"America Will Survive ObamaCare" – Conceptual Metaphors in Reports of U.S. Health Care Reform in *Newsweek*, *Time*, *BusinessWeek* and *Forbes*

Minna Sikiö
University of Tampere
School of Language, Translation
and Literary Studies
English Philology
Pro Gradu Thesis
April 2011

Tässä tutkielmassa tarkastellaan metaforan käyttöä Yhdysvaltain terveydenhuoltouudistusta käsittelevissä artikkeleissa neljässä amerikkalaisessa aikakauslehdessä (*Newsweek, Time, BusinessWeek* ja *Forbes*). Keväällä 2009 vastavalittu presidentti Barack Obama aloitti työskentelyn Yhdysvaltain terveydenhuoltojärjestelmän uudistamiseksi, mikä kautta historian on ollut ylitsepääsemätön tehtävä sitä yrittäneille edeltäville presidenteille. Uudistuksen saavuttamisesta tuli myös tällä kertaa pitkittynyt ja monimutkainen prosessi, jota vaikeuttivat erityisesti Yhdysvaltain kongressin kahden valtapuolueen, demokraattien ja republikaanien, vahvat näkemyserot asiaan liittyen. Tästä huolimatta, lakiehdotus hyväksyttiin lopulta ja Obama allekirjoitti uuden terveydenhuoltolain maaliskuussa 2010.

Tutkielman tarkoituksena on selvittää, millaisia asenteita ja ideologioita terveydenhuoltouudistukseen liittyen edellä mainitut aikakauslehdet välittävät lukijalleen metaforan käyttönsä kautta. Tarkastelun alaisena ovat erityisesti konseptuaaliset metaforat, joiden tunnistaminen ja havainnointi perustuvat kognitiiviseen metaforateoriaan. Tämän teorian, joka toimii myös tutkielman teoreettisena viitekehyksenä, ovat kehittäneet George Lakoff ja Mark Johnson (1980). Teorian välittämä käsitys metaforista on se, että ne eivät ole vain kielen elävöittämiseen käytettäviä trooppeja vaan ensisijaisesti mentaalisia konstruktioita, jotka ovat keskeisiä ajattelun kehityksessä. Täten ne vaikuttavat myös jokapäiväiseen toimintaamme ja siihen, miten ymmärrämme ja määrittelemme elämän realiteetteja. Koska konseptuaalisten metaforien muokkaamat mentaaliset konstruktiot ovat juurtuneet syvälle ajatteluprosesseihimme, emme usein huomaa näiden metaforien käyttöä. Tästä johtuen ne ovat erittäin tehokkaita välittämään epäsuorasti erilaisia asenteita ja ideologioita. Kognitiivisen metaforateorian lisäksi tutkielmassa käytettävä metodi pohjautuu Jonathan Charteris-Blackin (2004) kehittämään kriittiseen metafora-analyysiin, joka tarjoaa työkaluja metaforien käytön kriittiseen analysointiin erityisesti ideologioiden välittämisen instrumenttina.

Tutkimustulosten perusteella selviää, että aikakauslehdet *Newsweek, Time, BusinessWeek* ja *Forbes* välittävät konseptuaalisten metaforien käyttönsä avulla Yhdysvaltain terveydenhuoltouudistuksesta ennen kaikkea negatiivisen kuvan. Sotametaforien avulla uuden lain muodostamiseen liittyvää prosessia kuvataan jatkuvana taistelutantereena. Uusi laki ja sen sisältö puolestaan esitetään vastustajana ja vihollisena sekä muita konseptuaalisia metaforia käyttäen vahingollisena amerikkalaiselle yhteiskunnalle ja taloudelle sekä riittämättömänä korjaamaan terveydenhuollon nykytilanne. Yhdysvaltain terveydenhuoltouudistusta kuvataan kuitenkin myös hieman positiivisemmin esimerkiksi matkustusmetaforilla, joiden tarkoituksena on välittää ideologiaa uudistusprosessista eräänlaisena matkantekona, jossa päämäärän saavuttamiseksi uudistuksen eri osapuolten tulee pystyä yhteistyöhön. Lisäksi erilaiset urheilumetaforat lieventävät uudistusprosessin vakavuutta yhdistämällä siihen mielikuvan jännittävästä viihteestä.

Avainsanat: metafora, kognitiivinen metaforateoria, kriittinen metafora-analyysi, ideologia, terveydenhuoltouudistus, *Newsweek, Time, BusinessWeek, Forbes*

Table of Contents

1 Introduction

A historical president needs historical achievements. For Barack Hussein Obama, who was historically selected as the first African American to ascend to the highest office in the United States, this meant first and foremost a change in the American health care system. The task ahead was not easy, though, as reform had been unsuccessfully attempted by many presidents before him. Health care reform was the biggest domestic policy electoral promise Obama made in the 2008 presidential election and its success (i.e. passing) was viewed by many to be of crucial importance for the newly elected president's credibility and the rest of his presidency. Finally, after a long and complicated debate, the reform was passed in March 2010 and a new legislation was signed.

However, the issue of health care was not only important for Obama but it was also highly important for Americans and their future. Moulding the proposed new law into such that it would correspond with the needs and requirements of as large a part of the public as possible was vital in order to attain the needed amount of votes from Members of Congress. Yet, through which means was the public able to form their opinion on the issue? Many may have followed the different televised discussions on the topic in Congress or taken part in functions organized by their local party representatives, but undoubtedly the majority of Americans formed their opinions on health care reform based largely on the reporting of different media. Fairclough (1995, 2) points out that "[the media has] the power to influence knowledge, beliefs, values, social relations, social identities. A signifying power (the power to represent things in particular ways) which is largely a matter of how language is used, . . .". With all this power that the media holds, it has most certainly also influenced the opinion formed by Americans when it comes to health care reform, and as Fairclough points out in the above quote, this power to represent things comes down to language selection and use. The linguistic choices made by different journalists and editors to express their varied opinions on the matter may have, with explicit or implicit intention from their part, affected the opinions of the public. It is these language choices that I am interested in studying in this thesis,

which is a study of discourse on the language used to describe and represent the process of the United States health care reform and the health care reform plan in one branch of mass communication – magazines.

The material compiled for the analysis on the language used to represent health care reform emanates from four renowned magazines published in the United States: *Newsweek, Time, BusinessWeek* and *Forbes.* However, in order to be able to conduct the research within reasonable limits, the number of linguistic elements under scrutiny in the articles is restricted. Since I am especially interested in the different tropes and rhetorical devices used in the English language, I will focus on the analysis of metaphors and metaphorical language in the articles dealing with health care reform. Furthermore, I have selected magazine articles in particular as the basis for my study because their primary purpose is not in communicating up-to-date news but rather in offering a more in-depth look into the news of the previous week and hence their articles and language use can be more opinionated, daring and allowing. Also, the use of metaphor in magazine language has been paid less attention to than that of newspapers which makes it an interesting area of study.

Evidently, the overall context in which language is used affects the linguistic choices made. Here, it is the general conventions of the four individual magazines analysed as well as their perceived audience and the subject matter of health care reform that in general affect the selection and use of any linguistic items, including the use of metaphors and metaphorical language. Yet, many magazines may convey particular representations of and ideologies on an issue to their readers, either explicitly or implicitly, and often via the persuasive power of metaphor. It is these ideologies concerning the depiction of U.S. health care reform and the health care reform plan in four American magazines that I am particularly interested in uncovering and analysing in this study. Thus, one of my aims is to show that metaphors and metaphorical language can be used as a tool to convey and deliver opinions and ideologies, and often in a less evident manner.

The research questions are the following:

- What kinds of metaphors and metaphorical concepts are used in the magazines to represent U.S. health care reform and the health care reform plan?

- Which representations of and ideologies on U.S. health care reform and the health care reform plan do the metaphors bring forth?

With the interest of uncovering ideologies and representations, I have chosen one particular method from inside the broad field of critical discourse analysis (CDA) which I will follow in order to conduct my analysis on metaphors and answer the aforementioned research questions. This is an approach to studying metaphors called critical metaphor analysis (CMA) which is developed by Jonathan Charteris-Black (2004) and aims to identify the intentions and ideologies underlying language use. Based on his research, Charteris-Black (2005, 16) concludes that metaphors "can be used to convey the values of the journalist (or the newspaper for whom they are writing) and thereby influence the reader's interpretation of current political issues". To assist him in the interpretation of metaphors, Charteris-Black uses the influential theory on metaphor derived by Lakoff and Johnson in their book *Metaphors We Live By* (1980). This theory is called conceptual metaphor theory which I will also rely on in conducting my analysis of metaphors in magazine articles dealing with U.S. health care reform. A detailed description of both critical metaphor analysis and conceptual metaphor theory is provided in chapter 3.

Analysing the representation of the United States health care reform via the use of metaphor in magazine articles is a topic incorporating many different aspects. Yet, it is the topic's relatedness to several different issues and identities, such as the character of Barack Obama and the nature of American politics, the power of the media in conveying ideology, the institution of magazines and their language use, metaphorical language and the use of the English language in general that give justification for the analysis conducted in this study. In addition, since the overall viewpoint and methodological approach for the study is adopted from critical discourse analysis, which incorporates many overlapping methodologies, the results may turn out to be of interest to many

different fields, such as linguistics, English philology, different social sciences such as communications theory and mass media, political science and history, for example.

Before entering into the discussion and analysis of the metaphors and metaphorical language encountered in the magazine articles, chapter 2 provides an outlook on the overall phenomenon of the United States health care reform. Chapter 3 explains and defines some theories on metaphor, concentrating especially on the ones that are most relevant for the study in question. In chapter 4, the conventions and readership of the four magazines under scrutiny are examined, before moving on to discussing the method used in the analysis in more detail. The results of the empirical study are introduced in chapter 5, which is followed by discussion of the results in chapter 6. Finally, some conclusions are presented in chapter 7.

2 The United States Health Care Reform

Since the days of President Franklin D. Roosevelt and his efforts with the Social Security Act in 1935, every Democratic president and several Republican presidents have wanted to provide affordable health coverage to more Americans. President Bill Clinton was the one who most adamantly worked in order to pass a new health care law in 1993-94 but ultimately failed to convince Congress with his complicated, 1300-page bill. Some of the bill's biggest adversaries were insurance companies, who in 2009, however, together with employers and business groups were ready to take part in negotiations for a new health care law, accepting the need for change. (Internet source 1.)

Still, passing new legislation on health care in 2009-2010 was complicated as well, not the least because of the very differing views on the issue between the Democrats and the Republicans. The United States Congress, where the two ideologically differing parties work, is the legislative branch of the country and is divided into a bi-cameral body between the Senate and the House of Representatives (internet source 2). Therefore, for any new bill to become a law it needs to be approved as a unified version in both houses, which in part made passing new health legislation even more complicated. The Republican Party (also commonly referred to as the GOP) denounced the proposed bill as impeding job creation and was specifically concerned about the bigger role it would give to the government in managing the health care system. The Democrats, on the other hand, stressed the plan's beneficial aspects, especially to the uninsured and noted that the law would also reduce future deficits. Despite their opposition to the matter, the Republicans never actually offered a unified health care bill of their own and finally, on Christmas Eve 2009 the Senate passed their bill on health care reform, and the same bill was finally approved in the House after a close vote on March 21st 2010. Not a single Republican voted for the final version of the bill. On March 23rd 2010, after a year of intense bipartisan debate, President Obama was able to sign the new historical legislation to overhaul the U.S. health care system. (Internet source 1.)

Previously, the United States health care system has been based mainly on private health insurances which most citizens obtain via their employer who either pays for all of the health insurance or helps pay part of it. The fact that obtaining health insurance at an affordable price has depended significantly on whether you are employed or not (and working in a company which even provides their employees with insurance) led to the most serious problem to be fixed in Obama's reform: the 46 million uninsured Americans (internet source 1). There are two social welfare programs in the U.S. funded by payroll taxes for people who do not have private insurance: Medicare and Medicaid. Medicare offers government health insurance to people who are 65 or older, blind or permanently disabled. Medicaid, on the other hand, is a health insurance program for the poor, so whether a person is eligible to receive Medicaid or not depends largely on their income. (Internet source 3.) Hence, these social welfare programs are only obtainable to certain few groups of people who need to fulfil very specific requirements when it comes to their medical condition, age and income. As can be seen, they do not offer coverage for a large group of Americans, who are, in addition, not able to purchase private health insurance because of, for example, its high price or a pre-existing medical condition which denies them coverage.

The new accepted health care legislation, however, promises to make insurance more affordable especially to lower- and middle-income people as it will subsidize private coverage and reduce premium costs for middle-class families and small business owners via tax cuts. These benefits are needed to aid citizens in obtaining health insurance which will be required by law from 2014 onwards or a fine will need to be paid. In this manner, the law provides coverage for 30 million who now lack it. The bill will add 16 million people to Medicaid rolls and will regulate more intensely the actions of private insurers who, in accordance with the new law, are now banned from denying coverage because of pre-existing conditions. The estimated costs of the new bill will be about $938 billion over ten years but the new law is also said to reduce the federal deficit by $138 billion over the same time-period. (Internet source 1.)

The Republicans have not accepted their defeat in the health care debate without objection. Ever since the bill was signed into law in March 2010, the party started campaigning on a promise to repeal it. In the November 2010 midterm elections, Republicans won back control of the House and were able to cut the Democratic majority in the Senate which meant they could now start fulfilling their campaign promise. Indeed, in January 2011 the House voted to repeal the health care overhaul which signified the start for the GOP's all-out effort of dismantling Obama's largest single legislative achievement so far. However, the vote in favour of repeal has been widely considered as only a symbolic act since it would eventually be blocked by both the Democratic majority in the Senate and President Obama. Hence, the Republicans have devised other ways in which to forestall the law from proceeding by, for instance, trying to withhold money needed by federal officials to administer and enforce the law. Also, since the signing of the new law, states have started to file challenges to it in federal court, many of them put in motion by Republican governors and attorneys in general. A large part of these challenges have centred on the so-called individual mandate which requires all Americans to buy health coverage or pay a fine. However, the mandate is central for the success of the law as the income received from it helps insurance companies in treating patients with expensive chronic conditions. Nevertheless, by February 2011 two judges have found the law to be unconstitutional based on the fact that Congress cannot compel citizens to buy a commercial product. Most likely, the matter will be eventually determined by the Supreme Court. (Internet source 1.)

As these challenges have been in process in court, the Democrats have been busy in getting the law into action. Federal and state regulators have been rolling out early provisions and laying out the groundwork for the broad changes to be taking place in 2014. President Obama has responded to the criticism caused by the individual mandate, saying that he would be willing to amend portions of the law as long as states can find other ways of expanding coverage to as many people without driving up health costs. (Internet source 1.) However, only time will tell if these

amendments will be effective and what the eventual fate of the new health care law will be. What is certain, though, is that the topic will be a matter of heated debate for a long time to come.

3 Theories and Analyses on Metaphor

The Oxford English Dictonary (1989) defines metaphor in the following manner:

> The figure of speech in which a name or descriptive term is transferred to some object different from, but analogous to, that to which it is properly applicable; an instance of this, a metaphorical expression.

This is just one of the many definitions of metaphor and certainly a very restricted one. An extensive amount of research and theorizing has been conducted on the trope and its use both in English and in other languages. In this chapter, I will first introduce some more traditional theories on metaphor, such as the substitution, interaction and comparison theories. I will continue by discussing the groundbreaking conceptual metaphor theory, which is of relevance in this thesis for the process of identifying metaphors in the articles. After presenting these theories, a closer examination is conducted on the method that I will use for analysing metaphorical language: critical metaphor analysis (CMA). Finally, a brief overview is provided on the previous studies made of the use of metaphor in media language.

3.1 Traditional Theories

The theorizing on metaphor reaches as far back as to the influential writings of Aristotle in his classic works *Poetics* and *Rhetoric* (Ortony 1979, 3). Aristotle analysed, among other things, the purpose of metaphors in communication, and quite surprisingly to the modern-day researcher, found them to be primarily ornamental (Ibid.). However, many researchers have taken to the topic since, with somewhat different views and more precise theories. One of them is I.A. Richards, who proposed the widely used terms for talking about metaphors such as *the tenor* (the topic or what is being compared) and *the vehicle* (the comment or what it is being compared to) (Mei-Zhen 1999, 229). Many other terms are used as well for roughly the same phenomena: Black (1979, 28) talks about the *primary* and *secondary subjects*, while Lakoff and Johnson (1980), for example, refer to the *target* and *source domains* (although in their theory the two terms are not compared to each

other but instead there exists a set of correspondences between the two called *a mapping*; see the following chapter on conceptual metaphors).

The comparison between the topic and vehicle terms has been considered as essential since the time of Aristotle's writings and the emphasis on many theories of metaphor has indeed been on explaining the existent similarity between the two terms in a metaphorical expression (Gibbs 1992, 586). This is the case, for instance, in comparison theory which is one of the three main traditional theories on metaphor (Mei-Zhen 1999, 229). Theorists that support this view of metaphor believe that there are some pre-existing similarities between the tenor and the vehicle term since they are used to refer to each other and depending on the context, the hearer/reader should be able to infer these similarities. The theory is based on the notion of metaphor playing with resemblances and thus, in the case of a metaphorical expression such as "Man is a wolf", the interpretation would be that man is similar to a wolf in that both share properties X, Y, Z, etc. (Ibid., 229-230). Comparison theory, according to Ortony (1979, 3) is the most similar to Aristotle's views since he saw metaphors as implicit comparisons which were based on the principles of analogy.

The second main theory on metaphor is substitution theory where the vehicle term is used to refer to the tenor instead of the literal term in order to make language sound more interesting and attractive (Mei-Zhen 1999, 229). Thus, the main point of the theory is that the vehicle is only a substitution for the literal term because metaphor cannot mean directly. Hence, in a metaphor such as "Man is a wolf", it is clear that man cannot actually and literally be a wolf, but instead this is just an indirect way of pointing out that "Man is fierce" etc. (Ibid.).

However, these two theories of metaphor have received their share of criticism. Black (1979, 28), for instance, argues that both the substitution and comparison theories on metaphor view the trope as something expendable except for "the incidental pleasures of stating figuratively what might just as well have been said literally." He, then, is a supporter and developer of a more widely held view on metaphor called interaction theory, which has been developed and modified on the

basis of I.A. Richard's valuable insights (Ibid., 27). Searle (1979, 104) analyses the theory as trying to explain metaphor "as a relation between senses and beliefs associated with references." These two references are the primary and secondary subjects (as termed by Black 1979) and in a metaphorical utterance, a set of associated implications (commonplaces) of the secondary subject are projected upon the primary subject (Black 1979, 28). The two subjects hence interact as implications fitting to the primary subject are selected from the secondary subject's properties, thereby also inducing changes in the secondary subject (Ibid., 29). Mei-Zhen (1999, 230) explains this interaction process as a "filtering of the tenor by the vehicle" since the tenor (primary subject) is not only compared to the vehicle (secondary subject) but is instead seen as the vehicle. Thus, in the case of the previous example "Man is a wolf", man is viewed through a wolf filter (Ibid.).

Gibbs (1992, 587), who has studied metaphor among other things from the point of view of time course of metaphor interpretation, analyses the comprehension of metaphors according to the interaction view in the following manner:

> . . . when understanding a metaphorical utterance listeners project the two conceptual domains, linguistically represented by the topic and vehicle terms, onto each other (a comprehension process) to arrive at a metaphorical meaning or meanings that highlight the emergent similarity between the two terms (an interpretation product).

What stands out from this analysis is the use of the term *conceptual domain*, which is central to a theory differing from any of the traditional ones: conceptual metaphor theory.

3.2 Conceptual Metaphor Theory

The now-classic conceptual metaphor theory introduced a new kind of approach to understanding metaphor and its role in language and the mind. It was first developed by Lakoff and Johnson in their book *Metaphors We Live By* (1980) and further advanced and modified in, for instance, Lakoff and Johnson (1999); Lakoff (1987) and Lakoff and Turner (1989). The three main findings that Lakoff and Johnson (1999, 3) present in the field of cognitive science and metaphors are as follows:

"The mind is inherently embodied. Thought is mostly unconscious. Abstract concepts are largely metaphorical." According to their theory, metaphor is no longer to be considered as solely a rhetorical device to be used by the linguistically imaginative and gifted, such as poets and great rhetoricians, but it is instead something which is pervasive in our lives, in our thought and action. Hence, when it comes to, for example, the kind of language we use when we talk about arguing, Lakoff and Johnson (1980, 5) point out that this language is not "poetic, fanciful, or rhetorical; it is literal". We understand expressions such as the ones in italics, "He *shot down* all of my arguments", "Your claims are *indefensible*", "He *attacked every weak point* in my argument" and "I *demolished* his argument" literally because the metaphor is not only in the words but in our very concept of an argument (Ibid., 4-5). Here, the concept of ARGUMENT contains the conceptual metaphor ARGUMENT IS WAR which we share in our conceptual system (Ibid., 4). We structure, perform, understand and talk about arguing and arguments in terms of war, and often without even realising it, since the use of such expressions as above stem from the conventional metaphorical concepts that we possess in our cognitive system, not solely from conscious word selection (Ibid., 5). And this cognitive system, according to Lakoff and Johnson's conceptual metaphor theory (Ibid., 3-4) is largely metaphorical in nature. Thus, metaphor is not just a matter of mere words as it is our whole human thought processes that are largely metaphorical and the human conceptual system is metaphorically structured and defined (Ibid., 6). It is precisely because we have such a conceptual system with metaphorical concepts that we are able to form metaphors as linguistic expressions.[1]

However, it is to be noted that when a certain metaphorical concept is shared in the conceptual system, it is shared only by a particular culture. For example, when it comes to the metaphorical concept ARGUMENT IS WAR, Lakoff and Johnson (1980, 4) point out that, "[the] metaphor is one that we live by in *this* culture; it structures the actions we perform in arguing" (italics added). Yet, there may be some other culture where arguing is not seen at all in terms of a

---

[1] And hence, metaphors can be understood and referred to as metaphorical concepts (Lakoff and Johnson 1980, 6).

battle but it might be structured in terms of dance, for example, and thus the whole notion of arguing would be viewed, experienced, carried out and talked about in a different manner (Ibid., 5). In addition, personal values to some extent always have an impact on how an individual views, constructs and uses different metaphorical concepts. As Charteris-Black (2005, 14) notes, the meanings of metaphor are relative rather than absolute, because the meanings of words themselves change for different individuals at different rates given their differing experiences of language.

In the words of Lakoff and Johnson (1980, 5), "The essence of metaphor is understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another". In metaphorical concepts such as, for example, LIFE IS A JOURNEY there is a set of correspondences between the two conceptual domains, LIFE and JOURNEY which are "mapped" onto each other in order to understand the structure of the metaphor (Lakoff and Turner 1989, 3-4). In this particular concept, LIFE can be considered as the target domain, which is the topic under discussion, and JOURNEY as the source domain from which certain aspects are mapped onto the target domain in order to form a new and more structured understanding of such an abstract concept as LIFE (Ibid., 38-39). Thus, JOURNEY as a concept is understood to contain such characteristics which correspond to those of LIFE. When life is considered as a journey, it is thought to have destinations and paths towards those destinations, which in turn make life purposeful to us. To elaborate the concept, Lakoff and Turner (1989, 3) present some example expressions:

> (1) We can speak of children as "getting off to a good start" in life and of the aged as being "at the end of the trail." We describe people as "making their way in life." People worry about whether they "are getting anywhere" with their lives, and about "giving their lives some direction." People who "know where they're going in life" are generally admired. In discussing options, one may say "I don't know which path to take."

However, as Lakoff and Johnson (1980, 12-13) point out, it is important to realize that a metaphorical concept such as JOURNEY only provides us with a partial understanding of what life is like, as it highlights certain aspects of it while hiding others. If the metaphorical structuring would

be total, then one concept would actually be the other, instead of just understood in terms of it (Ibid.) Also, according to Lakoff and Turner (1989, 60), a member of a culture needs to have a certain amount of conventional knowledge of a particular source domain in order to be able to understand what it is that is being mapped onto the target domain. And yet, not everybody shares the exact same knowledge or impression of a source domain, or at least do not map the exact same things of the source domain onto a target domain in each particular instance. This is possible since the understanding of life as a journey, for example, permits the mapping of different types of journeys in order to arrive at a corresponding variety of understandings of life. (Ibid., 61.)

Basic metaphorical concepts, such as LIFE IS A JOURNEY, DEATH IS DEPARTURE and TIME MOVES to name but a few, have become conventionalized in the English language since there is a large variety of words and idiomatic expressions which could not be interpreted correctly without knowledge of the conceptual metaphors underlying them (Lakoff and Turner 1989, 50). Still, not all concepts are metaphorical. In general, Lakoff and Turner (Ibid., 57) view a concept as not metaphorical if it is understood and structured on its own terms without relying on such structure which would be imported from a completely different conceptual domain. Such concepts are, for instance, things that we view as straightforwardly physical (e.g. arms, legs, rocks, trees) and which we conceptualize rather in terms of our bodily experience than metaphorically (Ibid., 59). Abstract concepts, such as life, death and time, on the other hand, are most often conceptualized metaphorically, as the examples above show. In addition to these, only a part of a concept can be metaphorical as well. In such a case, part of the concept's structure is understood metaphorically by importing structure from another domain whereas part of the concept may be understood directly, completely without metaphor (Ibid, 58). This is the case, for example, with the concept of dog that we share in our culture. Lakoff and Turner (1989, 58) point out that in most cases, the physical properties of a dog are not understood metaphorically whereas from the emotional point of view we

often view dogs as loyal, for instance. Therefore, part of the concept of dog is understood metaphorically while part of it is not.

Even though Lakoff and Johnson (1980, 5) state that the language of argument, for instance, is not poetic or fanciful but instead literal, this does not mean that metaphorical language based on conceptual metaphors could not be imaginative and unique. Lakoff and Turner (1989, 50) draw a distinction between the two distinct levels of metaphor – the conceptual level and the linguistic level – and note that a particular poetic passage, for example, may present a unique linguistic expression out of a basic conceptual metaphor even though the conceptual metaphor underlying the expression is extremely common. Still, it is possible to form new metaphors as well which are not based on our conventional system of thinking. Like all metaphors, new metaphors highlight certain realities and aspects of our experience while hiding and downplaying others (Lakoff and Johnson 1980, 156). In this way, as Koller (2005, 201) points out, they have the power to control discourse. The topic of new metaphors is discussed in more detail in section 3.2.2. First, however, let us take a look at the different metaphor "types" in Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) conceptual metaphor theory: structural, orientational and ontological metaphors, personification and metonymy.

3.2.1 Types of Conceptual Metaphors

Metaphorical concepts such as the previously discussed ARGUMENT IS WAR and LIFE IS A JOURNEY are what Lakoff and Johnson (1980, 14) call structural metaphors which structure one concept metaphorically in terms of another. However, there are other types of conceptual metaphors in the English language as well; one subgroup is called orientational metaphors. These metaphors organize a whole system of concepts in respect to one another. The spatial orientations described by the metaphor are based on the kinds of bodies that we have and how they function in our physical environment (Ibid.). One example of an orientational metaphor is the concept HAPPY IS UP. This

concept, together with its opposite SAD IS DOWN, is the source of several different expressions in the English language (Lakoff and Johnson 1980, 15):

> (2) I'm feeling *up*. That *boosted* my spirits. My spirits *rose*. You're in *high* spirits. Thinking about her always gives me a *lift*. I'm feeling *down*. I'm *depressed*. He's really *low* these days. I *fell* into a depression. My spirits *sank*.

The orientational metaphor HAPPY IS UP has been given a spatial orientation, which has a physical basis on the fact that in our culture we usually believe that an erect posture signifies a positive emotional state whereas a drooping posture signifies sadness and depression (Lakoff and Johnson 1980, 15). Thus, in this manner, our cultural experiences have modified language into a direction that we can make sense of both conceptually and physically. Similar orientational metaphoric concepts are, for example, CONSCIOUS IS UP / UNCONSCIOUS IS DOWN (Wake *up*. / He's *under* hypnosis.), MORE IS UP / LESS IS DOWN (My income *rose* last year. / He's *under*age.) and GOOD IS UP / BAD IS DOWN (He does *high*-quality work. / Things are at an all-time *low*.) (Ibid., 15-16).

Ontological metaphors, just as orientational ones, are based on human bodily experience. We conceive of our bodies as particular entities that are bounded by a surface (the skin) and made up of substances (e.g. flesh and bone), just as other physical objects are. The understanding that we have of physical objects, including our own bodies, provides the basis for ontological metaphors which, as Lakoff and Johnson (1980, 25) state, refer to the way of viewing events, activities, ideas, and so forth as entities and substances. Due to our experience with physical objects, it is easier for us to understand other phenomena in life by imposing artificial boundaries on them. Once we have identified our experiences as substances and entities, we can start referring to them, categorizing them, quantifying them and in this way reasoning about them (Ibid.). Often, as is the case with orientational metaphors, we do not notice ontological metaphorical expressions as being metaphors at all because instead of depicting something in terms of something else, with ontological metaphors we mostly refer and quantify (Lakoff and Johnson 1980, 27). Lakoff and Johnson (Ibid.,

26) exemplify this element of referring via ontological metaphors with the experience we have of rising prices:

> (3) INFLATION IS AN ENTITY
> *Inflation is lowering* our standard of living.
> If there's much *more inflation*, we'll never survive.
> We need to *combat inflation*.
> Buying land is the best way of *dealing with inflation*.
> *Inflation makes me sick*.

As inflation is here viewed as an entity, it is possible to refer to it, to quantify it, to act with respect to it and to see it as a cause for something. Ontological metaphors hence provide us with ways of dealing rationally with our experiences in life. (Ibid.)

Personification is a subgroup of ontological metaphors and functions by further specifying a physical object as being a person (Lakoff and Johnson 1980, 33). In this manner, human beings are able to comprehend a variety of experiences involving nonhuman entities in terms of human motivations, characteristics, and activities. Here are some examples by Lakoff and Johnson (Ibid.):

> (4) *Life has cheated* me.
> *Inflation is eating up* our profits.
> His *religion tells* him that he cannot drink fine French wines.

In these examples, something inhuman is seen to act like a human being would.

Charteris-Black (2005, 15) introduces another type of personification called depersonification. Contrary to personification, in depersonification something human or animate is referred to by using a word or expression which in other contexts refers to something inanimate. For example, the euphemistic phrase *collateral damage*, which could be viewed as referring to something inanimate, actually refers to the unintentional, civilian victims of a bombing. (Ibid., 15.)

Metonymy can easily be mixed up with personification but the one differs from the other in that in metonymy we are not placing human qualities to some entity or substance but instead are using one entity to refer to another that is related to it (Lakoff and Johnson 1980, 35). Again, it is useful to look at some examples (Ibid.):

> (5) He likes to read the *Marquis de Sade*. (= the writings of the marquis)

Acrylic has taken over the art world. (= the use of acrylic paint)
The *Times* hasn't arrived at the press conference yet.
(the reporter from *The Times*)

In addition, Lakoff and Johnson (1980, 36) introduce a special case of metonymy rhetoricians have traditionally called synecdoche where the part stands for the whole, as in these examples:

(6) The *automobile* is clogging our highways. (= the collection of automobiles)
There are a lot of *good heads* in the university. (= intelligent people)

Lakoff and Johnson (1980, 36) want to point out that metonymy and metaphor are different kinds of processes: with metaphor we conceive of one thing in terms of another and its primary function is understanding, whereas metonymy allows us to use one entity to stand for another and its primary function is referring.

3.2.2 New Metaphors

So far, the examples provided by Lakoff and Johnson (1980) and Lakoff and Turner (1989) have all been instances of conventional metaphors which are structured by the ordinary conceptual system we share in the western culture and which are reflected in our everyday language (Lakoff and Johnson 1980, 139). These conventional metaphors, though they might be formulated in the form of different and sometimes even unique and novel linguistic expressions, still most often only represent an underlying, very basic conceptual metaphor (Lakoff and Turner 1989, 50). However, it is possible to form completely new metaphors as well. As Lakoff and Johnson (1980, 139) point out, these new metaphors are outside our conventional system and they can give us a new understanding of a particular experience and new meaning to our daily activity.

To give an example of a new metaphor, Lakoff and Johnson (1980, 139) present the metaphor LOVE IS A COLLABORATIVE WORK OF ART. They find this metaphor particularly forceful and insightful since it makes sense of our experiences of love in just as an equal manner as conventional metaphors involving the same topic do. It provides coherent structure, and it highlights some things

while hiding others. This coherent structure is built from a large network of entailments which all new metaphors as well as conventional metaphors have. The entailments consist of such other metaphors and literal statements which correlate with our beliefs about and experiences of what it means for something to be a collaborative work of art, for example. (Ibid.) This particular metaphor of LOVE IS A COLLABORATIVE WORK OF ART, according to Lakoff and Johnson (1980, 140), contains entailments such as "Love requires patience", "Love is an aesthetic experience" and "Love requires cooperation". When such entailments fit with our experiences of love, the metaphor becomes coherent and it makes sense to us (Ibid.).

It is to be noted, however, that as both conventional and new metaphors highlight some aspects of an experience and hide others, the LOVE IS A COLLABORATIVE WORK OF ART metaphor, as Lakoff and Johnson (1980, 141) state, can only be used to express the various active aspects of love, such as WORK, CREATION and HELPING. In this manner it differs from the normal conventionalized metaphorical concepts of LOVE that we share in our culture (e.g. the LOVE IS MADNESS metaphor), which instead tend to highlight the passive and emotional aspects of love that are not under the lovers' active control. The LOVE IS MADNESS metaphor, for example, is used to form expressions such as "I'm crazy about her" and "She's driving me wild", which express a clear lack of control. Thus, with this highlighting of specific aspects of a particular concept, new metaphors can provide us with such views of love which our conventional conceptual system does not make available. (Ibid.)

Lakoff and Johnson (1980, 144) emphasize the special and important power that new metaphors have which is the power to create a new reality. They discuss this power via examining a possible new metaphor for viewing human problems: the CHEMICAL metaphor. The basic conceptual metaphor that normally arises when we are dealing with different kinds of problems is the PROBLEMS ARE PUZZLES metaphor, which characterizes our present reality. We are used to seeing problems as something that need to be solved correctly and permanently. (Ibid., 144-145.)

However, it would be possible for us to start viewing problems as a chemical, a solution which never totally disappears but may instead be dissolved temporarily when some resolution is found, but which might turn up again later in "solid" form (Ibid., 143). Hence, a different kind of reality and attitude towards problems could be created with this new metaphor instead of the conventionalized view, which only gives us a way of conceptualizing a pre-existing reality (Ibid., 144). Lakoff and Johnson (1980, 145) go as far as to suggest that if a new metaphor really enters our conceptual system at a deeper level as we start acting according to it, it would be involved in cultural change. They state that the introduction of the TIME IS MONEY metaphor, for instance, has had an impact on the westernization of cultures. They do not, however, give any particular evidence on the matter and it is indeed doubtful as to how such an issue could be proved.

When it comes to the analysis conducted in this thesis, it is rather difficult to find any new metaphors concerning health care reform in the sense of Lakoff and Johnson (1980). The topic cannot be compared to concepts such as LIFE, DEATH or LOVE since these concepts are always present in our lives whereas health care reform is tied to a particular time and place. There is no way of knowing in advance what even the conventional conceptual metaphors depicting health care reform are (let alone new ones), since the process of devising it is unique and has not taken place before in the U.S. to a similar extent. The aim of this thesis is, of course, exactly that of finding out the conceptual metaphors used in the discourse on health care reform which at the moment are all new to us. It would require another health care reform and another study such as this to see whether any new metaphors depicting health care reform would have arisen since "ObamaCare".

3.2.3 Criticism towards Conceptual Metaphor Theory

Naturally, no influential and well-renowned theory of the calibre of Lakoff and Johnson's 1980 version of the conceptual metaphor theory can remain without its share of criticism. For example, Kertész and Rákosi (2009) have explored the charges of circularity projected at the theory by

different scholars. They state that conceptual metaphor theory has some circular aspects in its argumentation for example, as it leaves relevant data out of consideration (Ibid., 724). With this they refer to non-linguistic data, which is basically non-existent in conceptual metaphor theory; no psycholinguistic experiments on the topic are presented or analysed. However, they (Ibid., 727) do point out that in later versions of the theory (Lakoff and Johnson (1999)) neurological research has been included into the analysis as new type of data. Nonetheless, as further criticism, Kertész and Rákosi (Ibid., 724) state that the theory does not take into account the differences in individuals' linguistic competences but relies solely on the linguists' intuition. Holmgreen (2008, 102-103), on the other hand, broadens the criticism placed on conceptual metaphor theory from solely the realms of the individual to the cultural. She points out that the theory has been criticised for not focusing sufficiently on the interaction between culture, context and the choice of metaphor which has resulted in its failure to "fully account for the dialectics between the situational, social context and language and thought."

McGlone (2001, 95) agrees with Kertész and Rákosi in their critique on the theory solely being based on linguistic evidence which, in his view, is not enough to justify the claim that metaphors transcend their linguistic manifestations to influence conceptual structure. He also criticizes conceptual metaphor theory for not presenting "a realistic portrayal of the human conceptual system" (Ibid., 105). This is because he perceives it to be placing too much value on the co-dependence between abstract and concrete concepts which in turn would make it impossible for us to talk about an abstract target domain such as LIFE independently of journeys (Ibid.).

The above critique no doubt represents just a minority of reviews given to Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) conceptual metaphor theory. In addition to the commentary, Kertész and Rákosi (2009, 727) point out that many novel and rival approaches have been developed to overcome the shortcomings of the original and to further improve the theory. For the development of the area of cognitive linguistics, this is of course highly important. Still, the theory remains, in Holmgreen's

(2008, 102) words, as "one of the most important contributions to the understanding of metaphor in thought and language." We shall now examine the way it is applied in critical metaphor analysis.

3.3 Critical Metaphor Analysis

Charteris-Black, the creator of the approach to studying metaphors called critical metaphor analysis (CMA), defines metaphor as

> a linguistic representation that results from the shift in the use of a word or phrase from the context or domain in which it is expected to occur to another context or domain where it is not expected to occur, thereby causing semantic tension. It may have any or all of the linguistic, pragmatic and cognitive characteristics that are specified above (Charteris-Black 2004, 21).

The last sentence of this definition reveals one of the key viewpoints that Charteris-Black has to studying metaphors. His method, critical metaphor analysis, is strongly based on the cognitive and semantic approaches to metaphor, developed, among others, by Lakoff and Johnson (1980), but Charteris-Black (2004, 2) argues that a pragmatic perspective needs to be added to these. This perspective takes into consideration speaker intention as metaphors are chosen "to achieve particular communication goals within particular contexts rather than being [totally] predetermined by bodily experience" (Charteris-Black 2004, 247). Hence, the selection of a particular metaphor in discourse depends on the linguistic, pragmatic and cognitive resources that an individual possesses. Cognitive resources refer to the thoughts, feelings and bodily experiences that a person has of the world; pragmatic resources refer to the understanding of what will be effective in a particular context and linguistic resources refer to the knowledge a person has of his/her linguistic system. (Charteris-Black 2004, 249.)

Now, incorporating a pragmatic view into the study of metaphors aims at emphasizing the element of persuasion included in metaphor use. According to Charteris-Black (2004, 249) the cognitive and linguistic views of metaphor account well for its interpretation (metaphor decoding) but they lack in the ability to explain why a particular metaphor is preferred instead of another one

(metaphor encoding). Critical metaphor analysis helps the analyst in studying metaphor encoding as well as it takes into consideration the fact that metaphor choice is also a conscious selection of one linguistic form over another in order to make discourse persuasive. As already noted, this selection is based on the individual resources that a person possesses but Charteris-Black (2004, 248) adds to these certain social considerations that affect the choice. These are both a person's cultural and historical knowledge as well as their ideological standpoints (e.g. religious/political beliefs).

Thus, critical metaphor analysis provides a methodology for analysing metaphors and metaphorical language which largely concentrates on the analysis and interpretation of ideology. The overall theoretical frame that Charteris-Black has adopted for his method comes from critical discourse analysis (CDA), which has ideology as one of its main areas of inquiry (Blommaert 2005, 21). Wodak (2001, 3) points out that ideology is one of the three concepts that figure indispensably in all CDA (along with the concepts of power and history). van Dijk (2001, 354) adds to this list notions such as dominance, discrimination, hegemony, social structure and social order. And Fairclough (1995, 62), who has contributed some of the most groundbreaking research to the field, includes into CDA three aspects of sociocultural practice: economic, political (issues of power and ideology) and cultural (questions of value and identity). To put it brief then, critical discourse analysis can be defined as being

> concerned with analysing opaque as well as transparent structural relationships of dominance, discrimination, power and control as manifested in language. In other words, CDA aims to investigate critically social inequality as it is expressed, signalled, constituted, legitimized and so on by language use (or in discourse) (Wodak 2001, 2).[2]

As such issues as the manifestations of ideology and power in language are often unclear to people, CDA aims to make these aspects of discourse more visible (Fairclough and Wodak 1997, 258). Hence, a focus on the intentions of the language user is central to CDA and it is not trying to hide the fact that this focus is politically and ideologically motivated (Charteris-Black 2004, 29). It is,

---

[2] However, the notion of ideology as employed in this thesis differs slightly from the traditional CDA perspective. In my forthcoming analysis, ideologies are understood as the representations constructed and conveyed of U.S. health care reform and the health care reform plan, instead of as revealing social inequality, for example.

however, to be noted that the paradigm does not consist of one theory or methodology shared by everyone, but that researchers identifying with CDA are united more by their common domains and topics of investigation (Blommaert 2005, 24). For more on critical discourse analysis, see for example Blommaert (2005), van Dijk (2001), Wodak (1997; 2001) and Fairclough (1989; 1995; 1997).

In the context of CDA, metaphor can be considered an important topic of investigation because by critically analysing its use in large corpora, it is possible to reveal the underlying intentions of a text producer and hence "identify the nature of particular ideologies" (Charteris-Black 2004, 28). Ideologies, by Fairclough's (1989, 2) definition, function as a means of legitimizing already existent social relations and differences of power which through ordinary, everyday behaviour have become self-evident. They are closely linked to language, "because using language is the commonest form of social behaviour, and the form of social behaviour where we rely most on 'common-sense' assumptions" (Ibid.). Charteris-Black (2005, 21) also views language and communication as being crucial in the practice of ideology as they are involved in the process of self-legitimisation where an individual decides for him/herself what is right and wrong, good and bad and hence places themselves in a social group that shares those values. He then goes on to define ideology as "a consciously formulated set of ideas that comprise an organised and systematic representation of the world and therefore forms the basis for acting in the world" (Ibid., 21-22).

Whereas Charteris-Black's definition of ideology concentrates more on the forming of individual ideologies, Fairclough, on the other hand, examines the issue from a slightly larger, societal perspective. Even though every individual has their own beliefs and ideologies, Blommaert (2005, 159) notes that many authors emphasize the fact that there are also many normalised patterns of thought and behaviour that penetrate societies and communities and that are reinforced by different power structures. From the point of view of media discourse, these ideological representations are more implicit rather than explicit in texts and in Fairclough's (1995, 44-45)

words are "embedded in ways of using language which are naturalized and commonsensical for reporters, audiences, and various categories of third parties . . . ". Thus, we do not often even notice that a certain ideology is communicated to us as the patterns of thought and the language used to describe them are something so normalized and taken-for-granted in our culture.

When it comes to metaphor and critical metaphor analysis then, Charteris-Black (2004, 247) notes that often metaphor choice is motivated by ideology. Depending on the ideology, the same concept or idea can be communicated with a host of different metaphors and also, the same metaphors can be employed differently according to ideological perspective (Ibid.). For CMA, ideology is an important concept because metaphor selection and use are often motivated by the purpose of arousing the emotions in order to persuade the hearer/reader and in this manner metaphors have a social role in constructing ideology (Ibid., 251). Still, both Charteris-Black (2004, 30) and Fairclough (1995, 47) remark that not all metaphor use in specific or media discourse in general are ideologically loaded by definition.

All in all, Charteris-Black (2004, 41) defines critical metaphor analysis as "an integration of corpus linguistics with cognitive linguistics and Critical Discourse Analysis". In order to arrive at conclusions about issues such as ideology and legitimisation, studies conducted with the CMA approach consist of three stages: metaphor identification, metaphor interpretation and metaphor explanation (Charteris-Black 2005, 26). These stages are further explained in section 4.2 in conjunction with the method for my research, as that method is, in general terms, based on critical metaphor analysis. The following section, on the other hand, reviews some of the research made on the use of metaphor in the media of newspapers and magazines.

3.4 Metaphor and Media Language

Overall, the study of metaphors in the sphere of printed media language seems to concentrate largely on the language of newspapers. For instance, Holmgreen (2008) has studied the way the

European debate on biotechnology is metaphorically constructed in Danish broadsheets and tabloids. She analyses the connection between metaphors, ideology and public opinion with the assumption that the basic functions of metaphors in media discourse are that of explaining and persuading. These functions are then influenced by the public's perception and knowledge of the topic as well as the ideological stance adopted by the paper. Holmgreen (2008) employs a social-constructivist approach to understanding metaphor use in text and discourse which she bases on both Lakoff and Johnson's conceptual metaphor theory and Teun van Dijk's sociocognitive approach. In her view, "the choice of metaphor will be partly contingent on embodied meaning, personal and social experience as well as the interpretation of the actual communicative situation" (2008, 104). Holmgreen's (2008) study shows that the main metaphors in use in the public debate on biotechnology in the Danish newspaper press are built around the concepts of CONTAINER/ORGANISM, OBJECT, SUBSTANCE and PATH. These same concepts can be used either with the intention of supporting or contesting a certain view on biotechnology and genetically modified organisms. Most often, however, the view conveyed on the issue via the use of metaphorical expressions based on the above concepts is that of genetically modified organisms and biotechnology being unpredictable, risky and dangerous.

Chiang and Duann (2007) also use newspaper language as their material for a study on metaphors. They examine the use of conceptual metaphors for SARS in three major Asian broadsheets which are all published under different political systems and which all represent differing editorial stances. Hence, the main hypothesis of the study is that the newspapers will represent the disease differently. The three papers selected for the study are *The Liberty Times* and *The United Daily News* from Taiwan and *The People's Daily* from China. *The Liberty Times* supports Taiwan independence over reunification with China whereas *The United Daily News* upholds a Chinese nationalist identity. *The People's Daily*, on the other hand, is the main communication channel of the Chinese Communist Party.

In order to demonstrate how the different ideologies of the newspapers influenced the representations of the disease in Taiwan and Mainland China, Chiang and Duann (2007) examine the use of naming strategies and metaphors for SARS using the theoretical framework of Charteris-Black's (2004) critical metaphor analysis. However, they add to this the notions of Self and Other construction to further expose the motivation behind the newspapers' metaphor selection. Chiang and Duann (2007) discover that the predominant metaphor for SARS in the three broadsheets is SARS IS WAR via which the newspapers form their particular constructions of Self and Other to profess a certain ideology. *The People's Daily*, for example, only views SARS as the Other whereas *The Liberty Times* actually equates China with the disease (and hence views the country as the Other).

Koller (2005), who has studied media discourse on mergers and acquisitions (M&A), uses both magazine and newspaper texts as her material. She analyses her +160,000 words machine-readable corpus compiled from *BusinessWeek*, *The Economist*, *Fortune* and the *Financial Times* with the help of a framework that incorporates aspects from both cognitive linguistics and critical discourse analysis. With this framework, she wants to study the use of metaphor in particular to discuss its sociocognitive impact and to trace and explain its use in forming ideology.

Koller's (2005) main finding in her corpus published between 1997 and 2000 is that in media discourse on M&A, three metaphor clusters of FIGHTING, MATING and FEEDING prevail and represent subcategories for the overarching EVOLUTIONARY STRUGGLE metaphor. This metaphor "naturalizes the social practice of corporate restructuring as part of an evolutionary process" (Ibid., 216). Also, all of the three subcategories can be considered as conceptual parallels since they centre on aggressive movement with the goal of extinction of rivals by various means. Koller (Ibid., 219) notes that combining fighting and business is an ideologically motivated choice which (re)establishes and also helps sustain "the discourse on and social practice of M&A as a male-defined domain." In fact, the topic of M&A was already introduced by Koller (2004) where she

studied the same publications, albeit with a bigger corpus, and also extended her analysis to texts on marketing and sales. Koller's (2004) main focus was on examining the use of metaphor and gender in business media discourse, where the WAR/FIGHTING metaphor proved to be prominent in masculinizing both the discourse and its social practices.

4 Material and Method

In this chapter, the materials and method for the research will be explained in more detail. The reasons for the selection of particular magazines and articles are given and the methods for analysing the material are uncovered. The results of the actual analysis are presented in chapter 5.

4.1 The Magazines

The articles concerning the United States health care reform which were extracted for this study emanate from four magazines: *Newsweek*, *Time*, *BusinessWeek* and *Forbes*. All magazines publish both the original, North-American version as well as different international editions (*Time*/*BusinessWeek* Europe, *Newsweek* Latin American Edition, *Forbes* Asia, etc.) which can vary somewhat as to their content, often including articles with more regional topics. However, all the articles used as material for this thesis were chosen from the North-American editions of the magazines.

Selecting magazines which all emanate from and are published in the United States was crucial for the aims of this analysis on metaphorical language, because what I wanted to study in particular were the representations and possible ideologies that mainly Americans journalists presented of this polemic domestic issue to a mainly American readership who would ultimately be affected by the decisions made on the topic. Inside the category of American magazines then, these four were selected primarily based on the amount of such articles they contained that were dealing with health care reform, and based on the magazines' availability and accessibility from the Tampere University Library electronic magazines archive. However, some relevant articles could not be accessed from the archive and were hence copied either directly from the paper versions of the magazines or from their web pages. In addition to the aforementioned characteristics concerning the selection of the magazines, it was important that all of them belonged to a roughly similar kind of genre as regards their subject matter (all deal mainly with general business, politics and

international affairs) and that they were published more than once a month to provide enough data for the research (*Newsweek, Time* and *BusinessWeek* are published weekly, *Forbes* biweekly).

A total of 60 articles dealing with health care reform were analysed for this study and they amounted to c. 67,500 words of running text (see Table 1). The articles were selected regardless of their genre within the magazines (cover story, regular column, etc.) over a time span of roughly a year (from March 2009 to April 2010). This period coincides with the time it took to achieve health care reform, as President Obama started working on the issue shortly after his inauguration in January 2009 and eventually signed new health care legislation at the end of March 2010.[3]

Table 1. The origin and size of the data examined in the study.

Magazine	*Number of articles*	*Word count*
*Newsweek (*NW*)*	25	27,396
*Time (*TM*)*	14	19,318
*BusinessWeek (*BW*)*	12	12,457
*Forbes (*FB*)*	9	8,239
TOTAL	60	67,410

However, as can be seen from Table 1, the material analysed was not evenly distributed across the four magazines. Clearly, as *BusinessWeek* and *Forbes* are more concentrated in their subject matter on economics, they dealt with this political issue of health care reform less than *Newsweek* and *Time*. Still, for the purposes of the research in question, this did not represent a problem since the intention of the analysis was not so much to compare the magazines to each other but to offer an overall look into the phenomenon of U.S. health care reform from the point of view of metaphor use.

In the following subsections, I will provide the reader with some background information on the magazines under scrutiny. *Newsweek* and *Time* will be covered in the same section since they present a more general outlook on different subject matter in their publications, whereas

---

[3] Hence, the material analysed for this study does not include articles which deal with the events having taken place in the health care debate since April 2010 (these events were briefly revised at the end of chapter 2).

BusinessWeek and *Forbes* are more concentrated on dealing with topics from the perspective of business and economics. An overview is provided on the readership demographics of the magazines as well as on their missions and goals. In addition, issues such as the magazines' political stance and possible bias are discussed briefly. These factors will impact the magazines' language use and hence their use of metaphors as well.

4.1.1 Newsweek and Time

The first ever issue of *Newsweek* was published in February 1933 and it quickly earned its place as one of the top three newsweeklies in the United States (Pedersoli 1990, 313). Since then, the magazine has steadily grown in circulation and now has 11 different editions in more than 190 countries which give it an overall worldwide audience of over 19 million. The national edition, which is analysed in this thesis, is distributed throughout the U.S. and Canada, and has an audience of approximately 15,241,000 readers. Out of this audience, 53% are male and 47% female with an average age of 52 years. 88% of the readers have either attended or graduated college and indeed, according to *Newsweek,* their readers are "smart, influential and engaged" people "looking for a trusted source that can help them put the flood of news into perspective." (Internet source 4.) This "flood of news" consists of topics such as politics, business, international issues, technology, sustainability, health and culture. *Newsweek*'s aim is to be "provocative, but not partisan, through insight, opinion and original reporting" (Ibid.). From the beginning on, the magazine has been quite daring and liberal in its subject matter as it was, for example, the first leading newsweekly to cover issues such as the Civil Rights movement of the 1960s with an in-depth study of racial problems in the U.S. and in 1984 raised awareness of AIDS with a cover of two males embracing (Pedersoli 1990, 315).

Newsweek's biggest competitor *Time* brought its first issue to the market already in March 1923 which makes it America's first newsmagazine (Adkins Covert and Wasburn 2009, 35). Today

the magazine has a U.S audience of 19,000,000 readers, which places it in front of *Newsweek* and along with its overseas editions makes it the largest circulation magazine in the world. Out of the U.S. readership, 53% are male and 47% female readers, which correlates with *Newsweek*'s readership distribution. The average age of a *Time* reader is 48 years and 44% of the audience has graduated from college or more. The magazine states that its mission is to separate the crucial from the trivial and to convert information into knowledge through "exceptional writing, first-hand reporting and stunning photography." (Internet source 5.)

Adkins Covert and Wasburn (2009, 43-44) note that during their existence, both *Newsweek* and *Time* have been accused of conservative or liberal bias. In the context of media, the term *bias* (or *partisanship*) can, in their view, be defined "as a consistent tendency to provide more support to one of the contending parties, policies, or points of view in a sustained conflict over a social issue" (Ibid., 49). The ownership of the two magazines by major media corporations (*Newsweek* owned by The Washington Post Company, *Time* by Time Warner) in particular has roused suspicions about their ability to remain objective. According to Adkins Covert and Wasburn (Ibid., 43-44), conservatives are worried that some of the liberal-leftist views of the companies' key people might have an effect on the magazines' output whereas liberals fear that both *Newsweek* and *Time* have to give in to corporate and capitalistic views and disregard topics such as pro-labour issues and social and economic reforms because they belong to big, conglomerate companies. However, both *Newsweek* and *Time* state that they are not partisan, and this view also found support in a study conducted by Adkins Covert and Wasburn (Ibid., 89) where it was concluded that the magazines convey an overall "centrist" viewpoint.

4.1.2 BusinessWeek and Forbes

BusinessWeek (nowadays officially *Bloomberg BusinessWeek* due to an ownership change in October 2009) was founded in 1929 (internet source 6). It considers its task to be not so much

reviewing the week's news as preparing its readers for the week ahead. According to *BusinessWeek*'s media kit, its readers are business leaders who depend on the magazine as "a trusted source of essential, comprehensive insight" when planning their future actions. (Internet source 7.) 66,4% of *BusinessWeek*'s readers are men and 33,6% women who total an audience of 4,687,000 (internet source 8). This information, which was actually retrieved from *Forbes*' media kit, shows a clear difference in the gender division of the readers as well as in the overall audience number to both *Newsweek* and *Time* and matches *BusinessWeek*'s more specific, business-oriented content and target group. More than half of *BusinessWeek*'s readers (52,9%) have graduated from college or have a postgraduate degree and their average age is 46 (internet source 9). *BusinessWeek* covers topics on global economics, companies and industries, politics and policy, technology, markets and finance as well as lifestyle – although through a business lens (internet source 7).

Just as is the case between *Time* and *Newsweek*, *Forbes* is one of *BusinessWeek*'s biggest competitors, albeit it is only published biweekly. The magazine was founded in 1917 and is today, in their own words, "the most trusted, recognized and influential brand of business journalism in the world" (internet source 8). The magazine has a total audience of 5,383,000 readers, which places it slightly ahead of *BusinessWeek*. This audience consists mostly of men (63,5%) with female readers totalling to 36,5%. Together their average age is 45 and 48,7% of the readers have graduated from college or more. *Forbes* magazine also conceive of their general reader as a high-powered business leader who with the help of the information provided by the magazine is better able to "capitalize on business and financial opportunities." (Ibid.) When it comes to content, *Forbes* is very similar to *BusinessWeek* but stands out from its competition especially with its annual, world-renown lists, which include, for example, the list of the most powerful people in the world (Ibid.).

When it comes to bias and partisanship, both *BusinessWeek* and *Forbes* are independent and generally ideology-free. However, it is to be noted that some of the articles from the four magazines analysed in this thesis are, for example, regular columns that are always written by the same

journalist from whose writing a personal ideology may come forth somewhat explicitly as well. Still, this is not an overall position taken up by the magazine itself and is usually somehow balanced out in other articles dealing with the same issue (Adkins Covert and Wasburn 2009, 39). Nevertheless, printed words always have the ability to influence their receiver and certainly impact the overall image conveyed of an issue.

4.2 The Method

As already stated earlier, the overall method in this study for examining the metaphors depicting U.S. health care reform is based on Charteris-Black's critical metaphor analysis (CMA). Accordingly then, both qualitative and quantitative analysis were used in the research, although for the most part the results are analysed qualitatively. Despite the two very general tables presenting the findings in numeric terms in the results section, the main emphasis of the study resides in finding out the possible representations and ideologies provided by four American magazines on health care reform rather than concentrating on the frequencies of particular metaphor use in a specific corpus. Hence, the three stages of critical metaphor analysis – metaphor identification, interpretation and examination – were not followed rigorously or to the point. Instead, they were modified to fit the purposes of this particular research. However, before moving on to discuss the exact method used in the study, it is necessary to further examine the three stages of CMA.

In the first stage of critical metaphor analysis, candidate metaphors are searched from the material in question with a close reading of sample texts. They are examined and identified based on whether there is a "presence of incongruity or semantic tension – either at linguistic, pragmatic or cognitive levels – resulting from a shift in domain use – even if this shift occurred some time before and has since become conventionalized" (Charteris-Black 2004, 35). What Charteris-Black is referring to here is that many expressions might not stand out immediately as metaphors because they have become quite conventionalized in their use. However, often these metaphorical

expressions do belong to an overall conceptual metaphor and are hence to be considered as candidates as well. Those expressions that do not meet the criteria above are to be excluded from the study. With the manual search, Charteris-Black (2005, 36) is interested in finding and classifying a host of keywords, which are words that seem to be used often in a metaphoric sense. These keywords are then inserted into a computer search facility to measure their overall frequencies in the corpus. Finally, the corpus context surrounding the keywords needs to be studied again to see whether each use of a keyword is metaphoric or literal. (Ibid.)

After being left with only the metaphoric keywords and their related expressions, the next stage in the CMA approach may begin. This phase consists of metaphor interpretation where a relationship between the metaphors and the cognitive and pragmatic factors determining them is established (Charteris-Black 2004, 37). With the help of Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) theory, conceptual metaphors are identified as well as possible conceptual keys which are higher level metaphors explaining the relationship between several conceptual metaphors. Charteris-Black (2004, 38) points out, however, that in order to make the claim of an overall conceptual metaphor, there need to be several expressions identified that fit to it. Once the different conceptual metaphors are established, their use can be analysed and explained from the point of view of ideological motivation. This stage of metaphor explanation is the third and final stage in the CMA approach. In order to determine the ideological and rhetorical (the aim to persuade) motivation behind metaphor use, the discourse function of metaphors is identified based on the context in which the metaphors occur (Charteris-Black 2004, 39).

Now, having examined the method for critical metaphor analysis, we can take a look at how it is used and modified in this particular thesis. To begin with, the search for articles dealing with U.S. health care reform was conducted by using two sets of search words in the Tampere University Library electronic magazines archive: "health care reform" and "Barack Obama". However, not all the articles that corresponded with the search words could be used as material for the research as

some just mentioned the issue in one sentence and otherwise dealt with a completely different subject matter. Thus, at least one third of any article needed to discuss health care reform for it to be approved as material for the study. Once all the relevant articles were extracted, a closer reading of them began with the intention of identifying candidate metaphors. The metaphor identification stage of CMA is, however, where the method used in this research mostly deviates from Charteris-Black's method. Instead of looking for particular metaphor keywords which would then be inserted into a computer search facility to measure frequencies of use in a corpus, my search for metaphors was conducted in every stage only manually and without the intention of looking for certain keywords. The reasons behind this decision were, for one, the preference to include conceptual metaphors of all kinds in the study and secondly, the concentration on qualitative rather than quantitative analysis. Had the study been conducted from the start with only a concentration on certain keywords, and wholly in accordance with Charteris-Black's method, many interesting metaphorical expressions could have been left out if they did not occur together with a specific keyword. My main intention was to study the overall representations and ideologies provided by the four magazines on health care reform and had I used and examined only certain keywords and the metaphors surrounding them, especially as I began the study with no clear hypothesis, this would not have been possible.

As there were no particular keywords to be searched, all possible metaphors were at first identified in the material by close reading. Only then, and in accordance with the second stage of the CMA approach, could the conceptual metaphorical expressions be distinguished from amongst them with the help of Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) conceptual metaphor theory. Interpreting the metaphorical expressions helped divide and place them into different categories depending on their source domain. Further analysis was then conducted to ensure that the example expressions really fit a proposed category which could then be named with an overall conceptual metaphor. Finally, the use of the conceptual metaphors was analysed from the point of view of ideological motivation

and conclusions were drawn on the representations that they bring forth. The results of this stage of metaphor explanation are elaborated on in the following chapters 5 and 6.

Analysing and interpreting metaphors, or any item of discourse for that matter, is always and ultimately a subjective effort influenced by a person's experiences of the world and their cultural background. Hence, alternative interpretations of the metaphorical expressions encountered in this study are most likely to be found. It was not always easy to categorize the metaphors found as many of them fit several of the overall conceptual metaphors. Although from the point of view of qualitative analysis this did not normally present a problem for the research, it did affect the representation of the results in numeric terms in the tables given at the beginning of chapter 5. It is also to be noted that only *conceptual* metaphors that are referring to the process of health care reform or to the plan itself were included in the study; if other metaphors occurred in the texts, they were excluded. No special attention was paid to the word classes of the words occurring in metaphorical expressions or to the gender of the authors in the articles. However, when it comes to the metaphors found in the titles of the articles or in direct quotations as stated by the participants of health care reform, these have been included in the study.

Finally, a few notions of a typographical nature are in place. First of all, when examples are presented in the results section, the names of the magazines that they emanate from have been abbreviated in the following manner: *Newsweek* – NW, *Time* – TM, *BusinessWeek* – BW and *Forbes* – FB. Small capital letters are used to refer to conceptual metaphors or to the concepts that are part of them (i.e. JOURNEY), in accordance with the tradition originated by Lakoff and Johnson (1980). The example metaphors under discussion in a given stretch of text are presented in italics; if other metaphors occur in the same stretch of text but are not relevant to the discussion at that point, they do not appear in italics. I will now continue by presenting the results of the analysis conducted on the use of conceptual metaphors on the reporting of U.S. health care reform.

5 Results

The metaphors found in the articles in *Newsweek*, *Time*, *BusinessWeek* and *Forbes* can be roughly divided into two groups. The first group consists of metaphors that depict the overall process of devising and achieving health care reform while the metaphors found in the second group are used to refer to the actual reform plan itself. As both of these groups include examples of metaphorical expressions that belong under several different general concepts such as e.g. JOURNEY, the following qualitative analysis presents and examines the metaphors and their use according to their overall concept group (and conceptual metaphor). These concept groups may then entail metaphorical expressions referring to both the process of health care reform as well as to the plan itself.

Before presenting the results with a more detailed, qualitative analysis, let us take a look at the conceptual metaphors found in the articles with the help of two tables. These tables present the results in numbers and percentages based on the previously mentioned division of the metaphors into two groups. Hence, the first table demonstrates the amount of metaphorical expressions found in the articles that have as their target domain the overall process of health care reform. The second table, on the other hand, presents the results for such metaphors that take specifically the health care reform plan as their target domain. Thus, both tables can include examples from the one and the same concept group (e.g. WAR) but they are divided between two tables due to the difference in their target domain.

The two tables present the results for each magazine according to the source domains encountered in the articles. To start with, in Table 2 we can see that 51 tokens of metaphorical expressions using WAR as their source domain were found in the *Newsweek* article material analysed for this research. This makes HEALTH CARE REFORM IS WAR the most utilized conceptual metaphor in *Newsweek*'s reports on the topic with an incidence percentage of 43.59. The WAR metaphor resulted to be the most used metaphor in all the four magazines together as it was the

source domain for a little over 38% off all the conceptual metaphors in the articles. The only magazine to use another conceptual metaphor the most is *Time* which prefers the HEALTH CARE REFORM IS A JOURNEY metaphor slightly more than the following WAR and SPORTS metaphors. The HEALTH CARE REFORM IS SPORTS metaphor is the second most used conceptual metaphor also in *Newsweek*, whereas there were no instances of this metaphor found in *BusinessWeek* or *Forbes*. This places the JOURNEY metaphor in front of the SPORTS one as the second most used source domain for conceptual metaphors when the results of all the four magazines are counted together.

Table 2. Metaphors for the concept of HEALTH CARE REFORM.

	Newsweek		Time		BusinessWeek		Forbes		All
Source domain	*Token*	*Incidence (%)*	*Token*	*Incidence (%)*	*Token*	*Incidence (%)*	*Token*	*Incidence (%)*	*Token (Incidence%)*
WAR	51	43.59	21	23.86	15	57.69	7	43.75	94 (38.06)
JOURNEY	14	11.97	25	28.41	6	23.08	6	37.50	51 (20.65)
GAME:									
SPORTS	16	13.68	21	23.86	0	0.00	0	0.00	37 (14.98)
GAMBLE	6	5.13	2	2.27	1	3.85	0	0.00	9 (3.64)
RISK	8	6.84	4	4.55	0	0.00	0	0.00	12 (4.86)
FORCING	7	5.98	6	6.82	2	7.69	2	12.50	17 (6.88)
FOOD PROCESSING	1	0.85	2	2.27	0	0.00	0	0.00	3 (1.21)
Overlapping metaphors	14	11.97	7	7.95	2	7.69	1	6.25	24 (9.72)
TOTAL	117	100[4]	88	100	26	100	16	100	247 (100)

As Table 2 shows, a total of 247 tokens of metaphorical expressions were found for the concept of HEALTH CARE REFORM. However, some of these metaphorical expressions used terms that belong to several lexical fields and could therefore be categorized as belonging to many different conceptual metaphors. These were terms such as *victory*, *defeat* and *opponent*, which can have originated from both the source domains of WAR and SPORTS. Also, terms such as *track* could be analysed as belonging to either the source domain of JOURNEY or SPORTS, slightly depending on

---

[4] Due to the fact that the percentages have been rounded up into two decimal numbers, not all of the incidence percentages come up to the even 100.00%.

the co-text of the sentence. Hence, to ease out the presentation of the results in numeric terms (and to avoid mistakes in counting), the category of overlapping metaphors was included in the tables.

Table 3. Metaphors for the concept of THE HEALTH CARE REFORM PLAN

Source domain	*Newsweek*		*Time*		*BusinessWeek*		*Forbes*		*All*
	Token	*Incidence (%)*	*Token*	*Incidence (%)*	*Token*	*Incidence (%)*	*Token*	*Incidence (%)*	*Token (Incidence%)*
WAR: ADVERSARY	5	12.82	2	8.33	1	6.67	2	18.18	10 (11.24)
JOURNEY: TRAVELLER	5	12.82	2	8.33	1	6.67	1	9.09	9 (10.11)
HEAVY OBJECT	4	10.26	2	8.33	1	6.67	2	18.18	9 (10.11)
PERSON (VILLAIN/ INADEQUATE)	11 (6/2)	28.21	7 (2/3)	29.17	9 (4/4)	60.00	5 (3/1)	45.45	32 (35.96)
SUBSTANCE	3	7.69	4	16.67	0	0.00	0	0.00	7 (7.87)
CONSTRUCTION	8	20.51	2	8.33	1	6.67	0	0.00	11 (12.36)
COMMODITY	1	2.56	5	20.83	1	6.67	1	9.09	8 (8.99)
FOOD	2	5.13	0	0.00	1	6.67	0	0.00	3 (3.37)
Overlapping metaphors	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0 (0.00)
TOTAL	39	100	24	100	15	100	11	100	89 (100)

Table 3 presents the results for such metaphorical expressions that take the health care reform plan as their target domain. As becomes clear, the plan is mainly depicted via the use of personification; especially as a villain or as an inadequate person. *BusinessWeek* and *Forbes* are especially numerous in their use of these two conceptual metaphors, although their overall corpora sizes are considerably smaller to *Newsweek* and *Time*. The categories of ADVERSARY and TRAVELLER also employ personification but their results are presented separately in the table since they are discussed in the qualitative analysis in conjunction with their overall concept groups of WAR and JOURNEY respectively. When the categories of personification are set aside, the viewing of the plan as a construction was quite often encountered, especially in *Newsweek* (in over 20% of the metaphorical expressions). *Time*, on the other hand, uses the COMMODITY metaphor considerably more than any other magazine. However, it is important to remember that especially in

Table 3, the total number of the example expressions found is very small (89 tokens) and therefore the percentages in some categories may result misleadingly high.

I will now move on to the qualitative analysis of the results. The order in which the concept groups are presented in the following sections depends, for the most part, on the size of the groups: the group entailing the most conceptual metaphorical expressions found in the articles is presented first and so forth. In addition, the first three sections of WAR, JOURNEY and GAME metaphors mainly focus on structural metaphors whereas the fourth section on ENTITY metaphors differs slightly from these as it concentrates on ontological ones. However, the focus of the following analysis is on the representation brought forth by the different concept groups of U.S health care reform, not on which conceptual metaphor type they represent.

5.1 WAR Metaphors

In the four magazines, the most frequently found metaphors referring to both the process of devising health care reform and to the health care reform plan itself were WAR metaphors. As discussed in chapter 3.2, the concept of WAR is used, for example, to structure and talk about the actions performed in arguing according to the conceptual metaphor ARGUMENT IS WAR (Lakoff and Johnson 1980, 4). However, the source domain in this conceptual metaphor, war, is by no means limited in its use to the target domain of argument but instead has been extended to a number of different target domains. One of these target domains is politics in general (see, e.g. Beer and De Landtsheer 2004) and in this case, based on the evidence found in the articles, the area of health care reform in particular. The following subsections examine the different kinds of WAR metaphors found in the articles based on whether they are used to construct a particular outlook on the whole process of devising health care reform (section 5.1.1) or just on the plan itself (section 5.1.2).

5.1.1 HEALTH CARE REFORM IS WAR

The topic of health care reform and the process of undertaking it are no simple matters and are difficult to grasp for almost anyone. Hence, as Lakoff and Johnson (1980, 61) point out, in order to understand an abstract and less delineated concept such as HEALTH CARE REFORM in this case, human beings tend to make sense of it in terms of something else which we understand more readily. As the process of devising and working on health care reform is altogether like a big argument and entails debate between two or more parties, it becomes easy to expand the ARGUMENT IS WAR metaphor into the realm of health care reform. Hence, an extension of this conceptual metaphor can be compounded on the basis of the different cases of metaphor use in the material. The majority of metaphors found in the articles dealing with health care reform in *Newsweek*, *Time*, *BusinessWeek* and *Forbes* fall then under the conceptual metaphor of HEALTH CARE REFORM IS WAR.

The picture provided by this conceptual metaphor to the general public is that the process of devising a new health care system for the United States is something that can be paralleled to a war. Like any war, this one as well has its different parties with their own interests and goals to achieve. The main opponents are the Democratic Party with President Obama and the Republican Party (GOP). The battle between these two becomes evident for instance, from the following examples:

> (7) The other factor that helps Obama is that his *opponents are fighting the last war*, too. Because obstructing 'Hillarycare' worked for them politically in 1994, many Republicans seem to think that *spiking* 'Obamacare' will play the same way the second time around.
> (NW, 10th August 2009)

> (8) Now President Obama and the Democrats are holing up together on their Posturepedics as they work out *battle plans on health care*, banking reform, and Afghanistan. The question is whether they'll be *daring soldiers of the future* or content to *fight the last war*.
> (NW, 26th October 2010)

> (9) GOP *opponents* of the reforms have also intensified their *attacks*.
> (BW, 16th November 2009)

These examples showcase the wide array of lexicon used to build the conceptual metaphor of WAR that depicts the process of devising health care reform. The noun *war* is openly used to refer to the process and the two parties involved are described as being either opponents fighting against each other and conducting "battle plans" or as in (8), as courageous soldiers (although the reference is only to Democrats here). The Republican Party's attempt to stop health care reform from progressing any further also fits into the WAR metaphor as the verb *spike* and the noun *attack* in examples (7) and (9) entail violent action.

To succeed in a war, a good plan is needed to structure the process, which in this case means a proper strategy (10):

> (10) So Obama and his advisers also are pursuing a tougher, *divide-and-conquer strategy*.
> (BW, 29th June 2009)

Having a strategy is especially important for the Democratic Party since they are the ones most adamantly pursuing an overhaul of the American health care system. Still, not all Democrats want the exact changes that Obama as their party leader is pursuing and they are therefore willingly leaning slightly more towards the Republican views (11):

> (11) So I'd like to single out the "Suicide Six": Democrats – besides abortion foes like Bart Stupak – from districts Obama carried who are *threatening* to withhold their votes and *blow up* everything.
> (NW, 22nd March 2010)

Now, with the selection of the verbs *threaten* and *blow up*, the journalist in question employs the conceptual metaphor HEALTH CARE REFORM IS WAR. By utilizing these verbs, s/he is able to emphasize the serious threat that certain Democrats pose to their own party's attempt to pass health reform. In addition, the use of the term *Suicide Six* further elaborates the kind of danger that these politicians are placing both themselves and their party in, as their actions might be lethal for both. However, due to its reference to physically harming oneself rather than others, the term *suicide* was not included in the lexical field of WAR.

The topic of health care reform is not only important to the two political parties in charge but there are many other special interest groups that function in the area of health care and are hence involved in the battle (12):

> (12) The U.S. Chamber of Commerce has already allocated $2 million to *fight* the idea of a public plan that would compete with private insurers; two liberal groups – Health Care for America Now and the National Physicians Alliance – have run ads in six states arguing that a public option is essential.
> (TM, 10th August 2009)

> (13) It makes sense for all parties to be enthusiastic in the early going, if only to be in a better *position to defend* their interests.
> (NW, 23rd March 2009)

Example (13) shows how the process of health care reform is conceptualized via the concept of WAR, as it talks about the different groups' needs to look out for their own interests via the use of metaphorical language. Just as the participants in a war need to position themselves correctly to best defend their own territory lest they might lose it, the different parties in the health care debate need to do this as well when it comes to their interests. Moreover, depending on their viewpoints when it comes to certain specifics of the proposed plan, these special interest groups are allocated as either allies or opponents of President Obama and the Democratic Party in this so-called health care war. The following example (14) positions the doctors of the American Medical Association (AMA) as possible threats to the Obama Administration as they might "attack" them by refusing to co-operate and perhaps by joining forces with the Republicans:

> (14) Obama is trying to *soften the blow* by promising to limit malpractice lawsuits, which are most often filed against specialists. Ultimately, though, it boils down to this: Will the AMA and its members realize it is in their best economic interests to work with the Obama Administration rather than go into *attack mode*?
> (BW, 29th June 2009)

Obama as the leader of his party has the possibility to control the impact that certain parts of the new legislation would have on members of the society and here specifically on the doctors of AMA. Since the health reforms would most probably mean pay losses for specialists due to the planned

changes in the current fee-for-service system, Obama is willing to lessen the impact of those losses by giving them other concessions to get the doctors to stay on his side. The use of the phrase "soften the blow" to express the foregoing gives the impression of Obama being in a physical battle with the doctors where he decides to hit them less aggressively to get them to co-operate. Although fighting with fists such as the example metaphor depicts is not something that you would normally encounter in a war where most of the fighting is done with different fire-arms, I have nevertheless included this example in the HEALTH CARE REFORM IS WAR category, because it does entail the idea of battle.

An interesting extension of the WAR metaphor into the realms of religion is present in the next two examples:

> (15) His [Obama] health-care *crusade* comes after a $787 billion stimulus (which has effectively made the Energy Department into the nation's largest venture-capital firm, scattering scores of billions of dollars to speculative energy investments) and the semi-nationalization of two car companies.
> (NW, 7th September 2009)

> (16) This year, the liberal insistence on a marginally relevant public option has been a tactical mistake that has enabled the right's "government takeover" *disinformation jihad*.
> (TM, 31st August 2009)

Both examples (15) and (16) include a reference not just to war in general but to a holy war, which includes religious aspects. The difference between the two is that *crusade*, which Obama is depicted to be on, refers to the holy wars fought by the Christians of Europe against Muslims in the 11th, 12th and 13th centuries, whereas *jihad* refers to (most often in the western context) a religious war fought by the Muslims against unbelievers in the Islamic religion (*Oxford English Dictionary*, 1989). In example (16), the Republican Party is told to be taking part in a "disinformation jihad" where they are purposely spreading false information about health care reform because they do not want a public option in the plan. The fact that the American health care system would be controlled by the government via this public option poses a threat to what the Republicans want the American society

to be like – free of too much government control. *Jihad* as a term has very negative connotations to Americans due to the September 11 attacks and therefore, the use of the word in connection with the Republican Party places the party and its members in a very negative light. Depicting Obama, on the other hand, as on a "crusade" offers a less negative image of him (and possibly of Democrats in general) because he would, in fact, then be fighting against Muslims which in the United States would, in most cases, be seen as more justified. Thus, with the metaphorical use of the words *crusade* and *jihad* in the context of health care reform, two magazines (*Newsweek* and *Time*) convey a very opinionated but unified view of both Obama and the Democratic Party as well as the Republican Party.

Despite the few rarer terms appearing in metaphoric expressions referring to the process of devising health care reform (e.g. *crusade*), the most common tokens found in total of the WAR metaphor in *Newsweek*, *Time*, *BusinessWeek* and *Forbes* are quite conventional. The most frequently found token in the conceptual metaphor HEALTH CARE REFORM IS WAR was the word *fight*, both in its nominal and verbal form, as well as as an adjective (*fighting*). The second place goes to the word *attack* and the third place is divided between the words *war*, *ally*, and *strategy*. All together, these words amount to 44 tokens which means they together occur in almost 47% of all the expressions belonging to the WAR category.

According to Koller (2004, 73), whose research was already discussed in section 3.4, war is very masculinized in nature and the widespread use of it in marketing discourse in the form of metaphoric expressions hence helps maintain marketing as a male arena. Her findings on the use of the WAR metaphor in the area of business media discourse are, in my view, applicable to the domain of political media discourse as well. Politics is still a considerably masculine field and hence it has become very natural to talk about and conceptualize issues in that field in terms of other masculine areas such as war, for example. Warfare is, in addition, a political issue in its own right which further naturalizes the mixing of the two. Moreover, it is not just male reporters who use the WAR

metaphor in their writings; at least based on the material analysed for this research, female text producers have not been able to escape the conceptual metaphor of HEALTH CARE REFORM IS WAR either.

The next section analyses only one part of the process of health care reform as it examines how the WAR concept is extended in its use to refer to the proposed health care bill in particular.

5.1.2 THE HEALTH CARE REFORM PLAN IS AN ADVERSARY

What is really at stake in the process of health care reform are the contents of the new legislation. Many Republicans may not want any reform at all but at least the devised plan should be something that largely corresponds to their values and principles. The same applies, of course, to the Democratic side of the debate, although they have more power in the issue since they (at the time of devising reform) outnumber the Republicans in both the House and the Senate. Hence, they can feel more secure about the contents of the new bill.

As what is being fought over by the two parties in Congress (as well as by other, less noticeable interest groups) is the actual health care reform plan, which is not really anything physical, let alone human, a special case of metaphor is used in the articles which allows us to make better sense of the object of battle in human terms. These metaphors employ personification, which is a practice of attributing human qualities to something which is nonhuman in order to be better able to explain it and our reactions toward it (Lakoff and Johnson 1980, 34-35). The topic of personification was already discussed in the theory part (section 3.2.1) and will be further elaborated on, albeit from slightly different perspectives, in sections 5.2.2 and 5.4.2.

As Lakoff and Johnson (1980, 33-34) point out, personification not only allows us to view a phenomenon as a person with human objectives, goals and motives but it further allows us to pick out different aspects of a person in a particular metaphor. This is the case with the health care reform plan as well, which according to example expressions found in the material, is further

personified as being an adversary. The conceptual metaphor in question is thus in the form of THE

HEALTH CARE REFORM PLAN IS AN ADVERSARY, which positions the plan as an enemy that might

be harmful in the health care "war". Consider the following examples:

> (17) He [Charles Grassley] complains that *it* [the plan] expands the deficit,
> *threatens* Medicare, and does too little to restrain health-care inflation.
> (NW, 21st December 2009)

> (18) Will *the proposed government-centric fixes destroy* the parts of health
> care that work?
> (BW, 13th July 2009)

> (19) Will *ObamaCare destroy* the pillars of Adam Smith's capitalism, as
> we know it?
> (FB, 26th April 2010)

All of these examples use personification in order to be better able to illustrate the possible threat

the health care reform plan poses to certain sections of American society. The plan is depicted as

performing such actions that only a human being would, in most cases, perform in a situation of

war; that is, threatening and destroying. Examples (17) and (18) view the plan as dangerous to parts

of the current American health care system, hence implying that reform would in fact not improve it

at all. Of course, example (17) does express the opinion of the Republican Senator Charles Grassley

and in that sense is not an objective statement concerning the plan. Example (19), on the other hand,

regards the plan as an economical threat, which fits in with *Forbes'* business oriented agenda. It

expresses concern about the destruction the plan might cause on the very foundations of the

American economic system. In that way, it would assist in severely damaging something which

helped the United States become a world power in the first place.

The preceding examples undoubtedly depict the health care reform plan as an adversary via

the use of personification. In addition to providing a particular outlook on any phenomenon,

personification also justifies particular ways of acting towards that phenomenon (Lakoff and

Johnson 1980, 34). Thus, as the health care reform bill is seen as a kind of enemy, it is natural to

respond to the threat and fight back:

(20) He [Charles Grassley] *attacks the bill* now being debated on the Senate
  floor as an indefensible new entitlement.
  (NW, 21ˢᵗ December 2009)

(21) He [Bill Clinton] explained that the legal argument conservatives are
  preparing to make to *strike down HCR* [health care reform] is that the
  Constitution doesn't allow for an individual to be forced to buy a
  product (health insurance) from a private company.
  (NW, 5ᵗʰ April 2010)

(22) The irrational *attacks on health care reform* show what the GOP has
  become: a party of nihilists.
  (TM, 31ˢᵗ August 2009)

All of these examples contain metaphors referring to violent, physical assault which places the health care reform plan in the position of a humane object. Since the health care reform plan as Obama and the Democrats are suggesting it is not what the Republicans want, it is not surprising that all of these examples showcase either one member (Charles Grassley) or the whole Republican Party as the attackers of the bill. Indeed, there were no examples in THE HEALTH CARE REFORM PLAN IS AN ADVERSARY category where Democrats would be fighting against the plan.

In conclusion, it becomes clear from the examples presented that the health care reform bill is seen as an adversary that could be of harm to American people's health and abilities and threaten their economy as well as the foundations of America as it is. Overall a very negative view is presented of the contents of the plan via personification and an atmosphere of war is created with the use of specific vocabulary. According to the examples, the Republican Party is the participant in the process actively at war with the reform plan, although there are other interest groups that might oppose it as well.

5.2 JOURNEY Metaphors

The second most common conceptual metaphor found in the articles in *Newsweek*, *Time*, *BusinessWeek* and *Forbes* views the overall process of devising and achieving health care reform as incorporating aspects of a journey. The LIFE IS A JOURNEY metaphor, which was already discussed

in chapter 3.2, is one of the very basic conceptual metaphors depicting an abstract concept such as life (Lakoff and Turner 1989, 52). The characteristics of a journey correspond well with the characteristics of the process of health care reform: it too involves plenty of action, faces some challenges along the way, and has many possible endings and directions it can go to. Also, the notion of a journey naturally incorporates different participants as travellers, who in the following examples are either politicians involved in the issue or, as exemplified in section 5.2.2, the health care reform plan itself. First, however, let us take a look at the metaphoric expressions found in the articles that correspond with the more extensive category of HEALTH CARE REFORM IS A JOURNEY.

5.2.1 HEALTH CARE REFORM IS A JOURNEY

The example metaphors found in the material analysed that belong to the HEALTH CARE REFORM IS A JOURNEY metaphor could be further divided into smaller groups depending on the aspect of a journey that they depict. First of all, the travelling on a journey can be conducted on board a vehicle, as the following examples demonstrate:

> (23) [Chip Kahn, President of the Federation of American Hospitals]: "From my standpoint, we're all *on the train* together, and I expect to *ride it all the way* into a signing ceremony." All *aboard*?
> (NW, 23rd March 2009)

> (24) Putting the Democratic legislative barons *in the driver's seat* has undercut bipartisanship.
> (NW, 10th August 2009)

> (25) The White House has no chance of changing the system without physicians *on board* – and some are very unhappy there are no provisions to cap malpractice suits.
> (FB, 7th September 2009)

Example (23) positions everybody involved in devising health care reform as passengers on board a train which Chip Kahn hopes to be travelling on until the day a new legislation on health care is signed. With this metaphor that places all the interest groups on one and the same train together, Kahn illustrates the fact that they all have to move into the same direction and find an agreement on

things because reforming health care is too important for them to pass. However, the author of the article then questions the possibility for all the interest groups to work together as s/he asks whether they are "all aboard", alluding to the fact that not everybody wants reform.

Another vehicle is used as a metaphor in example (24). The writer depicts the situation in Congress where the Democrats have most of the control in devising the new health legislation, by referring to them as being "in the driver's seat" in an imagined car. The use of this metaphor in the context of the sentence evokes a thought process in the reader, where the car is now seen to be driven into the wrong direction because having the Democrats as drivers has reduced the possibility of collaboration with the Republicans and other interest groups. Example (25) on the other hand, states the need the White House has of having the physicians' approval on their plans if they want to succeed in health care reform. This need is referred to with the use of the JOURNEY metaphor by placing the staff of the White House as travellers on a cruise with the final destination of signing new legislation. However, as the cruise symbolizes the law-devising process, the outcomes of that trip cannot be successful if the physicians are not "on board".

The journey towards a new health care law can also be made on foot. This journey could even be a very short one as long as the right way to success is selected (26):

> (26) The *path* to enactment as it is envisioned now, requires *two steps*.
>   (TM, 15th March 2010)

According to this example, the pursuers of reform (most likely Obama and the Democrats here) would only be "two steps" away from signing new legislation. Also, the path that they have selected to tread on during their travel corresponds, according to the LIFE IS A JOURNEY metaphor, to the means they have for achieving their purposes (Lakoff and Turner 1989, 3). Hence, they are travelling on a particular path because it is the one that they believe will best help them attain what they want in the end, which is health care reform.

However, there are no shortcuts to success as the next example (27) shows. With the use of a metaphorical expression belonging to the conceptual metaphor HEALTH CARE REFORM IS A

JOURNEY, the writer of this *BusinessWeek* article criticizes Obama of his need to achieve new health legislation as quickly as possible, without paying attention to the consequences this has on other interest groups:

> (27) In his rush to fix everything, Obama is *skipping vital steps* in the change process.
> (BW, 6th July 2009)

Nonetheless, to secure the safe passage of a bill that would please most of the interest groups, it is useful to have some kinds of instructions to lead the traveller on their journey towards the signing ceremony (28):

> (28) After months of uncertainty, *a road map* for passing comprehensive health care reform is finally at hand, one that could send a bill to Barack Obama's desk by the end of March.
> (TM, 15th March 2010)

Still, even with the help of a map, some travellers might choose to take an alternative route (29):

> (29) But the atmosphere deteriorated over the summer as the Republicans *took a turn towards* nihilism.
> (TM, 1st February 2010)

When a person is on a journey and they are going somewhere, they continuously have to make decisions on which routes and turns to take. According to the LIFE IS A JOURNEY metaphor, these crossroads we encounter correspond to the choices we have to make in life (Lakoff and Turner 1989, 3). As the above example denotes the Republicans as having taken "a turn towards nihilism", it uses the conceptualizations that we share about what it means to be on a journey to demonstrate the fact that the Republicans have made a conscious decision to oppose health care reform simply because they oppose the Obama Administration. Hence, the writer of the article is basing his/her language selection on the conceptual metaphor HEALTH CARE REFORM IS A JOURNEY. Also, by using the JOURNEY metaphor the writer is able to convey his/her viewpoint in a more concise form.

The Republican resistance to new health legislation is an obvious problem that the Obama Administration has to face. Still, it is not the only impediment on their way, as the following examples illustrate:

(30) That's the immediate source of Obama's frustration, but there is a larger, structural issue *blocking his path*.
(TM, 10th August 2009)

(31) Between now and then, White House officials say, don't be surprised to see *rough spots* and *bumps along the road*.
(TM, 27th July 2009)

According to example (30), Obama might not be able to move forwards in his attempt to change the American health care system, because there is some issue standing in his way and "blocking" the direction he has decided to take. Example (31) on the other hand, uses the metaphoric expressions of "rough spots" and "bumps along the road" to refer to the general obstacles that there still exist in passing health care reform. The metaphors used in these last two examples take advantage of the idea of impediments to travel included in the concept of JOURNEY (Lakoff and Turner 1989, 3-4) which corresponds here to the difficulties encountered in devising health care reform.

Some of the metaphorical expressions found in the material that belong to the HEALTH CARE REFORM IS A JOURNEY category, depicted the process of conducting and achieving new health legislation as a very slow one. This effect was realized with the selection of particular nouns and verbs that express slow and difficult movement:

(32) But as the rancorous and seemingly endless health-care debate *dragged on*, Congress appeared ever-more polarized.
(NW, 11th January 2010)

(33) But during the health-reform bill's *long slog up* and *around* Capitol Hill, Obama was a strangely passive figure.
(NW, 5th April 2010)

The use of the verb *drag on* in example (32) depicts health care debate as moving along very slowly and with considerable effort. However, as *The Oxford English Dictionary* (1989) reveals, this particular verb further entails the implication of something progressing slowly because it is boring, which in turn relates an additional viewpoint of the health care debate to the reader. Example (33) depicts the health care reform plan as a traveller and thus it actually belongs to the group of metaphors analysed in the next section. However, as it also exemplifies the slow progress of the

process, it is discussed at this point already. The example in question expresses the difficulty of the health reform bill to reach the White House where it would be signed by Obama as the new health care legislation. The fact that the White House is situated on Capitol *Hill* functions as a starting point for the writer in this JOURNEY metaphor, where s/he then depicts the bill as slowly advancing both upwards and around the hill for a long time. The effect of the slowness is created with the use of the noun *slog*, which according to *The Oxford English Dictionary* (1989) means "hard, steady work". Although the noun as such does not refer to motion, the verb *slog* means "to walk heavily or doggedly" (Ibid.). Hence, it is possible to make the inference of the noun *slog* entailing the notion of movement as well, especially as it is collocated with the directional preposition *up* and the adjective *long*.

Example (33) is by far not the only example found in the articles that belongs to more than one of the devised categories. The following example can be included into both the WAR and JOURNEY concepts:

> (34) It was the sort of statement that seemed old a year ago, when the health
> care reform *death march* began.
> (TM, 15th March 2010)

Now, the use of the metaphor "death march" in this example to refer to health care reform conveys a very sombre picture of the process. *Death march* historically refers to a march that prisoners of war were forced to take part in where they had to walk for a long time without food and were physically abused, which resulted in the death of many (internet source 9). Since the term is used in the above example metaphorically to provide the reader extra information on the process and since it can be seen to belong to the JOURNEY category due to its expression of movement and travel, it can hence also be inferred that the travellers (i.e. prisoners) on this particular march are the participants taking part in the process. Moreover, since the "statement" that is talked about in the example was given by a Democrat and the Democratic Party has been the main initiator of the whole reform process, it would place them in particular as the "prisoners" walking towards their

destruction. The use of the metaphor "death march" clearly dooms the process from its beginning stages and implies that there has not really been any possibility for the Democrats to win on this issue in the first place. Thus, with the use of one metaphoric expression plenty of implicit ideology can be communicated.

In the category of HEALTH CARE REFORM IS A JOURNEY, the most frequently found token was the noun *way*, followed by nouns such as *step*, *path* and *road*. However, as these terms only occurred 3-4 times each in the material, it is clear that the metaphorical expressions belonging to this category are made up of a large variety of different lexicon, as becomes apparent from the examples presented as well.

5.2.2 THE HEALTH CARE REFORM PLAN IS A TRAVELLER

The use of the general category of personification is uncovered in this section from the point of view of metaphorical expressions belonging to the JOURNEY concept. Previously, the plan was seen as an adversary in accordance with the WAR concept where it was quite strongly depicted as an enemy to American society and economics. In the examples to come, however, the plan is a traveller and the overall conceptual metaphor is hence THE HEALTH CARE REFORM PLAN IS A TRAVELLER. One metaphorical expression belonging to this category was already discussed in conjunction with example (33), where the plan was described to be travelling up and around Capitol Hill.

In the JOURNEY metaphor, and as a traveller, the health care reform plan is given much more "neutral" characteristics than what it possessed as an enemy:

> (35) When (or rather, if) *Obama's health-care reform bill reaches the floor of Congress*, he'll be lucky to get a single Republican vote.
> (NW, 24th August 2009)

> (36) But now that *the bill is on track*, Democrats should revisit the issue [of a public option], or at least make sure a public issue has a steel-reinforced hair trigger.
> (NW, 26th October 2009)

(37) What's worse is that *the health-care plan is moving forward* before
we've grappled with the questions at the root of the mess.
(BW, 6th July 2009)

The plan is described as in motion ("moving forward"), travelling along on a certain path ("on track") toward a particular goal ("reaches the floor of Congress"). The first two examples unite the bill very strongly to Obama and the Democrats, and in example (35) it is even compared directly to Obama as it is referred to with the pronoun *he*. This of course showcases the basic position in the debate where Democrats are the protagonists in pursuing overhaul but also places plenty of responsibility on President Obama. Still, from the context around the metaphors it is possible to see the uncertainty regarding the bill's ability to reach its destination (35), as well as the negativity surrounding its progress (37). Only example (36) views the bill's progress positively as it is now depicted as being on the right course.

In addition to being viewed as a traveller, two examples were found in the articles where the reform plan was portrayed as a vehicle:

(38) Lawmakers know that insurers still have the firepower to *derail reform*.
(FB, 7th September 2009)

(39) As a result, we have *three major 'reform' initiatives steamrolling forward* before they should.
(BW, 6th July 2009)

The use of the verb *derail* in example (38) indicates that the reform plan would be a train whose travelling could still be prevented by the interest group of insurers. Example (39), on the other hand, describes the reform plan as an even heavier vehicle, a steamroller, which implies that the reform is moving forward in the manner of crushing all obstacles that come in its way. With the selection of the verb *steamroll*, the reform and its main initiators are hence implied as being selfish and inconsiderate to other participants' opinions.

A few of the examples found that portray the health care reform plan as a traveller also included the verb *pass,* which in the JOURNEY category can be bestowed another meaning besides the most obvious one in a legal context. *Pass* in the legal context would normally mean to approve

as a law in a vote, but in the following examples the subject of the verb is the health care reform

plan, not for example, any politician:

> (40) Administration officials predict that Obama will not weigh in on many
>   of the more contentious issues until *a health-care bill passes both*
>   *houses and reaches a conference committee* this fall, much as he has
>   done with other big bills.
>   (TM, 27th July 2009)

> (41) But Montana Sen. Max Baucus, chairman of the Finance Committee,
>   says *a [plan including a] public option cannot pass the Senate*.
>   (NW, 21st September 2009)

> (42) Without the support of conservative "Blue Dog" Democrats, *health*
>   *care reform can't pass the House of Representatives*.
>   (FB, 7th September 2009)

Hence, when the plan is seen as a traveller in compliance with the conceptual metaphor THE

HEALTH CARE REFORM PLAN IS A TRAVELLER and it is depicted as passing something then it can be

inferred that the verb *pass* is used as meaning "to go past". In order for the plan to finally reach the

American people as a new law, it needs to be able to move forward and go past Congress and

Capitol Hill. Thus, the verb *pass* can be viewed to function metaphorically here together with the

use of personification, even though it normally has quite a set meaning in a legal context.

The use of personification in the JOURNEY category conveys a picture of the health care

reform plan as a traveller trying to move forward on its path and needing to pass certain difficult

spots. The travelling is done with the assistance of the Democratic Party although the progressing is

seen continuously as quite uncertain.

5.3 GAME Metaphors

The following sections investigate the use of such metaphors in the discussion of health care reform

which use as their source domain the area of games and sports. Herbeck (2004, 123) notes that

sports metaphors in particular are routinely found in public discourse on politics in the United

States and they also regularly appear in use in advertising and literature. It is, thus, not surprising to

find them quite extensively used in the article material analysed for this thesis as well since the metaphors concentrate on depicting a very important and wide-ranging political topic in American history. The discussion on GAME metaphors begins with an analysis on metaphors from the field of sports and is continued in the second section with metaphors from the field of gambling and risk-taking.

5.3.1 HEALTH CARE REFORM IS SPORTS

The areas of sports and war as source domains are very resembling to each other as they both have a similar starting point, at least when it comes to team sports. In both situations, there is a battle between two teams with their coaches/leaders and players/soldiers where one side is destined to win while the other loses. In addition, Koller (2004, 110) notes that both the WAR and SPORTS metaphor use each other as source domains as there are plenty of metaphoric expressions of war in the media coverage of sports events and vice versa. Based on the examples found in the article material analysed for this research the conceptual metaphor of HEALTH CARE REFORM IS SPORTS was derived. The most frequently encountered token in the category was the noun *team*, which is in use in the following examples as well:

> (43) You can diagram *Team Obama's game plan* by reversing the Clinton
> *playbook.*
> (NW, 10th August 2009)

> (44) What *Obama and his team* also know is that fixing health care has
> become not only a defining moment for his presidency but also a test of
> his leadership.
> (TM, 10th August 2009)

What these examples demonstrate is the team-approach adopted by the journalists in question to the issue: via a SPORTS metaphor, the process of devising and promoting health care reform is depicted as a match between two sides. From these examples it also becomes clear that Obama and the Democrats are a team and that they even have a plan on how they are going to play the game. However, there were no instances of metaphors where the Republican side would have been

depicted as a team but instead they were only given the name "opponent". Already back in examples (7) and (9) in the section on WAR metaphors, the term *opponent* was used to refer to members of the GOP, which shows that the term can belong to that category as well. This overlapping is due to the already mentioned two-way metaphoric relationship between the categories of WAR and SPORTS (Koller 2004, 110). Let us look at another example of the term *opponent* in use:

> (45) The Administration will portray *opponents* as heartless for not wanting
>   to do something about the uninsured.
>   (FB, 11th May 2009)

Now, not having a team might imply that the Republicans are not considered to be as unified in their efforts as the Democrats are. However, the examples that included a metaphoric expression of the kind "Team Obama/Obama's team" all appeared either in *Newsweek* or in *Time*, whereas the word *opponent* to refer to Republicans could be found in all four magazines. From this it would be possible to infer that *Newsweek* and *Time* are overall leaning slightly toward the Democratic side of the debate, as viewing the Democrats as a team and the other side only as an opponent implies support for the Democrats. In addition, and as the above example shows, *Forbes* is the only magazine to somewhat support the Republicans here as they subtly accuse Obama and his administration of vilifying their opponents. However, it is not possible to draw any well-grounded conclusions on which side each magazine supported on the issue of health care reform based on the use of only two metaphorical expressions ("Team Obama/opponent").

For Obama and the Democrats it is important to get the process of devising health care reform successfully till the end, which is also exemplified via the use of the SPORTS metaphor:

> (46) Getting to *the Finish Line*.
>   (TM, 15th March 2009)

> (47) He [Obama] set forth a few ambitious *goals*: expanding coverage,
>   reigning in health-care spending, improving medical quality.
>   (TM, 27th July 2009)

(48) The party's [GOP] real *goal* has been to stop any and all legislation for
political reasons – to deny Obama a major *victory*.
(TM, 15th March 2009)

In example (46) the term *finish line* refers to a race where it is necessary to cross the finishing line,

preferably first. A race also entails the idea of speed which is needed if one wants to win. Speed has

been important for Obama in the process of pushing for health care reform since the further the

process has gone the more resistance it has encountered both from Republicans and from parts of

the general public. The noun *goal* has a clear sports reference and in example (47) we are given the

objectives of Obama and the Democratic side whereas example (48) presents an alleged Republican

goal, as reported by *Time*. The extract presents the Republican Party as only concentrating on their

party's success instead of considering the issue of health care reform from the point of view of what

is best for their nation.

Despite female athletes and the increasing amount of female soldiers, the domains of sports

and war are still quite masculinized. Koller (2004, 109) points out that both areas are still mainly

reserved for men and, for example, in the media, male sport is given more coverage than female

sport. The same happens with metaphors, where it is mostly male sports that function as source

domains (Ibid.). This could be encountered in conjunction with the metaphors dealing with health

care reform as well:

(49) And now, as Congress returns to resume *wrestling with health care reform*, we shall see if he [Obama] continues his August project of proving that the idea of an Ivy League Huey Long is not oxymoronic.
(NW, 7th September 2009)

(50) He [Obama] *jabbed* the hyperbolic Republicans.
(TM, 5th April 2010)

(51) When the time came to *tackle the hardest reform – health care –* he [Obama] waffled.
(NW, 15th February 2010)

(52) Progressives are so dispirited – and, like the rest of the country, so sick
of talking about sick people – that they can't wrap their heads around the
reality that this [health care reform] is the Big One, *The Super Bowl*, for
all the marbles.
(NW, 22nd March 2010)

Example (49) depicts the difficulties of Congress in coming to an agreement on health care reform in terms of wrestling, whereas example (50) introduces Obama as a boxer punching down members of GOP with his argumentation. Furthermore, examples (51) and (52) take as their source domain American football which is a very masculine sport. Two of the examples, (49) and (51) also use personification where the reform itself is seen as an opponent that is being tackled and wrestled with. Here we can once more see a correlation between the WAR and SPORTS categories as the health care reform plan was depicted as an ADVERSARY in the section on WAR metaphors.

However, the metaphors found in the articles analysed do use more neutral and feminine sports as their source domain as well. Examples were found from the fields of athletics ((53) and (54)) and dance (55):

(53) The next *hurdle* is to get a bill through the House and Senate by the
time Congress adjourns for its August break.
(TM, 27th July 2009)

(54) White House officials concede that missing that deadline [getting a bill
through by August] could throw the entire *exercise off track*, because it
would give opponents a month to undermine it.
(TM, 27th July 2009)

(55) The *choreography on health care* has been difficult in no small part
because of the long-standing animosity between the two chambers of
Congress.
(TM, 15th March 2010)

The terms *hurdle* and *track* are clearly referring to track and field and the SPORTS metaphor is further emphasized with the use of the word *exercise*. The expression "choreography on health care", on the other hand, neatly demonstrates the unwillingness of the two chambers of Congress to collaborate with each other.

Semino and Masci (1996, 250) point out that a basic function for sports metaphors in politics is that of simplification as when they are in use "the complexities of ideological and ethical issues are backgrounded and politics is presented as a relatively simple domain with clear participants (the party 'teams'), unproblematic goals (winning) and unambiguous outcomes (victory or defeat)." A political subject such as health care reform might then become more understandable and interesting to people from across social classes when it is partly presented in the language of sports. Also, many political topics often seem quite distant or alien to many and Semino and Masci (Ibid., 251) add that sports metaphors can bring warmth and excitement to the domain. Referring to the end stages of passing health care reform as "The Super Bowl" in example (52), for instance, immediately brings along with it the feeling of something very entertaining and exciting taking place, something that no American would wish to miss.

5.3.2 *HEALTH CARE REFORM IS A GAMBLE/A RISK*

Lakoff and Johnson (1980, 51; 155) mention the conceptual metaphor LIFE IS A GAMBLING GAME according to which actions in life are experienced as gambles via such everyday expressions as, for example, "I'll *take my chances*", "The *odds are against me*" and "I've got an *ace up my sleeve*". Expressions from the same source domain of gambling were also encountered in the article material on health care reform, which resulted in the forming of the overall conceptual metaphor of HEALTH CARE REFORM IS A GAMBLE. Now, gambling and sports as games differ somewhat in their implications. For instance, when a tennis player loses a match, s/he is unable to gain a victory and loses his/her chances of continuing on in a tournament. Still, s/he does not personally lose anything that s/he already had. However, when a person is gambling, s/he is placing a bet and in that way risks losing what s/he already has in order to gain something more. Let us examine some of the GAMBLE metaphors found in the article material analysed:

> (56) Perhaps not since the New Deal has a new president made such *a massive bet* on a single domestic initiative.
> (NW, 11th January 2010)

> (57) It was a Friday when the President's decision to go all in on health care was beginning to seem like *a disastrous gamble*.
> (TM, 1st February 2010)

> (58) [Historian Michael Beschloss]: "Obama said the rewards were so high, it [taking up the issue of health care] was worth *gambling his Presidency*."
> (BW, 5th April 2010)

The use of the GAMBLE metaphors in the discussion on health care reform foregrounds the importance of the issue via the element of sacrifice involved in it. Example (58) most clearly pronounces what has been at stake for Barack Obama as he has moved forward with the issue: he is depicted as having been gambling his possible second term in office as the President of the United States. The fact that one political issue would be able to end short Obama's presidential career shows how flammable the topic of health care reform is in the United States and how divided the nation is in their views on the issue. President Obama is the one who in all of the examples above is the one taking the risk or initiating the gamble. This seems natural, though, as he has been the main pursuer of reform.

A *Newsweek* article uses GAMBLE metaphors to speculate on the possible thought processes taking place on the Republican side after the signing of the new health care law:

> (59) I could see how, if I were a Republican pol, I could rationalize the health care defeat as *a bad spin of the wheel*, and reassure myself that Obama's *luck* is unlikely to hold all year.
> (NW, 5th April 2010)

The metaphorical expression "bad spin of the wheel" depicts the Republicans as considering their failure in health care reform to have been only the cause of an unfortunate turn in a gambling game. The use of metaphorical language in the extract further insinuates that the Republicans view Obama's achievements on the issue as merely a stroke of luck instead of having anything to do with skill and hard work. The picture provided by this *Newsweek* extract via their metaphor use hence

presents members of the Republican Party as dismissive and slightly bitter of Obama's achievements.

The risk involved in pursuing health care reform was not only depicted via GAMBLE metaphors but also with a small selection of other expressions. Most often the category of HEALTH CARE REFORM IS A RISK involved metaphors referring to a risk to one's health:

> (60) But it is going to require House and Senate Democrats to put aside their mutual suspicions, *join hands and take a political leap* worth of Butch Cassidy and the Sundance Kid.
> (TM, 15th March 2010)

> (61) After *jumping off a high, scary cliff,* they [House Democrats] expected to *hit rocks,* and instead found themselves *bathed in warm water,* ready to *jump again.*
> (NW, 5th April 2010)

> (62) The only real question is if Democrats are in the mood to *slit their own throats.*
> (NW, 22nd March 2010)

Whereas in the GAMBLE metaphors the risk involved in health care reform was assigned to Obama and his presidency, here the risk is more generally on the Democratic Party as a whole. Both examples (60) and (61) depict the risk metaphorically in terms of jumping off a cliff, not knowing quite where and how you will land. Example (60) portrays the situation before the final vote on the new law and encourages Democrats to be as brave as the characters of Butch Cassidy and the Sundance Kid in a famous American western of the same name. Example (61), on the other hand, describes the Democrats as already having made the jump and realising that it was worth it, as the extract comes from a time after the health care bill was signed into law. Still, what the first two examples indicate with the use of RISK metaphors is that the Democratic Party needs to go on with health care reform despite the resistance of many Americans and the possible negative implications victory might have for their party in the next elections. The third example (62) views the risk Democrats are taking with health care reform as a conscious one. Signing up for the task of reforming the American health care system has been from the beginning on a risky decision and if

the Democrats are not able to get health care reform passed, it would make their party seem ineffective and unable to carry out their electoral promises. In this way they would then "slit their own throats".

As can be expected, the metaphorical expressions encountered in the article material from the source domains of gambling and risk-taking all depicted either Obama or the Democratic Party as the protagonists. The Republican Party is not portrayed as taking any risk with their resistance to health care reform which is because they are acting according to their political principles, beliefs and their supporters' expectations. The same can, of course, be said of the Democratic Party but since some of the issues included in the proposed health care law (e.g. the public option) might alienate the party's more conservative supporters, not to mention Republican voters, pursuing health care reform may have serious repercussions.

5.4 ENTITY Metaphors

The metaphors discussed in this section have been formed around the conception of the health care reform plan as some kind of a physical entity. Viewing ideas, activities and events as entities was discussed in the theory part in conjunction with ontological metaphors (3.2.1) where it was stated that metaphors such as these arise from the experiences people have with their own bodies as well as other physical objects. As we are experientially familiar with the concept of a physical object, it is also easier for us to talk about and understand abstract, nonphysical phenomena in these same terms. The example metaphors introduced in the following sections provide us with a vision of the health care reform plan as different kinds of entities: as a person, a substance, a construction etc. However, first we will take a look at some examples which, in addition to viewing the plan as a heavy object, provide a particular outlook on the whole process of health care reform.

5.4.1 THE HEALTH CARE REFORM PLAN IS A HEAVY OBJECT

Plenty of examples were found in the article material analysed which, via the use of conceptual metaphors, provide a picture of the process of conducting health care reform as including forceful action. Moreover, such examples most clearly indicate the experience of the plan as a physical entity. The following examples illustrate these two points:

> (63) The effort to *jam the bill through Congress* made the public dubious.
> (NW, 11th January 2010)

> (64) Compromise is often painful, but *the push to get a bill out of the Senate* verged on the squalid.
> (NW, 11th January 2010)

> (65) How Obama's epic victory in *pushing forward health reform* revitalized his presidency.
> (TM, 5th April 2010)

> (66) With an ice-cold disdain for public opinion and an obsession worthy of Lenin, President Obama and Speaker Nancy Pelosi *rammed Obamacare through the House* by unprecedented parliamentary trickery, bribery and deceit.
> (FB, 12th April 2010)

From these examples it can be seen that the object of all the forceful action is the health care reform plan which is conceived of as some kind of an object that needs to be moved around and pushed into a given direction in order to gain desired results. Since this moving around is depicted as requiring force and effort, the conceptual metaphor of THE HEALTH CARE REFORM PLAN IS A HEAVY OBJECT can be formed. What the examples also showcase is the difficulty involved in the process of health care reform and especially in passing it. Several verbs of force, such as *push*, *ram* and *jam* are used metaphorically to describe the struggle involved and based on these examples and others found in the material, it is possible to devise the conceptual metaphor HEALTH CARE REFORM IS FORCING. The metaphorical expressions evoke an image of (especially Democratic) senators and representatives as well as Obama himself trying to push some sort of an object (the plan) out of Congress. When Obama is depicted as taking part in the pushing, or as actually being the main

participant in it (examples (65) and (66)), the importance of health care reform and its most immediate execution to him are brought to the forefront.

However, as the co-text surrounding the metaphors of force reveals, there is a clear difference in attitude in the vision of Obama as a pursuer of reform. Example (65) depicts him as a strong and passionate leader whereas example (66) views him as a selfish liar. The more negative view of him can be explained when thinking about the nature of forcing. When something is forced along, it usually means that there is something or someone opposing the matter and that despite this opposition, the matter is completed. The feeling of inconsideration and slight bitterness resulting from this kind of action is present especially in example (66), which conveys a very harsh picture of President Obama and Speaker Nancy Pelosi.

All in all then, the vision of the health care reform plan as a heavy object does not in itself convey a certain ideology or attitude towards the plan. Nonetheless, together with the FORCING metaphor it conveys the notion of difficulty and necessity involved in passing health care reform.

5.4.2 *THE HEALTH CARE REFORM PLAN IS A PERSON*

The topic of personification has already been discussed in this thesis mainly in conjunction with the WAR and JOURNEY metaphors. There, the health care reform plan was conceptualized as an adversary and as a traveller but in addition to these, there are several expressions where the plan is depicted as a person, only with slightly different attributes.

As pointed out in the method section, there were many metaphorical expressions found which corresponded to several of the categories devised and some overlapping was encountered. Now, there were some examples where personification was used that came very close to the ADVERSARY-category but could not be included in it because of their lack of war-related vocabulary. These examples are hence placed under the conceptual metaphor of THE HEALTH CARE REFORM PLAN IS A VILLAIN. This category includes metaphorical expressions which depict the health care reform bill

as a person that is harmful and possibly dangerous, thereby once again providing the readership of the four magazines under scrutiny with a negative picture of the proposed health care reform plan via their use of metaphors. The health care reform plan can be, for instance, harmful to health:

> (67) *ObamaCare can spike up our blood pressure* and *blind us* to moneymaking opportunities.
> (FB, 26th April 2010)

> (68) *It* [the health-care plan] would be *a self-inflicted wound*.
> (NW, 23rd November 2009)

Example (67) uses the medical metaphors of "spike up our blood pressure" and "blind us" as tools for explaining the danger the plan poses on the health of Americans and hence on their ability to make business decisions and achieve economical gains. Example (68), on the other hand, views the plan as a kind of physical self-harm. The content of the article further elaborates on the topic by clarifying that this self-harm would be caused by the Democrats to themselves if they pass the plan in the form in which it was when the article was first published. This example shows a similar kind of image of the Democratic Party as consciously playing with their own physical well-being in their pursuit of health care reform as example (62) of the RISK metaphors does.

As example (67) already reveals, in its role of a villain, the proposed health care reform plan is also depicted as being harmful to American economics. By attributing human qualities to it with the use of personification, the plan is made to look like it is responsible, for instance, for the excess spending the U.S. might face when the plan is in use (example (69)) or for the monetary losses it might bring to individual Americans as insurance costs would rise (example (70)):

> (69) *It* [reform plan] *would bloat spending, not restrain it*.
> (NW, 3rd August 2009)

> (70) *This health reform bill would drive up* insurance costs.
> (FB, 30th November 2009)

However, as is obvious, it is ultimately the people devising the plan and its details that are responsible for the repercussions it might bring with it. Whatever these repercussions might be, it is clear that there is a fear for the plan:

(71) The continuing uncertainty over what *the final plan will do*, and *to whom*, helps explain why public doubts are growing.
(TM, 10th August 2009)

Example (71) leaves it unclear as to what kind of harm the plan might be able to do, but as becomes clear from the rest of the sentence, it is causing worry to the public. In fact, this is one of the few instances amongst any of the examples where the general public is alluded to and it actually positions them as against reform.

In addition to the vision of the plan as a villain, several examples of metaphorical expressions were encountered in the articles which view the plan as an inadequate, flawed and unpredictable person. These examples were placed under the conceptual metaphor of THE HEALTH CARE REFORM PLAN IS AN INADEQUATE PERSON. The following examples clarify the use of the metaphor:

(72) *Obamacare's Fatal Flaw*.
(TM, 17th August 2009)

(73) How does *the health-care overhaul propose to control spending*?
(BW, 5th April 2010)

(74) One often heard criticism of the health-care reform legislation that President Barack Obama has now signed into law is that *it won't do enough* to rein in the cost of treatment.
(BW, 5th April 2010)

The article title in example (72) depicts the proposed plan as not only flawed but as having one flaw above all else, which, based on the rest of the article, is the plan's inconsistency. The projected inability of the plan to actually save money when in use is the worry put forward by the next two examples (73) and (74), which emanate from the same *BusinessWeek* article. The extracts demonstrate the importance that the economic side of health care reform has especially to this magazine's authors and readership.

To conclude, some examples were found in THE HEALTH CARE REFORM PLAN IS A PERSON category that depicted the plan as a more neutral person. One of them described the plan with a slightly more positive note, although even in this example there is an element of uncertainty involved in the verb *promise*:

(75) *ObamaCare promises* to pay for itself.
(FB, 7th September 2009)

Thus, despite the good intentions, it still is not certain if the new health care law can reach the targets designed for it. With the use of the conceptual metaphors THE HEALTH CARE REFORM PLAN IS A VILLAIN/INADEQUATE, a very sceptical and incredulous attitude is adopted towards the plan.

5.4.3 *THE HEALTH CARE REFORM PLAN IS A SUBSTANCE/CONSTRUCTION/COMMODITY*

There were some examples found in the article material that also use the concept of an ENTITY to describe the health care reform plan but with a more detailed reference. First of all, the bill is conceived of as being made up of a substance which specifically brings the process of devising the actual plan and its contents to the attention of the reader:

(76) As Congress began the long haul of trying to *shape a health-reform bill* over the summer – and the president essentially lay low – conspiracy theories began to pop up.
(NW, 15th February 2010)

(77) Obama's two biggest domestic-policy proposals – *health care reform* and alternative energy – *will be pulverized and reshaped* by the Senate.
(TM, 20th July 2009)

These examples showcase how we conceptualize the forming of something basically nonphysical (only words on a paper) such as the health care reform bill in terms of actually physically moulding a material into a particular form. In example (76), some material seems to be shaped in order for it to eventually become the new health care plan. In addition, example (77) further exemplifies the viewing of the plan as made up of matter as it is said that even the already finished plan can still be "pulverized and reshaped" in the form the Senate wants.

The next conceptual metaphor under discussion – THE HEALTH CARE REFORM PLAN IS A CONSTRUCTION – takes the vision of the plan as made up of a material one step further as the plan is now seen as a whole construction. Charteris-Black (2004, 70) notes that metaphors from the source domain of buildings and construction "carry a strong positive connotation because they

express aspiration towards desired social goals." These social goals cannot usually be achieved overnight but instead require planning, patience and effort just as construction work does (Ibid., 71). However, as has become apparent, health care reform is by no means a desired social goal for many Americans, which the context surrounding the following CONSTRUCTION metaphors reveals:

> (78) But as Congress inches closer to *forging a massive package of health-care reforms*, it's increasingly clear how difficult it will be to keep that pledge [not raising taxes for middle class people].
> (BW, 16th November 2009)

> (79) And the way *it* [the new legislation] *was secretly bolted together* and jammed through Congress in the final days made a mockery of Obama's campaign promise of 'transparency.'
> (NW, 5th April 2010)

The verbs *forge* and *bolt* take the health care reform plan as their object which illustrates the way the plan is seen as a construction under development. Still, not all of the example sentences incorporating a CONSTRUCTION metaphor were negative ones. The following three examples present a somewhat positive vision of the health care reform plan:

> (80) *The best-constructed health-care bill*, developed by Senator Ron Wyden of Oregon, would eliminate the health-care tax exclusion the unions want.
> (TM, 10th August 2009)

> (81) *The political architecture of the bill* was pure Chicago.
> (NW, 5th April 2010)

> (82) It was a sentence that many Americans had been waiting for – quite the opposite of much that has preceded it in this raucous debate – and he [President Obama] proceeded to *lay out the elements of health care reform* that he considers essential.
> (TM, 21st September 2009)

Time-wise, we can see that the first example (80) was published quite early on in the health care reform process when it was still possible to speculate on which factors would constitute the best possible health care bill. The source domain of CONSTRUCTION is used to assist in the understanding of a concept such as a reform plan, which is made up of many small pieces and parts just as a building would be. Examples (79) and (81) are both actually from the same *Newsweek*

article published after the plan was signed into a law. The writer of the article has hence used the same conceptual metaphor more than once. Koller (2004, 86) refers to the repeated use of metaphorical expressions originating from the same conceptual metaphor as "metaphorical chains" where the different uses of the metaphor create links which elaborate and extend the concept. She (Ibid.) also points out that metaphors can be attenuated which is the case in example (81) here. The adjective *political* has been added in front of the noun *architecture*, which makes the reader notice the metaphorical use of the term more easily and hence weakens the power of the metaphor.

The last significant ENTITY metaphor group encountered in the magazine articles is based on the idea of a commodity. When something is viewed as a commodity, it becomes an item of trade, hence receiving a certain price and value. Lakoff and Johnson (1980, 47) mention the conceptual metaphor IDEAS ARE COMMODITIES which consists of such everyday expressions as, for example, "That idea just won't *sell*", "That's a *worthless* idea" and "It's important how you *package* your ideas". Similar expressions could be encountered in conjunction with the topic of health care reform and the conceptual metaphor THE HEALTH CARE REFORM PLAN IS A COMMODITY was devised. Here are some examples:

(83) And the Democrats wonder why *selling health-care reform* to the public has been so hard?
(TM, 17th August 2009)

(84) No amount of clever strategizing is going to make *the sales job* easier this time.
(TM, 17th August 2009)

(85) To keep Blue Dogs licking their hands instead of biting them, House Democratic leaders agreed to slash *the price tag of reform* by roughly $100 billion.
(FB, 7th September 2009)

(86) First, the House would pass the exact bill that cleared the Senate on Christmas Eve – even though it is loaded with provisions that many in the House say they would not accept in *a final product*.
(TM, 15th March 2010)

The first two examples (83) and (84) come from the same *Time* article and clearly indicate the conceptualization of the health care reform plan as a commodity as it is depicted as an entity that needs to be sold to the general public and, of course, to the politicians working in Congress. However, as the health care reform plan is not an actual physical object, it is the contents and implications of the plan that the Democrats in particular are trying to get approval for in their attempt to get people to buy "the product", as it is named in example (86). Example (85) further emphasizes the outlook on the health care reform plan as a commodity as it given a price tag. Naturally, the changes made in the American health care system because of health care reform would cost a significant amount of money and hence the reform could in fact be considered as having a price. However, this price is not to be paid by any one individual but by Americans and their nation as a whole.

Viewing the health care reform plan as a commodity that is given a value and that can be bought and sold once again employs a conceptual metaphor which is based on a certain shared experience that we are all very familiar with in everyday life. This familiarity that we have of trade and commerce aids us in understanding the stages involved in passing an issue such as health care reform: both the buyer and the seller must be content with the terms on which the transaction is made. Still, sometimes concessions have to be made in order for the matter to proceed which is the case with health care reform as well.

5.5 OTHER Metaphors

This last section of the results chapter introduces four more conceptual metaphors found in the articles which could not be coherently included in the metaphor groups discussed so far. Also, they all possess a very limited amount of examples (five or less). The first two conceptual metaphors originating from the source domain of food still refer to either the process of health care reform in general or to the plan itself. However, the last two conceptual metaphors to be introduced actually

reveal a specific outlook on the main pursuer of health care reform, Barack Obama and on the state of the American health care system before reform via the conceptual domain of MEDICINE.

To start with, some examples viewed the process of devising health care reform as cooking, or more specifically as food processing:

> (87) It is likely to be an ugly summer of *sausage-grinding* in Washington.
> (TM, 20th July 2009)

> (88) And that was the third problem: the focus on *sausage making* was unavoidable, given that health care aroused every special interest extant in Washington.
> (TM, 1st February 2010)

These examples showcase the conceptual metaphor of HEALTH CARE REFORM IS FOOD PROCESSING, where certain characteristics involved in making sausages in particular are mapped on to the conceptual domain of HEALTH CARE REFORM. For instance, example (87) predicts that the "sausage-grinding" will be "ugly" which, when applied to health care reform, seems to imply that the process of devising health care reform is messy and complicated. Example (88), on the other hand, makes use of the fact that food and, in this case, sausages usually contain several different ingredients and spices to elaborate the fact that every special interest group in Washington also wants to add their own "ingredient" to the new plan, which in turn complicates and slows down the process even more.

The health care reform plan itself was also depicted from a culinary perspective via the conceptual metaphor THE HEALTH CARE REFORM PLAN IS FOOD:

> (89) Most Democrats voted for a version of *the bill* on the first round without having read, let alone *digested*, *its thousands of pages*.
> (NW, 11th January 2010)

> (90) *The Senate health-care bill is* particularly *sausage-like*.
> (NW, 1st February 2010)

Example (90) also uses the conception of a sausage and what it is made of to depict the convoluted contents of the Senate plan. Example (89), on the contrary, does not specify the type of food that the plan is but uses the verb "digest" to explicate the fact that most Democrats had not made the effort

to thoroughly internalize the contents and implications of the plan before voting for it. In conclusion then, the purpose of these two culinary conceptual metaphors seems to be to bring attention to the fact that health care reform is messy and problematic because it involves having to take into consideration so many different interests and opinions and somehow mix them all together to end up with an inviting, new product.

The last two conceptual metaphors to be discussed in the results section differ somewhat from all the previous ones in that they do not directly refer to the United States health care reform. However, since they are used to present the state of the American health care system before reform as well as President Obama's role in changing it, and in addition do this from a very interesting viewpoint, I find it worthwhile to mention them here. Nevertheless, given that the next few examples discussed do not represent conceptual metaphors with either HEALTH CARE REFORM or THE HEALTH CARE REFORM PLAN as their target domains, the examples are not included in the tables found at the beginning of chapter 5.

The following conceptual metaphors use the source domains of health and medicine to depict the state of the American health care system before reform. They also reveal a particular vision of Obama's role in changing that system. Let us take a look at two examples:

> (91) Still, Obama and his team are aware that the more Americans learn about how Washington proposes to *cure that system*, the more skeptical they are about the whole enterprise.
> (TM, 10th August 2009)

> (92) Reform advocates have continually pointed to *the ills of our health care system*, and President Obama has tried to reassure Americans that *reforming it will be painless*.
> (FB, 30th November 2009)

With the use of terms such as *cure* and *ill*, these two example extracts make use of the conceptual metaphor THE AMERICAN HEALTH CARE SYSTEM IS SICK. Naturally then, as the system is considered to be weak and unwell, some treatment is needed to cure it. As example (92) already reveals, reforming the system would seem to be the most effective remedy and clearly President

Obama is the one who is largely responsible for it. He is then granted the position of a doctor and the conceptual metaphor PRESIDENT OBAMA IS A DOCTOR can be devised. The following examples showcase the conceptual metaphor in use:

> (93) Is it time for *the President's prescription*?
> (TM, 27th July 2009)

> (94) *Can Obama Find a Cure*?
> (TM, 10th August 2009)

> (95) *Obama's Cost Scalpel*.
> (BW, 5th April 2010)

Obama as the main initiator and pursuer of health care reform is in these examples depicted as a doctor who has the possibility to cure the feeble American health care system. The metaphorical use of a medical term such as *prescription* in example (93), for instance, brings forth the question of whether Obama should more readily offer his own input in devising the specific contents of the proposed plan rather than leaving it up to Congress. Example (94) on the other hand, wonders whether there is such input (or a prescription) in the first place that Obama might include in a reform plan that would help cure the American health care system in an effective and balanced way. Finally, the *BusinessWeek* extract (95) furthermore describes Obama as a surgeon who has to make serious cutbacks with his scalpel on the money spent on health care.

Starting from the context of examples (91) and (92), almost all of the extracts presented here showcase once again the uncertainty involved in devising health care reform. Obama's efforts in the role of a doctor are not counted on whole-heartedly. What is certain, though, is that the American health care system in its current state is not working properly and via the use of conceptual metaphors from the field of medicine, this issue can be further elaborated on and discussed.

6 Discussion

The results of the research on conceptual metaphors in reports of U.S. health care reform reveal, above all, the dominance of the WAR metaphor. The metaphor was encountered the most in total in the four magazines analysed, which is not exactly surprising, given its well-spread use in many areas of social life, including politics (see, e.g. section 3.4). Charteris-Black (2004, 69) attests to the prevalent use of metaphors of conflict and war in the political context and proposes the overall metaphor of POLITICS IS CONFLICT (consisting of the use of terms such as *fight*, *battle* and *threat*). He (Ibid.) continues by noting that conflict metaphors are used to highlight the personal sacrifice and physical struggle needed to achieve social goals. In the context of U.S. health care reform, the use of conceptual metaphors of WAR reveal that it is the members of the two parties, the Democrats and the Republicans, who most have to devote their time and effort to fighting for the plan they want. In Koller's (2004, 10) view, the WAR metaphor emphasizes aspects of aggression, fighting and strategy whereas the somewhat similar conceptual domain of SPORTS focuses on competitive features. Together, the metaphorical expressions originating from these two conceptual domains strongly emphasize the polarized nature of health care reform, as the issue arouses constant conflict and competition between the two contending parties of the Democrats and the Republicans. In addition, in any war, or sports competition for that matter, only one of the parties can win and hence consensus is not strived for. Thus, when an issue such as health care reform is presented in the magazines largely as corresponding to war, it may have an implicit influence in further separating the two parties as well as the opinions of the public into two, instead of focusing on finding a way of coming to an agreement.

However, the concept group of JOURNEY metaphors slightly balances out the representation of health care reform. Whereas the WAR and SPORTS metaphors depict the issue as quite irresolvable without physical action, the metaphorical expressions used that emanate from the JOURNEY category represent health care reform with more neutral tones, focusing on the possibility

of co-operation. The HEALTH CARE REFORM IS A JOURNEY metaphor was the second most used metaphor cluster in the data and it depicts the participants of health care reform as, for example, travellers whose destination and common goal is signing a new health-care law. In order to reach their destination, the Democrats and the Republicans need to travel along the same path and co-operate, despite different impediments or disagreements along the way. Holmgreen (2008, 115) further elaborates the implications of the term *path*, as she discusses a subcategory of the JOURNEY metaphor, the PATH metaphor, which she encountered in her Danish newspaper corpus on biotechnology. She views the PATH metaphor as emphasizing the progressive aspect in an issue (Ibid.), which can be applied to health care reform as well, as the intention of reform is, after all, to proceed from the current state of affairs to a better, more functional American health care system. Hence, based on the corpus analysed for this thesis, the JOURNEY metaphor is mainly employed to represent aspects of co-operation and progression in U.S. health care reform.

Nonetheless, the metaphor clusters of WAR and SPORTS can also be used to express co-operation, albeit within one group rather than between the two different parties. As Koller (2004, 113) points out, these metaphorical concepts embody aspects of teamwork which could also be encountered in the examples on SPORTS metaphors in this research. There, it was noted that it is the Democrats specifically that are labelled as a team in their efforts whereas the Republicans are only depicted as the opponent. Now, although this representation of the Republicans as without a unified team might be considered as conveying a slightly negative outlook on the party, it actually does not do much more than express the fact that the Republicans are in opposition when it comes to health care reform, rather than adamantly pursuing it.

As noted, the two metaphor groups of SPORTS and WAR are very resembling to each other and even use each other as source domains (Koller 2004, 110). Also, both areas are still very masculinized and hence influence the conceptualization of their target domain, in this case health care reform, as a male arena (Ibid., 73). Indeed, the only female politician occasionally mentioned

as involved in the issue is the then Speaker of the House of Representatives, Nancy Pelosi. However, the concept groups of SPORTS and WAR do also differ from each other in that WAR entails something serious and dangerous that can even lead to death, whereas SPORTS does not. Metaphorical expressions originating from the source domain of SPORTS express a competitive aspect to an issue but they can also be used, as Semino and Masci (1996, 250-251) pointed out, to simplify the understanding of an issue and to bring more excitement to it.

Lakoff and Johnson (1980, 33) state that personification helps human beings in comprehending experiences involving nonhuman entities in terms of human motivations and characteristics. Personification was used widely to depict the health care reform plan and Charteris-Black (2005, 41) notes that the ideological basis for using it is "either to arouse empathy for a social group, ideology or belief evaluated as heroic, or to arouse opposition towards a social group, ideology or belief that is evaluated as villainous." Now, based on the overall results on the use of personification to refer to the target domain of THE HEALTH CARE REFORM PLAN, it can be said that the ideological basis for its use is the latter option mentioned by Charteris-Black. In addition to viewing the plan as an adversary or enemy in the WAR category, two thirds of all the metaphorical expressions employing personification depict the plan as either villainous or as inadequate and harmful to American society. Only the notion of the plan as a traveller in the JOURNEY category provides a more neutral representation of the plan as it focuses on expressing the slow progress of the health care reform plan and its need to be able to move forward from Congress.

According to the ADVERSARY category, the plan is an enemy because it does not consist of the correct regulations and paragraphs of law that are required by the Republicans especially. Hence, it is an adversary not only to individual politicians' values and perceptions of what the American health care system should be like but also to party politics and future electoral success. The use of personification in conjunction with the new U.S. health care reform plan reveals that the plan in its current state is seen by many to be harmful to American society and economy, being too

inconsistent and inadequate for approval. However, since it is the contents of the plan that largely arouse objection towards health care reform, the inference is, of course, that by changing the contents, the objection might be alleviated as well. Thus, it can be concluded that based on the use of personification in metaphorical expressions of the health care reform plan, Americans at large are not against health care reform in general as long as the terms with which it is carried out are acceptable.

In addition to the larger metaphoric clusters of WAR, JOURNEY, SPORTS and PERSON, a number of other, slightly smaller metaphoric groups were encountered to depict both the process of health care reform as well as the plan itself. Metaphorical expressions originating from the conceptual metaphors of HEALTH CARE REFORM IS A GAMBLE/RISK, HEALTH CARE REFORM IS FORCING and HEALTH CARE REFORM IS FOOD PROCESSING are used to portray the process. Instead of relating a certain attitude or ideology towards health care reform, these metaphors relate extra information about the nature and characteristics of the process. The example expressions discussed in the GAMBLE/RISK category for instance, had either Obama or the Democratic Party as their subjects, thereby highlighting their exposure in particular to possible failure and loss. This seems quite natural, as President Obama and the Democrats are the main pursuers of reform. However, the emphasis that these metaphors place on the risk taken by Obama and the Democrats in specific could also be viewed as a way of glorifying them and making them seem more courageous than the Republicans. Still, the category does reveal the difficulty of the topic in the United States and pays attention to the courage needed to undertake the issue. The difficulty of health care reform is also underscored in the metaphorical expressions belonging to the HEALTH CARE REFORM IS FORCING category, which additionally conveys the notion of objection towards the proceeding of the issue since it becomes something which needs to be forced. THE HEALTH CARE REFORM IS FOOD PROCESSING metaphor, on the other hand, depicts the process as difficult because it is messy and needs to take so many different elements and opinions into consideration.

When it comes to the health care reform plan itself, it is further elaborated on with the concepts of HEAVY OBJECT, SUBSTANCE, CONSTRUCTION, COMMODITY and FOOD. Essentially, the function of these metaphors seems to be that of helping us comprehend what is involved in forming a new health care law. Presenting the plan as a heavy object, for instance, makes it possible to express the forceful action needed to move it further from Congress. Furthermore, conceptualizing the plan as a kind of substance emphasizes the fact that the contents of the plan can be shaped and moulded whenever needed. The metaphorical expressions belonging to the CONSTRUCTION group also convey the idea of forming a plan and how the plan needs to be built on solid ground with the right elements for it to succeed. Then again, the representation of the plan as a commodity, as something that is given a price and needs to be sold, helps us understand the fact that not everybody is willing to accept the new health care reform plan unless it is cost-effective and otherwise comprises of what an individual considers to be reasonable legislation. Finally, the FOOD metaphor yet again emphasizes the consisting of the plan of several different constituent parts.

The conceptual metaphors depicting the U.S. health care reform process and plan as found in the data in *Newsweek*, *Time*, *BusinessWeek* and *Forbes* have now been presented and analysed. However, in order to fully understand the kind of ideologies they are conveying, it is also important to consider which aspects of health care reform the use of these particular metaphors is hiding. As discussed, for instance, in section 3.2.2 on new metaphors, conceptual metaphors always highlight some aspects of an experience whilst hiding others. As an example, Lakoff and Johnson (1980, 141) mention the LOVE IS A COLLABORATIVE WORK OF ART metaphor which highlights the active side of love rather then the more passive and emotional side foregrounded by the traditional LOVE IS MADNESS metaphor. In the same manner, the conceptual metaphors on health care reform can be examined.

The most dominant representations brought forth by the conceptual metaphors on U.S. health care reform are the aspects of battle and competition, which are conveyed to the reader via the WAR

and SPORTS metaphors. In addition, when it comes to the health care reform plan itself, it is mostly depicted as an enemy and a harmful villain. Despite the co-operative aspect somewhat underscored by the JOURNEY metaphor, the main focus of the majority of the metaphors found is to emphasize the breach of opinions on the issue and consequently the division of the nation into two, as well as the negative characteristics of the plan. They thus hide the possible co-operation between the parties or their wish for it, making it seem like agreement is an almost impossible conception when it comes to health care reform. However, let us consider for a moment that instead of the dominant HEALTH CARE REFORM IS WAR metaphor, for instance, the main metaphor found in the corpus would be HEALTH CARE REFORM IS A COLLABORATIVE WORK OF ART. With this metaphor, the representation of the issue would change dramatically and the process would suddenly seem much more possible as it would include aspects such as CREATION, BUILDING and HELPING (Lakoff and Johnson 1980, 141). Nonetheless, these are exactly the kinds of characteristics that the HEALTH CARE REFORM IS WAR metaphor hides as it focuses on elements of battle, destruction, victory and defeat.

In addition, since in Lakoff and Turner's (1989, 63) view conceptual metaphors are so innate in us that they cannot be easily resisted, representing the health care reform plan with negative metaphors can considerably affect the opinions of the public on the issue, thus hiding the possible positive contents and repercussions of it. Charteris-Black (2004, 251) notes that "since metaphor is a way of creating cognitive and affective meaning, by changing the metaphor we may change the way that we think and feel about something." Thus, if the issue of health care reform and the health care reform plan would be represented differently to the American public via different metaphor use, then perhaps it would be possible to start changing their viewpoints on it as well. Based on the main results of the analysis on conceptual metaphors in this thesis, the viewpoints could then be changed from largely negative towards positive and more optimistic.

As to the representations of and ideologies on health care reform provided by the individual magazines, it is clear that no decisive results can be presented since my main focus has not been in comparing their metaphor use to each other. However, on a general note and especially when the co-text of the metaphorical expressions is taken into consideration, *BusinessWeek* and *Forbes* seem to project a more negative view of the issue and the contents of the plan. Both magazines use the WAR metaphor the most when it comes to the concept of HEALTH CARE REFORM and are also more prolific in employing the FORCING metaphor than *Time* and *Newsweek*. As regards the health care reform plan, out of the four magazines *BusinessWeek* and *Forbes* most clearly represent it as inadequate and villainous. When the co-text of these examples is studied more closely, they reveal a conception of the plan as an economical threat in particular, which suits the magazines' business-oriented outlook. Due to their overall criticism of health care reform based on both general, quantitative results and the individual use of metaphorical expressions in context, it would seem that *BusinessWeek* and *Forbes* slightly support the Republican side of the matter.

Newsweek and *Time*, on the other hand, seem to project more criticism towards the Republican side and their opinions in their use of conceptual metaphors on U.S. health care reform. Thus, they can be viewed as providing more support for the plan and hence on the Democrats. According to their religion-infused use of the WAR metaphor, for example, both equate the Democrats with Christians and Republicans with Muslims in a holy war, which in an American context represents the members of the GOP with pejorative characteristics. However, both magazines do also criticize aspects of the process as well as the health care reform plan itself via their use of metaphors, just as *BusinessWeek* and *Forbes* do not solely offer negative representations of the issue. Still, *Newsweek* and *Time* focus slightly more on the positive side of health care reform; *Time*, for instance, employs the JOURNEY metaphor above the WAR one in conjunction with HEALTH CARE REFORM, focusing on the aspects of progress and co-operation

encountered in the issue. Also, both magazines are prolific users of the lighter GAME and SPORTS metaphors which are hardly non-existent in *BusinessWeek* and *Forbes*.

Finally, it is worthwhile pondering for a moment on the method of the study conducted in this thesis. This method was based on Charteris-Black's (2004) critical metaphor analysis (CMA) which consists of the three stages of metaphor identification, interpretation and explanation. Overall, the method worked well as a variety of conceptual metaphors could be plausibly identified, categorized and their use analysed. The slight changes made into Charteris-Black's method, such as the decision not to focus on certain keywords or measuring the frequencies of their use in a computer search facility appear to have been useful. Since most concept groups consisted of such metaphorical expressions which used a large variety of different terms to convey a particular representation, the keyword selection could possibly have resulted in many of them having been totally disregarded. Also, due to the intention of uncovering all the possible conceptual metaphors used in conjunction with the process of health care reform and the health care reform plan, a close manual search was crucial for the analysis. However, this option always entails the possibility for error from the part of the analyst as some metaphorical expressions could have been left out by mistake or overlooked completely if they have seemed too conventionalized to be metaphors at all.

Nonetheless, the biggest challenge encountered in the analysis of the results was categorizing the metaphorical expressions found in a plausible manner. Most expressions turned out to belong to widely used and discussed conceptual domains such as WAR, JOURNEY and SPORTS but some also required the devising of totally novel conceptual metaphors. In addition, the overlapping of expressions presented a challenge in the presentation of results, especially quantitatively. Still, the most important part was to continually ascertain that the example expressions found corresponded to their overall conceptual metaphor and vice versa. When it comes to the selection of magazines, the four selected presented an interesting variety of conceptual metaphors on U.S. health care reform, also differing slightly in their conceptions on the issue. However, for the sake of obtaining

more comprehensive results, it would have been preferable for the corpora of the magazines to have been more equal in numbers, instead of the corpora of *BusinessWeek* and *Forbes* differing from *Newsweek* and *Time* as considerably as in the present study.

6 Conclusion

Health care reform was and still is at the time of completing this study a topic for considerable and heated debate in the United States, and it has been the focus of substantial coverage by the media. Discussions on the topic have awoken probably as many different opinions on the matter as there are Americans. For them, this was and is an issue of more than just health care which became evident, for example, when adversaries to the reform began to justify their opposition by pleading to the loss of the freedom of the individual if the government were to force health insurance on everyone. Such freedom of the individual is a very core and historical characteristic and value of the American society and incorporating it in the health care debate demonstrates the severity of the issue.

In addition to the American media, the international media also took quite an interest in the subject, making the issue widely known and discussed around the world. This discussion also sparked my interest in the topic and was one of the reasons why I chose health care reform in the United States as an entrance way to study the use of metaphorical language. As a person living in a country where all basic health care is paid equally by everyone via taxes and where there is no indispensable need for health insurance, I find the American system of providing health care multifaceted, intriguing and interesting.

The overall results of this study on conceptual metaphors in reports of U.S. health care reform in *Newsweek*, *Time*, *BusinessWeek* and *Forbes* reveal, above all, a negative representation and ideology of the issue. With the use of metaphors, the process of health care reform is most dominantly depicted as corresponding to a state of war. The main protagonists, the Democratic Party and the Republican Party are not only fighting against each other, but the Republicans in particular are also fighting against the health care reform plan which is depicted in the magazines as an adversary. In addition to the metaphors of WAR, the plan is also represented as a harmful villain, it is compared to an unpredictable and incompetent person and it is considered to be messy and

complicated. The difficulty involved in passing health care reform and enabling it to move forward from Congress is exemplified via the use of the HEAVY OBJECT and FORCING metaphors. The process of health care reform also requires risk-taking, especially by President Obama and the Democratic Party which becomes apparent with the use of the GAMBLE and RISK metaphors.

The above metaphors all highlight aspects of danger, gravity and difficulty when it comes to the process of health care reform and the health care reform plan. Still, not all the metaphors encountered represented the issue negatively. The JOURNEY metaphor was noted to be conveying the notion of co-operation and progress involved in the process, as it depicted the protagonists of health care reform as on a trip together, trying to travel towards a unified destination. The plan itself was also portrayed as a traveller with aims to move forward from Capitol Hill. In addition to the JOURNEY metaphor, the SPORTS metaphor projected more positive evaluations of the process as despite the competitive aspect, it also conveyed an idea of entertainment and excitement encountered in the issue.

In this research, I hope to have shown that with the use of conceptual metaphors different representations of and ideologies on an issue can be conveyed and most often in quite an implicit manner. As conceptual metaphors are something so embedded in us, we often do not even realize that they are being used, which is exactly what makes them so persuasive. Naturally, though, metaphors alone do not account for the persuasiveness of a text but instead, as Charteris-Black (2005, 30) notes it consists of the complex interaction between intention, linguistic choice and context. The intention and ideological motivation behind metaphor use are notions put forward by Charteris-Black in his method for analysing metaphors and are issues that I have been interested in uncovering in this thesis as well. However, even though the representations of and ideologies on health care reform put forward by the magazines are certainly influenced by the values and opinions of the reporters in question as well as the public at large, we can never totally discover the intentions behind language use without actually enquiring after the choices made from the language

users themselves. And even then, every individual interprets messages based on their own understanding of the world and their cultural and personal background. Hence, the results presented in this thesis as well only present a partial understanding to the representations of U.S. health care reform in four American magazines.

Finally, there are many aspects to the study of the use of metaphors in conjunction with U.S. health care reform that could not be included in the current context but would provide ample material for analysis in the future. First of all, the use of conceptual metaphors could be analysed by taking into account the notion of time and studying how the representations of the issue changed at different time phases during the roughly one year period when the new health care law was achieved, and even after that. As the issue has been discussed and debated on even to the time of completing this study (one year after the original signing of a new plan), it is most likely that the metaphors depicting it have changed, even considerably. Secondly, from the point of view of gender studies, analysing the influence of the gender of the reporter on the conceptual metaphors used could provide some interesting results and further our understanding of the effects of gender in the use of metaphors. And thirdly, as the current study has concentrated on analysing the representations of and ideologies on health care reform as conveyed by magazines, it would, of course, be interesting to see how these representations might change or be supported in the metaphor use of American newspapers for example, or in foreign press in general.

Bibliography

Primary sources

Newsweek

"Attack!" *Newsweek* 24 August 2009, Vol. 154, 8-9: 40-43.
"Bipartisanship Is Bad." *Newsweek* 24 August 2009, Vol. 154, 8-9: 65.
"Boethius Comes to the Beltway." *Newsweek* 5 April 2010, Vol. 155, 14: 8.
"Change We Can Believe In." *Newsweek* 1 February 2010, Vol. 155, 5: 24-25.
"Do As We Say, Not As We Do." *Newsweek* 21 December 2009, Vol. 154, 25: 30.
"Fight Club." *Newsweek* 11 January 2010, Vol. 155, 2: 48-49.
"Follow the Leader." *Newsweek* 8 February 2010, Vol. 155, 6: 22-25.
"Get Real on Health Costs." *Newsweek* 21 December 2009, Vol. 154, 25: 36.
"Health Reform That Isn't." *Newsweek* 3 August 2009, Vol. 154, 5: 28.
"How the GOP Sees It." *Newsweek* 1 March 2010, Vol. 155, 9: 26-31.
"An Ivy League Huey Long." *Newsweek* 7 September 2009, Vol. 154, 10: 18.
"Learning from LBJ." *Newsweek* 5 April 2010, Vol. 155, 14: 30-33.
"A Losing Strategy." *Newsweek* 22 March 2010, Vol. 155, 12: 22.
"Mitch McConnell Smiled?" *Newsweek* 21 September 2009, Vol. 154, 12: 26.
"No Harry and Louise." *Newsweek* 23 March 2009, Vol. 153, 12: 49.
"Obama's Health Care Gamble." *Newsweek* 11 January 2010, Vol. 155, 2: 21.
"Obama's Malpractice." *Newsweek* 23 November 2009, Vol. 154, 21: 21.
"Obama's Other Deficit." *Newsweek* 15 February 2010, Vol. 155, 7: 26-29.
"One Nation under Medicare." *Newsweek* 29 June 2009, Vol. 153, 26: 24.
"A President's On-The-Job-Training." *Newsweek* 29 March 2010, Vol. 155, 13: 4.
"Post-Bush Stress Disorder." *Newsweek* 26 October 2009, Vol. 154, 17: 20.
"'Socialism,' Chicago Style." *Newsweek* 5 April 1020, Vol. 155, 14: 23.
"Stay Out of It, Mr. President." *Newsweek* 1 March 2010, Vol. 155, 9: 18.
"W. Doesn't Live Here Anymore." *Newsweek* 10 August 2009, Vol. 154, 6-7: 22.
"1965 All over Again?" *Newsweek* 5 April 2010, Vol. 155, 14: 22.

Time

"Can Obama Find a Cure?" *Time* 10 August 2009, Vol. 174, 5: 26-29.
"The Character Question." *Time* 21 September 2009, Vol. 174, 11: 24.
"Democracy's Discontent." *Time* 10 August 2009, Vol. 174, 5: 34-35.
"Full Steam Ahead." *Time* 29 March 2010, Vol. 175, 12: 17.
"Getting to the Finish Line." *Time* 15 March 2010, Vol. 175, 10: 8.
"Hard Choices." *Time* 20 July 2009, Vol. 174, 2: 27.
"Just Say No." *Time* 31 August 2009, Vol. 174, 8: 16-17.
"Lead Time." *Time* 14 September 2009, Vol. 174, 10: 21.
"More Data + Less Care = Lower Cost + Better Health." *Time* 29 June 2009, Vol. 173, 25: 36-40.
"Obamacare's Fatal Flaw." *Time* 17 August 2009, Vol. 174, 6: 35.
"Paging Dr. Obama." *Time* 27 July 2009, Vol. 174, 3: 17.
"Promise Delivered" *Time* 5 April 2010, Vol. 175, 13: 20-23.
"Starting Over." *Time* 1 February 2010, Vol. 175, 4: 22-29.
"Their Own Worst Enemy." *Time* 15 March 2010, Vol. 175, 10: 21.

BusinessWeek

"Bitter Medicine for the AMA." *BusinessWeek* 29 June 2009, Issue 4137: 27.
"Congressman Calculator." *BusinessWeek* 15 March 2010, Issue 4170: 59.
"Health Care's Sinkhole." *BusinessWeek* 16 March 2009, Issue 4123: 19.
"The Long Road Back from Massachusetts." *BusinessWeek* 1 February 2010, Issue 4165: 20.
"A Mad Rush to Health Reform." *BusinessWeek* 13 July 2009, Issue 4139: 85.
"Not So Fast, Mr. President." *BusinessWeek* 6 July 2009, Issue 4138: 68.
"Obamacare's Cost Scalpel." *BusinessWeek* 5 April 2010, Issue 4172: 64-66.
"Obama Starts Over." *BusinessWeek* 1 February 2010, Issue 4165: 22-27.
"A Precidency Restored to Health." *BusinessWeek* 5 April 2010, Issue 4172: 30.
"A Tax Hike by Any Other Name." *BusinessWeek* 16 November 2009, Issue 4155: 30-31.
"What Health Reform Won't Cure." *BusinessWeek* 21 December 2009, Issue 4160: 46-49.
"Why Business Fears the Public Option." *BusinessWeek* 12 October 2009, Issue 4150: 26-27.

Forbes

"America Will Survive ObamaCare." *Forbes* 26 April 2010, Vol. 185, 7: 19.
"…And Undermining Health Care." *Forbes* 3 August 2009, Vol. 184, 2: 17-18.
"Don't Doc American Health Care." *Forbes* 25 May 2009, Vol. 183, 10: 14.
"The Fight." *Forbes* 11 May 2009, Vol. 183, 9: 17-18.
"A Grotesquerie." *Forbes* 12 April 2010, Vol. 185, 6: 15.
"Hey, Big Spender." *Forbes* 7 September 2009, Vol. 184, 4: 22.
"Higher Premiums Ahead." *Forbes* 30 November 2009, Vol. 184, 10: 24.
"The Profit Snatchers." *Forbes* 13 July 2009, Vol. 184, 1: 68-73.
"Sick on Arrival." *Forbes* 7 September 2009, Vol. 184, 4: 24.

Secondary sources

Adkins Covert, Tawnya J. and Philo C. Wasburn. 2009. *Media Bias? : A Comparative Study of Time, Newsweek, the National Review, and The Progressive Coverage of Domestic Social Issues, 1975-2000*. Lanham (Md.): Lexington Books.

Beer, Francis A. and Christ'l De Landtsheer, eds. 2004. *World Politics*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press.

Black, Max. 1979. "More About Metaphor." In *Metaphor and Thought*, ed. Andrew Ortony, 19-43. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Blommaert, Jan. 2005. *Discourse: A Critical Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Charteris-Black, Jonathan. 2004. *Corpus Approaches to Critical Metaphor Analysis*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Charteris-Black, Jonathan. 2005. *Politicians and Rhetoric - The Persuasive Power of Metaphor*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Chiang, Wen-Yu and Ren-Feng Duann. 2007. "Conceptual Metaphors for SARS: 'War' between Whom?" *Discourse & Society* 18, 5: 579-602.

Fairclough, Norman. 1989. *Language and Power*. New York: Longman Inc.

Fairclough, Norman. 1995. *Media Discourse*. London: Edward Arnold.

Fairclough, Norman and Ruth Wodak. 1997. "Critical Discourse Analysis." In *Discourse as Social Interaction*, ed. Teun A. van Dijk, 258-284. Sage Publications: London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi.

Gibbs, Raymond W. 1992. "What is metaphor? The Idea of Understanding in Theories of Metaphor." *Poetics Today* 13, 4: 575-606.

Glucksberg, Sam. 2001. *Understanding Figurative Language: From Metaphors to Idioms*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hamilton, Heidi E., Deborah Schriffin and Deborah Tannen, eds. 2001. *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Malden (Mass.): Blackwell.

Herbeck, Dale A. 2004. "Sports Metaphors and Public Policy: The Football Theme in Desert Storm Discourse." In *World Politics*, eds. Francis A. Beer and Christ'l De Landtsheer, 121-139. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press.

Holmgreen, Lise-Lotte. 2008. "Biotech as 'Biothreat'?: Metaphorical Constructions in Discourse." *Discourse & Society* 19, 1: 99-119.

Kertész, András and Csilla Rákosi. 2009. "Cyclic vs. Circular Argumentation in the Conceptual Metaphor Theory. *Cognitive Linguistics* 20, 4: 703-732.

Koller, Veronika. 2004. *Metaphor and Gender in Business Media Discourse.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Koller, Veronika. 2005. "Critical Discourse Analysis and Social Cognition: Evidence from Business Media Discourse." *Discourse & Society* 16, 2: 199-224.

Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson. 1980. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago.

Lakoff, George. 1987. *Women, Fire and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal about the Mind*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, George and Mark Turner. 1989. *More than Cool Reason: A Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor.* Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson. 1999. *Philosophy in the Flesh: The Embodied Mind and Its Challenge to Western Thought*. New York: Basic Books.

McGlone, Matthew S. 2001. "Concepts as Metaphors." In Sam Glucksberg, *Understanding Figurative Language: From Metaphors to Idioms*, 90-107. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mei-Zhen, Liao. 1999. "Metaphor as a Textual Strategy in English." *Text* 19, 2: 227-252.

Nourie, Alan and Barbara Nourie, eds. 1990. *American Mass-Market Magazines*. New York: Greenwood Press.

Ortony, Andrew, ed. 1979. *Metaphor and Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ortony, Andrew. 1979. "Metaphor: A Multidimensional Problem." In *Metaphor and Thought*, ed. Andrew Ortony, 3-16. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pedersoli, Heleni. 1990. *"Newsweek."* In *American Mass-Market Magazines*, eds. Alan Nourie and Barbara Nourie, 313-317. New York: Greenwood Press.

Searle, John R. 1979. "Metaphor." In *Metaphor and Thought*, ed. Andrew Ortony, 92-123. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Semino, Elena and Michela Masci. 1996. "Politics Is Football: Metaphor in the Discourse of Silvio Berlusconi in Italy." *Discourse & Society* 7, 2: 243-269.

Simpson, J.A. and E.S.C. Weiner, eds. 1989. *The Oxford English Dictionary*. 2nd edition. Oxford: Clanderon Press.

van Dijk, Teun A, ed. 1997. *Discourse as Social Interaction*. Sage Publications: London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi.

van Dijk, Teun A. 2001. "Critical Discourse Analysis." In *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, eds. Heidi E. Hamilton, Deborah Schriffin and Deborah Tannen, 352-371. Malden (Mass.): Blackwell.

Wokak, Ruth and Michael Meyer, eds. 2001. *Methods of Critical Disourse Analysis.* London: SAGE Publications.

Wodak, Ruth. 2001. "What CDA Is About – A Summary of Its History, Important Concepts and Its Developments." In *Methods of Critical Disourse Analysis*, eds. Michael Meyer and Ruth Wodak, 1-13. London: SAGE Publications.

Internet sources

1. http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/health/diseasesconditionsandhealthtopics/health_insurance _and_managed_care/health_care_reform/index.html
[Accessed 22nd March 2011]

2. http://usa.usembassy.de/government-legislative.htm
[Accessed 15th November 2009]

3. http://www.cms.gov
[Accessed 15th November 2009]

4. http://www.newsweekmediakit.com/US/us_overview.html
   [Accessed 29th January 2011]

5. http://www.timemediakit.com/us/index.html
   [Accessed 29th January 2011]

6. http://weblogs.jomc.unc.edu/talkingbiznews/?p=11237
   [Accessed 29th January 2011]

7. http://mediakit.businessweek.com
   [Accessed 29th January 2011]

8. http://www.forbesmedia.com/forbes
   [Accessed 1st February 2011]

9. http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/55717/Bataan-Death-March
   [Accessed 14th December 2010]