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1. Introduction

Metaphors are all around us: our language use is riddled with them and yet they seem remarkably imperceptible to the casual observer. Many metaphors have become so widespread they seem like conventional language use. We don’t bat an eye when we read that *the construction of a factory will harm the local environment*. Yet the use of the word *harm* in this context reveals a whole set of assumptions about how we conceptualize nature. It implies that nature is a living thing that can be harmed and that is a victim. Similarly the age old trope of ‘mother nature’ implies a certain way of thinking of nature: as something benevolent that nurtures and provides for us. Because of their seemingly conventional nature some ways of talking metaphorically can appear to just be ‘common sense’. That is exactly where their power, and according to some, danger lies. If something is ‘common sense’ it is presented as a fact, just the way it is and something that resists questioning and alternative points of view. Particularly in the area of politics metaphors are an important part of the discourse, and a powerful one at that: metaphors shape our way of thinking and talking about certain subjects (Deignan 2005). American politics in particular, which tends to be awash with emotion and rhetoric, is a fruitful ground for metaphors. President George W. Bush’s use of the phrase “the axis of evil” to describe a number of US adversaries has become a notable example of this (Charteris-Black 2004:8). The use of *evil* in this context sets up a metaphorical scenario that projects the domain of religion, with good and evil onto the domain of international politics. This allowed to represent the subsequent American military operations as rooted in religious conviction (Charteris-Black 2004). When deciding on a subject for this thesis I saw the chance to combine two things that greatly interest me: American politics and metaphors.

The specific topic of this thesis is the environment and the way it is talked about in American politics. In the past years environmental issues have moved to the forefront of political debate, particularly as the effects of climate change become more noticeable with rapidly melting glaciers and more extreme weather events such as droughts and hurricanes (Jackson 2018). Nonetheless the opinions and feelings about the environment differ drastically across the ideological spectrum in the U.S, with
democratic primary contender Bernie Sanders calling climate change “the biggest national security threat facing the United States” (Wagner 2015), in contrast to the former administrator of the environmental protection agency, republican Scott Pruitt expressing skepticism on the scientific consensus regarding climate change (Pruitt 2016). It can be expected that these diverging points of view are reflected in diverging uses of metaphors.

This thesis will examine the conceptual metaphors that are at play when talking about the environment in American politics. More specifically it looks at texts concerning the environment in magazines that have a particular political affiliation and tries to determine which conceptual metaphors are operating in those texts. It is in large part based on the work of George Lakoff whose book Moral Politics looks at the fundamental differences between the two main political forces in the United States, liberalism and conservatism. Among those differences is the way these two ideologies look at and talk about the concept of nature. Lakoff suggests a set of metaphors for both groups but does not provide authentic language data. The main aim of this paper is to take Lakoff’s theory into the real world and see whether it applies to actual language use.

The first part of the thesis consists of a description of the liberal and the conservative political movement in the United States, followed by an overview of the theory of conceptual metaphor and a more in-depth explanation of Lakoff’s work in this regard on American politics. I then turn to the methodology and explain how the texts have been selected and what procedures were used in determining whether something was counted as metaphorical or not. In a third part I take a close look at the results, examining every metaphor in turn, including some additional ones that were found in the research. In the final part of the thesis I explain why all of this matters and why metaphors are not just an innocent linguistic or literary phenomenon.
2. Theoretical background and research question

2.1 The American political landscape

Contemporary American politics is dominated by two major forces: conservatism and liberalism. Those ideologies are associated respectively with the Republican Party and with the Democratic Party. In order to give some context to the ideas George Lakoff puts forward in *Moral Politics* I will give a brief overview of what liberalism and conservatism stand for in the American context. It is however important to note that Lakoff states that the ideas presented in the book are about central types of liberals and conservatives. He readily admits that conservatives and liberals are not monolithic blocks and that the positions ascribed to liberals and conservatives in the book are not necessarily supported by everyone who identifies with these monikers. There are many less central variations of these positions among individuals but Lakoff explains that his theory is concerned with the prototypical liberal and the prototypical conservative.

2.1.1 Liberalism in the United States

Liberalism originally referred to a 19th century philosophy that strives for the freest and fullest development of the individual and the elimination of any factors that restrict that goal, such as certain societal beliefs, conditions, laws or institutions. Notable thinkers of this strand of philosophy include John Locke and John Stuart Mill. In terms of government policy liberalism stood for a policy that would be most beneficial to individual liberty with specific attention to constitutions, bills of rights, the separation of powers and checks and balances. In terms of economic policy 19th century liberalism or classical liberalism has come to stand for a laissez-faire approach (Smith & Zurcher 1968).

Modern liberalism however takes on a slightly different view of the role of the government. Whereas classical liberalism has some suspicion with regard to governmental overreach modern liberalism does not typically share this distrust. It is seen as the government’s task to eliminate the major obstacles that people face in developing themselves by taking positive action to address conditions such as poverty, disease and discrimination. An example of this would be the various New Deal policies...
implemented by President Franklin D. Roosevelt in the 1930s to combat the effects of the Great Depression. Additionally modern liberalism has continued to push for the rights of disadvantaged groups by supporting the civil rights movement and equal rights for women and people belonging to the LGBT community (Encyclopedia Britannica). In recent years liberalism has had some political successes such as the election of Barack Obama as the first African-American president in 2008 and again in 2014. However it was followed by major electoral defeats in congressional elections and most recently with the defeat of Democratic candidate Hilary Clinton in the 2016 presidential election.

Lakoff cautions that his use of the term liberal is meant to refer to “political liberalism” and not the theoretical liberalism as put forward by thinkers such as John Locke, John Stuart Mill or later on in the twentieth century John Rawles (Lakoff 1996:20). Liberalism according to Lakoff “characterizes the cluster of political positions supported by people called “liberals” in our everyday political discourse: support for social programs; environmentalism; public education; equal rights for women, gays, ethnic minorities; affirmative action; the pro-choice position on abortion, and so on.” (Lakoff 1996:21).

2.1.2 Conservatism in the United States

Conservatism as a philosophy is generally associated with 18th century Irish writer Edmund Burke who advocated to control societal change in a way that allowed the preservation of the best elements of the past and organically integrate those with new elements in an ever changing society (Smith & Zurcher 1968).

In the United States modern conservatism came to the forefront as a political force at the end of the 1960s as a reaction to the civil unrest of that decade which included the counterculture, student protests and the civil rights movement. The idea arose that the country had lost its moral compass (Schoenwald 2001). This so-called “neo-conservative” movement also proposed that high levels of taxation and government interference in private businesses were factors impeding economic growth. They argued that social welfare programs were making people permanently
dependent on the government rather than promoting hard work and persistence. Additionally they promoted an interventionist stance in foreign affairs by claiming that the United States had a right to protect its interests and fight communism abroad (Encyclopedia Britannica). The slowing of economic growth in the mid-1970s and the societal dissatisfaction this created proved to be an important factor in attracting people to the conservative movement. The election of Ronald Reagan as President in 1980 signaled the definitive breakthrough of this relatively new political movement. Since then conservatism has only gained steam with for example the presidency of George W. Bush from 2001 to 2009 and significant gains in congress for the Republican Party in 2010 and 2014. With the rise of Donald J. Trump and his ensuing election as President the American conservative movement has taken a new turn. While he is conservative on many social issues his protectionist trade stances and anti-interventionist appeals are not typically conservative. Some bastions of American conservatism such as the magazine National Review (one of the sources for the corpus for this thesis) have resisted this new turn, publishing a collection of essays by contributors titled “Conservatives against Trump” (NR Symposium 2016). Other major conservative organizations have fully accepted Trump and his policies. He was for example the key note speaker at the 2018 edition of the influential Conservative Political Action Conference (CPAC) after being unwelcome there in 2016 (Smith 2018).

Lakoff defines conservatism for his purposes as the collection of political positions that sees the positions taken by liberals as governmental overregulation. They oppose things like welfare, workplace regulations, environmental regulation, stricter gun control and affirmative action. Conservatives tend to support a strong military and a strict criminal justice system (Lakoff 1996:169).
2.2 Metaphor theory before 1980

Metaphors have been a subject of interest since at least the period of Ancient Greece. The word metaphor is derived from the Greek *meta*– ‘beyond’ and *phora* which is itself derived from the word *pherein* meaning ‘to carry’ (Taverniers 2002). In its original sense a metaphor is thus a kind of movement from one thing to another. The first theorizing about metaphor was done by Aristotle. He saw metaphor as the transfer of one term onto another on the basis of similarity. This transfer involves a certain “strangeness”, which is the effect of a transgression of categories within a hierarchy. The transgression can mean moving up or down a hierarchy to find a more general or specific term, move across a hierarchy to find an equally specific term or using an analogy (A stand to B as C stands to D) (Taverniers 2002). Aristotle also described the use of metaphor in poetics and rhetoric. According to him metaphor is a way to represent reality, not necessarily as it is, but as it is perceived and it can be used to make others see something in reality (Taverniers 2002). Since Aristotle metaphors have been approached in a number of different ways throughout the centuries but those approaches have largely remained in the sphere of literary studies. Roman rhetoric interpreted Aristotle’s thoughts very narrowly which resulted in metaphor being seen as the substitution of one word for another. Metaphor was treated as a purely ornamental device. Up until the twentieth century this view, which focuses on creative metaphors that are used as an ornament in literary language use rather than on metaphor as a feature of everyday language use, remained prevalent (Deignan 2005).

An important step in metaphor research was the publication of *Metaphors We Live By* written by George Lakoff and Mark Johnson. The theories proposed in the book were essential in setting up a new research agenda in which metaphors were no longer considered to be a literary phenomenon but rather a cognitive one. Some of the ideas that led to a broader approach of metaphor had been theorized some time earlier, notably in Richard’s and Black’s interaction-organization theory and Pepper’s root metaphor theory. In Richard’s theory metaphor is no longer seen as a transfer of one word to another word like in the Aristotelian view but as two equally important thoughts that interact with each other (Taverniers 2002). Black further developed this theory and added the idea of seeing the two parts of a metaphor as systems of ideas.
rather than discrete words. On a macro-level Richard and Black introduced the idea of metaphor as a way of organizing certain aspects of reality and making us see and understand reality in a certain way (Taverniers 2002). Pepper’s root metaphor theory introduces the idea that every worldview is based on root-metaphors, meaning basic commonsensical analogies (Taverniers 2002). This is important because it connects metaphor to the way we see the world and underscores the idea that metaphor is more fundamental than a decorative flourish in texts. Both the interaction-organization theory and the root metaphor theory were important in broadening metaphor studies throughout the twentieth century and paved the way for a number of different approaches, including Lakoff and Johnson’s conceptual metaphor theory.

2.3 Conceptual metaphor theory

Lakoff and Johnson define metaphor as “understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another” (Lakoff & Johnson 1980:5). This means that a certain conceptual domain A is understood in terms of another conceptual domain B. The term conceptual domain is used here to refer to the structured knowledge a person possesses of a coherent segment of experience, for example LOVE, BUILDINGS or FOOD. A conceptual domain involves knowledge of the basic elements that are part of the domain and how the elements interact. For the conceptual domain of buildings for example this involves knowing that buildings have a foundation, that they are usually designed by an architect, etc. In conceptual metaphor theory domain A is known as the target domain and domain B as the source domain (Kövecses 2010). For example the conceptual domain of arguing can be understood in terms of the conceptual domain of war (Lakoff & Johnson 1980) making arguing the target domain and war the source domain. Conceptual metaphors are conventionally denoted in small capitals in an A IS B structure, so for the previous example that would make the following structure: ARGUMENT IS WAR.

Conceptual metaphors are taken to be situated at the level of thought but are realized at the level of language in linguistic metaphors. The ARGUMENT IS WAR metaphor for example gives rise to various linguistic metaphors in expressions such as:
Your claims are indefensible
He attacked every weak point in my argument
His criticisms were right on target
(Lakoff & Johnson 1980:4)

The underlying conceptual metaphor is rarely explicitly expressed in language use but these sort of metaphorical expressions are all emanations of the same understanding of arguing in terms of war. Other examples of common conceptual metaphors include LOVE IS A JOURNEY, THEORIES ARE BUILDINGS and IDEAS ARE FOOD (Kövecses 2010).

Generally speaking conceptual metaphors tend to have a more abstract target domain and a more concrete or physical source domain (Kövecses 2010). Put more succinctly we tend to understand the abstract through the concrete. In the examples given above love, theories and ideas are more abstract concepts whereas journeys, buildings and food are more concrete and/or more physical. This tendency can be explained by idea that concrete and physical concepts are in a sense more “known than abstract concepts because they are grounded in our physical experience” (Deignan 2005).

A conceptual metaphor implies a series of systematic correspondences between elements of the source domain and the target domain. For example Kövecses describes the mappings that form part of the LOVE IS A JOURNEY metaphor mentioned previously. In this case the lovers correspond to travelers, their love relationship itself is the vehicle in which they travel, events in the love relationship are the journey, the lover’s common goal corresponds to their common destination on the journey, the difficulties experienced in the relationship are the obstacles along the way, choices about what to do in the relationship are decisions about which way to go and so forth. The mappings are systematic and form a coherent system. It is important to note that a conceptual metaphor does not imply that every element of the source domain is mapped onto the target domain. There is a coherent set of correspondences but not every element of the source domain is included. For example the conceptual domain of journeys could arguably include the notion of gas stations or resting areas.
along the way. This element is not mapped on the love domain in the LOVE IS A JOURNEY metaphor. The mapping between two domains also cannot be reversed. This means that while we can think of love as a journey or of theories as buildings, we do not think of journeys as love or of buildings as theories. This has been called the principle of unidirectionality (Kövecses 2010).

In regard to the constraints on possible correspondences between conceptual domains, Lakoff also proposes the invariance principle:

*Metaphorical mappings preserve the cognitive topology (that is, image schema structure) of the source domain, in a way consistent with the inherent structure of the target domain.*

(Lakoff in Ortony 1993:215)

This principle constrains the possible correspondences between the conceptual domains based on the structure of both domains. In the case of the LOVE IS A JOURNEY metaphor, the image schema underlying the conceptual domain of journeys is a path. A path is an image schema on which involves spatial movement (forward, backwards) along a trajectory and it also implies a source and a goal. This means that the structure of spatial movement is preserved in the mapping to the target domain of love, but in a way that is consistent with structure of the love domain.

The basis for conceptual metaphors can vary. Kövecses distinguishes four types of motivation for metaphors: correlations in experience, a perceived structural similarity, a perceived structural similarity induced by basic metaphors and source as the root of the target (Kövecses 2010).

A lot of common conceptual metaphors are motivated by everyday experiences. For example the **MORE IS UP; LESS IS DOWN** metaphor. This metaphor frames quantity as verticality and is realized in expressions such as:

*Prices are going up*

*Unemployment numbers are down*

*Turning the volume up*

(Kövecses 2010:129)
Kövecses explains how in our everyday experience quantity correlates with verticality: when an amount of a substance increases typically the level of the substance goes up as well. There are many other metaphors that have a basis that is tied to how we experience the world such as CONSCIOUS IS UP; UNCONSCIOUS IS DOWN (the experiential basis here is that humans and most other mammals lie down while sleeping and stand up when they are awake) (Lakoff & Johnson 1980:15), PURPOSES ARE DESTINATIONS (if we want to achieve a certain goal we usually have to go to a specific place) (Kövecses 2010:129). Kövecses also notes the importance of seeing the link between these experiences as correlations and not as similarities. Adding more objects to a pile and the pile growing bigger are not similar events but they are correlated to one another.

Other conceptual metaphors are based on a perceived structural similarity. For example in the LIFE IS A GAMBLING GAME metaphor. Some examples of realizations of this metaphor are:

_I’ll take my chances._

_The odds are against me._

_It’s a toss-up._

_If you play your cards right, you can do it._

_Where is he when the chips are down?_  

_He’s bluffing._

_Those are high stakes._

_He won big._

(Kövecses 2010:132)

Here the metaphor is based on a subjective and non-preexisting similarity that is felt by some people between life and gambling: in both cases the consequences of actions can be seen as winning or losing. This perceived similarity between the structures of the two domains functions as the motivation for the metaphor.

In other cases the perceived similarity may be based on what Kövecses calls “ontological metaphors” (Kövecses 2010:133). These are very basic metaphors that
give the shape or the status of substance, object or container to abstract entities and events. They can aid a perception of similarity between two conceptual domains that otherwise would seem unrelated. For example for the IDEAS ARE FOOD metaphor the similarity between food and ideas is not immediately apparent. Nevertheless we routinely talk about ideas in terms of food:

We cook food and we can stew over ideas; we swallow food and we can swallow a claim or insult; we chew food and we can chew over some suggestion; we digest food and we can or cannot digest an idea
(Kövecses 2010:133)

According to Kövecses the perception of similarity between ideas and food is aided by some primary concepts we have about the mind in the form of a set of ontological metaphors, namely: THE MIND IS A CONTAINER, IDEAS ARE OBJECTS and COMMUNICATION IS SENDING IDEAS FROM ONE MIND-CONTAINER TO ANOTHER. These ontological metaphors emerge from non-metaphorical ways of seeing the human body: “The body is a container. Food consists of objects or substances. We receive food from outside the body and it goes into the body.” (Kövecses 2010:135). The ontological metaphors regarding the mind allow to facilitate the perception of a structural similarity between the way food and the human body interact and the way we conceptualize ideas and the mind. This is how underlying basic metaphors lead to the IDEAS ARE FOOD metaphor.

Lastly in some cases a metaphor is motivated by the fact that the source domain is at the root of the target domain. There are two versions of this: biological roots and cultural roots. In the case of the source domain being a biological root of the target domain Kövecses brings up a number of conceptual metaphors to do with love and affection as an example: “LOVE IS A BOND (There’s a strong bond between them), LOVE IS A UNITY (She is my better half), AFFECTION IS CLOSENES (He’s close to his grandmother)” (Kövecses 2010:136). He writes that it is possible that these target domains have “selected” their source domains because the source domains represent certain properties that are typical of biologically determined states and events that are closely related to love such as sexuality, birth and the mother-child relationship. The conceptualization of love and affection thus seems connected to these image-
schematic properties (link, unity, closeness) which leads to the source domains BOND, 
UNITY, and CLOSENESS.

In other cases the root is a cultural root. Here Kövecses uses the ARGUMENT IS WAR metaphor as an example. He claims that it is likely that the verbal action of arguing has evolved from the physical domain of fighting and that thus the domain of fighting which was at the root of the target domain of arguing becomes a viable source domain. A similar logic applies for the SPORT IS WAR metaphor and for the LIFE IS A PLAY metaphor (plays are based on real life which then becomes the source domain). Important to note is that in all these cases what is looked at is the possible motivations for conceptual metaphors. These motivations do not serve in as a means of predicting metaphorical outcomes.

What is essential in Lakoff and Johnson’s conceptual metaphor theory is the fact that these metaphors are not just a way of talking about concepts but that they are presumed to structure our thinking about those concepts (Deignan 2005). In fact it can be quite difficult to conceptualize an abstract idea without taking recourse to a metaphor. This notion is extended by some scholars to claim that metaphors also structure our developing knowledge (Deignan 2005). This can be the case for specialized scientific knowledge but also about very general knowledge about the world. This is reflected by the fact that experts often make use of metaphors in order to explain phenomena to lay people. For example the “greenhouse effect” uses the metaphor of a greenhouse to explain why particular gasses in the atmosphere contribute to rising temperatures on earth.

If conceptual metaphors indeed structure our thinking they are potentially quite powerful and it is important to be mindful about them. Because the structure of the source domain is never fully equivalent to the structure of the target domain, the understanding of the target domain will always in some way be partial and warped. A conceptual metaphor highlights some parts of the conceptual domain are highlighted, while others remain hidden (Lakoff & Johnson 1980). To give an example of the ways in which metaphor does not always give a clear understanding of the target domain: research has shown that the aforementioned greenhouse gas metaphor has resulted
in conceptualizations of climate change on the part of students that differ drastically from the scientific perspective (Niebert & Gropengießer 2014). This link between metaphor and thought will be expanded on later in the paper.

2.4 Further theoretical developments

Lakoff and Johnson’s outline of conceptual metaphor theory generated a lot of critical debate and lead to a number of criticisms. One such criticism is offered by Blending theory, proposed by Fauconnier and Turner. They argue that the two domain approach to conceptual metaphor as proposed by Lakoff and Johnson cannot adequately explain all metaphorical meaning. For example, the use of the butcher metaphor in the phrase “that surgeon is a butcher” implies a sense of incompetence which cannot be explained by claiming that the conceptual domain of butchery is projected onto the domain of surgery (Kövecses 2010). Instead, a different theory of conceptualization is proposed which involves four mental spaces: two input spaces, a blended space and a generic space. These mental spaces are mental representations of the external world that are drawn up online as we process information (Deignan 2005). They are generally much smaller and more specific than conceptual domains because they are constructed as the thought process enfolds, whereas conceptual domains are regarded as more static and more general (Kövecses 2010). The two input spaces are the mental spaces at play in the metaphor and they each contain representations of a real world concept. In the blended space the two input spaces are fused resulting in an imaginative third mental space, which allows for the metaphorical meaning. The generic space contains the common ground between the two input spaces: the abstract structure the two input spaces share. In the example of the butcher given above the two input domains would be butchery and surgery, which function as the source and target domain. The generic space would contain the notion of a person who uses a sharp tool on a body for a particular purpose. The blended space then contains the butcher and means of butchery from the source domain and the surgeon, the patient, some tool, the operating room and the goal of healing from the target domain. Consequently in the blend there is the idea of a surgeon who uses a tool and the means of butchery to heal the patient, which logically leads to the idea of incompetence (Kövecses 2010).
While blending theory does raise some important issues with regard to metaphorical meaning construction it is included here mostly for the sake of completeness. In this paper I will use conceptual metaphor theory as proposed by Lakoff and Johnson as the theoretical background.

2.5 Lakoff’s Moral Politics

In *Metaphors We Live By* Lakoff and Johnson already hinted at the role of metaphor in politics, warning that “political and economic ideologies are framed in metaphorical terms. Like all other metaphors, political and economic metaphors can hide aspects of reality. But in the area of politics and economics, metaphors matter more, because they constrain our lives.” (Lakoff & Johnson 1980:236). Lakoff expanded his ideas on the role of metaphor in politics in his 1996 book *Moral Politics*. In the book he examines the particular context of American politics and the way a set of political and moral principles line up with two opposing ideologies, namely liberalism and conservatism. He claims that at the basis of these different moral and ideological systems lies a different conceptualization of family and that this difference is visible in much of the political discourse of conservatives and liberals.

Lakoff starts his book by pointing out that both strict liberals and strict conservatives tend to hold a set of viewpoints that cover a wide range of topic, such as the environment, gun legislation, taxes, and abortion but that all those different viewpoints are nonetheless regarded as forming a coherent political position. It does not automatically follow that being pro-gun control goes with being pro-choice in the abortion debate yet in the liberal ideology these stances go together, while conservatives are opposed to both these things.

Secondly he notes that a lot of conservative stances seem hypocritical or even contradictory to liberals and vice versa. For example conservatives generally oppose abortion arguing that they want to protect the life of unborn children. However they do not support government provided prenatal care and other programs that have been shown to lower the infant mortality rate. From a liberal perspective it seems hypocritical
to prevent the abortion of unborn children of mothers who do not want to be pregnant but to not prevent the death of mothers who do want their children, yet to conservatives this is not inconsistent. Similarly Lakoff writes conservatives find it contradictory that liberals claim to support equality of opportunity yet affirmative action allows for opportunities for certain people over others based on their race, sex or sexuality.

Thirdly Lakoff points out that the language of conservatism and liberalism differs drastically, both in terms of the meaning they assign to words such “big government” or “freedom” and in terms of what exactly they talk about. Conservatives discourse features some typical words and phrases such as: character, virtue, discipline, tough it out, get tough, tough love, strong, self-reliance, individual responsibility, backbone, standards, authority, heritage, competition, earn, hard work, enterprise, property rights, reward, freedom, intrusion, interference, meddling, punishment, human nature, traditional, common sense, dependency, self-indulgent, elite, quotas, breakdown, corrupt, decay, rot, degenerate, deviant, lifestyle (Lakoff 1996:30). Liberal discourse on the other hand features a different cluster of words and phrases. They tend to include: social forces, social responsibility, free expression, human rights, equal rights, concern, care, help, health, safety, nutrition, basic human dignity, oppression, diversity, deprivation, alienation, big corporations, corporate welfare, ecology, ecosystem, biodiversity, pollution (Lakoff 1996:31).

According to Lakoff all these differences and misunderstandings can be traced back to the particular and differing moral systems that conservatives and liberals have. He explains that he sees two moral conceptual systems at work: the strict father morality and the nurturant parent morality. These two systems are based on two different family models, respectively the strict father model and the nurturant parent model.

The Strict father morality is based on a model that is described as follows:

*This model posits a traditional nuclear family, with the father having primary responsibility for supporting and protecting the family as well as the authority to set overall policy, to set strict rules for the behavior of the children, and to enforce the rules. The mother has the day-to-day responsibility for the care of the house, raising*
the children, and upholding the father’s authority. Children must respect and obey their parents; by doing so they build character, that is, self-discipline and self-reliance. Love and nurturance are, of course, a vital part of family life but can never outweigh parental authority, which is itself an expression of love and nurturance—though love. Self-discipline, self-reliance, and respect for legitimate authority are the crucial things that children must learn.

Once children are mature, they are on their own and must depend on their acquired self-discipline to survive. Their self-reliance gives them authority over their own destinies, and parents are not to meddle in their lives.

(Lakoff 1996:33)

Crucial in this strict father model are the emphasis on self-reliance and self-discipline. It is these characteristics which parents try to pass on to their children to enable them to thrive in their adult life.

This model is in contrast with a different model, the nurturant parent model:

Love, empathy, and nurturance are primary, and children become responsible, self-disciplined and self-reliant through being cared for, respected, and caring for others, both in their family and in their community. Support and protection are part of nurturance, and they require strength and courage on the part of the parents. The obedience of children comes out of their love and respect for their parents and their community, not out of fear of punishment. Good communication is crucial. If their authority is to be legitimate, parents must explain why their decisions serve the cause of protection and nurturance. Questioning by children is seen as positive, since children need to learn why their parents do what they do and since children often have good ideas that should be taken seriously. Ultimately, of course, responsible parents have to make the decisions and that should be clear.

The principal goal of nurturance is for children to be fulfilled and happy in their lives. A fulfilling life is assumed to be, in significant part, a nurturant life—one committed to family and community responsibility. What children need to learn most is empathy for others, the capacity for nurturance, and the maintenance of social ties, which cannot be done without strength, respect, self-discipline, and self-reliance that comes through being cared for. Raising a child to be fulfilled also requires helping that child develop
his or her potential for achievement and enjoyment. That requires respecting the child's own values and allowing the child to explore the range of ideas and options that the world offers.

When children are respected, nurtured, and communicated with from birth, they gradually enter into a lifetime relationships of mutual respect, communication, and caring with their parents.

(Lakoff 1996:33–34)

These descriptions of family models form the basis for two different conceptions of morality according to Lakoff, each one with their own priorities. This results in two radically opposed moral systems.

Strict father morality puts a lot of stock in moral strength, meaning the strength to control yourself when faced by internal and external evil. This moral strength can be built through self-discipline and self-denial. Respect for and obedience to authority are also important, as are strict rules and behavioral norms. In strict father morality it is moral to pursue your self-interest because it is a way of using your self-discipline to achieve self-reliance. The overall self-interest of everyone will be maximized if everyone is free to pursue their own self-interest. The strict father morality paints the world as a potentially dangerous place where everyone must compete to survive. In order to be successful children must learn discipline and build character. They learn this through being obedient to authority which instills rules of behavior on which they later rely. Obedience remains important in this model argues Lakoff because self-discipline can be seen as being obedient to your own authority in fulfilling the plans you make and the commitments you undertake (Lakoff 1996:68). Success is a sign of being self-disciplined and is a reward for acting accordingly with this moral system. This results in success being seen as moral. Rewards given to people who have not earned their success through competition are seen as immoral as this violates the system.

Nurturant parent morality on the other hand emphasizes the necessity for empathy and for helping those who need it. Self-nurturance is also important: taking care of yourself and being happy and fulfilled is necessary in order to help others.
People should take care of their own needs first to be able to be in a position to properly take care of the needs of others and because being fulfilled yourself allows for feeling empathy for others. Only within these confines does the moral pursuit of self-interest come into play for this model. The priorities of this model are very different than the strict father model but both models essentially function under the assumption that the way a child is raised will be reflected in the child’s later behavior. In this model this means that children should be nurtured so that they later can be self-nurturing and have the ability to nurture others. Whereas reward and punishment (sometimes corporeal punishment) is seen as an important factor in instilling discipline and imposing authority in the strict father model, in this model this is seen in a negative light because children might reproduce this behavior later in life in order to gain authority which would result in a non-nurturant, violent society. In order to nurture other you must be empathetic to another person’s needs, which is why empathy is central in this model. In this model a fairness is also important and a fair distribution is moral. This applies in various senses: equality of distribution, equality of opportunity (everyone should have the same chance at an opportunity), procedural distribution (everyone who follows the rules gets something), rights-based fairness (everyone who has a right to something gets it), and needs-based fairness (Lakoff 1996).

Some of the moral principles that are prioritized also appear in the other system but with a lower degree of priority, which somewhat changes their functioning within the moral system. For example empathy and nurturance are central in the nurturant parent model but they also occur in the strict father model. However in the strict father model authority and strength are more important moral principles than nurturance and empathy and in fact these are seen as expressions of nurturance, in the sense of ‘tough love’.

The next step in Lakoff’s argument is to link these family-based conceptions of morality to a specific conceptual metaphor, namely THE NATION IS A FAMILY. In this metaphor the government or head of state is typically seen as the father. Lakoff refers to expressions such as “founding fathers”, “fatherland” and a country “sending its sons into battle” (Lakoff 1996:153) to support this notion. But the importance of the metaphor goes further than language, he argues. Linking the strict father morality or
nurturant parent morality to this metaphor forms the basis of conservative and liberal political views. In the nation as a family metaphor he distinguishes the following mappings: THE NATION IS A FAMILY; THE GOVERNMENT IS A PARENT; CITIZENS ARE CHILDREN (Lakoff 1996:154). Lakoff points out that the metaphor does not give information about what type of family the nation is. The two family models discussed earlier, strict father or nurturant parent, fill in the missing information: they specify what type of parent the government is and thus what their responsibility to their children looks like. The nation is conceptualized as a strict father family by conservatives while liberals see it as a nurturant parent family. As Lakoff established earlier these two family models lie at the basis of two different morality models. If a certain family model is applied he argues that it induces the morality model tied to that particular family model. This why liberals and conservatives have such diverging stances on a whole range of issues and why those stances form a coherent ideology. For example for conservatives the government should encourage citizens to be self-disciplined and self-reliant so they are strongly against any government programs that people could be dependent on. Conversely liberals see the function of the government as helping people in need so they support social policies that help and protect the underprivileged.

Lakoff then goes on to tackle what he calls “the hard issues”: social programs and taxes, crime and the death penalty, regulation and the environment, the culture wars, Christianity, and abortion. This wide range of issues is examined to show how conservatives and liberals think about these particular issues and explain why they do so, in light of the theoretical considerations in the previous chapters.

For example in the case of taxes conservatives and liberals have very different policy preferences. Conservatives rail against the idea of progressive taxation because in the strict father model the rich are model citizens. Through self-discipline and hard work they have deservedly achieved their success. They have earned their reward by being better than the competition and deserve to keep that reward. Taxing them is equivalent to punishing them for doing the right thing and succeeding at it. Liberals on the other hand see progressive taxation very differently. In the nurturant parent model the ones who have more have a duty to help the ones who have less. Rich people have benefitted from society and now they must in turn do their part to
help. Their taxes help pay in part for social programs that benefit the less fortunate. As they have more money it seen as only fair that they take on a bigger part of the cost to pay for those programs. This example shows how differently political issues are viewed through the two lenses and how they are moral issues at heart: for conservatives progressive taxation is theft and thus deeply immoral while for liberals it is not only fair but a civic duty (Lakoff 1996:189–190).

2.5.1 The issue of regulation and the environment in Moral Politics

One of the issues highlighted by Lakoff is regulation and the environment. He explains how protection is an important part of nurturance. For liberals, who conceptualize the government as a nurturant parent, an important role of the government is thus to protect its citizens from all sorts of dangers. This why liberals are typically in favor of governmental protections in a whole range of areas: workers protections, consumer protections, environmental protections, all protect citizens from unscrupulous business practices and malevolent individuals. Liberals are convinced these types of regulation are necessary based on past lessons of American businesses endangering their workers, polluting the environment, producing dangerous chemicals and cheating their customers. Regulations are expected to minimize this sort of behavior.

Conservatives on the other hand do not see it as the government’s duty to draw up regulations in order to protect its citizens. Within the logic of the strict father morality model government regulation is seen as interfering with people who are pursuing their self-interest in order to become self-reliant. These people are regarded as pursuing a moral goal and should be encouraged rather than deterred by putting burdensome regulation in their way. Particularly businessmen are seen as model citizens within the conservative system, who should not be hindered while pursuing self-reliance.

On the specific topic of environmental protections the opinions of liberals and conservatives also diverge widely. Lakoff argues that the conservative morality model includes the notion of natural order of domination in which God has dominion over human beings; human beings have dominion over nature; parents over children (Lakoff 1996:212). This order is seen as a moral order, which entails that the protection
and care go along with moral authority. This means that God takes care of humans, humans take care of nature and parents take care of children. However, the hierarchy also results in the needs of those higher up being more important. Seeing as humans dominate over nature, the needs of humans trump the need for protection of nature. In the conservative model it is moral for people to pursue their self-interest, which inevitably results in some damage. This damage should be minimized but it is unavoidable because the needs of humans rank higher than the needs of nature. Essentially nature is seen as a resource in the conservative model. Humans can use it for their own self-interest and profit but should be mindful of potential wastefulness. Conservative environmentalism focuses on conservation and taking into account the costs and benefits of conserving nature. All of this brings an economic logic to environmental issues. Lakoff distinguishes the following metaphors for conceptualizing human’s relationship to the environment within the strict father morality model:

NATURE IS GOD’S DOMINION (given to man to steward wisely)

This metaphor implies that “nature by God's authority, is man's to use for whatever he wants, but he should use it sensibly and frugally.” (Lakoff 1996:214)

NATURE IS A RESOURCE (for immediate human use)

The nature as a resource metaphor introduces an economic mindset into humans’ relationship to nature. Nature has no intrinsic value but its value is decided by the law of supply and demand: how useful is it to humans and how plentiful is it. Another consequence is that parts of nature are put into categories based on their purpose for human beings, such as food or fuel.

NATURE IS A PROPERTY (for the use of the owner and for sale and purchase)

The property metaphor implies that nature can be bought and sold like other commodities, which introduces another aspect of economic thought into humans’ relationship with nature. The value of nature is not intrinsic but changes according to
local tastes and market conditions. The owner of the property can decide what to do with his part of nature and even destroy it if he or she so wishes.

NATURE IS A WORK OF ART (for human appreciation)

This metaphor assigns aesthetic value to nature based on how much human beings appreciate the aesthetic quality of nature. This means that a waterfall or the Grand Canyon might have a high value but a marsh or a cow have a lower aesthetic value. Again nature’s value is determined by the eye of the human beholder and is not intrinsic.

NATURE IS AN ADVERSARY (to be conquered and made to serve us)

The adversary metaphor implies that nature is an enemy and that it must be fought and conquered in order for humans to survive. This makes the conquering of nature noble and moral and by conquering nature humans have earned the right to dominate nature. This metaphor implies a sharp distinction between humans and nature as separate entities rather than seeing humans as part of nature.

NATURE IS A WILD ANIMAL (to be tamed for our use)

The wild animal metaphor is similar to the adversary metaphor in the sense that it also frames nature as separate, alien and dangerous to humans. However the domination and ‘taming’ of nature can potentially have economic benefits in this case making the domination of nature a noble enterprise.

NATURE IS A MECHANICAL SYSTEM (to be figured out and put to use)

This metaphor implies that the internal workings of nature can be figured out. This is the task of science and the knowledge gained from this process can be used to control nature and use it.
Nurturant parent morality conceptualizes nature very differently. Nature is seen as the thing that sustains us and nurtures us. Humans have a responsibility towards nature because it has provided and continues to provide for us. The environment should thus be treated with respect and gratitude and has inherent value. Lakoff distinguishes the following metaphors for this model:

**NATURE IS A MOTHER (who provides for us)**

This metaphor casts human beings in the role of children of a nurturant mother. The relationship between a child and a mother is usually one of attachment and unconditional love that has inherent value. It is not a temporary commitment but a continuing relationship that is one of interdependence. The metaphor implies an attitude of human beings towards nature of gratitude, responsibility and respect which is shown through actions.

**NATURE IS A WHOLE (of which we are inseparable parts)**

This metaphor focuses on the whole-part relationship between humans and nature. Human beings are a part of nature rather than removed from it. The relationship is one of mutuality and interdependence.

**NATURE IS A DIVINE BEING (to be revered and respected)**

The nature as a divine being metaphor stresses humans’ dependence, respect and admiration for nature. This metaphor is often used more specifically framing nature as a female goddess.

**NATURE IS A LIVING ORGANISM (whose needs must be met if it is to survive)**

The living organism metaphor focuses on the fact that all parts of nature depend on each other and whose needs must be met in order to survive. The Gaia theory proposed by John Lovelock which claims that the entire earth forms a self-regulating
system (Harré, Muhlhauser & Brockheimer 1999) is a scientific theory that is reminiscent of this metaphor.

NATURE IS A HOME (to be maintained and kept clean)

The home metaphor emphasizes that earth is where humans live and that it is finite. Homes tend to be places of nurturance and security and should be kept clean. The value of a home is partly based on an emotional attachment to it and not only on its market value.

NATURE IS A VICTIM OF INJURY (who has been harmed and needs to be healed)

The injury metaphor stresses that nature can be delicate and focuses on the harm nature has already been subjected to. This harm implies that it is necessary to give nature the time to heal and that continuing damage cannot be tolerated if nature is to survive.

Some of the metaphors used in the strict father model can be used in the nurturant parent model and vice versa but they are of subservient status and their meaning is entirely changed by that status. Lakoff uses the example of the NATURE IS A RESOURCE metaphor which takes on a different meaning in the liberal nurturant parent model. In this model human beings and nature are interdependent rather than humans dominating nature. Humans are nurtured by the resources of nature but in the liberal model the one who nurtures must also be nurtured themselves, meaning that humans also have a responsibility to take care of nature. This implies the notion of sustainability which is a central ecological concept (Lakoff 1996). In the nurturant parent model nature can also be seen as a resource with economic value but it must be a sustainable resource and it is one that also has inherent value. This is a very different interpretation of the resource metaphor than the way it functions in the strict father model.

The two clusters of metaphors in the two models give rise to very different conceptions about what the relationship between humans and nature is. Consequently
these form a very different basis on which inferences are made about how environmental protection should be translated into policy choices and how those should be enforced. Liberals argue for monitoring of pollution and strict enforcement of environmental laws. Conservatives on the other hand see this as constraining and punishing free enterprise. Solutions to environmental problems should come out of the free market rather than be government imposed.

2.6 Research question

*Moral Politics* was written in 1996, over twenty years ago. Since then environmental issues have increasingly taken center stage in politics. It would therefore be interesting to take a look at the way the two political sides talk about these issues and see if Lakoff’s claims stand up. With his chapter about regulations and the environment Lakoff largely remains within the theoretical confines of his two proposed morality and ideological models. No examples are given of authentic language use that would reflect the metaphors he lists up. In this light the attempt of this paper is threefold. Firstly to examine whether linguistic metaphors can be found that realize these mappings in ideologically colored texts. Secondly to look at whether conservatives rely on their particular set of metaphors and liberals on theirs. Thirdly to examine whether it is possible to distinguish other metaphors that are used to talk about the environment that are not listed up by Lakoff.
3. Methodology

3.1 The corpus

The corpus for this paper consist of 60 articles from six different American political news and opinion magazines. Each of these magazines either self-identifies as conservative or liberal or is considered to be associated with one of the two political positions by other reputable media outlets. The magazines in question are:

- National Review (National Review 2017)
- The Weekly Standard (Frank 2018)
- The American Spectator (The American Spectator 2017)
- Mother Jones (Shear & Barbaro 2012)
- The New Republic (The New Republic 2017)
- The American Prospect (The American Prospect 2017)

The first three magazines constitute the conservative part of the corpus, whereas the last three make up the liberal part. The publication date of the articles included in the corpus ranges from 2012 to 2018.

I chose to focus on magazines with a political affiliation over other sources for a number of reasons. As a practical matter magazine articles are more readily available online, over for example political speeches and press releases. It would have been more difficult to find a sufficient number of political speeches from both sides that had the environment as a subject without going back decades. This would have made the different texts less comparable. Secondly using magazines allowed to easily achieve an even distribution of the corpus between conservative and liberal sources, by simply including an equal number of articles from an equal number of magazines in the corpus.

The next step was to find specific articles pertaining to the environment. To cast a rather large net I simply put in the search terms “environment”, "climate", and “nature” in each of the magazines' digital archives. The summary of the articles that were found in this manner were briefly scanned and if they were found to relate to the broad subject of the environment the article was added to the corpus. I then did a qualitative
analysis of each article by reading it thoroughly and highlighting the linguistic metaphors in the text based on a procedure which will be described in the next section.

A variety of reasons made the choice to do a qualitative rather than a quantitative analysis seem sensible. Firstly because the nature of conceptual metaphors lends itself more easily to a qualitative study. The way in which conceptual metaphors are realized in language is not predictable, which makes it difficult to sort through large amounts of text without knowing exactly what you are looking for. It would require settling on a set of search terms which means anything outside of those terms would not be considered in the analysis. This means that there would be no way to find unexpected metaphors, which was one of the research questions. That being said, quantitative research in a large scale corpus is definitely not impossible as demonstrated by Alice Deigian (Deignan 2005). Given that the research question of this paper starts from a theoretical claim about certain conceptual metaphors operating in ideological discourses and no examples of linguistic metaphors that realize these are identified, a qualitative approach seemed more suitable. It allows for all metaphors in these texts to be discovered. This is also why the corpus, which consists of 60 texts, is relatively small. The aim for this paper is not to make exhaustive assertions about metaphor use, but rather to act as a first preliminary step on which later (more quantitative) research could potentially build.

3.2 Metaphor identification

A continuous problem in the study of metaphor lies in the question of what exactly counts as a metaphor in a given discourse. The standard definition of metaphor in conceptual metaphor theory is one that sees metaphor as “understanding one kind of thing in terms of another” (Lakoff & Johnson 1980:5). However this definition leaves a lot of room to the researcher’s intuition when deciding whether a given lexical unit is an instantiation of a conceptual metaphor or when looking for new conceptual metaphors. In order to confront the arbitrariness that can occur when relying solely on intuition the Metaphor Identification Procedure can be useful.
The Metaphor Identification Procedure (MIP) developed by the Pragglejazz group presents a framework for the questions that should be asked when identifying metaphors. The key question is whether a given lexical unit has a meaning that is “more basic” than the meaning in context and if the meaning in context can be contrasted with the basic meaning on a basis of nonliteral similarity (Pragglejaz Group 2007). The procedure is broken down into several steps:

1. Read the entire text–discourse to establish a general understanding of the meaning.
2. Determine the lexical units in the text–discourse
3. (a) For each lexical unit in the text, establish its meaning in context, that is, how it applies to an entity, relation, or attribute in the situation evoked by the text (contextual meaning).
   Take into account what comes before and after the lexical unit.
   (b) For each lexical unit, determine if it has a more basic contemporary meaning in other contexts than the one in the given context. For our purposes, basic meanings tend to be
   - More concrete [what they evoke is easier to imagine, see, hear, feel, smell, and taste];
   - Related to bodily action;
   - More precise (as opposed to vague);
   - Historically older;
   Basic meanings are not necessarily the most frequent meanings of the lexical unit.
   (c) If the lexical unit has a more basic current–contemporary meaning in other contexts than the given context, decide whether the contextual meaning contrasts with the basic meaning but can be understood in comparison with it.
4. If yes, mark the lexical unit as metaphorical.
   (Pragglejaz Group 2007:3)

For this paper I have based myself on the MIP for determining metaphors in the texts. As is suggested by the authors I have used a dictionary in difficult cases to decide on the relationship between a basic and contextual meaning. The dictionary used for this paper was the online edition of the Oxford English Dictionary (OED). The use of this procedure revealed that a large number of expressions can be considered
metaphorical. I have only considered the metaphorical expressions that can be said to fall under the conceptual domain of NATURE. Furthermore potential metaphors that occurred in direct quotes in the articles were excluded, as the speaker possibly does not share the same ideological background as the magazine in which the text occurs. In light of the research question of this paper two additional steps were added.

Firstly determining whether it is possible to classify the metaphorical expression under any of the conceptual metaphors proposed by Lakoff. To reiterate these metaphors are:

For the strict father morality model:
- NATURE IS GOD’S DOMINION (given to man to steward wisely)
- NATURE IS A RESOURCE (for immediate human use)
- NATURE IS A PROPERTY (for the use of the owner and for sale and purchase)
- NATURE IS A WORK OF ART (for human appreciation)
- NATURE IS AN ADVERSARY (to be conquered and made to serve us)
- NATURE IS A WILD ANIMAL (to be tamed for our use)
- NATURE IS A MECHANICAL SYSTEM (to be figured out and put to use)

(Lakoff 1996:213)

For the nurturant parent morality model:
- NATURE IS A MOTHER (who provides for us)
- NATURE IS A WHOLE (of which we are inseparable parts)
- NATURE IS A DIVINE BEING (to be revered and respected)
- NATURE IS A LIVING ORGANISM (whose needs must be met if it is to survive)
- NATURE IS A HOME (to be maintained and kept clean)
- NATURE IS A VICTIM OF INJURY (who has been harmed and needs to be healed)

(Lakoff 1996:215)

If the metaphor in question cannot be reasonably attributed to one of these metaphorical mappings then it is necessary to establish another mapping. The Pragglejaz method identifies metaphorical language use but does not identify the underlying conceptual mappings that give rise to this language use. For this I turn to
Gerard Steen’s five step method. While this method was mainly development for metaphor in poetry it can also be used in other contexts (Steen 2009a).

Steen’s method relies on firstly identifying the metaphorical focus: the specific word that has been used metaphorically in a sentence. The next step involves constructing the propositions in which the metaphorical concept is contained. A proposition in this case refers to a “representational form of conceptual structure” in the psychological tradition, it is a breakdown of the conceptual elements contained in the phrase and the way they are related (Steen 2009a:298). Thirdly the proposition from the previous step is transformed into an open comparison between two propositions belonging to different conceptual domains. The two propositions that are constructed in this way are both incomplete. In a fourth step the two propositions are related in a single analogical structure, filling in the gaps of the two incomplete propositions. On the basis of this similarity structure the next step identifies a cross-domain mapping. Steen uses a particular formal notation for steps two, three and four which has not been replicated, but the general process of the method has been preserved. To illustrate this method Steen uses an example from a poem by Alfred Tennyson. The first line of the poem reads “Now sleeps the crimson petal, now the white” (Steen 2009b:198). The metaphorical focus in this phrase is “sleep”. The propositions contained in the phrase are: a crimson petal sleeps and a white petal sleeps. Then the next step tries to set up an open comparison between two domains: there is a similarity proposed between an action of the petals in the target domain and an entity that is sleeping in the source domain. The undetermined slots (the action in the target domain and the entity in the source domain) are filled in in the fourth step which leads to the following structure: There is a similarity between petals being inactive and a person sleeping. Then in a final step a cross-domain mapping is identified which in this case would be SLEEPING IS BEING INACTIVE, along with a list of correspondences between the elements and further inferences that can be derived from the analogy (Steen 2009a).
4. Results and discussion

4.1 General overview of the results

After analyzing the 60 texts in the corpus a total of 120 metaphors were found. Of these metaphors 24 were found in magazines that are considered conservative, whereas the remaining 96 were found in magazines that are considered liberal. Of the 13 proposed conceptual metaphors by Lakoff 11 had realizations found in the texts. These numbers are summarized in table 1.

The conceptual metaphors for which no realizations were found are:

- NATURE IS A DIVINE BEING
- NATURE IS A MECHANICAL SYSTEM

However some of the conceptual metaphors that had realizations had quite a limited occurrence, meaning only one or two realizations were found. These were:

- NATURE IS A PROPERTY
- NATURE IS A RESOURCE
- NATURE IS A WORK OF ART
- NATURE IS A WHOLE

The rest of the conceptual metaphors listed by Lakoff had more realizations. Conceptual metaphors that were realized more frequently were:

- NATURE IS A HOME
- NATURE IS A VICTIM TO INJURY
- NATURE IS A LIVING ORGANISM
- NATURE IS A MOTHER
- NATURE IS GOD’S DOMINION
- NATURE IS AN ADVERSARY
- NATURE IS A WILD ANIMAL

Other than the expected conceptual metaphors a number of other metaphorical expressions were also found that can be classified under the following conceptual metaphors:
NATURE IS A BODY
NATURE IS A VICTIM OF ASSAULT
NATURE IS A FACTORY
NATURE IS A PHYSICAL OBJECT

These will all be discussed in more detail in the following sections, concluding with a general discussion of the results and a return to the research questions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metaphor</th>
<th>Number of tokens in conservative texts</th>
<th>Number of tokens in liberal texts</th>
<th>Proportion of conservative metaphorical expressions</th>
<th>Proportion of liberal metaphorical expressions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nature is God's dominion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.3 %</td>
<td>3.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is an adversary</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16.7 %</td>
<td>18.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a wild animal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>9.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a resource</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a property</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a home</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.5 %</td>
<td>9.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a victim to injury</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.3 %</td>
<td>16.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a living organism</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.2 %</td>
<td>6.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a mother</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.2 %</td>
<td>5.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a work of art</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2 %</td>
<td>1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a whole</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>2.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a body</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.3 %</td>
<td>3.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a victim of assault</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.3 %</td>
<td>9.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a factory</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.2 %</td>
<td>5.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a physical object</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5 %</td>
<td>4.1 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: overview of results
4.2 Difficulties encountered during data gathering

Before going into a more detailed discussion of the results I would like to briefly point to some of the difficulties in gathering the data, specifically with regard to determining whether something was counted as metaphorical and assigning source and target domains.

Firstly while the MIP generally offers an adequate framework there is still a considerable amount of intuition involved in determining whether a given bit of text is metaphorical or not. The main difficulty lies in determining which meaning of a word counts as a “more basic meaning” (Pragglejaz Group 2007:4) and whether other meanings are metaphorical or rather an instance of polysemy. This difficulty is acknowledged by the Pragglejaz group who developed the procedure. They write that there were significant differences found between the researchers who all worked on the same texts, with the highest scoring judge finding half as many metaphorical expressions more than the lowest scoring judge in the text used as example in the article (Pragglejaz Group 2007). It was found however that after a group discussion these extremes tended to lessen. Given that writing a Master’s thesis is a solitary undertaking having multiple people look at the data was not possible for this paper. I have therefore opted to only select the most obvious cases of metaphors and leave the more doubtful cases aside.

A second problem that arose was assigning a source and target domain. The conceptual metaphors proposed by Lakoff are all metaphors with the same target domain, namely NATURE. However when looking at a specific instantiation it can be difficult to determine whether something belongs to the conceptual domain of nature, or whether it should be classified under a different conceptual domain. For example in one of the articles the following linguistic metaphor was found: “that epic muddy python of a river”. “Python” here is quite clearly used metaphorically, as there is a more basic meaning of python (a species of snake) that contrasts with its meaning in context (a long and meandering river) but can be understood by transferring some of the characteristics of snakes onto rivers (snakes are typically long and move in a serpentine way). Rivers can be said to be a part of nature but in this case it is an open
question whether the mapping NATURE IS A WILD ANIMAL OR NATURE IS A LIVING ORGANISM is applicable here or whether a much more local mapping is appropriate such as LONG AND WINDING OBJECTS ARE SNAKES (one could easily imagine other realizations having to do with hoses or pieces of rope for this mapping). If the latter mapping is closer to the mark then this linguistic metaphor does not really tell us anything about how nature is conceptualized and should not be considered in the corpus. I have opted here to include it in the list of metaphors but it illustrates some of the difficulties in analyzing specific cases of linguistic metaphors.

Similar problems were encountered when trying to assign a source domain. In the texts numerous examples were found along the lines of “fixing the environment”. Here the target domain can be reasonably said to be NATURE, but the source domain is less clear. The use of fixing could be seen as a realization of the NATURE IS A HOME metaphor because when something is broken in the house you fix it. This is also implied in Lakoff’s comment on this metaphor “[a home] to be maintained and kept clean” (Lakoff 1996:215). Maintaining a house includes fixing things that are broken. However there are also a number of other source domains that this linguistic metaphor can be attributed to, such as NATURE IS A PHYSICAL OBJECT. Again this highlights that designating metaphor mappings is not straightforward and always includes a degree of personal intuition by the one making the decisions.

4.3 Nature is God’s dominion metaphor

There were five realizations found of the NATURE IS GOD’S DOMINION metaphor in the corpus. Two of those were found in conservative sources, three in liberal sources. All of these contain the words “stewardship” or being a “steward” of nature:

“…include an attentive stewardship of the environment”
“…be better stewards of the environment…”

It could be argued that “stewardship” does not necessarily have a religious connotation and that these metaphorical expressions can also be classified under another conceptual metaphor such as the NATURE IS A PROPERTY metaphor. However
Lakoff explicitly mentions stewardship when he proposes the mapping: “NATURE IS GOD’S DOMINION (given to man to steward wisely)” (Lakoff 1996:213) which is why I have classified these expressions under this mapping. He writes that this metaphor is typical for the conservative worldview. As briefly mentioned in section 2.5.1 the NATURE IS GOD’S DOMINION metaphor is related to the metaphor of Moral Order which Lakoff considers to be one of the central metaphors in the strict father model. This moral order is based on a folk theory of the natural order of dominance that occurs in the world. This involves the following dominance relations:

- God is naturally more powerful than people.
- People are naturally more powerful than animals and plants and natural objects.
- Adults are naturally more powerful than children.
- Men are naturally more powerful than women.

(Lakoff 1996:81)

The moral order metaphor turns this folk theory of natural hierarchy into a hierarchy pertaining to moral authority, or stated more concisely: The Moral Order Is The Natural Order. This leads to the following hierarchy:

- God has moral authority over people.
- People have moral authority over nature (animals, plants and natural objects).
- Adults have moral authority over children.
- Men have moral authority over women.

(Lakoff 1996:81)

Lakoff points out that this metaphor is widespread and in the case of the environment legitimizes certain views and delegitimizes others. More specifically it supports the idea of nature as a resource for human use and the idea of humans as stewards of nature.

Of the five realizations three were found in liberal magazines and two in conservative magazines. Taken at face value this would seem to imply that this metaphor is equally important for both ideologies or perhaps even slightly more important for the liberal worldview. However taking into account the distribution of the metaphors those two realizations represent 8.3 % of the metaphors found in conservative magazines and the three found in liberal magazines represent only 3.1 % of all liberal metaphors. This seems to confirm Lakoff’s prediction that this mapping
is more prevalent in conservative discourse. However given the disparity between total number of metaphors found in conservative sources and the total number of metaphors found in liberal sources it is difficult to meaningfully compare the relative importance of the metaphor for both ideologies.

It is interesting to note that all the linguistic metaphors here essentially are the same realization of the mapping, namely containing the word steward or stewardship. It could be argued on this basis that there is not a true conceptual metaphor at play here, since a conceptual metaphor implies a mapping of a conceptual domain and not just of one element. Lakoff and Johnson write that “there are idiosyncratic metaphorical expressions that stand alone and are not used systematically in our language or thought. These are well-known expressions like the foot of the mountain, a head of cabbage, the leg of a table, etc. These expressions are isolated instances of metaphorical concepts, where there is only one instance of a used part (or maybe two or three).” (Lakoff & Johnson 1980:54). According to them these metaphors do not interact with other metaphors and don’t play a particularly interesting role in our conceptual system, and “hence are not metaphors that we live by” (Lakoff & Johnson 1980:55).

In other words, the kind of conceptual metaphors conceptual metaphor theory is mostly concerned with are metaphors that have multiple correspondences between source and target domain. Rather than this being the case, talking about human’s responsibility to nature in terms of stewardship seems to reflect a cultural influence of Christianity on political discourse. In the American political context this is unsurprising. A 2015 study by the Pew research center found that 70 % of Americans identify as Christian (Pew Research Center 2015) which could go some way to explaining the prevalence of Christian terminology in political discourse.

### 4.4 Nature is an adversary metaphor

There were 22 realizations found of the NATURE IS AN ADVERSARY metaphor, making it the most commonly found mapping in the texts. Four of those were found in
conservative magazines, the remaining 18 were found in liberal magazines. They represent respectively 16.7% of conservative and 18.8% of liberal metaphors.

Lakoff explains how the metaphor fits into the conservative model. He writes that this metaphor implies an alienation between nature and humans and that alienation can only be overcome by a conquest of nature. Unconquered nature presents a danger to humans who must dominate it in order to survive. This way the domination of nature becomes a form of self-defense, which is a moral enterprise in the conservative system (Lakoff 1996:215).

Despite Lakoff’s suggestion that this metaphor is more central to the conservative strict father model, here it seem to occur more in the liberal data both in relative and in absolute numbers. For both liberals and conservatives this was the most frequently found metaphor. However there is a slight difference in the way it occurs in the two types of sources. The conservative tokens all cast nature as an adversary of humanity using metaphorical expressions as:

“[the park has] a reputation for being \textit{hostile} to human habitation”

“Resolving the \textit{clash} of civilization with nature”

The expressions found in liberal magazines tended to talk about parts of nature as an adversary of other parts of nature. In other words the metaphorical expressions are used to talk about the detrimental effects of particular parts of nature:

“…better resist \textit{invading} bugs.”

“…with the \textit{army} of beetles as a helper”

However besides these the liberal texts also contained some metaphorical expressions casting nature as an adversary of humans similar to the conservative ones. These particularly occurred when talking about threatening natural phenomena such as hurricanes or flooding rivers:

“…appreciate the \textit{violence} such storms can wreak”
“Cyclones and hurricanes will *pummel* the shorelines.”
“…amid a *combat zone* of stripped forests and eroding hillsides”
“Our *beleaguered* planet”

Taking in account Lakoff’s proposed framework it can be argued that the adversary metaphor takes on a slightly different function in the liberal nurturant parent model than in the conservative model. In the conservative model competition is seen as something positive because it determines who is the most self-reliant. War can be seen as a violent competition of sorts, both involves winners and losers. This makes war not inherently morally reprehensible. For liberals on the other hand war can never be moral as it is violent and destructive and opposite to the nurturing values which are central in the model. Some of the metaphorical expressions that paint nature as an enemy used in liberal sources thus have an undertone that suggests that nature might be an enemy but that humans are fighting an unjust war, illustrated by the last two examples.

4.5 Nature is a wild animal metaphor

The *nature is a wild animal* metaphor had nine realizations. Interestingly enough while Lakoff classifies this as a conservative metaphor all nine metaphorical expressions were found in liberal sources. They represent 9.4 % of all liberal metaphorical expressions found.

Lakoff’s description of this metaphor (“Nature is a wild animal (to be tamed for our use)”) (Lakoff 1996:213) focuses on the danger that nature can pose and on the possibility of taming nature. The metaphorical expressions found in the articles however refer more to the ‘wild animal’ side of nature with words like “roaring”, “devouring” and not so much the notion of taming.

“Can a "Green Great Wall" stop sand from *devouring* the countryside?”
“…the ocean will *roar* past the marina and the town hall”
“…more beetles in the coming century, *preying* on bigger chunks of the country”
Because of the two occurrences of “devouring”, a term that can be said to be part of the conceptual domain of wild animals, I have also included linguistic metaphors that made use of the word “swallowing” under the NATURE IS A WILD ANIMAL metaphor, such as:

“The gulf of Mexico has swallowed 2,300 square miles of the state’s wetlands.”

Lakoff attributes this metaphor to the conservative model claiming that the metaphor casts nature as dangerous and alien to humans. However if humans can manage to “tame” nature it could be of possible economic use, which makes it a moral enterprise in the strict father model (Lakoff 1996:215). Here however the realizations of this metaphor were all found in liberal sources. As mentioned before it is possible to use some of the metaphors used in the strict father model in the nurturant parent model and vice versa but they are of subservient status and their meaning is changed by that status (Lakoff 1996).

While the use of this metaphor still suggests a separateness between humans and animals (and nature in general), the lack of any metaphorical expressions suggesting the “taming” of nature points to the fact that this metaphor takes on a different meaning in the liberal model. Without the notion of the taming the metaphor loses part of its economic logic. Still its use is curious because an overarching idea behind the conceptual metaphors described by Lakoff for the liberal model is the idea that human beings and nature are interdependent and intertwined, while the use of the NATURE IS A WILD ANIMAL metaphor focuses on the separateness of humans and nature.

4.6 Nature is a home metaphor

There were twelve realizations found of the NATURE IS A HOME metaphor. Three of those were found in conservative sources (representing 12.5 % of conservative metaphorical expressions) and nine were found in liberal sources (representing 9.4 % of all liberal metaphorical expressions).
As mentioned previously Lakoff comments that the metaphor implies that “nature is a home (to be maintained and kept clean)” (Lakoff 1996:215). There were a number of metaphorical expressions to do with cleaning:

“…help clean the notoriously smoggy air”
“…standards for autos in cleaning the air”

Other than the notion of cleaning there were quite a number of different realizations of this metaphor. Some have to do with maintaining the house, others reference more directly the idea of nature as a house with sinks inside and a door that can be locked.

“…fix the environment”
“…the only way to fix the Gulf of Mexico dead zone”
“…from the discomfort of cohabitating with insects”
"The biosphere has surpassed limits of both what can be safely extracted but also dumped into our various 'sinks”
“it'd be great if we could lock up the whole river”

Lakoff writes that this metaphor focuses on the earth as the place where we all live and as a place of nurturance and security. It also stresses the fact that homes have an inherent value that is not just the market value and that we are attached to a home (Lakoff 1996:216). While he classifies this metaphor as being part of the liberal system, it appears in both liberal and conservative sources. In absolute numbers it occurs more in liberal sources but percentage wise its occurrence rate is higher in conservative texts. As mentioned in other cases sometimes a 'liberal' metaphor can be used in the conservative model and the other way round but this usually alters the meaning of the metaphor so it fits into the ideological system of either nutritant parent or strict father morality. In this case however both liberal and conservative sources seem to use the nature is a home metaphor in a very similar manner. This suggests that perhaps the metaphor might just be a salient way of thinking about nature and not tied to a particular ideological worldview.
4.7 Nature is a victim to injury metaphor

There were 18 realizations found of the NATURE IS A VICTIM TO INJURY metaphor. That makes it the second most commonly found mapping. Two of those realizations were found in conservative sources, the remaining 16 were found in liberal sources. They represent respectively 8.3 % of conservative metaphorical expressions and 16.7 % of liberal metaphorical expressions.

Lakoff argued that this metaphor was typical for the liberal nurturant parent worldview and that seems to be confirmed here both in relative and absolute numbers. Part of the expressions found focus on the injury done to nature with expressions such as:

“…reverse osmosis process will harm marine life”
“…when nutrients flowed in abundance from the heart of Europe into the Black Sea and, for a time, maimed it.”
“…the landscape-scarring reality of American marijuana farming”

Others focus more on the healing aspect which is alluded to in Lakoff’s discussion of this metaphor “Nature is a victim of injury (who has been harmed and needs to be healed)” (Lakoff 1996:215). This can be seen in linguistic metaphors such as the following:

“…the recovery of the wolf”
“…prescribed burns in which fires are intentionally set and controlled to manage vegetation.”
“It’s like chemotherapy for the wild”.

One thing that surfaced during the analysis of the metaphorical expressions was the occurrence of a mapping related to NATURE IS A VICTIM TO INJURY, but that nonetheless seems distinct, namely the metaphor NATURE IS A VICTIM OF ASSAULT. Whereas Lakoff’s proposed metaphor involves some sort of bodily harm and the necessity of healing, NATURE IS A VICTIM OF ASSAULT involves an attacker and the need
to defend nature. This attack can result in bodily harm, which it why it is arguably related to the NATURE IS A VICTIM TO INJURY mapping, however it seems to emphasize the violent nature more than the aforementioned conceptual metaphor. The NATURE IS A VICTIM OF ASSAULT metaphor will be discussed in more detail in a later paragraph.

4.8 Nature is a living organism metaphor

There were six realizations found of the NATURE IS A LIVING ORGANISM metaphor. One of those was found in a conservative source, the remaining five were found in liberal sources. They represent 4.2 % of conservative metaphorical expressions and 6.3 % of liberal metaphorical expressions.

One issue in attributing this mapping to certain metaphorical expressions is that it is seemingly very broad. Lakoff specifies how the mapping should be interpreted: “the living organism metaphor (as in the Gaia hypothesis) focuses on interdependence and the fact that ecosystems have needs that must be met if they are to survive” (Lakoff 1996:216) but there are still a lot of cases in which it is unclear whether this mapping applies. The clearer cases are metaphorical expressions such as:

“…the ocean’s last hope for survival”
“…the survival of the planet trumps all other concerns”
“How to make a living on a living planet”

However other expressions such as “sensitive ecosystem” or “plant food” are more difficult. I have included these under the mapping under the argument that something needs to be alive in order to be sensitive and eating food is a need that must be met to survive.

This metaphor is placed in the liberal nurturant parent morality model by Lakoff. There were more realizations found in liberal sources in absolute numbers. Percentage wise they have a somewhat similar occurrence rate with still a higher rate in liberal sources. Lakoff’s claim thus seems to be confirmed here.
4.9 Nature is a mother metaphor

There were six realizations found of the NATURE IS A MOTHER metaphor, one in a conservative source, the other five in liberal sources. They represent 4.2 % of conservative metaphorical expressions and 5.2 % of liberal metaphorical expressions.

Lakoff writes about this metaphor that it focuses on nature as a nurturer and a provider. “The normal relationship of a child to a nurturant mother is one of attachment and love, something of a continuing inherent value that cannot be bought and sold- a relationship that gives meaning to one’s life. One’s moral attitude to a nurturant mother is one of gratitude, responsibility and respect. You have a responsibility to provide for her needs to the best of your ability. You accord her dignity. You show you gratitude in your deeds. The relationship is one of mutuality, of interdependence. And it is not a weak or temporary relationship, it is a continuing commitment.” (Lakoff 1996:216).

One of the metaphorical expressions is an almost explicit realization of this metaphor, namely:
“(…) human contribution to Mother Nature’s moods”.

The phrase “mother nature” has of course become practically an idiom but it is precisely in these seemingly conventional ways of speaking that metaphors operate. Other examples of this mapping were harder to assign. There were two instances of the term “carrying capacity”:

“…the earth’s carrying capacity”
“The carrying capacity for any species”

Because of the implication of sustaining and because mothers ‘carry’ their children I have included it under this mapping. Other realizations that were more difficult to assign were more tied to the domestic and kitchen sphere such as:

“That's how the thick, green soup that feeds the Gulf's food web gets made.”
“The Gulf of Maine, the great food processor of the western Atlantic”
Because of the traditional view of a mother as the one preparing food and because the nurturant parent model’s main focus is nurturance, which includes feeding children I have opted to see these realizations as instantiations of the the NATURE IS A MOTHER metaphor.

Lakoff proposes this metaphor as typical for the liberal model. In absolute numbers it occurs more in liberal sources and percentage wise it was also found slightly more in liberal texts, which seems to confirm that this metaphor is more typical for in liberal discourse.

4.10 Other metaphors

There were some metaphorical expressions that could be classified under a conceptual metaphor proposed by Lakoff but that had a very limited number of realizations. For example the NATURE IS A RESOURCE metaphor had one realization (“rainwater harvesting”), as did NATURE IS A PROPERTY (“land grab”). The NATURE IS A WORK OF ART metaphor had two realizations:

“…the hillsides directly across from me are emblazoned with vast swaths of trees”
“…gentle hills quilted with the ancient pattern of cows and sheep”

The NATURE IS A WHOLE metaphor also had two realizations:

“keeping these places intact”
“…fragmenting a fragile habitat”

Furthermore there were a number of the metaphorical expressions that could not be categorized under any of the mappings proposed by Lakoff. The following occurred only once:

Nature is a friend:
“environmentally friendly”

Nature is a treasure chest:
“…techniques used to *unlock* natural gas deposits”

The earth is a spaceship:
“*spaceship* earth is not for humans alone”

Nature is a monster:
“the man- made *monster* of a river”.

Nature is a friend is seemingly frequent metaphor. “Environmentally friendly” and other similar expressions with “friendly” are relatively common (“environmentally friendly” has 757 occurrences in Brigham Young University’s corpus of contemporary American English (COCA)). However as mentioned before in the discussion of the *nature is god’s dominion* metaphor it is debatable whether this one type of realization is sufficient basis to speak of a true conceptual metaphor. To call something a conceptual metaphor multiple correspondences between source and target domain are required. This does not seem to be the case here, rather it seems to be an case of an “isolated instance of metaphorical concepts, where there is only one instance of a used part.”(Lakoff & Johnson 1980:54).

The others are novel metaphors such as “*spaceship* earth”. These linguistic metaphors appear to be ‘one-offs’ that are again not realizations of a larger conceptual metaphor at work, because that would imply multiple source domain elements being mapped onto the target domain. Another example of one of this can be found in the following excerpt:

“…a storm *coiled* in the west”.

Here a storm is thought of in terms of a piece of rope, however this is a not a common conceptual metaphor. There are no other correspondences between the conceptual domain of weather event and the conceptual domain of ropes. We don’t routinely think of storms as ropes in the way we routinely think of life as a journey. Additionally we do not use our knowledge of the conceptual domain of ropes to make inferences about the conceptual domain of storms.
Lastly there were some linguistic metaphors that can be classified under other conceptual metaphors than the ones proposed. These will be discussed in the following sections.

4.11 Nature is a victim of assault metaphor

As mentioned previously in the discussion of the NATURE IS VICTIM TO INJURY metaphor there are 11 linguistic metaphors that can be classified under the NATURE IS A VICTIM OF ASSAULT metaphor. Two of those are from conservative sources, the remaining nine are from liberal sources. They represent respectively 8.3 % of conservative and 9.4 % of liberal metaphorical expressions.

Many of the realizations have to do with some form of violence being done to nature, such as:
“assaulting the environment”
“despoiling the environment”
“choke off salmon streams”.

Sometimes the linguistic metaphors veer towards sexual violence with expressions such as the following:
“…denude the landscape”
“…the right thing vis-à-vis nature is to be in harmony with it, to avoid violating it”

Another part of the linguistic metaphors that were found have to do with protecting nature from an attack or assault, which can be seen in expressions such as:
“…a defender of the environment”
“…ice sheets guard the northern arctic”.

As discussed earlier this metaphor can said to be related to the NATURE IS VICTIM TO INJURY metaphor. However whereas the injury metaphor focuses on the harm already done to nature and the necessity of healing this metaphor focuses more on the action of attacking nature and the protection it needs from these attacks. The idea
of violence and particularly sexual violence being done to nature has been discussed before, particularly in the ecofeminist movement. Collard and Contrucci’s book The Rape of The Wild (Collard & Contrucci 1989), of which the title already points to this theme is an example of this. This suggests that the NATURE IS A VICTIM OF ASSAULT metaphor is an existing mapping that has been used to conceptualize humans’ relationship to nature.

Conceptually this metaphor seems to fit into the liberal nurturant parent model. Someone who has been assaulted must be helped, nursed back to helped and protected against future attacks. The conservative model is focused on self-reliance so while someone innocent and helpless who is assaulted should be helped, they should also prepare themselves to be able to fight off the attack themselves later on. The metaphor also occurs more in liberal texts both in absolute numbers and percentage wise which seems to confirm that this metaphor fits into the nurturant parent model.

4.12 Nature is a body metaphor

There were five metaphorical expressions that can be classified under the NATURE IS A BODY metaphor. Two of these were found in conservative sources and three in liberal sources. They represent 8.3 % of conservative metaphorical expressions and 3.1 % of liberal metaphorical expressions.

This conceptual metaphor is also identified by Goatly but in slightly different terms: LANDSCAPE IS A BODY (Goatly 2007). He mentions multiple elements that were also found in this corpus such as fringe for the edge of an area, spine for a central row of mountains. Some of these same examples were found in the articles:

“the Yukon down the spine of the Rocky Mountains”
“it forms a lush fringe along the North Atlantic coast”

This conceptual metaphor can be said to be related to the NATURE IS A VICTIM TO INJURY metaphor and the NATURE IS A VICTIM OF ASSAULT metaphor. An injury consists
of bodily harm so implicit in this metaphor is the conceptualization of nature as having a body.

Goatly writes that this metaphor allows environmental destruction to be seen in terms of morality (2007:123). It is considered immoral to inflict pain and destruction on the bodies of others so by conceptualizing nature as a body, environmental destruction becomes immoral as well. This idea and the relation to NATURE IS A VICTIM TO INJURY and the NATURE IS A VICTIM OF ASSAULT metaphor indicate that this metaphor can be situated within the liberal nurturant parent model. While the metaphorical expressions in question occur slightly more in liberal sources, they make up a much smaller percentage of all liberal metaphors than is the case for the conservative metaphorical expressions. This would seem to belie the notion of this metaphor belonging to the liberal model. Therefore the metaphor is perhaps just a general way of conceptualizing nature that relies on an anthropocentric view.

4.13 Nature is a factory metaphor

There were six metaphorical expressions that can be placed under the NATURE IS A FACTORY metaphor. Five of those were found in liberal sources, and one in a conservative source. They represent 5.2% of liberal metaphorical expressions and 4.2% of conservative metaphorical expressions. The metaphorical expressions have to do with the notion of producing and building such as:

“the most productive estuary in the continental United States”
“oil and natural gas production”
“The wild, pre-20th-century Mississippi, with its constantly shifting watercourse and wide floodplain, built much of Louisiana”

This metaphor can be seen in conjunction with the NATURE IS A RESOURCE metaphor. This implies that it is part of the conservative strict father worldview. In this model nature is seen as something that can be exploited by humans if they see so fit. Additionally an economic logic is introduced into humans’ relationship to nature. Both these things seem to apply to the NATURE IS A FACTORY metaphor. However in absolute
numbers the metaphor occurs more in liberal texts. When looking at the percentages it also occurs slightly more frequently in liberal sources. Goatly also comments on the process of regarding nature as a commodity (Goatly 2007:99), noting that this metaphor also appears in ecological discourses. According to Goatly this metaphor is widespread because it is a very anthropocentric one, nature is regarded as something that be of use to humans. While this might seem to fit more into the conservative worldview, this metaphor can also be used as a way to advocate for protecting nature: it can be of use to us, so we better protect it. This fits into the focus on interdependence between human beings and nature that governs the nurturant parent model. These considerations can go some way in explaining why it occurred in both liberal and conservative discourse.

4.14 Nature is a physical object metaphor

Lastly there were a number of metaphorical expressions that can be classified under the NATURE IS A PHYSICAL OBJECT metaphor. There were seven realizations found for this metaphor. Four of those were found in liberal sources, three in conservative sources. They represent 4.1 % of liberal metaphorical expressions and 12.5 % of conservative metaphorical expressions.

Most of the metaphorical expressions have to do with the notion of damaging and with the idea of nature as a fragile object:

“…produces serious environmental damage.”
“Should the Lower Platte suffer further damage from the meatpacking industry”
“…the existence of the fragile coast”

The distribution of this metaphor suggests that it is more part of the conservative strict father model. However it is difficult to tie the metaphor into the moral system of strict father morality. It appears more likely that this metaphor is not strictly part of either ideological system. This metaphor follows the tendency of mapping a more concrete source domain onto a more abstract target domain. While the environment itself is obviously made up of physical parts, the concept of nature as a whole is rather
abstract. Conceptualizing nature as a physical object which, if not handled with care, can be damaged helps us to think about how to approach our relationship to nature.

4.15 General discussion

Looking at the data from a broader perspective one thing that catches the eye is the fact that the bulk of the metaphorical expressions were found in liberal sources. 96 of the 120 metaphors, or about 80 % of all total metaphorical expressions were found in liberal magazines versus 24, or 20% percent in conservative magazines. Speaking on a general level this is somewhat surprising as Lakoff observes in *Moral Politics* that conservatives tend to be better at understanding the myths and metaphors behind their politics and using those in their favor (Lakoff 1996:19). One might thus expect conservative texts to contain more linguistic metaphors than liberal texts. On a more local level however this discrepancy might be explained by the specific subject matter. Environmental protection is a much more central concern in the liberal nurturant parent model than in the conservative strict father model. An important part of nurturance is protection, especially of those who cannot protect themselves. It follows then that the protection of nature would be a more central theme in the liberal model. This was reflected in the content of the magazine articles. While conservative magazines did write about the environment, a substantial amount of the articles were criticisms of the liberal way of dealing with environmental protection. These pieces typically did not employ a large amount of metaphorical expressions. This focus makes sense within the logic of the strict father model. Environmental regulations are seen as immoral interference with businesses pursuing their self-interest, often with the use of their own private property. All of this was in contrast with the liberal magazines in which it was relatively easy to find stories pertaining to environmental protection that contained a number of linguistic metaphors that suggest a certain way of thinking about nature.

To conclude this discussion I turn to the research question of this thesis, which consisted of three parts: Firstly I wanted to find out whether linguistic metaphors can be found that realize the mappings proposed by Lakoff in ideologically colored texts. Secondly I wanted to examine whether conservatives rely on their particular set of metaphors and liberals on theirs. Thirdly I tried to distinguish whether there are other metaphors that are used to talk about the environment.
For the first question the answer seems to tentatively affirmative. In terms of actual realizations eleven out of the thirteen metaphors proposed by Lakoff are realized. Only NATURE IS A DIVINE BEING and NATURE IS A MECHANICAL SYSTEM have no realizations. However some of those have a very limited number of realizations, namely NATURE IS A WHOLE, NATURE IS A RESOURCE, NATURE IS A PROPERTY and NATURE IS A WORK OF ART. The NATURE IS GOD’S DOMINION metaphor only had realizations in the form of the same word and can thus also not really said to be realized as a conceptual metaphor. Leaving those aside six of the thirteen metaphors proposed are realized in the texts. One possible reason for this is the limited nature of the corpus in question. It is entirely possible that if a larger number of texts is taken into consideration realization of all the metaphors would be found. Nevertheless it is notable that there are some conceptual metaphors that are more present than others, namely NATURE IS AN ADVERSARY (22 realizations) NATURE IS A VICTIM TO INJURY (18 realizations), NATURE IS A HOME (12 realizations), NATURE IS A WILD ANIMAL (9 realizations), NATURE IS A LIVING ORGANISM (6 realizations) and NATURE IS A MOTHER (6 realizations). It suggest that some of the metaphors are more important or more pertinent to users than others. That being said overall Lakoff’s claim that the conceptual metaphors he lists up are used to think about the environment seems largely confirmed.

For the second part of the question this answer is mixed. The conservative metaphors that have multiple realizations are:
NATURE IS AN ADVERSARY
NATURE IS A WILD ANIMAL

These two metaphors are not markedly used more by conservatives. When the distributions are compared the NATURE IS AN ADVERSARY metaphor was used in almost equal measure by liberal and conservative magazines, slightly more so in liberal magazines. In absolute numbers it was the most frequently used metaphor in both liberal and conservative texts. For the NATURE IS A WILD ANIMAL metaphor on the other hand the realizations were only found in liberal sources.

The liberal metaphors that had multiple realizations were:
The first metaphor is markedly more present in liberal sources, 16.7% of the liberal metaphorical expressions were a realization of this mapping versus 8.3% of conservative metaphorical expressions. The second one however is slightly more prevalent in conservative discourse (12.5% vs 9.4%). The remaining two had a slightly higher percentage of realizations in liberal sources (6.3% vs 4.2% and 5.2% vs 4.2%) but the percentages are less clear cut. Of the four liberal metaphors there is only one that is notably more prevalent in liberal discourse than in conservative discourse. Two others point tentatively in this direction.

To summarize this means that there is only one case in which there is a notable difference in metaphors used and its use was as expected based on Lakoff’s theoretical considerations. There is one metaphor that liberals seem to rely on more than conservatives: the NATURE IS A VICTIM TO INJURY metaphor. The remaining metaphors were used either indiscriminately or sometimes even used more by the other side.

There are things to note about this that have been mentioned previously. One is the difficulty in comparing liberal and conservative sources because of the vastly diverging amount of metaphorical expressions found in both. For example for the NATURE IS AN ADVERSARY metaphor there were four realizations in conservative sources and eighteen in liberal sources, but those numbers make up a comparable portion of the total metaphors found for each ideology. Because there are relatively few conservative metaphorical expressions one more or one less realization of a metaphor has a more profound effect on the distribution and consequently on the conclusions that are drawn. The only real way of mitigating this would be to gather more data from conservative sources. For the purposes of this thesis I have chosen to take an equal sample of liberal and conservative texts because the discrepancy in number of metaphors can in and of itself be taken as noteworthy.
Secondly it is important to note again that Lakoff does not claim that these metaphors are exclusively tied to either one of the two models. Some of the metaphors used in the conservative view of nature also fit into the nurturant parent morality and the other way round, but they have a different status in those models. This can be seen for the \textit{Nature is an adversary} metaphor where conservative sources frame nature as an adversary to humans whereas part of the liberal metaphorical expressions frame parts of nature as being adversarial to other parts of nature. In general however it appears that Lakoff’s neat theoretical distinctions do not transfer easily to authentic language use and that either side does not seem to rely markedly more on ‘their’ set of metaphors.

Finally for the third part of the question, there were some other metaphors found that both sides used to talk about the environment that were not in Lakoff’s list. These were:

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{Nature is a body}
\item \textit{Nature is a physical object}
\item \textit{Nature is a factory}
\item \textit{Nature is a victim of assault}
\end{itemize}

The first two metaphors seem to be more prevalent in conservative discourse, with \textit{Nature is a body} metaphor representing 8.3 \% of conservative metaphorical expressions versus only 3.1 \% of liberal metaphorical expressions and the \textit{Nature is a physical object} metaphor representing 12.5 \% of conservative linguistic metaphors and 4.1 \% of liberal linguistic metaphors. The latter two conceptual metaphors have a more or less equal distribution with 4.2\% versus 5.2 \% and 8.3 \% versus 9.4 \%. Most of these other metaphors are in some way related to the metaphors proposed by Lakoff. The \textit{Nature is a body} metaphor and \textit{Nature is a victim of assault} metaphor can both be tied to the \textit{Nature is a victim of injury} metaphor. The \textit{Nature is a factory} metaphor on the other hand can be tied to the \textit{Nature is a resource} metaphor. The only one that does not seem to fit into either of those metaphor systems is the \textit{Nature is a physical object} metaphor, despite its predominant occurrence in conservative texts.
5. Metaphor and ideology

In this final chapter the link between metaphor and ideology is examined. First a general overview of theoretical considerations about the potential influence of metaphor on thought is given, before turning to the use of metaphor in politics. The aim of this chapter is to function as sort of justification for the present metaphor research. It is an attempt at showing that metaphor research, while valuable in and of itself, also has larger implications in political discourse and potentially in political action.

5.1 Metaphor and thought

A conceptual metaphor means that a particular conceptual domain is understood in terms of another conceptual domain. The central claim of conceptual metaphor theory lies then in the idea that metaphors are not just a matter of language but that they are a matter of thought. While they are realized in linguistic expressions, they are not just a way of talking about concepts but have implications on how we structure our thinking about these concepts. This means that we not only talk, for example, about arguing in terms of war but we tend to think of it in terms of war. While this might seem a very natural way of conceptualizing the idea of arguing it is important to note that conceptual metaphors are not a transparent and neutral vehicle for understanding things. In *Metaphors We Live* By Lakoff and Johnson already point to the potential of metaphors to obscure certain facets of concepts:

*The very systematicity that allows us to comprehend one aspect of a concept in terms of another (e.g. comprehending an aspect of arguing in terms of battle) will necessarily hide other aspects of the concept. In allowing us to focus on one aspect of a concept (e.g. the battling aspects of arguing), a metaphorical concept can keep us from focusing on other aspects of the concept that are inconsistent with that metaphor.*

(Lakoff & Johnson 1980:10)

In the case of arguing they point to the fact that the metaphor highlights the adversarial aspects of arguing while obscuring the more cooperative aspects such as the time invested into the discussion by each party in trying to come to a mutual understanding.
This means that the structure of the source domain potentially has implications on how we understand the target domain. But it is not only the structure of the source domain that is relevant, Andreas Musolff argues: “The analogical relationship of source and target concepts involves not only the transfer of semantic structures but also of emotive and evaluative aspects as integral parts of seemingly self-evident conclusions” (Musolff 2004:173). This implies that other than the structure there are also other more elusive aspects that are involved such as the emotional connotations of the source domain. Andrew Goatly stresses the importance of the emotional impact metaphors and argues that this capacity for moving people is why they are often use in literature (Goatly 2011:165).

The fact that conceptual metaphors hide and highlight particular aspects is not necessarily problematic, but it is important to be mindful of the way they can frame our conceptualization, particularly because metaphors are pervasive in our language use and are often seen as a commonplace way of talking about things. This last part is exactly what makes conceptual metaphors potentially dangerous, they seem to impose a certain way of thinking about concepts and make it more difficult to see aspects that do not fit into this system and they do all this while seeming just ‘common sense’:

*The languages we speak hand down to us ready-made categories which we regard as commonsense. They thereby unconsciously carry with them an ontology or ideology of which we may not be aware. We may think, naively, that the information conveyed by language is about the real world. But in fact “we have access only to the projected world – the world as unconsciously organized by the mind: and we can talk about things only insofar as they have achieved mental representation through these processes of organization” (Jackendoff 1983: 29 quoted in Goatly 2007:25)*

The influence of metaphor might thus be particularly strong when we are unaware of the metaphorical nature of some ways of thinking and instead regard them as the natural way of understanding things. Goatly distinguishes between conventional metaphors and original metaphors and assesses their effect as metaphor and their effect as ideology. The interpretation of original metaphors is described as “complex:
grounds and target need working out" whereas the interpretation of conventional metaphors is more simple, “target is reached through disambiguation, grounds are ignored”. This is contrasted with literal language where interpretation is relatively straightforward. The effect of conventional metaphors is stronger according to Goatly because they are unexpected and suggests a new meaning while the effect of conventional metaphors is minimal because they are already accepted ways of conceptualizing reality. However the effect on ideology of original metaphors is minimal he explains because they are one-off attempts and therefore fleeting. The effect of conventional metaphors in ideology on the other hand is considerable, precisely because they are conventional and accepted ways of speaking. However the effect of literal language is greater still according to him. (Goatly 2007:29)

In the same vein various distinctions have been made between metaphors based on their conventionality. Drawing one the work of Lakoff and Goatly Deignan adds two categories of metaphors. She distinguishes between innovative metaphors, conventionalized metaphors, dead metaphors and historical metaphors (Deignan 2005). However in the end arguably all metaphors still possess some sort of cognitive force “no matter how dead, or conventionalized, metaphors are metaphors none the less” (Kittay 1990).

5.2 Metaphor and politics

These general points about the ways in which metaphors can influence our thinking particularly have implications when they are considered in the light of political discourse. Metaphors are prevalent in political discourse notes Jonathan Charteris-Black, precisely because they can be used to propose a certain way of viewing things: “Metaphor is a figure of speech that is typically used in persuasion; this is because it represents a novel way of viewing the world that offers some fresh insight. Because metaphor is persuasive it is frequently employed discursively in rhetorical and argumentative language such as political speeches” (Charteris-Black 2004:7).

If conceptual metaphors structure our way of thinking about things they can both be used to influence thinking but also to account for political behavior. In 1991 Lakoff examined the metaphors behind the motivations for American involvement in
the gulf war, concluding that “metaphors can kill” (Lakoff 2009). He lines up all the metaphors that are commonly used both by the broader public and by foreign policy experts to talk about war and examines how these metaphors were specifically used in the context of the gulf war. Summarized briefly the Bush administration relied on various metaphors, for example the NATION IS A PERSON metaphor, that casted Kuwait as an innocent victim and the United States as the hero that would save her from the villain Iraq. He points to various problematic uses of this metaphor and the way they simplify a set of complex situations. Not only do metaphors suggest a certain way of thinking about concepts, highlighting some aspects and obscuring others, they also provide a framework for further inferences. This means for the example of the gulf war that Saddam Hussein was simultaneously portrayed as a madman who had invaded Kuwait on a whim and therefore needed to be stopped but also as a rational actor who would respond in a logical manner to use of force by the United States. This contradiction highlights why it is essential to be aware of the metaphors on which we rely to make inferences. Lakoff also notes that the nation as a person metaphor hides the internal structure of nations and presents them as monolithic blocks with single goals and aims, rather than as complex states with various racial and religious groups that may have diverging interests.

Lakoff’s comments on the metaphors used in the gulf war are an example of a more general idea, namely that metaphors are important in politics and that they can both justify and inform policy decisions, something which is also noted by Chilton:

*Of course investigation of cognitive and linguistic structure [metaphors] would be merely academic, were it not for the strong likelihood that cognitive and linguistic patterns enter into policy decisions (to put it no more deterministically) and thus policy actions.* (Chilton 1996: 58 quoted in Goatly 2007:30).

A point to consider when looking at the use of metaphors in politics is whether they are used consciously or not. A metaphor might be used deliberately to impose a certain way of viewing things but it could also be used without premeditation, simply because it make sense in the speaker’s worldview. Lakoff’s work on the gulf war remains largely agnostic about the intent with which the metaphors were used,
focusing instead on the way they obscure and distort certain aspects and the way this shapes a political approach. Other researchers however have stressed the need to look at the deliberate use of metaphors as a persuasion tactic. Jonathan Charteris-Black for example argues that it is important to focus on the way metaphors are used in a specific context to be able to determine the persuasive and deliberate employment of metaphor as a motive for particular metaphorical choices. Neglecting this assumes that metaphor use is an unconscious reflex rather than a potential tool for persuasion (Charteris-Black 2004:11).

The link between language, ideology and power has become a more central concern in linguistics from the 1970’s onwards. Norman Fairclough introduced the term critical discourse analysis (CDA) to characterize this type of research in his book Language and Power (Fairclough 2001). In Wodak and Meyer’s overview of critical discourse analysis the research agenda is summarized as:

* CDA may be defined as fundamentally concerned with analyzing opaque as well as transparent structural relationships of dominance, power and control as manifested in language. In other words, CDA aims to investigate critically social inequality as it is expressed, signaled, constituted, legitimized and so on by language use (or in discourse). Most critical discourse analysts would claim that ‘language is also a medium of domination and social force. It serves to legitimate relations of organized power. In so far as the legitimations of power relations are not articulated, language is also ideological’. (Habermas 1977:259 quoted in Wodak & Meyer 2009:10).

Jonathan Charteris-Black notes that since metaphors are involved in forming a coherent view of reality, they are crucial to critical discourse analysis. He tries to link the preoccupations of CDA with metaphor research and pragmatics and proposes a new approach dubbed “critical metaphor analysis” (Charteris-Black 2004). Charteris-Black’s main focus is on corpus research which he believes can fill in the missing parts of metaphor contexts, allowing for generalizations about the use and frequent contexts of particular metaphors. It is important to note that Charteris-Black does not claim that *all* metaphor use is potentially reflecting ideological considerations and should be looked at through that specific lens. He acknowledges that metaphors are also used
free of any ideology. He also emphasizes that while metaphors may be used with a
certain intent and propose a certain way of thinking, this attempt does not necessarily
determine the interpretation on the part of the hearer or as he puts it “the intentions of
the encoders do not necessarily overrule the interpretations of the decoders”
(Charteris-Black 2004:30).

The idea of metaphors affecting people’s conceptualizations and reasoning has
been largely rooted in theoretical work. There has been however some experimental
research with regard to the persuasive effect of metaphors. Jeffrey Scott Mio lists
some already existing research before describing two experiments of his own (Mio
1996). In the 1960s Bowers and Osborn found that that overall speeches containing
metaphor were regarded as more persuasive than texts with literal language use.
However they found that not all metaphors were equally successful and that a more
outlandish metaphorical scenario actually distracted from the message. Other
research has reached the same general conclusion for the persuasiveness of
metaphor but with some particularities. Mio writes that one experiment by Johnson
and Taylor found metaphors to be persuasive only for politically sophisticated
individuals where they had expected the opposite: that politically unsophisticated
individuals would be more sensitive to metaphorical manipulation. Other research by
Read, Cesa, Jones and Collins found metaphors to be persuasive and also found them
to be more memorable. Participants were able to recall metaphorical passages more
than literal ones. Other researchers on the other hand have found evidence against
the persuasiveness of metaphors and found indications that instead literal language
use is more persuasive (Mio 1996).

More recently Thibodeau and Boroditsky looked at the effect different
metaphors can have on our reasoning about societal problems. In their experiment
they presented two different texts to participants. In one text crime was described in
terms of a virus, in the other text it was described as a beast. When asked about their
preferred policy outcome Thibodeau and Boroditsky found an effect with regard to the
used metaphor. They found that when presented with a list of possible solutions the
group that had been given the text that contained a metaphor that painted crime as a
beast preferred more direct enforcement of criminals. The group that had been given
the text that talked about crime in terms of a virus preferred solutions that would address problems in the community such as improving education and combatting poverty. They also tested for metaphor retention and found that even the people who did not remember the metaphorical frame were still influenced by the frame. Furthermore when asked what had been influential in their thinking it was found that participants rarely pointed to the metaphors. Both these things are taken as evidence that metaphors work covertly to influence how people conceptualize and reason about problems (Thibodeau & Boroditsky 2013). This study has been criticized by Steen, Reijnierse and Burgers who raise questions about the conclusions that were made. They argue that a number of alternative explanations had not been addressed and present a follow-up study where they remedy some of the conditions they found lacking. This study found no metaphorical framing effect but rather found that simply reading about crime made participants more likely to choose the enforcement options, suggesting that textual exposure is the more important factor regardless of metaphorical language use (Steen, Reijnierse & Burgers 2014). All of this sometimes contradictory research suggests that more experimental research is needed with regard to how and when metaphors have a potential persuasive effect.

For this thesis I looked at the way conservatives and liberals talk about the environment. This is an issue with has only grown in importance these past years and various scientist and politicians have described specifically the issue of climate change as the biggest challenge of our time (2015 G20 Communiqué). A problem of this scale benefits from national and international political solutions rather than relying on the personal actions of individuals. This is particularly the case in the United States which produces a substantial amount of the carbon pollution that is threatening the environment (Gillis & Popovich 2017). If the way the environment is talked about metaphorically really has an influence on how it is conceptualized and how solutions are thought of it is critical to pay attention to this in language use.

The considerations discussed previously about the way metaphors can highlight and hide certain aspects do not mean that metaphors are to be avoided at all costs, but rather they might serve as a reminder that language use and particularly metaphors are not neutral and should be looked at critically. As Charteris-Black points
out the existence of a certain conceptual metaphor does not mean that all ways of talking about a concept will take on the form of that metaphor (Charteris-Black 2004:9). We can talk about arguing in other terms than war, or talk about life in ways that are not related to journeys. Having a variety of conceptual metaphors available seems thus desirable in order to have a fuller range of ways to conceptualize things, including the conceptualization of nature and environmental problems.
6. Conclusion

In this thesis I have looked at the way conservatives and liberals talk about the environment. Specifically I have looked at which conceptual metaphors are present when talking about the environment in articles in magazines that have a clear political leaning. I started this thesis with an overview of what the terms liberalism and conservatism stand for in the United States, followed by a general discussion of what conceptual metaphor theory is. The theoretical basis for this thesis mainly rests on George Lakoff’s *Moral Politics* which discusses the moral and conceptual basis for conservative and liberal ideology. The book posits that conservatives follow the strict father morality and liberals follow the nurturant parent morality. The underlying moral systems are then used to fill in the particulars of a conceptual metaphor that is commonly used to conceptualize the nation: THE NATION IS A FAMILY. Conservatives see the government as a strict father and use this as a basis for reasoning about what the relationship between a government and its citizens should be, liberals do the same on the basis of the nurturant parent model. Lakoff examines a number of issues and theorizes about the different conceptual metaphors that liberals and conservative use to think about these issues. One of these issues was the environment. Lakoff lists a number of conceptual metaphors for both liberals and conservatives that they supposedly use to conceptualize nature. The main purpose of this thesis was to look at authentic language use and examine whether it reflected these ideas. More specifically I wanted to see if these metaphors were used at all, if conservatives and liberals each used the metaphors ascribed to them and whether there were any other metaphors used to talk about nature. In order to examine this I created a small corpus consisting of 60 magazine articles with an even distribution between magazines considered conservative and magazines considered liberal. The MIP was used as a tool to determine what counted as metaphorical in these texts and what did not.

The first thing that was notable in the results was the fact that a majority of the metaphors that were found came from liberal sources. This made it difficult to compare which side used a particular metaphor the most. Nevertheless some conclusions could be drawn. Just under half of the conceptual metaphors proposed by Lakoff were frequently realized. Additionally there were four other metaphors that were found but
three of those could be related to the original list of metaphors. This suggests that in
the main the conceptual metaphors proposed by Lakoff are indeed quite commonly
used to conceptualize nature in political discourse. A second conclusion however is
that real life language use does not fully comport with the theoretical predictions
suggested by Lakoff with regard to metaphor usage by liberals and conservatives.
Only in the case of one metaphor did texts from liberal sources contain markedly more
realizations of that metaphor than conservative texts.

There are a number of questions raised by this thesis that might merit further
research. Firstly on a general note whether the tendency demonstrated here on a small
scale of liberal outlets using notably more metaphors than conservative outlets holds
true on a larger scale. Additionally the question could be asked whether the
overwhelming use of metaphors by liberals was due to the subject matter and whether
subject matters that are more central to conservative values such as tax policy would
present a different picture.

Further research could also be done on a corpus of a larger scale. In this light
the present research could be seen as a first step. Jonathan Charteris-Black outlines
a three stage approach to critical metaphor analysis in corpora: metaphor
identification, metaphor interpretation and metaphor explanation. In order to identify a
number of candidate metaphors he suggests a close reading of a small corpus. Words
that are commonly used metaphorically then become the metaphor keywords that are
analyzed quantitatively in a corpus (Charteris-Black 2004). The present research could
serve as a basis for this first step in identifying a number of recurring metaphorical
expressions. For example for the NATURE IS A HOME mapping a commonly found
metaphorical expression was the use of the variations of ‘cleaning’ and ‘fixing’. This
could then be an avenue for further quantitative research in large corpora. Other
metaphors that might warrant additional research based on how often they occurred
are the NATURE IS AN ADVERSARY metaphor and the NATURE IS A VICTIM TO INJURY
metaphor.

The final part of the thesis consisted of a discussion of the links between
metaphor and ideology. In the first section the way metaphor has an impact on thought
is explored, reiterating how the structure of a source domain can influence our understanding of a target domain. Additionally often the emotional connotations associated with the source domain are transferred to the target domain which can also have an influence on the understanding of the target domain. In the second section this general idea is explored specifically in the context of politics with particular attention to the way metaphors can be used to persuade. This final chapter is meant as an argument for the continued study of metaphor in discourse, particularly in political discourse.
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Metaphorical expressions found:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mapping</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>String</th>
<th>Token</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nature is God's dominion</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>to surrender the politics of the earth and its stewardship</td>
<td>&lt;stewardship&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is God's dominion</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>include an attentive stewardship of the environment</td>
<td>&lt;stewardship&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is God's dominion</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>to be generous stewards and protectors of the commons</td>
<td>stewards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is God's dominion</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>be better stewards of the environment, steward</td>
<td>&lt;stewardship&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is God's dominion</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>has a reputation for good environmental stewardship</td>
<td>&lt;stewardship&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is an adversary</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>have a reputation for being hostile to human habitation</td>
<td>hostile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is an adversary</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>resolving the clash of civilization with nature</td>
<td>clash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is an adversary</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>and nefariousness of the outdoors.</td>
<td>nefariousness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is an adversary</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>eels, barracudas, and other menacing critters.</td>
<td>menacing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is an adversary</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>China may be winning its war against nature</td>
<td>war</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is an adversary</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>they are the state's first, and strongest, defense against hurricanes.</td>
<td>defense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is an adversary</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>, engulfed by a violent river.</td>
<td>violent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is an adversary</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>Our beleaguered planet</td>
<td>beleaguered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is an adversary</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>has been the historic enemy of wolves</td>
<td>enemy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is an adversary</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>, an invasive species</td>
<td>invasive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is an adversary</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>saw &lt;invasive&gt; cheatgrass</td>
<td>invasive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is an adversary</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>better resist &lt;invading&gt; bugs.</td>
<td>invading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is an adversary</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>The ability to &lt;invade&gt; a new species</td>
<td>invade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is an adversary</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>with the &lt;army&gt; of beetles as a helper</td>
<td>army</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is an adversary</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>the bugs failed to &lt;infiltrate&gt; any of the survivor trees</td>
<td>infiltrate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is an adversary</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>a successful &lt;invasion&gt; by one who would not go on to populate the island</td>
<td>invasion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is an adversary</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>amid a &lt;combat zone&gt; of stripped forests and eroding hillsides</td>
<td>combat zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is an adversary</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>a building constantly &lt;embattled&gt; by the rising seas.</td>
<td>embattled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is an adversary</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>Starving puffins, stray whales, &lt;invading&gt; sailfish</td>
<td>invading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is an adversary</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>cyclones and hurricanes will &lt;pummel&gt; the shorelines.</td>
<td>pummel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is an adversary</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>along a &lt;phalanx&gt; of rippled hills</td>
<td>phalanx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is an adversary</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>appreciate the &lt;violence&gt; such storms can wreak</td>
<td>violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a wild animal</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>Can a &quot;Green Great Wall&quot; stop sand from &lt;devouring&gt; the countryside</td>
<td>devouring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a wild animal</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>The gulf of Mexico has &lt;swallowed&gt; 2,300 square miles of the state's wetlands</td>
<td>swallow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a wild animal</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>They &lt;swallow&gt; forests whole</td>
<td>swallow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a wild animal</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>of bark beetles have &lt;chomped&gt; 46 million of the country's 850 million</td>
<td>chomped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a wild animal</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>acres of forested land</td>
<td>more beetles in the coming century, preying on bigger chunks of the country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a wild animal</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>they'll all eventually be devoured by insects</td>
<td>the ocean will roar past the marina and the town hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a wild animal</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>that epic muddy python of a river</td>
<td>the countryside, the place that has been brought to order as a shared and cultivated home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a home</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>standards for autos in cleaning the air</td>
<td>from the discomfort of cohabitating with insects,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a home</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>&lt;Cleaning up&gt; the dead zones</td>
<td>It'd be great if we could lock up the whole river</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nature is a home</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>help clean the notoriously smoggy air</td>
<td>“The biosphere has surpassed limits of both what can be safely extracted but also dumped into our various sinks”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a home</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>fix the environment</td>
<td>the only way to fix the Gulf of Mexico dead zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a home</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>not directly responsible for land loss or, for that matter, the Gulf dead zone. But the money that comes out of the BP suit could do a lot toward fixing both</td>
<td>fix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a home</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>at the same time helping to fix the dead zone.</td>
<td>fix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a home</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>eventually rendering the entire planet uninhabitable.</td>
<td>uninhabitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a victim to injury</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>reverse osmosis process will harm marine life.</td>
<td>harm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a victim to injury</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>burns in which fires are intentionally set and controlled to manage vegetation.</td>
<td>prescribe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a victim to injury</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>the pipeline will pollute drinking water, injure wildlife.</td>
<td>injure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a victim to injury</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>Wildlife Service undertook the recovery of the wolf in the region.</td>
<td>recovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a victim to injury</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>winged beetles have long been culling sickly trees.</td>
<td>sickly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a victim to injury</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>the Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act.</td>
<td>healthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a victim to injury</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>. It's like chemotherapy for the wild.</td>
<td>chemotherapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a victim to injury</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>The landscape-scarring.</td>
<td>scarring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a victim to injury</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>nothing more than a Band-Aid on a gaping hemorrhage.</td>
<td>band-aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a victim to injury</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>nothing more than a Band-Aid on a gaping &lt;hemorrhage&gt;.</td>
<td>hemorrhage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a victim to injury</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>sacrifices the health of the Mississippi.</td>
<td>succumb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a victim to injury</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>THE MISSISSIPPI HAS suffered many ills.</td>
<td>suffered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a victim to injury</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>Its wetlands, its kidneys, are failing.</td>
<td>kidneys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a victim to injury</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>and it needs some kind of dialysis.</td>
<td>dialysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a victim to injury</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>Europe into the Black Sea and, for a time, &lt;maimed&gt; it</td>
<td>maimed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a victim to injury</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>we can form a global &lt;antibody&gt; to this carboniferous cancer</td>
<td>antibody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a victim to injury</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>we can form a global antibody to this &lt;carboniferous cancer&gt;</td>
<td>cancer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a victim to injury</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>stopping &lt;inflammation&gt; as it flares</td>
<td>inflammation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a victim to injury</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>the Restoring &lt;Healthy&gt; Forests for Healthy Communities Act</td>
<td>healthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a victim to injury</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>it's like &lt;chemotherapy&gt; for the wild</td>
<td>chemotherapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a victim to injury</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>The &lt;landscape-scarring&gt;</td>
<td>scarring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a victim to injury</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>nothing more than &lt;a Band-Aid&gt; on a gaping hemorrhage</td>
<td>band-aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a victim to injury</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>nothing more than a Band-Aid on a gaping &lt;hemorrhage&gt;</td>
<td>hemorrhage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a victim to injury</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>sacrifices the &lt;health&gt; of the Mississippi</td>
<td>suffered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a victim to injury</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>THE MISSISSIPPI HAS &lt;suffered&gt; many ills</td>
<td>suffering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a victim to injury</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>Its wetlands, its &lt;kidneys&gt;, are failing</td>
<td>kidneys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a victim to injury</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>and it needs some kind of &lt;dialysis&gt;</td>
<td>dialysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a victim to injury</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>Europe into the Black Sea and, for a time, &lt;maimed&gt; it</td>
<td>maimed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a victim to injury</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>we can form a global &lt;antibody&gt; to this carboniferous cancer</td>
<td>antibody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a victim to injury</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>we can form a global antibody to this &lt;carboniferous cancer&gt;</td>
<td>cancer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a victim to injury</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>stopping &lt;inflammation&gt; as it flares</td>
<td>inflammation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a living organism</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>excellent plant &lt;food&gt; known as carbon dioxide</td>
<td>food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a living organism</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>the &lt;dead&gt; zones</td>
<td>dead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a living organism</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>the oceans' last hope for &lt;survival&gt;</td>
<td>survival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a living organism</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>how to make a living on a &lt;living&gt; planet</td>
<td>living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a living organism</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>the &lt;survival&gt; of the planet trumps all other concerns</td>
<td>survival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a living organism</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>cottonwoods, its &lt;whispering&gt; willows</td>
<td>whispering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a living organism</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>climate change could have on a &lt;sensitive&gt; ecosystem</td>
<td>sensitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a mother</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>human contribution to &lt;Mother Nature's&gt; moods.</td>
<td>mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a mother</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>the earth's &lt;carrying&gt; capacity</td>
<td>carrying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a mother</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>The &lt;carrying&gt; capacity for any species</td>
<td>carrying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a mother</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>That's how the thick, green &lt;soup&gt; that feeds the Gulf's food web gets made.</td>
<td>soup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a mother</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>The Gulf of Maine, the great &lt;food processor&gt; of the western Atlantic</td>
<td>food processor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a mother</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>of the ocean's seemingly endless &lt;gifts&gt;.</td>
<td>gifts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a victim of assault</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>the right thing vis-à-vis nature is to be in harmony with it, to avoid &lt;violating&gt; it, etc.</td>
<td>violate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a victim of assault</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>without first &lt;assaulting&gt; the environment</td>
<td>assaulting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a victim of assault</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>produced both social injustice and environmental &lt;predation&gt;</td>
<td>predation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a victim of assault</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>as well as</td>
<td>despoiling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a victim of assault</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>&lt;Despoiling&gt; the environment in trying to extract them</td>
<td>despoiling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a victim of assault</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>&lt;Denude&gt; the landscape, scrape off the topsoil</td>
<td>denude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a victim of assault</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>News got around that Rasa was &lt;defended&gt; by a small, smiling but unyielding woman</td>
<td>defended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a victim of assault</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>slopes that &lt;choke off&gt; salmon streams during the rainy season</td>
<td>choke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a victim of assault</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>To get an idea of how American coastal waters might look just before they succumb to all the &lt;degradations they have suffered&gt;</td>
<td>suffer degradations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a victim of assault</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>To get an idea of how American coastal waters might look just before they &lt;succumb&gt; to all the degradations they have suffered</td>
<td>succumb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a victim of assault</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>vast ice sheet that has long &lt;guarded&gt; the northern Arctic,</td>
<td>guarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a victim of assault</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>to frame himself as a &lt;defender&gt; of the environment,</td>
<td>defender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a body</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>hundred feet from a &lt;combed&gt; beach</td>
<td>combed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a body</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>The illegal grows are usually &lt;carved&gt; out of forest land</td>
<td>carved out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a body</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>the Yukon down the &lt;spine&gt; of the Rocky Mountains</td>
<td>spine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a body</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>forestland follows the &lt;spine&gt; of California's rugged coastal mountains</td>
<td>spine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a body</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>it forms a lush &lt;fringe&gt; along the North Atlantic coast</td>
<td>fringe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a factory</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>oil and natural gas &lt;production&gt;</td>
<td>production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a factory</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>it was the flooding that &lt;built&gt; and sustained much of the southern part of the state</td>
<td>built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a factory</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>shifting watercourse and wide floodplain, &lt;built&gt; much of Louisiana</td>
<td>built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a factory</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>the most productive estuary in the continental United States</td>
<td>productive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a factory</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>more productive fisheries</td>
<td>productive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a factory</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>fishing area that's more productive than the Chesapeake Bay.</td>
<td>productive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a physical object</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>drive up food prices, and &lt;damage&gt; the environment</td>
<td>damage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a physical object</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>the &lt;fragility&gt; of ecological balances.</td>
<td>fragility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a physical object</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>produces serious environmental &lt;damage&gt;.</td>
<td>damage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a physical object</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>Should the Lower Platte suffer further &lt;damage&gt; from the meatpacking industry</td>
<td>damage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a physical object</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>&lt;fragile&gt; root systems</td>
<td>fragile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a physical object</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>the existence of the &lt;fragile&gt; coast</td>
<td>fragile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a physical object</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>fragmenting &lt;fragile&gt; habitat</td>
<td>fragile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a work of art</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>gentle hills &lt;quilted&gt; with the ancient pattern of cows and sheep</td>
<td>quilted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a work of art</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>the hillsides directly across from me are &lt;emblazoned&gt; with vast swaths of trees</td>
<td>emblazoned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a property</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>it's just a land &lt;grab&gt; to free up resources</td>
<td>grab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a resource</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>daylight dimming controls, and rainwater &lt;harvesting&gt;.</td>
<td>harvesting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a spaceship</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>&lt;Spaceship&gt; Earth is not for humans alone</td>
<td>spaceship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a treasure chest</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>techniques used to &lt;unlock&gt; natural gas deposits</td>
<td>unlock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River is a firehose</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>transitioned from being a complex marshy wetland into a &lt;fire hose&gt;</td>
<td>firehose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm is a piece of rope</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>A storm &lt;coiled&gt; in the west</td>
<td>coiled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature is a friend</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>who called the &lt;environmentally friendly&gt; ship a &quot;breakthrough&quot;</td>
<td>friendly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>