses to English-only legislation have gained substantial attention in scholarship because the field of communication can especially add vital insight to the impacts of promoting one language over others through legal means. Although much

research has been conducted concerning English-only policies, past articles have primarily focused on group vitality (Barker & Giles, 2005). Since these laws have not been implemented or proposed by all states, future research concerning this issue will continue and hopefully extend from focusing on the vitality of the Latino population in a wake of the movements and examine more social, economic, and relational impacts of English-only legislation.

*Presence in undergraduate textbooks.*

Immigration discourse concerning Latinos has been given slight attention in undergraduate communication texts. In Larry A. Samovar and Richard E. Porter's *Communication Between Cultures* (2004), the authors contend that Latino immigration has created controversy with respect to two major problems: illegal immigration and the refusal to adopt English. A much stronger and lengthier focus is placed upon the problems between Spanish and English than cultural identity construction. Similar to the trend of research conducted upon the English-only movement in the latter part of the 1990s, the textbook heavily emphasizes the importance of the language debate. "Businesses, schools, and health care organizations are struggling to find an equitable solution to the issue of language diversity. Intercultural communication will be an instrumental part of orchestrating a solution" (p. 13). Although a call for studying Latinos and immigration is put forth by the authors, no other parts of the book address the issue of Latino immigration.

Fred E. Jandt's *Intercultural Communication* (2004) incorporates a lengthier discussion of Latinos, culture, and immigration in his book. However, the book uses the term "Hispanic" (pp. 370) as the subheading for the category of the Latino

minority. Although he mentions that some have rejected the word because the United States government created the term, he, unlike Samovar and Porter, chooses to categorize anyone who speaks Spanish as Hispanic for discussion purposes. While he uses this label to categorize people who speak Spanish or have origins in Spain or Latin America, he chooses not to label Hispanics as a minority, which coincides with the formerly discussed research of Martha Gimenez (1992) and Maria Rodriguez (2004).

Kay E. Payne's textbook *Voice and Diction* (2002) mentions the influence of Spanish-speakers in American society. She, however, categorizes Spanish-speakers in a subheading labeled "other influences" (p. 129). Spanish-speakers are grouped in a category of all immigrants, rather than studying the group as a linguistic minority. Her research concerning the importance of studying immigration comes from a Census report from 1990, and the author chooses not to categorize these individuals by anything other than language; thus, neither the words *Latino* or *Hispanic* appear in the text.

Finally, Kathleen S. Verdeber and Rudolph F. Verdeber's *Interact* (2004) discusses the importance of a culturally educational text. "Since there is cultural variation in what behaviors are deemed to be effective, the text strives to sensitize students to these differences and teach them about the flexibility needed to be effective in various contexts" (p. xiv). In the only section of the book that addresses members of the Latino population, the authors discuss the concept of machismo. "In Latin and Hispanic societies, men, especially, are frequently taught to exercise a form

of self-expression that goes far beyond the guidelines presented for assertive behavior" (p. 294).

The book does not provide the same level of cultural insight that its introduction asserted it was committed to presenting. These four different textbooks' depictions of Latino culture are short and thus try to encapsulate the most vital information related to a specific communication subject such as intercultural or interpersonal communication. In taking this approach, these individuals have shown nothing more than that communication textbooks do not strive to conform to label Latinos as a group with the same title and thus attempt to construct this group's identity through different representations.

*U.S. Immigration History*

The following section discusses the history of immigration policy from a legislative and political perspective. Several immigration scholars have written extensively on the subject and have shared very accurate perceptions of how prior political leaders and laws have governed the history of immigration policy in the United States.

*Thomas Jefferson and founding ideas.*

The United States has had a long struggle with the issue of immigration as initially the country was founded with principles of implementing open immigration policies. Several immigration scholars name Thomas Jefferson as the first of the earliest political leaders to write about the need for open-policy immigration. Particularly, Mary Elizabeth Brown (1999) recognizes Jefferson's personal faults as a sexist and racist but also argues he did not explicitly keep people from varying

backgrounds from immigrating to the United States. Perhaps this was because some individuals could have been used for slave labor and indentured servitude, but the author claims Jefferson's famous creation of words involving inalienable rights were first and foremost related to immigration policies and the right to come to the United States. In his earlier writings, the future President claimed:

> Our ancestors, before their emigration to America, were the free inhabitants of the British dominions in Europe, and possessed a right, which nature has given to all men, of departing from the country in which chance, not choice has placed them, of going in quest of new habitations, and of there establishing new societies, under such laws and regulations as to them shall seem most likely to promote public happiness. (Jefferson, 1774)

As time went on, the United States' leaders changed the reasoning behind Jefferson's words to promote a separate agenda. "Once persons organized governments they put limits on themselves, for the sake of the community" (Brown, 1999, p. 3). Although Jefferson may not have been a model citizen to help promote equal rights for people of all backgrounds, Brown and others argue he had attempted to make an intent to have a least restrictive type of immigration policy.

### *Inspiration from Argentina.*

Immigration in the United States has a long history of a struggle with decisions to be more open or restrictive during different eras of the country's past. Samuel L. Baily (1999) asserts that several countries in the West have had long-standing debates about the issues. From the perspective of the new host country, immigration policies have been made to strengthen a nation's economy and reinforce the ideologies of

political structures. Countries such as Argentina implemented legislation in the late 1800s to call for only light-skinned immigrants to meet a social desire set forth by the administration of Domingo Faustino Sarmiento (Rock, 1987). Inspired by this restrictive policy by the Argentine government, the United States later became no different in setting forth similar ideologies that desired certain "types" of people (Baily, 1999).

The nation of Argentina underwent a major transformation, arguably unlike any other Latin American nation between 1850-1930. This transformation stemmed from a desire among a group of emerging liberal elites to fashion Argentina into an "enlightened" Northern European nation. Led by Domingo Faustino Sarmiento and Juan Alberdi, these liberal elites cringed at the political, economic, and cultural direction of the country under caudillo dictator Juan Manuel de Rosas during the years 1829-1852. They admonished Rosas' lack of political and intellectual freedom and the lack of economic development of the resources of their nation. They desired an Argentina that would defy the less civilized standards set by other Latin American nations and one that would progress to reach the standards set by the United States and Western Europe. In his famous book *Facundo: Civilization and Barbarism* (1845), Sarmiento called for a need to make Argentina a country that was similar to any Enlightened European nation. To achieve this dream, he felt, above all else, that Argentina needed to recruit Europeans who had experienced the Enlightenment. His friend and colleague, Juan Batista Alberdi, perhaps best encapsulated the goal of this new and liberal generation with his famous phrase "gobernar es poblar," or "to govern is to populate." This very mentality led Argentina to become one of the least

diverse countries of immigrants because of the future years of policies that would follow with Sarmiento in power (Andrews, 1980).

After Rosas was finally deposed in 1852, Sarmiento and Alberdi set out to put their vision for a new "enlightened" Argentina into practice.  In the new constitution of 1853, political leaders called specifically for white Northern-European immigrants and education as the catalyst for civilization, something which Sarmiento would vigorously promote as President during 1868-1874.  While it seemed that Sarmiento's dreams were on the path to reality, those dreams would take a different course. Rather than a mass influx of Northern Europeans like the English, French, Germans, and Dutch that Sarmiento, Alberdi, and others hoped to recruit to Argentina, the majority of those Europeans who arrived to Argentina were not exactly the "enlightened" ones that they had in mind (Rock, 1987).  Spanish, Italians, Jews, and Arabs made up the largest percentages of those who were new to the country.   While they were Europeans, these immigrants still altered the dreams of Sarmiento and his colleagues because of a lack of liberal education that these groups had in comparison to Northern Europeans.  Inevitably, these new players in Sarmiento's game came to change the future of the Argentine population.

This idea of creating a civilization based upon restrictive immigration policy comes from Sarmiento, yet the history of Argentina and the relationship between Sarmiento and political leaders in the United States is no coincidence.  Even though Argentine leaders did not fully realize their goals of creating an Argentina of those only from "Enlightened" nations, the policy-makers still were able to create an Argentina that still today has a lack of immigrant diversity.   Furthermore, while these

policies were heavily put into place from the years 1870-1914 (Baily, 1999), the United States soon followed in the early decades of the 20th century.

   *Madison Grant.*

Mary Elizabeth Brown (1999) discusses the 1920s lobbyist Madison Grant as the driving force for creating policies that would set the precedent for national xenophobia. When discussing his approach to immigrants, Brown asserts, "He divided them, like animals, into different categories, and he wrote and lobbied to keep the categories he considered inferior from migration to the United States" (p. 139). He later became a board member in the Immigration Restriction League and befriended several representatives in Congress; through these connections he was the most important lobbyist in getting Congress to pass the most restrictive immigration law in the history of the United States. The National Origins Act of 1924 is described by Brown as a law that

> assigned each nation a quota equal to two percent of that nation's nationals present in the U.S. population in the 1890 census. Using the 1890 census rigged the system to the disadvantage of the ethnic groups from southern and Eastern Europe, which had begun arriving in large numbers only after that date. After 1927, the total annual quota of immigrants was set at 150,000. Each country was permitted a total quota that bore the same relation to 150,000 that the nation's nationals had borne to the U.S. total population borne in the 1920 census. Thus, countries with more recent immigration, the nationals of which were few in number and who did not yet have numerous descendants, received small quotas. Countries that had been sending immigrants for a longer period

of time, and whose nationals had numerous descendants received large quotas.

(pp. 146-147)

The legislation at the surface seems to focus only on national restrictions, and the way it was written did not allow it to make race as large a factor in restrictive policy. Mostly because European countries were diversifying greatly at the time, it was quite difficult to include race without looking overtly oppressive. However, this does not mean that it was not Madison Grant's intent as noted by Brown. "Grant would have preferred passports that identified racial groups so the United States could include or exclude immigrants" (p. 147).

*John Fitzgerald Kennedy.*

This law remained and was not even questioned until John F. Kennedy wrote about the negative impacts of the legislation in a virtually unknown book (Joppke, 1999), *A Nation of Immigrants* (1964), originally written in 1958 but not widely published until after his death. More than just attacking the unquestionable racism of past policies, Kennedy opted to reopen America to a future for more immigrants (Joppke). The direct words of Kennedy in the publication show how his sentiment toward The National Origins was not favorable and how he advocated a need for new legislation in the law's place: "Such an idea is at complete variance with the American traditions and principles that the qualifications of an immigrant do not depend on the country of birth, and violates the spirit expressed in the Declaration of Independence, that 'all men are created equal'" (Kennedy, 1964, p. 75). With help from his brother, Ted Kennedy, both men became active in speaking out against the National Origins Act and other restrictive policies that followed in the next three

decades (Brown, 1999). The Kennedy administration became the most important agent in promoting the elimination of restrictive policies of the previous years but were unable to fully implement these ideas because, following the assassination of John F. Kennedy, successor Lyndon B. Johnson gained credit for helping institute liberal immigration policy as he "organized his administration around the theme of continuing Kennedy's legacy" (p. 220). Ted Kennedy became instrumental in passing the Hart-Celler immigration bill, also known as the Immigration and Nationality Act (1965), a law that overturned the former system of giving countries immigration quotas. While the bill passed and was quickly signed into law by President Johnson, it continued to be amended in the short time that followed and specifically resisted Mexican-American immigration to the U.S. in large numbers, and so began the start of heightened "illegal immigration" (Hayes, 2001).

In the next two decades that followed, more resistance to freer immigration policies were debated in the House and Senate. Small legislative reforms would continue to shape policies during that time. It was not until the 1990s that illegal immigration from the Mexico border became a reason for targeting immigrants to a stronger degree than before. In 1999, U.S. agents had come into contact with more than 1,700,000 illegal aliens, which was extremely high in comparison to only 420,126 in 1971 (Inda, 2006). The rise in illegal immigrants due to more dire economic problems in Mexico and Central America (Hayes, 2001) led to higher numbers of illegal immigrants crossing the Mexican border in the 1980s and 1990s. By recognizing a growing number of illegal immigrants, the United States began to impose domestic policies to hurt immigrant workers such as Proposition 187 (1994)

in California, which restricted illegal immigrants' rights to emergency healthcare and

social services (Santa Ana, 1999). Although the law later was ruled unconstitutional

because it concerned issues on a federal level, it was passed by voters and not

representatives and showed the growing sentiment of intolerance for immigrants in

the United States.

*September 11th, 2001.*

Nothing gave way to making more restrictive immigration policies than the events

of September 11th, 2001. Jonathon Xavier Inda (2006) sums up how the focus of

illegal immigration easily changed immediately following the terrorist attacks.

"Perhaps the most significant change involves how the issue of immigration,

undocumented or otherwise, has generally come to be viewed through the prism of

homeland security. 'Homeland security' is a way of thinking and acting that

developed in the wake of the September 11, 2001, 'terrorist' attacks" (p. 117).

Michael C. LeMay (2007) also agrees with the assertion as he sees the Homeland

Security Reform Act and the Patriot Act as restrictive policies that have hurt all

immigrants, both legal and illegal. The laws highly increased border security and

significantly restricted the number of ports of entry.

For the targeted groups of illegal immigration in the past, such as Mexican-

Americans, the increased border enforcement that was designed to keep "terrorists"

from entering the country has highly affected immigrants' abilities to enter and stay

in the United States. These laws, which have been renewed, still govern the politics

of immigration (Inda, 2006).

*Commentary*

Considering the heavy attention focused on the topic of illegal immigration in recent years, literature about the history of U.S. policies since the birth of the nation abounds. Writings by immigration scholars especially have been massively produced over the past several years and continue to make their way into contemporary scholarship. Although authors may share different perspectives of what individuals and pieces of legislation have most altered immigration policies in U.S. history, nearly all scholars have agreed about the general attitude of immigration during a certain point in history. By seeing a shared understanding of how prior policies have led up to the current laws that govern immigration in the United States, the results and opinions of immigration scholars have similar conclusions although they may have focused on different ways to reach those sentiments.

*Problem*

Through an understanding of the history of immigration policy coupled with a lack of study in contemporary communication scholarship, further research is needed concerning the subject of U.S. policy and its affect on the construction of immigrant identity. Also as decades have passed with different historical events and leaders in the United States, the political and social attitudes toward the subject of immigration and immigrants as U.S. citizens have evolved greatly. Especially considering how post-September 11<sup>th</sup> sentiments have affected attitudinal shifts, understanding current policies and their affect on Latino immigrants is vital for study. Specific to problems in the communication discipline, research tends to focus on only a minor range of subjects. The English-only movement, media constructed perceptions about Latinos,

20

and cross language effects on intergroup dynamics barely scratch the surface of topics that could be covered in the communication discipline. Although the research on the formerly mentioned subjects is adequate in quantity, an expansion to more subject areas is necessary to help better understand discourse surrounding Latino immigration in the United States. The former study of Otto Santa Ana is profound, yet the scholarship is almost nine years old, and public and political rhetoric about immigration has significantly changed since that time. From these assertions, I pose the following research questions:

RQ1: What metaphorical representations of Latino immigrants in political discourse have significantly changed since September 11th, 2001?

RQ2: Have prior dominant metaphorical representations of Latino immigrants remained from before September 11th, 2001?

Method

*Methodological Perspectives*

   *Kenneth Burke.*

   First, I turn to Kenneth Burke for a foundational perspective in framing an understanding of how language functions.  Burke's approach to language is crucial as he argues that language is the most important tool in understanding how humans construct an understanding of reality (Foss, Foss, & Trapp, 2006).  For Burke, rhetoric is "rooted in an essential function of language itself…the use of language as a symbolic means of inducing cooperation in beings that by nature respond to symbols" (Burke, 1969, p. 23).  While Burke takes a view of rhetoric as a persuasive tool, he separates himself by further addressing how rhetoric grounded in language is the very tool that constructs human understandings of reality, or, in the interpreted beliefs of the reader, rhetoric "designates the very process in which human societies are created, maintained, transformed, destroyed, and recreated" (Crusius, 1999, p. 121).

   Kenneth Burke's perspective asks rhetorical scholars to primarily see identification as the foundation for how rhetoric works.  Identification is how Burke explained the connection between human beings and external properties, people, or other ideas (Foss, Foss, & Trapp, 2006). To further explain this, Burke uses the term *consubstantiality* as a substitution for *identification*.  In explaining how human beings identify themselves the scholar asserts, "To identify A with B is to make A 'consubstantial' with B" (Burke, 1969, p. 21).  Human beings can only understand reality by identifying themselves in relation to different objects, concepts, people, ideas, and so on. (Foss, Foss, & Trapp, 2006). The foundation of the human condition

is then only found in one's relation to the symbols with which they interact.  The symbolic understandings fundamentally rooted in language and created by human beings are the very elements that create an understanding of reality.  Ultimately, absent of language Burke argues no meaningful reality can exist.

In Burke's fourth edition of *Permanence and Change* (1984), he highlights his beliefs and understandings about the power of language and how it constructs meaningful realities for human beings.  "Experiments with organisms that do not use language cannot tell us anything essential about the distinctive motives of a species that does use language" (p. li).  Human beings are superior to other creatures in Burke's mind because members of the species have the ability to communicate with the use of language.  As language has the power to empower and strengthen connections between human beings, it also has the ability to cause harmful effects; depending on how language is used to frame thoughts, phrases, and meaning.  Meaning can only be represented by words and can never be truly communicated, as language acts as a barrier for understanding the true essence of thoughts and understandings.

In further depth, Burke proposes the following understanding of motives as a critical part in interpreting meanings:

> All in all: when we see a man explaining his conduct by the favored terms in his social code, we may see that he is making exactly the same kind of rationalization as when he, having lived among psycho-analysts, begins discussing in terms of libido, repression, Oedipus complex, and the like.  This too is a rationalization, a set of motives belonging to a specific orientation-and

it is even a serviceable set, since frankness of those who express their motives

thus humbly procures them the goodwill of persons who dislike the vastly

more pretentious vocabulary of moral motivation prevailing before the era of

hypocrisy came to a close. (p. 23)

Although this example is specific to the context of a few situations, Burke uses it

to show how motives cause human beings to change their use of terms when in a

certain type of situation.  Although he never discussed the words in terms of adapting

to those who influence language choices, Burke's varying examples are intended to

show how contextual factors cause human beings to alter the language which they

choose to use in a given rhetorical situation.

Burke's understanding of rhetoric comes from many directions but ultimately

goes back to how language functions to both limit and create shared understandings.

By definition he is considered as much a symbolic interactionalist as a rhetorical

thinker (Duncan, 1965).  In his discussion of how language functions, one primary

purpose of Burke's understanding of the function of language is its power as a

metaphorical tool. In *A Grammar of Motives* (1945), the scholar argues how

"perspective" acts as a substitution for the definition of metaphor.  He also asserts,

"Metaphor is a device for seeing in terms of something else.  It brings out the thisness

of a that or a thatness of a this" (p. 503). Metaphor creates new understandings of the

representation of meanings because the use of metaphor for representing meaning is

used by motivated and learned forces.  Beyond explaining how metaphor functions,

Burke's later writings show how metaphor acts as powerful tool.

Indeed, the metaphor always has about it precisely this revealing of hitherto

unsuspected connectives which we note in the progressions of a dream. It

appeals by exemplifying relationships between objects which our customary

rational vocabulary has ignored. Were we finally to accommodate ourselves,

for instance, to placing the lion in the cat family, a poet might metaphorically

enlighten us and startle us by speaking of 'that big dog, the lion'-or were we

completely inured to thinking of man as an ape, from a reference to man as the

ape-God. (Burke, 1954, p. 90)

Although Burke's examples may seem only specific to using metaphor in poetic

writing, he still shows the power that metaphor has to affect us in our everyday

interaction with symbols. For his greatest help in explaining the rhetorical power of

metaphors comes in his overarching view of the function of language; all symbols are

types of metaphor because they represent the essence of something else (Foss, Foss,

& Trapp, 2006). Burke speaks of the intentional and motivated metaphor and gives

the example of the poet's writings to enhance these concepts; he also speaks of the

universal power of metaphor in elevating the tool as the very crux of using language

is in understanding, using, and interpreting.

*Haig A. Bosmajian.*

To continue the discussion on the power of language, I turn to ideas proposed by

Haig A. Bosmajian in his book *The Language of Oppression* (1983). "While names,

words and language can be and are used to inspire us, to motivate us to humane acts,

to liberate us, they can also be used to dehumanize human beings and to 'justify' their

suppression and even their extermination" (p. 6). When discussing how past

oppressive groups have used language to negatively impact other groups, Bosmajian

offers the example of how the Nazis redefined the identity of Jewish citizens.  Using terms like parasites, plague, and demons, Nazis gave the label of Jewish citizens a new social meaning that led to a negative impact both rhetorically and through actual acts of violence.  Although acts of violence against Jewish people could have occurred without such drastic renaming, the new labels allowed for the onset of violence because the words dehumanized people of the Jewish faith.  "Just as our thoughts affect our language, so does our language affect our thoughts and eventually our behavior" (p. 8).

Later, Bosmajian argues how language of oppression affects the continuous cycle of oppression, and as long as dominant groups remain in control of the power to name, they also have the ability to either maintain or diminish oppressive discourse.  He states,

> Once one has identified the language of oppression and determined that it is instrumental in subjugating individuals and groups, that the power of the word has been and is used to justify the inhumanities and atrocities of the past and present, then it becomes necessary to consider appropriate remedies.  We can no longer afford to simply stand by and say 'Oh they're only words.' (p. 133)

Bosmajian's call-to-action for changing the language of oppression is directly related to the power structures that dominate discourse in social, political, and global contexts.  The use of oppressive language will always exist and thus must be directly identified to be able to create an understanding of how to stop using the language through policy-making such as libel laws or other legal remedies.  "We will always have with us power-seekers and tyrants, some petty and others extremely dangerous,

who will use deceptive and inhumane language to gain and sustain power" (p. 138).

The most effective remedy then comes at focusing on both eliminating the "language

of oppression" through language itself and the very power structures which dominate

and control our understandings of language, as little to nothing is achieved in just

pointing out the negative impacts of verbal insults or inhumane language. In his text,

Bosmajian concludes,

> If 'Intolerance, Ignorance, and Ignobility' are acquired then their destruction
>
> can partially be achieved by the eradication of the language of oppression since
>
> 'the three I's' are not only reflected in our language but are aggravated by the
>
> learned language of deception and dehumanization. For those who wish to
>
> help achieve and live in a more linguistically humane world it is within their
>
> power to give no sanction to the language of bigotry. (p. 143)

*Otto Santa Ana*

Formerly discussed in the literature review section, Otto Santa Ana's (1999) study

concerning the metaphorical representations of Latin American immigrants in

contemporary media provides a critical third element to methodological

considerations. Whereas Burke and Bosmajian discuss the power and impact of

language in constructing identity and oppression, Santa Ana's study critically focuses

on the impact of metaphor on perceptions of Latino immigrants. While Santa Ana

does not use Burke's understandings of the power of metaphor for framing his own

perceptions of his study, he still approaches the definition of the function of metaphor

in a similar way. He summarizes Lackoff's (1987) definition of metaphor by saying,

> A metaphor is conceptual mapping from one semantic source domain to a

different semantic target domain.  The source domains are often those things

we as humans can easily think about, the parts of our world which are handy

and familiar.  We borrow the 'embodied conceptual structure of the familiar to

make sense of the target domains.  Then we use the borrowed structure

extensively or exclusively. (p. 194)

Both Santa Ana and Lackoff have similar perceptions to Kenneth Burke by

approaching the function of metaphor as crucial to creating understanding of

meaning.  Yet unlike the Burkian approach, these scholars have defined the ability to

interpret metaphor with less rigidness.  While the perceptions function well for these

scholars in their research, such an approach still takes away Burke's notion of

elevating metaphor to the most central element in creating understanding of

messages.

Otto Santa Ana further discusses the importance of understanding the impact of

metaphor in contemporary study when discussing its linguistic function in political

discourse.  He frequently cites the works of Chilton and Ilyin (1993) to assert that

metaphors in political discourse are never permanent and change frequently over time

as motivations and shifts in power change.

Metaphors of political domains operate in the same way that they do in matters

of love.  They facilitate listeners' grasp of an external, difficult notion of

society in terms of a familiar part of life.  In the case of rapidly changing

political events, metaphors are subject to negotiation.  In the case of the

disruption of a longstanding political order, the establishment of new

metaphors facilitates the replacement of existing conceptual frames of

reference. (p. 195)

Ultimately, metaphors function in political discourse no differently than they do in other contexts, but because political discourse is inherently controlled by power structures and frequently changes leadership, the types of metaphors that most commonly abound are related to the controlling hegemonic forces involved in constructing the representations.

Although the approach to the power of metaphor is slightly different than Burke's, Otto Santa Ana applies his own definition well in his study of anti-immigrant rhetoric. He analyzed a series of *Los Angeles Times* articles to see what the dominant metaphor about immigrants was in common public discourse in contemporary media. By approaching the study to analyze what dominant metaphor existed in contemporary media, Santa Ana also named a long list of a subset of metaphors that follow the dominant one. To make these conclusions the researcher explains how he analyzed many articles from *The Los Angeles Times* that covered stories about immigrants and the passing of Proposition 187 (1994).

> The total of the 107 articles were examined for examples of metaphor and other figurative language in this article. Over 1900 instances of metaphor were catalogued. The present article is a report based upon approximately 10 percent of the total database, focusing on tokens for which the target concept is the immigrant. (p. 196)

This approach allowed Santa Ana to limit his scope of study to one newspaper and conclude what common metaphors were prevalent in many articles.

In the conclusion of the study, the researcher found the dominant metaphor that emerged portrayed immigrants as animals. Findings where immigrants had been portrayed as having appetites whet with red meat or were in a "chase" with officers at the border were among the many examples used to explain this as the dominant metaphor. "Immigrants are seen as animals to be lured pitted or baited, whether the token was intended to promote a pro-immigrant or anti-immigrant point of view" (p. 200). Among the set of secondary metaphors were representations of immigrants as weeds and debased people. After determining that these metaphors were the most prevalent in the 107 articles examined, Santa Ana argues such portrayals are extremely racist. He explains this by discussing a definition of racism proposed by Miles who was quoted in Wetherell and Potter (1992) and relates the concept of racism solely to political economics. Where non-natural divisions made among people in a false hierarchy of power are created, racism is the product generated. Although the researcher recognizes that the definition may not be as clear as some, he still asserts that this definition serves his claim well and is certainly one that is accurate when examining how metaphor functions in contemporary political discourse. As this was the claim made in his 1999 study, Santa Ana still understands the conclusions do not mean hope has been lost.

> While it has been shown here that racism undergirds America's everyday
> discourse about immigrants, the dominant metaphoric representations of
> immigrants are not as fixed as the orientational metaphors that give us
> predispositions of over and under. The latter are impervious to change.
> Political and social metaphors on the other hand are negotiable. In contrast to

highly conventionalized domains such as love, political domains are openly

debated and discussed, hence the underlying structure of these domains can

change. As a function of the debate, competing underlying views of the world

are engaged. Because of the social implications that follow from the use of

racist political metaphors and the world-views involved, the dominant

mappings of political issues can and should be contested. Exposing and

contesting these discursive practices will lay bare the false and dehumanizing

conceptualizations embodied in racist metaphor. (p. 218)

*Textual Analysis*

To best answer the formerly proposed research questions I will analyze the text of

Congressional resolutions concerning the subject of immigration. As the discourse in

a post-9/11 world has had a dramatic shift in the way that politicians have approached

the subject of immigration, I will also limit the scope of the research to an analysis of

those resolutions written after September 11, 2001. By specifically analyzing

resolutions of the House, I will accomplish several goals and allow for further

understanding of the general sentiments of elected representatives in the United

States. Unlike using proposed legislation, the intent of resolutions is to convey

general feelings, understandings, and hopes about a subject from congresspersons.

By analyzing the sentiment of legislation proposed rather than actual law I will have

the ability to qualitatively interpret the general disposition of the relationship between

political representatives and the immigrants from Latin America.

To further justify why these resolutions make an excellent central artifact for

analysis, I offer the rhetorical perspectives of three scholars to aid in examining the

texts of these documents. Using the Kenneth Burke's understanding of language, Haig Bosmajian's research concerning the language of oppression, and Otto Santa Ana's method for analyzing both dominant and secondary metaphors will help illuminate further understandings of the rhetoric of post-September 11th congressional resolutions concerning immigration. Although these scholars have separate approaches to the ways in which language functions, using a combined notion of their ideas will allow me to be able to answer the formerly discussed research questions and draw conclusions about both the intents and impacts of current political discourse about immigration.

In using a qualitative approach to textual analysis, I will ultimately echo the approach Otto Santa Ana. Just as he examined a series of newspaper articles to interpret the common dominant and secondary metaphors in contemporary media, I too will conduct this study using the actual text of Congressional documents. Unlike Santa Ana, I will only examine these texts for instances of metaphor and not other types of figurative representations, such as metonymy or the other Master Tropes. While these devices are also strong to analyze text, the Burkian notion discussed earlier, that metaphor is the central force in how language constructs reality, will be the perspective of this study too. While the approach may be similar, using Congressional resolutions to conduct the textual analysis may reveal very different findings than those of Santa Ana. Also because the research model was used in 1999, a post-September 11<sup>th</sup> focus on Congressional resolutions will also allow me to compare findings and determine how the metaphorical representation of Latin American immigrants has evolved over the past nine years.

Specifically, I will analyze the text of 25 House resolutions and determine the meaning behind instances of metaphor in those resolutions. I will analyze the text and discover a dominant metaphor in these documents as well as determine a secondary set of metaphors that will follow the dominant one. I then will discuss conclusions concerning the reality constructed by the language of these texts and how the metaphorical construction compares to earlier findings on the subject.

Data Findings

Twenty-five total resolutions were analyzed to find representations used to define the identity of Latino immigrants and other groups specific to crossing the Mexican-American border.  In total, 19 House resolutions contained metaphors which defined the identity of these immigrants.  The four not included were duplicate resolutions from other resolutions, which were amended at a later date.  After finding 109 different metaphoric representations in these House resolutions, I also decreased the number included in this report to 91 representations to keep consistent with the 21 final included resolutions of this study.

In the process of discovering how the House has represented Latin American immigrants since 2001, this study has determined that the dominant metaphor used by Congress is "Immigrants are Outlaws."  The secondary set of metaphors which also occurred includes, "Immigrants are a Mass Quantity," "Immigrants are Burdensome," "Immigrants are Non-Americans," "Immigrants are Catalysts for Terrorism," "Immigrants are Enemy Combatants," "Immigrants are Objects," "Immigrants are a Threat," and "Immigrants are Persistent."

Also other less common representations occurred with scarcity, including "Immigrants are Destructive," "Immigrants are Invincible," "Immigrants are Disrespectful," "Immigrants are not Self-Caring," "Immigrants are America's Biggest Problem," "Immigrants are Underprivileged," "Immigrants are Sponsored," "Immigrants are Parasites," and "Immigrants are Animals."

The previous metaphors were determined to be negative representations of immigrants.  Also found with scarcity in U.S. House resolutions were a set of positive

representations including, "Immigrants are Ambitious," "Immigrants are Family-Centered," "Immigrants are Necessary," and "Immigrants are Martyrs."

To further clarify these findings I offer a list of the of the metaphorical representations under the heading of the category where each was placed.

*Immigrants are Burdens*

1.  "…and local agencies to **discourage illegal immigration** and to ease the **burden** placed on the United States" (H. Con. Res. 83, 2007).

2.  "Whereas granting amnesty **to illegal aliens would subvert the efforts** of the Border Patrol" (H. Con. Res. 350, 2002).

3.  "Whereas Border Patrol agents continue to perform their duties under **tough circumstances**" (H. Res. 1030, 2006).

4.  "Whereas the lack of such enforcement lets **immigrants know they can take advantage** of government benefits paid for by American taxpayers" (H. Res. 499, 2007).

5.  "Whereas such a policy **unfairly burdens U.S. citizens** because there are fewer places for legal residents in those colleges and universities and **out-of-state students pay more than illegal immigrants**" (H. Res. 499, 2007).

6.  (in regard to immigration) "Whereas such **failure strains the economy, imposes additional burdens** on Federal, State, and local law enforcement officials" (H. Res. 351, 2007).

7.  "Whereas the Interior Repatriation program, which is underutilized, may be used to send apprehended **undocumented Mexican immigrants** to locations in Mexico

closer to their hometowns, **alleviating a burden** on border communities" (H Con.

Res. 289, 2003).

8.      (in regard to immigrants) "…would help decrease the number of appeals of orders

**which clog the Federal Court system**" (H. Res. 499, 2007).

*Immigrants are Outlaws*

1.      "Whereas granting amnesty to **illegal aliens** would reward **those who break the**

**laws** of the United States" (H. Con. Res. 350, 2002).

2.      "Whereas granting amnesty to **illegal aliens** would demonstrate the United States

is not committed to **upholding and enforcing its laws**" (H. Con. Res. 350, 2002).

3.      "…prohibit blanket amnesty for **those who have deliberately broken the law**"

(H.Res. 440, 2007).

4.      "…**arrest aliens** who have violated existing United States laws" (H. Con. Res.

218, 2007).

5.      "…should be provided the necessary resources to **prosecute those who have**

**broken United States immigration laws**." (H. Con. Res. 218, 2007).

6.      "Whereas there are currently only 27,500 **detention beds for holding illegal**

**immigrants**" (H. Res. 499, 2007).

7.      "Whereas additional **detention beds will help ensure that all criminal aliens**

and individuals apprehended while **crossing the border illegally** are detained prior to

**prosecution and deportation**" (H. Res. 499, 2007).

8.      "…to ensure the removal of deportable **criminal aliens**…"  (H. Res. 1018, 2006).

*Immigrants are a Catalyst for Terrorism*

1.      "Whereas granting amnesty to the millions **of illegal aliens residing in our country is not in the national security** or economic interests of the United States" (H. Res. 351, 2007).

2.      "Whereas **if illegal aliens can enter** and remain in the United States with impunity, **so, too, can terrorists** enter and remain while they plan, rehearse, and carry out their attacks" (H. Con. Res. 119, 2007).

3.      "…will not only reduce the **number of illegal crossings** at the border but will also **enhance United States national security**" (H. Con. Res. 218, 2007).

4.      "Whereas issuing driver's licenses to **undocumented individuals presents a national security risk**" (H. Res. 800, 2007).

5.      "Whereas the porous nature of the nation's borders is **a threat to national security and allows for a massive influx of illegal aliens**…" (H. Res. 239, 2006).

6.      "Whereas the failure to control and prevent **illegal immigration** into the United States **increases the likelihood that terrorists will succeed** in launching catastrophic attacks on United States soil" (H. Res. 239, 2006).

7.      "Whereas **granting amnesty to illegal aliens would undermine** the process of legal immigration into the United States; Whereas it is **vital to national security** to ensure the integrity of the Nation's borders; Whereas the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, further demonstrated the **necessity of securing the nation's borders**" (H. Con. Res. 350).

*Immigrants are a Threat*

1.      "Whereas the Government of the United States is charged by its citizens with **not protecting the inalienable rights and liberties of those who reside within its border**" (H. Con. Res. 220, 2001).

2.      (in regards to illegal immigration) "…**puts public safety in communities across the country at risk**" (H. Res. 351, 2007).

3.      "A prohibition of blanket amnesty for individuals **who have deliberately broken the law that does not harm** the innocent victims of circumstance" (H. Res. 440, 2007).

4.      "Whereas securing the border has to be the first step in any pursuit of immigration reform…**It is vital for the people of the United States** that the Congress is immediately prepared to provide the resources necessary to **secure the borders** of the United States" (H. Res. 932, 2006).

5.      "…contributed to **the explosion of illegal immigration** our Nation faces today" (H. Res. 351, 2007).

6.      "…to restore the Secretary of Homeland Security's authority to **detain dangerous aliens**" (H. Res. 1018, 2006).

*Immigrants are Non-Americans*

1.      "Therefore all existing Federal immigration laws must be vigorously enforced to ensure the integrity of **our immigration system** and the sovereignty of **our great Nation"** (H. Res. 351, 2007).

2.      "Whereas granting amnesty to the millions of **illegal aliens residing in our country**" (H. Res. 351, 2007).

3. "…making it less likely that **these individuals** will again attempt to enter" (H. Con. Res. 289, 2003).

4. "…twenty million **illegal immigrants** in the United States have **overstayed their non-immigrant visas**" (H. Res. 499, 2007).

5. "…and that **this population** is estimated to increase more than 500,000 annually" (H. Res. 932, 2006).

6. "…the men and women of the United States Border Patrol should be supported for their dedication to the United States and to their mission to secure **our borders**" (H. Res. 1030, 2006).

*Immigrants are Objects*

1. "…and the easy availability of jobs acts as **a magnet that attracts illegal immigrants**" (H. Res. 499, 2007).

2. "…must be caught **smuggling** at least twelve **illegal immigrants** before they can be prosecuted" (H. Res. 499, 2007).

3. "Require prosecution of anyone caught **smuggling immigrants** across the border illegally irrespective of how many **immigrants are being smuggled**" (H. Res. 499, 2007).

4. "…the Secretary of Homeland Security will **use every tool** available to stop illegal immigration into the United States and to announce efforts for **the removal of illegal aliens** from the United States" (H. Con. Res. 119, 2007).

5. "Whereas the National Guard has successfully **intercepted many undocumented illegal immigrants and shipments of illegal drugs**" (H. Con. Res. 455, 2006).

6.  "Increase the use of expedited removal procedures for all **illegal immigrants eligible for expedited removal** under United States immigration laws" (H. Res. 499).

*Immigrants are a Mass Quantity*

1.  "Whereas the failure of the United States government to in enforce existing immigration laws has led to a 20-year **influx of aliens**" (H. Res. 351, 2007).

2.  "…to reduce the **massive influx of illegal aliens** into the United States" (H. Con. Res. 119, 2007).

3.  "Whereas the **number of illegal aliens continues to grow significantly**" (H. Res. 440, 2007).

4.  "…is estimated to **increase** more than 500,000 annually; Whereas **reducing the amount of illegal immigration** into the United States" (H. Res. 932, 2006).

5.  "…**a massive influx of aliens** on a daily basis…" (H. Res. 839, 2006).

6.  "Whereas there are more than 12, 000,000 **illegal aliens** residing in the United States, the **highest level in history**" (H. Res. 440, 2007).

7.  "Whereas amnesty granted in the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 did nothing to **stem the tide of illegal immigrants**" (H. Res. 351, 2007).

*Immigrants are a Persistent Problem*

1.  "…**these individuals will again attempt to enter** the United States illegally" (H. Con. Res. 289, 2003).

2.  "Whereas such a catch and return without prosecution policy encourages illegal **immigrants to keep trying to enter illegally**..." (H. Res. 499, 2007).

3.  "…and creates **a revolving door of illegal immigration**" (H. Res. 499, 2007).

4.  "…serves only **to generate more illegal immigration**" (H Con. Res. 119, 2007).

5.  "Whereas granting the granting of amnesty under the Immigration and Control Act of 1986 has not **curtailed the flow of illegal aliens** to the United States" (H. Con. Res. 350, 2002).

6.  "Whereas granting amnesty to illegal aliens could **encourage additional illegal immigration**" (H. Con. Res. 350, 2002).

*Immigrants are Self-Destructive*

1.  "…**undocumented immigrants** will re-enter the United States across the deserts of Arizona at **great risk to their own lives**" (H. Con. Res. 289, 2003).

2.  "Whereas the Lateral Repatriation program seeks to reduce the **number of deaths of migrants** entering into the United States through deserts in Arizona, where **146 people have already perished this year**" (H. Con. Res. 289).

3.  "Whereas, **illegal aliens make the arduous and potentially lethal journey**" (H. Res. 440, 2007).

4.  "Whereas, in 2005, 453 **illegal aliens died during their attempt** to cross the United States-Mexico border" (H. Res. 440, 2007).

*Immigrants are Enemies of War*

1.  "Expressing the sense of the House of the Representatives that any comprehensive plan to **combat illegal immigration must increase resources** for our border patrol" (H. Res. 440, 2007).

2.  "…to ensure the removal of deportable criminal aliens, and **combat alien gang crime**…" (H. Res. 1018, 2006).

3.  "…to preserve the integrity of the borders of the United States and **protect the nation from intrusion**"  (H. Res. 839, 2006).

*Immigrants are Sponsored*

1.    "The policy of certain cities and other political subdivisions of **providing sanctuary to illegal aliens** encourages illegal immigration to the United States" (H. Res. 351, 2007).

2.    "…the purpose **of opening bank accounts encourages illegal immigrants to stay** in the United States" (H. Res. 499).

3.    "Whereas the government of **Mexico actively encourages illegal immigration to the United States** by, among other things, publishing 'how to' books…" (H. Con Res. 119, 2007).

*Immigrants are Invincible*

1.    "Whereas the failure to enforce immigration laws in the interior means that **illegal aliens face little to no risk of apprehension or removal** once they are in the country" (H. Con. Res. 119, 2007).

2.    "Whereas if **illegal aliens can enter and remain** in the United States **with impunity**…"  (H. Con. Res. 119, 2007).

*Immigrants are Disrespectful*

1.    "Whereas by providing official government-issued identification to individuals who are in the United States legally, States and other government entities reward **those who show disrespect and disregard** for Federal immigration laws" (H. Res. 800, 2007).

2.    "Whereas **the very act of entering the United States illegally shows disrespect** for the laws of the United States…" (H. Res. 800, 2007).

*Immigrants are Animals*

1.   "…**many were caught and released** multiple times" (H. Res. 499, 2007).

2.   "**End the practice of catching illegal immigrants** at the border and **returning them**…" (H. Res. 499, 2007).

*Affirming Metaphors*

   *Immigrants are Ambitious.*

1.   " Whereas, **illegal aliens** are willing to make the arduous and potentially lethal journey to the United States in order to **pursue economic opportunity**" (H. Res. 440, 2007).

   *Immigrants are Family-Centered.*

1.   " Whereas, **illegal aliens** are willing to make the arduous and potentially lethal journey to the United States in order to pursue economic opportunity, **seek reunification with family**" (H. Res. 440, 2007).

   In addition to the former resolutions discussed, which specifically targeted those coming over the U.S. Mexican-American border, three documents concerning other specific immigrant groups were also examined.  These resolutions targeted immigrants from the Koreas, the Philippines, and Poland.  Fourteen metaphors were found, and all put these immigrant groups in a positive description.

   The dominant metaphor found in these resolutions was "Immigrants are Helpful." Less common metaphors which were also found included: "Immigrants are Accomplished," "Immigrants are Americans," "Immigrants are Family-Oriented," "Immigrants are Martyrs," and "Immigrants are Appreciated."

*Immigrants are Helpful*

1.    "Recognizing the centennial of sustained immigration from the Philippines to the United States and **acknowledging the contributions of our Filipino-American community to our country** over the last century" (H. Con. Res. 218, 2005).

2.    "Whereas the **bonds between our two countries have been strengthened through sustained immigration** from the Philippines to the United States" (H. Con. Res. 218, 2005).

3.    "Whereas **Filipino Americans have also maintained close ties to their friends and relatives in the Philippines and in doing so play an indispensable role in maintaining the strength and vitality** of the U.S. Philippines relationship" (H. Con. Res. 218, 2005).

4.    "Whereas members of the **Korean-American army have served with distinction** in the armed forces of the United States during World War I, World War II, and the Korean Conflict" (H. Con. Res. 297, 2001).

5.    "Whereas Korean **immigration has invigorated businesses, churches and academic communities** in the United States" (H. Con. Res. 297, 2001).

6.    "Whereas **Korean-Americans play a crucial role in maintaining the strength and vitality** of the United States-Korean relationship" (H. Con. Res. 297, 2001).

7.    "Whereas within the United States, **Filipino Americans have retained many of their country's proud cultural traditions and contribute immeasurably to the diverse tapestry of today's American experience**" (H. Con. Res. 218, 2005).

*Immigrants are Accomplished*

1.  "Whereas the contributions **of Korean-Americans include…achievements in engineering, architecture, medicine, acting, singing, sculpture, and writing**" (H. Con. Res. 297, 2001).

2.  "…**recognizes the achievements and contributions of Korean-Americans** to the United States over the past 100 years" (H. Con. Res. 297, 2001).

3.  "Whereas the **contributions of Filipino Americans to the United States include achievement** in all segments of our society, including, to name a few, labor, business, politics, medicine, media, and the arts" (H. Con. Res. 218, 2005).

*Immigrants are Martyrs*

1.  "Whereas it has been determined that numerous **soldiers of Asian descent fought bravely and honorably** in the Union and Confederate armed forces during the United States Civil War" (H. J. Res. 125, 2002).

2.  "Whereas the story of America's **Filipino-American community** is little known and rarely told, yet the quintessential immigrant **story of** early struggle, pain, **sacrifice**, and broken dreams" (H. Con. Res. 218, 2005).

*Immigrants are Americans*

1.  "…**soldiers of Asian descent who fought in the Civil War are** posthumously proclaimed to be honorary **citizens of the United States**" (H. J. Res. 125, 2002).

*Immigrants are Family-Oriented*

1.  "Whereas **Korean-Americans, like waves of immigrants** that came to the United States before them, have taken root and **thrived in the United States through strong family ties**" (H. Con. Res. 297, 2001).

*Immigrants are Appreciated*

1.  "That the Congress…**acknowledges the achievements and contributions of**

    **Filipino Americans** over the past century" (H. Con. Res. 218, 2005).

Discussion

*Interpretation of Data*

     *Burke's perspective.*

The process of identification shows that Congressional representatives identify immigrants with the many metaphorical representations found in this study. Most often, immigrants are identified with the two dominant metaphors found in this study, "Immigrants are Burdens" and "Immigrants are Outlaws," and quite often immigrants are identified with the series of other metaphors that followed. When considering the metaphorical representation "Immigrants are Objects," one of the metaphors discovered shows the powerful relationship of identifying and interpreting the meanings of phenomena, "…and the easy availability of jobs acts as **a magnet that attracts illegal immigrants**" (H. Res. 499, 2007). This representation is a perfect example of immigrants being identified with something that is not human as humans cannot be attracted by a magnet. Although the "availability of jobs" is what "acts as a magnet," immigrants are implicitly represented by metallic material that is drawn toward the magnet and cannot get away. This means that the underlying meaning of this metaphor identifies immigrants with objects that have no ability to think, feel, or make decisions for themselves. By identifying the immigrant with the inanimate object, as Congress did in several instances in various resolutions, the individual is stripped of his or her status as a human being and is easily discounted by politicians and the public because the resolutions are not fighting against human beings but rather are fighting against that which is non-human.

In several metaphorical representations immigrants were described as burdens. Although the resolutions do not construct a reality that immigrants are non-human, the metaphors used still represent immigrants as harmful, such as "Whereas the Interior Repatriation program, which is underutilized, may be used to send apprehended **undocumented Mexican immigrants** to locations in Mexico closer to their hometowns, **alleviating a burden** on border communities" (H Con. Res. 289, 2003). This metaphor shows how undocumented immigrants are represented as humans, but are still negatively depicted in House resolutions. Although humans may not be able to fully identify the subject (the immigrant) directly with the (burden), Burke's identification process shows how one can create identification through a chain-like process. In examples where the subject of metaphor was not directly the immigrant but was the subject of "illegal immigration" or something else, the immigrant can still be included as part of the identification process. In the metaphor, "…would help decrease the number of appeals of orders **which clog the Federal Court system**" (H. Res. 499, 2007), the immigrant is not the direct subject but can be immediately identified as the agent that causes "the number of appeals." "The number of appeals" are the next link in the chain that "clog[s] the Federal Court system." Therefore, the metaphor exists because immigrants clog the Federal court system.

Considering how many metaphors were found in this type of relationship where the subject was not in direct relation to the representation but were rather identified with a second subject, many of the metaphors used by Congress are extremely implicit. The widespread use of this rhetorical strategy is further echoed by Kenneth

Burke in the introduction of *A Rhetoric of Motives* (1969) and cited by Blakesley (1999). "Recall that a Rhetoric of Motives begins with Burke's choice of 'Identification' as the 'instrument' for marking off areas of rhetoric, by showing that 'a rhetorical motive is often present where it is usually not recognized, or thought to belong" (p. 86). The most powerful use of creating identification is to hide the intentions, so by using a number of metaphors where the "immigrant" or "immigrants" are not explicitly the A that identifies with the B, they are still the implied representative symbol.

Not all metaphors found in this study used a hidden strategy, but the ones that were more blatant in their metaphorical relationship to another subject still worked to create a negative construction of reality. The study has shown what Burke noted in Foss, Foss, and Trapp. Identification is the foundation for how a human being identifies with another person or object. Identification, then, is more than identifying one person or object in relation to another, but also considering the self as the A which identifies with the B (2006). This means that because all of the metaphors discovered about Latino immigrants are not the ways Congress would describe Americans, the interpreter of the metaphor can only identify with the immigrant by seeing the antithetical division and not the relation between themselves and the Latino migrant. Division and the use of the antithetical are only one of the three modes of identification. "Paradoxically… identification is rooted in division. Rhetoric is an attempt to bridge the conditions of estrangement that are natural and inevitable" (p. 193). Metaphors such as "Immigrants are Burdens," "Immigrants are Outlaws," "Immigrants are Objects," and especially "immigrants are Non-Americans," are

examples of how politicians create legislation that makes the Latino immigrant removed from being able to be identified with. Rather, legislators and citizens can only identify that which is dissimilar with the division between themselves and the immigrants.

The former observations discussed are solely related to Latino immigrants and are not related to immigrants of other backgrounds. In the study conducted on the resolutions concerning immigrants of Filipino, Korean, and Asian descent, the metaphors used by Congress explicitly allow politicians and readers to identify with these individuals with less division. "Whereas within the United States, **Filipino Americans have retained many of their country's proud cultural traditions and contribute immeasurably to the diverse tapestry of today's American experience**" (H. Con. Res. 218, 2005). This is one of many examples where the non-Latino immigrant is depicted in a positive way. The preceding metaphor was placed in the category "Immigrants are Helpful" because it shows how the Filipino-American is connected to the contribution. Beyond the metaphor, the reader of the legislation can more easily identify with the Filipino-American than the Latino-American; and rather than using Burke's third stage of division, these metaphors fall under the process of using identification "as a means to an end" (Foss, Foss, and Trapp p.192). Rhetoric motivated by this type of identification is used to show the similarity between the person and the other. Clearly, creating these similarities is motivated by Congress's desire for non-Latino immigrants over Latino immigrants.

While metaphors and identification are essential to Burke's methodological framing, a meta-perspective of the affects of the legislation is warranted because

50

Congress is constructing a reality through the use of negative metaphors about Latino immigrants. Language is a tool that can be used for good and bad and according to Burke has the ability to be the most powerful tool in creating what humans think and feel about a subject (Cheney, Garvin-Doxas, &Torrens, 1999). The metaphors set forth by Congress about Latino immigrants are used to keep negative rhetoric alive and maintain the position that these individuals are the undesirables. No counter-rhetoric exists about this subject as any and all legislation about immigrants crossing the Mexican-American border was examined in this study. Since the language used to describe Latinos is inherently disapproving and the metaphors describing other immigrant groups is quite the opposite, Congress has created a discourse of skepticism within and outside of the political realm. In the beliefs of Burke, "Once created, a social force—or, in more specific terms, a rule, law, norm, or governing document— in turn affects the individuals who would be governed by it. And the ongoing process of adherence (and, sometimes, revision or evolution) determines the shape of the social constitution for the future" (p. 143).

*Bosmajian's perspective.*

With these metaphors constructing a linguistic reality of dissent for Latino immigrants, Bosmajian's perspective of the power of language to oppress certain groups while helping to sustain power and control for others illuminates the influence of the House of Representatives' use of metaphors in the resolutions of this study. Although not the dominant metaphor, "Immigrants are a Catalyst for Terrorism," was found with consistency in several examined resolutions. This frequently found metaphor is an excellent example of how the use of language can keep certain

individuals in power by oppressing others. The metaphor "Whereas **if illegal aliens can enter** and remain in the United States with impunity, **so, too, can terrorists** enter and remain while they plan, rehearse, and carry out their attacks" (H. Con. Res. 119, 2007) shows how a tactic of fear has been used to keep the Latino immigrant oppressed and bolster the political leaders who are operating in the interest of national security. The metaphor also places the immigrant on the same side of the war as the terrorist, and in a post-September 11th society, creates social discourse of fear and unease by making the immigrant an enemy of war. This is undoubtedly oppressive, as Bosmajian (1983) asserts, "Linguistically legitimizing the killing of 'the enemy' during wartime has long been a preoccupation of military and civilian officials bent on waging war. Language is the tool to be used to make acceptable what civilized people would ordinarily not see as acceptable" (p. 121). Although no words of killing occurred in these resolutions, many still appreciated and honored the efforts of the minutemen and border patrol who have wounded and killed immigrants crossing the border.

Both of the dominant metaphors discovered in this study show how language has been used oppressively by The House of Representatives. "Immigrants are Outlaws" and "Immigrants are Burdens" certainly are metaphorical representations which help those in power maintain control by removing and degrading immigrants. Comparing immigrants to outlaws makes immigrants less important as such a metaphor equates them to any criminal who has no rights nor is commonly respected. "Whereas additional **detention beds will help ensure that all criminal aliens** and individuals apprehended while **crossing the border illegally** are detained prior to **prosecution**

**and deportation**" (H. Res. 499, 2007). Calling aliens "illegal" and referring to the immigrant as a "criminal" removes him or her from the standard judicial process of fairness and presumed innocence. Moreover, this practice is assisted by significant number of metaphors placed in the category, "Immigrants are Non-Americans," because only Americans would be given the right to the most non-discriminatory judicial process. In returning to the metaphor, "Whereas granting amnesty to the millions of **illegal aliens residing in our country**" (H. Res. 351, 2007), the immigrant is given the non-American title which legally allows for discriminatory policy and helps to maintain the sense that immigrants are also outlaws. "By suppressing and distorting the truth, we protect our sensibilities and preserve our self-esteem. Now, language is a device men use for suppressing and distorting the truth" (Bosmajian, 1983, p. 121). To maintain power, representing immigrants as outlaws easily strips them of American rights and further allows for those in power to maintain such status and control.

The other dominant metaphor discovered, "Immigrants are Burdens," is also a clear way which the House of Representatives has been able to maintain power and oppress Latino migrants. In Bosmajian's report of how Adolf Hitler used oppressive language to promote Anti-Semitism, the author claims Jewish citizens were depicted in many negative ways. "Instead of allaying fear, the Nazis aroused it; instead of subduing indignation, they encouraged it; instead of diminishing hate they excited it. All of these emotions were indispensable to Nazi persuasion" (p. 15). Although the results of treatment in Hitler's Germany are more severe than modern day Latino immigrants in the United States, representing an out-group as a burden is shared by

both political regimes. Whereas Jewish citizens were referred as "bacilli" and "poison," Latinos are less-severely referred to as "burdens" and "annoyances." The majority of Hitler's labeling portrayed Jewish citizens as entirely sub-human, whereas the rhetoric of anti-immigration has overwhelmingly depicted immigrants as burdensome and criminal. While the metaphors used to depict Latino migrants are not kind nor helpful, these representations are still less severe than the language used to control and kill other ethnic groups in history.

Regardless that these metaphors may seem to have less strength in comparison o the labels found in Bosmajian's study, the negative depictions have still been used by the United States House of Representatives to maintain power and control. Whereas Latino immigrants have worked to define themselves with different labels and the U.S. congress has opted to define Latino migrants in a variety of negative depictions, the contrast between the two is irrelevant because the rhetoric of federal resolutions and legislation disseminates faster and more powerfully than the rhetoric of the minority outgroups. In the end of his introduction, Bosmajian concludes, "Isn't it strange that those persons who insist on defining themselves, who insist on this elemental privilege of self-naming, self-definition, and self identity encounter vigorous resistance. Predictably, the resistance usually comes from the oppressor or would-be oppressor and is a result of the fact that he or she does not want to relinquish the power which comes with the ability to define others" (p. 10).

*Santa Ana's perspective.*

Otto Santa Ana's 1999 study revealed the *Los Angeles Times* used the dominant metaphorical representation "immigrants are animals" to label Latino migrants. Otto

Santa Ana's 1999 study concluded the dominant metaphor found in *The Los Angeles Times* was "Immigrants are Animals." While the dominant metaphors found in post-September 11th U.S. House Resolutions were not as severe because these metaphors include human qualities, both studies comparatively show the depiction of the immigrant is overwhelmingly negative. According to Santa Ana, immigrant-affirming metaphors were the least common metaphors representing Latino immigrants, and in this study immigrant-affirming metaphors were also scarcely found in congressional resolutions. In my textual analysis concerning other immigrant groups, all metaphors concerning migrants of Polish, Filipino, Korean, and Asian backgrounds were categorized as immigrant-affirming.

In Santa Ana's study, the author concluded the dominant metaphor "Immigrants are Animals" was racist. His conclusion was solely related to the comparison of the Latino human to the non-human but did not show how Latino immigrants were necessarily singled out in comparison to other immigrant groups. Although "Immigrants are Burdens" and "Immigrants are Outlaws" gives Latino immigrants human-like qualities, these dominant metaphors can still be declared racist and discriminatory too. Post-September 11th House resolutions that metaphorically praised immigrants of certain ethnicities and demeaned Latinos at the same time period show the U.S. congress prefers the immigration of people of certain ethnic and racial backgrounds over others.

Although metaphorical representations in U.S. House resolutions depicting Latino immigrants as sub-human were not the dominant metaphor, several instances were still found which fell in to this category. "Immigrants are Objects" and "Immigrants

are Animals" were discovered in several instances in the pieces of legislation.

"Whereas the National Guard has successfully **intercepted many undocumented illegal immigrants and shipments of illegal drugs**" (H. Con. Res. 455, 2006). This metaphor, which was included in the category "Immigrants are Objects," is an example of the many metaphors which were used to represent the Latino immigrant as having less than human qualities. Declaring that immigrants can be "intercepted" is similar to how objects like a football or postal package are intercepted. While the comparison could also be used in relation to human beings in some instances, by juxtaposing illegal immigrants with illegal drugs, the U.S. House of representatives has dehumanized Latino migrants by comparing these individuals to illegal contraband and thus objectifying the immigrant in the most negative of representations.

Santa Ana's dominant metaphor "Immigrants are Animals" was found with moderate regularity in this study too. Most striking is the similarity between the metaphors found by Santa Ana in the *Los Angeles Times* and this study. When analyzing a June 9, 1992, article, Santa Ana discovered the metaphor of the curb, which is a word meaning an oral piece used to maintain power over animals. "Those who want to sharply **curb illegal immigration** include conservatives, liberals, and most unions" (p. 201). In a post-September 11th House resolution, the following metaphor was also discovered: "Whereas the Federal Government has failed to take adequate measures to **curb illegal immigration**" (H. Con. Res. 83, 2007). These metaphors are extremely similar, meaning the same representative depictions are still alive and active in current depictions. Other metaphors depicting immigrants as

animals found in this study included the words "catch and release" as if patrolling officers were like animal control in their approach to illegal immigration. Ultimately, Santa Ana's dominant metaphor "Immigrants are Animals" still exists in modern representations of Latino immigrants amongst the less frequent categories of metaphorical depictions.

*Conclusions*

As all of the perspectives of Kenneth Burke, Haig Bosmajian, and Otto Santa Ana have each been used to illuminate the power of the metaphors depicting Latino immigrants used by the House of Representatives, clear and definitive answers to the research question posed by this study have emerged. Research Question One asked, "How have metaphorical representations of Latino immigrants in contemporary discourse have changed since before September 11th 2001?" By having utilized three varying perspectives, but particularly Otto Santa Ana's (1999) study, I conclude the dominant metaphorical representations have altered from giving immigrants more human-like qualities than before. "Immigrants are Burdens" and "Immigrants are Outlaws" do not make immigrants less than human but have depicted Latino migrants as less than American. The rhetoric following September 11th was used to unite Americans against other people but did not overwhelmingly dehumanize those who were not United States citizens. While the dominant metaphors used by the U.S. House of Representatives since September 11th may not be as severe as Santa Ana's dominant metaphor, the depictions are undeniably negative and oppressive. Thus, the type of dominant metaphors used to depict Latino immigrants has changed in a

categorical sense, but still functions as an oppressive and discriminatory linguistic device.

The second research question posed was "Have prior dominant metaphorical representations remained from before September 11th 2001?" The dominant metaphorical representation found by Santa Ana, "Immigrants are Animals," certainly remained but not as a dominant metaphor. While *Los Angeles Times* articles of the 1990s commonly depicted Latino immigrants as sub-human, the U.S. House of Representatives has less commonly compared immigrants to animals in post-September 11th resolutions. However, not all of the metaphors placed in the dominant category by Santa Ana were used to negatively depict Latino migrants. "Immigrants are seen as animals to be lured, pitted or baited whether the token was intended to promote a pro-immigrant or an anti-immigrant point of view" (p. 200). In my study, the metaphor "Immigrants are Animals" may have appeared with less regularity; however, these metaphors were never used to help a pro-immigrant stance. Therefore, Santa Ana's dominant metaphor still remains in contemporary immigration political discourse in fewer instances, but dangerously only remains as a negative semantic tool to portray Latino immigrants.

The final research question, which fully allows the implementation of all of the scholars used in the methodological considerations chapter, was "Are politically constructed metaphors able to significantly influence both the political and social attitudes toward Latino immigrants?" Burke's assertions concerning the power of metaphor show how language is implemented into everyday discourse through the use of motives. As earlier discussed in his book *Permanence and Change* (1984), the

scholar argues how motives in varying rhetorical situations are changed to fit the audience. This shows why the metaphors in political discourse have significant differences from those found in Santa Ana's study of U.S. public discourse. However, resolutions are the preceding documents to legislation which could certainly alter perceptions of both politicians and the public. When discussing the power of language Burke also argues that rhetoric "designates the very process in which human societies are created, maintained, transformed, destroyed, and recreated" (Crusius, 1999, p. 121). This statement helps show how all rhetoric functions with the ability to influence and alter perceptions.

Burke's perspective is a meta-view of how all discourse affects the mainstream's attitudes, beliefs, and understandings. Haig Bosmajian and Otto Santa Ana also give more specific perspectives of how such understandings will alter mainstream perception of Latino immigrants. According to Bosmajian, "While names, words and language can be and are used to inspire us, to motivate us to humane acts, to liberate us, they can also be used to dehumanize human beings and to 'justify' their suppression and even their extermination" (p. 6). Thus, in an extension of Burke's discussion of the power of words one can determine from Bosmajian's perspective that words are used to "justify" the actions of others and can lead to the most dire of circumstances.

*Implications*

Those in power can make the most negative of actions seem justified when the oppressed are labeled with metaphors that remove them from the oppressors. "Immigrants are Burdens," "Immigrants are Outlaws," and "Immigrants are Catalysts

for Terrorism" are just a few of the many metaphors that work to oppress Latino immigrants by removing them from a familiar status and placing them on the outside. These metaphors make immigrants less than American and in many ways enemy-like which could justify actions ranging from minor oppression to wide scale violent action. Furthermore, less dominant but still prevalent metaphors such as "Immigrants are Animals" and "Immigrants are Objects" strips migrants of their human status. As Hitler dehumanized Jewish citizens by comparing them to animals and insects, he was also able to justify the negative actions that followed because Jewish citizens had been labeled with metaphorical names which removed them from a familiar status. Less than human labels allow the oppressor and those influenced by the rhetoric of the oppressor to remove emotional and physical connections to the oppressed. The racist implications paralleling Otto Santa Ana's research also reveal how targeting a specific group creates a political and social structure of division between desired immigrants and non-desired immigrants. Whether the oppressed are labeled with metaphors which are less severely oppressive or the most oppressive sub-human representations, removing the identifiable characteristics of Latino migrants creates a negative political and social discourse. Future research in contemporary immigration discourse should employ the perspectives of scholars of other national backgrounds so as to gain a more comprehensive understanding of how metaphorical representations continue to affect the identity construction of the Latino community. Ultimately, research in communication must continue in public and political discourse to keep current with the sentiments used to label immigrants and promote social justice.

Works Cited

Andrews, G. (1980). *The Afro-Argentines of Buenos Aires: 1800-1900.* Madison,

WI: University of Wisconsin.

Barker, V. & Giles, H. (2003). A structural equation model of support for English

only policies and social limitation of immigrants and minorities. *International

Communication Association Conference Papers*, 1-34. Retrieved October 10,

2006, from EBSCO host database (AN16028772).

Baily, S. (1999). *Immigrants in the land of promise: Italians in Buenos Aires and

New York City, 1870-1914.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell.

Bosmajian, H. (1983). *The language of oppression.* Lanham, MD: University.

Brown, M. (1999). *Shapers of the debate on immigration: A biographical

dictionary.* Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Burke, K. (1945). *A grammar of motives.* New York: Prentice Hall.

Burke, K. (1969). *A rhetoric of motives.* Berkeley, CA: University of California.

Burke, K. (1968). *Language as symbolic action: Essays on life, literature, and

method.* Berkeley, CA: University of California.

Burke, K. (1984). *Permanence and change*, (4th ed.). Berkley, CA: University of

California.

Chilton, P.A. and Ilyin, M. (1993). 'Metaphor in political discourse: The case of the

"Common European House,"' *Discourse and society,* 4(1), 7-31.

Crusius, T. (1965). *Kenneth Burke and the conversation after philosophy.*

Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University.

Demo, A. (2006). Sovereignty discourse and contemporary immigration politics. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 91(3),* 291-311.

Foss, S., Foss, K, & Trapp, R. (2006). *Contemporary perspectives on rhetoric*, (3rd ed.). Long Grove, Il: Waveland.

Gallois, C. (2001, September). Communication and identity- The English-only movement. *ICA Newsletter, 29(7),* 2-4.

Giles, H., Bouris, R.Y., & Taylor, D.M. (1977). Towards a theory of language in ethnic group relations. In H. Giles (Ed.), *Language, ethnicity, and intergroup relations* (pp. 307-348). London: Academic.

Gimenez, M. (1992). U.S. ethnic policies: Implications for Latin Americans. *Latin American Perspectives, 17,* 7-17.

Gonzales, M. (1999). *Mexicanos: A history of Mexicans in the United States.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University.

Halauani, R.T., Chitgopekar, A.S., Morrison, J.H. T. A., & Dodge P. S.–W. (2004). Diverse in name only? Intercultural interaction at a multicultural university. *Journal of Communication, 54,* 270-286.

Hayes, H. (2001). *U.S immigration policy and the undocumented: Ambivalent laws, furtive lives.* Westport, CT: Praeger.

Hillman, R. S. (2001). Introduction. In R.S. Hillman (Ed.). *Understanding Contemporary Latin America* (2nd ed.). (pp. 1-10). Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.

Inda, J. (2006). *Targeting immigrants: Government, technology, and ethics.* Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Jandt, F. (2004). *An introduction to intercultural communication: Identities in a*

*global community* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.).  Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Jefferson, T.  (1774).  *A summary view of the rights of British America*.

Williamsburg, VA: Clemintin A. Rind.

Joppke, C.  (1999).  *Immigration and the nation-state: The United States, Germany,*

*and Great Britain*.  New York: Oxford.

Kennedy, J.  (1964).  *A nation of immigrants.*  New York: Popular Library.

Lackhoff, G.  (987).  *Women, fire and dangerous things: What categories reveal*

*about the mind*.  Chicago: Chicago University.

LeMay, M.  (2007).  *Illegal immigration*.  Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO.

Maciel, D. R. & Herrera-Sobek, M.  (1998).  Introduction: Culture across borders.  In

D. R. Maciel & M. Herrera-Sobek (Eds.).  *Culture across borders: Mexican*

*immigration and popular culture.*  (pp. 3-26).  Tucson: The University of Arizona.

Martin, J. N. & Nakayama T. K.  (2006).  Communication as raced.  In G.J. Shepard,

J. St. John, & T. Striphas (Eds.).  *Communication as…Perspectives on Theory.*

(pp. 75-83).  Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Martinez, R.  (2004).  At the crossroads: Latinos in the new millennium. *Public*

*Broadcast Service Online Edition*.  Retrieved November 19, 2006 from

http://www.pbs.org.

Payne, K.  (2002).  *Voice and diction* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.).  Bowling Green, KY: Western

Kentucky University.

Pew Hispanic Center.  (2006).  *America's immigration quandary: No consensus on*

*immigration problem or proposed fixes.*  Washington, D.C.

Pew Hispanic Center.  (2006).  *The state of American public opinion on immigration in Spring 2006: A review of major surveys.* Washington, D.C.

Rock, D.  (1987).  *Argentina 1516-1987: From Spanish colonization to Alphonsín,* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.).  Berkeley, CA: University of California.

Rodriguez, C.  (2004).  What it means to be Latino.  *Public Broadcast Service Online Edition*.  Retrieved November 19, 2006 from http://www.pbs.org.

Samovar, L. & Porter, R.  (2004).  *Communication between cultures* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.).  Toronto: Wadsworth.

Santa Ana, O.  (1999).  Like an animal I was treated: Anti-immigrant metaphor in U.S. public discourse.  *Discourse and Society, 10(2),* 191-224.

Sarmiento, D.  (2004).  Facundo: Civilization and Barbarism (K. Ross, Trans.).  Berkeley, CA: University of California. (Original work published 1845).

Stefancic, J.  (1997).  Funding the nativist agenda.  In J.F. Perea (Ed.). *Immigrants out: The new nativism and the anti-immigrant impulse in the United States.* (pp. 119-135).  New York: New York University.

Suarez-Oroco, M. M.  (1998).  Introduction: Crossings: Mexican immigration in interdisciplinary perspectives.  In M. M. Suarez-Oroco (Ed.).  *Crossings: Mexican immigration in interdisciplinary perspectives.*  (pp. 5-50).  Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.

United States House of Representatives. (2007). *House Congressional Resolution 83.* Washington, DC: Thomas.

United States House of Representatives. (2007). *House Congressional Resolution 119.*  Washington, DC: Thomas.

United States House of Representatives. (2007). *House Congressional Resolution 218.* Washington, DC: Thomas.

United States House of Representatives. (2001). *House Congressional Resolution 220.* Washington, DC: Thomas.

United States House of Representatives. (2003). *House Congressional Resolution 289.* Washington, DC: Thomas.

United States House of Representatives. (2001). *House Congressional 297.* Washington, DC: Thomas.

United States House of Representatives. (2002). *House Congressional Resolution 350.* Washington, DC: Thomas.

United States House of Representatives. (2006). *House Congressional Resolution 455.* Washington, DC: Thomas.

United States House of Representatives. (2002). *House Resolution 125.* Washington, DC: Thomas.

United States House of Representatives. (2006). *House Resolution 239.* Washington, DC: Thomas.

United States House of Representatives. (2007). *House Resolution 351.* Washington, DC: Thomas.

United States House of Representatives (2007). *House Resolution 440.* Washington, DC: Thomas.

United States House of Representatives. (2007). *House Resolution 499.* Washington, DC: Thomas.

United States House of Representatives. (2007). *House Resolution 800.* Washington,

   DC: Thomas.

United States House of Representatives. (2006). *House Resolution 839.* Washington,

   DC: Thomas.

United States House of Representatives. (2006). *House Resolution 932.* Washington,

   DC: Thomas.

United States House of Representatives. (2006). *House Resolution 1018.* Washington,

   DC: Thomas.

United States House of Representatives. (2006). *House Resolution 1030.* Washington,

   DC: Thomas.

Verderber, K. & Verderber, R.  (2004). Inter-*act: Interpersonal communication*

   *concepts, skills, and contexts* (10th ed.).  New York: Oxford University.

Yelvington, K.  (2001). Patterns of race, ethnicity, class, and nationalism.  In R.S.

   Hillman (Ed.). *Understanding Contemporary Latin America* (2nd ed.).  (pp. 229-

   262).  Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.