

Metaphors and Metonymy in Politics. Selected Aspects. by Paweł Zieliński

Introduction.....	2
Chapter 1 The Theory of Metaphor and Metonymy	3
Chapter 1.1 Other views on metaphor.	8
Chapter 1.2 Metonymy.....	10
Chapter 1.3 Methods of Research	14
Chapter 2 Metaphor in Politics	18
Chapter 2.1 The Republican Debates	20
Chapter 2.2 The Democratic Debates.....	26
Chapter 2.3 Obama vs McCain – Presidential Debates.....	32
Chapter 3 Metonymy in Politics.....	38
Conclusions.....	44
Summary in English	47
Abstract.....	49
References:.....	50

Introduction

This work is devoted to metaphor and metonymy, as researched and discussed in cognitive linguistics. The poetic function of metaphor is of now interest, however a connection can be made between the two. Metaphor has been an object of discussion since the 1980s, where serious consideration of it started with the publishing of Lakoff's and Johnson's work called *Metaphors We Live By*. Not since the times of Aristotle have metaphors been discussed in a new light as in this work. The most important idea mentioned by the two authors is that metaphors are a matter of not only language, but of thought as well. More on this idea can be found in later chapters of this work.

The title of this paper is *Metaphors and Metonymy in Politics*. The main aim is to show how politicians discuss topics when talking to people who agree with them, and how to people who do not support their views. Regardless of the worldview, however, politicians, are people who work together and they just happen to have different views on different matters. Exactly how they express them is the main focus of this work. In order to understand this question better, one needs to look first at how politicians talk to their voters i.e. people whose votes they are sure of, and how do they talk to people from the opposite *camp* of the political spectrum. To put the question in more on topic terms, I want to describe the metaphors which drive the speeches made by politicians, and how it is, that some voters switch their sympathy to a totally different side every four years. The best ground for this question are the Presidential elections in the United States of America. Owing to a specific system in which they choose their Presidents, where each party has a pre-election (the so called Primary) during which they choose the candidate for the whole party to compete in the general election, it seems like an ideal environment for finding the answer to the question put forth in this paper. The closest elections at the time of writing were the 2008 American Presidential elections. Many different topics were discussed during them, but I have narrowed them down to the ones concerning foreign policy, domestic policy (economy etc), and the military. There is a strong division in the United States

between the Conservative and the Liberal political movements, which greatly shows every time the country needs to vote for their government.

In chapter 1 the main ideas concerning the theory of metaphor are discussed. Works start with Lakoff and Johnson, and continue through books by other linguists. The theoretical part is to show the significance of metaphors, and show how the base for this paper was formed. Chapter 2 is devoted to the practical aspect of metaphors. That is, examples from political debates are discussed, categorized according to the topic. Chapter 2 is also divided into parts. The first one deals with Republicans, the Second with the Democrats and the third deals with the clash of the two political sides. Chapter 3 discusses metonymy. In it, the examples provided are taken from both, political speeches, and newspaper articles.

Chapter 1 The Theory of Metaphor and Metonymy

The aim of this chapter is to present the theoretical basis for the later, practical, part of this work. I present the basic theories and concepts behind metaphors, and how they influence, not only the language we use, but also the world around. In the later part of this chapter I also discuss metonymy. The first part is devoted to the general theory of metaphors, as discussed by Lakoff in *Metaphors We Live By* (1980) co-written with Mark Johnson. There are also other views on metaphors and metonymies present in this work, and discussed

in this chapter. Finally, my focus is on Lakoff's idea that Conservatives and Liberals think in different terms, using two different metaphors and sets of other linguistic phenomenon connected with it.

In this paper it is researched how everyday speech is metaphor driven, but the main focus of this work is to show how metaphors can be used, not only subconsciously, but also intentionally, in order to avoid talking about certain subjects, or to create a certain cognitive connotations in the listener's head. How certain type of people value different things. One sentence can be interpreted as having two different meanings, which in turn is what a politician intends to do. It is also shown, how metaphors can demonize, or make people think differently.

Ever since ancient times, in poetry, and literature in general, metaphor was widespread. It was treated as a literary device used by authors in order to enhance the quality of their work. Up till the 20th century, most linguists did not bother with metaphors as a linguistic phenomena, any more than poets discussed language theory in detail. However, all this changed when Lakoff and Johnson published their work in the year 1980. They discovered that metaphors, contrary to what was thought throughout the years, are actually a matter of thought as well. Not just language. They are responsible for our thinking, they govern our cognition and also they are present in our speech (1980).

Lakoff and Johnson (1980) distinguish three types of metaphors in their work. These are the ontological metaphor, the orientational metaphor, and the structural metaphor. Ontological metaphors are based on the notion of a container. Something can be in, or out of the container. It can be overflowing, or be empty. All these states are used in such expressions as e.g. *to be IN love*, *to SPILL the beans*, *to have a FALLING OUT* etc. The examples are numerous. One can immediately see the frequency of use of these expressions. Inflation can be *over the roof*, or the *economy can be in a ditch*. A country can be *down a hole* from which it needs to get out. A certain person can be *IN the know*, a phrase popular with politicians. It is useful when

describing some abstract concepts like the inflation, and making them easier for the lay man, who is not interested in the intricate workings of Wall Street, but wants to know that if the stock brokers had a *falling out* with the government on spending, it simply means that they disagreed on several matters of importance to him. Many people do not have the time to spend on reading about business, that is why metaphors are employed.

The orientational metaphor is based on the three-dimensional space. The direction, whether it is left or right, up or down, are used in this type of metaphor. It is interesting to add, that it is based on our culture. For example, in the Anglo-Saxon cultural group, for example, the direction of right is associated with good. It is even reflected in the language e.g. something is right i.e. it is the correct way to do it. In Polish the word for *right* is *prawy*. We have an expression *prawy człowiek* (translated as *righteous man*). Christians believe that after dying they will be placed on the right hand side of God. On the opposite side of the spectrum, we have got the left, which in some cultures is treated as mischievous. People who were left handed were frowned upon. A similar situation can be observed with the *up – down* dimensions. In the European culture, which is mostly catholic, *up* is associated with salvation. God is up in his golden throne, Heaven and Paradise are also beyond our heads. We *look up* to someone when we admire a person, we ascend our skills, we are at the *top* of our class in schools. All those are metaphorical expressions associated with the three-dimensional space. Down, on the other hand, is considered evil, and bad. It is negative in the sense that we say e.g. *to look down on somebody*, which means that we are better, or feel better, morally, for example. In Catholicism down is where Hell and the Devil are. God has *cast him down* beneath the earth. Another example is giving someone the so called *thumbs up* when we approve, and the *thumbs down* when we disapprove. This metaphor is also used in politics to great extent. However, one must have some knowledge of the world at large in order for this type of metaphorical utterances to work. The examples I provided were all taken with the Anglo-Saxon, or European background in mind. Our history, or place of habitat has got an influence on our manner of speaking. In India, or countries in which the Buddhist religion is dominant, it would not be

uncommon to hear of a metaphor: LIFE IS A CONTINUOUS JOURNEY, or LIFE IS A CIRCLE. In Christian faith death is considered as the end of life on Earth, however in Hindu cultures it is only a temporary stage in the cycle of dying and rebirth. This shows the importance of categorization in metaphors.

The last type of metaphor that Lakoff and Johnson (1980) introduce in their work is the structural metaphor. This is, according to the authors, the most complex on the three types. The concept of domains is introduced. In a structural metaphor, for example, *love is a journey*, or *argument is war*, we have to domains. There are target and source domains. In the example mentioned, the target domain of love is described by the source domain of a journey. The source domain is then mapped onto LOVE. Similarly, the target domain of argument is described by means of the source domain of war. In the former example, love is compared to a journey. Like every journey, it has got hardships, parts of it a *uphill*, some or *downhill* etc. The whole abstract concept of love is seen here as a travel. In the latter example of war, it is compared to an argument. According to Lakoff and Johnson "we talk about arguments that way because we conceive of them that way - and we act according to the way we conceive things" (5). Thus we say about *defending* our arguments, *attacking* the positions of the *opponent* etc. Metaphors make it easier for us to visualize and apprehend the concept of arguing.

The fact that metaphors are so fertile as a topic is because they enable us to change the world at large. Take, for example, the infamous *War on drugs*. From a military standpoint it had nothing in common with war. There were no fronts, 2 or more opposing armies, or warfare in general. It consisted in the government introducing new, stricter laws for drug possession, and it allowed the police officers to be more effective. Not even one soldier from the United States Army was involved. However, what this did was it created two metaphorical fronts that people could side with – if you took drugs you were evil, and therefore deserved punishment, if not, you were one of the ‘good guys’. The repercussions of using such a term have created a division in the society which would not be present otherwise. Imagine if the name was *Tougher Laws*

Created In Order To Stop Others From Taking Drugs. Apart from the ludicrously long and impractical name, it does not entail the same kind of emotions. A similar situation was with *The War on Terror*. This slogan, apart from having a similar metaphor in it, also uses metonymy (discussed in further detail in later chapters).

Using metaphors has also got the added benefit of making difficult topics sound approachable by lay people. Imagine a situation where a politician would debate with his colleague about the importance of inflation rates, of the money rates etc, using the language that only a selected few who have been educated in economics can understand. This would not work on the political stage, because what a candidate, senator, or member of Parliament wants in the end, is to get new voters. If one wants a voter, he or she needs to use a similar language to them, and what is more, discuss things in a clear way. Apart from this, metaphors are implemented into various commentaries and newspaper articles in which they serve an additional purpose. Namely, they help to visualise the severity, or absurdity of an action, or a statement made by a politician.

Thus one can safely assume that these assumptions made by Lakoff are in fact true:

States are locations (bounded regions in space) e.g. *I'm so full of anger now*.

Changes are movements (into or out of bounded regions) e.g. *I have fallen in love*.

Actions are self-propelled movements. *The Civil Rights movement has spread*.

Purposes are destinations. *We need to head towards lower taxes*.

Means are paths to destinations. *It is through hard work that we will achieve success*.

Difficulties are impediments to motion e.g. *Our marriage has hit the rocks; His drinking problem has caused him to reach rock-bottom*.

External events are large, moving objects e.g. *U2 managed to steamroll the audience*.

Long-term, purposeful activities are journeys e.g. *Life is a journey; Love is a journey*.

Before Lakoff and Johnson, there was Michael Reddy. His addition is acknowledged in *Metaphors We Live By* (1980). Reddy described a phenomenon which he called the *conduit metaphor*. Similar to what the two scholars were saying, the conduit metaphor is present in our lives. Take an expressions: It's hard to *get* that idea across to him. It's difficult to *put* my ideas *into* words. I *gave* you that idea. etc. All these are metaphorical. The conduit metaphor says that expressions are containers for meaning. That is to say that all sentences, even said without context, are in fact meaningful. In the above examples meaning in 'put into containers' and sent to the addressee. Its use is seen in later parts of this work, whenever there appears to be a misunderstanding, or a disagreement. Moderators will also employ this metaphor when trying to get the right person to speak and to stop everyone from interrupting each other. Failure to uphold this metaphor results in chaos, where the messages sent are distorted and misinterpreted by the receivers, thus no coherence can be spoken of.

Saying that *love is a journey*, or that we are *full of anger* are examples of using a metaphor in our everyday communication. As one can see, with the examples provided, metaphors are used when we are concerned about abstract concepts. When we are dealing with a situation describing concrete phenomenon, we do not need to use metaphors e.g. *a balloon is going up* describes a simple situation which we can visualise without the help of metaphors. It is however a metonymical expression (the focus on metonymy is in later chapters).

Chapter 1.1 Other views on metaphor.

The question which arises is how exactly do we distinguish a metaphorical utterance from a concrete, non-metaphorical one. Eva Feder Kittay in *Metaphor: its cognitive force and linguistic structure* (1987) says that there are some reasons why this question has only been partially answered. One is, she claims, that scholars have not properly named which parts of discourse are metaphors (p. 40). 'Language can only be identified as metaphorical by virtue of linguistic and contextual conditions that require that we interpret it

differently from its surrounding discourse' (Kittay pp. 40-41). That is why identifying the unit of discourse which is a metaphor is so crucial.

According to Searle (1980), in order to understand how metaphorical utterances work, one needs to understand how literal ones do. He also argues that many scholars failed to make the effort to correctly define literal utterances, and thus their work on metaphors is somehow limited because of the fact. As has been noted earlier in this work, metaphors are not used in a situation where we are met with a concrete situation. Searle writes that some sentence's literal meaning 'determines (..) a set of truth conditions. His example is *The cat is on the mat*. This utterance presents us with just one variant of meaning, thus it is not metaphorical. The cat is either on the mat or not. However, how is that when we say A is B, but in fact we mean A is C (Searle, p. 89). In concrete or literal expressions, this is not a problem. A sentence can mean only this and that. When the matter concerns metaphors, the speaker and the hearer require to have some additional, extra lingual information. In other words, the speaker and the hearer need to possess the same background assumptions (89). Thus: Searle asks a question, which he forms as follows: 'What are the principles that enable speakers to formulate, and hearers to understand, metaphorical utterances?' (Ortony p. 85).

It is difficult in some cases to determine whether an utterance is metaphorical or not because of language change. Lakoff calls these *dead metaphors* (1980), Searle also focuses on this aspect. A situation like this happens when an expression has been used so frequently in its metaphorical sense and less so in its literal sense. Through years of such use, the impact on the hearer is weakened and thus, the metaphor becomes a literal expression. That is not to say that e.g. calm down is more literal than e.g. the ARGUMENT IS WAR metaphor. Some utterances, over time become idiomatic, but the whole point of metaphor is that the meaning of the speaker's intention is different from the meaning of the individual words. This, according to

Searle is the central problem of understanding metaphors: to understand why the sentence meaning and the speaker's intended meaning can be at the same time different and related.

Chapter 1.2 Metonymy

Metonymy is a slightly different concept than a metaphor, however by no means narrower. When describing a metaphor, we take one concept, which we can call A, and compare it in a way to a different concept – B. So we can have A is B as a definition. In Lakoff (1987) there is a proposition that a metonymy is created when one conceptual entity, known as *target*, is understood by means of another conceptual entity, called the *vehicle*. This happens in one Ideal Cognitive Model (ICM). Thus, according to Gunter Radden and Zoltan Kövecses (1999), one word or the other can be a metonymy. Yet, because of taboo, or social norms, or other cognitive rules we choose which one.

Raymond Gibbs shows that metonymy can be used in discourse to understand tautology, indirect speech acts and of better understanding of contextually determined reference. Also, Gibbs thinks that the Gricean notion of conversational implicature is also metonymically driven. (the notion of quality, quantity etc). Other scholars have also discussed metonymy. Gilles Fauconnier and Mark Turner (2002) show that Lakoff's unidirectional model of metonymy (the one in which we choose the metonymy based on some cognitive rules) does not work in some utterances. They provide the example *smoke is coming out of her ears* in which the meaning can only be recognized by means of blending of the source and the target.

Peter Koch (1999) looks for metonymy in imagery. If metonymies can change the meaning of an utterance, then the new meaning becomes the *figure*, and the old one becomes the *ground* Koch also distinguishes three types of what he calls ad hoc metonymic innovation which can induce a metonymic change: the hearer

based *fireplace* treated as *fire*, speaker based which create *hip* instead of *thigh*, and the expressive innovations – *skull* for *head*.

Antonio Barcelona (2000) claims that while both metaphor and metonymy seem to be discussed together, the latter has received less space than the former. Even though metonymy seems to be even more basic to language and cognition. How it happens, or how exactly the hearer of an utterance is able to recognize the metonymy and understand it is discussed in later parts of this work.

Its use varies greatly. In most cases it helps to simplify an utterance, or serves the pragmatic function of using less space in newspapers. In the medium that this work explores, namely politics, metonymy is used as a tool for glorification, or vilification of certain entities (people, countries, organizations etc). When not used by politicians themselves, journalists tend to favour it in articles. It is not uncommon to read lines like: *the White House has denied allegations; The Senate is discussing the bill* etc. When it comes to vilification of certain organizations, it is also helpful. Most people are not exactly aware of what the Irish Republican Army does, but when the British Prime Minister uses the name *terrorists*, it fits the mental category of *evil*.

There are many different types of metonymy that I would like to discuss in detail. The examples are provided and explained below. The first type of metonymy to be described is PRODUCT FOR PRODUCER. It is very frequently used in such sentences as: I have bought a *Ford* (a brand name for a car), or They have stolen some *Picasso*, a *Van Gogh* and *Rembrandt* (not the painters themselves, but the paintings by the artists). In many cases, because of cognitive categorization, the brand name is used to describe all products of similar nature, but of different producers: I have bought a *hoover* (a vacuum cleaner).

The next one is OBJECT FOR USER. We are all familiar with a Polish commercial of a pain killer, in which a conductor of an orchestra says that the *clarinet* has a headache, the *tuba* a stomach ache etc. This

was an example of a metonymy type in which the object is used instead of the user of the object. The conductor wanted to say that the musician who plays the clarinet has got a headache, but chose to say that the musical instrument has a headache instead. When we watch the news about some strikes happening around the world, we can hear utterances like: the *metro* went on strike, or *the trains* are being late. It is a similar situation.

The next few examples that are discussed are: I had an accident, some *BMW* drove into my boot, or *Władysław Jagiello* won the battle of Grunwald. We call this type of metonymy CONTROLLER FOR THE CONTROLLED. In the first example, the car did not drive into our boot by itself, it had a driver. In the latter example the situation is of a military commander who commanded his army. It is logical to assume that it was his decisions that won him the battle, not his personal fighting.

INSTITUTION FOR THE PEOPLE RESPONSIBLE is probably one of the most frequently used metonymies in newspapers. Imagine reading a sentence like: *The Ministry of Finance* raised the taxes, or *Orlen* has raised the price of gasoline. Instead of enumerating the people involved in some event, we just use the collective name of an institution. It is obvious that *Orlen* employs many people who had nothing to do with their policy of raising the price of petrol; or in the former example, in the Ministry of Finance there are people whose jobs do not include taxes, or are not in power to make such a decision. It is however, as mentioned before, used to glorify or to vilify a whole organization. When we say that the current government has built several football grounds for children to play on, we glorify the institution, at the same time failing to notice that there were lots of parties involved in the said project, and the government just signed the deals. On the other hand, we can see that an exploit of a single politician of a party can cause the whole party to be considered not honest. This type of metonymy is of much focus in later parts of this work. A very similar phenomenon is the PLACE FOR INSTITUTION metonymy. I do not separate the two because they are in fact the same. It is possible to say that the *White House* denied the allegation, or the

Moscow wants to wage war against *Tokyo*. More examples are discussed in greater detail in later chapters of this work.

PLACE FOR EVENT e.g. We should never forget *9/11*, or *Katyń* is an issue that Poland and Russian need to solve. In all these examples, a place, or time of an event replaces the event. There are some historical dates, or places which are set in our minds quite firmly. In Polish history we have the year 1939, or the date 1st of September, as the time that World War Two began; or *Katyń*, which is a place where the Soviets murdered Polish officers, University professor et al. In The United States of America, 9/11 is a date which stands for the attacks on the World Trade Center in 2001. Pearl Harbor, as a place where the Japanese army bombarded the US Navy. Some events were so dire, or significant, that one needs only to mention the place or date, and immediately in our minds opens a slot, which helps us to recognize what that person is talking about. This metonymy is used in popular culture, in songs which are supposed to commemorate events, or disasters: Tchaikovsky's Overture 1812 is said to commemorate Waterloo, Andrzej Wajda's film *Katyń* immediately tells what it is going to be about. All countries, or different cultures have different perceptions of such events, or different events entirely, however in all those said cultures and countries, this type of metonymy is used.

In the previous chapters I provided a few examples of how metaphors can influence the world at large. Metonymy also has such power. In one of the earlier examples the *War on Terror* was used. The repercussions of naming something a war have already been discussed, however, the second part of the slogan is just as interesting. Terror is such a broad word which can encompass very many things. Indeed, that is one of the basic concepts behind metonymy. All our world is metonymical because, according to the cognitive viewpoint, we cannot see the whole of a thing at once. We are limited to one part at a time. However, the word Terror can be dangerous because, as mentioned, it can be a lot of things. When metaphors or metonymy are used in politics, quite often a second meaning is hidden behind them. For many

Americans a *terrorist* is not someone who has been convicted of terrorist acts, but anyone from the Middle-East. That is why whenever you hear about white terrorist such a civic out roar is heard. The danger of calling something a War on Terror is exactly this. We brand certain groups of people in one group. It is ethnicity, or your country of origin that causes you to be a *terrorist* and not your deeds. This is just one of the many examples where metonymy is used as a way of simplifying, but at the same time in a harmful way. Another example is calling the political situation in some countries a *regime*. The background assumption of a regime is that there is one dictator, who gets rid of the opposition and democracy, and rules his people against their will. It is true in some cases, however, without the basic understanding of how some countries work, and of the mentality of the people there, it is a similar situation to the *terror* example. This happens often before the countries of the West want to send their troops to some place. The newspapers, and politicians immediately start talking about regimes, which sound really negative in most people's ears.

Chapter 1.3 Methods of Research

The practical part of this work focuses on an analysis. In chapter 1 what is described is the background theory with limited examples concerning the subject matter of this work. It is vital to describe said subject matter because it is expanded upon in later parts of this work. The methods of research focused on in chapter 2 henceforth are as follows. Politics is a productive medium, because politicians need to speak publicly about ongoing problems. I use transcripts of speeches and debates, for they are the main subject of interest of mine. It is shown how much of the speech is metaphor based.

The focus of this work is on the speeches conducted during the elections. Due to the specific nature of American voting process, the so called pre-elections are also taken into consideration. This will allow to highlight the difference between how politicians speak to members of their own party, which entails similar worldview and a certain concurrence in their political programmes, and how they behave when faced with

an opponent from an opposing political party. This also includes the above mentioned different types of metaphorical use. Besides speeches created entirely to sway the voters on their side, there are also instances where a politician has made an unpopular decision, or is about to explain himself to the public (like George Bush and the Iraq War), where the speech writers need to make the bad sound as if it is good, or neutral at worst. Clausewitz's *War is business pursued by other means*, as discussed by Lakoff, or trying certain metonymies in order to avoid saying what the conflict really is are used to great extent.

Newspaper articles and TV reports are the subject matter of this paper as well. The basic of the media is to fit a lot of content into a limited space, or time. Thus, certain restrictions have to be arranged in order to do so. That is why metonymy is so useful. It also avoids confusion of the viewers (which the media want to have the majority of), because it is simple to state that *the Kremlin* disagreed with the US foreign policy, than name the person responsible in the Russian government, and offer additional explanation. Plus, if a certain website, newspaper, or TV network wants to have its views known, there is no better way than metonymy (for reasons mentioned in this work).

I distinguish two types of metaphorical use that are the focus of this work. One is subconscious, meaning that it is used without being exactly aware of the fact. The other type is the one where metaphors are consciously used in order to achieve a certain goal. It will be analysed just how and when certain utterances are used.

I look at the Clausewitz metaphor which claims that **WAR IS BUSINESS PURSUED BY OTHER MEANS**. Current events (at the time of writing this paper) are full of international tension, rebellion and war. This is a very productive time for metaphor and metonymy usage. People in power try to justify their actions by sounding as if it is not as dire as it is in reality.

Metonymical expressions are explained in a similar manner as in chapter 1. The type of metonymy is provided with explanation, further example and the source. It is of importance that metonymy is used more often to describe politics, not by politicians themselves. That is not to say that they do not use it at all, just the frequency is not as high as in newspaper articles.

To conclude, article articles, speech transcripts and debate transcripts are the basis of analysis in the later parts of this work. Each example is described in a similar way, namely the type of metaphorical expression i.e. ontological, orientational, or structural (plus conduit), what is the TARGET DOMAIN and what is THE SOURCE DOMAIN, and what does it mean in the utterance, how is the meaning changed, and what were the possible intentions of the speaker.

Metonymical expressions are discussed in a narrower way, albeit not scarcely. The source and the type of metonymy will be used, and, as mentioned earlier, what is the reason for such an expression. Is it used pragmatically, because there is not much space, or is it used purposefully in order to create a certain effect in the reader. However, that is not to say that politicians' speeches are devoid of such stylistic devices. We remember Ronald Reagan who, in one of his speeches addressed Gorbachev: *Mr Gorbachev, turn down this wall*, or John F. Kennedy: *Ich bin ein Berliner* (I am a Berliner).

During the course of the research I have gathered some expressions which are metaphorical in nature, however they do not serve the purpose of this work. The typical ones include: *he is swift like a horse* among others. These are similes which are not the subject matter of this paper. Their usage can be traced back to the politician's background. People for the Southern United States tend to use this stylistic phenomenon more often than politicians from the North. George W. Bush, the previous President of the US was known for such colourful expressions. Ronald Reagan is quoted saying: *We should pull ourselves up by our own*

bootstraps. However, while some rare events of these occurring may happen, that is not the type of metaphor, or stylistic device that is of interest to this work.

In Lakoff's *Moral politics: How Liberals and Conservatives Think* he claims that the division between the so called *red states* and the *blue states* is more than just division between what is conservative and what is liberal. It is, as he claims, a division in the world view (p. iv). It is further explained that what we conceptualize is metaphors, and we think in terms of them. What is more, it is perfectly reasonable to make an assumption that politics is a metaphor driven force. The example that he uses is taken from a newspaper article in Washington Post. In the article the columnist compares the Government to a mother who spends too much money on things that the citizens (children in this metaphor) do not need. On the other side of the spectrum we see the Congress, which is like a strict dad who does not want his children to be spoiled, and he cuts of the funding. The claim that is later made is that not one of the readers has a problem with this article. It is just one big metaphor which is not directly explained, yet everyone knows what it is about. As it is seen in later parts of this work, one can not only compare the Government to a parent, but also a country, or even a political party to a human being. In previous works, Lakoff mentions the STATE AS A PERSON metaphor (1992), where the strong military is the person's strength, and the state of the economy is the health. In the Republican debates some talk is devoted to *growing* the military, or *stabilizing* the economy, so that the country can come out of a recession (which is compared to a ditch). Thus, the assumptions made later in this work have a basis in the fact, that people understand metaphors and what is more, view the world through them.

Lakoff's work is also useful when describing who a Republican and who a Democrat is. As it is seen later in this paper, people from the same party differ, on some points, substantially. However, they are still referred to as either a Republican or a Democrat. For example, most Republicans are for oil drilling, and are somewhat against forced changes in the way that the country may produce electricity. Yet, Arnold Schwarzenegger, who served as the Governor of California, was keen on implementing the so called *green*

energy while being elected as a Republican. The issue that is the most important that all politicians of a given party agree on is social care. It is seen in chapter 2 of this thesis that the Democrats tend to discuss social benefits, as e.g. health-care, the benefits for single parents etc, the GOP focuses more on the self-employed Americans, the building of industrial and military power, gun-owners etc. Indeed, this is one of the defining factors of a politician, the focus on key matters. This stems from the mentioned COUNTRY AS A FAMILY metaphor (Lakoff p. 13). The conservatives think that the government should be like a strict father, who teaches children through their own mistakes and waits until they get back on their feet by themselves, which favours the American mentality of *every man for himself*, while on the other hand, the liberals think that it is the *nurturing mother* who helps her children and forgives them their mistakes. Which is why there is a clash in the world view of so many Americans, and it is seen by the use of metaphors (p. 16).

Chapter 2 Metaphor in Politics

As seen in chapter 1, metaphors are directly connected with our speech. Debates are also better to analyse, because, apart from basic preparation, most of what is being said, is spontaneous. Which, linguistically, is more valid, and so it is more useful for this work.

The aim of this chapter is to present and then to analyse the use of metaphors and metonymies during Presidential debates. The main subject matter, or the question that is answered in this chapter is how does a politician speak to his voters, and how does it differ from the way he speaks to people who are supporters of his fellow candidate. There is a considerable difference in the choice of vocabulary used in the two situations. American politics is a phenomenon which illustrates this perfectly due to the characteristic form of their political elections. At first, each of the major party has to elect their candidate for the main election. Thus, the so called *primary* debates are held. What this does, is it shows the duality of language. When a Republican is speaking to other Republican candidates, with an audience comprised primarily of the GOP (Grand Old Party – other name for the Republicans) supporters, he is sure to evoke the ‘classics’ i.e. the most successful and famous Republican Presidents. As it is shown, Ronald Reagan is the choice of the Right, and John F. Kennedy and Franklin D. Roosevelt are the people most often mentioned by the Left. However, as a side note, I want to turn to one detail of discussing politics. Namely, the supporters. Supporters meaning voters, but also people who are for a political bill. It can be supported by the voices of America, it can also mean that some people support a policy.

This, however, shows just one spectrum of metaphorical expressions which are the subject of this paper. The other one is when we contrast two opposite worlds and discuss to what extent metaphors and metonymy can be used to sway the voters from the opponent’s side. This clash of ideas gives a plethora of information and materials for this work, which are analysed. In chapter 2.1 and 2.2 I discuss the first problem, namely, politicians talking to their own voters, and discussing matters in their own ‘environment’. In chapter 2.3 the metaphors used to talk to a different voter are expressed and discussed.

Later in this work, there is also focus put on how politicians need to describe some unpopular decisions to their voters. What structures are used, and what words are carefully chosen for such an event. The question of how to hide unpleasant facts is answered as well.

Chapter 2.1 The Republican Debates

As noted earlier, during the primary debates, there were characteristic utterances used. It shows what is the most important issue for a given voter. During the Republican discussion, asked about the state of America, Mitt Romney had this to say:

I came into a state which was very much in a deep ditch. (http://articles.cnn.com/2008-01-30/politics/GOPdebate.transcript_1_governor-romney-budget-gap-mitt-romney?_s=PM:POLITICS). Here, the state of the economy of a State is said to have been *in a ditch*. This is an example of the orientational metaphor. In the Anglo-Saxon culture up is good and down is bad. So, when saying about the state of the economy of something that it is in a *ditch* it means that it is bad. A *ditch* is a place near the side of the road, lower than the surrounding terrain, which is used to gather water. Roads are also a big part of America, that is why the *ditch* metaphor is used. It is more probable than a *ravine*. In the same comment, Romney also uses a very popular term a budget *gap*. A gap is something that needs to be filled. A gap also happens when some material is lacking. Therefore a gap in the budget is created when there is a lack of income to the state. Using such expressions to explain the economy is also approached via metaphors. *Deficit* is a word which is not used. Note also, that he said *gap*, and not *hole*. The latter causes substances to leak, while the former is something that can be filled. The whole *budget has a gap* utterance is a use of the ontological metaphor type. The budget of something is a container into which money is poured in, however there are some gaps, which causes the container not to be filled in properly. A different example of the use of the orientational metaphor is when Romney commented on the current administration saying thus: *Nevertheless, this*

president did pull us out of a deep recession. This sentence is very rich in terms of metaphorical usage. Firstly, the country was *pulled out of* something. It means that the situation was bad (low, or to use the earlier metaphor: *in a ditch*), but the President managed to pull it out of it, just like one would pull a car out of a hole. If something has been pulled out, it also means it is in a better shape now. The other part of the sentence likens the recession to something deep. Again, a very important thing to notice is the emphasis on DOWN. Also worth noting is the use of the *president* metonymy (see: chapter 3). Different candidates can also be heard talking about the economy by the help of the orientational metaphor. Other uses of it are seen in Ron Paul's answer in which he talks about how the standard of living is *going down*, and how the middle class is hurting because of the monetary policy. Again, if something is going down, it does get worse. However, note the themes again, the standard of living, the middle class etc. The democrats, as it is shown in later parts of this work, have a different mindset and focus more on the lower classes, health, education. The Republican voters, however, treasure self-sustainability the most. They care about their standard of living, their house prices etc, not someone else's. Ron Paul, who is somewhat a different Republican than the people mentioned before puts even more emphasis on Reagan's famous *bootstraps* saying.

To answer the statement from the beginning of this chapter, there are also certain values evoked for a certain type of voter. The right side of the political spectrum focuses more on material matters, that is why the state of the economy is so important. In a different example, again from Romney's answer, there are the values represented, which would be different if he were talking to the left. The above mentioned values are represented by most of the Republicans present on the debate. To illustrate this, former governor of Arkansas, Mike Huckabee, evokes all these into one swift answer. He talks about house prices, the job market, and most importantly, about Americans who have their own business. This is the thing that I want to highlight, the Republicans policy of *every man for himself*. Senator McCain, for example said that they should have some *straight* talk. A use of the conduit metaphor, in which communication is sent in packages, thus if someone says about straight talk, he intends to communicate as quickly and truthfully as possible.

The opposite of this would be *avoid* talking directly, as if going through curves on a road, which causes the message to arrive at the hearer's later than planned. When discussing climate change, and Global Warming, an issue controversial on the right side of the political spectrum, they try to avoid talking directly. For example, a lot of time is put into discussing the so called *caps* on the heavy industry. What this means is that oil drilling, and other heavy industrial corporations are like pots with boiling liquid. Therefore there is a need to put a *cap* on so that the liquid does not spill. It is noted in later parts of this work that the Democrats talk openly about limits on the industry. Something which is not well seen by the Republican supporters. A *cap* is a neutral word. It is an example of an unpopular decision to be made and talked about. In this metaphor, as has already been said, people are afraid that the contents of the container may spill, that is why a cap is necessary. Mitt Romney also talks about a safety *valve* that needs to be implemented, thus talking the metaphor even further. What is brilliant in naming this in such a way, is that both the Left and the Right will accept this

Later in the debate, we witness when politicians start accusing each other of *stepping out* of the Republican thought, or not being in the *mainstream* of said thought. Once more with the conviction that only few things really matter to Republican voters. That is why when someone *sways* from the main thought, he is immediately accused of *siding* with the Democrats (ARGUMENT IS WAR metaphor). Note the use of metaphors not only to talk about policy, but also to attack the opponents from the same political party. *Not staying the course* is another example of such thinking. Senator Ron Paul says that the Republicans were elected to *change the course*. Changing a course on a ship means changing direction and choosing a new route. Policy is like a ship, someone sets it in motion and prepares a *course* for it to go. However, if it is not successful, someone different must *change* it.

The United States army is another topic mentioned by the GOP (Republicans). In the next example it is likened to a plant, which needs to grow. *No one is talking about cutting the military, we ought to grow it.*

This is a quote from Mitt Romney, please note that, as mentioned, the military as an organisation is treated like a plant. Cutting it is bad, what one should do to be strong is to *grow* it. Like a tree. This can be approached from different angles. First of all, growing is the orientational metaphor, where UP is GOOD. Also, in Lakoff's paper *Metaphor and War, Again* (Lakoff, 2003), a strong military is used as a metaphor for a human being's strength. This is a further extension of the STATE AS A PERSON metaphor. It is used to a great extent here. That is why if we talk about *growing* the army, there are connotations of making the country stronger, just as a person who goes to the gym in order to *grow* muscles. In the same article, the state of the economy is like the health of a person. So, when the politicians are talking about how the economy is collapsing, the health of a country is collapsing. To stay on the course of military language use, the army is not the only phenomenon that is talked in such a way. The power of metaphor is such, that one takes one domain and uses it on a different target. A lot of time and effort has been put on discussing the so-called *bailout* plans for the economy, to help stop the recession. The subject of recession has been discussed earlier, however a *bail out* is a term used in the military, which describes (following Cambridge Online Dictionary) a situation when a crew of a plane must jump out of it, because it will crash. Also, this phrasal verb means to evacuate from a dangerous area. A *bailout* however, is defined, using the same dictionary, as helping a person by lending them money. There is a similarity between the two phrases. What is of note, the plan of the Government bailout proposed by George Bush, has been criticised by the public, and the Democrats, so its use is very scarce.

The obvious use for the utterances mentioned above is to describe the conflict in Iraq, an issue which is controversial and provokes a lot of emotions. In Lakoff (2003) there is a line about how calling Saddam Hussein a tyrant has caused the public to forget the fact, that a lot of civilians have been killed during the war. It is because if someone says that we are fighting Al-Qaeda, or Saddam, there is no need to mention that innocent people are dying. The fact of the matter is, when discussing the war, some views, even from the Republican party, are that the Americans should not be there. It is described as an intervention, not a

war, for two reasons. Firstly, a President cannot wage war without the Congress's support. Secondly, Americans have a good memory when it comes to wars. They had one in Vietnam, they had one in Korea. Conversely to the mentioned *War on Drugs*, where there is no open conflict, yet it is acceptable by the public, a peace mission in a foreign country is much more suitable. However, senator Ron Paul calls it *interventionism* and being the *policemen of the world*. If we take Lakoff's STATE AS A PERSON metaphor, then the world is like a playground, or a city. If one country invades the other, it means that it is in its personal space, thus it is wrong. Being the policemen of the world is also a metaphorical extension of the United States foreign policy. If the world is like a city, then policemen are needed to watch everyone. Using these words tells that Ron Paul is against the policies of the current administration, wherein the country is entangled into war, because they feel that they should control everybody. However, a stabilizing mission, as was mentioned before, is much better than war. This is semantics, but what Paul said was metaphor. In chapter 1 I discussed Lakoff's work on the mentality of American politics. It is a clash of world view. The Republicans feel that the Government should be like a *Strict Father* (he uses the term Strict Parent, however in order to differentiate between this and the following metaphor, I chose to use this terminology). This can be extended to external affairs as well. As it is seen in the following chapter. The *Strict Father* does not help his children, but waits until they learn their lesson by themselves. However, when it comes to external threats, which can be seen as an attack on American property, the *Father* is aggressive. That is why there is a lot of military language, and the emphasis on the importance of a strong military. It is shown that the Democrats also use such rhetoric, but they focus on different problems. In later part of this paper, the way that John McCain, who became the candidate from the Republican party, tries to blend the two political views together. It is seen that the aggressive rhetoric and the ideas represented by the Strict government are also able to function in the minds of the Democrats and their voters. It is achieved by creating certain images, which immediately cause various picturing of a given phrase.

America has been created on some myths. One of the myths is the Wild West. It was a wild place where only the strong could survive, and the law was carried out by individuals with a strong moral character. This is characteristic of the Right in the United States. They want to be independent, and want to get rich by their own hard work. An excellent example of the already mentioned *dead metaphors* is the following sentence: *We have to put together a plan that says we're going to rein in the excessive growth in those areas, promising to meet the obligations we made to seniors.* When I wrote about the so called *dead metaphors*, it was said that they had been used so many times, that they lost their metaphorical power and receive, for lack of a better word, a literal meaning. However, they are still metaphorical expressions. It is the case of the phrasal verb *rein in* something. The literal meaning was to use the reins to control your horse and to stop it. It became an expression used in order to describe the execution of power and authority. As it can be seen in the sample sentence, a plan needs to be put together in order to *rein in* something. In other words, to stop something from growing. The beauty of this expression is that it can be used by both, the Left and the Right, but in the minds of the Republican voters it opens an image of the aforementioned Wild West, and of a powerful individual, which is the exact viewpoint of some Americans – a strong individual to take the law in his hands. However, in the example I provided, a very unpopular opinion of social benefits, and interfering into the matters of the public is hidden behind this metaphor. Thus, as one of the thesis of this work stated, in what way does a politician say something unpopular, and at the same time does not limit his chances of being elected. He or she can either use a dead metaphor, or an expression which has different connotations, but means the exact opposite. The power of such imagery is once again apparent, because it is the connotations of freedom, yet the phrase means to take control over something, which is not a popular train of thought in the Republican party.

A very important notion that American politicians have is their legacy. Since they have two major parties battling each other during the elections it is vital for them to stay true to this legacy. The Republicans, and the Democrats have had a history of great Presidents. That is why they evoke their names so often. As

mentioned in the previous paragraphs, the STATE AS A PERSON metaphor can also be used when describing political parties. The Republicans feel that some policies make the party *weaker* and some policies make it *stronger*. Ronald Reagan was the person who made the GOP stronger. In the course of the preliminary debates this metaphor is evoked. Even though the people are from the same political side, they have conflicting views at some matters, mostly spending tax money. Tax money is money which flows into the government from the tax payers i.e. normal citizens. This money is supposed to be used as a means of sustaining life. So, tax money is like blood to a human (the STATE AS A PERSON metaphor), therefore spending it is making that person weaker. That is why so many politicians propose tax *cuts*, that is stopping the government from spending, like a doctor would stop a person from bleeding to death.

Chapter 2.2 The Democratic Debates

In this part of the work, the focus is put on the Democratic preliminary debates that were held at the same time as the Republican ones. The issues discussed are of a different nature, because the Democrats have a different view of how the country should be governed. However, a cross reference is made when the politicians discuss similar matters. In later chapters the two worldviews are clashed against each other. For the purpose of this work I chose a debate held on January 5, 2008, found on <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/01/05/us/politics/05text-ddebate.html?pagewanted=all> which included four Democratic candidates, Additionally, the subject of this paper is also a debate held on April 16, 2008 with a transcript found on <http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/DemocraticDebate/story?id=4670271&page=4>. It is a debate between two major candidates of the Democratic party: Hilary Clinton and Barack Obama, which was one of the deciding factors on who will represent the party during the proper election.

This work deals with the cognitive idea of world view, as used by Lakoff and discussed in chapter 1. There is the liberal view of a *Nurturing Mother*, who takes care of her children. This is highlighted in the examples

provided. The so called core voters of the Democratic party are more socially conscious, therefore there is more emphasis put on these matters. Also, the notion of the Government helping people, and the Congress giving more money to social matters will be much more conspicuous. This again hints on Lakoff's theory of the COUNTRY AS A FAMILY metaphor. The State should care for its children.

The first example comes from Barack Obama, who, in response to a question about nuclear weapons in Pakistan and Iran said the following: *We have not locked down the loose nuclear weapons that are out there right now. These are all things that we should be taking leadership on.* This is not a complex metaphor, but in fact just an extension of the *Nurturing Mother* metaphor discussed earlier. A *Nurturing Mother* locks up the dangerous toys so that no one can be hurt. Imagine a mother hiding and locking dangerous chemicals in a cabinet where a child cannot reach them. As talked about earlier, this metaphor can be extended to the whole world. In this case it is the United States who are supposed to be the mother, and other countries (of higher risk – Pakistan, Iran, North Korea) should not possess nuclear arms for the better of the world. Note that the Democratic worldview is that they should lock it up, not attack the countries and punish them for even trying to acquire dangerous materials, like a *Strict Father* would (the Republican views on attacking different countries if they pose a threat). Such rhetoric is also present in the debate between Hillary Clinton and Barrack Obama when they are discussing external affairs. Both politicians talk about *detering* other countries from possessing nuclear weapons and creating *havens* for terrorists. Once again, the view that the United States should not be like a policeman, but as a mother who reaches out and tries to discuss problems with others is in play here. However, when someone threatens one of the allies of the United States, it is then they should strike. Note the aggression is present only after a certain barrier is crossed. A similarity can be drawn to a female bear which protects its cubs. During the same debate the notion of guns was also raised. The situation is likened to that of a war, where people are better armed than the police officers, who are there to have order. It is seen not a limiting freedom, because no such words are used. Instead, the proposition is that there should be a ban on one type of firearm, because the police have weaker ones. I *will*

also work to reinstate the assault weapons ban (...)It really was an aid to our police officers who are being outgunned on our streets by these military-style weapons. A nurturing mother takes care of her citizens, which means that bans need to be made on things that are able to hurt them. This is in accordance to the problem with nuclear weapons. All dangerous materials should be cleaned up, or taken off the streets, so that no one can get hurt.

With regard to domestic policy, the same type of metaphor is used. The Democrats as a rule want to take care of the citizens, meaning if someone does not have health care because she or he cannot afford it, they want to enable that person this. There is also talking of how people are to be *forced* to have medical insurance. A metaphor of a mother forcing good thing onto a child. It is easy to visualise this, just think of a mother trying to force a child into eating vegetables. In the discussions concerning the health care plans, the Left is discussing exactly how should the universal health care plan be introduced, and should it cover all people in the United States. This is also discussed in Lakoff's *Metaphor, Morality and Politics*. (1995) He characterizes regulation as a matter of protecting the citizens from the dangers of the world. I have discussed the external threats with regard to nuclear weapons in some countries which are deemed unsafe for America. There, the whole world was treated as children, and the States as the mother. However, in domestic policy, it is the citizens who are children and the Government is the mother. Health care is a controversial issue, which should be regulated by the Government (the mother), and imposed on her children (citizens). The health care reform should *cover* people.

Another difference between Republicans and Democrats in terms of their worldview, is that the Democrats have got the mentality that everyone is responsible for everyone else. It is the justice equals fairness problem (Lakoff, 1995). An example: *I would ask the American people, when it comes to being more energy-conscious, to be cognizant of appliances, of fuel efficiency, the vehicles we drive, mass transit.* Again, the need of the Government to tell people what they should do for the better of the rest of the people.

This is a collective mentality, and the metaphor is an extension of the good, or nurturing mother metaphor. All children are responsible for themselves, and when the mother does something, all children should follow it. This gives less freedom from the Strict Father model represented on the Right, however, it gives more emphasis on the fairness model discussed earlier.

The Left is also seen as the political party which combats the corporations (see: chapter 3). The metaphor example is: *the three of us took on the powerful insurance industry and their lobby every single day of the fight for the Patient's Bill of Rights*. The talk is about health care, which by many Americans is seen as ruled by big corporations that do not want to insure people who have lower income. It was discussed that the Republicans are more the people who use a lot of military connected words, like battling, invading etc. However, the Democrats are also guilty of their usage, but concerning different topics. Big Corporations are perceived as inhumane organizations which only think in terms of profit. This is bad for the Democrats, and seen even as *evil*. In the example, senator Edwards talks how he *took on* the big companies. This is unusual in the mouth of a Democrat, however the purpose is that, as mentioned before, the *justice = fairness morality* (Lakoff, 1995) metaphor. Organisations with big amounts of money are seen as evil and not fair. This is why it is perfectly justifiable for a Democrat to use military language. You can take on someone, which means you fight them. For the greater good of the people. Like a mother who would fight for the well being of her children. This is also emphasised in Edwards following words *that's just an example of why this battle is personal for me*. Fighting for fairness is a battle for Democrats, just as it is a battle for the Republicans to fight immigration. The metaphors are in this case similar, but the use is different. Another example concerning the same problem, that uses strong war metaphors is: *George Bush killed it*. This is about the Patient's Bill of Rights that was passed by the Senate, but finally vetoed by the President. The metaphor is *ideas are people*, or in this case *political bills are people*, which are killed by the administration. This also opens the connotations of the bad president who does not care about the less fortunate in life, *killing* their hopes of winning against big corporations.

There is also talk about hidden tax cuts for the rich, or the companies they own. For example a Bill was passed in the 2000s that gave enormous tax breaks for the drilling companies, which is against the Democratic world view. In the next example, these tax breaks are considered as an attack on the poorer Americans, which again is seen as not fair, which equals not justice. *You know, it is true that these entrenched interests* in this example we see that the interests are well hidden. Again the use of war rhetoric and terminology. If something is entrenched it means that is their to stay in a stalemate, like soldiers in the trenches of World War I. In other words, there is a bill, but something negative is well located in it and occupies it. *They have a stranglehold on this democracy and they are having an incredibly destructive force on the middle class.* Democracy is seen as the most sacred thing, and middle class is being *destroyed* by the large companies. It is safe to assume that war rhetoric is justified on the Left only when the lives of middle and lower class Americans are affected by it. When talking about the Iraq conflict, there were no so many metaphors connected with fighting. It is a very emotional way of talking about matters. The person of Teddy Roosevelt is even evoked as a person who *fought* openly with companies and lobbyists. Roosevelt was a Republican President, who was famous for his tough personality.

Green energy is a very important issue mentioned before. This part of the work is devoted to the examples of propositions about this problem. Firstly the quote: *use energy as an opportunity to actually jump-start economic recovery.* Which is a piece of rhetoric designed to incite laughter and be witty. However, there is also a metaphor here. Economy is a car, which needs to be jump-started by new form of energy. This use presupposes that the economy will be fast and effective, if it is powered by ecological power source. Which is in contrast with the Republican unwillingness to spend money on it and shows that it has been ineffective. If the car is not working right, you cannot go anywhere. This metaphor is used to tell the people that green energy is the only choice they have for a stable and dynamic economy. Regulations are a big part of the discussion, where every candidate talks about the need of controlling the emission of gasses etc.

To illustrate the above point better, I provide an example of Barack Obama's answer to the question on economy during one of the debates. *Senator McCain, that essentially said that we should strip away regulations, consumer protections, let the market run wild, and prosperity would rain down on all of us.* If, according to the Democrat view of the world, there are no regulations on the market, no government intervention into the matters of the citizens, there is only profit to be had by the richest and most influential of the people in the country. In the above example Obama disagrees totally with the Strict Father model of governing, where the Congress and the President do not impose regulations, thus making life more difficult for the average American. This, along with the earlier ideas about Big Corporations, does not only uphold the rule that justice equals fairness, is another example of how a Democrat sees the world. The Nurturing Mother metaphor is again used.

The Democrats own view of the world presented above is in direct contrast to that of the Republicans. It has been noted that a more lenient tone is used with regard to foreign policy, and domestic affairs and more emphasis is put on the Government being a good parent who helps his children. Also, justice, equals fairness is the model employed. I have tried to show what are the basic metaphors that a Democrat uses when discussing matters with other Democrats to his or her voters. That is not to say that the Left avoids using strong military language, and the ARGUMENT IS WAR metaphor. When discussing big business in America, all candidates use terms like *fight* and *take on*, which are typical examples of the use of said metaphor. When they disagree with the companies' policy to mind their own money and not share with the rest of the citizens. Therefore, their language of debating is a mix between the mother who is full of caring, and a mother who feels that her children are being threatened.

Chapter 2.3 Obama vs McCain – Presidential Debates

In this chapter I discuss how two candidates talk about issues and try to reach out to both crowds – the Left and the Right. So far it has been noted that each party talks to their supporters i.e. people who they are sure that they will vote for them, the language used is different from the one used to sway the voters from the other side. The division between conservatives and liberals in America is very distinct. One group is for smaller government which does not intervene into the matters of the citizens. They are against raising taxes and for a strong military. They are also for strong individual rights and that every person should take care for himself or herself. The other group is for a larger government which deals with problems not only on the national scale, but also inside the States. In their view justice equals fairness, that is why the tax brakes should not only concern the richest Americans but all of them. Also, as it was seen in chapter 2.2 the Democrats also talk in war-like rhetoric when the matters concern the so called Big Corporations, whereas the Republicans talk in such a way when discussing foreign policy. The two views are described in this work as the Strict Father model and the Nurturing Mother one respectively. In this chapter I discuss what happens if the two points of view clash on one stage. Every politician wants to have as many voters as he or she possibly can have, that is why sometime they need to resort to a different speaking pattern. What is important is that they should not alienate their core voters by swaying to much to the opposite side of the political spectrum. However, there are time were typically Republican and typically Democrat modes of talking enter into play.

For the purpose of this chapter I use the debates between John McCain and Barack Obama, who met several times. The sources of these transcripts can be found on <http://elections.nytimes.com/2008/president/debates/transcripts/first-presidential-debate.html>, and <http://elections.nytimes.com/2008/president/debates/transcripts/second-presidential-debate.html>

appropriate number of the debate is noted after the quote.

First quote comes from Obama when asked about the financial situation of the country. He responds by saying *theory that basically says that we can shred regulations and consumer protections and give more and more to the most, and somehow prosperity will trickle down*. The Nurturing Mother is used here to establish that Obama is in fact still a Democrat. The idea is that regulations are good, because a mother needs to take care of her children. This is in opposition to the Republican Strict Father model which promises liberty to all, and very little or no intervention of the Government on the affairs of people. This establishes Obama as the candidate who does not condone to the Republican view, which is a statement made at an appropriate time at the beginning of the debate. Senator McCain, however, has a slightly different tactic. He uses the Nurturing Mother metaphor, but at the end puts an additional twist. Here is the quote *This package has transparency in it. It has to have accountability and oversight. It has to have options for loans to failing businesses, rather than the government taking over those loans*. The first sentence is the metaphor in which words like *transparency* and *accountability* are used, meaning that the Government is responsible for the economic situation. Furthermore, words like *oversight* are used, which evokes the picture of a mother who thinks of everything. However, while a Mother metaphor would go along the lines of: *we will take care of the problem*, McCain instead returns to the strict father metaphor by saying that the government cannot take the problems for the people. This statement that he made show two different views and uses two different metaphors, however the Father one is hidden beneath the first sentence. It is an example of how hiding inconvenient facts is possible thanks to metaphor. He is saying that indeed, there is going to be no hidden notions made by the Government, but it cannot do everything for the people.

To follow this thought, McCain uses another form of metaphor not typically associated with the Republicans. He talks about controlling agencies. *stricter interpretation and consolidation of the various*

regulatory agencies that weren't doing their job, that has brought on this crisis. This is a government which can be shared by the two groups of voters. Strict control over an organisation opens two different cognitive connotations models in both political sides. Firstly, the Right sees this as a further implementation of the Strict Father metaphor, where the father does what is best for their children, and rules with a heavy hand. He does not interfere with the people directly, which upholds the political philosophy of the Republican voter. On the other hand, in the mind of a Democrat, it is the Nurturing Mother metaphor which is used here. As it was seen when discussing foreign policy, the mother metaphor does not need to be seen as weak. It is dangerous to those who want to hurt her children, which in this case are the organisations that were created to stop the economy from collapsing. This swift rhetoric and the mix of the two metaphorical world views has created two different cognitive connotations in the voters, which is extremely successful for McCain. It is almost a textbook example on how to sound like a strict man, but caring at the same time.

Another example of trying to appeal to voters is using the rhetoric similar to the one discussed in the previous chapter. It was written that the Democrats use a very violent type of language when they talk about the so called Big Corporations, which essentially are companies which have direct contact with the people. Of the mentioned are oil companies, pharmaceutical companies, and insurance companies. The words used often are *fighting*, or *taking on*. It is an example of the structural metaphor ARGUMENT IS WAR. In this metaphor, when we disagree with someone on some grounds, we attack them in order to *win* a battle on arguments. This is very true in politics, and John McCain uses this type of language, with which his voters are not unfamiliar with, and uses it on the topic that the voters on the left side of the political spectrum find familiar. *I saved the taxpayers \$6.8 billion by fighting a contract that was negotiated between Boeing and DOD that was completely wrong. And we fixed it and we killed it.* This sounds exactly like the words spoken by Edwards which are quoted in the previous chapter. He talked about fighting Big Corporations, the exact same thing that McCain is talking about here. He disagreed with the contract, that is why he had to *fight* it. It is a typical example of this of the ARGUMENT IS WAR metaphor. The fact of the matter is that this

sounds extremely familiar. In chapter 2.1 I wrote about the Republicans and their war rhetoric when talking about foreign affairs, in the next chapter I wrote about the Democrats talking about domestic issues with big corporate America, and this time a blend of the two viewpoints is presented. As earlier, on the one hand John McCain is seen as the *sheriff* who stands on guard of the American people, on the other hand John McCain is seen as the one fighting Corporate America, and not as a person who is a part of it.

On foreign affairs, John McCain again sounds like a liberal politician not like a conservative. He does not use the metaphors associated with the Republicans. He says this: *I'm not prepared at this time to cut off aid to Pakistan. So I'm not prepared to threaten it.* The *aid* he is referring to means the support of the States after a bombing which took place in Pakistan. Aid means helping, or *reaching out* to someone, which is an example of McCain employing the Democrat's own Nurturing Mother metaphor, in which the government helps the citizens, only this time extended to foreign relations (discussed in previous chapters). When compared to what Hillary Clinton had to say about foreign relations (chapter 2.2), he is seen as even more liberal than her. There is not talk about military action this time, there is no talk about intervention, but of aid. This is an appeal to the Liberal voters. John McCain so far has done a very good job of knowing what the Liberals want to hear from a candidate. He has approached matter in a calm manner, not refusing help, battling Big Corporations, but at the same time he is seen as being a strong individual, who acts only when it is needed, and does not want to spend money on unnecessary things.

It is not to say, however, that John McCain managed to use this tactic throughout the debate. In the next part of the discussion we are back to the Strict metaphor, in which the Government must control spending, so as to not give people too much money, because it feels they might be wasted. The typical view is that the fishing pole is better than the fish. To use this, we are again treated with a long structural metaphor that ruling the country means to cut spending which is *irresponsible*. *Who fought against wasteful and earmark spending? Who has been the person who has tried to keep spending under control? Who's the person who*

has believed that the best thing for America is -- is to have a tax system that is fundamentally fair? This sounds like a father talking to his children. But it is in fact a structural metaphor employed in order to create the images of responsibility in American voters. One more time the problem of spending money by the Government is raised, which the Republicans diminish as foolish. Earlier in the debate McCain said that funding research of bear DNA uses up too much money of the citizens. This elaborate set up just says that there is no time in America to spend money on trivial matters. In the Strict Father model it is not possible for the Government to spend money on things which are unapproachable by most Americans. It is a rhetoric which is typical of the Right. Note that in the previous example there was a mix between the two views on matters of the country, now it has come back to the right-wing view of the responsible spending of tax payers money. Not regulating spending, but avoiding it whenever possible.

The next example comes from the moderator who asks a question two the candidates. *A lot of people now look back and think the federal government got drunk and, in fact, the American consumers got drunk.* This is rather self explanatory, Wall Street, the government who are drunk cannot make responsible decisions, something every administration wants to avoid. To this question Senator Obama, who is, we must remember, for the Nurturing Mother model of Government, which is always responsible not for the groups of Americans, but for all her *children*. To this Obama responds by saying *Well, I think it starts with Washington. We've got to show that we've got good habits.* In this metaphor, Obama presents the city Washington as being a person who leads the country. Without using the Democratic notion of taking care for people, he implies that whoever is in charge, that person should have good habits. This is one of the metaphorical sentences which can be interpreted in two different ways. Firstly, Government is a person who is in charge, therefore he needs to have good habits. He does not explain exactly the habits. It needs to be an example. The Conservatives think that good habits are when someone is not spending money for things that are not needed, the Liberals, on the other hand think that Washington's good habits are supposed to be

helping others. This simple metaphor of GOVERNMENT AS A PERSON can imply two different things. An example that can be successful with voters on both sides.

In a sudden turn of events in the debates, Obama uses this quote: *We can do it again, but it will take new direction and new leadership in Washington.* Such wording was unheard of when discussing Democratic preliminaries, it is more common with the Republicans. This metaphor goes back to the COUNTRY AS A SHIP model, where policies, and the President need to steer away from dangerous waters of the recession with the help of political reforms. This utterance is followed by a further visualisation: *I believe we can steer ourselves out of this crisis because I believe in America. And if you stand with me on November 4th then together we can overcome the broken policies and divided politics of the last eight years and renew America's Promise.* Here, not only is the country a ship, but the ship is even called – November 4th (date of the election). This is in fact a very long and convoluted answer to a question, which is designed to motivate the Democrats, and to show the Republicans that Obama, even though coming from the Left, is capable of making strong and independent decisions, much like Ronald Reagan. He presents himself as a strong personality, who is ready for taking over America's decision making. McCain's response to this is as surprising as Obama's utterance. *If I'm elected President I'll act immediately with reforms to restore the fairness, integrity, and financial sanity to the institutions that have failed us on Wall Street.* It seems that the nomenclature of Republican vs. Democrat is no longer valid. McCain wanted to be perceived as an independent individual, who has a clean political *record*, however this time, it is him who evokes the Mother metaphor, and Obama is like a captain on a ship or a sheriff.

All these speeches were made during the debates held before the main election. Obama and McCain were sure of the support of their respective parties, that is why they tried to convince the other group of voters. What was witnessed was the change of wording and topics for both candidates. During the election, both

candidates were very close, that is why both of them decided that the best reaction to the polls would be to appear a bit different from their real political backgrounds.

Chapter 3 Metonymy in Politics

The aim of this chapter is to focus on metonymy during the presidential debates and also during the press coverage of them. Additionally, articles concerning current affairs are used to provide a broader perspective. Metonymy is linked with politics in the same manner as metaphor. As it was said before in chapter 1,

metonymy is used in various ways. One of the more pragmatic uses is to save space in the newspaper articles. Therefore it is widespread. Furthermore, it is also used to justify or even to hide unpopular decisions or situations that are made. One example discussed in chapter 2.1 was of how the Republicans shift the responsibility of the Congress, where they and the Democrats have their members. When we are saying that Congress spends too much money, or has sent us to war, we also mean that not only one party is responsible for this.

Firstly, during the debates, which is noted in the examples provided, some time was devoted to metonymy. The basic example is the use of *president*. A well known fact is that the President does not make the important decisions alone. He has a staff of advisors, who analyse every aspect of the problem and present him with a solution. However, it is in the Republican tradition that a strong individual will succeed. The American Dream etc, have all been in the mindset of the right. When we describe the president who was able to pull us out of the recession, it immediately opens the connotations of a strong leader. It is also similar to the famous words by Ronald Reagan, who said about pulling yourself by your own bootstraps. This works on two grounds. Firstly, Romney does not directly blame his party for the recession, secondly, he does not want to alienate Bush's supporters, because they are his potential voters. Furthermore, using an expression which is similar to Reagan's bootstraps analogy also causes a positive reaction.

Mitt Romney also uses different metonymical expressions in his speech. *Washington is badly broken. I think we recognize that. Washington has not dealt with the problems that we have in this nation.* The Government of the United States is located in Washington DC. Here, we see a situation where the city which is the location of an institution, stands for that institution. It is *broken*, it has not *dealt with* the problems etc. At the time, the Republicans had the majority of seats in the Government, therefore in order to avoid blaming his own party in front of its supporters, Romney chose to use the PLACE FOR INSTITUTION metonymy, which puts blame on the Government, however it does not specifically blame the people in charge.

With metonymy in politics, and the Republicans more precisely, there is a phenomenon called *record*. All the candidates say that their record is *clean* and that they are proud of it. The record is a word which describes all the things they have done while in government. A criminal has got a record of his crimes, but more importantly, soldiers have records of their service. Thus, being in the government is likened to being in the military. Democratic politicians may also talk about a record, however their voters do not see it as such. Democrats are opposed military interventions of any kind. This opens a cognitive connotations of *service for the country* for the Republicans, as if it was a military operation.

For example, in chapter 2.2 there is talk about the big corporations which rule Washington, and of lobbyists who buy the bills. On the Left side of the political spectrum, Big Corporations are a synonym of evil. What is interesting is that this metonymy is used to describe all larger companies that deal with things connected with humans. For example pharmaceutical companies, or insurance companies. When we use the term Big Corporation it enables the listener and the speaker to have a common unnamed enemy. It also demonizes and dehumanizes the companies. If we put every company under one label, it opens the cognitive connotations of evil in the minds of people. That is one of the reason why senator Edwards could use war-like rhetoric when saying that he will *battle* them. It was also mentioned that metonymy is used in order to vilify entities. For example, George W. Bush said that Saddam Hussein should be stopped. He also said that Hussein is to be bombed and that his *regime* is to be a threat no longer. Wording it in such a way disguises the fact that the bombs will not fall on Saddam only, but on cities full of innocent people and that collateral damage will be taken because of this. This is just one way of justifying going to war. In a similar manner one can refer to troops.

A very frequent metonymy which is used in politics, but also in newspapers is 9/11. It refers to the happenings of November 11th when two planes hit the World Trade Center buildings. This type of

metonymy is DATE FOR EVENT. The focus in the election that is discussed in this paper was on the Iraq and Afghanistan wars. If they are called wars or something else is discussed in the previous chapter. However, whenever someone says Afghanistan, what is beneath this is the amount of money that is spent on the army stationed there, additionally, whether the Americans are winning, or losing. The latter is interesting from a linguistic viewpoint, because if it is not called a war openly, how can one win or lose it. A similar situation is in Iraq. After the regime of Saddam Hussein has been dealt with, what is left is an unstable country in which American troops are stationed. Interestingly, right wing and left wing papers use this metonymy and, as it was the case with metaphors, they inspire different cognitive connotations models in their respective readers. Some think that it is perfectly justified to be there, and some think that it is a *mess* and that America should immediately leave.

As metaphors, metonymy can operate on the orientational basis i.e., the UP and DOWN scale. In Washington Post an article was posted before the election on October 26th 2008 by Mike Allen (<http://www.politico.com/news/stories/1008/14951.html>), it was written *Things are trending back for McCain. His numbers are rising and Obama's are dropping on a daily basis*. The general theory about metonymy is that we are constructed in such a way, that our eyes perceive only parts of the whole image. Thus, the journalist used the metonymy of numbers going up and going down, which is a way of talking about someone's popularity. This was also described in the chapters about metaphor, however in this situation, we can see that the use of the word *numbers* hides a lot of things. Firstly, it is a sign of growing popularity, however, the author did not mention the whole picture. Which groups are supporting him, is it the fact that some Democrats were not happy with Obama, are these votes from the so called undecided voters, or have the conservative voters return to him. What the public sees when reading such articles is the growing popularity of one candidate, and the fall of popularity on the other one.

As it was pointed out, metonymy appears mostly in newspaper articles. It saves space, or, as the example above shows, tells the truth from a certain point. In this part, I focus on the more current articles concerning the war in Iraq. In an article by Jonathan Steele from April 25th 2011 published in the Guardian (<http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2011/apr/25/united-states-troop-presence-iraq-long-term>) there is a text book example of metonymy used. *Stretched close to the limit by combat in Afghanistan and determined not to get into a ground war in Libya, the Pentagon is stepping up the pressure to maintain a huge US troop presence in today's largely peaceful Iraq.* Firstly, it is written that the Pentagon is *stretched close to the limit*. It is implied that the Pentagon is the entity fighting. It is written as such, because the Pentagon is the head military body responsible for the US Army, however the soldiers themselves are doing the fighting. What is more, the commanding officers responsible for the situation in the Middle East have to answer to the Pentagon, however they are present in the location of the war, not in Washington. Another interesting fact which is implied in this article, is that the Americans are the only ones responsible for fighting and keeping order in the region. In this way war seems to be dehumanized in a way. The article does not mention the soldiers' fate, their weariness with a new conflict in Libya before them, but the Pentagon is stretched (metaphorically and in real life) because the theatre of war is geographically vast. In the quote provided it is also said that Iraq is now *largely peaceful*, however in an article which made headlines a week before this one (<http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2011/apr/18/baghdad-car-bombs-kill-nine-green-zone>), there was mentioning of two car bombs exploding on one day in that country.

The second example of current newspaper headlines and the use of metonymy is found in an article found on the *Guardian* webpage titled: *Osama bin Laden wasn't sheltered by us, says Pakistan* (<http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2011/may/03/osama-bin-laden-pakistan-president>). It was published on May 3rd 2011 and written by Declan Walsh and Ewen MacAskill. The title itself is metonymy. One of the most recent events, the death of Osama Bin Laden, has received a lot of media attention. In the article we can read, that *America accuses Pakistan* of hiding Bin Laden, and *Pakistan* denies. Firstly, when one reads about two countries discussing matters, he or she deals with metonymy. This has been explained in this

paper. Secondly, this metonymy does a great job of blaming not just the government of Pakistan, but also the terrorist cells (a metaphor) that are present in the country. However, what is more important besides what I have just written, is the fact that America lost one of the prime people to blame for, and the justification for the war in the Middle East. Osama Bin Laden, first blamed by the cabinet of George Bush, and now by Barack Obama, has been the face of terrorism. It has been mentioned in this work, that when the term WAR on something is used, the connotations and emotions associated with it are that of the *good guys* and the *bad guys*, of *sides*, *fronts* etc. Now, that America has lost this convenient, linguistically speaking, metonymy of Osama Bin Laden, the man responsible for terrorism in the world, it will be much more difficult to find new reasons for being there.

Linguistically speaking, having a target to direct all the negative emotions towards is a positive thing, not only for governments, but also for the newspapers. It directly inspires the notions of a righteous cause. It helps people to justify their opposing, or being for a certain subject, plus it offers the opportunity to create a simple, binary world. The British petroleum company called BP has been a subject of a media outrage recently, because it has caused one of the major ecological catastrophes in recent years. This, paired with the awakened sense of the environment in people and the ecological self-consciousness, created a lot of bad press for the company. It is mentioned in the chapter about metaphors how the Democrats use a military and violent like language when discussing the so-called Big Corporations. BP is ideal for this, because it encompasses everything there is to hate about a company for a liberal voter. Firstly, they were drilling for oil near the coast of the US. Oil is seen as an expensive and wasteful resource, because more and more cars can run on electricity. Secondly, it has caused a major environmental catastrophe. Furthermore, even after issuing an apology and talks about paying the US government for the damages done, BP has received criticism for one more thing. In an article titled: *BP creates another fine mess as it bars Deepwater protesters* written by Andrew Clark (<http://www.guardian.co.uk/business/2011/apr/17/bp-annual-meeting-deepwater-protesters>) published on April 17th 2011 there is a line which runs as follows: *When the oil company refused to let five US activists into its annual meeting, it rubbed salt in the wounds of the Gulf of*

Mexico disaster. This is an example how metonymy and metaphor can go together to create one big picture. In the title the metonymy ORGANISATION FOR PEOPLE is used. BP is placed here instead of the directors and people in the management. This demonizes everyone who works in the company making them responsible for what happened in the Gulf of Mexico. This is a theme already mentioned in this work, where the public requires an enemy, linguistically speaking. BP serves the same purpose as Bin Laden served, it is a personification of some threat or crisis. Bin Laden represented terrorism and BP represents large companies. Linguistically it is very convenient, because it saves space, and creates an image of a large, heartless company which is interested only in acquiring wealth. The *Gulf of Mexico* disaster is also used metonymically here. Interesting thing about this text is that the author does not need to use specific dates or have thorough descriptions of what happened. The *Gulf of Mexico disaster* is sufficient, just like 9/11, 1812 etc. Metonymy plays a large role in newspapers as it is seen here. People need a personified enemy, thus metonymy is a very useful tool for journalists, and an interesting subject for linguists.

Conclusions

The aim of this part of the work is to finally answer the question put forth at the beginning of this thesis. Whether metaphors can really influence the way we think about the world, and secondly, are metaphorical expressions linked to a worldview, and if a politician speaks using a familiar metaphorical system, will he gain votes (because that is the aim of the debates) from someone who otherwise would not have supported him. The answer to the first question is positive. Metaphorical expressions do influence our worldview, just as words like *I pronounce thee man and wife* influence the lives of people and change reality. Metaphors are integral. The human communication connected with abstract topics would be very difficult, if not impossible. It is one of the most important discoveries how metaphors are a matter of not only language, but also thought. We think clearly because of them, we are able to visualize everything, and to conceptualize.

To answer the second question, namely, are metaphors connected to a worldview, the answer also is positive. There are numerous examples presented in this paper which show the difference between the Republican way of thinking and the Democrat one. The comparison highlights different phenomena which are important to them. In this work, it is written that the Republican party does think more about independence i.e. every person is responsible for himself. Additionally, they are in favour of large companies, because they *save* the economy. They also quote Ronald Reagan as their inspiration, because his record as a Republican president is pristine. This is why the emphasis is put on the strict father metaphor. It shows the responsibility, the need to rely only on yourself etc. Another view predominant of the right side of the political spectrum is the believe in the military. A strong military is one of the most important attributes of a strong country. I have discussed the STATE AS A PERSON metaphor, in which the economy is the person's health, and the military is the person's strength. Thus, a lot of time is put into discussing the military. The Republicans claim that it should be *grown*, and that they should not *pull out* of the Middle East. The Democrats stress the opposite. They say that it is not right to be in a different country, because the army, despite the fact that soldiers are for fighting, should be sent home, which would not cause further escalation of conflict. The strength of a nation, according to the Democrats is not to be abused. This is a conflict of worldviews, but also a conflict of metaphors. As it was proven, the Nurturing Mother type metaphor does not support the same values as the Strict Father metaphor. So, linguistically speaking, there is a conflict between two concepts, and they are expressed in metaphor.

In the last part concerning metaphors, in chapter two, I contrast the two views. There is More importantly, there is emphasis put on how a politician can verbalize certain thoughts, so that they sound acceptable to both political sides. John McCain is shown as discussing the withholding of government aides to people in need, but he uses the words like *responsibility*, or *being prepared for everything*, and many more. All of these words are directly connected with the Mother metaphor. Hence, he created a blend of the two metaphors, which has had an effect of turning Democrats on his side, and at the same time keeping to the beliefs of his core voters. A similar *switch* is seen on the Democrats side, because they are also 'guilty' of

using strong, military language. Only in their view of the world, it is the big companies that people need to *fight*. Big companies, or big corporations, as they are also referred to. The main conclusion from this part is thus, if some entity, like a large company, tries to abuse its rights and hurt people in the process, it is necessary to *take it on* (the phrase is used quite often). As it was mentioned, the Democrats focus on military language when describing something they feel is unjust to people. However, Big Corporations are also used in newspaper articles as an example of metonymy, where, depending on the view of the paper, they are pictured as either a company which does what it has to, or that it is evil. The example provided in this work is an article in Guardian about BP. It is written as if every person who is involved in any way with the company is responsible for the oil spill. It gives the face to the bad thing that happened, much like, when bombing the country of Iraq one could hear that the Americans are bombing only Saddam Hussein.

Summary in English

The aim of this work is to show and describe the way in which metaphors, understood as a cognitive phenomenon, rule the world of politics. When it occurs, it does not happen so because of the politician's whim, but because they are able to convey the person's worldview. Thus, metaphorical expressions, and metonymy to a smaller extent, are a subject of interest in this work. The look on politics is conducted from a linguistic point of view, for this work is supposed to showcase one of the many phenomenon of language, not to agitate on who is right and who is wrong. Even though world view is discussed extensively, it is not the intention nor the aim of this work to convince people of what is the *correct* version.

The medium of politics was chosen for few reasons. Firstly, it is an integral part of our lives, and since the aim of this paper is to show the influence of metaphors and metonymy on people. Secondly, the amount of debate transcripts, statements and other speeches made by politicians is astounding. Additionally it is also well documented. Every word ever uttered in public by a politician has been written down. Thus, the amount of source material is plenty. Furthermore, politicians speak, and language is the main focus of linguistics. It is the intention of this thesis to show, discuss, and prove that metaphors can be influential in language. Spoken words are better than the written ones for a couple of reasons. Primarily, besides obvious preparations, the politician is 'left on his own' when speaking to the public. One cannot predict all the questions and responses, and conversation is a live medium. Many times, the true opinions might surface, and the real idiolect of a person may emerge.

The Presidential elections in the United States in 2008 have been chosen because of the specificity of the American political system. Before a person can candidate directly for the seat of the President, he or she must first be elected in preliminary elections i.e. when each party votes for the candidate they like best, or represents their worldview the best.

In the main body of the work, there are many examples taken from the transcripts of the debates held in the year 2008. The main point that is explained there is that America is divided into two separate worldviews. One, represented by the Republican party, can be described as being the *strict father* model of governing a country. Imagine a strict father figure, and the way he treats his children. He let's them burn themselves, so that they will not do it again, he does not help etc. This is how most Republicans view the Presidency and the government. It is there just for the basic regulations, supporting the army etc. The rest is in the hands of the people. Responsibility for your own actions, and for yourself is the main point. The less interventions into the lives of ordinary citizens, the better. Contrasted to this is the Democratic part view that the government should be like a nurturing mother. A mother always helps her children, prohibits the use of certain things, or doing certain activities that may endanger not only the individual, but also the surrounding people. The view represents the group responsibility model, justice equals fairness etc. In other words, the government should help the less fortunate instead of waiting for them to get up on their own, or to pull themselves *up by their bootstraps*.

Another phenomenon highlighted in this work is the themes each side of the political spectrum touches. The Republicans talk about the self-employed, the military, and is less eager to talk about state funded programmes, and climate change. On the other hand, the Democrats tend to favour topics which seem to be closer to the average voter, like social security, state schools, poverty etc. All of this is expressed by using the two model described above.

In the chapter about metonymy, it is discussed how exactly can one expression be as influential as it is. Apart from the very pragmatic reason of using metonymy to save space in an article, the much more interesting, linguistically, is how it shapes the world around, and causes certain opinions to form. If one is not careful, a sentence *We are bombing the tyrant Saddam* could mean that a invading a sovereign state is legal, as long as we bomb the *bad guy*. However, what this does not show, it that the bombings often hit people who are not necessarily evil, in the tyrant sense of the word. Imagine a soldier, who is a good husband, father, son, who has joined the army in order to protect his country from a foreign invasion. He is not evil, but loyal to his homeland. Such use of metonymy avoids such topics. Another example provided in this work is the one with the company BP. In the article, the whole company is blamed for the infamous oil spill, however it is not the case. What is more, even the board of directors cannot be held accountable for the fact, because they were not their. But saying that BP has done something bad again, sets a people on a specific mindset. BP is an evil corporation, therefore everyone that is working for it and everything they do is bad. Think about a cleaner in one of the offices, or ordinary clerks, accountants etc. They cannot be held responsible for the oil spill. Metonymy is a powerful tool which can create its own reality.

Abstract

The subject matter of this work is to show how much politics is based on metaphors.

In chapter 1 the theoretical aspects of the paper are discussed. The main work that has been treated as a base was Lakoff and Johnson's *Metaphors We Live By* (1980). Furthermore, there are quotes from other linguists whose main topic of discussion is the cognitive use of metaphors. The main topic is the use of metaphors and metonymy in politics and newspapers. The examples that are focused on come from debates held during the 2008 Presidential elections in the United States of America. The examples of the use of metonymy come from articles from *the Guardian*.

References:

1. Lakoff, George, Johnson Mark. 1980. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
2. Radman, Zdravko. 1997. *Metaphors: Figures of the Mind*. The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
3. Panther, Klaus Uwe. 1999. *Metonymy in Language and Thought*. USA: John Benjamins B.V.
4. Panther, Klaus Uwe, Thornburg Linda L. 2003. *Metonymy and Pragmatic Interferencing*. USA: John Benjamins B.V.
5. Barcelona, Antonio (Ed). 2000. *Metaphor and metonymy at the Crossroads: a Cognitive Perspective*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co.
6. Neisser, Ulric. 1989. *Concepts and Conceptual Development. Ecological and Intellectual Factors in Categorisation*. CUP Archive.
7. Lakoff, George. 1995. *Metaphor, Morality, and Politics, Or, Why Conservatives Have Left Liberals In the Dust*. George Lakoff copyright.
<http://www.wvcd.org/issues/Lakoff.html>
8. Searle, John R.; Kiefer, Ferenc; Bierwisch, Manfred. 1980. *Speech Act Theory and Pragmatics*. USA: Kluwer Boston Inc.
9. Lakoff, George. 1996. *Moral Politics: How Liberals and Conservatives Think*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
10. Ortony, Andrew. 1993. *Metaphor and Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
11. Kittay, Eva Fender. 1987. *Metaphor: It's a Cognitive Force and Linguistic Structure*. New York: Oxford University Press.
12. Mio, Jeffrey Scott; Katz, Albert M. 1996. *Metaphors: Implications and Applications*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

13. Fauconnier, Gilles; Turner, Mike. 2002. *Metaphor and Metonymy in Comparison and Contrast*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
14. Holcombe, John C. 2007. *Metaphor: Theories*.
<http://www.textetc.com/theory/metaphor.html>
15. Transcript of GOP debate at Reagan Library January 13th 2008
http://articles.cnn.com/2008-01-30/politics/GOPdebate.transcript_1_governor-romney-budget-gap-mitt-romney?_s=PM:POLITICS
16. First Presidential Debate – McCain and Obama. September 26th 2008.
<http://elections.nytimes.com/2008/president/debates/transcripts/first-presidential-debate.html>
17. Second Presidential Debate – McCain and Obama. October 7th 2008.
<http://elections.nytimes.com/2008/president/debates/transcripts/second-presidential-debate.html>
18. Third Presidential Debate – McCain and Obama. October 15th 2008.
<http://elections.nytimes.com/2008/president/debates/transcripts/third-presidential-debate.html>
19. Democratic Preliminary Debate. January 5th 2008.
<http://www.nytimes.com/2008/01/05/us/politics/05text-ddebate.html?pagewanted=all>
20. Debate Between Hilary Clinton and Barack Obama. April 16th 2008.
<http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/DemocraticDebate/story?id=4670271&page=4>