ISSA Proceedings 1998 – Metaphorical Politics: Mobilization Or Tranquilization?

Politicians tend to express themselves indirectly. Sometimes they do so because they live in a totalitarian society, in which free expression is prohibited. Political crisis and war or severe economic crisis also affect directness and explicitness of political rhetoric. Politicians in prosperous democratic society, however, also see advantages in indirect or non-literal linguistic strategies. Commercialization of society, media, and politics reinforce this trend. Floating voters form an increasing segment of the electorate and politicians want to attract these voters by means of indirect statements with limited political content.

Metaphors are a form of indirect communication that has many advantages for politicians who know how to use them and when. Why is it that metaphors are essential to political rhetoric and mass communication? What does metaphorical reasoning include? How do politicians use metaphorical reasoning? How do social scientists deal with the study of metaphors in politics?

1. Metaphorical Reasoning and Cognitive Blending

Contemporary theory and research in cognitive science have widened scientific interest in metaphors, a literary device with ancient roots. Cognitive schema theory suggests that the mind generates virtual simulations, similar to computer software programs that interpret the physical world. Appropriate external stimuli activate these internal schemata, which help us understand and react. Human action and reaction are thus mediated by schema-driven cognition. Metaphors reflect and drive these schemata. Metaphor is thus both a facet of language and a dimension of cognition.

According to traditional Aristotelian theory, metaphors were linguistic phenomena that included the substitution of one word for another. The Oxford English Dictionary seems to follow this path when it defines metaphor as “the figure of speech in which a name or descriptive term is transferred to some object of different form, but analogous to, that to which it is properly applicable” (OED 2).

Going beyond this, modern metaphorical theory has created terminology to denominate elements of the metaphorical expression. In this lexicon,(A) is the topic, tenor, or target, the ground, which is the actual subject of discussion; (B) is the source or vehicle, which is an idea from a different sphere of life, which is literally used to describe the subject (A); between (A) and (B) exists a blended space producing tension (C). The interaction between these two ideas (A) and (B) generates a new, figurative, blended meaning (C), and a new view upon the subject. Older theories of metaphorical comparison and substitution neglect (C), the value added by the fusion of (A) and (B), which is at the core of the interaction theory (Turner and Fauconnier, 1995; Lakoff and Turner 1989; Ortony, 1984).
Metaphorical reasoning involves a kind of analogical thinking, as in the following simile: "A" is like "B," it begins; therefore, it continues, "C" follows. "All men are mortal," one classic syllogism begins. "Socrates is a man; Socrates is mortal." This syllogism is not, strictly speaking metaphorical. In it, Socrates is not like a man; he is a man. Nevertheless, the form is similar, analogically wrapping one pattern, Socrates, into another, man. Other forms of reasoning follow similar analog dynamics (Beer, 1993).

Such interaction theory allows for a less normative perspective of metaphors than has been traditional. In the traditional perspective metaphors were not appropriate for scientific discourse. Scientific reasoning was fundamentally different – a simple, logical, linear, systematic – kind of cognitive process. Scientific discourse, as a consequence, consisted of analytic language. Scientific and logical reasoning was expressed through logical argumentation dealing with the relation of arguments to the probandum. Metaphors, in this view, belonged not to science but to practice, to pragmatic argumentation and reasoning. Pragmatic reasoning and argumentation look at subjective reactions of the audience. The relation between the arguing person and the addressee is an essential part of pragmatical argumentation (Weinberger, 1995: 37-39, 52). Emotion plays a dominant role in the relation between the arguing person and the addressee. Logical reasoning and argumentation, to the contrary, solely rely upon ratio and cognition. According to interaction theory, however, the metaphor generates a new meaning (C). The juxtaposition of two separate domains of knowledge, like European unification (A) and bicycle (B), can be energising. One has to ride a bicycle in order to keep it moving. Jacques Chirac, the French president, used this metaphor in an interview with the newspaper Figaro to defend his view upon the political unification of Europe. The mixing of the issue in

question, the European Union, with an issue completely strange to the context, bicycle, generates new meaning for the issue in question. The European integration should progress in order not to abolish former results.

Not only persuasive communication and creative arts, but also science profit from this extraordinary interactive dimension.
Case-based reasoning is at the heart of the Anglo-American legal tradition. In case-based reasoning, a current case is interpreted in the light of a previous one. An abortion case comes before the United States Supreme Court; it is understood in terms of the Court's earlier decision in Roe v. Wade. In rule-based reasoning, the current case is compared with a body of rules or laws. Continental European jurisprudence, for example, tends to be based less on precedents from prior cases than on principles derived from central legal codes. Finally model-based reasoning found in the social sciences, uses mathematical models as core schemata for interpreting social behavior. Rational choice models are one example of the application of such templates to various social phenomena (Beer,1985; Sylvan and Voss, 1998).
There are, of course, famous philosophical figures of speech Plato's cave, Hobbes Leviathan. The law, according to the American Jurist Oliver Wendell Holmes, was a jealous mistress. According to one account, one core image of Einstein's theory of relativity came from a trolley ride around the Ring in Vienna (Feuer, 1974).
Beyond such specific images, however, metaphorical processes are central to reasoning. Contemporary social scientists consider metaphors to be much more than a linguistic phenomenon. Philosophers beginning with Vico have challenged the standard linguistic perspective. Instead of seeing metaphor as an embroidery of the facts, such thinkers viewed it as a way of experiencing facts. Metaphor is a form of non-literary or figurative language which was thought to precede, historically or logically, the concretised meanings of literal or scientific discourse, a secondary development (Gresson, 1987: 184-185). Metaphor is thus an important element of both literary style and cognitive process.

Metaphors are also a critical dimension of political style and process, finding their clearest expression in political rhetoric. Metaphor is, indeed, most often used because the speaker or writer estimates this opportune in relation to the audience. Metaphors are brief, implicit interactive comparisons. Insinuation has proved to be more persuasive than direct statements. Metaphors are expressed in words, but they include much more than metaphorical language; these express a

(metaphorical) thinking process. Metaphor is part of symbolic style, which can be opposed to logical style. The meaning it represents draws upon our real-world experience; metaphors are connected to language use and to context; these are style figures that transgress or manipulate grammar. Because we do not have metaphorical words but metaphorical wordgroups or expressions, metaphors do not belong to the field of grammar (De Landtsheer 1994, 1998; Ortony, 1984 Fraser, 1984; Dudley, 1984; Lepschy, 1976; Lasswell, 1949).

It is quite difficult to explain what metaphors are, how they work, and how to identify them. It is, however, as Saint Augustine suggested, rather easy to recognise metaphors. Regardless of language or nationality, people show a natural ability to identify metaphors, even in a foreign language. The reason seems to be that metaphors are absurd or meaningless when taken literally. One has to interpret the metaphor, one has to take into account the context of the metaphor, in order to understand the message. Metaphor introduces a conflict in a sentence, as the sphere where to it refers is obviously incompatible with the sphere of the utterance in general.

Resolution of this conflict results in interpretation of the metaphor, in a sense similar to that intended by the speaker or writer. Mother and war belong to different, conflicting spheres of life. Mother embraces you and offers love, comfort protection and warmth. War is death and killing. Saddam Hussein nevertheless named the Gulf War the “mother of all wars”. A sentence containing a descriptive statement referring to the issue in question, the Gulf war, is injected with emotion, the reference to a personal issue like mother. Metaphor uses a procedure that introduces duality, contradiction, or even conflict into a sentence. To picture the ruling government as the Titanic or as a metro wagon that has lost its way surprises and excites the mind. Metaphors are strange elements, unexpected in a particular context. Shifting between schemata dynamises content and catches attention.

We are used to thinking of metaphors in connection with literary similes, allegories, and parables. When a man tells a woman that she is a rose, for example, he offers and invites a schema for appreciating her. When the woman’s jealous stepsister responds that the rose is infected with aphids, the stepsister simultaneously extends the metaphor and transforms its meaning. She reshapes the original cognitive schema. In the former example, the rose is infected with aphids makes an effective metaphor, as it is full of suggestion.

Metaphors can be considered as a comparison statements with parts left out, or as compressed similes. “You are a rose” would be less effective when formulated

as a simile, an explicit comparison between two unlike things, saying that you are like a rose. Even less effective is a literal comparison, such as you are like your stepsister in which two similar things are explicitly compared, or an analogy. You are to your stepsister like a rose to an aphid is an analogy, for which four terms are needed (Miller, 1984). The sentence “purple turns into black and blue after a while” can be viewed as having strictly literal meaning in a family context, in which a boy felt himself a bruise on his leg. This sentence becomes metaphorical when pronounced in a television interview by the opponent of the Dutch purple coalition between socialdemocrats (red) and conservatives (blue).

The classical rhetorical arsenal includes pre-formatted categories. A brief listing and selective definition of some of these suggests their heavy dependence on explicit or implicit metaphorical processes:
Allegory – an extended or continued metaphor;
Metonymy – substituting for the name of a thing the name of an attribute;
Parable – comparison, allegory;
Synecdoche – substituting a whole for a part or a part for a whole;
Topos –
Trope – use of a word or phrase in a sense other than is proper to it.

A restricted metaphorical concept includes only the last kind of figurative language, the trope, which is based on direct transfer of name because of similarity. Metaphors in a broad sense include also most of the other forms of non-literary language use. Experience teaches us that most definitions still allow for a slightly different personal interpretation, even when specifications are given. The reason is that metaphors can be placed on a continuum, ranging from the living metaphors to dead metaphors. Awareness of metaphors differs both personally and culturally. Living metaphors are creative and original vehicles which illuminate the mind. Like a new pair of shoes these catch our attention during a long walk as they appear to small and look nice; dead metaphors are like an old pair of shoes: these are unspectacular and so often used and comfortable that one is no longer aware wearing these. Dead metaphors are no longer considered to be metaphors. The stronger the reference to the literary meaning, the more significant the conflict that the metaphor causes within a sentence. Commonly used metaphors generate weak references to literary meaning; these references may even disappear over time (De Landtsheer, 1998; Mooij, 1976).

2. Metaphorical Rhetoric – Emotion, Visualization, and Personality

The traditional formulation of rhetoric, with similar Aristotelian roots, distinguishes between three major sorts of rhetorical appeals – logos, ethos, and pathos. We have already discussed the metaphorical dependence of reason on prior models of reasoning. These ordered forms of rationality provide an implied metaphorical template for the kinds of reasons that are rhetorically given. The concept of "logos" should not be confused with formal logic. It means simply that the speaker should give a more or less coherent argumentation.
Arguments can be of various origin: personal history, religion, culture. These should, however meet the criterion that they are plausible, or seem reasonable to the audience.
Ethos, in a similar way, relies more directly and heavily on pre-existing patterns of customs and norms. "Ethos" depends upon the status of the speaker; the higher the position, the better his or her reputation, the more ethical rhetoric is perceived. Pathos, finally, is effective precisely because of its explicitly metaphorical invocation of prior experiences from a wide spectrum of collective life. Pathos is not the least important aspect of rhetoric. The speaker uses high doses of emotion in his speech in order to persuade the audiences of his or her point of view (Windt, 1987: xvii, xviii).

Pathos suggests a dimension of politics that many analytic and scientific observers find very disturbing. On many occasions, emotion dominates reason. The speaker's main objective is audience support. Most election campaigns are full of emotion-dominated rhetoric. After the elections, the corpses have fallen out of the closet, Karel van Miert, the present European commissioner used to say while he was an opposition party-leader of the Belgian social-democrats (ethos). His metaphor (pathos) argued that the governing parties deed not keep their promises made during election campaign (logos). This refined metaphor was a powerful mixture of reason and emotion. Metaphors are the politicians' keys to citizens' emotions. The powerful suggestion mechanism activated by metaphor triggers underlying emotions.
The distinction made by Ricoeur between emotion and feelings seems relevant to understand politicians' handling of metaphors in order to trigger emotions. Emotion is what we consider an irrational, non-cognitive, strictly physiological event. Emotion is a first order experience that can be contrasted with feeling, a second order experience. In other words, emotions are general and feelings are attached to specific objects (Dobrzynska, 1995: 597; Ricoeur, 1975). Politicians intentionally and cognitively produce metaphors, because they feel that arousing

emotions in the audience is a good way to persuade the audience.
In spite of their common human foundations, reason and emotion have traditionally been viewed dualistically, as opposing forces. Because of its emotional content, classical philosophy opposed itself to rhetoric: Rhetoric was philosophy's evil twin (Farrell, 1974}. Reason and emotion are, nevertheless, very compatible and have a delicate relationship one to another. We have already suggested the metaphorical dimension of reason itself, as abstract models of reason are applied in the world. It is also worth noting that reason itself involves emotion: The passion for reason can be as powerful and productive, misleading and counter-productive, as other emotions. As we have noted, metaphors activate conscious and sub-conscious, rational and emotional responses.

These different kinds of appeals exist in an uneasy tension. Political rhetoric uses all the dimensions of metaphors in its persuasive quest. Metaphors are a mountain full of wild flowers; these evoke non-linguistic primary processes that have powerful effects.
The symbolic or imaginative language (metaphors are a mountain of wild flowers) is synthetic and exists along with the linguistic, analytic, rational expression (metaphors evoke non-linguistic primary processes that have powerful effects) (Paivio, 1979, Bateson, 1972).
Persuasive effects of metaphors can be explained by means of a modular theory of the mind. According to this theory, left brain hemispheric (linguistic) messages are interpreted literally, while images are processed in the right brain hemisphere. Metaphor often creates in the mind of the audience a visual image as well as a verbal meaning. The fact that metaphors are processed both literally and imagically produces more retention and persuasive effect; metaphors increase the degree of attitude change and memorisation of the audience (Opfer & Anderson, 1992: 5-7). Metaphors thus mobilise broader potentials for human communication. The mobilisation of public opinion is considered to be an irrational process, just like collective human behaviour itself. This view by political psychologists and anthropologists clearly differs from the notion of rationality as posited by Aristotelian and Cartesian philosophy and epistemology (Haskell, 1987: 91; Bateson, 1972: 464; Osgood, Suci, & Tannenbaum, 1967: 273).
Personality variables may affect metaphoric communication. Political psychology suggests that the strong drive felt by politicians to establish a firm sense of self may positively affect their symbolic capacities. The compensation hypothesis

suggests that some politicians may have poor self-integration. Poorly integrated individuals seem to lack adequate boundaries between self and other, between feeling and thought, and between fantasy and reality. Both the creative activity of producing metaphors and the interpretation of metaphors may reduce anxiety (Feldman, 1994; Haskell, 141-162; Billow, Rossman, Lewis, Goldman, Kraemer, and Ross, 1987: 154-156; Lasswell, 1948).

The interpretation of metaphors, stimulates personal and emotional; interpretation and may also make anxiety more painful. Psychiatry considers the handling of metaphor as one of the most striking aspects of schizophrenic language. Metaphors have tremendous effects upon subjects with non-integrated personalities. The seriously disturbed seem to get emotionally upset by metaphors. The metaphorical utterances of other are responded to as if they are literal communications. In less disturbed subjects moderate anxiety levels may also heighten creativity, which is necessary for the production of metaphors (Bateson, 1972; Billow, Rossman, Lewis, Goldman, Kraemer and Ross, 1987: 151-156).

Clinical experiences teach that one should distinguish between purer metaphors and similar forms of figurative speech such as metonymy, similarity metaphors, proportional metaphors and proverbs. In the case of purer metaphors, the schizophrenic individual will feel the need to disturb communication by inaccurate, autistic, and/or literal responses. This is most often not the case when other forms of figurative language are used. New and powerful metaphors may generate even more effects than dead metaphors. Reasons may lay in the fact that the interpretation of new metaphors relies upon the context, while other forms depend upon learned associations (Mahler, 1968). It can be concluded that a main rhetorical effect of metaphorical communication is a broadening of the emotional dimension of cognition.

3. Metaphorical politics – Complexity, Diversity and Drama

Metaphorical reasoning and metaphorical rhetoric are central components of politics. Metaphors are part of political speech in all its forms: rhetoric by politicians, politicians' discourse mediated by mass media, political texts written by journalists, philosophers, and literary authors. Nowadays, sound bites have proved to be more often quoted by mass media than other expressions by politicians.

Sound bites are usually metaphors (Opfer and Anderson, 1992). The power to

impose metaphor is also the power to impose a form of political reasoning – and also a form of political order. Metaphors thus reflect, interpret, and construct politics.

Metaphors in politics seem to differ strongly from other metaphors, used in religion, advertising, journalism and sports though they may include elements from these other domains (Dirven, 1989: 22-38). A notion of community with individual identities is an aim formulated by both US and European policy-makers. The use of a mosaic metaphor that recognizes individual communities as part of the whole within a shared framework seems more appropriate than the melting pot or rainbow metaphor (Etzioni, 1997: 21-32). The "War on Drugs" metaphor used by the US government directs attention to restrictive measures, while driving attention away from treatment, prevention and curing (McGaw, 1991: 57-74). Italian politicians nowadays use horticultural metaphors in order to forget about past scandals and to give a "rosy" description of current affairs (Ferrarotti, 1996). The populist discourse by the right-wing Italian politician Silvio Berlusconi shows a preference for metaphors from the domains of football, war and the bible (Semina and Masci, 1996: 243-269). Sports metaphors were used in a distinct way by former US presidents Lyndon Johnson and Ronald Reagan. Johnson's rhetoric used the "starting line" metaphor to describe the need to establish equal competitive conditions. Reagan emphasised the "runners" idea in stressing that competitors need to rely on athletic character (Walk, 1995: 36-55). Defeated presidential candidates seem to share the same pattern in metaphor use (Corcoran, 1994).

Crisis situations of diverse origin and restrictions upon individuals generate public speech that is highly metaphorical. Metaphors belong to ornamental and symbolic style (contrary to sign-oriented or factual style), which is assumed to "infect" political discourse during severe political or economic crises. Style is simply the order and movement politicians give to their thought (Lasswell, 1949: 21). An acceptable explanation for this is that the need for "emotion" dominates crisis), and that metaphors predominantly belong to the emotive component of language (as far as this component can be divided from the cognitive). Speech by political leaders may thus be less cognitively, but more metaphorically and emotionally, powerful during crisis situations. At the same time, leaders may wish to conceal how things really are, both for the population and for the enemy in times of war (Dobrzynska, 1995; Lackner, 1995; De Landtsheer, 1994; Gaus, 1982; Ricoeur, 1975; De Sola Pool, 1956)

Culture, ideology, and gender affect the content of metaphors. Navigation metaphors are commonly used in The Netherlands, while French politicians prefer culinary metaphors and Chinese politicians use poetic ones. Marxism-Leninism uses construction metaphors, while capitalist society produces nature metaphors.

Several studies indicate that extremist political discourse both from the left and from the right differs from discourse by other ideological groups in using more metaphors. The extreme right seems to use relatively more cleaning and illness metaphors than other ideological groups. Female political discourse seems less metaphorical than male political speech. In times of prosperity, metaphors resemble everyday life and everyday-life speech, because they, for instance, include many proverbs and biblical expressions (De Landtsheer, 1998: 129-144; Karvonen, 1994: 441-452; Edelman, 1977: 35; Koeller, 1975: 222; Mooy, 1976: 16).

One of the major emotive functions of metaphors can be to reassure the audience. Metaphors picture reality and life as simple, they simplify complex situations and thereby give the audience a sense of confidence. Everyday life and nature metaphors are particularly fitted for democracy, prosperity and democratic politicians.

Different family models seem to affect underlying conservative (paternal model) and liberal (nurturing parent model) metaphorical models (Lakoff, 1995: 177-213). One should not allow people to become rich while sleeping, said the Dutch social-democratic prime minister Wim Kok before winning the 1998 Dutch elections. Kok thereby explained to his citizens-electors that his policy aimed at protecting working people.

Metaphors also allow people to escape from realty. Therefore they even sometimes refer to drama, music, film and games. I would love to have an African rhythm in Belgian politics, answered a Belgian politician when was asked whether he would accept a certain colleague that had gone to Africa to start a new career in his party. Metaphors, thus, relax the audience, sometimes even by reflecting repressed aggressive or psychotic feelings.

Different metaphors reflect and enhance power in different contexts. Current theory and research suggest that some metaphors are more important than others. According to one body of thought, there exists a deep metaphorical structure, a generative metaphorical grammar, resting on the common human experience of embodiment.

In other words, our bodies provide a fundamental “source” schema for much of our relation to the world (Johnson, 1990; Lakoff and Johnson, 1983). It is obvious that the metaphor of the body underlies a good deal of contemporary political discourse.

Traditional political philosophy relied heavily on the implied metaphor of the “body politic,” giving a corporeal form to an abstract, intangible entity, the state. The metaphor of the “state as person” is very much alive and well today. Using this metaphor, some analysts have generated elaborate scripts for the Gulf War, with frames for different settings and slots for various characters (Lakoff, 1991; Beer and Balleck, 1997). Though they may also have indirect bodily referents, other metaphors are important in their own right.

In a seminal, though now neglected work late in his career, the distinguished political scientist Karl Deutsch (1966) suggested that machines had provided a powerful modern template for political life. The Newtonian expansion of celestial mechanics thus found its political counterpart in the checks and balances of the American Constitution. Deutsch also imagined a third, emerging model for politics, the network. Modelled on the proto-science of cybernetics in vogue during the middle of the 20th century, the network concept has considerable resonance in the communications revolution at century’s end.

Beyond these core metaphors of body, machine, and network, nature, war and game there is enormous diversity and variety in political metaphors. Metaphors for politics and political community include a variety of terms. Some of these are presented in *Table I.*

These metaphorical shifters create a blended, hybrid space where the metaphorical sources and political targets coexist in a dynamic relationship (Turner and Fauconnier, 1995). The variety of choice, the richness of this metaphorical menu provides political actors and observers with an infinite inventory of rhetorical resources.

Table 1 Metaphorical Sources for Political Targets

Politics-as-Activism	Politics-as-Medicine
Politics-as-Art	Politics-as-Modernization
Politics-as-Balance	Politics-as-Myth
Politics-as-Beast	Politics-as-Narrative
Politics-as-Blood	Politics-as-Neighborhood
Politics-as-Body	Politics-as-Network
Politics-as-Bureaucracy	Politics-as-Nightmare
Politics-as-Business	Politics-as-Orchestra
Politics-as-Chaos	Politics-as-Order
Politics-as-Coalitions	Politics-as-Pattern
Politics-as-Cession	Politics-as-Peace
Politics-as-Commons	Politics-as-Pollution
Politics-as-Communication	Politics-as-Power
Politics-as-Competition	Politics-as-Prison
Politics-as-Container	Politics-as-Process
Politics-as-Conversation	Politics-as-Race
Politics-as-Cooperation	Politics-as-Reason
Politics-as-Corporation	Politics-as-Religion
Politics-as-Discourse	Politics-as-Repression
Politics-as-Disease	Politics-as-Resources
Politics-as-Disease	Politics-as-Science
Politics-as-Dominance	Politics-as-Science
Politics-as-Dream	Politics-as-Slavery
Politics-as-Education	Politics-as-Sport
Politics-as-Family	Politics-as-Story
Politics-as-Fantasy	Politics-as-Submission
Politics-as-Force	Politics-as-Suffering
Politics-as-Force	Politics-as-System
Politics-as-Game	Politics-as-Technique
Politics-as-Health	Politics-as-Theater
Politics-as-Hell	Politics-as-Therapy
Politics-as-House	Politics-as-Torture
Politics-as-Land	Politics-as-Village
Politics-as-Machine	Politics-as-Violence
Politics-as-Market	Politics-as-War

Table 1. Metaphorical Sources for Political Targets

4. Metaphorical Meaning and Metaphorical Power-Leaders, Elites and Citizens

Metaphors are political language, social life, and political life in a nutshell. The statement by some scholars that political language is interchangeable with politics also holds for metaphors. Political metaphors are condensed politics. The use and understanding of metaphors is interwoven with political life and with political culture.

This is what makes studying political metaphors so rewarding for social scientists. Metaphors adapt to circumstances of war and peace, prosperity and crisis, dictatorship and democracy. Metaphors always keep their charm, persuasive power and attractiveness, regardless of their content, regardless of the person who uses them, regardless of the medium that "distributes" them. Political metaphors exist in all ages and all places. The content and form of political rhetoric's provides important information about public beliefs and values. Audiences participate in constructing political discourse.

The politician searches for the best possible arguments to support a position. A final selection is made on the basis of audience appeal. The same holds for the style that politicians choose (more or less formal, dialect or not, what kind of metaphors,…). Political metaphors are always a function of the context and of the needs and interests of the audience involved. The audience is always incorporated in the chosen rhetorical style and metaphors. This is especially the case when political speech is what Windt calls "expressive". Politicians, or demagogues in this case, try to clarify their positions on issues in which the audience is

interested, they adjust their language to meet the culture of their audience. The metaphors used by demagogues thus provide particular insights for social scientists. Doctrinaire politicians, on the other hand, focus on ideas and disregard the audience; their language is “impressive language”, which focuses on pure ideas. Democratic rhetoric should balance between impressiveness and expressiveness (Windt, 1987: xvii, xix). For the above reasons, social scientists undertake content analysis of metaphors as a form of political analysis. Metaphorical analysis shows that De Klerck and his party managed to give an international impression of a “new” South Africa” while preserving their privileges (wa-Mwachofi, 1995: 331-352), or that despite obvious differences, election speeches by political opponents in New Zealand share underlying assumptions (Lyons, Stephens, Morgan, Praat, Tuffin, 1996: 77-90).

Metaphorical reasoning lies at the heart of political analysis, communication, and decision. Understanding the metaphorical construction of politics reveals previously hidden dimensions of political communities and previously hidden meanings of political discourse. It suggests new solutions to long-standing political conflicts and new areas for political co-operation. In our globalized, multicultural society, metaphors tap primary human experiences and cross boundaries. They can encourage greater mutual understanding and advance the search for peace. Metaphorical rhetoric is often successfully used by national political elites during severe political, military and economic crises. Metaphors, as these elites know, reassure and comfort their citizen audiences. Metaphors may help people to face periods of misery. During more prosperous times, political elites are aware that metaphors widen their voter audiences.
Metaphorical soundbites have considerable persuasive and mnemonic effects. Bright metaphors bring politics closer to the citizen.
Metaphors increase political participation, and further democracy.

Metaphors, however, may also carry stereotypes, deceit, and manipulation, in the various forms in which they are “distributed”, from traditional storytelling to Web pages. They may tranquilize people, and they may promote war, crime and civil disturbance; they may euphemize torture and state terrorism (Jones, Gwyneth, 1997; Crelinstein, 1991; Ping-Lin Liu, 1965). Metaphors can be instruments of propaganda. The impact they have on schizophrenics show that they can influence segments of the population in a powerful way. The master in metaphors dominates his or her environment, regardless of its scale. And he or she always

can deny what metaphors imply. Metaphors are crucial devices in maintaining and shifting meaning. If politics is a game, then every political-X means an element in game-Y." If political community is a family, then every element of political life is interpreted in terms of the categories and roles that family life provides. Metaphorical power flows directly from metaphorical capability to maintain and shift meaning. Metaphorical politics are about the power of meaning and the meaning of power. What political metaphors really mean are patterns of human political life.

REFERENCES

Balbus, Ike (1975). Politics as Sports: The Political Ascendency of the Sports Metaphor in America. *Monthly Review*, 26, 10.

Bateson, S. (1972). *Steps to an ecology of mind*. New York: Ballantine Books.

Beck, Brenda (1987). Metaphors, Cognition and Artificial Intelligence. In: Haskell, (1987)(ed.). *Cognition and Symbolic Structures: The Psychology of Metaphoric Transformation.* (pp. 9-30), Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Beer, Francis A. and Barry S. Balleck (1996). Body, Mind, and Soul in the Gulf War Debate. In: Mary E. Stuckey (ed.), *The Theory and Practice of Political Communication Research*. Albany, New York: SUNY Press.

Beer, Francis A. (1993). Words of Reason, *Political Communication*.

Beer, Francis A. (1995). Games and Metaphors. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*.

Billow, Richard, Rossman, Jeffrey, Lewis, Nona, Goldman, Deborah, Kraemer, Susan and Patrick Ross (1987). Metaphoric Communication and Miscommunication in Schizophrenic and Borderline States. In: Haskell, (1987)(ed.). *Cognition and Symbolic Structures: The Psychology of Metaphoric Transformation.* (pp. 141-162), Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Chilton, Paul; Ilyin, Mikhail (1993). Metaphor in Political Discourse: The Case of the 'Common European House'. *Discourse and Society*, 4, 1, Jan, 7-31.

Choi,-Jung-Min, Callaghan, Karen A. & Murphy, John W.(1996). *The Politics of Culture, Race, Violence and Democracy*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.

Corcoran, Paul E. (1994). Presidential Concession Speeches: The Rhetoric of Defeat. In: Kendall, Kathleen E.; Corcoran, Paul E.; Bauman, Sandra; Herbst, Susan; Meyrowitz, Joshua Symposium: Strategic Communication Problems in Presidential Campaigns. *Political Communication*, 11, 2, Apr-June, 107-164.

Crelinstein, R.D. (1991). *In Their Own Words: The World of the Torturers.* Paper presented at the III Pioom Symposium "Torturers and their Masters: The Politics

of Pain", The University of Leiden, Netherlands.
Czarniawska Joerges, Barbara; Jacobsson, Bengt (1995). Political Organizations and Commedia Dell'Arte. *Organization Studies*, 16, 3, 375-394.
De Sola Pool, Ithiel (1956). Variety and repetition in political language. In: H. Eulau et al. (eds). *Political Behavior. A Reader in Theory and Research* (217-231). Library of Congress.
Deutsch, Karl W. (1966). *The Nerves of Government: Models of Political Communication and Control.* New York: Basic Books.
Dirven, Rene (1989). Metaphors in Politics: The Case of Apartheid. *Communication and Cognition*, 22, 1, 22-38.
Dobrzynska, T. (1995). Translating metaphor: Problems of Meaning. *Journal of Pragmatics* 24, 595-604.
Dudley, A. (1984). Concepts in Film Theory. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
Edelman, M. (1974). *The Symbolic Uses of Politics*, Urbana, Illinois.
Etzioni, Amitai(1996-1997). The Community of Communities. *Responsive Community* 7,1, winter, 21-32.
Ezrahi, Yaron (1995). *The Theatrics and Mechanics of Action: The Theater and the Machine as Political Metaphors*. Social Research.
Farrell, Thomas B. (1993). *Norms of Rhetorical Culture*. New Haven, Yale University Press.
Feuer, Lewis S. 1974. *Einstein and the Generations of Science.* New York, New York: Basic Books.
Feldman, (1994). Personality and Politics in Japan. *Politics and The Individual*, IV, 2.
Ferrarotti, Franco (1996). Le Radici Tagliate [Cut Roots]. *Critica Sociologica*, 116, Jan-Mar, III-IV.
Feuer, Lewis S. 1974. *Einstein and the Generations of Science.* New York, New York: Basic Books.
Fritzsche, P. (1994). *Social Stress. A New Approach to Explain Xenophobia.* Paper VIII th Conference of the Dutch Society of Political Psychology. Amsterdam, The Netherlands.
Fraser, B. (1984). The Interpretation of Novel metaphors. In: Ortony, A. (ed.), *Metaphor and Thought*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 172- 185.
Gaus, Helmut (1979). *The Function of Fiction. The Usefulness of Functional Analysis for the Study of Cultural Phenomena*, Ghent, Belgium: Story Scientia.
Gaus, Helmut (1982) *Menselijk Gedrag in Perioden van Langdurige Economische Recessie*. Een Schets. Malle, Belgium: De Sikkel.

Gastil, John (1992). Undemocratic Discourse: A Review of Theory and Research on Political Discourse. *Discourse and Society*, 3, 4, Oct, 469-500.
Gresson, Aron David (1987). Transitional Metaphors and the Political Psychology of Identity Maintenance. In: Haskell, Tobert E. (ed.). *Cognition and Symbolic Structures: The Psychology of Metaphoric Transformation.* Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corporation.(163-185).
Haskell, Robert E. (1987) (ed.). *Cognition and Symbolic Structures: The Psychology of Metaphoric Transformation*. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
Holy, Ladislav (1994). Metaphors of the Natural and the Artificial in Czech Political Discourse. *Man*
Howe, Louis E. (1994). *Political Immunology: Political Subjectivity (Subjection) in the Information Age*. New Political Science.
Johnson, Mark (1990). *The Body in the Mind: The Bodily Basis of Meaning, Imagination and Reason*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Jones, Gwyneth (1997). The Neuroscience of Cyberspace: New Metaphors for the Self and Its Boundaries. In: Brian D. Loader (ed.). *The Governance of Cyberspace: Politics, Technology and Global Restructuring* (pp. 46-63), London: Routledge.
Karvonen, Lauri (1994). Political Language: Do Women Make a Difference? *Innovation*, 7, 4, 441-452.
Koeller, Wilhelm (1975). *Semiotik und Metapher [Semiotics and Metaphors]*. Stuttgart: Metzlzsche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
Lackner, M. (1995). Des termes subtils porteurs d'un grand message. Remarques a propos de quelques particularites linguistiques du discours politique en Chine. *Relations Internationales*, nr.81, 77-88.
Lakoff, George (1995). Metaphor, Morality, and Politics, or, Why Conservatives Have Left Liberals in the Dust. *Social Research*, 62, 2, summer, 177-213.
Lakoff, George (1991). Metaphors of War. *Propaganda Review,* 8, fall, 18-21, 54-59.
Lakoff, George (1991). Metaphor and War: The Metaphor System Used to Justify War in the Gulf. *Peace Research*, 23, 25-32.
Lakoff, George and Mark Turner (1989). *More than Cool Reason: A Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor*. Chicago, Illinois, University of Chicago Press.
Lakoff, George (1987). *Woman, Fire and Dangerous Things*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
Lakoff, George & and Mark Johnson(1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. University of Chicago Press.

De Landtsheer, Christ'l (1994). The Language of Prosperity and Crisis. A case study in Political Semantics. *Politics and The Individual*, Volume 4, Number 2, Hamburg: Kramer Verlag: 63-85.
De Landtsheer, Christ'l (1995). Political Communication. In: *Politics, Groups and The Individual, V 2, Special issue on "How to make a politician"*, ed. by C. De Landtsheer, Norderstedt, Germany: APP Verlag.
De Landtsheer, Christ'l (1998). The Political rhetoric of a Unified Europe, In: Feldman, Ofer & De Landtsheer, Christ'l (eds). *Politically Speaking: A Worldwide Examination of Language Used in The Public Sphere* (pp. 129- 145), Westport, Connecticut, Praeger.
Lasswell, H. D. & Lerner, D. and Sola Pool, I. de (1952). *The Comparative Study of Symbols.* An Introduction. Stanford, USA: Hoover Institute Studies, Stanford University Press.
Lasswell, H. D. (1949). The Language of Power. In: H.D Lasswell, Nathan Leithes and Associates (eds.), *Language of Politics. Studies in Quantitative Semantics*, (3-19) New York, USA: George W. Stewart Publisher Inc.
Lasswell, H. D. (1949). Style in the Language of Politics. In: H.D. Lasswell, Nathan Leithes and Associates (eds.) *Language of Politics, Studies in Quantitative Semantics* (20-39), New York, USA: George W. Stewart, Publisher Inc.
Lepschy, G. (1976). Interpretation and Semantics. *Cahiers de Lexicologie*, 29: 64.
Loader, Brian D. (ed.) (1997). *The Governance of of Cyberspace: Politics, Technology and Global Restructuring*. London: Routledge.
Lyons, Antonia C.; Stephens, Christine; Morgan, Mandy; Praat, Angelique C.; Tuffin, Keith (1996). Constructing New Zealand: Common Linguistic Resources in New Zealand Political Discourse. *Australian Journal of Communication*, 23, 1, 77-90.
Mahler, Margaret S. & Manuel Furer (1968). On Human Symbiosis and the Vicitudes of Individuation. New York: International University Press.
Miller, (1984). Images and Models, Similes and Metaphors. In: Ortony, Andrew (ed.) *Metaphor and Thought* (202-250), Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
McGaw, Dickinson (1991). Governing Metaphors: The War on Drugs. *American Journal of Semiotics*, 8, 3, 57-74.
Mooy, J. J. (1976). *A Study of Metaphor. On the Nature of Metaphorical Expressions, with Special Reference to their Reference.* Amsterdam, The Netherlands: North Holl. Publ. Co. OED 2. Oxford English Dictionary II. CD Rom.
Opfer, Joseph & Anderson, Peter (1992). *Explaining the Sound Bite: A Test of a Theory of Metaphor and Assonance*. Paper presented at the Western Speech

Communication Association Convention in Boise, Idaho.
Ortony, Andrew, ed. (1984). *Metaphor and Thought*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
Osgood, Charles E., Suci, George J. & Tannenbaum, Percy H. (1967). Semantic Measurement in Communication Research. In: *The Measurement of Meaning* (pp. 272-342), Urbana, Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
Obeng, Samuel Gyasi (1997). Language and Politics: Indirectness in Political Discourse. *Discourse and Society*, 8, 1, Jan, 49-83.
Paivio, Allan (1979). *Imagining and Verbal Processes*. Hillsdale, New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Press.
Ping-Lin Liu, A. (1965). *Adaptation of Traditional Storytelling to Political propaganda in Communist China*. Paper Centre for International Studies, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
Ricoeur, P. (1975). *La Métaphore Vive.* Paris, France: Editions du Seuil.
Semino, Elena & Masci, Michela (1996). Politics Is Football: Metaphor in the Discourse of Silvio Berlusconi in Italy. *Discourse and Society*, 7, 2, Apr, 243-269.
Sniderman, Paul M., Richard A. Brody, and Philip E. Tetlock, eds. (1991). *Reasoning and Choice: Explorations in Political Psychology*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
Sweetser, E.(1995). Metaphor, Mythology, and Everyday Language. The Netherlands: *Journal of Pragmatics* 24, 585-593.
Sylvan, Donald A. & Voss, James F. (1998)(eds). *Problem Representation in Foreign Policy Decision Making*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
Tano, Daisuke (1995). The Birth of the Arbeiter Body and Politics in the Third Reich. *Soshioroji*, 40, 2, Oct, 59-78.
Turner, Mark and Gilles Fauconnier (1995). Conceptual Integration and Formal Expression. *Journal of Metaphor and Symbolic Activity* 10, 3.
Weinberger, O (1995). Argumentation in Law and Politics. *Communication and Cognition* Vol. 28, Nr. 1, 37-54.
Walk, Stephan R.(1995). The Footrace Metaphor in American Presidential Rhetoric. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 12, 1, Mar, 36-55.
wa Mwachofi, Ngure (1995). Apprehending the Power and Ideological Import of Metaphor in President de Klerk's Rhetoric. *Howard Journal of Communications*, 5, 4, summer, 331-352.
Weinberger, O. (1995). Argumentation in Law and Politics, *Communication and Cognition* 28, 1: 37-54.

Windt, T. & Ingold, B.(1987). *Essays in Presidential Rhetoric.* Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt Publishing.