Analyzing War, Construction and Journey Metaphors in Obama's Political Discourse

MUSTAFA MOHAMED MOHAMED AHMED MOHAMED
Imam Abdulrahman Bin Faisal University (IAU), KSA

Abstract:

   Language is a vital part in human life, because people can't avoid using it during their activities. They use it to communicate with each other. People can interact and express their feeling through language.

   Metaphorical expressions and other forms of Figurative language are effective devices and tools in political discourse, they allow the audience to comprehend and understand the meaning of speeches delivered by politicians. Many political theorists have extolled the virtue of metaphors as effective persuasive tool, or have demonized metaphors as the politicians' manipulative devices.

   This paper will study and analyze war, construction, and journey metaphors in Obama's political discourse. It will explore four speeches delivered by Obama in his midterm mandate.

Key words: Metaphor, Political Discourse, State of the Union Address.

SECTION ONE: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction:

The term "metaphor" has comprehensive meanings and many definitions. Spencer (2012) indicates that since metaphor has

many meaning and various definitions, there is no human expression that would not be metaphoric in somebody's definition (p. 395). The dictionary depicts metaphor as "a figure of speech in which a word or phrase is applied to an object or action to which it is not literally applicable". This focal central idea of conveying meanings is also embedded in its etymological sense: the term metaphor is derived comes from the Greek word "meta" which means beyond or above and "pherein" which means conveying or bearing (Spencer, 2012, p.395). Generally, we can say that metaphor can be described as a device through which a thing is viewed as a representative of another thing.

There are two distinct methods for understanding metaphors: (a) the first classifies metaphors as mere rhetorical devices that have a nominal purpose which is making speech seem to be nice (Charteris-Black, 2004, p. 25); (b) the method sees metaphors from the cognitive perspective, as devices for comprehending and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p. 5). The first view of metaphor as purely artistic trope was prevalent until the leading-edge publication "Metaphors we live by" by George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, in which they managed to export this cognitive understanding of metaphor (Spencer, 2012, p. 396). Lakoff and Johnson (1980) clarify that the metaphor structures the way people think and act, and that the human conceptual system is fundamentally metaphorical (p. 3). The conceptual metaphors presented by Lakoff and Johnson are cognitive processes that are ordinary, unavoidable and rooted deep into our unconscious, but unlike the traditional understanding of metaphors, conceptual metaphors are cognitive, not linguistic (Sabbah, 2011, p. 155).

The language in politics is a practice of communication of how to use language efficiently to reach all of the social classes. Politics is inevitably connected to power. "Politics is concerned with power to make decision, to control resources, to control other people's behavior and often to control their

values". (Thomas. et. al, 2004: 38). Politics can be described as the activities of seizing and protecting power. The power of political discourse is established and maintained by the powerful function of language.

One of the politicians' objectives is to stimulate their audience. Language can be utilized to impact people's political and ideological perspectives through investigating in detail the methods in which politicians can utilize language for their own advantage. Persuasive political expressions should essentially be inventive by the ability to adjust the rhetorical techniques to compete for attention.

Literature Review:

Metaphor in political discourse:

Political discourse is guided by implied conceptual metaphor. Such metaphors are partly entrenched in ideas and cultural patterns. Straightforward cases of such metaphors contain the conceptual dualisms like: left and right, conservative and progressive, and so on. There is an enormous number of different terms from the scope of political discourse. Indeed, every political commentary in any newspaper includes political metaphors. Metaphors are completely vital to the "understanding" of many political ideas, which are generally too abstract, remote, and complex to be understood by common people.

Supporters of cognitive linguistics like Lakoff et al. (1980; 1978; 1982) recommended that conceiving or thinking involves influencing unconscious intellectual metaphor in order to let concretely pictured physical items and situations replace the more abstract items and situations we are striving to comprehend. Lakoff et al. (1980; 1978; 1982) concluded that metaphors are imaginary matters, a matter of thinking of one thing in terms of another. So, the conceptual metaphor or cross-domain map, for the supporters of the cognitive linguistics, was

a pervading culture-wide tendency to imagine one fixed kind of thing in terms of another fixed kind of thing. Therefore, the review specified a word or a phrase as a metaphor if a word or phrase could be comprehended beyond the literal meaning in the context, the literal meaning stemmed from a cultural experience area (source range), the source range was transferred to a second, often abstract area (target range). Wei (2001) took a solid stand on the significance and pervasiveness of metaphors utilized in election discourse through influencing thoughts and ideas in Taiwan. Data was collected from newspaper and website coverage of Taiwanese elections of 1997. She used all these sources to clarify voters, readers and campaigners' intercommunications. Utilizing a cognitively and culturally based analytic work as proposed by Lakoff (1980, 1996) and Quinn (1991), she investigated the specific socio-cultural conditions that provided basis for the new and productive metaphors. The study claimed the recent social events and specific cultural contexts gave rise to certain benign metaphors to describe the unique socio-cultural situations of Taiwanese politics. The study provided socio-cultural analysis for certain political metaphors, showing also that the pragmatic functions of metaphors were more than just heuristic or cognitive devices. They were also adopted for strategic reasons.

Moreover, many other scholars established that the metaphor structures our political, social and economic comprehension. The conceptual metaphor "POLITICS IS WAR" for example, structures the way we consider politics as a fight to be won. We would see politics in a different way if the metaphor was "POLITICS IS LOVE." Therefore. It's not peculiar that Wei (2001) established just as much in her study. Other studies specified words like "business" and "war" as the most common source domains for politics Unlike Wei (2001) who dissected metaphorical expressions used in the news coverage of Taiwanese political rhetoric, Vestermark (2007) conducted a study of the metaphorical personification of

America in political rhetoric. She based her analysis on the Cognitive - Semantic method produced by Lakoff and Johnson (1980). Her study looked specifically at the personification of America in the first inaugural addresses by Ronald Reagan (1981), George H.W. Bush (1989), Bill Clinton (1993) and George, W. Bush (2001). She concentrated on how they utilized metaphors and how metaphors could be elucidated and what messages they sent to the receivers. Therefore, her strategy in analyzing metaphors was to find the mentioned conceptual metaphors and to analyze how a non-human entity (US) was determined as being a human entity as well as to account for the speaker's potential intention. Vestermark (2007) investigated the conceptual metaphors THE WORLD AS A COMMUNITY, NATION AS A PERSON AND NATION ACTING AS HUMAN. She contended that the conceptual metaphors used in political discourse in the inaugural speeches were strongly intentional, yet it's hard to detect them. She found that America is conceptualized as human, and she concluded that the four presidents utilized the metaphor to personify the nation to make the American people identify with and comprehend their beliefs and goals. Despite the fact that she contended that the use of conceptual metaphors in the inaugural speeches was intentional, in many cases linguistic metaphors illustrate sub-conscious decisions on the speaker's role, based partly on the conceptual structures shared by individuals of their community. Vestermark study (2007), elucidated, clearly, that the features of conceptual sources could be manipulated positively rather than negative rhetorical conclusions. Taiwo (2010) studied metaphors in the Nigerian political discourse. His study mixed the Critical Discourse Analysis's methods with the Cognitive Linguistics' methods which were developed by Lakoff and Johnson (1980) to examine metaphoric expressions. Mainly, Taiwo (2010) concentrated on the metaphors' identification and how the discourses conceptually mapped metaphoric expressions of their source

and target domains. Guided by Lakoff and Johnson's Theory of Conceptual Metaphor, he specified three target domains as sources of conceptual metaphors in his data: the nation, politics and politicians. In his work, he stated that the NATION was conceptualized as a FAMILY and as a PERSON. He also specified the conceptual mappings of POLITICS AS A BATTLE, POLITICS AS A JOURNEY, and the POLITICIAN AS A BUILDER. Taiwo (2010) contended that the metaphor helps in forming the political categorization and argumentation's structure. Such a conceptual metaphor as POLITICS IS A GAME, for example, forms our political recognition. Moreover, he proclaimed that the targets and domains' mapping principle was utilized by Nigerian politicians to achieve persuasive and rhetoric objectives in their political speech. This can be utilized either negatively, or positively. The major objective of the politicians is not only to present facts, but also to be convincing. Taiwo mentioned Opeibi (2006) who accomplished a study about the negative political advertising and he discovered that many of the political candidates ignored positive advertisement which concentrate on the key issues and engaged in rhetorical methods of direct attacks on their adversaries. Attacks of political rivals assured that politicians projected both positive and negative presentation.

Lakoff (2002) indicated that metaphors are functional in discourses. He brought metaphor into political speeches, and utilized it as an analytical tool to enable people have a superior comprehension of ideology and significant in political addresses. In the article entitled "Metaphor, Morality, and Politics" (http://www.wwcd.org/issues/Lakoff.html) in which he censured the US government for advocating the war against Iraq, but withholding the truth that the war was for its advantages, he brought many conceptual metaphors revealing the US' diplomacy to Iraq. Cen (2009) studies various political speeches from the pragmatics' viewpoint. By adopting Grice's Cooperative Principle (CP) and Politeness Principle (PP), he

assumes that the maxim of quality in Cooperative Principle requires participants in conversation communication to comply with the following two standards: 1- Don't say what you think to be wrong; (2) Don't state that for which you have not appropriate proof, because the political speech must be true, convincing, encouraging and persuasive. Moreover, Hu (2001) studied the rhetoric in politics. In his article "Rhetoric in Politics and Its Knowledge Spreading", he studied various political speeches from various backgrounds. He indicates that many common shapes of rhetoric are extensively used, including: metonymy, metaphor, repetition, euphemism, and parallelism in addition to antithesis or contrast parallelism. These shapes, in political speeches, have a powerful impact on spreading political awareness. Moreover, he asserts that according to various environments, the political rhetoric can be categorized into the following five categories: head rhetoric, campaign rhetoric, institution rhetoric, situation rhetoric, and opposite rhetoric. So, we can conclude to that the political discourses can't be accomplished efficiently without rhetoric.

Stenvoll (2008, p. 36) states, "Language use, including the use of metaphor, is analyzed as a tool of power, as something that political actors 'stand outside' (to use a conventional metaphor) and may use to address, legitimate and/or cover political interests."

Charteris-Black's book Politicians and Rhetorics (2006) addresses a huge number of different conceptual metaphors in politicians' speeches. He mentioned four conceptual metaphors, namely: journey metaphors, heroic myth, construction and creation metaphors and destruction metaphors.

Jonathan Charteris-Black has a huge contribution in the field of corpus studies of metaphor. He inscribes that metaphors are regularly utilized by politicians to create fables/tales that explain the unknown‖ (Charteris-Black 2007: 28). What makes fable a very helpful tool for political people is that it gets rid of

doubts and fulfills the safety and reassurance's needs of their supporters (ibid.: 28).

Charteris-Black points that capability of recalling an emotional response is another feature of metaphors (ibid.: 43). Additionally, politicians' use of metaphor may influence beliefs and convictions of the audience, since these metaphors activate emotional connections (ibid.: 43). The ability of influencing such emotions is called pathos.

Obviously, the issue of political discourse terms is complicated and has been studied from different viewpoints. Määttä (2007: 168), making utilization of Foucault's (1969) insights, characterized the objective of [political] discourse analysis as "to decide why a specific part of discourse (e.g. statement) and no other has occurred in a specific place in a specific duration". This Foucaltian and pragmatic viewpoint makes the reader focus on the hidden variables of contextual meaning, ideology, relations of power and coercion, audience-specificity, and so on. All speech need to be investigated in terms of the part of the huge networks of concept, meanings, and desired goals. Analyzing metaphors could be defined as a specific methodology of discourse analysis, which would be a technique for analyzing either intentions of the players in a given political system (as the case of this study) or a political ideology in general.

Metaphorical expressions as communication devices:

Metaphorical expressions can be used as communication devices between the various systems and their relevant symbols of communities, i.e. Metaphorical expressions can play a vital part in supporting solidarity in a community and in suggesting social change. Modifications in the root metaphors may promote, as a result of these modifications, extensive change in the soci-cultural fields as well as the political field. According to in luhmam's social system theory, the techniques of communication between the systems in community remain as

doubtful issues (e.g. 1995; 2000). Alternatively, Leydesdorff (2001) pursues Habermas (1987) and characterizes language as the operating system of community. Neither meaning nor Language enables the elaboration of how these social systems and subsequent discourses communicate with one another in society. Nonetheless, this communication is important for the community integration.

Persuasiveness and Agenda-setting theory

In 1946, in his article (Politics and the English Language), George Orwell noted: "we spare more mental effort by using metaphors, similes, and metonymies, at the cost of leaving your meaning vague, not only for the reader but also for yourself." (Orwell 1968: 134 as referred to by Müller 2005: 54).

The term "stale" was, for Orwell, essentially a style issue. He examined it through ambiguous language and clichés as a sign of English rhetorics' decay, not as rudimental presence of the change of basics of public politics that can be traced back to such periods of time. As Müller interestingly indicates, Orwell's definition contradicts the "traditional" view of metaphors as an absolute stylistic ornament, for his conception is also linked to the state of the speaker's "morals" and "mental efforts".

Since the Second World War, more consideration has been given to the issues of persuasiveness, methodologies, self-portraying, and targeted utilization of concepts in political discourse. Currently, no one doubts the reality that political discourse is characterized by its predominantly persuasive function and argumentative, often market-oriented method. Under typical conditions of a democratic political system, language used within political discourse is a strategical tool used in a political combat. This has never been so much true as now, in the prosperous era of political marketing. All speakers should be considered as likely strategically selected methods of agenda setting and promotion. Utilization of metaphors in

political discourse is mainly "a performance of persuasive discourse" (Charteris-Black 2004: 13 as cited in Candel 2005: 16).

In agenda-setting theory (McCombs 2009) alludes to an intended emphasizing of those components of an issue that are considered as essential by an actor, or those definitions and viewpoints of the issue which are strategically beneficial, particularly using media (e.g. McCombs, 2009: 133). utilization of Metaphors is one of persuasion methods. "By shedding lights on some characteristics, and ignoring others, conceptual metaphors of media discourses are claimed to 'frame cognitive models which regulate ideas and activities'" (Gozzi 1999: 10 as in Chaban et al. 2007 : 88).

Generating metaphors can be used to make a specific socio-political topic critical or, alternatively, to depict the utterance as an agent capable of handling the perceived problem. Theoretical cases include conceptual frames such as Terrorism is a disease and Candidate is cure; or Political rivals are criminals and Candidates are guardians, etc. Metaphorical expressions may represent a vial part in addressing a voter since they can be used as a shortcut for conveying a message through utilization of concepts familiar to the voter.

Analyzing Metaphorical expressions:

Numerous political issues are complicated and abstract for voters to comprehend properly; subsequently, metaphorical expressions can function in helping them understand abstract and conceptual entities through more concrete ones (Mio, 1997). Moreover, politicians need to demonstrate that besides comprehending complex problems, they can handle them. Through applying experienced and concrete to abstract thoughts, they use metaphors to make persuasive arguments clearly showing their capacity of thinking rationally (Brukholder& Henry, 2009). However, bearing in mind the characteristics of metaphors and numerous possible

interpretations, voters may attribute their own meanings to them either positively or negatively. Therefore, the metaphor choice made by politicians may differ in accordance with the context and audience, and which one requires to be focused on while delivering political speeches.

When analyzing and investigating metaphors, one needs to ignore the intentions of a speaker since metaphors can be manipulative (Rozina & Karapetjana, 2009) but are more commonly persuasive. Van Dijk (2006) differentiates between manipulation, persuasiveness and the consequences as follows:

> ". . . in persuasiveness speakers are free to behave or believe whatever they deem fit, depending on whether or not they accept the arguments of the speaker, whilst in manipulation the audience are typically assigned a more negative side: they are the manipulation's victims. This negative consequence of manipulation appears when the audience are unable to comprehend the real intents or to see the complete consequences of the beliefs or actions advocated by the manipulator. This may be the case especially when the audience lack the knowledge needed to counter manipulation." (p. 361)

Considering the features of metaphors, a speaker takes advantages of the language's associative power attempting to arouse emotional responses, thus demonstrating the metaphors' persuasive power.

Objective of this study:

The main objective of studying and analyzing war, construction and journey metaphors made by Obama in his political discourse is to:

- investigate the functions of these metaphors in specific contexts to uncover the hidden meanings beyond the usage of these metaphors; and
- To provide English Language learners and Students who are not well informed of metaphorical language with

special techniques used in political discourse to make complicated political issues understandable and more attractive to common people.

Methodology:

The methods adopted to conduct this study are document research and textual analysis methods.

Scope of the study:

This research aims at studying and analyzing three types of metaphors made by Obama. They are: construction, war, and journey metaphors. The data of this paper consists of four State of the Union Addresses delivered by Obama in his midterm (2009-2012).

SECTION TWO: DATA ANALYSIS

This section will explore and analyze only three types of metaphors used by Obama in his political speeches. These types are: War, construction, and Journey metaphors.

First: War Metaphors:

The conceptual metaphor POLITICS IS WAR is deeply rooted in people's minds, which might be the reason for its frequent usage in political speeches especially in countries that led war(s) at some point in the past. If we want to summarize the concept of politics in a single word, the most appropriate word would be power, the same as with the concept of war, hence there is a grounding for the metaphorical mapping. War metaphors are frequently employed by politicians because they want to stress that in addition to achieving social goals, personal sacrifice and struggle are vital. Hence, war metaphors play an important role in evaluating social goals. In addition, politicians, political elections, political strategies and outcomes of politics are frequently conceptualized as soldiers, battles, war

strategies and outcomes of war some of which will be elaborated on in the following paragraphs.

In his state of the Union addresses, Obama used many metaphorical expressions show the pattern WAR. He used this type of war metaphor in his speeches to help his audience well understand how concrete source domain "War" is mapped onto the abstract target domain "Politics". So he used words as: **tactic**, **win**, **defeat**, **fight**, **battle**, **battleground**, etc., form a systematic way of talking about the aspects of politics. Winning a political election can be comprehended via the concept of winning a war. Fighting for votes can be understood through the concept of fighting for territory or treasure in a war. This result is supported by Lakoff and Johnson who summarize that metaphorical expressions in our language are tied to metaphorical concepts in a systematic way and people can use metaphorical linguistic expressions to understand the metaphorical concepts (Lakoff & Johnson 2003: 7). The following examples are taken from state of the Union Speeches showing this type of metaphor:

Example (1):
And the lobbyists are trying to <u>kill it</u>. But we cannot let them <u>win </u>this <u>fight</u>. (State of the Union Speech, 2010).

In Example (1), the phrases "kill it" and "win the fight" represent as source domain and the word lobbyists conducts as target domain. Politic is always structured as fight and war. In the concept of fight or war, a person can be a winner or a loser. Many political things in politics are structured by the concept of war. There is no physical battle, but there is a verbal battle that involves attack and defense.

By using this metaphor, Obama reveals that the strategies he plans to enforce could be killed by the lobbyists, however, he promises that he will overcome the difficulties to carry on these strategies for the economy recovery.

Example (2):

We have gone from a bystander to a leader in the <u>fight against</u> climate change. We are helping developing countries to feed themselves, and continuing the <u>fight against</u> HIV/AIDS. (State of the Union Speech, 2010)

The war term "fight against" in the previous example conveys such a meaning to us that the struggle between human body and physical disease is like a war. Maintaining a good mental health is a good way to strike or battle against the disease
Below are more examples made by Obama in the same context of making health care reforms using terms such as "fight", re-fighting":

Example (3):

So instead of <u>re-fighting</u> the <u>battles</u> of the last two years, let's fix what needs fixing and move forward. (State of the Union Speech, 2011).
Example (4):

Rather than <u>fight</u> the same tired <u>battles</u> that have dominated Washington for decades, it's time to try something new. (State of the Union Speech, 2010).

Once the war starts, there will be inevitably "sacrifice". And in order to win a battle, people may get injured, or even lose their lives. However, in Obama's State of the Union Speeches this type of war metaphor shows that as fighters, both – Democrats and Republicans – are required to sacrifice during recession. The following example illustrates this type of metaphor:

Example (5):

Given these realities, everyone in this chamber – Democrats and Republicans – will have to <u>sacrifice</u> some worthy priorities for which there are no dollars. And that includes me. (State of the Union Speech, 2009).

Being engaged in a war means facing different types of enemies. These enemies can cause disorders to the country, destroy the country's economy and affect the society's stability, peace and freedom, thus affecting the nation's daily life and future. As shown in the following examples, Obama, cleverly, used this type of war metaphors in his state of the Union speeches:

Example (6):
It [Obama's recovery plan] will launch a new effort to <u>conquer</u> a disease that has touched the life of nearly every American by seeking a cure for cancer in our time. (State of the Union Speech, 2009).

In the previous example, Obama is talking about his recovery plan which includes finding a cure for cancer through (investing in electronic health records and new technology that will reduce errors, bring down costs, ensure privacy, and save lives).

Example (7):
… and <u>combating</u> the corruption that can rot a society and rob people of opportunity. effort to <u>conquer</u> a disease. (State of the Union Speech, 2011).

By using this type of war metaphor in his speeches, Obama is trying to inform the American people that they are helping and (standing with those who take responsibility – helping farmers grow more food; supporting doctors who care for the sick). He is also attempting to urge them to be united in their fight against "corruption" inform them that because it's a great danger on the whole nation.

Example (8):
let's at least agree to stop expelling responsible young people who want to staff our labs, start new businesses, and <u>defend</u> this country. (State of the Union Speech, 2012).

In the previous example, Obama, during speaking about immigration reforms, used "defend this country" in order to convince the American People and gain their support so to pass his immigration reforms.

Example (9):
our freedom endures because of the men and women in uniform who <u>defend</u> it. (State of the Union Speech, 2012).
Example (10):
To overcome extremism, we must also be vigilant in upholding <u>the values our troops defend</u>. (State of the Union Speech, 2009).

From the previous two examples, we can notice that the concept of a political election can be conceptualized through the concept of a war, which is grounded in people's experience. When preparing a political campaign, both financial and human resources are used as well as when preparing a war as shown in the first example. Additionally, a competition between political parties and politicians in a political election can be conceptualized as a battle between nations and soldiers in a war.

Example (11):
What is required now is for this country <u>to pull together</u>, <u>confront boldly</u> the <u>challenges we face,</u> and take responsibility for our future once more. (State of the Union Speech, 2009).

Undoubtedly, this is a powerful metaphor for illustrating the need for unity and collaborative effort needed to recover from the economic recession. It also emphasizes the role of the

president as a strong and decisive commander-in-chief and is likely to appeal to more conservative Americans.

Example (12):
Some of what's broken has to do with the way Congress does its business these days. A simple majority is no longer enough to get anything, even routine business, passed through the Senate. Neither party has been blameless in these <u>tactics</u>. (State of the Union Speech, 2012).

From the previous example, different kinds of strategies are utilized by the parties in order to win a battle. Undoubtedly, the politicians often adopt all the strategies they can think out to win the election.

Example (13):
Now let's be clear – I did not choose to tackle this issue to get some legislative <u>victory</u> under my belt. (State of the Union Speech, 2010).

In the previous example, Obama, skillfully, used this type of war metaphor "victory in a war" to achieve success in passing his health care reforms.

Second: Construction Metaphors:
Construction metaphors show that something is being created or constructed. Everything that is being planned, turned into or (re)formed signifies a creation. Moreover, this type of metaphor can also denote the economy or society as a building that needs solid foundations, or a framework needs to be stabilized.

This type of metaphor is quite positive, for it makes politicians looks as the architects who have good plans or who are intending to build up something new. The concept of "building" is commonly used by political leaders in their discourse, either literally or metaphorically. Construction

metaphor mainly aims at oversimplifying complex issues through using explicit verbs like "create", "plan", "form" or "build". These issues are more easily understandable by the public.

In his state of the Union Addresses, Obama, skillfully used construction metaphors. The words '*build*', '*built*', '*re-built*', or '*building*' are used many times his speeches to refer either to the economy or clean energy as in the following examples:

Example (14):
A strong, healthy financial market makes it possible for businesses to access credit and <u>create</u> new jobs. (State of the Union Speech, 2010)
Example (15):
In the last 22 months, businesses have <u>created</u> more than three million jobs. (State of the Union Speech, 2012)
Example (16):
*And with our friends and allies, we will **forge** a new and comprehensive strategy for Afghanistan and Pakistan to defeat al Qaeda and combat extremism.* (State of the Union Speech, 2009)

It is obvious that all of the previous "creation and construction" metaphors are used while addressing economic issues.

As mentioned before, "building" metaphors involve the process of mapping between the conceptual domain of building a physical entity, e.g. building apartment, onto the conceptual domain of "creating", or building abstract things, e.g. building army, consensus or future. The subjects that follows verbs like "to build" can come in various levels of abstractness, from "building clean energy facilities" to "building partnerships". The following examples emphasize this type of metaphor:

Example (17):

We should put more Americans to work <u>building</u> clean energy facilities. (State of the Union Speech, 2009).

Example (18):

They're [China, Germany and India] <u>rebuilding</u> their infrastructure. They are making serious investments in clean energy because they want those jobs. (State of the Union Speech, 2010)

In the first example Obama urged the American people to cooperating in creating and establishing "clean energy facilities". The second example came in the same context "economic issues" and challenges and obstacles that to be faced because of the American political system, while other nations like "India, china, and Germany" are not standing still; instead they are working hard to revamp their economy.

Example (19):

So much of America needs to be <u>rebuilt</u>. (State of the Union Speech, 2012).

Example (20):

That's an America <u>built</u> to last. (State of the Union Speech, 2012).

In the last two examples, Obama uses the verbs "build" and "rebuild" to refer to the American nation. Such types of metaphors are quite common in American political discourse; they emphasize essential theme of American mythology of creation as it is related to the Frontier myth of building a civilization out of the wilderness.

It is also common that politicians talk of governmental progress as building a new structure. The following examples are made by Obama to describe the need to have a strong and solid new foundation for the society:

Example (21):

Now is the time to act boldly and wisely – to not only revive this economy, but to <u>build a new foundation</u> for lasting prosperity. (State of the Union Speech, 2009)

Example (22):

That is the <u>foundation</u> on which the American people expect us to <u>build</u> common ground. (State of the Union Speech, 2009).

It is also a brilliant method to explain the need for collaborative work – building requires a hard-working team of people to function under the supervision of an architect (the U.S President) who designs the blueprint. Obama makes this point completely explicit through the following examples:

Example (23):

No one <u>built</u> this country on their own. This nation is great because we <u>built</u> it together. (State of the Union Speech, 2012).

The previous type of construction metaphor can be opposed to bad constructions:

Example (24):

On the day I took office, our auto industry was on the verge of <u>collapse.</u> (State of the Union Speech, 2012).

Example (25):

Nothing will get done this year, or next year, or maybe even the year after that, because Washington is <u>broken</u>. (State of the Union Speech, 2012).

Example (26):

Rules to prevent financial fraud or toxic dumping or faulty medical devices don't <u>destroy</u> the free market. (State of the Union Speech, 2012).

Another form of construction is to plan properly. In the following example, Obama used the term 'blueprint', while

addressing economic issues, he spoke directly to the need to create more high-wage jobs. The following metaphorical usage shows this type of metaphor:

Example (27):
I want to speak about how we move forward, and <u>lay out a blueprint</u> for an economy that's built to last. (State of the Union Speech, 2012).

In this example, Obama, and through using the phrase " lay out a blueprint", emphasizes the Americans' need to follow certain rules and have plans in order to achieve long-lasting economic growth.

Third: Journey Metaphors:

According to Charteris-Black (2011, p. 66), JOURNEY metaphors were introduced to cognitive linguistics by Lakoff & Johnson in their book Metaphors we live by (1980). Charteris-Black (2004) suggests that social purposes can be regarded as destinations in JOURNEY metaphors. (p. 74). JOURNEY metaphors include required elements and optional ones. According to Charteris-Black, the required elements can be: start, point, path and entities moving along the path (2011, p.66). The optional elements can be: mode of travel, guides, companions, and so on (Charteris-Black, 2011. pp. 66-67).

Thus, journey metaphors are responding to emotions since the presentation of events can function as an encouragement. It also has an oversimplifying purpose, for example when representing the crisis as a deviation from the main road.

In State of the Union Speeches, America is often personalized as a traveler who walks together with its people in achieving their goals. And accordingly, they are unified in their journey in moving forward together. So, in the conceptual metaphor **AMERICA OR AMERICAN PEOPLE ARE**

TRAVELERS, the source domain (travelers) is mapped onto the target domain (America or American People).

The following examples reveal Obama's usage of journey metaphors in state of the union speeches:

Example (28):
As long as we maintain our common resolve, our <u>journey</u> <u>moves</u> <u>forward</u>, and our future is hopeful, and the state of our Union will always be strong. (State of the Union Speech, 2012)
Example (29):
Our <u>journey</u> goes forward, and the state of our union is strong. (State of the Union Speech, 2011).
Example (30):
As long as we're joined in common purpose, as long as we maintain our common resolve, <u>our journey moves forward</u>, our future is hopeful, and the state of our Union will always be strong. (State of the Union Speech, 2012).

In the above-mentioned examples, Obama, skillfully, compares the American life to a journey. This comparison enables his listeners to comprehend the required time for things to change in the United States. This kind of metaphor is one of the most powerful metaphors in political discourse, because it is used for convincing the listeners that this (Journey) requires patience and time.

In a same context, Obama used terms like "turn back", "goes forward", "walk away', and "move forward' as indicated in the following examples:

Example (31):
The state of our Union is getting stronger, and we've come too far to <u>turn back</u> now. (State of the Union Speech, 2012)
Example (32):
Our journey <u>goes forward</u>, and the state of our union is strong. (State of the Union Speech, 2011).

Example (33):

I will not <u>walk away</u> from these Americans, and neither should the people in this chamber. (State of the Union Speech, 2012).

Example (34):

We are instead called to <u>move forward</u> with the sense of confidence and candor that serious times demand. (State of the Union Speech, 2009).

Example (35):

America prevailed because we chose to <u>move forward</u> as one nation, and one people. (State of the Union Speech, 2010).

In the previous examples, Obama uses this type of journey metaphors in his state of the Union Speeches and presents America and the America People as travelers. the main purpose of using such kind of metaphor is to call on people to participate actively and effectively in this "journey" to contribute in developing the USA. We can clearly notice that the last two examples were made by Obama to address the American economic recession (2009), in which the American economy was badly weakened: Jobs shed and businesses shuttered. Obama concentrated on this issue and address it many times in his speeches. He used this type of metaphor to attract his audience's attention and to encourage them not to give up and face this challenge.

During this journey, one follows a *course, path* or *takes steps* in a specific *direction*. On such journey, one can *move forward*, *continue moving* and *be on track*, but one can also *move backward*, be *held back*.   This can be shown in the following examples:

Example (36):

That is the leadership that we are providing – engagement that <u>advances</u> the common security and prosperity of all people. (State of the Union Speech, 2010).

Example (37):
And we are <u>on track</u> to add another one and a half million jobs to this total by the end of the year. (State of the Union Speech, 2010).
Example (38):
With the bipartisan trade agreements I signed into law, we are <u>on track</u> to meet that goal ahead of schedule. (State of the Union Speech, 2012).

Similarly, Obama made some relevant metaphors in the same context using, in addition to the previous terms, other words like "go back", and "back down", as shown in the following examples:

Example (39):
We will <u>move forward</u> together, or not at all – for the challenges we face are bigger than party, and bigger than politics. (State of the Union Speech, 2011).
Example (40):
We will not <u>go back</u>" to "I will not <u>walk away</u>" and "<u>I</u> will not <u>back down</u> from". (State of the Union Speech, 2012)

Obama also used metaphors to argue that there are those who would see the path altered or progress stopped altogether. He used terms as "put on hold", "wait', "stand still, as shown in the following example:

Example (41):
Given these facts, we can no longer afford to <u>put</u> health care reform <u>on hold</u>. (State of the Union Speech, 2009).
Example (42):
I've been told that our political system is too gridlocked and that we should just <u>put things on hold</u> […] for a while. For those who make these claims, I have one simple question: How long should

we wait? How long should America <u>put</u> its future <u>on hold</u>? (State of the Union Speech, 2010).

In the above-mentioned examples, the lack of concerted effort is seen as an unnecessary and unacceptable interruption in the progress. In effect, those who would deviate from the "pathway" utilize the lack of movement in the journey "the Nation's Progress" to justify a further lack of movement, thus putting the goal of the journey at risk.

Example (43):
You see, Washington has been telling us <u>to wait</u> […] for decades, even as the problems have grown worse. Meanwhile, China's not <u>waiting</u> to revamp its economy. Germany's not <u>waiting</u>. India's not <u>waiting</u>. These nations are … not <u>standing still</u>". (State of the Union Speech, 2010)

As indicated in the above-mentioned example, Obama is comparing the American respond to the "Economic Recession" with the respond of all nations, stating that: failure to "move forward" means being lagging behind.

In the same context, Obama used again this type of metaphor in discussing trade, as indicated in the following example:

Example (44):
We have to seek […] new markets aggressively, just as our competitors are. If America <u>sits on the sidelines</u> […] while other nations sign trade deals, we will lose the chance to create jobs on our shore. (State of the Union Speech, 2010)

From the previous example, we can notice that Obama is considering "sitting on the sideline" without taking the proper action as a loss. So, according to the message he is trying to deliver, the success of the journey is not assured, and instead,

must be won from others that are actively seeking the same goal.

During this "journey" *obstruction,* interruptions and obstacles in the nation's progress are considered as a threat; deviations from the "path" of the journey must should not be allowed.

Obama considered issues that would disrupt or slow the progress of the "journey" as "obstacles", or "weight.". in order to address these type of obstacles, he used terms as "obstruct" and "burden" as shown in the following examples:

Example (45):
Neither party should delay or <u>obstruct</u> every single bill just because they can. (State of the Union Speech, 2010)

In the previous example, Obama used this type of metaphor to encourage the two main parties in the USA to work together in getting rid of the obstacles that might face passing bills.

In other examples connected to the financial crisis, Obama used metaphorical expression using term "path" in order to find a way in dealing with the obstacles that delay the economic growth.

Example (46):
That is why this budget creates new incentives for teacher performance; <u>pathways for advancement,</u> and rewards for success. (State of the Union Speech, 2009).
Example (47):
I'm also calling on Congress to <u>continue down the path</u> of earmark reform. (State of the Union Speech, 2010).

Many other political and social elements that might slow the progress were described as having weight that could "burden" people. As shown in the following example:

Example (48):

This recession has also compounded the burdens [emphasis added] that America's families have been dealing with for decades: the <u>burden</u> of working harder and longer for less, of being unable to save enough to retire or help kids with college. (State of the Union Speech, 2010).

In the previous example, Obama argues that the same burdens that slowing the country's progress are affecting the American people. This type of metaphors provides valuable insight into Obama's political view, particularly his view on the government's role.

CONCLUSION

After studying and analyzing war, construction and journey metaphors made by Obama in his State of the Union Addresses, it can be found that the source domains of these metaphors are closely connected to the daily life activities of the American people, which make the abstract and complicated political issues understandable for common people, thus together playing a vital and significant persuasive role by arousing strong emotional responses. Moreover, these metaphors in political discourse reflect three main functions of: simplification, persuasion and motivation.

This paper focused on studying and analyzing only three common types of metaphors used by Obama. There are also many other types of metaphors which can be studied and analyzed in the future with more research fields and aspects.

In general, there are many ways, for further study, of making an analysis in Obama's metaphorical usages in his political discourse, such as investigating and analyzing other metaphors not mentioned in this paper.

REFERENCES

1. Burkholder, T. R. & Henry, D. (2009). Criticism of Metaphor. In J.A. Kuypers (Ed.). Rhetorical Criticism: Perspectives in Action. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 97-114.

2. Chaban, N., Bain, J. & Stats, K. (2007a), '"Frenemies"?: Images of the US–EU Relations in Asia-Pacific Media', Critical Policy Analysis, vol. 1, no. 1.

3. Charteris-Black, J. (2004). Corpus Approaches to Critical Metaphor Analysis. Hampshire, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

4. Charteris-Black, J. (2011). Politicians and Rhetoric: The persuasive power of metaphor . London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

5. Charteris-Black, J. (2014). Analysing Political Speeches: Rhetoric, Discourse and Metaphor . Hampshire, UK: Palgrave MacMillan.

6. Charteris-Black, Jonathan (2007) The communication of leadership: the design of leadership style. Oxford and New York: Routledge

7. Gozzi, R. Jr. (1999). The power of metaphor in the age of electronic media. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

8. Habermas, J. (1987a). The theory of communicative action, Vol. 2: Lifeworld and system: A critique of functionalist reason. Boston: Beacon Press.

9. Hülsse, R., & Spencer, A. (2008). The metaphor of terror: Terrorism studies and the constructivist turn. Security Dialogue, 39(6), 571-592. Retrieved April 19, 2015, from: http://sdi.sagepub.com/content/39/6/571.full.pdf html

10. Kövecsec, Z. (2002) *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*. New York: Oxford University press.

11. Kövecses, Z. (2000). *Metaphor and Emotion: Language, Culture, and Body in Human Feeling.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

12. Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980) *Metaphors we live by.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. [Updated version, 2002].

13. Liu, T. (2007) *The Application of the Conceptual Metaphor to English Political Discourses.* Shanghai: Shanghai international studies university.

14. Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English. (2017). Online edition,

15. Macmillan Dictionary. (2017). Online edition, http://www.macmillandictionary.com

16. Mio, J. S. (1997). Metaphor and Symbol. Metaphor and Politics, 12(2).

17. Müller, F. M. (1877[1864]) The Science of Language, 9th edn in 2 vols. London: Longman, Green. Google Scholar.

18. Obama, B. H. (2009). State of The Union Address. Retrieved from: http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=85753

19. Obama, B. H. (2010). State of The Union Address. Retrieved from: http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=87433

20. Obama, B. H. (2011). State of The Union Address. Retrieved from: http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=88928

21. Obama, B. H. (2012). State of The Union Address. Retrieved from: http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=99000

22. Oxford Living Dictionary. (2017). Online edition, https://en.oxforddictionaries.com /

23. Quinn N (1991).The Cultural Basis of Metaphor. In: J.W. Fernandez (Ed.) Beyond Metaphor: The theory of tropes in anthropology. Stanford, C.A: Stanford University Press.

24. Rozina, G., & Karapetjana, I. (2009). The use of language in political rhetoric: Linguistic manipulation.

Süleyman Demirel University Faculty of Arts and Sciences Journal of Social Sciences, 19.

25. Sabbah, F. (2011). Conceptual metaphors of war in news reports covering the 2003 invasion of Iraq by The New York Times and The Daily Star. Paper presented at Lancaster University Postgraduate Conference in Linguistics & Language Teaching, Lancaster. Retrieved April 5, 2015, from http://www.ling.lancs.ac.uk/pgconference/v05/Sabbah.pdf

26. Spencer, A. (2012). The social construction of terrorism: Media, metaphors and policy implications. Journal of International Relations and Development, 15(3), 393-419. Retrieved April 19, 2015, from: http://www.gsi.unimuenchen.de/personen/wiss_mitarbeit er/spencer/publ_spencer/jird_spencer_post_print. pdf

27. van Dijk, T.A. (2006). Discourse and Manipulation. Discourse and Society, 17(3), 359–83.

28. Vestermark I (2007). Metaphors in Politics, A Study of the Metaphorical Personification of American Political Discourse, An Extended Essay. Lulea University of Technology and Culture.

29. Wei JM (2001). „The Pragmatics of Metaphor in Taiwanese Politics" In Virtual Missiles Metaphors and Allusions in Taiwanese Political Campaigns. United States: Lexington Books.