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Introduction: ideological metaphor

It is now well accepted that metaphors perform a range of rhetorical purposes in political genres that are broadly associated with persuasion.¹ The choice of metaphor is governed by the political context and the nature of the genre, since debates, conference speeches and social media platforms differ in their rhetorical needs. Such metaphors influence public events by reinforcing and legitimising the outlooks and beliefs of supporters and by attacking and delegitimising those of opponents. In either case, where there is evidence of the realisation of a predetermined strategy I have proposed the term ‘purposeful metaphor’ and argued that there is often corroborating linguistic and contextual evidence of this purpose (Charteris-Black 2012). Linguistic evidence of purpose is often provided by semantically related metaphor clusters. For example, words from the semantic fields of war, illness, journeys or the human body may refer to political struggle, opponents, political actions or the state of the nation, respectively. Reiteration of metaphors encourages ways of thinking about the entity referred to, and contributes to, conceptually based outlooks. The rhetorical context supplies the identity of a nation or social group, or the nature of a social problem. Clusters of cognitively related metaphors are typically represented using conceptual metaphors (Lakoff & Johnson 1980). Another form of contextual evidence of purpose is when metaphors contribute to a wider discourse in public debates, in which the metaphors of one group are contested by the alternative ones proposed by an opposing group. Metaphors are purposeful when they contribute to a speaker’s efforts to convince others that he or she is right.

Purposeful metaphors become ideological when they express a set of beliefs and values that are shared by a particular social group and contribute to a world-view that unites and defines this group. I view ideology as psycho-social in nature because it provides a means through which individuals are able to establish group identities that influence the social order (see Seliger 1976, p. 14; Charteris-Black 2011, p. 22). A world-view is a set of concepts that is required both to understand the world and to provide the justification for an individual’s – or a group’s – actions and behaviours in the world. In this chapter, I therefore use the term ‘ideological metaphor’ to refer to a metaphor that is both purposeful – because it has a distinct persuasive role – and ideological – because it legitimises the world-view² of
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a social group. The purposes of such ideological metaphors are most readily identifiable when they ostracise an Out-group by using a metaphor vehicle such as a disease (cancer, Ebola, etc.) or an animal (e.g. cockroach, or tiger) or dehumanise them altogether by metaphors based on dangerous climatic conditions (e.g. storms, floods) or environmental disasters (e.g. melt-downs, tsunamis). The idea shared by clusters of systematically related metaphors may be represented conceptually AS IMMIGRANTS ARE ANIMALS/NATURAL DISASTERS, etc. Musolff (2015) argues that the metaphor of the German nation as a body needing to be rescued from a deadly poison should be viewed as the conceptual basis for the Nazi genocidal policies that culminated in the Holocaust; Wodak (2015) provides many fascinating illustrations of ideological metaphors in more recent right-wing populist rhetoric. By contrast, an In-group may be identified using family and home metaphors that may be conceptually represented AS THE NATION IS A FAMILY/HOME. In some cases, the rhetorical motivation for such colourful uses of metaphor is fairly ‘transparent’, in the sense that the intention behind them is readily identifiable, however the deeper cognitive roots of an ideology may not be. Musolff (2015) demonstrates how metaphors deriving from the human body derive from deeply embedded ways of thinking that underlie much Western political thought. In such cases, ideological metaphors require considerable critical expertise to capture and elucidate because they covertly encapsulate a set of beliefs that permeates a way of thinking, a way of talking and a way of doing and acting in the world.

In this chapter, I analyse a metaphor that I suggest has sometimes gone unrecognised in the discussion of left- and right-wing perspectives on capitalism: a competitive sports metaphor in which social progress is framed as a race; I will refer to this as the ‘Competitive Race metaphor’. My interest in competitive sports metaphors is partly because I love sports: whether or not this is because I attended a British public school and enjoyed playing in hockey and cricket ‘first elevens’, I do not know. However, it was also sparked by recent use in British politics when this rather invisible metaphor was brought to our attention as a way of formulating ideological differences between the political left and right. In the following extract from a speech by a former leader of the British Labour Party, Competitive Race metaphors are shown in italics:

Let me explain why. You see he believes in this thing called the global race, but what he doesn’t tell you is that he thinks for Britain to win the global race you have to lose, lower wages, worse terms and conditions, fewer rights at work. But Britain can’t win a race for the lowest wages against countries where wages rates are pennies an hour and the more we try the worse things will get for you. Britain can’t win a race for the fewest rights at work against the sweat shops of the world and the more we try the worse things will get for you. And Britain can’t win a race for the lowest skilled jobs against countries where kids leave school at the age of 11. And the more we try the worse things will get for you. It is a race to the bottom. Britain cannot and should not win that race.

(Miliband, 24 September 2013)

Miliband begins by introducing the counter-position of ‘he’ (his opponent, the-then Prime Minister, David Cameron) in which international relations are framed in terms of nations competing as individuals in a race, with the assumption that winning the race is desirable. As Underhill observes:

From the nineteenth century onwards, attempts had been made to define the nature of ‘the character of nations’ and races, which were then compared and contrasted in order
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to allow us to establish hierarchies which attributed a transcendental justice to transient reigns of power and spheres of influence…

(Underhill 2012, p. 138)

Without rejecting the Competitive Race metaphor, Miliband elaborates it by drawing attention to Cameron’s assumption that the ‘race’ is one where international ‘performance’ is measured by GDP and introduces social criteria by which the performances of nations can be measured. The race is no longer one of economic competition in which ‘coming first’ means earning the most money. Cameron’s Competitive Race metaphor is contested by drawing on another aspect of competitive events – the league table – in which a team can move ‘upwards’ or ‘downwards’ in relation to other teams. Miliband’s use of metaphor draws attention to an ideology that is covert in Cameron’s use of ‘global race’ by drawing attention to it as a ‘competition’ by repetition of ‘race’ and then reframing and elaborating the metaphor by drawing attention to the aspects of ‘progress’ that it ignores. In a typical race, the competitors run towards a finishing line; there is a single winner, many losers and no prizes for being runner-up. When used by the political right, ‘global race’ assumes that we all know what race we are in, that we all want to be participants in it and we want to win it. But as Underhill (2012, p. 154) reminds us: ‘Competitors in sports became an expression of the “Will to Power”, the will to destroy opposition … The sportsman was reduced to a conqueror who imposed himself by crushing others’. The will to power of one nation over another was originally found in the concept of ‘the arms race’ that was prominent in the 1930s and 1980s when there was political confrontation between nation-states as they sought to crush each other. Miliband’s ‘race to the bottom’ reframes the Competitive Race metaphor by redefining what is meant by ‘winning’ away from economic measures such as GDP, trade and profitability towards measures of social progress.

Once metaphors are viewed as characterising and influencing thought rather than just as stylistic preferences, it is necessary to consider the cognitive semantic approach initiated by Lakoff and Johnson (1980) and developed extensively elsewhere (e.g. Lakoff 1996; Charteris-Black 2004). From this view, the systematic correspondences between the primary and secondary senses of words – their original senses when used literally, and their extended senses when used metaphorically – imply a single underlying idea known as a conceptual metaphor that constitutes a way of thinking. The original, earlier, more basic or literal sense of a word is known as a ‘source domain’ and the extended, later and more abstract metaphorical sense is known as a ‘target domain’. A conceptual metaphor is inferred from the systematic correspondences, or mappings, between source and target domains. So that, if words from the semantic field of ‘racing’ – such as ‘rat race’, ‘overtake’ or ‘catch up’ – are used systematically to describe life in general, then we can infer a conceptual metaphor LIFE IS A RACE. If such ‘racing’ metaphors regularly occur in the political discourse of particular politicians, then this is because they attach ideologically motivated positive values to competition. They may also value the attributes that make winning more likely: fitness, strength, organisation, training, teamwork, strategy, etc. Notice how the conceptual metaphor always commences with the target domain – the concept that the metaphors refer to – here LIFE, and then follows with the semantic field of the more basic sense of these words – here A RACE; they are then joined by the copula. The conceptual metaphor is intended to describe the relatedness of these metaphors through a single cognitive representation that is orthographically represented in upper case. They are not grammatically fixed; for example, the above nominal form could be re-phrased verbally as LIVING IS RACING. The conceptual metaphor can be thought of as the shadow of individual metaphors, like their reflections on the wall of the mind’s cave.
Conceptual metaphors are motivated by ways of thinking, or frames, that place constraints on other ways of thinking and often exist in a relationship of complementary distribution with alternative frames. For example, Lakoff (1996) contrasts two alternative politically motivated frames: adherents of traditional social values who follow the Strict Father frame use language based on conceptual metaphors such as Morality is strength, Being good is being upright and Morality is pure. By contrast, adherents of socially progressive outlooks use language that is conceptually based on opposing conceptual metaphors such as Morality is empathy, Moral action is nurturance and Moral growth is physical growth. Conceptual metaphors therefore constitute arenas of contested ideological outlook that are manifest in language.

In this chapter, after discussing some related studies, I consider some methodological issues confronting those who seek to research ideological metaphor. I then illustrate how the Competitive Race metaphor can be analysed using the published online records of the British parliament: Hansard. Throughout, my purpose is to show the ideological motivation that underlies much choice of language and to demonstrate how the process of identifying metaphors, and the concepts that they assume, is a way of revealing their rhetorical role in the creation of power.

Related studies

Research into ideological metaphor has occurred across a wide range of settings and across diverse genres. Researchers move from identification of particular metaphors in a corpus of texts to claims regarding the cognitive processes involved in their production; these are represented by conceptual metaphors that connect the semantic fields of the metaphor. Researchers provide an explanation of why these metaphors occur, although they differ in the emphasis they place on rhetorical purpose. Their explanations imply that metaphors can be attributed to ideological motives to varying degrees – although it is not always clear how conscious their producers were of such motives because it is difficult for text-based studies to explore the processes behind the production of ideological metaphors.

The idea that analysis of metaphors could identify ideologies originated in Sontag (1989) who argued the use of ‘war’ metaphors in the treatment of cancer was insensitive to those experiencing the illness. In a political context, Dirven (1994) grouped together various metaphors to identify the differences between Afrikaans and Dutch metaphors in a South African newspaper corpus. As regards competition and sports metaphors, Straehle et al. (1999) found evidence of the notion of ‘struggle metaphors’ in EU discourse, and as they summarised:

‘Survival of the fittest’ is the general organising principle of human life; economism has adapted this idea and reframed it in terms of competition and rivalry. From the perspective of economism, society exists as a site for permanent competition and struggle, a place where individuals only ‘survive’ if they internalise the struggling. According to such a world-view, the forces guiding society are not co-operation and solidarity, but competition and rivalry, such that the individual ability to act becomes synonymous with competitiveness.

(Straehle et al. 1999, p. 94)

Howe (1988) identified the use of sports and war metaphors in American political discourse, noting their appeal to men in particular. Semino and Masci (1996) identified the use of
football metaphors by the Italian media tycoon Silvio Berlusconi, and Jansen and Sabo (1994) examined the role of sports metaphors in the first Gulf War.

A number of studies have identified a competition frame in business-related genres; for example, Boers (1997) examined a corpus of editorials from *The Economist*, suggesting that competition metaphors were indicative of a free-market ideology and that this was evident from clusters of metaphors relating to the notions of health, fitness and racing. These were classified as *economics is health care* and *economic competition is racing*, concepts that imply a set of value judgements that impact on decision-making. He argues that most novel figurative language arises from taking established conceptual metaphors, rather than inventing new ones, or from including peripheral aspects of the source domain. Koller (2004) examined marketing texts and proposed that *marketing is a sports competition*. In a rigorous study of ideology and metaphor, Goatly (2007) analyses the ideological evidence for the metaphor theme *speed is success*. Downing et al. (2013) examined a corpus of multimodal advertisements to identify *e-business is a race* and *high performance e-business is a sports competition*. The authors propose that as e-business has become more familiar, ICT companies have moved away from conventional journey and race metaphors to represent technology companies as animals, drawing on attributes such as speed and agility to compete.

The above studies show how insights from critical linguistics could be applied to metaphor studies, and Critical Metaphor Analysis (Charteris-Black 2004) offered a methodology for this approach. It proposed that in order to understand many different types of metaphor in political and social contexts, it was necessary to examine the contexts in which metaphors occurred. It invited approaches that make inferences about *why* speakers had chosen a metaphor rather than a literal alternative for conveying the same propositional meaning. Examination of the contexts in which metaphors occur provided evidence of speakers’ intentions. This approach towards meaning was governed by the tradition of British linguistics, such as Firth and Halliday, which emphasised the importance of context. Critical Metaphor Analysis sought to combine the methodology proposed by Fairclough (1995, p. 6) of identifying linguistic features, and then interpreting and explaining these choices with reference to how far they could be accounted for by differences in power relations.

The distinctive hallmark of the approach is the claim that speakers make linguistic choices in order to achieve rhetorical and ideological purposes. In more recent work (Charteris-Black 2012, 2014), I have emphasised the importance of purpose over intention since speakers – even when their purposes are clear from text-based methodologies – may not be fully conscious of how they achieve them, and because metaphors can simply pop out automatically, as the most persuasive way of framing a particular issue. In political contexts effect is more important than intention. Rhetoric, according to James Berlin (1988), is the study of language in the service of power. From this point of view, what is ‘critical’ about metaphor choice is that metaphors contribute to the formation of an ideology, and by interpreting and explaining metaphor choices, we can better understand this ideology. Ideology is ‘the basis of the social representation shared by members of a group. This means that ideologies allow people, as group members, to organise the multitude of social beliefs about what is the case, good or bad, right or wrong, for them to act accordingly’ (van Dijk 1998, p. 8). Ideology may therefore be described as ‘meaning in the service of power’ (Thompson 1984, quoted in Goatly 2007:1).

After discussing some of the different methodologies used by researchers in the next section, I will analyse the Competitive Race metaphor in British parliamentary debates by tracing its discourse history. Since racing is related to embodied experience of fast
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movement, I will also illustrate the frame of health and disease that is used to generate ideological metaphors for an anti-EU ideological position through the concept of ‘Euro-sclerosis’. Competitive running (racing), fitness and health are conceptually related because the body becomes fitter and healthier by running; by contrast, the body that avoids exercise becomes less fit and therefore less healthy. Historically, issues of fitness have become socially important in relation to the threat of international conflict and the fitness level of army recruits – rather than because of concerns for individual health. This was especially the case in the periods prior to the two World Wars when neo-Darwinist views predominated, and wars between nation-states have been viewed as struggles to the death. As Goatly (2007, p. 54) notes: ‘…constructing activity as a competitive race relates to the question of human is animal metaphor, through neo-Darwinians’ and socio-biologists’ construction of human society as inexorably competitive’.

I will argue that cultural assumptions of the social value of ‘health’ has led to a resurgence of the ‘fitness’ frame and – less visibly – encouraged an orientation towards individualism that Cameron’s use of the Competitive Race metaphor assumes. Miliband re-activates another aspect of racing, which is that sports is also a social activity and that ‘health’ can also be interpreted as having social value as well as being individually virtuous. By drawing attention to the fact that such metaphors are ideologically contested, I will be encouraging their critical re-evaluation and reframing.

Researching ideological metaphor

Researchers encountering metaphor in political contexts usually start with a hunch about their ideological motivation, either by analysing explicit metaphors (e.g. the use of ‘disease’ and ‘fitness’ frames that are activated by metaphoric uses of words such as ‘sclerosis’, ‘cancer’, ‘overweight’ or ‘obese’), or by identifying phrases that we might not initially even think of as metaphors because they have become conventional ways of talking about a topic (‘the race to the top’). We should immediately notice that this introduces two problems: first, there may be variation in what counts as a metaphor, depending on what cognitive frames are activated by a word for a particular individual; and second, that a single ‘metaphor’ may spread over several words. I suggest that ‘race to the top’ is a single metaphor, although it is apparently four words; this is because it contains a single idea. Both problems invite empirical responses: the first by drawing on expert informants; the second by examining a corpus. The identification of possible metaphors leads the researcher to explore hunches by developing research questions that explore issues such as the topic and the genre of language where such ideological metaphor may occur. Genres include political speeches, the press or broadcast media, or other types of text that has the purpose of influencing how people think – such as political banners/slogans, campaign posters or press releases. The ideological potential of metaphor may be enhanced by a semiotic analysis of images or visual-verbal representations, particularly where these seek to subvert power elites (e.g. satirical cartoons).

Taking into account the geographical and temporal specifications of the discourse topic (such as ‘British parliamentary debates in the 1980s’), metaphor researchers may then assemble a dataset(s) and corpus/corpora (verbal or visual) for the identification of candidate metaphors. This will entail identifying political actors and other agents of social cognition who use metaphor (e.g. politicians, demonstrators, journalists). Researchers will need to fix a time frame for compilation of a dataset that can be examined for metaphor. Taken together, these stages require attention to the issue of genre that overlaps closely with ‘political
discourse’: language designed for a particular ideological effect or purpose. In some cases, researchers undertake empirical research whereby they record focus groups, or undertake psycholinguistic experiments. The design of an appropriate dataset is crucial if claims for ideological metaphor are to be upheld empirically.

Identifying metaphor(s) relating to a political issue(s) entails deciding who will undertake such a task, how they will do it, and perhaps counting metaphors. Typically, this requires an operational definition of metaphor, the use of reference works, corpora, reliability considerations and the use of several analysts’ views on whether a particular word or phrase is a metaphor. A common method is to identify a candidate metaphor, say ‘fitness’ and then search for words in the same semantic field, say ‘overweight’, ‘obese’, ‘sprint’ and ‘marathon’, all of which could potentially be related to ‘fitness’; I have described these as ‘metaphor keywords’ (Charteris-Black 2004, p. 35). It may also involve initial categorisation of metaphor as conventional, novel or dead. Visual metaphors can be identified by establishing underlying concepts that are evident from semiotic analysis of multimodal genres, such as satirical cartoons.

Once metaphors have been identified, the next stage of analysis requires classification. Initially this may be either by the semantic fields of the words classified as metaphors (‘source domains’) when they are used with their literal senses, or by the topics they refer to when used with metaphoric senses (‘target domains’). Researchers then identify patterns of metaphors and identify their shared cognitive frames, as described above in the introduction (p. 202); this often requires an abstract category to represent a concept shared by a number of metaphors. Depending on the theoretical approach adopted, researchers may propose a conceptual metaphor such as THE NATION IS A BODY to represent this concept.

Once language and concepts have been analysed, and depending again on the theoretical approach, researchers usually make claims that metaphors contribute to the formation of ways of thinking, or ‘frames’ that influence the current social perceptions that govern future ways of thinking. Van Dijk refers to this process as ‘social cognition’. For example, thinking about the nation as a ‘body’ may frame policies in terms of essential ‘surgery’. It may require the leader to ‘inject’ into the ‘patient’ a ‘medicine’ that is necessary to ‘cure’ a political or economic ‘disease’. The post-2008 financial collapse policies of reduced public expenditure are often described as ‘austerity’; but whether this is necessary suffering, or a pain inflicted unnecessarily on a long-suffering ‘patient’ depends on ideological outlook. What is certain is that the metaphor of ‘austerity’ evokes an argument (with dubious evidence) that short-term sacrifice is a necessary precondition for long term ‘health’.

There may, of course, be more than one metaphor frame, and frequently metaphors are contested areas of language use – as we have seen in the contrast between the ‘global race’ and the ‘race to the bottom’ metaphors in the discourses of Cameron and Miliband. This is when we move to an explanation of ideological metaphor; this may involve identifying how features occurring in conjunction with metaphor contribute to the identification of ideological metaphor. Analysis of additional discursive features contributes to the identification of underlying purpose and may facilitate triangulation of data by combining verbal and visual evidence of ideology.

The ‘Competitive Race’ metaphor

In this section, I illustrate how Critical Metaphor Analysis can be employed to identify an ideological metaphor. I do this by outlining the method I have used to identify evidence of the Competitive Race metaphor in the range of British parliamentary genres that are
collectively known as *Hansard*. This includes all debates in the House of Lords and House of Commons and those in Westminster Hall; it also includes Written Answers, Written Statements, Lords reports and Grand Committee reports.

‘Race’ as a noun has three separate entries in the Oxford English Dictionary (2nd edition, 2003): the first is ‘A competition between runners, horses, vehicles, boats etc. to see which is the fastest in covering a set course’ and I will refer to this as the ‘competition sense’. This sense of ‘race’ originates in the Old Norse *rás* meaning ‘current’ and was originally a northern English word with the sense ‘rapid forward movement’. The second sense is ‘each of the major divisions of human kind, having distinct physical characteristics’, and it originates from the Italian *razza* (via French) meaning ‘a group with common features’. The two senses of the word ‘race’ are in complementary distribution: that is, the competition sense does not occur in those texts in which the ethnicity sense occurs, and vice versa. The ethnicity sense is relevant in discussions of ideology concerned with national identity, whereas this chapter focuses on the competition sense.

My procedure was first to map out the semantic field for racing, competition and fitness to identify metaphor keywords, and then search on the Hansard web site to establish whether the use of these keywords was metaphoric because a more basic or literal sense of the word or phrase was not relevant in this context. Table 13.1 shows which terms were searched:

One of the difficulties with a large database is the number of ‘hits’ generated; for example, ‘race’ alone produced 51,637 hits. The solution I adopted was to search for metaphoric phrases or compound forms containing the word ‘race’, such as ‘rat race’ (329 hits) and ‘race against time’ (105 hits). Once candidate phrases were identified I could produce a much more manageable dataset. For example, ‘fast’ produced 40,342 hits, whereas ‘super-fast’ produced only 9 hits. Clearly, a larger study could examine uses of all lemmas in a semantic field, but analysis of phrases, compound forms and less-frequent words allowed sufficient examination of a large data set to identify ideological metaphors.

The database also provided valuable contextual information, for example, the earliest use of ‘global race’ in parliamentary debates was as follows: ‘Jobs have been lost in the textiles industry – because we cannot compete *in the global race to the bottom* with Morocco, Sri Lanka and the far east’ (Judy Mallaber, 16 December 1997).

The contextual information shows the name of the speaker, the genre, the topic and date of the debate. A bar graph at the top of the page also shows the frequency of the search term by year and by decade, so it is easy to identify shifts in frequency over time. An advantage of a chronological database of this kind is that it facilitates identification of whether a metaphor was novel when first introduced and to trace its conventionalisation and eventual

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 13.1 ‘Racing and Competition’ metaphor keywords</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Racing and competition general</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rat race</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>race against time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>race to the top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>race to the bottom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fast-track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>track record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
entrenchment. A lack of awareness of a word being used as a metaphor implies a gradual normalisation process in which a concept becomes cognitively embedded, with clear ideological implications. Psycholinguistic processing of metaphor depends on the extent to which a comparison is cognitively active. For example, I would suggest that the phrase ‘rat race’ in the 1970s became so entrenched that there was no longer any comparison with the behaviour of rats, as the term came to evaluate negatively any aspect of an unpleasantly competitive life-style. Similarly, in the 1990s, the gradual shift to accepting competition as normal reflects how the competition frame became similarly ideologically entrenched; part of the contestation of metaphor relies on recognising that a use of language is, or once was, a metaphor.

I would like to focus on the ideological motivation of the competition frame that has emerged in the construal of global capitalism as a ‘race’ of nations seeking to outperform their ‘competitors’. I propose that the shift away from the unpleasant evaluation of competition implied by ‘rat race’ is grounded in neo-Darwinist outlooks that view human progress as some sort of struggle for survival in which those nations with powerful ‘genes’ in the form of ‘transferable skills’ in technology and science, are better ‘equipped’ for survival. The neo-liberal concept of the ‘global race’ originated in the earlier political concept of nations being involved in an ‘arms race’. A search of Hansard in the 1930s shows the rapid emergence of the expression ‘arms race’; this was associated with the rise of Hitler and the attempts of Nazi Germany to circumvent the impositions on re-armament that had been imposed by the Treaty of Versailles after the First World War. The concept of an ‘arms race’ continued in the Cold-War period and enjoyed a considerable resurgence in relation to the foreign policy of Margaret Thatcher and Ronald Reagan. However, the point I would like to emphasise is that throughout the period 1930s–1980s, the notion of ‘an arms race’ was exclusively negative – irrespective of whether or not speakers supported or opposed military expenditure, and it was rhetorically deployed as an argument to reject participation in such a race. A more positive prosody for ‘race’ began to emerge in the metaphor of the ‘space race’ – whose original reference was to the competition to put a man on the moon; however, most of the references to ‘space race’ in Hansard are by speakers who criticise the cost of being involved in this ‘race’, as British political opinion was not favourable towards space exploration at that time.

The idea that social relations between nations can be viewed in terms of a ‘race’ as compared with other frames, such as co-operation, has become a metaphor of the political right and can be illustrated in the following use by David Cameron when describing the ideological context for policy:

Because the truth is this. **We are in a global race today.** And that means an hour of reckoning for countries like ours. Sink or swim. Do or decline. To take office at such a moment is a duty and an honour … and we will rise to the challenge. If we’re going to be a winner in this global race we’ve got to beat off this suffocating bureaucracy once and for all.

(Cameron, 15 October 2012)

As well as when announcing policy:

Today we announce a **new fast-track system** for international patents to reduce the global backlog which stifles growth and enterprise and costs the global economy £7.6 billion for every year patents are delayed.

(Cameron, 28 May 2010)
Enterprise is associated with speed and progress and to be slow is retrograde. I will now summarise findings for three ‘competition’ metaphors: two based on speed – ‘the rat race’ and ‘the global race’ – and one on slowness and illness – ‘Euro-sclerosis’.

‘The rat race’

In the 1970s, ‘the rat race’ implied that a ‘race’ was not something in which any right-minded person would wish to participate and contributed to an ideology of the time that questioned the value of sacrificing quality of life for the accumulation of wealth. Figure 13.1 shows this phrase peaked in the 1970s, and has since declined.

The decline in the negative use of ‘arms race’ and ‘rat race’ and their replacement by ‘global race’ in Tony Blair’s and David Cameron’s discourse was a purposeful attempt to reverse the negative semantic prosody of the ‘race’ metaphor. The ‘rat race’ and the ‘arms race’ were races to be avoided. By contrast, we are all supposed to want to participate in the ‘global race’: things are only worth doing if ‘we’ are going to win because there are no prizes for the also-rans. This indicates a shift in ideology that is indicative of globalisation, the spread of international capitalism and the normalisation of competition. This is a shift away from a society where quality of life was measured in terms of global peace, lower personal stress and where having enough time was more important to national welfare than material advantage and never-ending competition. This shift is illustrated in the following:

She [Margaret Thatcher] believes that the smaller the size of the public sector in the economy and the larger the market economy, the better. However, that is taken one stage further by the Prime Minister and her Government. The market economy is not just to be let loose in Britain, but is to be seen on a world-wide basis. We are to play our part in that and we must produce, become more efficient and pay our way in an international rat race.

(Spearing, 23 July 1981)
Here the ‘rat race’ metaphor expresses an ideological opposition to the global market-orientated economy of the type that began to develop in the 1990s and has continued until the present.

‘The global race’

The Competitive Race metaphor is evident in Cameron’s understanding of the world and of the relationships between individuals and society:

To get decent jobs for people, you’ve got to recognise some fundamental economic facts. We are in a global race today. No one owes us a living. Last week, our ambition to compete in the global race was airily dismissed as a race to the bottom … that it means competing with China on sweatshops and India on low wages. No – those countries are becoming our customers … and we’ve got to compete with California on innovation; Germany on high-end manufacturing; Asia on finance and technology.

(Cameron, 2 October 2013)

The value placed on competition was surely instilled [and] nurtured by his education at Eton and Oxford – as well as by his family values (Elliott & Hanning 2012). Cameron assumes an unquestioning sense of legitimacy around the idea of competing. His construal of political policy has also been influenced by the ‘speed’ frame in literal language as shown in the value placed on projects related to speed:

My Government will support investment in new high-speed broadband internet connections, enable the construction of a high-speed railway network and reform the economic regulation of airports to benefit passengers.

(Cameron, 22 May 2010)

The super-fast broadband cables are going to be laid. And high-speed rail is going to criss-cross this country.

(Cameron, 28 January 2011)

Here, there is a curious conflation of the speed frame in reference to two otherwise apparently unrelated policy areas: cable networks and rail transport.

However, Competitive Race metaphors were equally prevalent in the discourse of New Labour who, in turn, inherited the racing frame from Margaret Thatcher. Table 13.2 illustrates how, over a relatively long period of time, speed-related metaphors were deployed by Margaret Thatcher and then continued in the discourse of Tony Blair.

There are many other such metaphors characterising the discourse of New Labour that reinforced an ideology based on unregulated market competition – such as being on the ‘right track’ and gauging policy with reference to a ‘track record’. Goatly (2007, p. 53) proposes that they can be conceptually represented as SUCCESS IS SPEED, and reminds us that etymologically ‘speed’ meant ‘success’ or ‘prosperity’ before there were means available for the measurement of speed. However, here it is the competitive element that is salient, implying that LIFE IS A RACE and NATION-STATES ARE COMPETITORS. New Labour became well known for the introduction of ‘targets’ and ‘league tables’ in most areas of public life – in particular education and health. Clearly, there was a broad acceptance by both major
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political parties of a cognitive construal of government and social relations as a competitive race. In

Table 13.2 ‘Global race’ metaphors in the Thatcher-period and New Labour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Metaphors (in italics)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thatcher, 12 Oct. 1979</td>
<td>The world has never offered us an easy living. There is no reason why it should. We have always had to go out and earn our living – the hard way. In the past we did not hesitate. We had great technical skill, quality, reliability. We built well, sold well. We delivered on time. The world bought British and British was best. Not German. Not Japanese. British. It was more than that. We knew that to keep ahead we had to change. People looked to us as the front runner for the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thatcher, 8 Oct. 1982</td>
<td>Far-away countries scarcely heard of ten years ago now overtake us in our traditional industries. Suddenly we are faced with the need to do everything at once – to wake up, catch up and then overtake, even though the future is as hard to predict as ever.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thatcher, 14 Oct. 1983</td>
<td>Our competitors are improving all the time and some of them started well ahead of us. So we must improve even faster than they do if we are to catch up. It is no good just beating our previous best; we have to beat our competitors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thatcher, 14 Oct. 1988</td>
<td>At home, the fast pace of economic growth has put more money into people’s pockets and more money into industry’s profits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blair, 26 Sept. 2000</td>
<td>Don’t tell me that a country with our history and heritage, that today boasts six of the top ten businesses in the whole of Europe, with London the top business city in Europe, that is a world leader in technology and communication and the businesses of the future, that under us has overtaken France and Italy to become the fourth largest economy in the world…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blair, 1 Oct. 2007</td>
<td>And this underscores I think the profound characteristic of the modern world: the speed of change. In truth, globalisation is a fact. It’s why resisting it is self-defeating and even absurd. But the inevitable consequence of it, is unquestionably challenging because it makes change happen at break neck speed and indeed if you decide to open up, and if you are on the open side of the argument, it happens even faster. That’s why the natural inclination is to ward it off or seek to place limits on it … So I’m saying this – that globalisation, and the interdependence and speed of change that accompanies it, is a fact. However, what we do about it is a choice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blair, 1 Oct. 2007</td>
<td>And this is a different type of argument, but it awakens all the old primeval fears about the nature of capitalism. And recent events in the financial market show again the truth of the proposition that globalisation presses the fast forward button of world events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blair, 18 Mar. 2007</td>
<td>China’s wind turbine technology still lag [sic] a few years behind the state of the art, but is priced at about 30% less than European products – If the level of technology keeps improving China could become the world leader in both construction and production of wind energy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In some cases, the competition frame allowed me to identify the theme of a whole speech. From the table above, we see that the speed element of the competition frame was active in a speech given by Blair on the topic of globalisation. This speech starts:
What I want to talk to you about tonight is really how I see the debate about globalisation in politics today. And the real dividing line to think of in modern politics has less to do with traditional positions of right versus left, more to do today, with what I would call the modern choice, which is open versus closed. If you take any of the big motivating debates in politics today, in Europe or America, international engagement or isolation, immigration – is it good or bad, free trade – a benefit or a fear. Each essentially has, at its core, this question: ‘Do we open up? Albeit with rules and controls, or do we hunker down, do we close ourselves off and wait till the danger has passed? Is globalisation a threat or an opportunity?’

(Blair, 1 October 2007)

Here, metaphors occur in combination with antithesis; political choices are presented as stark alternatives in which, in each case, the first item (italicised) is the option that is positively evaluated, while the second (underlined) is the negative option, that is until the final question where ‘threat precedes opportunity’ and hence gains added impact. It seems that there is no choice as to whether to engage in the race, because globalisation is represented as ‘open’, ‘good’ a ‘benefit’, and so on – so the answer to the rhetorical question is that globalisation is an opportunity and not a threat.

As Goatly (2007, p. 56ff.) argues, the association between speed and success originates in the treatment of time as a commodity that could be measured, bought and sold, so that time became equivalent to money. Urbanisation, mechanisation and digitalisation all seek to reduce the time involved in production and to make access to markets quicker through accelerating the ordering and transportation processes. However, there are costs entailed by an obsession with speed, such as reduced quality and increased stress: these are much more difficult to measure.

‘The Euro-sclerosis metaphor’

Within the competitive frame, ‘fast’ metaphors convey the positive values of the ‘we’ group, while ‘slow’ metaphors convey the negative values of the opposition. A particularly good example of this is the metaphoric use of ‘sclerosis’ in debates on the European Union. The ubiquitously negative compound form ‘Euro-sclerosis’ has frequently been used to frame an ideological position on the European Union, as illustrated in Table 13.3.

Conceptually, for its opponents, THE EUROPEAN UNION IS AN ILLNESS, and measures that seek to protect workers are ‘sclerotic’ because they encourage government regulation and conflict with the Anglo-American business model with its competitively orientated values of being ‘lean’ and ‘fit’. In a study of American political discourse, Howe (1988) argued that the most pervasive sports metaphor was based on the notion of a ‘team’. It is employed during campaigns to create a bond between candidate and electorate, or to express a sense of common enterprise and loyalty, while the Competitive Race frame more typically activates individualism and argues against the values of team membership. In other cases, particular aspects of the competition frame are highlighted; for example, the ‘relay’ metaphor can be used to argue for collective rather than individual effort. The relay is the closest that competitive running gets to being a team sport – as team members have, like politicians, shared objectives. However, in practice ‘relay’ is more commonly used as a way of criticising those individuals who are letting down the team:
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The Government should not just thank the commission, as we do, but should apologise to it. It is as though the captain of the relay team had instructed the runners of the first legs to sprint around the track at high speed, but when the baton was handed over to the captain for the final lap, he relaxed into a leisurely stroll.

(Young, 19 June 2000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>‘Euro-sclerosis’ metaphors (in italics)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hurd, 22 Apr. 1993</td>
<td>I find the attitude of the Liberal Democrats more puzzling, because their leader was clear at the outset. A few days before Maastricht, looking ahead as is his wont, he warned that the social chapter could lead to a form of Euro-sclerosis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Alexander of Weedon, 7 Jun. 1993</td>
<td>Europe as a whole has lost its competitiveness over recent years. It is in danger of what a decade ago used to be called ‘Euro-sclerosis’. It is going through a period of structural change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major, 15 Jul. 1993</td>
<td>I am glad that the right hon. Gentleman has not forgotten, but perhaps I can remind the House what he said: I believe what is now being put forward in the social chapter may well lead to a form of Euro-sclerosis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Alexander of Weedon, 22 Jul. 1993</td>
<td>They are concerned about the high rate of non-wage labour costs. The spectre of Euro-sclerosis is back with us again.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Peter Hordern, 23 Jul. 1993</td>
<td>It is an example of Euro-sclerosis. European companies are increasingly investing overseas because the costs of employment in the Community are becoming prohibitive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Taverne, 14 Mar. 2001</td>
<td>They (the Conservatives) contrast the low tax, low spending and dynamic economy across the Atlantic with its recent high rate of growth and low unemployment on the one hand, with the so-called ‘sclerotic’ economies across the Channel, weighed down with high taxes and high spending which have resulted in low growth and high unemployment…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell, 9 Jul. 2003</td>
<td>It is of course true that there could be enlargement without these provisions being enacted, but it would be a curious European Union which emerged as a result, and one that would be all the more likely to be subject to paralysis and sclerosis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

So after a brisk sprint round the first lap by Lord Wakeham, the baton was handed over to a jogger in rather poor shape, and it has taken the Government nearly two years to produce their response, optimistically entitled ‘Completing the Reform’.

(Young, 10 January 2002)

This implies that individualism pervades the Competitive Race frame: the onus is on the individual to stay in shape so as not to let the side down – as in a true public school sporting ethos. It is a doctrine of individual moral responsibility with implications for an individualist society in which ‘Let the devil take the hindmost’.
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Conclusion

This investigation of metaphors from the semantic field of racing and competition has identified an ideological orientation that has coloured British – and to some extent ‘world’ – politics during this period. Until recently, there has been an uncritical advocacy of global capitalism within a competitive framework in which countries are equated with runners in a ruthless race in which there are only winners and losers, a race in which the rewards for the winners are high, while there are none for the losers – although a ‘safety net’ may be provided to prevent social collapse. This has been summarised as nation-states are competitors and life is a race. This implies an acceptance of evolutionary psychological views of an inherent and biologically determined aggression and what Goatly summarises as the ‘naturalistic fallacy’ that nature is inherently competitive and that humans are driven to self-perpetuate their genes: ‘Most theories that accept human is animal as the best explanatory model take as the ground for the model/metaphor the aggression and competitiveness on which Darwinian theories of evolution are based…’ (Goatly 2007, p. 159). Not only may models based on aggression be damaging to individual mental health and well-being, but global political stability requires co-operation between nation-states to overcome problems, such as environmental disasters that threaten all states equally. The Competitive Race metaphor is therefore one that is ideologically contested between supporters and opponents of unregulated capitalism and the ‘free’ market.

More generally, I have tried to demonstrate how clusters of metaphors can be shown to reveal the cumulative cognitive, or cultural, models that constitute the collective beliefs of a community as represented in the minds of its individual members. These models have been summarised using conceptual metaphors. If I have succeeded in raising awareness of how a capitalist ideology underlies many Competitive Race metaphors, then Critical Metaphor Analysis can be said to have done its job of revealing metaphor in the service of power.

Notes

2 See Underhill (2012) for a discussion of the term ‘world-view’.
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