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ABSTRACT

Perceiving the ‘refugee crisis’ as a construct shaped, among others, by contemporary political cartooning, we examine how cartoonists have represented European attitudes towards refugees by focusing on the metaphorical representation of ‘Europe’ and the ‘refugee.’ Specifically, we identify the conceptual metaphors used to depict Europe and refugees, and how political cartoons framed the ‘refugee crisis by applying Conceptual Metaphor Theory – CMT (cf. Lakoff and Johnson 1980) – and Critical Metaphor Analysis – CMA (cf. Charteris-Black 2004, Musolff 2012). Our analysis reveals that cartoonists re-frame the migration phenomenon according to the emphasis they put on: (a) Europe’s role in the Syrian conflict; (b) Europe’s policies concerning the reception of refugees in Europe; (c) the implications of Europe’s policies for refugees; (d) implications of receiving refugees for Europe; and (e) refugees’ expectations from Europe. Political cartoons thus serve as ‘perspectivisation devices’ (Silaški 2012:216) that construct the ‘refugee crisis’ as ‘the Syrian refugee crisis,’ a ‘humanitarian crisis,’ a ‘crisis of European governance,’ and a ‘European identity crisis,’ reproducing dominant narratives around migration.

1. Introduction

The civil war in Syria is a geopolitical and humanitarian issue that has caused massive movements of people since 2011. Although Syrians mainly found refuge in neighboring countries (approximately 5.5 million refugees), over one million Syrian refugees and asylum seekers headed to Europe through dangerous and exhausting routes (cf. UNHCR 2021). This condition has been a great challenge for the EU nation-states and
governments and the normative-regulative framework of the EU, mainly the Common European Asylum System (CEAS) (cf. Pries 2019), especially after the gradual forced migratory surge in early 2015. Since the EU appeared unable to manage this massive influx of people, the ‘refugee crisis’ has become a common term of the European political and media discourse for describing extended migration processes (cf. Agustín and Jørgensen 2019; Triandafyllidou 2017). A growing academic literature mediating the idea of the crisis has emerged, and part of it has been critical toward the notion of the ‘refugee crisis’ in current political discourse (see Section 2.1).

Political cartoons position themselves within the historical process by embracing and reproducing discourses about an issue, in this case, the ‘refugee crisis,’ and/or by omitting or questioning others. Therefore, we can only make sense of political cartoons and their metaphors in specific sociopolitical contexts. Their meanings are provisional and transitional since their audiences interpret them within such a context from which they draw arguments and the dominant discursive elements they reproduce in turn. Moreover, we approach the discourse of political cartoons as a form of satirical journalism and a type of visual public opinion or news discourse (cf. Greenberg 2002). By acknowledging the role of political cartoons in challenging political power through counter-narratives and acting as vehicles of persuasion (cf. Marín-Arrese 2019), we have attempted to raise awareness for covert meanings in visual argumentation to reproduce dominant discourses around forced migration.

Given political cartoons’ ability to influence public political discourse, we took their representations of the ‘refugee crisis’ as performed conceptual metaphors. Besides, metaphor’s power to persuade and shape our conception of a given topic is well documented (cf., for example, Silaški 2012). Political cartoons either reproduce dominant discourses of the migration phenomenon or challenge them. Therefore, it is crucial to uncover representations of social phenomena by following the diverse paths of their metaphorical construction.

2. Theoretical Background

2.1. Dominant ‘Refugee Crisis’ Framings

During the last decade, the expression ‘refugee crisis’ has been extensively used in everyday political and media discourse, getting integrated into our mental lexicon as an established concept. However, relevant studies have raised concerns about this term, treating it as a construct whose use has imperceptible implications for how we perceive the migration phenomenon. Therefore, alternative phrases have been proposed such as ‘crisis of legitimacy’ (Castelli Gattinara 2017), ‘crisis of solidarity’ (Agustín and Jørgensen 2019; Dahlstedt and Neergaard 2016), ‘crisis of European borders’ (de Genova 2016), or ‘reception crisis’ (Christopoulos 2017).
The complex emergency following the war in Syria since 2011 has been presented as the 'Syrian crisis' (e.g., Nas 2019; Pierini 2016; Turkmani and Haid 2016) or 'Syrian refugee crisis' (e.g., Balsari et al. 2015; Crețu 2015). Drawing on Habermas’ (1976) definition of crisis as a rarely occurring situation that can destabilize citizens' beliefs and, more generally, the status quo, Stockemer et al. (2019:3) recognize the 'European refugee crisis' as a 'milestone event.' They use this term to refer to two dimensions of the crisis: (a) a 'humanitarian crisis' of people fleeing from war, oppression, or disastrous economic circumstances to EU member states since 2015, and (b) a 'crisis of European governance.'

Concerning the second dimension, Postelnicescu’s (2016) description of Europe’s internal conflict points out that the 'refugee crisis' triggered the acceleration of an underlying conflict of visions among the EU states and even states outside the European Union. This pressure within the EU has revealed the Western socio-economic order’s economic, financial, fiscal, macroeconomic, and political weaknesses. This development has also been addressed as an 'existential crisis' (e.g., Menéndez 2013). Ammaturo (2018:2), on the other hand, argues that the 'refugees/migrants crisis,' referred to as an 'existential crisis,' is an 'ontological' and 'epistemological crisis' that Europe and European citizenship are undergoing “because the dominant narrative on Europe and Europeanness seems to be a ‘narrative of coherence.’” What underlies this idea is a cartographic definition of Europe, which in turn raises the ontological question of what constitutes Europe (cf. Delanty 2006:183), as well as of "border practices” (Dell’Agnese and Amilhat Szary 2015:8) and "their roles in 'suturing' and knitting adjacent spaces" (Makarychev 2018:747).

Acknowledging, thus, the multiplicity of the term as discussed above, we have adopted Stockemer et al.’s (2019) approach to the ‘refugee crisis’ integrating several framings such as ‘solidarity crisis,’ ‘reception crisis,’ and ‘European border crisis.’ Moreover, we have added two more literature-driven dimensions that are perceived and applied in this study as follows: ‘Syrian crisis/Syrian refugee crisis,’ with regards to Europe’s role in dealing with the Syrian conflict as a foreign policy issue (e.g., Crețu 2015, Pierini 2016); and ‘European identity crisis,’ integrating the perspectives of an ‘existential crisis’ (cf. Menéndez 2013) as well as ‘an ontological and epistemological crisis’ (cf. Ammaturo 2018) that both refer to the quality of ‘Europeanness’ as an imagined property of the European citizen.

2.2. Migration Metaphors, Political Cartoons Discourse and Metaphor Research

Many recent studies have explored metaphors that have shaped political discourse in Europe and the USA (cf., for example, Bratanova and Ishpekova 2019; Fotopoulos and Kaimaklioti 2016; Musolff 2016). Castaño Castaño, Laso Martín, and Verdaguer
Clavera (2017) point out that the dominant representation of immigration in public discourse since the early 20th century includes dehumanizing metaphors. More recently, Chouliaraki and Stolic (2017) revealed the symbolic instability of the ‘refugee,’ which shifts between ‘speechless victim’ and ‘evil-doing terrorist,’ and proposed a typology of refugee’ visibilities’ each of which construes different forms of civic agency and responsibility towards refugees.

Immigration is often described as a threat, a natural force, an uncontrollable flood with devastating consequences for host communities conceptualized as bodies and organisms (cf., for example, Santa Ana 1999; Cisneros 2008; Strom and Alcock 2017). Immigration is also represented as a risk for a country’s internal welfare; thus, controlling immigration appears as a battle to protect the country’s interests (cf. Castaño, Martín, and Clavera 2017). When the nation is conceptualized as a house or a fortress (cf. Charteris-Black 2006, Cisneros 2008), its physical or symbolic boundaries facilitate the reproduction of the Us/Them polarity in public discourse (cf. van Dijk 2000). Thus, the government emerges as a heroic agent responsible for protecting the country (cf. Binotto 2015, Musolff 2011) from ‘invaders,’ ‘criminals,’ or ‘illegal aliens’ (cf. Binotto 201, Flores 2003).

This metaphorical construction of immigration as a security problem renders the protection of the citizens as a government’s duty, comparable to the responsibilities of a father, reflecting thus Lakoff’s ‘strict father model’ (cf. Lakoff 1996, 2006). At the same time, it discursively reproduces the conception of immigration as a threat. In this way, political metaphors frame arguments and suggest context-specific value-laden readings of the sociopolitical realities (e.g., Abdel-Raheem 2014, Charteris-Black 2005, Kjeldsen 2015, Tseronis 2013).

In their Conceptual Metaphor Theory (hereafter CMT), Lakoff and Johnson (1980) approached metaphor as a part of the sphere of thought, rather than that of language, introducing thus a paradigm shift in metaphor studies. Many metaphors involve the mediation of visual sensory information contained in image schemas or the re-visualization of conventional verbal metaphors, a practice extensively used by cartoonists (cf. Yus 2009:167-168). Among the various methods used to identify metaphors in written or multimodal discourse, the Visual Metaphor Identification Procedure (VisMIP) is especially recommended for visual and multimodal discourse (cf. Šorm and Steen 2018).

Considering the cognitive-semiotic premise that argumentation is a cognitive category, it is more accurate to take a text as instructing the reader to construct argumentative meaning than containing argumentation (cf. van den Hoven 2015:157). Thus, the meaning-making process presupposes situating the cartoon in the macro-contextual socio-political reality it addresses and guiding the reader to grasp its evaluative stance and argumentative value (cf. van den Hoven and Schilperoord 2017). To identify how visual language, and specifically cartoons, place readers on an argumentative
track concerning preexisting frames and shared values, Critical Metaphor Analysis (cf. Charteris-Black 2004, hereafter CMA) tracing the stages of identification, interpretation, and explanation, may prove to be a helpful approach.

Although there are studies that have applied CMA (e.g., Musolff 2012), Muelas-Gil (2018:26) claims that, to her knowledge, "there is no reference to multimodal metaphors as a critical tool in discourse," pointing out the need for a new approach to political metaphor and multimodality which can be called Critical Multimodal Metaphor Analysis (hereafter CMMA). In the following section, we present in detail how we have identified and analyzed the pair 'Europe – Refugees' as visual metaphors in each political cartoon, exploring their argumentative value that draws on and re-produces diverse dimensions of the 'refugee crisis' concept. Her argument probably relates to the specific genre of political discourse since there are studies applying critical frameworks, such as a critical feminist discourse perspective, to explore multimodal metaphors in other genres like advertising (e.g., Lazar 2009).

3. Methodological Notes

Our primary research question in this study is how do political cartoon(ist)s address the concept of 'refugee crisis'? To address it, and after taking into consideration Negro, Šorm, and Steen’s (2017) as well as Šorm and Steen’s (2018) work on visual metaphor identification, we employed an integrative approach of CMT (Lakoff and Johnson 1980) and CMA (Charteris-Black 2004). According to CMT, there are two types of conceptual domains: a) the source domain, from which we draw metaphorical expressions (e.g., learning is/as/a journey), and b) the target domain that we try to understand (e.g., learning is/as a journey). Mapping is, then, a set of correspondences between the source and the target domain elements. To know a conceptual metaphor is to know the set of mappings that applies to a given source-target pair.

Our analysis focused on the metaphorical use of the concepts 'Europe' and 'refugee,' mapping the relation of the target and the source domains used for the semiotic construction of the political cartoon. We first identified visual metaphors used to depict Europe and refugees, respectively, reconstructing visual information in terms of verbal (or propositional) premises. Secondly, we identified the relation of the two conceptual metaphors used in each cartoon to create a particular framing of the 'refugee crisis,' forming a conclusion. Here, we roughly follow the rules that Govier (2010:31ff.) summarizes as "standardizing" an argument, i.e., clearly stating, arranging in a logical order, and enumerating premises and conclusions. Thirdly, we aimed at exploring how the particular metaphors chosen in those specific discourse contexts, political cartoons, relate to dominant narratives about the 'refugee crisis.'
All target domains of the visual metaphors identified in the cartoons of our sample refer to Europe and refugees, respectively. In order to code and analyze the data of our corpus, we have used the following codification: (a) Data Item (DI), (b) Target Domain (TD), (c) Source Domain (SD), (d) Mapping (MAP), with a verbal or codified subscript, e.g., SDEurope, SDRefugees, DIS1.12, that refers to specific cartoons we analyze each time. The following process was used for analyzing each data item (DI), each political cartoon.

Premise (1) refers to mapping the concept of Europe, Premise (2) refers to mapping the concept of the refugee to reach an Overt (propositional) Conclusion that maps Europe’s attitudes towards refugees relating the pairs of conceptual metaphors. Through this process, we identified the cartoon’s argumentative meaning. Then, using critical metaphor analysis, we identified the macro-contextual influence of the dominant narratives that relate to the construction and communication of the ‘refugee crisis,’ situating the cartoonist’s perspective within the four-dimensional framing of ‘refugee crisis’ as presented in the theoretical background section (Covert Conclusion).

Following the three stages of CMA, we worked through the analysis of each cartoon as follows:

a) identification of the domain(s) describing the content of the political cartoon with CMT propositions: TDEurope ∩ SDEurope, TDRefugees ∩ SDRefugees,

b) interpretation of the cartoon’s meaning that corresponds to the Overt Conclusion of the visual argument about Europe’s attitudes towards refugees through relating the conceptual metaphors for Europe and refugees with IF...THEN propositions, and

c) explanation of the cartoon’s argumentative value, identifying the cartoonist’s positioning concerning the framing of the ‘refugee crisis’ as a Covert Conclusion of the visual argument drawing from an explicitly determined ‘repertoire of framings.’

Our corpus consists of cartoons published between April 11, 2012, and November 19, 2018, drawn from the dynamic database Cartoon Movement and specifically the ‘Migration and Refugees’ collection (cf. Cartoon Movement n.d.). Cartoon Movement is an online community of international editorial cartoonists and fans of political satire that uses the motto "There is more than one truth." Since the database is dynamic, our initial corpus comprised 79 data items until November 2018. After refinement, we retained 41 data items, including only those referring to Europe, an initial analysis of
which was presented at the 12th International Conference of Semiotics in Thessaloniki (November 2019). In the present study, we have chosen to discuss 5 data items that correspond to the five ‘force schemata’ of the Purposive Activity conceptual domain (cf. Forceville and Jeulink 2011) that were found to be used in the cartoons to reconstruct four framings of the ‘refugee crisis’ concept presented in the previous section.

4. Metaphor Identification and Analysis: Results

4.1. Framing 1: ‘Refugee Crisis’ AS ‘The Syrian Refugee Crisis’

Identification of Visual Metaphors

In terms of its referential meaning, Figure 1 is an example of Europe represented as land bordered by water/the sea on a map. There are no borders between states on this map. A water-wheel that carries containers and boats serves as a mechanism of transferring objects and people instead of water. The direction indicated by a white line is left to right and implies that the water-wheel is moving; therefore, people are moving. More specifically, a truck loads the first container with rockets subsequently unloaded.

Figure 1. “Cause & Effect” [DI.SI.13], Naoufal Lahlali, Morocco, May 12, 2016
to non-European countries (the East). Then, the containers become boats of a different color that transport people to Europe by sea. A person is drowning in the sea, waving their hands for help, while another falls off the boat as the water-wheel moves to reach Europe. People land on the coasts of Europe and continue on foot, carrying luggage and holding children. Therefore, the main source domain here is Technology/Device (water-wheel). Europe sets the water-wheel in motion in order to move military devices. Europe is the cause of the war (weapons provider), and migration is its effect. Thus, Europe as a source of military devices and refugees as cargo are in the same water-wheel (cycle of migration), and the water-wheel in motion is forced migration.

**Interpretation**

This political cartoon presents a cause-and-effect process (as also indicated in the title) that results in people becoming refugees through the metaphor of the water wheel. The Mediterranean is literally water and one of the deadliest migrant routes in the world; approximately 2,000 refugees have lost their lives trying to reach Europe in 2015 only (cf. Crețu 2015:255). Just as the water-wheel produces energy, Europe is presented as a mechanism producing conflict and forced migration. The water-wheel metaphor implies that as long as Europe provides arms, it will receive refugees. If migration is a water-wheel in motion (the transfer of weapons as the cause, that of refugees as effect), then Europe is identified with the military devices that encourage this.

**Explanation**

The Syrian refugee crisis is depicted as a cycle, with Europe being an active agent in the conflict. This cycle gives rise to death, loss, and the need to seek refuge. The territory of Europe is depicted as a laboratory for supplying conflict/war and creating the need for refuge. The cartoonist’s framing of the refugee crisis here seems to be the Syrian refugee crisis. Presenting the “The cycle of migration & violence” (the respective caption from the database under the political cartoon), the cartoonist attempts to explain the Syrian refugee crisis and show Europe’s involvement. The focus is on Europe’s role in terms of external politics and international affairs, as indicated by the borderless map, the European territory as an entity representing the West and its interference in the Syrian conflict (cf. Pierini 2016; as well as Turkmani and Haid 2016, concerning the provision of arms and its embargo during 2012–2013).

The cartoonist’s motive may also reflect the concept of the ‘vicious circle’ used in relevant literature to question the EU’s problem solving-capacity and legitimacy in a crisis context (cf. Falkner 2016). It may even refer to the asylum-seeking vicious cycle (cf. Castle-Kanerova 2003) that generates discrimination against migrants (cf., for example, da Silva Rebelo, Fernandez, and Meneses 2020). In all cases, it indexes qualities of endless repetition, pointlessness, and unwillingness to learn.
4.2. Framing 2: ‘REFUGEES CRISIS’ AS A HUMANITARIAN CRISIS

Identification of Visual Metaphors

In Figure 2, Europe is symbolized by the European Union flag in the background. The flag’s placement in the horizon’s position implies that Europe is the horizon. A woman is wearing a black headscarf and carrying luggage in her left hand while holding on to her child with her right hand. The two refugees, mother, and boy, are walking on railway tracks headed towards the European Union. The conceptual metaphor identified here draws from the domain of Transportation/Travel, i.e., refugees as the train.

Interpretation

The flag of the European Union stands for Europe. The circle of stars looks like the sun and may imply hope. In another reading, the stars indicate that this scene occurs during the night. This political cartoon has no train to Europe, which is contradictory to the cartoon’s title, making refugees’ path to Europe more difficult. The picture is divided into two parts by its colors: a black and white part representing the route to Europe (present) and the colorful part that relates to refugees’ destination (future). Therefore, Europe (represented by the flag of the European Union) appears to be the bright horizon, the hopeful future for refugees. In contrast, refugees’ travel to Europe on foot without a train is the problematic black and white present.

Figure 2. “Train to Europe” [DI S1.12], Paolo Lombardi, Italy, May 26, 2016

Premise (1) MAP: Europe is a military device/water-wheel motion mechanism
(TD: EUROPE ∩ SD: TECHNOLOGY/ENERGY)

Premise (2) MAP: Refugees are cargo of the water-wheel < goods < energy
(TD: REFUGEES ∩ SD: GOODS/ENERGY)

Overt Conclusion (micro-context): People are shipped < cargo ⇒
Europe is a military device ⇒
Europe as responsible for the forced migration cycle

Covert Conclusion (macro-context): ‘Refugee crisis’ as the Syrian refugee crisis
IF Europe is the horizon, THEN the empty railway that leads to Europe is a walking route for refugees.

Explanation
Considering the caption, "Greece is evicting more than 8,000 refugees and migrants from the makeshift Idomeni camp. Where will they go?" this cartoon points out the next step for the refugees after reaching Europe. Greece serves as a frontline passage for refugees. They look for hope on the horizon, which appears to be in the hands of other European Union members. This political cartoon points out the condition of the here-and-now of the refugees as a path to a safe future that is, however, very difficult to reach. Instead of using the train, they are walking to find refuge. Considering the title of the cartoon, "Train to Europe," we observe an antithesis with the refugees’ movement on foot. More specifically, the first part of the cartoon’s title, which reads "train," guides the viewer to notice the act of moving as an ironic statement or a paradox that refers to the apparent absence of a train; the mother-child entity is moving on foot on an empty railway track. The second part of the title, "to Europe," emphasizes the direction of the movement, and we could identify some antithesis between the bright horizon (refugees’ expectations from Europe) and the lack of provision for safe transportation within Europe (no train to Europe while already in Europe).

This framing of the ‘refugee crisis’ is identified as a humanitarian crisis since the focus is on the people acting now (walking towards Europe, fleeing from war). The point of departure or the reason for their movement (Syria, Syrian war) is not made clear. Instead, the focus is on Europe’s role as a refuge through the eyes of those heading towards the EU, which does not have an active role but is part of the environment representing the refugees’ expectations (horizon). The horizon in the background of the cartoon (the ‘sun’ of EU stars) could then be perceived as hope or as the journey towards the unknown reflected in the concern expressed under the cartoon: "Where will they go?"

| Premise (1) MAP(EUROPE): Europe is the horizon < destination < transportation < travel/journey |
| TDEUROPE: EUROPE ∩ SD(UROPE): TRANSPORTATION/TRAVEL) |
| Premise (2) MAP(REFUGEES): Refugees as a walking entity on railway |
| TDREFUGEES: REFUGEES ∩ SDREFUGEES: TRANSPORTATION/TRAVEL) |

Overt Conclusion (micro-context): Refugees walk towards < travel to Europe ⇒ Europe is a destination for refugees ⇒ Europe is the sun to refugees < hope

Covert Conclusion (macro-context): ‘Refugee crisis’ is a humanitarian crisis
4.3. Framing 3: ‘REFUGEE CRISIS’ AS A CRISIS OF EUROPEAN GOVERNANCE

Identification of Visual Metaphors

The flag symbol in Figure 3 represents Europe. More specifically, the stars representing each member state are anthropomorphized and appear to hold rackets and play a game with balls around a blue table. The anthropomorphized stars as players are portrayed hitting four balls – people, one with a backpack and one with a bundle on a stick – back and forth across the table. Their facial expressions depict them as unhappy, arguing, and pointing at one another. One holds something like a fishnet or a lacrosse racket, while another stretches their hands in the air with an open mouth as if saying something. The balls are rendered as miniature human beings identified as refugees by the luggage they are carrying. According to the cartoon’s macro-contextual features, they appear to be flying above the table.

Figure 3. “Migrant Talks” [DI SI.23], Hassan Bleibel, Lebanon, October 25, 2015
Europe is identified by a) the players’ star shape and b) the color combination of the stars and the game table. The source domain from which the conceptual metaphors draw is Sports/Game; in other words, the EU member-states are players, Europe is a game field, and the refugees are the balls.

Interpretation
The European Union members are playing a game of negotiations about the issue of migration. Nine stars are positioned around the table, while eight players participate holding a racket, so there is not enough room to play the game. This crowding also represents the competing policies and practices of the EU member states. They are arguing about how to deal with refugees (e.g., who should receive refugees and in what numbers), pointing at one another. Nobody seems to be willing to accept refugees. Refugees as miniature people are in the hands of European politics, fleeing war but flying over the heads of Europeans as unwanted in Europe. The emphasis here is on the difficulty European Union members have in reaching a unanimous plan of action on provisions and support for refugees. "Migrant talks," the cartoon title, appears as an ironic commentary indexing the general EU policies on the migration phenomenon.

IF Europe is a sports team and its terrain is a game table, then handling the migration phenomenon is a game.

Explanation
The cartoonist uses the conceptual metaphor of the sports game to represent Europe as indifferent and unable to make decisions and find solutions to the refugee issue communally. The criticism targets European governance; how European member states handle the refugee issue. The game metaphor contrasts openly with the gravity of the situation that has led people to seek refuge in Europe. Treating war-affected populations as passive participants in a game thus points out the weaknesses and failures of European politics. The inner conflict of the member states renders them incapable of dealing with the refugee issue.

The cartoon caption reads: "EU emergency talks are underway to address the migrant crisis in the Balkans. Some member states even warn that an inability to find the answer to the migrant crisis might mean the end of the EU," highlighting the consequences of the EU members’ inability to address the problem. However, the warning about the EU’s existential problem does not appear straightforwardly in the cartoon. Instead, the cartoon’s elements seem to capture how negotiations of the EU members occur, while fears and warnings concerning the consequences of a failed approach to the refugee issue are only implied. They mostly appear in the extra-cartoon context, and therefore the framing of the refugee crisis recognized here is that of the European governance crisis.
4.4. Framing 2: ‘REFUGEE CRISIS’ AS A HUMANITARIAN CRISIS

Framing 4 is the only case that includes two (2) data items since two patterns have been identified in our corpus as indicative of the European-identity-crisis framing pointing out different identity aspects (aging/weak/tired, xenophobic) and therefore stances of Europe towards refugees through an anthropomorphous (older man) and mythical/monstrous entity (dragon) respectively.

Figure 4. “Old Man Europe” [DI S1.16 ], Osama Hajjaj, Jordan, July 11, 2017
Example 4.4.1: Aging Europe – Europe as an Old Man

Identification of Visual Metaphors

In this cartoon (Figure 4), Europe is an older man wearing a beret, a headscarf, glasses, and a long gray coat with a European Union flag button on his left lapel. He has a long white beard and skinny legs. He looks tired and weak and is stooped over, and his face is turned to the ground. He holds a supporting walking stick in his right hand, which also serves as a downward-pointing arrow that appears broken at one juncture due to the pressure exerted on it by the man’s weight. With his left hand, he is probably holding a breathing inhaler. He uses the downward-pointing walking stick to move his left leg, which is slightly in the air. In addition, he has a hump on his back and is carrying miniature gray people, men and women, the latter wearing headscarves. The miniature people can be identified as refugees due to the women’s scarves and the inscription "migrants" in capital letters on six lifeboats full of people, depicted on the sea at varying distances from the shore. One has just reached the shore, and a person has debarked and is trying to pull the boat ashore. There is also a second one just arriving. The source domain’s conceptual metaphors drawn from here are Human Life/Human and Physical Quantity/Gravity. Therefore, Europe is an older man, refugees are miniature people, and they are burdens.

Interpretation

Europe is personified here as a human entity. Refugees are represented as additional weight on the back of Europe, which results in a burden on the walking stick that finally breaks. The walking stick also resembles a downward pointing arrow used in stock market diagrams. It thus may be considered a symbol of Europe’s economic decline. An alternative secondary reading would suggest the stick’s relation to a Jovian lightning bolt, indexing the Jupiter/Europa myth, which is also about arriving on Europe’s shore, despite its different perspective and connotations as an abduction or seduction story. When arriving in Europe, refugees’ quantity and size are represented as inversely proportional qualities (more people-smaller size). The difference in the size of the human beings depicted in this cartoon may also be interpreted as a difference in the value of human life; European citizens as part of a unique human body that is aged and suffering, compared to miniature people, a small unidentifiable mass, arriving in Europe as refugees.

IF Europe is a weak older man, THEN refugees are burdens on his shoulders weighing him down.

Explanation

Refugees appear here as a threatening burden on a declining Europe. Considering the complementary comment of the cartoon on the platform, "Many Europeans consider
migrants a burden Europe cannot bear, but we can also see them as a vital invigoration of a graying continent,” the argumentative meaning of the political cartoon appears explicitly. However, the second part of the comment referring to a counter-perspective on refugees (cf., for example, Crețu 2015:259) does not appear in the visual argument. Instead, the Weight or Burden metaphor has been identified as a typical pattern to denote refugees and migrants. According to Taylor’s (2021:475-476) historical discourse analysis of migration metaphors, it occurs in conventionalized form only in the 1980s and the 2010s with two lexicalizations (strain, burden).

The tendency to attribute human qualities to nations representing them as bodies or organisms has been well documented (cf., for example, Strom and Alcock 2017). Gender and age chosen to depict Europe in this cartoon are also interesting aspects that differentiate this cartoon from others in our corpus (e.g., compared to the representation of Europe as a young or middle-aged woman dressed up in ancient Greek clothing that draws on Greek mythology 2). Europe as an aged man represents the ‘graying continent’ that could also indicate the ‘aging’ of the European Union as a set of tired nations challenged by migration.

On the one hand, the cartoonist seems to visually represent one of the dominant discourses around the refugee issue. By adding the comment that refugees may be seen as a ‘vital invigoration’ for Europe, he distances himself from this framing of the refugee crisis. Therefore, he visually presents one of the dominant framings of the (European) refugee ‘crisis’ as an existential crisis for Europe, a crisis that affects its identity. On the other hand, the broken walking stick/downturned arrow implies the overload in an already aged organism. An alternative reading of this cartoon could suggest that Europe is old (a graying continent) and therefore cannot cope with migrants effectively, explaining thus the reason for the crisis and representing the ‘reception crisis’ pattern (cf. Christopoulos 2017).

| Premise (1) MAP_EUROPE: Europe is an old man |
| (TD_EUROPE: EUROPE ∩ SD_EUROPE: HUMAN LIFE/HUMANS) |
| Premise (2) MAP_REFUGEES: Refugees are weight/load |
| (TD_REFUGEES: REFUGEES ∩ SD_REFUGEES: PHYSICAL QUANTITY/ GRAVITY) |

Overt Conclusion (micro-context): Refugees are load on the shoulders of Europe ⇒ Refugees weigh Europe down < threaten Europe’s health/progress ⇒ Europe is overloaded with refugees < Europe is suffering due to refugees

Covert Conclusion (macro-context): ‘Refugee crisis’ is a European identity crisis

2 However, let us consider the alternative reading of the walking stick as Jupiter’s lightning bolt. We can identify a similar pattern that draws on Greek mythology elements, especially to represent the arrival stage of refugees in Greece or Europe as a human body (entity).
Example 4.4.2: Xenophobic Europe – Europe as a Mythical Monster

Identification of Visual Metaphors

Europe is indicated cartographically and verbally in Figure 5. The map has the shape of an aggressive grey face – we mostly read here a dragon’s face – threatening a slender black figure with its mouth gaping and carrying a suitcase. The figure has emaciated limbs, a leaning backward/retreating posture, and is identified as a “Refugee” by the corresponding script. A cloud of smoke appears from the creature’s nostrils with an inscription in red capital letters (the red threat here is identified as indexing fire): “Go Home.” The creature is thus personified with human-like properties such as the ability

---

3 Alternative readings of the cartoon have identified the creature as a carnivorous dinosaur or an angry dog. We read the creature more like a dragon, both due to its semiotic construction (gaping mouth, ‘Go Home’ in red as fire coming out of nostrils within a cloud of white smoke) and the reappearance of mythology patterns in our corpus as a source domain to depict monstrous/negative aspects of Europe. Additionally, the mythical monster could also symbolize the mythical/imaginary unitary nature of the European Union. Compared to the EU game table cartoon where EU members were identified as separate ‘stars-players’ repelling refugees from one to another, EU members with a common xenophobic strategy are a monstrous unity repelling refugees out of Europe.
of speech, whereas the refugee receives skeletal properties in the threshold of safety/life and threat/death. Therefore, the source domain here is Mythical Creatures/Mythology and Natural Creatures/Human Life (Death). On the cartoon’s upper left part is the word “Xenophobia.” The word “Refugee” is placed over the head of the slender figure whose size is tiny compared to the creature threatening it. The conceptual metaphors identified here are: Europe is a scary creature, Europe is a (mythical) monster, and refugees are intimidated emaciated creatures.

**Interpretation**

In this political cartoon, if we accept its proposed identification as a dragon, Europe is portrayed as a mythical fire-breathing creature that threatens the slender figure heading towards it. The dragon is scary, aggressive, and explicitly displays the message “GO HOME.” Europe is depicted here as a gigantic unified body that expresses xenophobic attitudes towards refugees. It tries to maintain its territory, developing xenophobia and appearing indifferent, cruel, and cold-blooded in the face of the situation the emaciated figure confronts. Therefore, in the cartoon, Europe’s indifferent stance towards refugees is transformed into aggression that receives mythical proportions and, in this context, could be characterized as ‘monstrous.’ The emaciated slender refugee reminds the viewer of how detrimental (monstrous) it will be to refuse to help or even to turn away the people that have suffered mainly after leaving home due to the ‘ugly face’ of war.

IF Europe is an attacking dragon, THEN emaciated refugees are threatened to go back home due to xenophobia.

**Explanation**

Dragons are usually represented as breathing fire, having a reptilian body (and sometimes wings), and being part of Europe’s tradition; they could be associated with Teutonic and Greek mythology. The cartoonist calls this: “The ugly face of xenophobia” in their caption to this cartoon, pointing out the ‘ugly’ picture of Europe exercising anti-refugee policies and discourses. The “GO HOME” slogan seems to be one of the dominant narratives of far-right anti-immigration discourses (cf. Taggart 2004). In addition, it reflects concerns of a domestic self (‘local,’ ‘national,’ or ‘European’), one that is threatened by external others (‘alien,’ ‘foreign,’ ‘unwelcome’) (cf. Makarychev 2018:747).

The cartoonist positions himself against this discourse, labeling it as xenophobic and attempting to show the ‘ugly face of xenophobia’ – as an antithesis of the repelling face of Europe towards a retreating/intimidated person looking for a safe passage to Europe, a refuge. Through this contrast of the powerful/powerless, strong/weak, attacking/retreating binaries, the cartoonist frames the refugee crisis as a European identity crisis that gives rise to xenophobic attitudes and helps raise a counter-narrative by making visible the ugly reality of employing such practices.
5. Discussion

Based on our research data, four dominant framings of the ‘refugee crisis’ have been identified in academic and political discourse: (a) a Syrian refugee crisis; (b) a humanitarian crisis; (c) a European governance crisis; (d) a European identity crisis. Applying CMA that aims precisely to "demonstrate how particular discursive practices reflect socio-political power structures" (Charteris-Black 2004:29), our overall aim was to reveal covert framings of the phenomena studied. The analysis thus served to identify the focal point of the visual or multimodal argument in the political cartoon concerning 'refugee crisis' framings.

In our corpus, cartoonists a) describing, b) explaining, c) foreseeing processes related to aspects of forced migration applied a cause-and-effect or here-and-now perspective in their cartoons. Specifically, they re-framed the migration phenomenon according to the emphasis they put on a) Europe’s role in the Syrian conflict (responsibility, positioning, active/passive role), b) Europe’s policies concerning the reception of refugees in the European territory (game, xenophobia), c) the implications of Europe’s policies for refugees (emaciated figures, drowning in the Mediterranean, part of a game), d) implications of receiving refugees for Europe (weighing down, reviving), and e) refugees’ expectations from Europe (refuge, hope, future).

Despite all cross-cultural variations, immigration as it has been mainly treated in public discourse since the early 20th century, as Castaño Castaño, Laso Martín, and Verdaguer Clavera (2017) reported in their literature review, has been chiefly portrayed through metaphors that dehumanize immigrants (e.g., representations of immigrants as animals, debased persons, weeds or disease, cf. Santa Ana 1999) or that describe them as a threat to host countries (cf., for example, Teo 2000). These notions have also appeared in our data (see Europe as an aging man). In our corpus, refugees appeared as debased tiny people, emaciated figures, or miniature individuals. In huge groups or individually, they have been depicted to be in transition,
moving forwards or backward (cf. Abdel-Raheem 2014 who explores the conceptual metaphor of JOURNEY in moral and political cognition, which is most relevant to this study). This SOURCE-PATH-GOAL (SPG) image-schema as a central concept in human cognition (cf. Johnson 1993:166) underlies the human understanding of physical movement but also of all purposive activity (cf. Forceville and Jeulink 2011:40).

Based on Johnson’s (1987:45-48) experiential (image-schematic) gestalts for the force that plays a central role in the movement, the political cartoons examined in this study draw on the conceptual domain of the Purposive Activity (cf. Forceville and Jeulink 2011:40). In mapping Europe’s attitudes towards refugees, they reconstruct the phenomenon of the ‘refugee crisis’ through the force schemata of ‘compulsion’ (Europe as a war-wheel ‘forcing’ people to move, creating the person-on-the-forced-move, the refugee); ‘attraction’ (Europe as the horizon of refuge ‘attracting’ refugees); ‘diversion’ (Europe as a game field ‘diverting’ refugees’ routes among ‘players’); ‘enablement’ (Europe as an old man ‘enabling’ refugees to reach a safe land while weakening), and ‘counterforce’ or ‘blockage’ (Europe as a mythical monster intimidating refugees to draw back or blocking refugees’ entrance to European land). In this context, our understanding of ‘purposive activity’ is construed as ‘seeking refuge’ through the Source-Path-Goal (SPG) image-schema contextualized in a forced migration context, where the movement is forced, and the traveler is the refugee.

The main qualities of the visual metaphors used to compare ‘Europe’ and ‘refugee’ as actors constructing the migration phenomenon as a ‘refugee crisis’ could be summarized as follows: i. size (e.g., dragon vs. skeleton-thin figure, old man vs. tiny women/men); ii. quantity (e.g., Europe as one entity, a borderless map, a dragon, one older man vs. many refugees); iii. color (e.g., black and white vs. multicolored); and iv. the direction of the viewer’s gaze (e.g., refugee confronting Europe in the skeleton-thin figure-dragon antithesis; following the refugee towards Europe on the EU flag horizon route; Europe and refugees heading towards viewers in the old man metaphor). These qualities allow for identifying the central positioning of the cartoonists with regard to the arguments of their cartoons. These arguments appear to construct the ‘refugee crisis’ in a multimodal discourse through different refugee ‘visibilities’ that construe varying levels of civic agency and responsibility towards refugees, reflecting a broad range of practices of a responsible agent, from monitorial to empathetic to self-reflexive citizenship (cf. Chouliaraki and Stolic 2017).

Castaño Castaño, Laso Martín, and Verdaguer Clavera (2017) observe that when the perspective shifts away from the ‘devastating’ effects of immigration on nations and focuses instead on the immigrants themselves, we see the emergence of the figure of nations as protective hosts. In our case, when turning to refugees, the figure of nations as the protective host appears only as an imaginary perception of the refugee envisioning hope through Europe as a territory of refuge. On the contrary, European
nations become integrated into a monstrous united entity with xenophobic attitudes in a cartographic definition of Europe that reflects an imagined entity of European consciousness (cf. Delanty 2006). They also appear as a cold-blooded war machine responsible for migration, a multi-actor terrain that questions this dominant ‘narrative of coherence’ (cf. Ammaturo 2018), or an already weakened/aging body with limited potential to ensure a better future for refugees (arrow of decline). These representations thus challenge the European governance validity and effectiveness and question the European identity values. Finally, perceiving the political cartoon as both a process and a product of argumentation, this study tried to contribute to the discussion surrounding political metaphors as agents of argumentative meanings that may serve as “persectivization and attention-grabbing devices” (Silaški 2012:216).
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