Syracuse University

SURFACE

Dissertations - ALL

January 2015

Chiraq: One person's metaphor is another's reality

Jacoby Cochran
Syracuse University

Follow this and additional works at: https://surface.syr.edu/etd

Part of the Social and Behavioral Sciences Commons

ABSTRACT

This Master's Thesis explores the deployment and appropriation of the war metaphor as it relates to criminal justice policy in the United States from 1930 forward, paying close attention to the 1980s and 2010s. More specifically, this thesis centers on the city of Chicago to analyze the use of the war metaphor throughout the city's history, from earlier invocations by Mayors to present-day, local appropriations in the form of the metaphor *Chiraq*, which blends Chicago and Iraq as a statement to the conditions of some of Chicago's most resource deprived neighborhoods. Using Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) Conceptual Metaphor Theory I will outline how the war metaphor has been studied in rhetoric and utilized in Presidential, Mayoral, and media discourses in chapter one. In chapter two, I will turn my attention to fragments organized around the metaphorical term *Chiraq* and apply CMT to highlight how the war metaphor has become a central component of daily language in Chicago's most volatile neighborhoods.

Chiraq: One Person's Metaphor is Another's Reality

by

Jacoby R. Cochran

M.A., Syracuse University, 2015

Thesis
Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
Masters of Arts in Communication and Rhetorical Studies

Syracuse University
August 2015

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Setting the Metaphorical Stage

Since the days of the Reagan Administration (1981-1989) and second wave of the *war on drugs,* urban, minority communities in cities across America have been implicated as epicenters of the nation's punitive pursuit to lessen illegal distribution and consumption of narcotics (Larson, 2011; Hartnett, 2000). The Reagan Administration did not simply inherit the war and the over-arching war metaphor but oversaw its vast expansion and transformation into political, media, and social doctrine. To be clear, there is a distinction to be noted between *war metaphor* and *war rhetoric.* War rhetoric is defined as the persuasive techniques officials pursuant of war utilize to convince others in power, as well as citizens of the necessity of engaging in militaristic war, in one of its myriad of forms (Reeves & May 2013; Williamson 2010; Kohrs-Campbell & Jamieson 2008; Dow 1989). On the other hand, war metaphor is defined as the discursive construction of non-warlike situations, such as a countries' political orientation towards a particular subject matter, concept, or item, utilizing the terminology associated with traditional war (Ling 2010; Lakoff 1990; Ivie 1982).

As early as 1982 Reagan had already signed Executive Order 12368, Concerning Federal Drug Abuse Policy Functions. This Executive Order gave the White House unprecedented authority over anti-drug policy resulting in drastic increases in federal funding, international military operations, local community policing, and efforts at *governmentality,* or the dispersion and normalization of dominant ideology across the social nexus (Brown 2006; Foucault 1991). In other words, beginning in 1982, The Reagan Administration executed the contemporary expansion of the war metaphor, both symbolically and materially, from an executive justificatory device to an ideologically entrenched positioning that quickly became the dominant social

vocabulary for anti-drug policy, spreading from government rhetoric into laws and federal institutions, churches, schools, community centers, and beyond (Nadlemann 2014; Garland 2001). While this thesis will highlight various material representations of the war metaphor, I am most concerned as a communications student with its rhetorical and symbolic salience.

During the Executive Order signing ceremony in the Rose Garden the President remarked, "We're taking down the surrender flag that has flown over so many drug efforts; we're running up a battle flag. We can fight the drug problem, and we can win" (Reagan 1982). This redoubled focus on illegal drug prohibition echoed beyond the Executive branch and the war metaphor gained broad acceptance across national, political, and media discourses on both sides of the aisle, before trickling down the channels of government. By 1986, mayors across America, including Chicago's first African American mayor, Harold Washington (1983-1987), were announcing their very own anti-drug-gang-crime "D-Day," a direct, metaphorical allusion to the Allied Forces' invasion of Western Europe during World War II (Remarks and Documents: U.S. Conference of Mayors mid-winter meeting, January 22, 1986, Harold Washington Papers).

In the aftermath of these declarations, the increasingly militarized *war on drugs* and the subsequent tough-on-crime rhetoric has had a great deal of rhetorical and financial capital committed to fighting this war, with estimates well over one trillion dollars (Robinson & Scherlen 2014; Branson 2012; COHA 2011; Hartnett 2010). These material consequences have been well documented as the astronomical rise in prison populations, harsher criminalization and stigmatization of drug users, increase of police aggression tactics, abuse of mandatory and minimum sentencing laws, vague search and seizure laws, and civil forfeiture laws have largely

been predicted on the backs of mostly nonviolent, low level, Black, and Hispanic drug offenders (Blanks 2014; The Sentencing Project 2013; Flock 2012; Larson 2011; Alexander 2010).

This thesis seeks not the quantitatively definable ramifications of this war, but focuses on the symbolic power of war metaphor, especially its present day communal appropriation and embodiment as a mode of identification in harshly affected neighborhoods. To accomplish this, I will establish in the first chapter a contextual foundation of the war metaphor in the United States focusing heavily on the contemporary dispersion of the metaphor beginning in the 1930s. To best understand the scope of the war metaphor, I will move the conversation from a national context to a local one focusing my analysis on the city of Chicago highlighting how uses of the war metaphor have trickled down overtime. I believe widening analysis of the war metaphor beyond governmental rhetoric, into local, communal responses to the war metaphor's deployment is important for the field of metaphor studies.

It is key to situate the city of Chicago in the larger conversation. Chicago holds a special place in my heart as my hometown and this thesis is deeply personal for me. I feel in many ways I witnessed and experienced the social effects of war metaphor, particularly the *war on drugs*, as it for all practical purposes transformed the urban landscape of Chicago. The city I grew up in was driven by the war metaphor throughout the 1990's and beginning in 2000 familiar neighborhoods changed before our very eyes. Neighbors were pushed out. Communities started becoming to expensive to live in. City blocks were demolished and gave way to unfamiliar development and even more unwelcoming residents. Placing these memories inside a broader historical context and productive rhetorical framework in hopes of developing meaningful scholarship is my motivation. Even beyond my personal affinities, Chicago remains an important

case study because of its unique place in the broader discussion of the deployment of war metaphors. In my second chapter, I will analyze a constructed archive of fragmented, local vernacular, organized around the local nickname *Chiraq,* highlighting how the war metaphor is deployed amongst local community members.

Chiraq is a local reference birthed in Chicago's vibrant music and gang culture blending Chicago and Iraq (Bowean 2013). Most agree it was coined by local rapper King Louie in 2009 who began using the term *Chiraq, Drillinois.* The term was popularized throughout the city in 2009 after it was reported that Chicago suffered from more gun murders in 2008, with 513, than the number of troops that had died serving in Iraq that same year (CBS 2013). In his 2013 Mixtape, *The Chiraq Report*, Chicago native *Achillez* raps, "Reporting live from an Englewood war-zone, where children go to die because their homes have been foreclosed" (1:31). Dozens of others have also used the term in their music including local sensations like Chief Keef, Lil Durk, Lil Mouse, and international superstars including Rick Ross, Nicki Minaj, and Kanye West. Since its inception the term has gained national acclaim and scrutiny. Musicians from across the industry have coopted the term while local residents are split on its resonance with many calling for the term to be retired as it represents and celebrates the negativity of the city. When Spike Lee began shooting his film, "Chiraq," in April, 2015 some, including Mayor Rahm Emmanuel, demanded the acclaimed director change the name (Breitman 2015). Others argue it highlights the reality of life in some of Chicago's hardest hit communities, and "proudly declare their city Chiraq, and themselves soldiers or savages" (Vice 2013, 13:21).

Either way accounting for this transition and embodiment has largely been absent in rhetorical theory though scholars have discussed hip hop within the context of black vernacular

practices that use metaphor and parody to redeploy meaning (McCann 2012; Keyes 2002). Beyond the terms social media popularity it is representative of a larger consequence and response to the deployment of war metaphor. Aldermen and Jaspersen (2015) write, "Chicago is a city of conflicting identities depending on one's social and geographic position in its networks of power and resources. Chiraq is not merely an alternative nickname for Chicago or hip-hop styling or personae; rather it marks larger geographies of exclusion, violence, and resistance within the city" (para. 13). For many residents in Chicago, *Chiraq* is more than a metaphor or play on words but a social reality guided by the language of war.

I am certainly not the first to investigate the importance of metaphor and war metaphor studies. As Ivie (1982) writes, "I begin with the premise that metaphor is the base of rhetorical invention. Elaborating a primary image into a well formed argument produces a motive, or interpretation of reality, with which the intended audience is invited to identify" (pg. 166). Additionally, I am not unique in pointing out the predatory lineage of these tropes (Ivie & Giner 2007; Ivie 2004, 1982). Ling (2010) writes, "The domain of war is employed metaphorically for all types of human struggle and conflict. War metaphors have become an indispensable part of the English language over hundreds of years, since more and more war terms like besiege, fight for, win out, attack, battle and fend off are widely used by ordinary people in everyday language" (pg. 3). Specific examples of the deployment war metaphor such as the *war on drugs*, *war on cancer*, *war on crime* represent synecdoche terms for larger domestic and global campaigns. Like more "traditional" wars and war rhetoric that are accompanied by borders, designated oppositions, and somewhat strategic reasoning, this perpetual, metaphorical war continues to

expand as a discursive formation with very material and ongoing manifestations (Kohrs-Campbell & Jamieson 1990; Steinert 2003).

In their edited volume, *Metaphorical World Politics*, Francis A. Beer and Christ'l De Landtsheer (2004) write, "the power of metaphor is the power to understand and impose political order. Metaphors reflect, interpret, and construct politics" (pg. 30). The highly popularized and controversial *war on terror*—a metaphorical banner which has sanctioned decades-long combat missions in two countries and covert operations in dozens of others—demonstrates the distinguishing lines between metaphor and reality have for all practical purposes been rendered irrelevant (Rothkopf 2014). My concern with these rhetorical tropes is that war metaphors and the corresponding political vocabulary—Drug Czars, Guerrilla Policing, Enemies of the State, Battle flags—ignore the significance of lost lives and failed policies, contributing to a negligent apathy amongst the American public and a desensitization towards the war metaphor (Gordon 2008). It is this apathy and gap in knowledge that provides the launching pad for this project.

Metaphorical studies have long been a subsection of our discipline dating back to Aristotle's *Poetics* where he explores its artistic and literary importance. During the eighteenth century, as philosophy was subordinating metaphor to Cartesian logics, Giambattista Vico, an Italian humanist, set out to understand metaphor as the lens through which interpretation is possible (Foss & Trapp 2014). His work would be revitalized and modernized in Ernesto Grassi's 20th century texts. In his beautiful ode to metaphor studies, *The Primordial Metaphor,* Grassi (1990) argued metaphor and its basic functions highlight the inadequacies of traditional scientific thought and suggested a shift in paradigm towards the imagined. "Metaphor, then, is for Grassi the foundation of the perception of existence, the way in which humans actually work and

6

become 'humanized,' using their ingeniousness to found social and political institutions and to convey (inferentially through poetry and the arts) human meaning" (Fierz 1994; pg. 107).

A rhetorical methodology to investigate the work of metaphor wasn't offered until Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) germinal work, *Metaphors We Live By*. As they write, "Primarily on the basis of linguistic evidence, we have found that most of our ordinary conceptual system is metaphorical in nature" (pg. 4). Conceptual metaphor theory outlines the importance metaphor plays in the construction of social realities arguing metaphor is the basic foundation of language. Conceptual metaphor means that conceptual domain (A) is conceptual domain (B) (Kövecses 2002; Lakoff & Johnson 1980). The two domains in conceptual metaphor are called source domain and target domain. Source domain refers to the conceptual domain used to help understand another conceptual domain. Target domain refers to the conceptual domain which we try to understand via source domain (Kövecses 2002). Lakoff and Johnson's very first conceptual example explored the metaphor, "Argument is War" (pg. 4). In this statement WAR is the source domain and ARGUMENT is the target domain. From here they construct a conceptual map that illustrates how the war metaphor provides the basic terminology for the foundation and performance of Western argumentation. For example:

ARGUMENT is WAR

Your claims are *indefensible.*

He *attacked* every weak point in my argument.

His criticisms were right on *target.*

I *demolished* his argument.

I've never *won* an argument with him.

You disagree? Okay, *shoot!*

If you use that *strategy,* he'll *wipe you out.*

He *shot down* all of my arguments (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980; pg. 4).

To ground this thesis my analysis utilizes *Conceptual Metaphor Theory* to identify how the war metaphor, specifically the *war on drugs,* operates as a conventional metaphor across the two chapters. A conventional metaphor is a metaphor that is deeply entrenched in everyday use by ordinary people for everyday purposes (Kövecses 2002). For example, in the metaphor *war on drugs,* WAR is the source domain and DRUGS or DRUG POLICY is the target domain. Conceptual metaphor theory recognizes metaphor in language as serving both a symbolic and material function as it operates as a synecdoche in political discourses representative of a larger social vocabulary and thus social policy. In chapter one, I will use CMT to map how the *war on drugs* operates as a conventional metaphor in governmental deployment. In chapter two, I will use CMT to analyze the daily use of war metaphor amongst local populations via collected fragments.

With argumentation and dialect at the center of Western pedagogy the war metaphor is built directly into Western language and thought, which Derrida (1987) argued is organized around binary opposition that generalizes between benevolence and malevolence, order and chaos, truth and falsity, and "one of the two terms governs the other" (pg. 41). This "governing" takes many shapes. In argumentation knowledge and communication attempt to govern or, for the sake of metaphor, wage war on ignorance and confusion. When criminal justice policy is described as war then similarly the state is positioned as a benevolent force exercising necessary means to govern malevolent forces, or gangs, terrorists, drug producers, sellers, consumers, etc.

The metaphor does more than describe situations but constructs them. It could be argued that if metaphor is the basic foundation of Western language, and metaphor is constitutively ideological, than language is also ideological. In other words, Western language is structured with war as an inherent function. As Lakoff and Johnson (1980) posit, "Metaphors may create realities for us, especially social realities. A metaphor may thus be a guide for future action. Such actions will, of course, fit the metaphor. This will, in turn, reinforce the power of the metaphor to make experience coherent. In this sense metaphors can be self-fulfilling prophecies" (pg. 156).

Scholars across fields of rhetoric, cognitive science, and linguistics built off of these early theories establishing metaphor as more than a mere tool of language and poetics, but a necessary element of social life (Feldman 2006; Fauconnier & Turner 2002; Kövecses 2002; Goatly 1997; Pinker 2007). This research into the prevalence of metaphors naturally sparked scholarship into particular social metaphors, arguably none more important than the war metaphor (Lakoff 1990; Bacharach 2006; Lewis & Reese 2009). Though war as metaphor is a common feature of language the political *activation* and strategic use of the war metaphor as a rhetorical and material banner represents a much more complex deployment.

War, as a physical, violent act, represents a social and political device rooted in national and ideological protection, expansion, nationalism, confronting socially constructed others, amongst other reasons (Engels & Sass 2013). As an offshoot, war metaphor, specifically in criminal justice policy, operates in the exact fashion, constructing others and individuating communities, and thus rhetorically and ideologically shapes policies, characterizes populations, conceals human injustices, and performs public opinion management (Williamson 2010; Anderson 2009; Ivie 2007; Simon 2007). As Anderson (2009) writes, "The contemporary

9

strategies of the *war on drugs* and the subsequent *war on terror*, both waged by the US government simultaneously on and with its citizens, represent biopolitical campaigns that rely on and employ the tactics of governmentality to simultaneously fulfill particular policy aims while reinforcing and legitimizing the existence of the nation-state" (pg. 3). In other words, the war metaphor simultaneously creates and responds to a threat as defined by the state, allowing the state to impose restrictions on the bodies of citizens (Foucault 1975; Butler 2006). The bulk of scholarship on war metaphors has focused on this biopolitical essence and how the war metaphor is deployed, often in Presidential address to justify public policy and shame rhetorical others (Bacharach 2006; Ivie 2008, 2005, 1982; Lakoff 1990; Cherwitz & Zagacki 1986). Yet, for all the complexities of war, the underlying rhetoric, just like the metaphor, relies on a very simple premise of heroes and villains, good versus evil, civilized versus uncivilized. This simplicity when coupled with the ambiguity of metaphor amplifies the hazardous nature of the metaphor. However, I am less interested in how presidents and mayors rhetorically invent situations, or simply how "intended" audiences interpret the metaphor but how implicated communities take up the rhetoric and audiences ultimately embody and appropriate the metaphor as their own. It was Lakoff (1990) who so bluntly wrote, "Metaphors can kill" (para. 1). The war metaphor, and its focus on establishing ideology and demarcating communities, can be argued to serve not only a biopolitical but a *necropolitical* function, granting the state "the power and the capacity to dictate who may live and who must die" (Mbembe 2003; pg. 11).

Throughout this thesis I will also be utilizing the work of Achille Mbembe to read the war metaphor as a racially charged political trope. In other words, the war on drugs—and now terror — inherently implicates racial, ethnic, and religious minorities. Specifically, I am interested in

Mbembe's work on *Necropolitics* (2003). Necropolitics is concerned with "the contemporary ways in which the political, under the guise of war, of resistance, or of the fight against terror, makes the murder of the enemy its primary and absolute objective" (Mbembe 2013; pg. 12). Simply put, the deployment of the war metaphor in public address as with Mayor Harold Washington's "D-Day" campaign or President Reagan's "battle flag" statement, or by criminal justice officials not only highlight the state's (Federal government/City of Chicago) ability to shape morality and dictate social relationships via regulation and rhetoric, but to also designate who is and isn't worthy of an equitable life.

In line with influential critical race theorists (Alexander 2010; Crenshaw 1988; Delgado & Stefancic 2001), Mbembe articulates, "I have put forward the notion of necropolitics and necropower to account for the various ways in which, in our contemporary world, weapons are deployed in the interest of maximum destruction of persons and the creation of death-worlds, new and unique forms of social existence in which vast populations are subjected to conditions of life conferring upon them the status of living dead" (pg. 40). With that being said, I believe Mbembe's analysis is not only helpful in recognizing the prejudice in governmental rhetoric, but also in describing the adoption of the war metaphor amongst local communities, through a tool I am calling *necropolitical skepticism*. During my chapter two analysis I will focus on how the war metaphor is deployed when discussing the communal and personal relationship to social institutions and narrative formations with an emphasis on *necropolitical skepticism,* or a narrative paradigm that implies political action (war metaphor) works to reinforce hegemonic structures and perpetuate inequality on the basis of race, class, sexuality, and so forth

As Lakoff (1990) writes, "Metaphorical thought, in itself, is neither good nor bad; it is simply commonplace and inescapable" (pg. 2) However, when the war metaphor is strategically and ideologically deployed it works dangerously off of the binary of "good and evil" and naturally implicates hegemonic structures which segregate on the basis of a vague and arbitrary binary opposition. This deployment has rhetorical and material consequences beyond political policy decisions. Simply put, in the language of conceptual metaphor theory, the conventional metaphor LIFE is a JOURNEY has been transformed in Chicago's inner city. In *Chiraq,* LIFE is WAR.

Chapter One: Understanding the War Metaphor

While the contemporary (1930-2015) manifestations of war metaphors have been heavily scrutinized in the last decade for their economic inefficiencies and consequential exacerbations, the metaphor has risen to a place of omnipotence within our national political lexicon because to be viewed as soft on crime, and now soft on terrorism, is for lack of better terms political suicide (Schneider 2015; Cockburn 2014; Mallea 2014; Gerber & Jensen 2013). War is the language of criminal justice, and in effect has influenced public policy, become prevalent across public address, and shaped electorate politics (Simon 2007; Dubber 2004). And, as this thesis argues, the language of war has become increasingly popularized and appropriated in communities like Chicago, making a reprisal and retraction of the war metaphor increasingly difficult, if not wholly impossible. This immense value and rhetorical significance only further substantiates and makes urgent continued focus on the constitutive power of contemporary invocations of the war metaphor.

Though my thesis began with the redeployment of the war metaphor under President Reagan's second wave of drug war rhetoric it is crucial to understand that the contemporary use of the war metaphor in US federal and local discourse, precedes this particular deployment. While the legacy of opium and alcohol prohibition run even further back in the United States, the socio-political popularization of the war metaphor in criminal justice rhetoric largely took place beginning in 1930 and continues today. Long before Nixon's creation of the drug *mythos* and battle against sixties radicals and rock and roll, J. Edgar Hoover and Attorney General Homer Cummings were waging their very own literal and discursive *war on crime,* during the thirties which greatly empowered the Federal Bureau of Investigations and represented a fundamental

shift in governance tactics in this country (Beckett & Herbert 2008; Simon 2007). The *war on crime* returned as a central component of President Lyndon B Johnson's (1963-1969) presidency. In 1965, the same year Johnson signed the Voting Rights Act, he explained, "I hope that 1965 will be regarded as the year when this country began in earnest a thorough, intelligent, and effective war against crime" (as cited in Condon 2015, para. 2). According to Elizabeth Hinton (2015) it was under Johnson that the federal government began transferring military grade equipment to local law enforcement and increased the mass surveillance capabilities of federal organizations.

During his 1970 State of the Union Address, President Richard Nixon (1969-1974) explained "we have heard a great deal of overblown rhetoric during the 60s in which the word 'war' has perhaps too often been used, the war on poverty, the war on misery, the war on disease, the war on hunger, but if there is one area the word war is appropriate it is in the fight against crime" (as cited in Lenz 2005, pg. 118). Then in 1971 he launched an "all-out offensive" and named drugs "public enemy number one" before declaring ""this Administration has declared all-out, global war on the drug menace," in 1972 (as cited in Friedersdorf 2011, para. 2). This was followed by a substantial increase in the size and presence of federal drug control agencies including the Drug Enforcement Administration (formerly known as the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs), and pushing through measures such as the RICO Act, asset forfeiture, and no-knock warrants (Sonnenreich & Ebner 2012; Koppel 2011). Reagan's push to expand the drug war during the 1980s came on the heels of President Nixon's initial "drug war" crusade and only expanded the metaphor even further taking great advantage of ever growing media technologies. Alongside Nancy Reagan, the president made it a political bullet point to get anti-drug rhetoric in

every household, school, and social institution in America. Together these initiatives from Democrats and Republicans alike substantiated the war metaphor as the primary source domain for articulating criminal justice policy in the United States. The war metaphor was and is implemented as it works especially well to justify increasing government authority and shaming oppositions whether that be those implicated directly (criminals, drug users, terrorists, etc.) or those opposed to the punitive approach (Ivie 2004, 2007). The metaphor has become salient in all aspects of criminal justice rhetoric, especially when that rhetoric is coming from the very top, and to understand this conceptually let's look at the mapping:

ANTI-CRIME POLICY IS WAR

Public *enemy* number one in the United States is drug abuse

We must wage a new all-out *offensive*

The Administration is launching a *global war* against drugs

We can *fight* the drug problem, and we can *win*

Criminal forces were considered *vermin* in human form by the FBI

Drugs are a *menace* to our society

We need you to be unyielding and inflexible in your *opposition* to drugs

Losses *inflicted* upon the Nation by crime must be arrested (Condon 2015, Friedersdorf 2011, Lenz 2005).

Together these examples highlight instances where the war metaphor is foundational to criminal justice rhetoric both justifying government force and shaming *criminal forces*. As mentioned earlier this most certainly has material ramifications. The mass deployment of the war metaphor in 20th and 21st century America has consistently been accompanied by increases in

state authority and punitive measures (Simon 2007). The wars on crime, communism, terrorism, and drugs have all coincided with actual military conflicts including World War II, the Vietnam War, and the recent wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. The conflation of military language, metaphor, and physical conflict has strengthened the ethos of the war metaphor, normalized an increasingly militarized society, and resulted in perpetual deployment, physically and metaphorically speaking (McCann 2012; Hartnett 2008).

Not all usages of the metaphor have been as explicitly connected to expansions in militaristic capabilities. In 1933 as the country dealt with the Great Depression, President Franklin Roosevelt announced in his inaugural address "I shall ask the Congress for the one remaining instrument to meet the crisis—broad Executive power to wage a war against the emergency, as great as the power that would be given to me if we were in fact invaded by a foreign foe" (as cited in Rosenman 1933, para. 23). Lyndon B. Johnson's *war on poverty* and Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 led to the largest expansion of the American welfare system since FDR. Nixon was really keen on the metaphor during his tenure and also coined the *war on cancer,* passing the National Cancer Act of 1971 spurring over 100 billion dollar in cancer research funding over the last forty years (Desilver 2014; Davis 2007; Proctor 1996).

With that being said, all have been questioned in recent years for their true impact on the public. Underhill (2013) theorized that Roosevelt's depression era war discourse, which made great use of radio to normalize the war metaphor, emblazoned Director Hoover and provided the basis of the war metaphor's expansion in criminal justice policy. Stricker (2009) argues that Johnson's war on poverty shifted towards a war on the impoverished during the rise of conservatism in the early 70s and 80s. Ultimately the campaign to decrease poverty has become

more about making the aesthetics of poverty less visible as with anti-homelessness laws. Wadley (2014) argues the war on cancer has hazardously altered the language of treatment. Take for example this CMT mapping of a few phrases representative of the *war on cancer's* primary lexicon.

EX: CANCER TREATMENT IS WAR

The patient's body is under *attack*

The patient's body is a *battlefield*

Cancer treatment is seen as *ammunition*

Cancer is an *enemy* pathogen

You can *beat* cancer and don't *quit*! (Wadley 2014)

Wadley furthers, as the language has changed so has the focus with far more attention placed on eliminating the "enemy" than environmental factors and alternative preventive measures, effectively obscuring the hardships individuals face as the primary treatment for cancer, chemotherapy, often leaves patient's financially depleted and physically immobilized "as their bodies are treated as battle fields" (2014, pg. 209). In other words when the source domain is WAR and the target domain is CANCER, the language of solvency becomes coded in war metaphors which hazardously simplifies the situation and limits the way methods are theorized. As more pervasive and risky treatments are justified as necessary in the fight against the enemy, the language of winning and losing that is often deployed in relationship to cancer could be argued to have a shaming component as dying or choosing against certain treatments may be equated with quitting. Nevertheless, my point is that in most cases the strong use of the war metaphor by officials can have an immediate impact, galvanizing and expanding US

governmental capabilities, and also a damning effect limiting the very rhetorical scope of a given situation.

Why Now?

While the war metaphor remains a viable political trope both locally and nationally, this thesis arrives during the first presidency to distance itself from the war metaphor, while in office, since President Jimmy Carter (1977-1981) (Flock 2012). On May 13, 2009, the head of the White House Office of National Drug Control Policy, Gil Kerlikowske, stated," Regardless of how you try to explain to people it's a 'war on drugs' or a 'war on a product,' people see a war as a war on them. We're not at war with people in this country" (as cited in Fields 2009, para. 3). This admission not only represented the Obama Administration's belief in shifting drug policy away from primarily punitive measures (Lemaitre 2011), but also the first executive quasi-challenge of the American drug war from a rhetorical perspective. While Kerlikowske's statement continues the dangerous work of implicating those on the subordinate end of the war metaphor by effectively shifting blame for the failures of this rhetorical trope from the users (government officials and media pundits) to the receivers (citizens), the administration's acknowledgment of the discursive pitfalls of the war metaphor opens the door for a strengthened rhetorical inquiry and criticism.

Even still, President Obama has held strong to his denunciation of the war metaphor. In May 2013 the president declared, "The Global war on terror is over," arguing the misguided and "boundless" rhetoric had created an unmanageable and ineffective military campaign (as cited in Shinkman 2013, para 4). Then in April 2015 during a state visit to Kingston, Jamaica, President Obama reiterated his belief in a rhetorical shift in regards to drug policy stating, "I am a very

18

strong believer that the path we have taken in the United States in the so-called war on drugs has been so heavy in emphasizing incarceration that it has been counterproductive" (as cited in Wolfgang 2015, para 3). Besides a few headlines, this shift in positioning has had no grand impact on the dominant media-political vocabulary. This lack of impact highlights the vitality of the war metaphor and its deep sociopolitical history. This moment despite its dismal reception represents an important opportunity to reinvestigate the evolution of the war metaphor, from rhetorical trope to state of identification. A metaphor that gained steam in the executive branch, and filtered nationally throughout local political discourses, now sustains whether or not the Administration supports it.

To better account for the local genealogy and pervasiveness of the war metaphor in US political discourse I return to Chicago where the war metaphor is central to the history of criminal justice tactics in the city. Lakoff and Johnson (1980) argued metaphor produces "self-fulfilling prophecies," or in the case of the war metaphor, produces the very situation it describes (pg. 156). In Chicago the war metaphor has been a mainstay in political discourse since the 1930s, and recently it has reemerged in local communities. The self-fulfilling prophecy has been realized in a new metaphor, *Chiraq*.

Why Chicago?

The city of Chicago has always been central to the deployment of war metaphor in criminal justice policy, but remains absent in many key theorizations of war metaphor in rhetorical studies. The creation of the Federal Bureau of Investigations in the early 1900's, and the expansion of its authority under Director J. Edgar Hoover's "*war on crime*" during the 1930's was largely in part due to the sophisticated criminal organizations that called Chicago

home including the likes of Al Capone, Johnny Dillinger, and Tony Accardo, three of the most notorious crime syndicates in American history (Hoffman 1993; Burrough 2004). In fact, Hoover coopted the term "public enemy number one" from the Chicago Crime Commission which established the first public enemies list (America's Most Wanted) in 1930 with Chicago gangster Al Capone at the very top (Chicago Crime Commission 2013).

During this same time hundreds of thousands of African Americans migrated from the south to Chicago during the "Great Migration" (Grossman 1989). Slavery, the failures of Reconstruction, and Jim Crow laws of the time had already subjugated Blacks to the status of subordination and thus unfit for equality. Greeted by violence and racial tensions —resulting in major riots: 1919, 1946, 1968— the African Americans living in Chicago became highly segregated to the South Side and tolerance took the form of inadequate housing, education, protection, and economic prospects (Grossman 1989; Lemann 1991).

As white immigrant populations began integrating across the city, and white ethnic gangs began fading in the 1950s, measures of segregation within Chicago increased (UIC Chicago Gang History Project 2001). Due to such poor opportunities for mobility local organizations including the Black Power Movement, Blackstone Rangers, Vicelords, and other street "gangs," were created in Chicago during the 1950s and 60s to resist prejudice and governmental negligence. These organizations, in attempts to persevere through what they perceived to be insurmountable barriers, carved out both legal and illegal ways to generate economic and social prosperity for their downtrodden neighborhoods. While illegal narcotics became a staple for many of these organizations' ascension (resulting in increased violence and "territorial disputes") John Fry (1973) argued Mayor Richard J. Daley (1955-1976) "waged war on young blacks and

gangs" not because "they shot at each other, or because some of them had committed murders, but due to the growing political and business sophistication of young black gangs and rising influence of the Black Panther Party in the city" (pg. 1). In December 1969 the Daley administration gave the go ahead on a "night raid" of an apartment belonging to twenty-one-year-old Chicago Black Panther state chairman Fred Hampton. The raid, which Jeffery Hass has labeled a coordinated "assassination" carried out by the FBI, the Cook County State's Attorney's Office and the Chicago, resulted in the death of Black Panther leader Fred Hampton and Mark Clark (2009, para 6). Hass argued these murders were "a pivotal event in the suppression of militant black resistance and the emergence of today's U.S. police/prison state" (2009, para 1). Daley's 1969 *war on gangs,* which directly coincided with Nixon's national deployment of the war metaphor, drastically increased criminal justice efforts in primarily black neighborhoods across Chicago, and counterproductively spurred the growth and fractioning of street gangs citywide. While "Daley's war" shifted criminal policy efforts in Chicago it was nothing compared to the *war on drugs* which was brewing in executive rhetoric and on the verge of spreading globally and locally just a decade later.

On August 14, 1986, just eight weeks before President Ronald Reagan signed a 1.7 billion dollar bill for anti-drug legislation funneling federal dollars into regional and state institutions (and introducing mandatory minimum sentencing), Chicago's Mayor Harold Washington began his very own anti-drug campaign in his city. In Chicago the "offensive effort" was coined "Washington's War" after the mayor announced to a group of business leaders, law enforcement agencies, community groups, and media members his intention to make Chicago "America`s first drug-free city" by "waging war on the epidemic of drug sales and use" (as cited

in Strong 1986, para. 3). His Press Secretary at the time Alton Miller suggested in a later published memoir that Washington was a deeply, traditional patriotic man and as a World War II vet took the language of war very seriously (Miller 1989).

Following President Reagan's official signing of the bill in October 1986, Mayor Washington doubled down on the war metaphor in coalition with local governments across the country. The US Conference of Mayors declared that over 350 cities across America were officially backing and using the war metaphor, and becoming an "ally" with the federal government, launching "D-Day" on November 18, 1986 (Remarks and Documents: U.S. Conference of Mayors mid-winter meeting, January 22, 1986, Harold Washington Papers). I believe this national campaign was one of the most significant factors in the social normalization of the war metaphor across local governments and media vernacular as it promoted and maximized community-based enactments of the metaphor.

The *Chicago Tribune's* Jack Houston (1986) reported Washington emphasized heavily that this effort was a city wide campaign supported by students, media members, community and political officials. During a breakfast meeting on November 6, which was scheduled as "D-Day In War on Drugs," Washington explained, "The war on drugs has begun… We must wage it with relentless vigor and determination, with our goals being the elimination of this scourge from our society and the salvation of our people from its grip" (as cited in Houston 1986, para. 5). At first glance Chicago's campaign seemed like a drop in the metaphorical bucket to me, yet, the significance of Chicago's campaign is measured by both the city's historical connection and its ongoing relationship to the war metaphor which chapter two analyzes. Mayor Washington was a strong proponent and leading voice in the development of the D-Day campaign, and as the Chair

of the Task Force on Youth Gangs and Youth Crime Prevention at the January, 1986 U.S Conference of Mayors mid-winter meeting in Washington D.C. Even after the official D-Day campaign took place nationwide Mayor Washington remained vigilant. Three months after President Reagan's bill signing, the mayor drafted a resolution along with the mayors of Boston and New York, calling on Congress to increase funding to major cities for anti-drug efforts and authorize military action in stifling the flow of narcotics form outside the United States. In the resolution they wrote,

> Drug abuse has become the scourge of our society, escalating the crime rates of our cities and threatening future generations; Whereas, mayors have long recognized the serious negative consequences that drug abuse and drug trafficking are having on The health and safety of our cities and of our citizens; and whereas with the passage of the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1986 the federal government became our ally in the war on drugs… Be it further resolved that the U.S. Conference of Mayors calls upon Congress to enact legislation authorizing military interdiction of narcotics outside the land area of the United States (U.S. Conference of Mayors Resolution No. 35, Mayoral Records, January 22, 1987, Harold Washington Papers).

The intertwining of militarized metaphors and reality had trickled down from the executive branch to local mayors. Below are a few basic breakdowns from the above excerpt.

DRUG POLICY is WAR

Drug abuse is the *scourge* of our society

Government is our *ally*

Cities and citizens are being *threatened*

While the resolution is a material intervention the war metaphor's symbolic salience guides not only the Mayors' explicit language but their conceptualization of the issue at hand.

I actually visited the Harold Washington Archive and Special Collections at the Harold Washington Library Center in downtown Chicago due to my curiosity surrounding the "D-Day" Campaign. I visited the archive most recently on March 14, 2015. The choice to examine the archive of the D-Day campaign which includes photos, conference reports, talking points, and fact sheets rather than simply Washington's political addresses came about organically as I researched Chicago's place in the broader relationship towards the war metaphor. Honestly, I never expected to find the war metaphor in the discourse of Harold Washington. So when I did find the strong presence of the war metaphor I dug deeper.

I spoke with a Harold Washington Library archivist in the weeks preceding my visit about the range of materials in the collection. However, in my discussions the archivists were unable to guarantee that the *war on drugs* had any "significant artifacts" amongst the larger and more popular categorizations, two of them being other invocations of the war metaphor. Harold Washington's first term in office was defined heavily by the polarizing *"Council Wars"* and *"Press War,"* characterized by a City Council that voted against every single one of his proposals and appointments forcing him to lead Chicago from 1983 to 1986 via veto; and a deep tension between the Mayor's office and the mainstream media, which he believed was unable to adequately respond to the concerns of minorities in the city because "the people in the media don't represent across the board the makeup of the city" (Dimensions 1985, 1:22). According to my research, the D-Day campaign was able to bridge these divides uniting people across Chicago because for all practical purposes it is easy to rally people against an inanimate object like drugs (Newman 2013). Unlike the two earlier popularizations of the war metaphor during

Washington's tenure, the D-Day campaign was a citywide coalitional effort, with Washington metaphorically and physically leading the charge (Strong 1986).

Before becoming Chicago's first African-American mayor, the Chicago native was a state and national politician for three decades, serving in Illinois United States House of Representatives from 1980 through 1983. As a boy in Chicago, I grew up watching and studying the public address of Harold Washington. My father told stories of his charisma, and my mother hoped I would be "as eloquent as Harold, because I was already as verbose." If you spend just a day exploring his archive, or reading his book of speeches, you will quickly learn how historically significant a figure Washington was as he greatly advocated for racial and gender equality, built Chicago's strongest community coalitions to date, and enjoyed and believed in the political process (Miller 1988). In her forward, Coretta Scott King (1988) wrote, "Like Dr. King, Mayor Harold Washington knew that all those who work for change dace an uphill struggle. And like Dr. King, Mayor Harold Washington stood at the center of a movement committed to reach for the heights. He was a fine talker, but more to the point, he was a doer" (pg. viii). He worked his entire career to improve Chicago's education system, public housing infrastructures, and deracialize politics. My goal is in no way to denigrate the late Mayor Washington. It is exactly his influential and progressive impact along with my deep respect which made his archive so fascinating because of what it revealed about the war metaphor. In excavating his mayoral archive I located fragments of the "D-Day" campaign, which hint at a discursive legacy that preceded Mayor Washington and has only grown more dangerous in the thirty years since. It quickly became clear to me as I poured over the archive materials that the war metaphor was more than a public address trope but an explicitly sanctioned and strategically organized term

that was utilized in everything from Washington's official government memos to his travel schedule.

In Washington's official schedule from 1986, the November campaign was officially titled "Mayor's D-Day on the War on Drugs" (Schedules and Evaluations, 1983-1987, November 18, 1986, Harold Washington Papers). This ownership suggests the significance placed on the war metaphor was deeply strategic for Washington. Moreover, this ownership was meant to distance Mayor Washington from the federal government and President Reagan, whom the Mayor was deeply at odds, while simultaneously co-opting the metaphor as his own. Washington was an on-the-record opponent of the Reagan regime during the 1980s and rise of conservatism. The archivist laughed almost uncontrollably as he recalled Washington's many scathing annotations alongside the text of President Reagan's (and his cabinet members') speeches. Nevertheless, the metaphor popularized and guided by the President was now coming out of the mouth of one of his most vocal critics. In a fact sheet labeled "Mayor Washington's War On Drugs" which circulated during and after Chicago's D-Day, Mayor Washington emphasized that his earlier announcement on August 14, 1986 had come weeks before the President (Updated Fact Sheet: Susan Weed to Anti-Drug Committee Members, January 8, 1987, Harold Washington Papers).

Let me be clear, I do not argue the Reagan administration had exclusive ownership of the metaphor. Instead he controlled the direction of the metaphor as it related to law enforcement efforts, especially during the 1980s. The same can be said of Presidents Wilson and Roosevelt (via Hoover), Johnson, Nixon, and Bush with the *war on terror* metaphor at the turn of the century. The Executive Branch may not be directly responsible for the spread of the war

metaphor in local communities but it does play a large role in dictating the trajectory of nationalistic rhetoric (Ivie 2002; Dow 1989).

Following Mayor Washington's sudden death in 1987 a special mayoral election took place in 1989, and saw the election of Richard M. Daley (1989-2011), who would go on to be Mayor for over two decades. The City grew tense in the years following Washington's passing. As coalitions began to fall apart and violent crime began to climb back up, Mayor Daley Chicago's most vigilant war on drugs and gangs (Chicago Now 2011). In 1992, just ten years after President Reagan drastically expanded the reach of federal anti-drug organizations Daley created an integrated anti-drug and gang task force, "Change: Chicago Housing Authority Neighborhood Gang Enforcement Task Force" which saw the Drug Enforcement Agency officially set up shop in Chicago as part of the task force. During the City Hall announcement Daley proclaimed, "We are putting the gang-bangers and drug dealers on notice. For too long you have made the community a target. Now you`re the target" (as cited in Kass 1992, para. 4). His language is almost identical to President Reagan's 1982 proclamation. His actions would resemble those of not only the former President, but his late father Richard J. Daley. For the next 20 years, Chicago's anti-drug initiative grew in militancy and scope. With the help of the DEA Chicago's war on drugs and gangs saw the unprecedented arrest of major high level gang leaders and a drastic increase in neighborhood surveillance and policing (CBS 2013).

While Harold Washington was not directly involved in growing this militarized task force the tolerance he had built towards the war metaphor, through justifying its use and shaming opposers, allowed Mayor Daley to initiate criminal justice efforts with near impunity. Over the next twenty years Daley's urban community policies were always first considered through the

lens of criminal justice which resulted in Daley taking drastic measures including eradicating Chicago's low income housing projects, integrating federal agencies into local police forces, and overseeing the largest privatization of public services in Chicago's history. (Chicago Now 2011). Even after Daley retired the war metaphor did not lose its politically discursive lust and continues to normalize across the city as it remains a staple of local political and media doctrine. In 2012, newly elected mayor, Rahm Emmanuel followed in the footsteps of his predecessors announcing, "The gangbangers and the gang members and the gangs do not own this city—we do!" (as cited in Dumke 2012, para. 7). Along with the police superintendent the mayor promised an all-out "ground war on gangs and drug markets" (para. 5).

Unfortunately, for Chicago's south and west side neighborhoods largely affected by the rising tide of urban policing and the growing number of gang members due to the decreased structure, the war metaphor has become less a tool of justificatory rhetoric and a tool of identification and meaning making. Thirty years since the second wave of the *war on drugs* began and remnants of the nation's war on drugs, crime, and now terror, litter the streets of Chicago's most dismal minority communities. However, the metaphor's viability is no longer driven solely by mayoral discourse (which launched a citywide rhetorical campaign), or even presidential rhetoric as we have discussed. The war metaphor has thrived as a political trope and in a sense activated or instigated the popularization of the war metaphor as a means of community identification, a claim I will flesh-out in my second chapter.

Chapter Two Preview: Chiraq and the Appropriation of the War Metaphor

The war metaphor remains the dominant frame of reference for not only drug policing in Chicago, but also the daily experiences for many young people growing up in the most ravished neighborhoods who have renamed their city *Chiraq*. The war metaphor has characterized the anti-drug and crime coalition as a benevolent collective simultaneously creating a malevolent other (Ivie 2005). *Chiraq* represents this 'other' as it is both the appropriation of the state sanctioned war metaphor and an embodiment. This epithet, *Chiraq,* is more than a clever, playful, or distasteful metaphor, depending upon your vantage point. An Anti-Chiraq movement has also began in the city, though it has gained much less media attention (Samuels 2014). Nevertheless this name is simultaneously an appropriation and embodiment of what McCann (2012) calls the *mark of criminality*. McCann defines the *mark of criminality* as "a regime of discourses associated with race and crime during the second half of the twentieth century… an intricate web of cultural discourses that teach citizens to fear their criminalized neighbors rather than see them as potential allies for building stronger communities" (pg. 369). In this thesis the war metaphor belongs to this "regime of discourses" within urban communities and has become a part of the modern day scarlet letter marking minority populations as the opposition in a criminal justice war.

Scores of individuals, particularly the youth, and the approximate 1150,000 gang members (Chicago is the nation's leading city for gang populations) in the city whom participate in criminalized activity have embraced Chicago as a war-zone (CBS 2012). During a September 2012 CBS interview, reporter Walter Jacobson held a roundtable with local gang members in the Chicago neighborhood of Englewood, arguably Chicago's most dangerous community. Jacobson,

who mispronounced Englewood, "Anglewood," asked, "How many times have I walked these blocks that are always the same? They don't change. Bad things just won't go away poverty, sticks, and stains" (CBS 2012, 0:47). Time and time again participants explained survival was their only concern living in neighborhoods where there only options were to, "Rob, steal, and kill" (CBS 2012, 1:13). In the decades since the nation and citywide popularization of the war metaphor, community members have been born into, adopted, and redeployed the war metaphor with some stating "killing is the solution," "we are at war with the police," "[in ten years] I just hope I'm still living" (CBS 2012, 0:26).

As poet John Fountain (2014) writes, "It [*Chiraq*] insinuates war. Conjures images of ravaged villages. Of devastation. And a mounting toll of human carnage and decimation that leaves the stench of death billowing, like white smoke, toward the heavens. A portrait of casualties, abomination and abnormality" (para. 10). This chapter explores an archive constructed from the discourses of the margin in Chicago arguing this process of embodiment and naming serves similar functions as its governmental counterpart, to shame and justify. Yet while the government deploys the war metaphor to shame individuals ideologically (and physically) opposed and justify disproportionately punitive practices, *Chiraq* redirects this shaming back at government institutions and justifies the *warring* mentality with a narrative tint I am calling *necropolitical skepticism*. During my analysis I will focus on how the war metaphor is deployed when discussing the communal and personal relationship to social institutions and narrative formations with an emphasis on *necropolitical skepticism,* or a narrative paradigm that implies political action (war metaphor) works to reinforce hegemonic structures and perpetuate inequality on the basis of race, class, sexuality, and so forth.

To substantiate these claims and investigate the term *Chiraq* as a significant rhetorical artifact, chapter two will explore two documentaries. These documentaries are HBO Vice's "Chiraq," and Director Will Robson-Scott's, "Chiraq." Included in these documentaries are radio and television interviews, news transcripts, music lyrics, social media posts, and resident interviews. These documentaries provide a diverse set of fragments that when placed alongside one another reveal a dangerous ramification of deploying war metaphor, the eventual appropriation. With that being said, this archive represents only a small sample and brief conceptualization of the shift that has taken place in Chicago since the days of Harold Washington and the Daleys.

Together these documentaries shed light on the multitude of elements contributing to the violence and degradation in the city of Chicago, and investigate *Chiraq* not simply as a consequence of gang violence within the city, but rather an implication of federal rhetorical strategy which deploys the war metaphor, without regard for the damning rhetorical and material effects, as a means of justifying expansions of US power and capabilities behind the banner of social, moral, and political security. Quite simply, after three generations of invoking the war metaphor, it has quite literally become the language and social reality of millions of community members living in some of Chicago's most isolated neighborhoods. I accept that each of these documentaries are not without criticism and agenda. In pursuing the story of *Chiraq,* interviewers, editors, and producers are by definition interested in the war metaphor and capturing it on film. Additionally, there are lengthier documentaries such as "The Field" and Noisey's "Chiraq" series, both of which I have evaluated. The directors and narrators of both documentaries are white and disconnected from the community of Chicago. Will Robson-Scott is

from London. This brings in concerns about framing, representation, and agenda based filming. I will address some of these concerns throughout my analysis. However, due to HBO Vice's journalistic reputation, and following an interview with Mr. Scott, I decided for the sake of space and preference these documentaries were sufficient in displaying my overall point. My project combines a large sample of fragments and personal knowledge to argue not about how the war metaphor is portrayed but critique the compulsion (and lineage) to portray and embody it.

In June of 2013, HBO's documentary miniseries *Vice* aired its latest episode "Chiraq" into millions of homes across America. In it, the *Vice* narrator, Thomas Morton, traveled across the city of Chicago and some its deadliest south and west side neighborhoods meeting with local residents, clergymen, self-announced gang members, police officials, and state legislators to better elucidate what has contributed to the United States' third largest city being compared, by its very residents, to the Middle Eastern State of Iraq.

During his *Vice* ride-along the host captured a variety of perspectives each contributing to the understanding of this *Chiraq* phenomena. While Chicago P.D. officials were more consumed with reacting to gang and gun violence than criticizing urban social policy, Illinois State Senator Jacqueline Collins provided a more systemic critique. The 16th district representative explained, "These are disenfranchised communities. And it's not just a month occurrence or a year occurrence, this is decades of a lack of resources flowing into these communities" (Vice 2013, 13:48). Local residents, while many aware of the systemic nature of their city's ills, with some outlining how dismal public housing and hospitals contribute to violence, most were too occupied with personal survival to see through the veneer of their narratives to focus solely on the systemic root of their inequalities. One gang member explained, "If we get shot at then we're

32

gonna wanna retaliate because if they shoot one of our friends, now it's war" (Vice 2013, 7:49).

Morton concluded, "Left to fend for themselves in an urban desert many kids see gangs as the

only form of structure left in their community and have internalized their situation and proudly

declare their city Chiraq, and themselves soldiers or savages. And who could blame them, they

do live in a war-zone, the south-side of Chicago is basically a failed state within the borders of

the US" (Vice 2013, 13:10).

While his remarks highlight the social crisis facing Chicago, and the connection between

Chicago and Iraq as they relate to the war metaphor, some still fail to acknowledge the

importance of investigating the presence of war metaphor. CBS producer and columnist Mason

Johnson (2013) has argued in his columns the use of terms such as "Chiraq" and "war-zone," as

it relates to Chicago urban spaces, are simply exaggerations promulgated by musicians.

However, to doubt the relevance of war metaphors, while simultaneously shifting blame towards

community members (as the White House's Kerlikowske did) is to ignore the roots of the war

metaphor and the impact it has had on US policy, vulnerable communities of color, and the

constitutive power of metaphors to dictate social realities. By ignoring the significance of such a

term and seeking to quickly dismiss it, an opportunity is missed to critique the historical lineage

of war metaphors, and institutional and systemic negligence is brushed under the discursive rug.

I will not miss this opportunity as the second chapter of this project will be devoted to exploring

this term as a site for serious rhetorical inquiry and academic exploration. *Chiraq* rhetorically

represents a communal embrace and adoption which doubly harms the urban communities

implicated in this "war." It is crucial to understand the implications of such an adoption and

highlight how it serves as continued justification for the very elements that begat the perverse and disparate living conditions.

Chapter Two: Chiraq Emerges

Accompanied by Secret Service officials, Michelle Obama stepped out of an all-black SUV on February 9, 2013, visibly emotional ahead of the memorial service for fifteen-year-old Chicago native Hadiya Pendleton. The First Lady was one of many government officials, including US. Secretary of Education Arnie Dunkin, Illinois Governor Pat Quinn, and Chicago Mayor Rahm Emmanuel, whom attended the funeral procession for the young woman who was tragically gunned down in a neighborhood park just a week after attending the President's inauguration ceremony alongside classmates in January. In the weeks following, Hadiya's sudden killing made national news. The tragedy was mentioned in both Governor Quinn's *State of the State* address, and President Obama's *State of the Union* national address in 2013.

The First Lady later remarked to a group of Chicago business leaders, "The story of Hadiya's life and death, we read that story day after day, month after month, year after year in this city and around this country. I'm not talking about something that's happening in a war-zone halfway around the world" (as cited in Lee 2013, para. 3). However, despite the First Lady's message, Hadiya's death was still framed largely as another casualty of Chicago's ongoing gang wars. Pendleton's murder and the uptake galvanized response with a surge of over 400 officers placed into Chicago's most vulnerable neighborhoods, a move that cost the city a reported 1 million dollars a day (Vice 2013). What is especially interesting for this project is not simply the instantaneous cooption of Pendleton's story amongst city and national elites, but the simultaneous framing of her death within the context of the war metaphor.

CBS ran a national special just months later titled, "48 Hours: The War In Chicago." In it, reporters used Pendleton's death as an entry point to discuss Chicago's rising gang and drug

related crimes. In 2013, Chicago was engulfed in its most violent stretch in a decade. On September 18, 2013, The Washington Post, and subsequent national outlets, adorned Chicago with the controversial moniker "US. Murder Capital" passing New York City, the nation's most populated city boasting a population three times the size of the Midwestern city (Wilson 2013). This disheartening label unfortunately represents the violent record of the city that compiled over 500 gun homicides, and 4000 non-fatal shootings and gun assaults in 2012—and over 420 in both 2013 and 2014, most of which are gang and drug related (DNA Info 2013). However, like the CBS special, this polarizing headline fails to account for how the dominant language simultaneously employs and pathologizes the war metaphor.

One reporter explained, "The Chicago Police force and the DEA have been hunting down drug-dealing gangs" (CBS 2013, 3:50). 28 year DEA veteran and head of the Chicago-area division, Special agent Jack Riley explains that on the streets of Chicago, where heroin overdose death is up 70% and almost 75% of murders go unsolved, "This is good versus evil, and you're riding with good today" (CBS 2013, 13:00). Another reporter explains, "This may look like a scene from Iraq or Afghanistan but just 20 miles from Chicago Jack Riley of the DEA is training an army to fight a drug war" (CBS 2013, 14:50). Yet, in this special on "The War in Chicago" the assumed opposition, or *Chiraq,* is never truly accounted for. I believe using conceptual metaphor theory provides a tool to account for and map the presence of the war metaphor across diverse, local discourses and draw rhetorical implications. For example, from the clips mentioned above it is fair to say that the Chicago media and police force are both rhetorically guided by the war metaphor in their conceptions of Chicago's gangs and drug trade.

EX: CRIMINAL POLICY IS WAR

Police units are vigilant in their *fight* for justice

Tactical units hold *covert* operations using *army* tactics

Gangs and drugs are *evil*

Gang members and drug dealers are *hunted* down

Streets in Chicago and its local suburbs are *battlefields*

Arrests and busts are *victories* in the ongoing *war*

Citizens are both *victims* and *enemies* (War In Chicago 2013).

Together these fragments further highlight the US federal and local inclination towards the war metaphor. They seek to guide onlookers on how to comprehend these neighborhoods and individuals while informing and justifying the state of police practices in urban communities (Ivie 2004; Steinert 2003). Both the deployment and perpetuity of the war metaphor scapegoats urban communities, such as Chicago, detracting attention from the historical degradation of these neighborhoods and populaces (McCann 2012; De Coster & Heimer 2006).

Yet, as stated above these fragments alone are not wholly representative of the war metaphor's salience. In the months following Pendleton's death, coverage surrounding Chicago and the moniker *Chiraq* reached a fever pitch (Alderman & Caspersen 2015; Abernethy 2013; Bowean 2013). The name *Chiraq* combines Chicago, one of the discursive and material "battle-zones" for the national *war on drugs*, and Iraq, one of the literal battlegrounds of the Bush, and consequentially the Obama Administration's, *war on terror*.

Two documentaries in particular were extremely fascinating to me as they tackled the challenge of investigating and unpacking the term *Chiraq* through the discourse of community members. These documentaries are HBO Vice's "Chiraq" and Director Will Robson-Scott's

"Chiraq." Included in these documentaries are radio and television interviews, news transcripts, music lyrics, social media posts, and resident interviews. I am not a documentarian and don't claim to be doing the most sophisticated documentary analysis, however, I do believe these two artifacts provide an archive of fragments that allow critical insight into the construction and circulation of this metaphor. For descriptive purposes only, the two documentaries I have selected each represent a specific style or form of documentary filmmaking (Nichols 1991, 2001).

HBO *Vice's* documentary is a more traditional (though Vice is an alternative news organization) expository documentary which speaks directly to the viewer through an active narrator. The *Vice* episode is a piece of investigative journalism above all else providing diverse perspectives including media clips, officers, politicians, clergymen, gang members, and [unaffiliated] residents. Will Robson-Scott's "Chiraq" is an observational-performative documentary that blends minimal intervention (filmmaker is physically absent from the film) with a post-production artistic flair that is "fragmentary, impressionistic, and lyrical" (Burton 2007; para. 2). Burton (2007) writes, "Performative documentaries stress subjective experience and emotional response to the world. They are strongly personal, unconventional, perhaps poetic and/or experimental" (para. 12) Robson-Scott's black and white short film consists entirely of community testimonies stitched together to tell both individual narratives and a collective story of how Chicago became *Chiraq,* and what that looks like and means in daily life.

This chapter analyzes a set of fragments pulled from these two exposé pieces on *Chiraq* with an emphasis on *necropolitical skepticism,* or a narrative paradigm that implies political action (war metaphor) works to reinforce hegemonic structures and perpetuate inequality on the

basis of race, class, sexuality, and so forth. For the sake of this chapter, I have put forward the notion of *necropolitical skepticism* because I believe this tool is resourceful in not only characterizing the narrative elements present in these fragments but also analyzing how the local appropriation of the war metaphor employs the same methods of justification and shaming we discussed in the first chapter (Ivie 2004).

Exploring two documentaries in particular provide fragments of local discourse which reinforces—and critiques at times—the war metaphor. Using conceptual metaphor theory I utilize these fragments to construct mappings demonstrating how the war metaphor is found in the language of local community members in Chicago's most impoverished, urban communities. More specifically, I believe these documentaries point towards two crucial aspects of local appropriation of the war metaphor. First, the war metaphor is foundational in describing relationships between community members and social institutions (i.e. government, law enforcement, hospitals, etc.), as well as the construction of personal narratives. Second, throughout this chapter I will situate these fragments alongside the federal and local deployments by displaying how the local appropriation of war metaphor simultaneously redirects the shaming and justificatory components of the war metaphor.

HBO Vice: "Chiraq": The metaphor is built into social institutions and relationships

In June of 2013, HBO's documentary mini-series *Vice* aired its latest episode "Chiraq" into millions of homes across America. In it, the *Vice* correspondent, Thomas Morton, traveled across the city of Chicago into some of its deadliest south and west side neighborhoods meeting with local residents, clergymen, self-announced gang members, police officials, and state legislators to better elucidate what has contributed to the United States' third largest city being

compared, by its very residents, to Iraq. The *Chiraq* episode of *Vice* was chosen not only because of its popularity, as it is one of the first major pieces done on the moniker *Chiraq,* but it also provides a diverse set of fragments to understand how the war metaphor has been adopted by community members and is foundational to discussing social relationships in designated neighborhoods. Again, using conceptual metaphor theory I have mapped statements from the documentary that highlight the salience of war metaphor.

EX: CHICAGO is a WARZONE

More people have died in Chicago than US *troops*

Children and communities are *victims* of gangs and drugs

Streets are mapped as *rival territories*

Gangs *rule* over neighborhoods

We are having *wars* like the *army*

Communities seem to be *targeted* (Vice 2013).

These fragments suggest that in Chicago social elements including social relationships, spatial configuration, and identity formation are all reliant upon the language of war and comprehension of the war metaphor in order to make sense of daily experiences in these vulnerable neighborhoods. Analyzing these fragments is crucial to understanding the full impact of the war metaphor and further theorizing how *necropolitical skepticism* is employed to both shame and justify.

 The episode begins by pulling the viewers in and focusing attention on Chicago's nation leading violence. *Vice* owner, Shane Smith, explains, "In the last two decades most major cities in America have seen a dramatic drop in violent crimes. The exception to the rule being Chicago

where gang violence is out of control. In 2012 alone over 440 school aged children were shot, making it one of the deadliest places in the country for young people. In fact, things have gotten so bad many locals have renamed their hometown, Chiraq" (Vice 2013, 1:25). Within the first 90 seconds viewers are being increasingly primed to view Chicago through the lens of the war metaphor and children are positioned as the ultimate victim in Chicago.

However, just as quick as the audience is asked to empathize with school aged children, the frame jumps to a police ride along with *Vice* journalist Thomas Morton and a Chicago Police Department Deputy Chief. During the footage, the radio in the background reports that a 16-year-old with a gun was threatening his family and a 14-year-old was arrested for gun possession. This contrast between *victim* and *enemy* is even more complicated when it is visually represented. As Williamson (2010) explains, "The State's collective ethos," or in this case the collective deployment of the war metaphor, relies "on allegorical versions of the sacred and agonistic" (pg. 216). Think DEA Agent Jack Riley earlier reference "good versus evil" (CBS 2013, 13:00). Yet, the machinery of the metaphor does nothing to distinguish between the sacred and agonistic as it relates to children rendering the body of the black child in the documentary as ambiguous and easily maneuverable from one domain to another.

All the while the police's nonchalant attitude pervades every scene as the Chief articulates "shootings and murder are what we deal with on a daily basis," while displaying a map of Chicago's inner city communities which is marked not as street signs but overlapping gang territories (Vice 2013, 3:12). The scene shifts to the near west side neighborhood "The Village" (University Village). Morton, clearly intimidated, questions a group of young black male residents, most of whom self-identify as members of Chicago's "New Breeds," a street

gang that began in the early 1990s, with an estimated 4000 plus members (Gang History Project 2001). In the clip Morton asks, "How far does the Village extend? How far can you go to each side?" (Vice 2013, 3:57). Though these questions are common in Chicago's gang-affiliated neighborhoods, the basic structure of the question is endemic of the social structure within these communities. The question "How far can you go to each side?" alludes to the territorial disputes that contributes to gang related violence. After being told the boundaries of "The Village" which equal to approximately just one square mile, he coyly followed up, "What happens if you cross Ashland (the west-end of "The Village")?" (Vice 2013, 4:03) Instantaneously, multiple individuals respond in unison, "Don't cross that gun line" (Vice 2013, 4:05). Just like the police officers who refer to Chicago streets based on the gang that occupies the neighborhood, local residents are acutely aware of where their territory begins and ends. For a group of at least fifteen the dominant sentiment was that to travel just a matter of blocks in any direction was a matter of life and death.

Morton, with an awkward, yet misplaced smile stands amongst the young men as they display hand guns. The editors string together clips oscillating between a young child whose face is blurred out and a close up on a waving gun. Again the episode captures, or at the minimum plays off of, this tension between black criminality which sort of rejects age yet simultaneously threatens the innocence of school aged children. The ambiguity metaphor creates reframes the child in the clip from child growing into adult, but *victim* growing into potential *perpetrator*.

Morton continues his ride along and learns how community members feel about the national gun debate. When asked how easy it was to get a gun in Chicago individuals laughed at him before one replied, "It's not that hard" (Vice 2013, 4:19) Another individual explains, "We

use hand guns in Chicago… while they try to ban assault rifles. We don't use assault rifles in Chicago. We like to get up on you baby" (Vice 2013, 5:02). In just two sentences a staple of President Obama's gun control legislation to slow the flow of guns into these communities, a piece of legislation that failed in Congress in April of 2013, has been delegitimized and laughed at as a joke. Chicago PD Superintendent Garry McCarthy agreed that "the ease with which guns are obtained" in Chicago is his number one concern as an officer (Vice 2013, 8:33). As commonly seen media coverage of criminal justice efforts, the Superintendent displayed a table filled with guns seized in Chicago during a press conference. Ernst (2014) reported, Chicago police seized nearly 7000 illegal guns in 2013. Despite these seizures the ease of obtaining guns in Chicago is unwavering with residents arguing, "You can get a gun anywhere it's the hood" (Vice 2013, 4:21). Both police and residents see the proliferation of guns as a local arms race, and none of the sides involved are willing to retreat. One gang member explained during a ride along, "That's why we call it Chiraq. Because we live like them. They die for theirs so we die for ours" (Vice 2013, 5:17). In listening to his matter-of-fact justification a hint of *necropolitical skepticism* emerges. With clear awareness of the damage guns have on communities in Chicago, local gang members still justify guns as a necessary evil in a city where "Kids walking through rival gang territory can be shot just for showing their face" (Vice 2013, 7:29).

From interviews with police officials (like those displayed in "War In Chicago") and local gang members it is clear the language of war and territoriality exists on both sides of the discussion. Both [gang members and police] are equally motivated by their individuated interpretations and embodiment of the war metaphor and justify their actions wholeheartedly.

Murray Forman writes, "Identities forged in the 'hood' are products of spatial compression and are deeply influenced by locally sustaining bonds cohering within the more narrowly defined social parameters of space" (pg. 200). In other words, the relationship between the police and gangs (gangs and gangs) is guided by the war metaphor, thus the very spatial configuration, and subsequent monitoring and policing is guided by the framework of war. As one individual explained, "we in the hood having real wars like the army, having shootouts" (Vice 2013, 5:21).

The war metaphor has become foundational in the conceptualization of space in Chicago over time and may also distract from or obscure the degradation of social institutions within implicated neighborhoods. John Tirana (2006) has noted, "Among the consequences of war is the corrosion of social and institutional barriers to crime," and, furthermore social structures (pg. 5). In his study on the war on terror he explains that during the occupations of both Iraq and Afghanistan there has been little to no national attention focused on how the both countries have experienced the corrosion of social structures, such as schools, museums, hospitals, local clinics and other social institutions ultimately feeding into the larger crisis. These institutions for all practical purposes have become labeled as collateral damage and dismissed from public view. The same may be true of Chicago during the war on drugs. In 2012, *Harpers Magazine* produced an expose titled "The Last Tower." In it author Ben Austen discussed the transformation of public housing that took place during the 1990s in Chicago explaining,

> Chicago was once home to the second-largest stock of public housing in the nation, with nearly 43,000 units and a population in the hundreds of thousands. Since the mid-1990s, though, the city has torn down eighty-two public-housing high-rises citywide, including Cabrini's twenty-four towers. In 2000, the city named the ongoing purge the Plan for Transformation, a $1.5 billion, ten-year venture that would leave the city with just 15,000 new or renovated public-housing family units, plus an additional 10,000 for senior citizens (para. 3).

According to Austen, over a decade later and not only did Chicago not complete its projected 15,000 but many former public housing tenants were moved into unfamiliar neighborhoods that were equally poor and segregated. It is not a coincidence that the "Plan for Transformation" was also concentrated in the same neighborhoods as Daley's 1992 DEA led task force. The *Vice* reporter spoke with a few local ex-gang members about the transformation in the public housing system in Chicago and their statements were uniform in saying the mismanagement of former public housing tenants and forced relocation spread the violence further into the city of Chicago and into its south side suburbs (Thomas 2011). One individual explained, "A lot of those guys never been outside of those buildings but when you tear them down and then you give them section 8 and tell them 'hey we gotta send you out to the suburbs that you not even used to. People telling you 'they from the projects' and not welcoming you" (Vice 2013, 6:30). With the public housing units seen as synonymous with the crime and drugs mayor after mayor waged war against in Chicago, it was only a matter of time before they were removed all together as a crime reduction tactic. By framing the state of public housing alongside the war metaphor, the larger human consequences became obscured from attention. The war metaphor not only limits the way policies and individuals are discussed, but it equally limits the way Chicago's degrading social institutions are prioritized. But housing units are not the only social institutions to suffer in Chicago's poorest communities.

Illinois State Senator Jacqueline Collins was interviewed during the *Vice* episode and she articulated that Chicago's social institutions, especially in urban, minority, communities have faced similar degradation during the time of the war metaphors deployment. Collins, the 16th

District representative, which encompasses many of these south side communities including its most dangerous Englewood, explained, "there are consequences to failed economic and political policies, issues that most communities of color in Chicago are facing, high unemployment 23% or more, failing schools, closing of mental facilities, the foreclosure crisis, so certain communities seem to be targeted" (Vice 2013, 11:17). The *Vice* narrator extended the State Senator's claims stating,

> Not only has the south side lost the majority of its schools, clinics, and public housing, they don't even have a hospital to treat all of the gunshot wounds that happen here which is doubly fucked because there are three hospitals in the neighborhood (University of Chicago Medical Center — a new 700 million dollar facility, St. Bernard Hospital, Provident Hospital of Cook County) that use to treat gunshot wounds but stopped because it was costing them to much money (Vice 2013, 11:42).

In response to this horrific fact State Senator Collins responded, "How do you put a price on a life?" (Vice 2013, 13:05). Collins argues the very choice to stop treating, or even allow, local hospitals to stop treating, the city's most polarized crime dehumanizes local communities in the wake of resource deprivation. Together Morton and Collins exhibit *necropolitical skepticism* implying that political action (war metaphor) was working to subjugate minority communities to resource inequality on the basis of race and class. Neither explicitly states that the government acts in the interest that allows them to best kill citizens, yet both acknowledge the system as is produces just that. They both deploy this skepticism as a means of shaming local and national government officials for allowing Chicago's urban communities to suffer under such abysmal resource allocation.

Community activist and Roman Catholic priest, Father Michael Pfleger has been a vocal skeptic of Chicago's urban policies and criticizes how failed criminal policy has caused the

46

viewing public to turn their backs on black and brown communities. Pfleger, who has been a pastor at Chicago's St. Sabina church for almost 35 years, explained, "we've ignored violence in America, we've turned our back on it because it's been primarily black and brown children" (Vice 2013, 9:24)

Vice's "Chiraq" captures how the war metaphor is present in the diverse discourse across the city of Chicago and informs social relationships. The devastation that has taken place in the post Washington and Daley years has grown "D-Day" into a perpetual campaign that now resonates in the moniker *Chiraq.* "Daley's War" became Washington's, then Daley's, and is now Mayor Emmanuel's.

Chiraq: Narratives are told with the language of War

Metaphor is a powerful tool in the production of meaning and crafting of narrative. Metaphor is especially important because narratives help us to articulate and understand ourselves, inform others of a particular way of life, and participate in the construction of larger social realities (Lakoff & Johnson 1980). London-based photographer and director Will Robson Scott released the documentary "Chiraq" in August 2013. I highlight this film because I appreciated its diverse set of narratives from residents in Chicago. In this thirteen minute documentary, Scott interviews local gang members, musicians, former residents, parents of murdered children, and others. Scott explained to *XXL* magazine in 2013, "These are young wild guys from South Chicago, they're talking about what they see and do to a point. I just wanted to try and give it a human face and try and make an honest portrayal of the people in the film's stories" (para. 6).

Scott, who himself can't escape utilizing the war metaphor, seemed to provide this documentary for the exact reason I am analyzing it. Rarely are the narratives found in Chicago broadcasted outside the context of music and/or one-sided news stories. Engaging these narratives, paying attention to how the war metaphor functions in individual constructions of identity and storytelling may offer a richer understanding of just how the war metaphor is adopted and pushed forward. Despite differing vantage points each participant is informing onlookers on a collective version of Chicago's dangerous, inner city neighborhoods. I will analyze these perspectives exploring just how narratives and identity formation are informed by the war metaphor.

Conceptual metaphor theory is a useful method for analyzing these narratives because the war metaphor is important to what participants find relevant to discuss when constructing their own identity. By isolating and analyzing these fragments for their constitutive power I also invite the reader, as the onlooker is similarly invited in the documentary, to challenge their own perceptions of the crisis facing Chicago as community members share their side to the story, a side that often falls on deaf ears. While *Vice* focused attention more on the premise CHICAGO is a WARZONE, Will Robson-Scott's piece is slightly more geared towards how the war metaphor becomes representative in individual narratives. The following fragments elucidate the pervasiveness of the war metaphor and warrant further analysis to understand how these narratives also utilize *necropolitical skepticism* to shame and justify.

EX: LIFE is WAR

This is the way the city is *designed*

There are no *leaders* to control rival gangs

This is real life *Taliban* and *Al Qaeda*

Chiraq everybody is afraid to come here because it's a *war-zone*

My life changed when I entered the *system*

If *heaven* is up top, this can't be nothing but *hell* (Chiraq 2013).

The documentary begins like HBO *Vice's* "Chiraq*,"* priming the audience to interpret the following footage through the lens of war. The words flash across the screen, "4,625 US citizens have been killed in Chicago since 2001. This is 2.5 times more than in the Afghanistan war-zone" (Chiraq 2013). This strategy, which draws parallels between Chicago and Afghanistan, as well as Iraq, has been problematic since it emerged in 2007 and the rhetorical implications of this frame, particularly *Chiraq,* haven't been fully unpacked, until now. In June of 2007, *Time Magazine* published an article titled, "Is Baghdad Safer Than Chicago?" In the article Amanda Ripley debunked the myth of Chicago being more dangerous than Iraq calling it "tactically limited, as well as mathematically flawed" (para. 11). However, in both documentaries (released six years after Ripley's article) the comparison is still widely utilized as segue into the discussion of urban violence in Chicago. Ironically, Ripley traced this comparison back to speeches from Chicago Mayor Richard Daley and then Illinois Senator Barack Obama. I wonder if individuals realize that this comparison does nothing more than project the failures of the *war on drugs* against the backdrop of the questionable *war on terror.*

With that being said, my analysis is not concerned with why this comparison is compulsive but highlight how the war metaphor makes such comparisons salient to the audience, and instinctual to cultural production and social meaning making. Framing Chicago's death toll next to an "official war-zone" goes unquestioned since the inner city of Chicago has long been

rhetorically framed by the use of war metaphor. As a result, the individuals filmed in Scott's "Chiraq" use various metaphorical concepts in their narratives to provide context to Chicago's inner city community, many of which allude to the dominant deployment of war metaphor.

The bulk of interviews featured in "Chiraq" offer similar context and examples of the local deployment of war metaphor to the HBO *Vice* episode in the form of narrative. In the very first interview presented the individual complicates notions about Chicago's inner city violence and in his own ways justifies his lifestyle. As the clouds come into focus on the screen a voice begins to speak. "Chicago was always a violent place you know what I'm saying. As time gone on it just got more and more violent cause the attitude changed to now everybody don't give no fuck… And ain't no leaders out here, ain't nobody accountable for their actions, and you can do whatever the fuck you want basically" (Chiraq 2013, 0:16). In this remark the absence of leadership is in reference to the wave of mass incarceration of gang leadership that began in the 1990s and continued well into the 2000s after Mayor Richard Daley explicitly announced his "targeting" of Chicago's south and west side gangs with a DEA sponsored task force (Proudfoot 2014; Street 2002). Both Daley and current mayor, Rahm Emmanuel, have championed the task force (and police) for its gaudy arrest numbers in the two decades since its inception. However, to individuals like this young man the wave of incarceration has actually unleashed a more disturbing form of violence in Chicago.

As individuals tell their stories they simultaneously tell the collective story of death, war metaphor, and *necropolitics* (Mbembe 2003). In other words, individuals consistently acknowledge the failures of policies conceived under the guise of war metaphors, as represented by Presidents Nixon and Reagan's "war on drugs," and Mayor Washington and 400 other

mayor's "D-Day." The generational consequences have not escaped residents who shape narrative with a sense of *necropolitical skepticism.* Former resident and musician, Mario Hess, explicitly argued the politics of Chicago's war on drugs were designed to bottleneck and isolate residents into increasingly volatile neighborhoods.

> They took all the gang chiefs away, they took the structure and when they took the structure away we developed a systematic uproar man, it's a systematic downfall man. They put a glitch in our computer chips when they took all the gang chiefs … then they took the projects … So ok we gone take they structure then we put them out in the ghettos and let them kill they self so we can clean them off the streets… This shit ain't no movie though, this real life. We living this shit. This is Taliban, Al Qaeda shit it's going on over here and we in war with each other man (Chiraq 2013, 1:32).

During his narrative development, Hess makes use of multiple metaphors to quickly explain how Chicago violence has continued to buck national trends yet they are all connected by indirect and direct allusions to war. He compares the city's urban neighborhoods to that of a malfunctioning computer system. However, within his metaphor the onus or blame is not entirely on one party, but shared with the system infiltrators who "put a glitch in our computer chip" and created an unlivable situation. This initial metaphor seeks to inform onlookers of the trajectory of the city since the mass incarceration of gang leaders, and destruction of the public housing projects that took place in the 1990s. His computer glitch metaphor continues criticism of the *war on drugs* and subsequent policies as inherently *necropolitical*, or carried out by the state to expose black citizens to insufferable communal conditions. He explicitly asserts that government policies have placed whole communities in areas for them to kill themselves.

Hess argues the story of Chiraq is the story of a calculated plan to subjugate blacks and other racial minorities to inadequate living conditions. Judith Butler and Athena Athanasiou

write, "In such contexts, the power of dispossession works by rendering certain subjects, communities, or populations unintelligible, by eviscerating for them the conditions of possibility for life and the 'human' itself" (2013, pg. 20). This use of metaphor is multi-layered and broadens the scope of the narrative. The next metaphor enacts this shift and directly relates to the adoption of war metaphor. Comparing his community to the likes of Al Qaeda and Taliban forces serves a dual purpose: it both communicates severity, but also establishes an understanding between the audience and himself, as it provides a relatable knowledge schema as most people are familiar with his references. His proclamation reminds us *Chiraq* is more than a popularized term but a way of life for many. While Hess suggests the system was constructed for community members to "kill themselves," he also embraces and accepts these conditions as reality stating, "We in war with each other man so we don't give a fuck about nobody else" (Chiraq 2013, 2:15). This narrative is metaphorically rich and reveals how the war metaphor operates materially as it simultaneously pits government vs. communities and communities vs. communities. The speaker critiques the failed policies of public housing and aggressive policing yet deals with the circumstances that are present. Just six months after the documentary aired Mario Hess was gunned down by rival gang members and shot ten times. (Stefano 2014).

The war on drugs and crime have made life in Chicago's harshest communities increasingly a risk, and this risk has fueled a nihilism towards mortality, death, and the *warring* that surrounds the city. In *Chiraq,* this is displayed by mothers whose children lost their lives in Chicago, as well as the young men who navigate the city streets daily. Valerie Kyles, 51, whose 28-year-old son was gunned down in 2012, explained, "Something is missing for the young men… These kids don't have hope and don't care if they die" (Chiraq 2013, 3:36). Instantly, the

frame shifts to a 15-year-old telling the story of the first time he was shot. He calmly retells the story of an altercation in which he was shot in the head and dropped off at the hospital before blacking out. His eyes stare directly into the camera and his emphasis is not on the shooting but the normality in the incident, asserting, "Hell yeah I was popped in the head. This shit is real out here, 15-years-old, this is deep" (Chiraq 2013, 4:30). In two back to back scenes the viewer is forced to confront a stark and potentially foreign reality in which death is seen as more than an ever present, but as looming over the space of urban neighborhoods and black bodies.

Thirteen year old rapper Lil' Mouse sums it up answering, "Chicago is where I'm from, Chiraq. Everybody is afraid to come to Chicago because there is a war-zone in Chicago" (Chiraq 2013, 4:50) The scene featuring Lil' Mouse, just like the one prior too featuring the 15-year-old, further problematizes the hegemonic conceptions and portrayals of the black child as both victim and perpetrator. Lil' Mouse challenges this basic binary. Scott's "Chiraq" does an equal job of troubling dominant conceptions on what it means to be a child in Chicago. The scene with Lil' Mouse shows the thirteen year old surrounded by a haze of smoke and adults as he raps his own lyrics. Back in 2013, I wrote a speech analyzing Mouse's position as a child hip hop artist who has drawn major criticism from media outlets with one going as far to criticize his parents for "child abuse." (Mitchell 2012, para. 1). I argued then, like I do now, the hegemonic narratives of childhood cannot be held as models of moral benchmarks especially in communities largely governed by the language of war.

The narratives of childhood and life expectancy are increasingly framed by the war metaphor in this documentary as individuals detail what it is like growing up as a child in a city of turmoil. One individual explains,

53

Growing up in Chicago, it was like good and bad because like I had a lot of fun but it's kind of dangerous having fun… The first thing I remember is being arrested when I was a shorty. That changed me when I became a part of the system… I was locked up for three bags, four bags of crack, and I was thirteen. After that it was in and out, in and out. A lot of people don't have the privilege of having they mother in they life, or they father in they life. Some people momma's crackhead, daddy might have never been there. So as soon as that household situation go bad you become an adult (Chiraq 2013, 5:27).

In his remarks he uses the conventional metaphor of the "system" as a representation for the criminal justice regime which as he explains is difficult to escape after entering. For him, his life has always been impacted by the *war on drugs* whether it be his parents' drug dependence or his own coming of age inside the Chicago juvenile justice system.

Another resident calmly elaborated that, "Being my age in Chicago is like being old. I'm 28 years old and the life expectancy in the hood is statistically ain't that long. 25 might be old. 21 might be old. The caskets getting shorter and shorter" (Chiraq 2013, 8:30). Similar to the last statement even when the war metaphor is not directly represented, the urgency, paranoia, and *necropolitical skepticism* it expresses is. Together these separate scenes provoke viewers to confront how basic notions of childhood, innocence, and even what it means to be old are drastically altered in communities within Chicago. The narratives in "Chiraq" and the use of metaphorical language challenges the simplification promoted by governmental deployments of the war metaphor. By rejecting these binary notions and complicating understandings of Chicago's inner city these narratives also serve to shame government officials into comprehensively and responsibly addressing the needs of communities.

Together the fragments in "Chiraq" and *Vice's* "Chiraq" can be read as both the instinctual drive to use metaphor in language, but also the active appropriation, embodiment, and

critique of the war metaphor through *necropolitical skepticism.* The deployment of the war metaphor in the campaigns of the 1970s and 1980s rhetorically justified the systemic targeting of minority communities such as Chicago's African American neighborhoods, inadvertently contributing to the proliferation of gang communities and the adoption of the metaphor as with *Chiraq*. Moreover, this deployment scapegoated gangs and drugs as the city's public enemy number one unapologetically shaming vulnerable communities, rather than addressing the original deployment and short sighted policy provisions. Lakoff and Johnson (1980) warned us against this self-fulfilling consequence of metaphor, or its ability to bring into reality that which it describes through metaphor. The war metaphor, and its use in criminal justice campaigning, mobilized the city of Chicago in an offensive effort against gangs and citizens involved in the illegal drug trade. This has unfortunately backfired as the amount of drugs that flow through Chicago, the addiction rate across the city, and the number of gang members in the city are all at an all-time high (Pannell 2014; CBS 2012).

It would be easy, and ignorant, to consider the violence in urban communities purely from a surface level as senseless and barbaric. Upon further exploration it becomes clear that these urban neighborhoods, evidenced by the policies created to specifically govern them and the people who continue to live in them, have been designated as practically disposable. This is the common sentiment I gathered from community members, State Senators, priests, parents, and local gang members. When my brother and I drive through the abandoned neighborhoods and substandard, boarded up housing it is clear these conditions are deemed as acceptable by way of them being ignored for years. The thousands of teens living without true opportunity for advancement are regarded as either a threat to social order, or designated to the periphery of

consideration. These hundreds of thousands did not just start referring to themselves as soldiers and savages. The entire nation listened as President after President, Mayor after Mayor, Congress person after Congress person proclaimed that these neighborhoods were the battle zones where a drug and crime war would be fought. These were neighborhoods of precarity and epidemic that housed criminals — not citizens acting within the burdening constraints of circumstance, and bodies were literally and figuratively marked (McCann 2012). By viewing the fragments in *Vice's* "Chiraq" and Will Robson Scott's "Chiraq" we have only scratched the surface of how the war metaphor proves foundational in conceptualizations of social, institutional, and spatial relationships as well as constructing individual and collective narratives. However, with the use of conceptual metaphor theory this thesis has provided a new route for war metaphor studies to better understand first, how the war metaphor expanded from a national justificatory trope into local political and media doctrine with respects to Chicago; and second, how this deployment facilitated a communal appropriation marking the war metaphor as foundational in the language of social relationships and narrative formation. I have also developed *necropolitical skepticism,* as a method for analyzing local, non-governmental deployments of the war metaphor. I believe together these frameworks can be useful in making similar critiques on the war metaphor that are unique to specific communities and rhetorical histories.

I loved growing up in Chicago but watching it slowly transform into *Chiraq* has inspired my drive to better understand just how the war metaphor operates and devise ways to hopefully counteract its salience, if it already isn't too late. As one Chicago native explained in Scott's "Chiraq," "They say it's a better way. Yea, true indeed it is but for some of us that's a picture we

can't even see. What we do every day is a better way for us because if heaven's up top this can't

be nothing but hell right here" (Chiraq 2013, 10:37).

Epilogue

In taking on this year long project I have had the great fortune of analyzing a wide variety of materials including scholarly articles, presidential speeches, mayoral archives, documentaries, music lyrics, books, and more. The archive experience in particular provided a completely new scholastic experience. Tracking the war metaphor through literal boxes of transcripts and government memos was exhilarating and beneficial in both the successes and productive shortcomings. Combining these various components to create both a timeline and working understanding of war metaphor required a delicate blend between contextualizing and analysis. As a result I choose to provide highlights across the spectrum of war metaphor including snapshots of eras. As I move forward with this project I believe there are definite opportunities to deepen the context in key eras including contemporary music lyrics, 1930s-50s criminal justice rhetoric, and 1980s mayoral discourse in additional cities across America. With that being said, I believe this vast snap shot works to the reader's advantage as it simultaneously deepens their understanding of Chicago's relationship to war metaphor and offers off ramps into additional analysis points.

Returning to Chicago, my examination of *Chiraq* not only highlights the predatory trajectory of deploying the war metaphor but perhaps reveals a potential coalitional moment for invested activists. As Chavez (2013) explains, "A coalitional moment occurs when political issues coincide or merge in the public sphere in ways that create space to envision and potentially reconstruct rhetorical imaginaries" (pg. 8). I believe my analysis lays provides a foundation for future research into the collaborative potentialities between domestic anti-violence, and international anti-war campaigns, using *Chiraq* as a rhetorical entry point. This

controversial epithet does more than simply blend the city of Chicago with the Middle Eastern State of Iraq, connecting both as war-zones in relation to US policy. As mentioned earlier the term *Chiraq* comes out of a rhetorical strategy that began in political discourse and serves to highlight (and illicit shock) the annual number of murdered individuals in Chicago. Yet, it simultaneously rhetorically obscures the number of civilians murdered in Iraq as Chicago civilian deaths are compared to US troops rather than Iraqi civilians. During the same time period referenced to draw this problematic comparison the number of Iraqi citizens murdered as a result of direct US occupation was 10,130 (Iraq Body Count 2009).

The relationship between Chicago and Iraq is not purely metaphorical. The US expansion of power that has accompanied the polarizing wars on crime, drugs, and terror over the last century have directly impacted communities of color, and discursively constructed "others" whether domestic or abroad similarly affecting Chicago's inner-city and Iraq's post-occupation state. As such, the term *Chiraq* reveals itself not simply as a manifestation of inner city frustrations, but a potential coalitional moment for activists invested in domestic anti-violence campaigns, and those interested in broader anti-war critiques.

Out of the turmoil of increased violence in both Chicago and Iraq has come an untapped site of political potentiality; a site for robust critique of US hegemonic law and continued use of the war metaphor. The increased power of the US political and corporate state has come during the most technologically and communicatively intertwined period in human history. And as the recent massive protests across the globe in places as far spread as Venezuela, Ukraine, Egypt, New York City, and Tunisia, prove is that accountability, transparency, and progress is to varying degrees being demanded by a restless public. To what effect each of these movements have

changed systemic and institutional norms is still up for debate. Nevertheless it provides an example of an international longing still in its revolutionary infancy. Out of this restlessness comes a coalitional potentiality. The intersectionality of oppressions that connects Chicago and Iraq goes beyond the blending of these two names but exposes opportunities for coalitional possibility.

References

"A Brief History of the Drug War." Drug Policy Alliance. N.p., n.d. April 17, 2014.

Abernethy, Samantha. "Is The Term 'Chiraq' Offensive?" Chicagoist. June 10, 2013. Accessed May 14, 2015.

Alderman, Derek, and Janna Caspersen. "What's in a Nickname? In the Case of Chiraq, a Whole Lot." American Association of Geographers. March 4, 2015. Accessed May 14, 2015.

Austen, Ben. "The Last Tower." Harper's Magazine. May 7, 2012.

Bacharach, Marc "War Metaphors: How President's Use the Language of War to Sell Policy." Electronic Thesis or Dissertation. Miami University, 2006.

Baldwin, Davarian L. *Chicago's New Negroes Modernity, the Great Migration, & Black Urban Life*. Chapel Hill, North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press, 2007.

Beckett, Katherine, and Steve Herbert. "Dealing With Disorder: Social Control In The Post-industrial City." *Theoretical Criminology* 12, no. 1 (2008): 5-30. doi: 10.1177/1362480607085792.

Beer, Francis A. *Metaphorical World Politics*. East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University Press, 2004.

Bell, Derrick A. "Who Is Afraid of Critical Race Theory." *University of Illinois Law Review* 1995. Accessed April 7, 2014.

Blanks, Jonathan. "Obama Says He Ended the 'War on Drugs.' Don't Believe Him." The Washington Post. July 18, 2014. Accessed May 7, 2015.

Bowean, Lolly. "Chiraq: What's in a Nickname? It Could Be a Lot." Chicago Tribune. July 14, 2013. Accessed May 7, 2015.

Branson, Richard. "War on Drugs a Trillion-dollar Failure." CNN. December 7, 2012. Accessed May 7, 2015.

Breitman, Kendall. "Rahm Emanuel on Spike Lee's Movie 'Chiraq': Please Change the Title." Politico. April 16, 2015. Accessed May 8, 2015.

Brown, Wendy. Regulating Aversion: Tolerance in the Age of Identity and Empire. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2006.

Brzezinski, Zbigniew. "Terrorized by 'War on Terror'" The Washington Post. March 25, 2007. Accessed May 7, 2015.

Burrough, Bryan. P*ublic Enemies: America's Greatest Crime Wave and the Birth of the FBI, 1933-34*. New York City, New York: Penguin Press, 2004.

Butler, Judith. Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity. New York, NY: Rout ledge Classics, 2006.

Butler, Judith, and Athena Athanasiou. *Dispossession: The Performative in the Political, Con versations with Athena Athanasiou*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2013.

Campbell, Karlyn Kohrs, and Kathleen Hall Jamieson. Presidents Creating the Presidency: Deeds Done in Words. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 2008.

Chavez, Karma. *Queer Migration Politics Activist Rhetoric and Coalitional Possibilities*. Chica go, Springfield, and Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 2013.

Cherwitz, Richard, and Kenneth Zagacki. "Consummatory versus Justificatory Crisis Rhetoric." *Western Journal of Speech Communication* 50, no. 4 (1986): 307-24.

Chiraq. Protein, 2013. Film.

Chiraq. HBO Vice. Home Box Office, June 7, 2013.

Cochran, Joshua and McAfee, DJ. *"The Chiraq Report,"* *The Chiraq Report*. © 2013.

Condon, Stephanie. "Is It Time to End the War on Crime?" CBSNews. April 3, 2015. Accessed May 18, 2015.

Crenshaw, K. W. "Race, Reform, and Retrenchment: Transformation and Legitimation in Antidiscrimination Law." *Harvard Law Review* 101, no. 7 (2008): 1331–1387. doi: 10.2307/1341398.

Delgado, R., and J. Stefancic. *Critical Race Theory: An Introduction.* New York: New York Uni versity Press, 2001.

Davis, Mike. *Planet of slums*. London: Verso Books, 2006.

Davis, Devra Lee. *The Secret History of the War on Cancer.* New York: Basic Books, 2007.

De Coster, S., and Heimer, K. Crime at the intersections: Race, class, gender, and violent

offending. In L.J. Krivo, R.D. Peterson, and J. Hagan (Eds.), *The many colors of crime: Inequalities of race, ethnicity, and crime in America*. New York, NY: New York University Press (2006): 138-156.

Desilver, Drew. "Who's Poor in America? 50 Years into the 'War on Poverty,' a Data Portrait." Pew Research Center. January 13, 2014. Accessed January, 25 2015.

Dow, Bonnie J. "The Function of Epideictic and Deliberative Strategies in Presidential Crisis Rhetoric." *Western Journal of Speech Communication* 53 (1989): 294-310.

Dubber, Markus D. "Criminal Justice Process and War on Crime." *The Blackwell Companion to Criminology*. By Colin Sumner. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing (2004): 49-67.

Dumke, Mick. "Rahm Emanuel Declares Another War on Drugs." Chicago Reader. March 27, 2012. Accessed May 16, 2015.

Engels, Jeremy, and William O. Saas. "On Acquiescence and Ends-Less War: An Inquiry into the New War Rhetoric." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 99.2 (2013): 225-32.

Ernst, Aaron. "Why Does Chicago Have so Many Illegal Guns? | Al Jazeera America." Why Does Chicago Have so Many Illegal Guns? October 22, 2014. Accessed May 8, 2015.

Esposito, Stefano. "Slain Rapper Big Glo Laid to Rest; Father Vows Better Life for Children." Homicide Watch Chicago. April 18, 2014. Accessed May 7, 2015.

"Ethan Nadelmann Rocks the Crowd at TEDGlobal 2014: The War on Drugs Has Got to End." Drug Policy Alliance. November 12, 2014. Accessed May 7, 2015.

Fauconnier, G., and Turner, M. *The way we think: Conceptual blending and the mind's hidden complexities*. New York: Basic Books, 2002.

Fierz, Charles L. "Philosophical Implications of Ernesto Grassi: A New Foundation of Philosophy?." *Philosophy & Rhetoric* 27, no. 2 (Spring 1994): 104-120.

Feldman, J. A. *From molecule to metaphor: A neural theory of language.* Cambridge: The MIT Press, 2006.

Fields, Gary. "White House Czar Calls for End to 'War on Drugs'" The Wall Street Journal. Dow Jones and Company. May 14, 2009. Accessed December 1, 2013.

Flock, Elizabeth. "Bill Clinton, Jimmy Carter Slam War On Drugs In New Documentary." US News. US.News and World Report. December 3, 2012. Accessed January 28, 2015.

Foss, Sonja K., Karen A. Foss, and Robert Trapp. Contemporary Perspectives on Rhetoric. 30th
        Anniversary ed. Waveland Presss, 2014.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, Inaugural Address, March 4, 1933, as published in Samuel Rosenman,
        ed., *The Public Papers of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Volume Two: The Year of Crisis, 1933*.
        New York: Random House (1938): 11–16.

Foucault, Michel. "Society Must Be Defended" in *"Society Must Be Defended" Lectures at the
        Collège de France, 1975-76,* ed. Mauro Bertani and Alessandro Fontana, trans. David
        Macey. London: Penguin Books (2003): 241.

Foucault, Michel. 'Governmentality', trans. Rosi Braidotti and revised by Colin Gordon, in Gra
        ham Burchell, Colin Gordon and Peter Miller (eds) *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Gov
        ernmentality*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press (1991): 87–104.

Garland, David. The Culture of Control: Crime and Social Order in Contemporary Society.
        Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 2001.

Gerber, Jurg, and Eric L. Jensen. *Drug War, American Style: The Internationalization of Failed
        Policy and Its Alternatives.* New York: Garland Pub. 2001.

Goatly, A. *The language of metaphors*. London: Routledge Classics. 1997.

Gordon C. Disposable Heroes: Soldiers, Sacrifice, and the War Rhetoric of Non-Rememberance.
        Conference Papers -- National Communication Association [serial online]. Communica
        tion and Mass Media Complete, Ipswich, MA: January, 2008. Accessed October 29,
        2013.

Hartnett, S.J. Prisons, profits, crime, and social control: A hermeneutic of the production of vio
        lence. In A. Light and M. Nagel (Eds.), *Race, class, and community identity.* New York,
        NY: The Humanitarian Press (2002): 191-222.

Hartnett, S.J. The annihilating public policies of the prison-industrial complex; or, crime, vio
        lence, and punishment in an age of neoliberalism. *Rhetoric and Public Affairs* 3 (2000).
        491-533.

Hartnett, S.J. *Executing democracy, volume one: Capital punishment and the making of America*.
        East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press. 2010.

Harvey, D. *A brief history of neoliberalism.* Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2005.

Hoffman, Dennis E. *Scarface Al and the Crime Crusaders: Chicago's Private War against
        Capone.* Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press. 1993.

Houston, Jack. "Mayor Fires Shot In War On Drugs." Chicago Tribune. November 7, 1986. Ac
      cessed January 28, 2015.

Ivie, R L, "Speaking Democratically in the Backwash of War: Lessons from Brigance on
      Rhetoric and Human Relations," in *Rhetoric and Democracy: Pedagogical and Political
      Practices*, ed. Todd R. McDorman and David M. Timmerman. East Lansing: Michigan
      State University Press (2008): 265-80.

Ivie, R L, and Giner, O, "Hunting the Devil: Democracy's Rhetorical Impulse to War," *Presiden
      tial Studies Quarterly* 37.4 (2007): 580-98.

Ivie, R L, "Savagery in Democracy's Empire," *Third World Quarterly* 26.1 (2005): 55-65.

Ivie, R L, "Democracy, War, and Decivilizing Metaphors of American Insecurity," in *Metaphori
      cal World Politics*, ed. Francis A. Beer and Christ'l de Landtsheer. East Lansing: Michi
      gan State University Press (2004): 75-90.

Ivie, R L,, "Distempered Demos: Myth, Metaphor, and US. Political Culture," in *Myth: A New
      Symposium*, ed. Gregory A. Schrempp and William F. Hansen. Bloomington: Indiana
      University Press (2002): 165-79.

"Infelicitous 40: The Anniversary of the U.S.'s War on Drugs." Council on Hemispheric Affairs.
      June 29, 2011. Accessed May 7, 2015.

Jacobson, Walter. "*Killing Is The Solution,' Gang Member Tells Walter Jacobson*. CBS Evening
      News. Chicago, Illinois. September 27, 2013. Accessed May 7, 2015.

Jones, Daniel S. "The American Roots of Neoliberalism." History News Network. George Mason
      University. March 18, 2013. Accessed December 2, 2013.

Kamen, Al, and Scott Wilson. "'Global War On Terror' Is Given New Name." The Washington
      Post. March 25, 2009. Accessed April 7, 2014.

Kass, John. "Daley Enlists U.S. In War On Drugs, Gangs." Chicago Tribune. October 23, 1992.
      Accessed May 7, 2015.

Keyes, Cheryl. *Rap music and street consciousness*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois
      Press, 2002.

Klein, N. *Shock doctrine: The rise of disaster capitalism*. New York, NY: Picador, 2007.

Kövecses, Z. *Metaphor: a practical introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

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

Lakoff, George. "Metaphor and War: The Metaphor System Used to Justify War in the Gulf." Linguistics Department,. University of California at Berkeley, Berkeley. December 31, 1990. Speech.

Larson, D.M. Killing democracy; or, how the drug war drives the prison-industrial complex. In S.J. Hartnett (Ed.), *Challenging the prison-industrial complex: Activism, arts, and educa tional alternatives*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, (2011): 73-104.

Lee, Trymaine. "A Tearful Michelle Obama: 'Hadiya Pendleton Was Me, and I Was Her'" MSNBC. September 12, 2013. Accessed May 7, 2015.

Lemaitre, Rafael. "Alternatives to the "War on Drugs:" Obama Drug Policy and Reforming the Criminal Justice System." The White House. November 11, 2011. Accessed January 28, 2015.

Lenz, Timothy. "Conservatism in American Crime Films" *Journal of Criminal Justice and Popu lar Culture* 12.2 (2005): 116-134.

Lewis, S. C., and S. D. Reese. "What Is the War on Terror? Framing through the Eyes of Journal ists." *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly* 86.1 (2009): 85-102.

Lyndon B. Johnson: "Statement by the President on Establishing the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice.," July 26, 1965. Online by Gerhard Pe ters and John T. Woolley, *The American Presidency Project*.

Mallea, Paula. *The War on Drugs: A Failed Experiment*. N.p.: Dundurn, 2014.

McCann, Bryan, Dr. "Contesting the Mark of Criminality: Race, Place, and the Prerogative of Violence in N.W.A's "Straight Outta Compton"" *Critical Studies in Media Communica tion* 29.5 (2012): 367-86.

Miller, Alton. *Harold Washington: The Mayor, The Man*. Chicago: Bonus Books, 1989.

Mitchell, Mary. "Where's the Public Outcry over Chicago Boy's Raunchy Rap Video?" Chicago Sun Times. August 8, 2012. Accessed May 7, 2015.

Newman, Tony. "5 Reasons People Who Hate Drugs Should Want to End the Drug War." Alternet. January 18, 2013. Accessed May 16, 2015.

Obama, Barack. "Remarks by the President in the State of the Union Address." The White House. February 12, 2013. Accessed May 7, 2015.

Pinker, S. *The stuff of thought: Language as a window into human nature*. USA: Viking Press, 2007.

Proctor, Robert. *Cancer Wars: How Politics Shapes What We Know and Don't Know about Cancer*. New York: Basic Books, 1995.

Proudfoot, Jesse. "Drug Policy and Mass Incarceration in Chicago." AAG. December 4, 2014. Accessed May 16, 2015.

Quinn, Pat. "Governor Quinn Delivers 2013 State of the State Address." Illinois Government News Network. February 6, 2013. Accessed May 7, 2015.

Ramos, Elliot. "The Data behind Chicago's Gun Crimes." WBEZ 91.5. Chicago Public Media. July 17, 2013. Accessed November 30, 2013.

Reagan, Ronald: "Remarks on Signing Executive Order 12368, Concerning Federal Drug Abuse Policy Functions ," June 24, 1982. Online by Gerhard Peters and John T. Woolley, *The American Presidency Project*.

Reeves, Joshua, and Matthew S. May. "The Peace Rhetoric of a War President: Barack Obama and the Just War Legacy." *Rhetoric and Public Affairs* 16.4 (2013): 623-50.

Ripley, Amanda. "Is Baghdad Safer Than Chicago?" Time. July 19, 2007. Accessed May 16, 2015.

Robinson, Matthew B., and Renee G. Scherlen. *Lies, Damned Lies, and Drug War Statistics: A Critical Analysis of Claims Made by the Office of National Drug Control Policy.* Albany: State University of New York, 2007.

Rothkopf, David J. National Insecurity: American Leadership in an Age of Fear. New York, New York: PublicAffairs, 2014.

Samuels, Adrienne. "War of Words: Chiraq Should Die, Some Rappers and Activists Say." Chicago Sun Times. June 1, 2014. Accessed May 7, 2015.

Shinkman, Paul. "Obama: 'Global War on Terror' Is Over." US News. May 23, 2013. Accessed May 27, 2015.

Simon, Jonathan. *Governing through Crime: How the War on Crime Transformed American Democracy and Created a Culture of Fear.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Sonnenreich, Michael R., and Stanley Ebner. "No-Knock and Nonsense, An Alleged Constitutional Problem." *St. John's Law Review* 44.4 (2012): 626-59.

Steinert, Heinz. "The Indispensable Metaphor of War: On Populist Politics and the Contradictions of the State's Monopoly of Force." *Theoretical Criminology* 7.3 (2003): 265-91.

Street, Paul. "Race, Prison, and Higher Education: The War on Drugs in Illinois and Chicago." In The Vicious Circle: Race, Prison, Jobs, and Community in Chicago, Illinois, and in the Nation. Chicago, Illinois: Chicago Urban League, 2002.

Stricker, Frank. *Why America Lost the War on Poverty-- and How to Win It*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 2007.

Strong, James. "Mayor's Drug War Begins with Internal Skirmish." Chicago Tribune. August 15, 1986. Accessed January 15, 2015.

The Harold Washington Archives and Special Collections Research Center. Harold Washington Library Center. Chicago, Illinois.

   — Remarks and Documents: U.S. Conference of Mayors mid-winter meeting, January 22, 1986, Box 52, Folder, 7, Harold Washington Papers, The Harold Washington Archive and Special Collections, Harold Washington Library Center.

   — U.S. Conference of Mayors Resolution No. 35, Mayoral Records, January 22, 1987, Box 52, Folder, 7, Harold Washington Papers, The Harold Washington Archive and Special Collections, Harold Washington Library Center.

   — Record Group 10: Schedules and Evaluations, 1983-1987, November 18, 1986, Box 1 Folder 17, Harold Washington Papers, The Harold Washington Archive and Special Collections, Harold Washington Library Center.

   — Updated Fact Sheet: Susan Weed to Anti-Drug Committee Members, January 8, 1987, Box 52, Folder 20Harold Washington Papers, The Harold Washington Archive and Special Collections, Harold Washington Library Center.

   "The history of gangs in Chicago" *Chicago Gang History Project*. Accessed May 7, 2015.

   "The Legacy of Richard M. Daley on Chicago's South and West Sides." The Legacy of Richard M. Daley on Chicago's South and West Sides. May 23, 2011. Accessed May 7, 2015.

"The War in Chicago." CBSNews. May 18, 2013. Accessed May 7, 2015.

Thomas, Charles. "South Suburbs Such as Riverdale See More Crime as Chicago Crime Rate
       Drops." ABC7 Chicago. October 3, 2011. Accessed May 7, 2015.

Trotter, Joe W. The Great Migration in Historical Perspective: New Dimensions of Race, Class
       and Gender. N.p.: Indiana University Press, 1991.

Urist, Jacoba. "More Money Won't Win the War on Cancer." The Atlantic. Atlantic Media
       Company. August 28, 2013. Accessed April 7, 2014.

Wadley, Jared. "War Metaphors for Cancer Hurt Certain Prevention Behaviors." University of
       Michigan News. The University of Michigan. December 15, 2014. Accessed January 27,
       2015.

Washington, Harold. "Dimensions." Interview by Joan McGrath. June 26, 1985.
       https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gQw5Zw2imTE

Williamson, Larry A. "Bush's Mythic America: A Critique of the Rhetoric of War." *Southern
       Communication Journal* 75.3 (2010): 215-31.

Wilson, Reid. "FBI: Chicago Passes New York as Murder Capital of US." The Washington Post.
       September 18, 2013. Accessed September 22, 2013.

Wolfgang, Ben. "Obama Blasts War on Drugs: 'It's Been Very Unproductive'." Washington
       Times. April 9, 2015. Accessed May 27, 2015.

       "2012/2013 Chicago Murders-Timeline." DNAinfo.com Chicago. N.p., n.d. Accessed. 30
       Nov. 2013.

EDUCATION

Master of Arts in Communications and Rhetorical Studies, *Syracuse University, 2015*
Bachelor of Science in Philosophy, International Studies, *Bradley University, 2013*

ACADEMIC HONORS

- Panelist and Performer at Penn State University's Camp Rhetoric, February 2015
- SU Student Rep at National Communications Association 100th Annual Convention, November 2014
- Presenter at Cultures of Memory Masters Symposium at York St. John's University, October 2014
- Panelist at National Council for Black Studies 38th Annual Conference at University of Miami, March 2014
- GSO Research and Travel Grant Recipient, 2014-2015
- CRS Graduate Teaching Assistantship, 2014-2015
- African American Studies Graduate Research Fellowship, 2013-2014
- BU Presidential Scholar, 2009-2013

PUBLIC SPEAKING HONORS

- National Champion, 140th Interstate Oratorical Association (oldest speaking competition in US), 2013
- National Champion, American Forensics Association: Top Speaker, 2013, 2012; Communication Analysis, 2012; Duo Interpretation, 2012
- National Champion, National Forensics Association: Rhetorical Criticism, 2013, 2012; Persuasive Speaking, 2013, 2011; Top Speaker, 2012, 2011
- State Champion, IL Intercollegiate Forensics Association: Top Speaker, 2013, 2012; Impromptu Speaking 2013, 2012; Informative Speaking, 2012; Persuasive Speaking, 2012; After Dinner Speaking, 2011
- Bedford V. Lawson Oratorical Champion, Midwestern Regional & District of Il, Alpha Phi Alpha, Inc, 2012

PUBLICATIONS

- Cochran, J. R., Tilton, B., and Melendez, T. (2013). Fix the 2009 Fraud Enforcement and Recovery Act. Winning Orations of the Interstate Oratorical Association (2013): Print.
- Cochran, J. R., Chen, M., and Smith, D. (2012). Special administrative measures. Winning Orations of the Interstate Oratorical Association (2012): 40-42. Print.

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Education and Communications Consultant
Syracuse, New York *(2013-2015)*

- Co-Founded "The Forensics Edge" ('14), a first-of-its-kind online public speaking training platform coaching thousands of high-school students. Integral in the development of digital content, recruitment and training of talented partners, and establishment of brand recognition and online presence.
- Authored course materials, provided voice over, and filmed and edited videos for Pearson Education's emerging online platforms and #1 selling public speaking textbook two years running.
- Produced a national online public speaking course with Connect4Education and Acclaim in 2014.
- Public Speaking Instructor for over 2500 students through National Speech and Debate Association, Bradley University Summer Forensics Institute, University of Texas at Austin National Institute of Forensics, The Perfect Performance Camp, U-Camps, and additional institutions.

University Course Instructor
Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York *(2013-2015)*

- Educated 110+ students for *Presentational Speaking* and *Contemporary Perspectives in Rhetorical Theory*, increasing writing proficiency, comprehension of rhetorical methods, political literacy, and public speaking abilities with a focus on multimedia, conference setting, epideictic, and podium presentations.
- Modernized the University's Public Speaking Courses for incoming undergraduate students by introducing integrative coursework that blends digital media and performance studies to promote multicultural experiences and cross cultural communication.