

## Chapter IV

# A qualitative analysis of war news

### 1. Introduction

This chapter is an attempt to identify and describe conceptual metaphors that motivate the metaphorical construction of the concept of war in order to compare and contrast the discursive construal of war in war reports in two different languages and cultures over the period of 20 years. In this way it will add to the understanding of the concept of 'war' in this specific genre. That is why the interaction between the concepts of 'war', 'politics' and 'diplomacy' is also discussed. The analysis consists of a qualitative investigation of a number of newspaper articles describing four different military conflicts, three of the 1980s, and one which took place in 2001 (see Introduction to this book). A detailed description of the Polish and English corpus of war reports and commentaries gathered specifically for the present study is given in Appendix 1.

The analysis of data concentrates on the identification of linguistic metaphors and their role in the structure of discourse. The structure of particular conceptual metaphors underlying them, their constitutive mappings and entailments<sup>1</sup> are noted, but they are not detailed out, as the focus is on their function in discourse structure and in highlighting and hiding certain aspects of the target domain. To make the distinction between the conceptual metaphor and its linguistic realisation clearer I refer to the parts of the conceptual metaphor as Source and Target Domain, while to the lexical realisations as Vehicle and Topic of metaphor.

The qualitative analysis is expected to show what the predominant imagery patterns and rhetorical strategies were that were employed in reporting military conflicts. The analysis also allows the identification of words typical for the lexical field of war. This list (presented in Appendix

---

<sup>1</sup> John Barnden (2007) in his presentation at a RaAM workshop on metaphor in discourse claimed that in the analysis of discourse metaphors it is unnecessary and often impossible to identify all the mappings. Lexical items used as metaphor vehicles (sources) are often used to elaborate the source domain, to add to the liveliness of the image of the source domain.

2) serves as a basis for the quantitative study in Chapter Five. The aim of Chapter Five is to determine if the frequencies of the basic literal senses of these words corroborate the claim that the metaphorical linguistic expressions in which they appear are motivated by the X IS WAR conceptual metaphor.

## **2. Analysis of data**

### **2.1. Trybuna Ludu on the Falklands war (1982)**

The qualitative analysis section is divided for each conflict under consideration into several subparts.<sup>2</sup> The first one is devoted to linguistic metaphors whose influence extends over larger stretches of text than a sentence, thus organizing a paragraph, several paragraphs or an entire text. This section is called *Paragraph-structuring metaphors*. The second section is devoted to those metaphors which do not cluster in chains within one text, but constitute single instances in a particular text. They reappear, cross-textually, in the discourse on the given topic over time. I call these metaphors *isolated metaphors*, and the section is named so as well.<sup>3</sup> The qualitative analysis of each subcorpus ends with a section on other rhetorical strategies deemed important for the given topic. They may but do not necessarily have to involve metaphorical expressions and is called *Other rhetorical strategies*. As these three types of rhetorical strategies were not always identified in the investigated texts, the analysis of the texts concerning various conflicts may consist of a different number of subsections.

---

<sup>2</sup> The rationale behind the structure of data presentation is repeated here after Section 2.7. of Chapter One for to facilitate the reading of the present chapter.

<sup>3</sup> My isolated metaphors operate at the level of text and should not be confused with Lakoff – Johnson's (1980: 54) idiosyncratic metaphors which operate at the conceptual level. Isolated metaphors in my sense, are lexical realisations which do not create a chain, do not influence paragraph structure. On the conceptual level they can come from a rich, well-elaborated, complex metaphor.

### 2.1.1. Paragraph-structuring metaphors

The qualitative analysis of data, consisting in the close reading of all the collected texts, showed that, on the whole, the activated metaphors had little influence on the structure of the article. Only one commentary, that by Zdzisław Antos entitled “Falklandy-Malwiny: Groteska czy dramat” [The Falklands–Malvinas: A grotesque or a drama] from April 30<sup>th</sup> – May 2<sup>nd</sup> 1982, exploited the conceptual metaphor WAR IS A THEATRE extensively. A major part of the article was structured around this metaphor, so that its lexical realisations played a clear discursive function, as evidenced in the following sentences:

- (1) *Tak kończy się jeden z aktów sztuki, o której jeszcze nie wiemy, czy okaże się groteskowym widowiskiem, czy krwawym dramatem o nie ustalonym jeszcze tytule.* ‘This is how one of the acts of this play ends. We don’t know yet if this play will turn out to be a grotesque show or a bloody drama of an as yet unknown title.’  
(Mappings: Stages of War are Acts of a Play, War is a Play, War is a Grotesque Show, War is a Bloody Drama<sup>4</sup>)
- (2) *Ale na razie oglądamy w telewizji niezwykle widowisko* ‘So far we have been watching an unusual show on television.’  
(This is not a metaphorical expression. It refers to the farewell ceremony for the British fleet setting off to the South Atlantic. It does, however, elaborate the details of the vehicle.<sup>5</sup>)
- (3) *Wspaniała okazja do nakręcenia historycznych, batalistycznych filmów.* ‘A wonderful opportunity to make historical battle films.’  
(Again, this is an elaboration of the Vehicle.)
- (4) *Największy show od czasu brytyjsko-francuskiej wyprawy do Suez w 1956 roku.* ‘The biggest show since the British-French expedition to Suez in 1956.’  
(Mapping: War is a Spectacle)
- (5) *Widowisko ma kostiumowe akcenty.* ‘The show has costume overtones.’  
(Mapping: War is a Spectacle)

---

<sup>4</sup> Following the convention introduced in Lakoff – Johnson (1999) I will capitalise the first letters only when positing the possible conceptual mappings.

<sup>5</sup> See Barnden (2007), footnote 58.

- (6) *skompletowanie rekwizytów* ‘the collecting of the props’  
(Mapping: Elements of Military Equipment are Theatrical Props)

The potential underlying conceptual metaphorical mappings postulated above as well as the elaborations of the Vehicle focus on those aspects of war which make it a spectacular show for those who can safely watch it from a distance. However, in this particular article the whole construction is employed ironically, so that through a clash between the entertaining aspect of the Source Domain and the death-related aspect of the Target, the show becomes a cruel spectacle. The author seems to ridicule the authorities who, in his view, want to hide the real picture of war behind the show. This is made possible by the active involvement of the mass media in the reporting of the event.

### 2.1.2. Isolated metaphors

Metaphoric expressions originating from the lexical field of theatre are also scattered in the other texts, but they do not seem to play any major discursive function, for instance:

- (7) *przedostatni akt wojny* ‘the last but one act of war’; *nowy akt agresji* ‘a new act of aggression’  
(8) *teatr działań wojennych* ‘the theatre of war’  
(9) *zakulisowe zabiegi* ‘efforts behind the scene’, *kuluary* ‘backstage’  
(10) *odgrywać rolę* ‘to play a role’

The WAR IS A THEATRE conceptual metaphor underlying these expressions is an oblique reference to the Glory of War Myth, so aptly described by Janion (1998) and Wiśniewski (1987) from the literary perspective and by Knightly (1975) from a mass media critique perspective. The unveiled reference to the myth is rather rare. There are only four instances of it in all of the 69 texts analysed. Moreover, only one of them, number (15), does not carry ironic overtones.

- (11) *zatriumfuje brytyjski oręż* ‘the British army will triumph’  
(12) *galanteria* ‘gallantry’

- (13) *podreperować nadszarpnięty prestiż i dumę narodową Brytyjczyków* ‘to repair the undermined prestige and the national pride of the British’  
(14) *honorowe rozwiązanie sporu* ‘honourable solution of the conflict’

Before we turn to lexical fields more frequently represented in these war reports, we need to discuss the relationship between the concepts of ‘politics’ and ‘war’, as represented in these texts. Example (15) below seems to indicate that diplomacy stands in opposition to war, and that possibly they both form subparts of politics:

- (15) *kontynuowanie wysiłków na rzecz dyplomatycznego rozwiązania konfliktu* ‘a continuation of efforts for a diplomatic solution of the conflict’

At the same time, politics and war can too be juxtaposed:

- (16) *sygnały z frontu politycznego i wojskowego świadczą ...* ‘the signals from the political and military front indicate...’

Example (16)<sup>6</sup> is significant also because it shows how terms from the lexical field of war (‘political front’) permeate the discourse on politics, even if the context – a real war, does not seem to require any further dramatisation of the topic. Example (17) shows a similar vocabulary use:

- (17) *manewr dyplomatyczny* ‘a diplomatic manoeuvre’

Some examples, e.g. (18), contrast military action with political dispute, and then the verbs from the lexical field of dispute tend to penetrate the realm of war:

- (18) *Ich kraj jest gotów do negocjacji z Wielką Brytanią, ale odpowie zbrojnie na wszelkie próby odzyskania wysp.* ‘Their country is ready for negotiations, but it will answer militarily to any attempts to recapture the islands’.

---

<sup>6</sup> Szwedek (2006, p. c.) pointed out that example (16), and probably also (15), is an instantiation of the POLITICS IS WAR metaphor.

*Negocjacje* ‘negotiations’ are used in their literal sense, while *odpowie zbrojnie* ‘will answer militarily’ is used metaphorically. This use may be motivated by the conceptual metaphor WAR IS A DISPUTE.

Simultaneously, the verbs of speaking (dispute) play an important role in both politics and war, as in (19) and (20) below:

- (19) *stan niewypowiedzianej wojny* ‘the state of undeclared war’  
 (20) *zdefiniowanie politycznego stanowiska* ‘the defining of the political stance’

Example (19) refers to a war-constitutive ritual, that of declaring war<sup>7</sup>, while (20) points to the role of constructing narratives in the making of politics. Appearing side by side with other metaphorical uses, they blur the distinction between the two.

The group of words originating in the lexical field of business and representing the metaphor WAR IS BUSINESS<sup>8</sup> is most common with 13 types of lexical expressions:

- (21) *ekonomiczne podteksty* ‘economic undertones’, *bilans strat obu stron* ‘the balance of losses of both conflicting sides’, *zapłaci znacznie wyższą cenę w ludziach i sprzęcie* ‘... will pay a considerably higher price in both men and equipment’, *straty* ‘losses’, *kosztownym* ‘costly’, *rozmiar strat* ‘the scale of losses’, *w ostatecznym rachunku* ‘at the last count’, *minimalizować straty własne* ‘to minimise collateral damage (lit. self losses)’, *utracić/odebrać terytorium* ‘to lose/gain territory’, *znaczne ilości sprzętu woj-skowego* ‘significant amount of military equipment’, *osiągnąć cele polityczne przy minimalnej cenie* ‘to achieve political goals at minimal price’, *cena popularności* ‘the price of popularity’, *większość laburzystowskich posłów stwierdziła, że nie wolno mu [rządowi] wystawiać czeku in blanco*

---

<sup>7</sup> Kamila Turewicz (2007, p. c.) has pointed out to me that this ritual may be motivated by the WAR IS THEATRE conceptual metaphor, in that declaring war is like the part of the chorus in the theatre, the chorus which introduces the audience to the play and outlines whether it is going to be a tragedy or a comedy. Similarly, when war is declared, the audience (nation/states as well as their citizens) learn about the change from peace-to war-like relations obtaining between the countries.

<sup>8</sup> The WAR IS BUSINESS metaphor appears in the Clausewitzian theory of war and is discussed in detail by Lakoff (1992).

‘the majority of Labour MPs stated that they cannot make out a blank cheque to [the Government]’

Possible underlying conceptual metaphor: QUALITY IS QUANTITY licences the degradation of human life to a quantifiable object. It is possible through the operation of the metaphorical mapping: Human Life is an Object of Trade, which entails that human life may have a price and may be exchanged for political gains. Some of the examples above may be considered an elaboration of the Vehicle rather than a linguistic realisation of conceptual metaphor. This elaboration consists in supported by the enumeration of equipment involved or lost by either side of the conflict.

The list presented in (21) signals a certain methodological problem with categorisation. That is if ‘politics’ is a concept superordinate to ‘diplomacy’ and ‘war’, and if in a coherent text anaphoric relations can hold between the superordinate and the subordinate noun, then it is difficult to say whether for example ‘economic undertones’, or ‘to achieve political aims at minimal price’ refer to ‘politics’ or to ‘war’. In fact, in such a context, conducting war and conducting politics seem largely synonymous. This synonymy is not only a matter of conceptualisation or wording, but also of social structure, as the heads of states, regardless of their education, are often also the commanders-in-chief of their country’s armed forces.

The next most popular sources represented in the war reports analysed here were FORCE and JOURNEY with 12 and 11 types of linguistic expressions respectively. The concept of ‘force’, as a basic system underlying a number of various conceptualisations, from causation, through psycho- and sociodynamic patterns to discourse structuring in argumentation, has been discussed by Talmy (2000, see Chapter One, Section 5). It seems that the concept of ‘force’ may be one of the systems underlying such concepts as ‘politics’, ‘war’ and ‘argument’, thus constituting a similarity allowing for cross-domain mappings. In the analysed articles the linguistic manifestations of the concept were the following:

- (22) *odbić Falklandy* ‘to recapture the Falklands’, *umocnienie suwerenności* ‘the strengthening of sovereignty’, *rzucenie na kolana* ‘lit., idiom the act of throwing sb. to the knees = humiliating sb., English equivalent: *bring sb. to their knees*’, *dotkliwy cios* ‘a painful blow’, *siły* ‘forces’, *przerzucać żołnierzy* ‘lit. to throw soldiers = to transfer soldiers’, *odpierać* ‘to throw back’, *napięcie* ‘tension’, *usunąć* ‘to

remove', *starcie/starcia* 'lit. frictions =clashes', *poprzeć stronę brytyjską z całą swoją mocą* 'to support the British side with all their might', *opór* 'resistance'

'Force' as a concept structuring the domain of war results in the representation of military conflict in terms of hand-to-hand combat (*odbić* 'recapture', *rzucić na kolana* 'to throw sb. to their knees', *dotkliwy cios* 'painful blow', *odpierać* 'to throw back', *usunąć* 'remove', *napięcie* 'tension', *opór* 'resistance'). It may also lead to abstracting from the war reality, when armies are referred to as 'forces', and military action is rephrased as 'the strengthening of sovereignty'.

The type frequency of expressions motivated by the metaphorical mappings from JOURNEY as the Source Domain was similar to that of FORCE. However, the Source Domain of JOURNEY did not structure the concept of 'war' but that of 'politics'.<sup>9</sup> As the focus of the present study is 'war' and not 'politics', we will not regard it any further.

The remaining sources for the structuring of the concept of 'war' in newspaper reports were less frequently represented by linguistic expressions. They were GAME (5 lexical types), BALANCE (5),<sup>10</sup> NATURAL FORCE (3), GEOMETRY (3), RAPE (2), and DISEASE (1). They were evidenced by the following expressions:

- (23) WAR IS A GAME: *szanse powodzenia* 'chances of success', *zagrać va banque* 'to play va banque', *USA prowadziły odwrotną zagrywkę* 'the USA played a different gambit', *posunięcie militarne* (CHESS) 'a military move', *przedłużanie gry na obu frontach* 'protracting the game on both fronts'
- (24) BALANCE: *przeważy u Brytyjczyków poczucie realizmu* 'the feeling of realism will dominate the British' (*przeważać* is morphologically related to *ważyć* = 'to weigh'), *wypowiedzi władz są ostrożniejsze i o wiele bardziej wyważone* 'the statements of the authorities are

<sup>9</sup> Underwood (p.c.) drew my attention to the fact that POLITICS IS A JOURNEY seemed to be one of the most persistent images in the communist propaganda. See also Fabiszak (2007). Szwedek (p.c.) remarked that every process can be conceived in terms of a JOURNEY.

<sup>10</sup> BALANCE, like FORCE, should be regarded as a scheme (see Johnson's (1987) image schemata, Chapter One, Section 4) underlying the concept of conflict and the related concepts rather than as a domain which allows for rich mappings.

- more careful and balanced', *rozważać* 'to weigh, to consider', *przeważa pesymizm/stanowisko* 'pessimism/a position dominates', *Pani Thatcher balansuje na linii między przeżyciem a upadkiem* 'Mrs. Thatcher is balancing on a line between survival and fall'
- (25) WAR IS A NATURAL FORCE: *fale nalotu* 'air raid waves' (SEA), *zaognienie sporu* 'lit. inflammation = aggravation of the conflict' (FIRE), *gorący etap* 'a hot phase' (FIRE)
- (26) WAR IS GEOMETRY: *punkt oporu* 'point of resistance', *linia obrony* 'defence line', *skala konfliktu* 'the scale of conflict'
- (27) WAR IS A RAPE: *pogwałcenie neutralności* 'violation of neutrality' (in Polish expressed by a morphological derivate of 'rape', not a Latinised euphemism), *gwałcić prawo międzynarodowe* 'to violate the international law'
- (28) WAR IS A DISEASE: *gorączka wojenna* 'war fever'

The source domains of GAME and GEOMETRY were already represented in Clausewitz's treaty on war. He compared conducting war to a game of cards, stressing that in both endeavours not only skill and assets (trumps or a well equipped and trained army), but also luck are important to achieve victory. In the present data the words from the lexical fields of both games of luck and chess are used. Like in Clausewitz, they highlight the significance of luck in war, but they are also used to refer to a phase of war ('gambit', 'protracting the game'). The last example motivated by the Source Domain GAME is particularly interesting as it combines game imagery with the literal and a metaphoric use of the word 'front'. This can be an evidence of the activation of a mixed metaphor (WAR IS A GAME + POLITICS IS WAR).

The geometrisation of war is related to the drawing of tactical maps, where, like in most cartography, the world is reduced to a handful of geometric symbols. Such reduction, naturally, dehumanises the soldiers to lines and points, hiding the fact that it is real people who are wounded, mutilated or killed on these 'lines' and 'points'. The idea of scale also clearly links war with geometry and cartography, allowing a distant perspective, enabling the authorities to compare one war to another as well as encouraging the WAR IS BUSINESS point of view. It disregards the individual perspective, where death and suffering are petrifying, unwanted experiences regardless of the number of people they may affect.

The concept of ‘balance’ is inherently linked to the concept of ‘force’. Talmy (2000) identifies balance of strengths as an element of the force-dynamic frame. It is therefore not surprising that BALANCE tends to appear as a source when force-related targets are intended. Stockwell (2002), for example, notes that Shakespeare’s *Richard II* is constructed around the BALANCE metaphor, which functions as a megametaphor or discourse-structuring metaphor in the play. In the Falklands war data, BALANCE underlies expressions concerned with the political dispute which may lead to war, so that these expressions may be regarded as referring to ‘politics’ as well as ‘war’. In any case, though, the result of the weighing of political pros and cons here is war. This balancing, apart from being intrinsically related with FORCE, is the major scheme underlying the WAR IS BUSINESS metaphor.

The activation of the Source Domain of NATURAL FORCE highlights the intensity of war; simultaneously it hides the human agent, apparently removing the responsibility for war brutality from the authorities who decided to launch it.

RAPE, like POLITICS, ARGUMENT and WAR is a particular realisation of the scheme of conflict based on the concept of force, which makes it a suitable input for mappings. Its use highlights the violent nature of war and implies that it is illegitimate.

The DISEASE metaphor in this case implicates a certain intensity and lack of control.

### **2.1.3. Other rhetorical strategies**

The qualitative analysis has also isolated a group of semantically related words which played an important role in the construction of the war accounts. These words were not linguistic realisations of any WAR IS X conceptual metaphor. Despite that they are discussed below as they played an important function in the discourse structure and often interacted with some of the conceptual metaphors, especially those devoted to the representation of the enemy. These emotionally loaded words, although bleached through their overuse in the media reporting of political events, were used to increase the expressive power of the texts. They belong to a diverse group of vocabulary presented in (29) below:

- (29) terms for emotions: *entuzjazm* ‘enthusiasm’, *z wielką satysfakcją* ‘with great satisfaction’, *zatroskana* ‘worried’, *niepokój/zaniepokojony* ‘anxiety/anxious’, *wzrost zaniepokojenia międzynarodowego* ‘an increase in international anxiety’, *nastrój przygnębienia i smutku* ‘the mood of depression and sadness’, *żałoba* ‘mourning’, *ubolewać* ‘to regret’, *powaga* ‘solemnity’, *zaciętość* ‘determination’, *radosny* ‘cheerful’, *nadzieja* ‘hope’, *frustracja* ‘frustration’, *głęboki pesymizm* ‘deep pessimism’,  *optymizm* ‘optim-ism’, *w atmosferze szczerości* ‘in an atmosphere of honesty’, *upokorzenie* ‘humiliation’, *gorycz* ‘bitterness’, *straszliwy* ‘horrible’, *zadowolenie* ‘satisfaction’, *złagodnieć* ‘to become less harsh’, *ostrożność* ‘caution’, *poszanowanie* ‘respect’, *ubolewać* ‘to deplore, in Polish morphologically related to ‘pain’ = *ból*’, *ulga* ‘relief’, *rzucenie na kolana* ‘the act of throwing sb. to their knees = humiliating’;
- emotionally loaded political terms: *anty-* ‘anti’, *ksenofobia* ‘xenophobia’, *nacjonalistyczny* ‘nationalistic’, *dplomacja kanonierek* ‘gunboat diplomacy’ (POLITICS IS WAR taken to the extreme), *kolonializm* ‘colonialism’, *ucisk* ‘oppression’, *wyzysk* ‘exploitation’ *interwencyjny* ‘intervention, adj.’, *eksploatować* ‘to exploit’, *ekspansjonistyczny* ‘expansionist’, *dominować* ‘dominate’, *postępowy* ‘progressive’, *anachronizm* ‘anachronism’, *okupować* ‘occupy’, *kolonialne i imperialistyczne ambicje* ‘colonial and imperialistic ambitions’, *znieważanie symboli narodowych* ‘profanation of national symbols’, *represje* ‘repressions’, *zatarg* ‘a conflict, lit. implies trade’, *stosowanie gróźb i nieprzejednane stanowisko* ‘the use of threats and uncompromising position’, *brutalne dławienie* ‘brutal suppression’, *hegemonistyczny* ‘hegemonic’, *nacjonalistyczne oszołomienie* ‘nationalistic stupefaction’, *samoobrona* ‘self-defence’;
- negative speech acts: *potępić* ‘to condemn’, *oskarżać* ‘to accuse’, *oburzać się/oburzenie* ‘to be indignant/outraged’, *ubolewać* ‘to deplore’;
- violence-related negative words: *awantura* ‘lit. brawl = incident’, *rozbój* ‘robbery, mugging’, *krwawy* ‘bloody’;
- deceit-related negative words: *rzekomy* ‘alleged’, *jakoby* ‘reputedly’, *stoi w jaskrawej sprzeczności* ‘it stands in stark/glaring contrast’, *szantaż* ‘blackmail’, *kłamlliwe wieści* ‘mendacious news’;
- irrationality: *absurdalna postawa* ‘absurd position’;

Among the emotion terms, those related with ‘anxiety’ dominated in the period preceding military action, while ‘sadness’-related ones appeared in the reports on the two sunken warships: Argentinean General Belgrano and British HMS Sheffield. Political decisions could arouse ‘hope’ and ‘optimism’ or ‘bitterness’, ‘frustration’ and ‘pessimism’ among the public. ‘Honesty’ and ‘caution’ were attributed to politicians, which the news makers seemed to be siding with. The Glory of War Myth was evident in the framing of the possibility of defeat as a humiliation.

In the emotionally loaded political terms, the subgroup associated with ‘colonialism’ and ‘imperialism’ as well as ‘progress’ remaining in opposition to ‘anachronism’ were the catch-words of the political propaganda of the time, and I believe, aroused more agitation than the emotion terms per se.

Negative speech acts were used to report the statements of various authorities evaluating the actions of the politicians from the ‘expansionist’ side of the conflict.

Violence-, deceit- and irrationality-related words seem to be the common stock in the texts aiming at arousing the reader against the participant of the conflict, of whom these terms are alleged. Sandikcioglu (2000) discovered that similar features were ascribed to Arabs in general and to Hussein in particular within the so-called orientalist framework. In the Polish newspaper of 1982, similar values were employed to describe Great Britain (esp. in terms of violence and irrationality) and the US (esp. in terms of deceit).

## **2.2. The Times on the Falklands war (1982)**

The corpus collected from *Trybuna Ludu* on the Falklands war consisted of all the articles that appeared in the newspaper between April 3<sup>rd</sup> /April 4<sup>th</sup> 1982 – June 17<sup>th</sup> 1982. A review of the newspaper for two weeks after April 17<sup>th</sup> 1982 did not render any more articles on the topic. The coverage of the war in *The Times* was naturally far more thorough. Therefore only a part of the group of articles was used in the present study. Also, the genre diversification of the articles varied. In *Trybuna Ludu* they could be classified as hard news and commentaries, while in *The Times* they ranged from parliamentary reports, hard news items, and war correspondent reports through political, military and economic commentaries on the war.

### 2.2.1. Isolated metaphors

The parliamentary reports constitute the bulk of the corpus in terms of word count. No wonder then that speech verbs are numerous represented. Similarly to *Trybuna Ludu*, the lines between 'war' as a hyponym of 'politics' and 'war' as an antonym of 'politics', are difficult to draw. One of the reasons behind this fuzzy nature of meaning of the concepts in question, apart from perspectivizing, may be the fact that they are all based on the concept of FORCE, as evidenced in these examples:

- (30) *The United States joined Britain last night in blocking a draft resolution in the Security Council for a ceasefire in the Falklands conflict but later admitted that its veto should have been an abstention.*
- (31) *At the time of the vote Mrs. Kirkpatrick said that the United States veto affirmed the principle that force should not be allowed to triumph.*
- (32) *Throughout Sunday, June 13, the 3rd Commando Brigade maintained pressure on the enemy from their newly-secured forward positions.*

Example (30) shows how conducting politics through diplomatic actions can be conceived of in terms of FORCE, in (31) the word *force* is equivalent to 'war', while (32) illustrates how the concept of FORCE structures the discourse on conducting military operations.

This image congruity is explored for rhetorical effect, when politics, war and diplomacy seem to merge or intermingle, see below:

- (33) *We shall have once again to try to substitute the weapons of peace for the weapons of war.*
- (34) *Mr Nicholas Budgen (Wolverhampton, North-West, C): In view of the great complement Mr Enoch Powell paid to her, has she recently fought an important battle on his behalf in Cabinet? Mrs Thatcher: I fight battles of war and battles of peace, frequently.*

Here the use of the words from the lexical field of war, such as *weapons* and *battles*, with the modifier *of peace* is clearly an oxymoron, but if we accept this oxymoronic vision, then *the weapons of war* and *battles of war* cease to be pleonastic.

Another set of examples of how these three concepts interpenetrate one another can be seen in (35) – (38):

- (35) *The search for peace must never be torpedoed by us.*  
 (36) *The words of the citation read “... he carried on as if nothing has happened...” a commendation which covers equally well his coolness under political fire.*  
 (37) *Mr Robert Adley (Christchurch and Lympington, C): Would she accept that most people in the country, and certainly on this side of the House, expect the Government to behave like a Government and not as if it is running a debating society, to make decisions and to come before this House and then defend them, whatever the decisions the Government takes.*  
 (38) *to smooth over their differences on the Falklands dispute*

Words such as *torpedoed*, *under political fire* and *defend* used in examples (35), (36), and (37) respectively, show how military vocabulary permeates the discourse on politics, even though, as I have said before, in a country at war such intensification<sup>11</sup> of the emotive power of reporting does not appear to be necessary. It should be also mentioned that categorising the word *defend* as belonging to the lexical field of war may be disputed, as its meaning may be considered more general (see Chapter Five, Section 5.4.). However, in the context of press articles on a military conflict, this sense may be the most strongly activated. Sentence (37) illustrates a common juxtaposition of diplomacy and war, in this example diplomatic actions are clearly less valued than military action. The phrase in (38) is an instance of how a word from the lexical field of dispute has become equivalent to war,<sup>12</sup> as if to increase the distance to the emotionally loaded event. It is thus a stylistic trope with a rhetorical effect opposite to that in (35) and (36). This linguistic expression can be motivated by the conceptual metaphor WAR IS A DISPUTE.

The next most prominent discourse motif was that connected with face saving and face threatening. The central underlying metaphor here is

<sup>11</sup> As shown in Chapter Two, Section 4, Hughes (1988) considers the use of war-like vocabulary in non-military contexts as resulting from a desire to increase the expressive force of the text.

<sup>12</sup> Underhill (2003) calls such a linguistic phenomenon a switch, where a word seems to take up a new meaning, antithetic to its original meaning.

that of NATION/STATE IS A PERSON, and the cultural tradition referred to by Janion and Wiśniewski (see Chapter Three, Section 5) and labelled as the Glory of War Myth. The metaphor is clearly expressed in the following quotations:

- (39) *The fact that Britain was forced to veto was seen as a victory of sorts for Argentina which had been seeking to tarnish Britain's image within the international community. Members of the council had earlier been amending and refining the draft resolution with the aim of finding a formula that would save face for both sides and avert the battle over Port Stanley. Argentina will maintain its freedom to protect the nation's interest and honour, it will not be negotiated. Lord Shackleton, for the Opposition, said it was the first time Britain had suffered the humiliation of the loss of a colony since the fall of Singapore. Mrs Thatcher: The future of freedom and reputation of Britain are at stake...*

These excerpts amply demonstrate how nations and states are conceived of as people, and interaction between them within the framework of international politics, be it diplomacy or war, can be construed analogically to speech acts or physical interaction between people.<sup>13</sup> This conceptualisation has a long tradition in European thinking on state and war, so that the conceptual metaphor NATION/STATE IS A PERSON goes back to the Renaissance idea of body politic described in detail in Musolff (2004). As a result of this metaphor countries can threaten each other's face or attempt to save it. In this way such human qualities as emotionality are ascribed to states. This emotional tone is further strengthened by references to the Glory of War Myth, represented by such phrases as *our ships and gallant men, bravery, dignity, injured pride, the supreme valour of our forces, to lower our colours, to kill for flags, revenge, pride and arrogance*. This Myth is also fostered by certain historical references, such as the one in the first sentence of (40):

---

<sup>13</sup> See Chilton – Lakoff (1995) on the metaphorical construction of international relations. Also Musolff (2004) on the conceptualisation of the European Community.

- (40) *however great the nation's appetite for heroes, there is no conviction here that a new Nelson has been born*  
*Mr Victor Coodhew (St Albans, C): Will she confirm that 30 million lives were lost in the last world war in Europe because democracy refused to accept and resist the aggressive intentions of a dictatorship? Will she ensure such a thing does not happen again?*  
*In scenes reminiscent of the last world war, posters were put up and loudspeaker messages broadcast at London railway stations, calling on men of the 3rd Battalion, the Parachute Regiment, to return to their bases immediately.*

The first example is designed to draw a parallel, or more likely to deny one, between Admiral Woodward and Admiral Nelson. The analogy to Nelson, even if negated, can arouse patriotic feelings in the British. The allusions to the Second World War have two different functions to play. The first one is an attempt to provide support in favour of war by analogising between Nazi Germany and the junta-governed Argentina. It is a far-fetched analogy, especially if we consider the death toll in both wars (in the Falklands war about a 1000 soldiers died on both sides to 'defend the freedom' of 1,800 Falklanders). The second mention of WW II, reporting the call for soldiers on leave, seems to aim at increasing the war feeling in the nation.

The analogy between the Nazis and the Argentines, an opposition between *our boys* and *invasion force* or *foul and brutal aggressor* contribute to a typical war propaganda routine of enemy vilification. It is also transparent in attempts to portray Argentines as deceitful and emotional (as tantamount to unreasonable):

- (41) *Feb 1982: More Argentine sabre rattling followed another round of negotiations at the United Nations, in New York.*  
*Accusing the Government of Argentina of deception and bad faith and of making manifestly impossible demands, Mrs Margaret Thatcher told Parliament yesterday that their total rejection of British proposals for a settlement of the Falklands crisis had implications of the utmost gravity.*  
*Argentines gathered spontaneously (...) shouting, weeping and singing the national anthem.*  
*Argentine left-wing xenophobes*

*Bob sounded calm, but said that the islanders were very disappointed and very worried, largely because they believed the Argentines to be unpredictable.*

*...they would stand idly by while South Georgia and British Antarctica, with no permanent inhabitants, were the subject of similar unprovoked and unjustified acts of piracy.*

*if they [Argentines] did not come to heel within 10 days British troops would go straight in to recover this country's property*

*Mr Sydney Bidwell (Ealing, Southall, Lab): Does her statement today mean that under her kind of leadership in the future there is no participatory role for a saner or civilized government of Argentina in any international system for the guarantee of peace in that area?*

The imagery used here has a very similar ring to that used in *Trybuna Ludu* and to *Rzeczpospolita's* depiction of Americans in the reporting of the American air raids on Libya, as well as the American construal of the Oriental as showed by Sandikcioglu (2000, see Chapter Three, Section 7). Thus, the Argentines are construed as highly emotional (*sabre rattling, shouting, weeping, singing*), deceptive ([acting in] *deception and bad faith, making impossible demands*), unpredictable, not sane enough and not civilised enough to be partners in diplomatic talks with Britain; their nationalism is viewed as xenophobic; they are the dogs and the pirates. Unlike in the case of the Polish depiction of Americans and the American construal of the Iraqis, the British do not intend to teach a lesson to the Argentines (at least in the articles analysed in the present work), but rather to learn a lesson themselves:

- (42) *The objective should be genuinely to learn lessons for the future, rather than score narrow party political points for the present.*  
(Conceptual metaphor HISTORY IS A TEACHER.)

The emotionally loaded vocabulary, in addition to that discussed above, also included propaganda related political terms (43), violence-related words (44) and emotion terms (45):

- (43) *It sounds to many of us as if, in the hope of saving some lives, Mr Foot is prepared to hand over the Falklands to a Fascist dictator.*

*The Argentines talk much of the need for the decolonization of the islands. What they appear to mean by this is colonization by themselves.*

*the nub of this crisis is that the Argentine junta has ridden roughshod over the wishes and liberties of the Falklands Islands and has imposed a neo-colonial rule over these islands*

*our boys in the South Atlantic, trying to provide for our people who are under the heel of the Argentinean dictatorship, the right of self-determination and of democracy*

*The regime responsible for the invasion did not do it to bring freedom and democracy.*

*Their record of repression in Argentina is an indication of the sort of people we are dealing with.*

*Others are watching anxiously to see whether brute force [= Argentina] or the rule of law [= Britain] will triumph.*

(44) *the hideousness of a bloody battle of Port Stanley*

*Mr Foot attacked the hysterical bloodlust of The Sun and the Daily Mail.*

(45) *Concern, deepest concern, cordial, cautious, friendly relations, hope, friendship, dramatic, tragic, agonizing, aggravated, acutely worried, awesome, indifference, displeasure, hysterical.*

The political terms presented in (43) unambiguously form a dichotomous series of positively evaluated words related to Britain (*liberties, the right of self-determination and of democracy, freedom and democracy, the rule of law*) and strongly negatively evaluated words related to the Argentine (*Fascist, dictator, neo-colonial rule, dictatorship, regime, repression, brute force*).<sup>14</sup> Examples in (44) refer to the calamities of war, and are usually used in a context criticizing the advocates of war (see also a discussion of (50) below). The emotion words in (45) provide a compelling evidence that the language of a mass media reported debate on war is far from providing an unemotional, impartial style. Together with the examples of a heated parliamentary debate in (43) it actually undermines the belief that the British may introduce the rational “rule of law” and that

---

<sup>14</sup> See van Dijk’s (1996: 8) results on racist discourse, where he shows that in the representation of self and the other the positive features of self are emphasized, the negative features of self are de-emphasized, while the negative feature of the other are emphasized and the positive features of the other are de-emphasized.

they actually represent values different from those of the “sabre-rattling Argentines”.

The third group of expressions is centred on the metaphor WAR IS BUSINESS. The economic cost of war, when it concerns possible losses in international trade, or considers the financing used for equipping the army, providing it with ammunition and fuel, training, supplying food, clothing and pay for the soldiers, organizing billets and medical support, finally paying insurance for requisitions, are hardly metaphorical (see example (46)). When, however, soldiers and civilians’ suffering, injuries and casualties are discussed in terms of gain and loss, then we encounter an implementation of the generic metaphor QUALITY IS QUANTITY in its specification WAR IS BUSINESS. It provides a metaphoric understanding of the ‘cost’ of human life. Often the human life is then balanced by such abstract and intangible notions as ‘freedom’ or ‘right to self-determination’. Such an approach is transparent in the excerpts in (47) and (58):

- (46) *As the Prime Minister said yesterday that she is ready if necessary to turn the Falklands into a fortress for an indefinite period, we are entitled to know the estimated annual cost of all this and where the money will come from?*
- (47) *Mr Whitelaw: The Prime Minister was surely right when she said freedom was worth defending. The right of self-determination of the Falklands is worth defending. That is what we are doing. The whole country owes an unrepayable debt to the forces who have given their lives in the Falklands.*
- (48) *As the price of recovery of the islands grows, in life, in injury and in money, will Mr Whitelaw accept that Argentina is not interested just in the Falklands and in South Georgia, but in the South Sandwich islands and British Antarctica...*
- (49) *a full list and analysis of the costs on life, equipment, and money in this tragic and unnecessary war?*

The passage in (48) is a particularly interesting instance of using the literal and the metaphoric meanings of the word *price* as if it was one in an enumerative sequence: *the price ... in life* (metaphoric), *in injury* (metaphoric) *and in money* (literal). What’s more, even the critics of the war (excerpt (49)) use the same metaphoric/literal meaning fuzziness in their argumentation (*costs on life, equipment and money*). Whether the speaker

is a supporter or a critic of the war, they both rely on the BUSINESS conceptual metaphor and obscure the distinction between the cost on life and cost on equipment and money, as if there were no difference in quality between loss of life and loss of money. Such uses contribute to the blurring of the distinction between metaphorical and literal, which leads to the bleaching and dangerous generalisation of meaning, as a result of which word meaning can be stretched ad infinitum, so that Underhill's (2003) switch of meaning can become possible. If we consider that much of politics is acted out in words, the vagueness of political speech acts may lead to misunderstanding and conflict.

In some cases the mercantile approach to human life is contrasted with the 'calamity of war' approach, as in (50):

- (50) *Since everybody believes that negotiations will have to take place in the end, how many more lives does the Government think it is sensible to lose before they go to the United Nations for some sort of ceasefire to permit these negotiations to take place, or is it the Government's intention in pursuing an ultimate military victory that this appalling tragedy which is now unfolding should be continued to its bitter end?*

Here the sensibility of losing any more lives is invalidated by reference to the Clausewitzian theory of war, where war is a necessary procedure before peace talks, and before a renegotiation of the pre-war status can take place. The questionable sense of this procedure is undermined by the use of a rhetorical question (*How many more lives...*) and highly emotionally loaded vocabulary (*this appalling tragedy*), which, together with the word *unfolding*, can be considered as originating in the lexical field of theatre.<sup>15</sup>

An extreme case of the rhetorical argumentation is represented by a journalist supporting the war, who attributes the following words to a simple seaman on board the royal navy fleet in the South Atlantic:

- (51) *And as a colour-sergeant remarked to me on the Canberra on the way down here, "If a place is worth dying for, it's got to be worth keeping".*

---

<sup>15</sup> I would like to thank Jacek Fabiszak for this suggestion.

The metonymy EFFECT FOR CAUSE used here in combination with the conceptual metaphor WAR IS BUSINESS reverses the hierarchy of values, so that a few mostly barren islands become valuable, not because of any inherent value, but because people kill each other to keep or ‘repossess’ them.

The Clausewitzian teaching, echoed in (50), can also be discerned in such phrases as those in (52):

- (52) *Mr James Hill (Southampton, Test, C) said the task force, when it went into action, should not be in leg irons. It should be given complete freedom of movement once the political decision was made. the task force is and was clearly under political control*

These two quotes refer to Clausewitz’s demand for a civilian control of the army. The example below rings of the famous Clausewitzian aphorism that war is *politics conducted by other means*:

- (53) *Lord Gladwyn (L) said it was hoped that diplomacy would succeed in solving the dispute. In the event of diplomacy failing (he went on) we must all assume that the Government has contingency plans, if necessary, for settling the dispute by other means.*

A number of metaphors seemed to turn up ad hoc, without any major impact on discourse patterns. They are listed below together with their exemplifications:

- (54) THE FALKLANDS WAR IS A CRUSADE: *Mr Peter Viggers (Gosport, C) said later: There is no better place for the beginning of a crusade for freedom than in the South Atlantic, where the sovereign territory of a democracy has been attacked by a dictatorship.*  
WAR IS A NATURAL FORCE: *His forces swept through the Argentine lines and found some of their troops ready to surrender. (Mapping: Attack is a Wind)*  
*Both British ministers said in Parliament that the crisis, storming from the illegal landing of a group of Argentine scrap merchants on South Georgia, was potentially dangerous. (Mapping: War is a Storm)*  
*Mr Nott, under pressure to resign as Secretary of State for Defence, said earlier that he would not hesitate to order the sinking of Argen-*

*tine ships or the storming of the islands.* (Mapping: Attack is a Storm)

*Whatever the outcome of the Falklands conflict, there will certainly be some form of inquiry into how the crisis erupted in the first place.* (Mapping: War is a Volcano)

*Had that been done, the United Kingdom would have been accused of inflaming the situation* (Mapping: Starting War is Starting Fire)

WAR IS CLEANING: *There was no official report that either had on board the 27 or so Marines captured by Argentine troops in “mopping-up” operations on the Falklands and South Georgia.* (Mapping: Apprehending Enemy Soldiers is Mopping-up)

WAR IS A HAND-TO-HAND COMBAT: *his men had an unshakeable hold* (Mapping: To Control the Battlefield is To Have a Hold on the Enemy)

*My battle group is properly formed and ready to strike.* (Mapping: A Battle Group is a Fighter in a Hand-To-Hand Combat, cross-fertilization with the conceptual metaphor: MILITARY UNIT IS A PERSON)

ANIMAL/HUNTING IMAGERY (WAR IS A HUNT): *Mrs Thatcher as a hawk, Mr Pym as a dove, Anglo-French Puma helicopters, hunter-killer boats* (Cross-fertilization with the conceptual metaphor: PERSON IS AN ANIMAL; mapping: A Weapon is a Predatory Animal)

WAR IS SPORT: *Argentina’s armed forces are on paper smaller, less well equipped and much less experienced than Britain’s but in terms of football they belong to the second or perhaps third division, not the Isthmian League<sup>16</sup> and pose problems, which, for British forces far from home and any friendly port, could prove insoluble.* (headline: *Third division takes on Britain*) (Mapping: Quality of an Army is the Quality of a Football Team)

*the genuine enthusiasm of the people — Who put the invasion on a par with winning a football match* (Mapping: Conducting a War is Winning a Football Match)

*This is the run-up to the big match which, in my view, should be a walkover.* (Mappings: The Decisive Battle is The Big Match, Yielding to a Dominating Military Force is a Walkover)

---

<sup>16</sup> Isthmian League is an amateur football league in Britain. The implication here is that Argentine is not a very easy enemy, but not a formidable one either.

*Now this is the heavy punch coming up behind. (...) (Mapping: War is a Boxing Match; submapping: A Military Attack is a Punch)*

*We do not (he said) underestimate the threat posed to our forces by the Argentine and we cannot put our servicemen at risk by requiring them to pull punches in the face of that threat. (Mapping: To Spare Losses to the Enemy is to Spare the Competitor in a Boxing Match)*

*The admiral said he was surprised at the speed of the Argentine surrender at South Georgia. "We were told they were a tough lot, but they were quick to throw in the towel". (Rear Admiral Woodward) (Mapping: To Surrender is To Throw in the Towel)*

*WAR IS A THEATRE: But now she [Mrs Thatcher] was no longer in charge. She was (...) a spectator of the tragedy which she was about to impose on this country. (Mappings: War is a Tragedy, Prime Minister is a Spectator, Country is the Actor)*

*The people cannot be ignored like actors sitting in the audience watching the historic drama unfold in front of them on stage. (words attributed to Senor Robaldo, an oppositionist from Argentina) (Mappings: War is a Drama. The Society are the Spectators)*

As the metaphors above do not motivate larger stretches of the texts analysed I comment on only a few of them. It is interesting to note that WAR IS A CRUSADE, which aroused such a strong reaction when used by President Bush after 9/11, here has a certain intensity, because in this framing, democracy and the right of self-determination become articles of faith (see also Charteris-Black's (2004) discussion of POLITICS IS RELIGION). Two metaphors: WAR IS A HAND-TO-HAND COMBAT and WAR IS SPORT share a lot of their conceptual space, which should come as no surprise, when the sport in question is BOXING. They both share such elements as 'strike' or 'punch'. The WAR IS A THEATRE metaphor is here profiled differently within potential metaphorical scenarios than it is in the Polish corpus. The sentence by a British commentator profiles Mrs Margaret Thatcher as unable to change the course of events once certain political decisions were made. The utterance attributed to an Argentinean oppositionist deprecates a situation where the society of a country is unable to participate in the making of political decisions. In Polish the metaphor focused on the artificiality of a theatrical show and mapped it onto the ceremonies aimed at constructing the Glory of War Myth, which allowed the Polish journalist to make derisive comments on the event. In this way,

what from one perspective can be a reason for national pride and unity building, from another becomes bombastic pomp.

### 2.2.2. Other rhetorical strategies

Unlike in the Polish press of the 1980s, where even two supposedly different newspapers represented a very unified vision of political events, as exemplified in their reporting of the American air raids on Libya, the British reporting, even within one newspaper, *The Times*, represented many voices. Some of them self-consciously comment on the role of the media in a country at war, others criticise the government policy, while some border on self-abasement.

The two opposite stands on the role of journalism at war were represented by two essays. One was by Simon Jenkins, a war correspondent accredited to the fleet in the South Atlantic, who wrote:

(55) *Now I understand perfectly the predicament of my father's generation of war correspondents. For we have inherited it. I would imagine that there are a good many voices in London today arguing that our reporting of the Falklands War has been much too uncritical and indeed jingoistic.*

The other essay was authored by Philip Howard, who recounted the first Falklands crisis in 1770 and recollected the role of Dr. Samuel Johnson who then wrote a pamphlet against the military solution. He called Dr. Johnson the rhetorical Exocet missile and whole-heartedly supported his arguments.

Some of the participants in the public discourse, especially in the Parliamentary reports, were trying to make fierce arguments, employing colloquial expressions or insults, as exemplified below:

(56) *I know that the blood-thirsty hooligans opposite do not want one [a cessation of hostilities]. (a labour MP about the conservative MPs) Mr Anthony Marlow (Northampton North, C): With regard to the Falklands, unlike the Commonwealth and the United States and, despite their public utterances, our Community partners seem to have been flapping around like so many decapitated chickens.*

*Earlier, Mr Anthony Marlow (Northampton North, C) had said: As our Community partners, instead of giving us wholehearted support over our Falklands problem, have decided to put us on probation, will he remind them that if they continue to wet their knickers at the first whiff of unvalidated Argentine propaganda, a lot of this trade benefit from our EEC membership will be put at risk. This dispute has revealed that the Government's defence priorities are mistaken. It has crippled the Royal Navy for the sake of the Trident programme, and the result is that these recent events have found the Government with its trousers down in the south Atlantic.*

These lively expressions seem to add to the intensity of the parliamentary debate, the first one giving a negative evaluation to the Conservative MPs' support of the military solution; the second one creating a dynamic picture of indecision; and the last two producing a vivid image of incompetence, bordering on obscenity. Such rhetoric was unlikely to appear in the Polish press of the period, as Polish political leaders were then construed as infallible 'fathers of the nation', in accord with the NATION IS A FAMILY conceptual metaphor,<sup>17</sup> and decorum required them to use only a rigidly formal style.<sup>18</sup>

## **2.3. Trybuna Ludu on the American air raids on Libya (1986)**

### **2.3.1. Paragraph-structuring metaphors**

In the series of *Trybuna Ludu* articles devoted to the American air raids on Libya there is one, which relies heavily on a discourse structuring metaphor WAR IS A DISPUTE. The article is an anonymous TASS commentary of April 16<sup>th</sup> 1986. I will quote one of its paragraphs, heavily permeated with intensely emotional, propaganda-loaded vocabulary:

---

<sup>17</sup> More on the role of FAMILY as the source domain in constructing national politics can be found in Lakoff (1996).

<sup>18</sup> Okulska (2004) writes about the conversationalization of the Polish political discourse on the basis of radio interviews of the years 2000 ad 2001. She also emphasizes the lack of dynamism of the political interviews prior to transformation. Clearly, a certain fossilisation of topics and linguistic expression was dominating the political discourse of the communist era in Poland.

- (57) ...neoglobalizm ujawnił swą rzeczywistą istotę i przemówił prawdziwym językiem — językiem bomb, ognia i śmierci, tym samym językiem, którym Waszyngton „rozmawia” z narodem wietnamskim, paląc napalmem ludzi i ziemię. Tym samym językiem, z którym „rozmawia” z wolną Nikaragwą, wysyłając przeciwko niej bandy płatnych morderców, pogrobowców byłego dyktatora i popiecznika Waszyngtonu — Somozy. Tym samym językiem agresji, który odezwał się gdy Amerykanie dokonali desantu na niewielką wyspę na Morzu Karaibskim — Grenadę. ‘Neoglobalism has disclosed its real nature and spoken its true language – the language of bombs, fire and death, the same language, by means of which Washington “talks” to the Vietnamese, burning people and land with napalm. It is the same language with which Washington “talks” to free Nicaragua, sending the bands of contract killers, epigones of the former dictator and a supporter of Washington – Somoza. This is the same language of aggression, that was heard (lit. sounded), when the Americans landed on a small island on the Caribbean Sea – Grenada.

In this passage the distinction between politics and war is clearly irrelevant; in fact, the possible border is further blurred when the image of politics (neoglobalism) speaking a language of war (bombs, fire, death, bands of contract killers, landing) is created. This image seems to be a perfect example of blending, where the two input spaces merge to create a new space, in which the blended reality, and not that of the input spaces separately, unfolds.

A well-represented thread of imagery is motivated by the legal domain. The examples presented below are undeniably metaphorically used expressions, however; there are several legal terms in the texts, e.g. *pogwałcenie prawa międzynarodowego* ‘the violation (lit. rape) of the international law’, which are not used metaphorically. That is the phrase *prawa międzynarodowego* ‘international law’ is used literally, while *pogwałcenie* ‘violation’ is of course metaphorical. However, below the focus is on the metaphorical exploitation of LAW as the Source Domain for the understanding of the concept of war. The highly emotional context blurs the distinction between the metaphorical and literal linguistic expressions even further, so that the effect is a vehemently propagandist image, where the journalistic responsibility for the produced meanings is a nonce issue.

- (58a) *Administracja Reagana wystąpiła w roli sędziego i kata egzekwującego wyroki.* ‘Reagan’s administration played the role of a judge and executioner executing the sentence’  
*samozwańczy sędziowie* ‘self-appointed judges’  
*Chcą oni sami stanowić współczesną odmianę „pax americana”, który brzemieniem waszyngtońskiej dominacji ciążył na narodach Ameryki Łacińskiej, a który dziś ma ogarniać dowolnie wybrane obszary świata.* ‘They want to pronounce a self-designed contemporary version of “Pax Americana”, which oppressed the nations of Latin America with a weight of American domination, and which will now include any selected area of the world’.  
*...działając z pozycji imperialistycznego żandarma* ‘acting from the position of an imperialist policeman’  
*chęć przekształcenia go w basen amerykański, w którym panowałyby prawo terroru i lotniskowców* ‘a will to transform it [the Mediterranean] into an American sector ruled by a law of terror and aircraft carriers’
- (58b) *pod pręgierzem narodów* ‘pilloried by the nations’  
*głównym winowajcą* ‘the main culprit’  
*Nadzieje na bezkarność nie spełniają się.* ‘Hopes for impunity are vain.’  
*te rządy USA i W. Brytanii powinny być postawione przed sądem „jako mordercy dzieci”* ‘these governments of the USA and Great Britain should be brought to court as the “murderers of children”’

The metaphoric expressions originating in the lexical field of law presented above can be grouped into two major categories. The first one (58a) is structured around the conceptual metaphor THE USA IS A JUDGE AND A POLICEMAN OF THE WORLD. It also gains additional solid support from the Hubris strand, which is discussed later. The phrase ‘the law of terror and aircraft carriers’ is an elaboration of the Vehicle, it is not used metaphorically. It may be historically motivated by the so-called ‘gunboat diplomacy’ conducted by the colonial empires, among other, in China during the Boxers’ Revolution. The second group of expressions (58b) clusters around the idea that the USA, and GB as their accomplice, should be amenable to law for the crime they performed on Libya. The entire construct is possible through the operation of personification: STATE IS A

PERSON, so that as a result states can be pilloried, prosecuted in court or indeed victimised.

Another metaphor covering a stretch of discourse is THE WESTERNER IS A TEACHER/ THE ORIENTAL IS A STUDENT, discussed by Sandikcioglu (2000, see Chapter Three, Section 7) with respect to the 1990-1991 war in Iraq. In a TASS commentary quoted in *Trybuna Ludu* of April 19-20<sup>th</sup> 1986, however, it is used ironically:

(59) ...*celem amerykańskich nalotów na Libię było „udzielenie lekcji” – pisze, że „pomoc naukowe” jakimi operował Biały Dom – bomby i rakiety – zabijały przede wszystkim spokojnych mieszkańców Trypolisu i Benghazi, wśród nich dziesiątki dzieci*

‘the aim of the American air raids on Libya was “to teach a lesson” – [the TASS commentator] writes that the teaching aids used by the White House – bombs and rockets – were first of all killing the peaceful citizens of Tripoli and Benghazi, tens of children among them’.

(Mappings: Air Raids are Teaching a Lesson, Bombs and Rockets are the Teaching Aids)

In this example, the air raids are represented as “teaching a lesson”, but the inverted quotes instantly distance the reader from the content, and the “teaching aids”, which are deconstructed as bombs and rockets, mark the passage as clearly ironic.

Another role assigned to the USA through a metaphoric construal of the represented world is that of a sheriff:

(60) THE USA IS THE WORLD SHERIFF: *USA, wraz z ich flotami i bazami wojskowymi – mogą pełnić rolę samowolnego szeryfa, podczas, gdy narody – szczególnie państw rozwijających się – mogą być potraktowane jak Indianie, z którymi szeryf może rozprawić się wedle własnej woli.*

‘The USA, together with their navy and army bases, can perform the role of a wilful sheriff, while the nations, especially of the developing countries, can be treated as Indians, whom the sheriff can crush at will’

*obecny świat nie jest amerykańskim „Dzikim Zachodem” a kraje rozwijające się nie mogą być traktowane jak indiańskie szczepy.*

*Stany Zjednoczone nie są także wszechmogącym szeryfem, „zapro-wadzającym porządek” przy pomocy swego colta. ‘The world today is not an American “Wild West” and the developing countries cannot be treated like Indian tribes. The United States is not an almighty sheriff either, a sheriff who “introduces order” with his colt’.*

(Mappings: The USA is the Sheriff, The Contemporary World is the Wild West, The (Developing) Nations are the Indian Tribes; implications: The USA can crush other Nations at will like the Sheriff could crush the Indian Tribes, The USA Introduce Their Order by Means of Force like the Sheriff Introduced His Order with His Colt)

THE USA IS THE WORLD SHERIFF metaphor is a discourse-structuring metaphor in an anonymous *Pravda* commentary published in *Trybuna Ludu* on April 14<sup>th</sup> 1986. It highlights the reactionary nature of the American worldview, as the time of the Wild West is long gone. It must be emphasised here that the word ‘reactionary’ in the language of the propaganda of the time created a dichotomy with ‘progressive’, which were axiologically linked with evil and good respectively.

### 2.3.2. Isolated metaphors

There are several other examples originating in the lexical field of dispute, as in (61) below:

- (61) *Jeżeli dokonane zostaną nowe ataki — dodał — udzielimy zdecydowanej odpowiedzi i zadamy agresorom ciężkie straty.* ‘If new attacks take place – he added – we will give a determined answer and will inflict heavy losses on the aggressors’.

(Mapping: Retaliating against Enemy Attack is Giving a Determined Answer)

This quote, attributed to Muammar Gaddafi, shows how the conceptual metaphor WAR IS A DISPUTE is employed to map *answering* onto *a military retaliation*. A similar mapping, but going in the opposite direction, underlies the next example:

- (62) *...czy prezydent Reagan swym atakiem na Libię nie storpedował ostatecznie spotkania na szczycie. ‘Has president Reagan not torpedoed the summit with his attack on Libya?’*  
 (Conceptual metaphor: POLITICS IS WAR, mapping: Taking Wrong Political Decisions is to Torpedo a Political Meeting, The Political Meeting is an (Enemy) Ship)

Here ‘an attack on Libya’ is synonymous to war, which is constructed as a weapon, a torpedo, used by the American President. It is significant that the question implies that the President may not have intended the side effects of this war, or at least disregarded them. In any case this implication is one of the ways of portraying the enemy in the war.

The Americans, like the Iraqis in the data analysed by Sandikcioglu (2000) are represented as sub-human and irrational:

- (63) ANIMAL metaphors: *„Pan Reagan może uważać innych ludzi za wściekłe psy. Ja uważam jego politykę za dotkniętą wścieklizną — stwierdziła ona [prof. U. Ranke-Heinemann, RFN]. — Jest to polityka mordu i morderców, która gryzienie, strzelanie i bombardowanie przyjmuje jako zasadę.” ‘Mr. Reagan can consider other people as rabid dogs. I consider his politics as afflicted by rabies – she stated. – This is a politics of murder and murderers, adopting biting, shooting and bombing as a rule’.*  
IRRATIONALITY metaphors: *o wojennym szaleństwie rządzących wielkim mocarstwem ‘about the military madness of the government of a superpower’, igrającym nieodpowiedzialnie losami milionów ludzi ‘irresponsibly playing with the fortunes of millions of people’, nieobliczalny krok amerykańskiej administracji ‘an unpredictable step of the American Administration’*

The first statement above is attributed to Prof. U. Ranke-Heinemann, West Germany, who first accuses President Reagan of treating other people as rabid dogs, and then claims his politics to be contaminated with rabies. This claim is followed by a curious blend of elements from at least three input spaces: legal or violence related terms (‘murder, murderers’), rabid dogs space (‘biting’) and war space (‘shooting, bombing’), all of which result in an image of great intensity and emotional appeal. The re-

maintaining disease and irrationality labels are a common stock of insults used to degrade the enemy.

Another group of such labels is organized around the notion of American arrogance. It is related to the notion of a classical tragic flaw or Hubris, where the protagonist's conviction of his infallibility leads to tragic consequences. The American perspective implying that the American vision of the world is the right one, and the American style of war (the decisive battle, massive technological advantage, pre-emptive strikes) is supreme, are criticised implicitly by Sandikcioglu (2000, see Chapter Three, Section 7) and quite openly by Roxborough (2003a, see Chapter Three, Section 4). The propaganda employed in *Trybuna Ludu* exploited this notion of Hubris on several planes, as can be seen below:

- (64) Hubris terms: jaskrawy przykład arogancji oraz lekceważenia opinii światowej przez rząd USA 'a dire example of arrogance and disregard of the public opinion by the US government', *przedstawiciel narodu, który ma pretensje do kształtowania stosunków międzynarodowych. A tego nie można robić wyłącznie według indywidualnego wyobrażenia.* 'a representative of a nation who has an ambition to shape international relations. Yet this cannot be done only in accord with one's own conception, *buta i pycha* 'arrogance and pride', *głęboka pogarda* 'profound disdain'

In the Hubris category such features as arrogance, pride, disregard for world public opinion, disdain and misguided ambition are ascribed to the Americans.

There are two more history-grounded conceptual metaphors in the analysed texts:

- (65) AMERICAN AIR RAIDS ON LIBYA ARE NAZI AIR RAIDS ON POLAND: Wielu ludziom starszego pokolenia ta bezprecedensowa akcja, przypomina wyczyny lotników hitlerowskich we wrześniu 1939 r. bądź też bombardowanie Warszawy przez samoloty niemieckie w 1944 r.  
'This unprecedented action reminds many people of the older generation of the exploits of the Nazi pilots in September 1939 or the bombing of Warsaw by the German planes in 1944'.

*...obecne obrazy zniszczeń i ludzkiego cierpienia w Libii odtwarzane w telewizji przywodzą na pamięć zgliszcza i krew ofiar nalotów hitlerowskich z września 1939 r.... ‘...the present images of destruction and human suffering in Libya broadcast by television bring to mind the ruins and the blood of the victims of the Nazi air raids of September 1939....’*

(Mappings: The Destruction of Libyan Cities in 1986 is the Destruction of Polish Cities in 1939, The Americans are the Nazi)

AMERICAN AIR RAIDS ON LIBYA ARE A CRUSADE: *Nasz przywódca, pułkownik Kaddafi powiedział: „Stany Zjednoczone postępują wobec Libii i świata arabskiego jak średniowieczny krzyżowiec...”*

‘Our leader, Colonel Gadaffi said: The United States treat Libya and the Arab world as the medieval crusader did...’ (words ascribed to ‘a local journalist’)

*antylibijska krucjata Białego Domu* ‘White House anti-Libyan crusade’ (Mapping: The USA is a Medieval Crusader)

The first Nazi-based example, if it were not so strongly negatively emotionally loaded, could almost be amusing due to the contradiction in terms it contains. The ‘unprecedented action’ can after all be hardly reminiscent of past actions. This contradiction may serve as a counter-example to the strong version of Critical Discourse Analysis, supporting its stern assessment by Bell (1991, see Chapter Two, Section 4), who claims that many of the journalist’s lexical choices may be a subconscious falling back on set phrases. In this case, it seems that the author of the text was more after the formidable emotional effect rather than image coherence, and that his word choice was not so much aimed at persuading the public as at arousing it.

This analogy referring back to the World War II schema is not reserved for the Polish press only, as Roxborough (2003a, see Chapter Three, Section 4) points out the American authorities, while preparing ground for the Second Gulf War, constructed Saddam Hussein as Hitler, and the Iraqis as the occupied French, who would await liberation from the American soldiers. Clearly the Second World War is an important reservoir of images and stereotypes structuring our understanding of contemporary wars.

The CRUSADE conceptual metaphor, although it does not seem to have much intensity for the Polish public, is clearly important from the Arab perspective. It is supported in the texts by numerous references to colonialism and related terms used literally, but with a clear ideological bias.

The conceptual metaphor WAR IS A NATURAL FORCE is also well-supported with numerous examples shown in (66), divided into several metaphorical mappings:

- (66) **Waging War is Starting a Fire:** *podejmuje dziś akcje w uwielokrotnionym stylu XIX-wiecznej polityki kanonierek, mogące podpaalić pokój świata. ‘he takes action today in the multiplied 19th c. gunboat policy, which can set flame to the world’s peace’  
*by to okropne wydarzenie nie stało się iskrą zapalną dla światowego pokoju ‘so that this terrible event would not become a spark setting fire’ to the world’s peace’*  
**War is an Avalanche:** *[naloty] mogą rozpętać lawinę wydarzeń ‘[air raids] can start an avalanche of events’*  
**War is a Wild Animal:** *polityka nieokiełznanego wyścigu zbrojeń jądrowych ‘the policy of an unbridled nuclear arms race’*  
**Enemy is a Wild Animal:** *pragnął brutalnie „poskromić” niezależną od siebie, antyimperialistyczną, orientację Dżamahiriji ‘he wanted to brutally tame the independent, anti-imperialist orientation of Jamahiriya’*  
**War is an Animalistic Behaviour:** *przeciw prawu dżungli ‘against the law of the jungle’**

In (66) I have presented examples originating from two inputs: NATURAL FORCE and WILD ANIMAL. The first three conceptual metaphors highlight the intensity and the unfathomable peril that war creates. It constructs war as beyond human control. It is therefore not particularly coherent with the context, in which the blame and the responsibility for the war is so undeniably apportioned to the United States. The major function of these mappings is to raise apprehension and anxiety about the outcomes of the conflict in question.

The remaining two metaphors facilitate the construing of a portrait of the enemy, in the first case of Libya, and in the second – of the USA. The ‘taming’ example rests on an assumption that the US treats their enemies as animals, without respect. This conceptual metaphor gains indirect support from the expressions activating the Glorious War Myth, such as *godność narodowa* ‘national pride’, *złamanie i rzucenie na kolana* ‘lit. breaking and throwing to the knees = humiliating’, *zwiększenia bezpieczeństwa i autorytetu Stanów Zjednoczonych* ‘an increase in the security and authority of the United States’.

In the ‘law of the jungle’ example the US is imputed to conduct their policy (including the waging of wars) in accord with the ‘law of the jungle’ rather than international law or the United Nations Charter. THE USA IS A WILD ANIMAL is yet another example of the vilification of the enemy already discussed in relation to the examples in (60), (64), (65). This metaphor is facilitated by the operation of the Great Chain of Being. That is, when a higher level entity, in this case humans are conceived in terms of a lower entity, here animals, they undergo a degradation.

The expressions illustrating the WAR IS A RAPE metaphor draw on two sources: the extremely emotionally negatively loaded RAPE and LEGAL terms:

- (67) *gwałcąc podstawowe normy prawa międzynarodowego i zasady Karty Narodów Zjednoczonych ‘raping (=violating) the basic norms of the international law and the principles of the United Nations Charter’*  
*autorzy wtorkowego gwałtu ‘the authors of the Tuesday rape’*

As in the previous set of texts on the Falklands war, the WAR IS A RAPE metaphor triggers negative emotions in the audience. Lakoff (1992, see Chapter Three, Section 7) in his analysis of the metaphor system underlying the first Gulf War claimed that to ensure the support of the American public opinion the war for oil had to be rhetorically restructured as a war in defence of Kuwait, which was cast as a rape victim. In Polish reporting of the air raids on Libya it is not Libya, but the international law which is violated.<sup>19</sup>

The second example in (67) is yet another case of a slightly incoherent image. The agents of the rape are referred to not as rapists, or perpetrators of a crime, but as ‘authors’.<sup>20</sup> It imparts a certain glamour to the agents, a rather unwanted effect in the present context. It seems to work along similar lines as the surgical operations of the contemporary war re-

---

<sup>19</sup> A different language/culture-specific perspectivizing within the same conceptual metaphor has been discussed by Musolff (2004, see Chapter One, Section 2.7.) as metaphoric scenarios and by Kövecses (2002) as cultural variation in metaphor.

<sup>20</sup> The example from an article by Zbigniew Leśnikowski published on April 18<sup>th</sup> 1986.

porting lore, where the positive value of a widely respected medical profession is predicated of the war's perpetrators.<sup>21</sup>

### 2.3.3. Other rhetorical strategies

Another small set of awkwardly used phrases in this context are the euphemistic expressions used to describe the major goal of American air raids, i.e. killing Muammar Gaddafi. Two expressions which according to Hughes (1988, see Chapter Two, Section 4) could be regarded as examples of the anaesthetic style were used:

- (68) *postawiono im zadanie jego[Kadafiego] fizycznej likwidacji* 'they were set a task of his [Gadafi's] physical elimination'  
*usunąć spośród żywych niewygodnych dla polityki Stanów Zjednoczonych osób* 'to remove the people inconvenient for the United States policy from the living'

These two clauses, although clearly euphemistic, can hardly be regarded as an attempt to disguise the atrocities of war as the first phrase appears in close proximity to *barbarzyńskich działań przeciwko dzieciom i spokojnej ludności* 'a barbaric action against children and peaceful population', while the second – is in the context of *Terror masowy podpadający pod kategorię zbrodni wojennych dowództwo amerykańskie zastosowało przede wszystkim w Korei i Wietnamie, gdzie dywanowe naloty dosłownie równały z ziemią całe miasta i wsie, a napalm wypalał indochińskie lasy i pola, a strzelcy z helikopterów zabijali wszystko co się rusza* 'The

---

<sup>21</sup> It must be emphasized that I do not make any claims about the coherence and consistency of conceptual metaphors here, I only point to the fact that the way certain expressions are employed is inconsistent. They may be regarded as performance errors on the part of the journalist, similar to the violation of certain well-established collocation patterns of the Polish language, e.g. *Brunatnożółty piach Sahary pokrywa dużą większość jego powierzchni* 'the brown and yellow Sahara sand covers a big majority of its surface' by Ignacy Krasicki published on April 19-20<sup>th</sup> 1986. The unmarked collocation, I believe, would be *znaczna/duża część* 'a significant/big part'. Adam Głaz (p.c.) pointed out to me that *Korpus PWN* (the Corpus of Polskie Wydawnictwo Naukowe, a Polish scientific publisher) corroborates my observation: *znaczna część* has a frequency of 416, *duża część* 408, while, *duża większość* 5. That last phrase is used in the context of parliamentary vote and in this context it cannot be replaced.

American command employed mass terror which could be categorized as a war crime first of all in Korea and Vietnam, where carpet bombing literally levelled out entire towns and villages, while napalm burnt the forests and fields of Indochina and helicopter riflemen shot everything that moved'. Such contexts can hardly allow the audience to distance themselves from the gory topic. The employment of these euphemisms is thus either another slip of the pen, or a testimony to the irresistible allure that newspeak has for journalists. Or else it may be a result of the news production process, so accurately described by Bell (1991, see Chapter Two, Section 4), where the final version of the article appearing on the page does not necessarily conform to the author's original, but may result from revisions by the news editor or the production editor, all performed under significant time pressure.

The overall impression created by the analysed texts rests on a repetitive massive use of highly emotionally and ideologically loaded vocabulary presented in (69):

- (69) terms for emotions: *głębokie zaniepokojenie* 'profound anxiety', *ucierpieć* 'suffer', *oburzenie* 'outrage', *najgłębsza troska* 'deep concern', *gniew* 'anger', *pasja* 'passion', *zatrważający* 'appalling', *powaga* 'solemnity', *gorycz* 'bitterness', *rozczarowanie* 'disappointment', *dezaprobatą* 'disapproval', *szok* 'shock', *straszny* 'terrifying',  
evaluative terms: *cyniczna akcja* 'cynical action', *ryzykowna decyzja* 'risky decision', *bezsensownie* 'senselessly', *moralnie wątpliwy i absolutnie bezwstydnym* 'morally doubtful and absolutely shameless', *haniebny* 'disgraceful', *nikczemny* 'despicable', *napastliwy* 'virulent'  
negative speech verbs and their derivatives: *pogróżki* 'threat-DIM', *wymowa moralna* 'moral significance' (in Polish *wymowa* is morphologically related to *mowa* 'speech'), *potępiać* 'condemn', *piętnować* 'stigmatize'  
emotionally loaded political terms: *niedopuszczalny warunek* 'unacceptable condition', *wojskowo-strategiczne i ekonomiczne panowanie* 'military, strategic and economic domination/rule', *terrorizm państwowy* 'state terrorism', *zagrożenie dla bezpieczeństwa* 'a security threat', *bratni(-a,-e)* [*Libia, kraje/państwa socjalistyczne*] 'sister (lit. brother) Libya, socialist countries/states',

*eskalacja konfliktu* ‘an escalation of the conflict’, *hegemonizm* ‘hegemony’, *neoglobalny szowinizm* ‘neoglobal chauvinism’, *amerykański dyktat* ‘American diktat’, *interwencjonizm* ‘interventionism’, *imperializm* ‘imperialism’, *neokolonializm* ‘neocolonialism’, *zaborczość* ‘a tendency to annex territory’, *fanatyzm* ‘fanaticism’, *ekstremizm* ‘extremism’, *wielkomocarstwowy* ‘superpower, adj.’, *stosowanie przemocy i ślepego odwetu* ‘employment of force and blind retaliation’, *syjoniści* ‘Zionists’, *dywersja* ‘sabotage’, *wojny kolonialne* ‘colonial wars’, *ekscesy* ‘riots’,  
violence-related negative words: *agresja* ‘aggression’, *agresor* ‘aggressor’, *depcząc prawa międzynarodowe* ‘treading upon the international laws’, *okaleczona bombami Libia* ‘Libya mutilated by bombs’ (personification of state + highly emotive word), *brutal* ‘brutal’, *ofiary* ‘casualties, victims’, *nie sprowokowany, niczym nie uzasadniony akt brutalnego rozboju* ‘unprovoked, unjustifiable act of robbery’, *akty przemocy* ‘acts of violence’, *okropieństwa wojny* ‘war atrocities’, *gangsterstwo* ‘gangsterism (political violence)’, *amerykańskie bestialstwo* ‘American bestiality’, *piracki atak lotnictwa amerykańskiego* ‘a pirate American air raid’, *odwet, zemsta* ‘revenge, retaliation’, *zniewolić* ‘to enslave’, *pognąć* ‘to oppress’, *awanturniczy hazard* ‘belligerent gamble’, *neogangsteryzm* ‘neogangsterism’, *przelana krew* ‘shed blood’, *Amerykańskie ludobójstwo* ‘American genocide’, *rozbójnicza akcja/zbrodnia* ‘murderous action/crime’, *trupy* ‘corpses’, *bandyci* ‘bandits, thugs’, *śmierć, śmiertelny* ‘death, deadly’  
deceit-related negative words: *spisek* ‘conspiracy’, *kłamiwe wybiegi* ‘false excuses’, *szantaż zbrojny* ‘military blackmail’, *agresywnym knowaniem* ‘aggressive scheming’, *ze zdradziecko napadniętą Libią* ‘with a treacherously attacked Libya’

The data above are, to a certain extent, similar to those presented in (29), so that such categories as: terms for emotions, emotionally loaded political terms, violence- and deceit- related negative words are repeated here and many of their representatives match those in (29). The negative speech acts category of (29) had to be re-structured and re-named; consequently, in (69) we have two categories: evaluative terms and negative speech verbs and their derivatives. The reason behind this is that in the Libya texts the alliances are very transparent. The US is constantly vili-

fied and constructed as the brutal oppressor of the heroic and innocent Libya. Thus, it is not only negative speech acts which are used to create this image, but also numerous negative evaluative adjectives and nouns (labelled here as evaluative terms) as well as verbs and verbal derivatives (labelled here negative speech verbs and their derivatives). As a result, not only the wide range of abusive roots, but also an extended use of word categories testify to the intensity of the propaganda of the time. Among the emotionally loaded political terms many of the examples in (69) coincide with those of (29). However, if interpreted jointly with the violence related negative words, the LEGAL metaphors of (60 a and b) and the RAPE metaphors, the press construal of the American air raids on Libya is less focused on the notion of colonialism and anachronism and more on the legal, or in fact illegal nature of the American military action. The Falklands reports also seemed less antagonistic to the British, while the Libya reports are vehemently anti-American. In consequence, violence-, deceit- and irrationality-related terms are lumped together in the discussion of their role in the construing of the war frame in the section on the Falklands, while in the present analysis IRRATIONALITY (example (63) above) is raised to the level of a source for metaphoric mappings generated to insult the enemy. Generally, the techniques of ritual verbal abuse of the opponent are brought to the utmost.

Some of the labels from the violence related stock may, at first sight, seem to generate a series of metaphors with potentially rich imagery, such as AMERICAN ACTIONS ARE PIRATE/GANGSTER/BARBARIC ACTIONS. However, none of these possibilities is explored in the discourse. They only serve a highly emotive, evaluative function, but do not contribute to the construction of discourse (unlike the JUDGE, POLICEMAN, TEACHER or SHERIFF discussed above, which affected the construction of paragraphs or entire texts). They only play a subsidiary function, in that they emphasize the brutality and illegality of the action, creating the background for the more particular metaphors. They follow the pattern of ENEMY ACTION IS 'NEGATIVE' ACTION, where almost any word with negative connotations can be substituted for 'NEGATIVE'. This evaluative bias precludes the representation of the complexity of the political situation described and results in a bi-polarity of the represented world.

## 2.4. Rzeczpospolita on the American air raids on Libya (1986)

In the qualitative analysis of the data from *Rzeczpospolita* I present the results in contrast with those from *Trybuna Ludu* to point out similarities and differences in their construal of the war, and to avoid repetition. The two newspapers used the same sources to construct their articles, so that many of the passages are, word-for-word, identical in both newspapers. They are identical especially in the official materials, which both newspapers had to publish, such as the official communiqué of the Warsaw Pact or the letter from Mikhail Gorbachev to Muammar Gaddafi. There is, however, some variation in the selection and ordering of the material. For example, in the two articles devoted to the opinion of the ‘man-in-the-street’, different respondents were chosen although both newspapers admit using the material collected by the unnamed Polish Press Agency journalists.

When it comes to the reprints from the Soviet sources, the “giving a lesson” TASS commentary is reprinted in full in *Rzeczpospolita*, while the “sheriff” commentary from *Pravda* appears only in *Trybuna Ludu*. *Rzeczpospolita* refers to two commentaries from *Pravda*, one labelling the air raids as *rozbój, awantura* ‘robbery/mugging, brawl’, which places the rhetoric in violent emotive terms, and another one which attributes hysteria and hypocrisy to the American society and the American authorities respectively – terms from the deceit group. In none of these commentaries, though, could any evidence of discourse structuring-metaphors be detected.

### 2.4.1. Isolated metaphors

Like in the previous group of texts, also here the concepts of politics, diplomacy and war interact closely with one another.

- (70) *Stany Zjednoczone, które wypowiadają się werbalnie przeciwko terroryzmowi, faktycznie prowadzą politykę terroryzmu międzynarodowego i agresji, ingerencji w sprawy wewnętrzne innych państw. The United States, who speaks verbally (sic!) against terrorism, actually conducts a policy of international terrorism and aggression, of intervention into the internal affairs of other countries.’*  
*Brutalne lekceważenie zasad międzynarodowego współzycia, po-deptanie Karty Narodów Zjednoczonych stanowi swoistą amerykań-*

*ską odpowiedź – po ostatnich próbach jądrowych – na różnorodne pokojowe propozycje Związku Radzieckiego...*

‘A brutal contempt for the rules of international co-existence, and the trampling over the United Nations Charter constitute the American answer – following the latest nuclear tests – to various peace proposals of the Soviet Union.’

In the first sentence of (70) the diplomatic acts are contrasted with military acts, so that ‘speaking against terrorism’ is opposed to ‘the policy of state terrorism, aggression and intervention’. Interestingly enough, policy here is synonymous to a militant action, and remains in contrast to political dispute, tantamount to diplomacy. Diplomacy is phrased by means of what seems to be a pleonasm: ‘speaking verbally’, but may as well be a necessary distinction between ‘speaking verbally’ – diplomacy and ‘speaking militarily’ – war.<sup>22</sup> This last phrase may be a result of the activation of WAR IS A DISPUTE metaphor. The interaction obtaining between two superpowers is framed in terms of a dialogue, where the USA gives an answer to the Soviet Union, the answer consisting in a military act. This sentence also represents the hubris set of labels with such words as ‘contempt’ and ‘trampling over’. This ties in nicely with the legal terminology, also often intertwined with the arrogance attributed to the enemy:

(71) *Zakłada ona także „prawo” do bezprawia ze strony USA, tzn. do jednostronnej interwencji zbrojnej, jeżeli taką decyzję podejmie prezydent. [doktryna Reagana]* ‘[Reagan’s doctrine assumes the right to a breach of justice (in Polish expressed by a pun lit. the law to anti-law) on the part of the USA, i.e. to unilateral military intervention if the President so decides.’

*USA uzurpują sobie prawo „karania” siłą każdego, kto myśli inaczej niż przedstawiciele amerykańskiej administracji* ‘The USA claim the right to “punish” by force everyone who thinks differently than the representatives of the American Administration’.

Here the legal motif intertwines with the hubris motif, so that the USA is presented as an arrogant state, which places its actions above the law, and is ready to inflict punishment on others. The second sentence testifies to the

---

<sup>22</sup> See also Section 2.2.1, this chapter, where *The Times* cites Mrs. Thatcher referring to *the weapons of peace and the weapons of war; battles of war and battles of peace*.

activation of the NATION/STATE IS A PERSON conceptual metaphor, which allows the construal of the USA as someone dealing punishment on others.

The newspaper also offers a definition of war, reminiscent of the Clausewitzian formula attributed to a Polish political scientist from the Polish Institute of International Affairs, Prof. Longin Pastusiak:

- (72) [Opinia] Prof. LONGINA PASTUSIAKA politologa z Polskiego Instytutu Spraw Międzynarodowych: *Brutalna napaść Stanów Zjednoczonych na Libię jest jednym z przejawów szerszego zjawiska w polityce administracji Reagana, a mianowicie wzrastającej tendencji do posługiwania się siłą militarną jako narzędziem polityki zagranicznej*. ‘Prof. Longin Pastusiak, political scientist of the Polish Institute of International Affairs: The brutal assault of the United States on Libya is an indication of a widespread phenomenon in the politics of Reagan’s administration, i.e. a growing tendency to use military force as a tool of foreign policy’.

‘The use of military force as a tool of foreign policy’ is clearly a reformulation of Clausewitz’ famous quote of *War is politics pursued by other means*.

An overview of the remaining metaphors present in the *TL* reports shows that only the DISEASE metaphor does not appear in *Rzeczpospolita*. In the case of the NATURAL FORCE metaphor and FORCE schema<sup>23</sup> further linguistic realisations can be added to those presented above.

- (73) *szantażowanie świata przez USA kolejnym kataklizmem, w imię ludobójczej polityki, sprzecznej z zasadami humanitarnymi* ‘the USA blackmails (threatens) the world with another (natural) catastrophe, in the name of the politics of genocide, which stands in contradiction to humanitarian principles’  
(Mapping: War is a Natural Catastrophe)

In (73) war is construed as a natural catastrophe, something that is so powerful that it cannot be controlled.

The FORCE schema example is interesting in so far as it does not refer to any abstract power of the countries involved in political conflicts, but through the NATION/STATE IS A PERSON metaphor reduces the conflict

---

<sup>23</sup> The FORCE schema was not discussed in the *TL* reports from Libya, because it was realized by the same linguistic expressions as those described in the Falklands reports.

to a fist fight. This interpretation, however, needs to deconstruct yet another layer of meaning, that of the propaganda colouring of the word *kułak* ‘fist’, which is a Russian loanword and a doublet to *pięść* ‘fist’. *Kułak* was used in the post war propaganda denominating rich land-owners before the agrarian reform. This lexical choice strengthens the negative impact of the sentence. The example runs as follows:

- (74) *Przykładem posługiwania się przez Waszyngton kułakiem militarnym jest nie tylko Libia*, ‘Libya is not the only example of the use of the military fist by Washington’

*Rzeczpospolita* also employs one phrase based on the WAR IS MEDICINE conceptual metaphor, as shown in (75):

- (75) *Ofiarami tzw. chirurgicznego bombardowania przez lotnictwo USA padły przede wszystkim kobiety i dzieci* ‘The victims of the so-called surgical bombing by the US Air Force were first of all women and children.’  
(Mapping: Air Raid is a Surgical Operation)

The phrase ‘so-called’ is of particular importance here as it questions the meaning of the following words, as well as flags off the phrase as non-literal. ‘Surgical bombing’ in this context is presented as an empty claim of precision on the part of the American administration and allows the Ghana representative to the UN, Mr. Gieho, to whom the words are attributed, to use irony.

## 2.5. The Times on the American air raids on Libya (1986)

As was the case with the Falklands crisis reporting, the data from *The Times* on the American air raids on Libya consist of a selection of articles on the topic. *The Times Archive online* allows one to search for key words in the newspaper texts of a delimited period. The time boundaries were set between April 12<sup>th</sup> 1986 and May 10<sup>th</sup> 1986. The key word ‘Libya’ returned 273 articles in which this word appeared. Out of these, 84 were selected on the basis of their article lead-ins as being the most relevant to the topic analysed here. As in the case of the Falklands articles the present

selection included hard news: reports from Tripoli and other involved capitals, as well as reports from parliamentary debates in the House of Commons and commentaries.

### **2.5.1. Paragraph-structuring metaphors**

The group of metaphoric expressions that comes to the fore of the text sample draws on the lexical field of animals. These animal names are mostly used as terms of abuse, and can be potentially a result of the activation of the following metaphorical mappings: Colonel Gaddafi is a Mad Dog, Colonel Gaddafi is a Dangerous Snake, America is a Paper Tiger, Mrs. Thatcher is Reagan's Poodle. These mappings are all motivated by the conceptual metaphor PERSON IS AN ANIMAL. The intensity of the *mad dog* abuse was further increased by an elaborate explanation provided by Robert Fisk in his commentary on the use of rhetoric by the American President and Vice-President and the effect it may have on the Arabs:

(76) *The word 'dog' has a special significance in the Arab world. It means something filthy and corrupt; traditionally – long before the days of Islam – a dog was symbolic of dirt. Thus when Vice-President Bush first called Moammar Gaddafi a 'mad dog' on Wednesday – some hours before President Reagan adopted the same phrase – even moderate Arabs felt insulted. In the Gulf and in the Levant, newspapers called Mr Bush's statement both insolent and arrogant.*

The use of the *mad dog* abuse term by the American President and Vice-President about Colonel Gaddafi places the comments of Prof. U. Ranke-Heinemann quoted in *Trybuna Ludu* and discussed above, in a light which was not available to the readers of *TL*, as Colonel Gaddafi was not referred to as a mad dog in the Polish newspaper. Could that suggest that the newspaper editors were so conscious of the techniques of language use and propaganda that they knew that denying a frame activates it just as well?<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> See Lakoff (2003) 'Don't think of an elephant' task and his discussion about the framing of political discourse by means of conceptual metaphors.

The *dangerous snake* label seems to be far less ritualistic and is creatively elaborated, as shown in (77) below:

- (77) *Mr John Browne (Winchester, C): In the near future terrorist overlords like Gaddafi will be in a position to dispatch atomic bombs, if not by missile then in the cargo holds of scheduled civilian aircraft. In view of such a threat, there is a clear duty on our leaders to act with fortitude. It is extremely unwise merely to tease a dangerous snake. It should either be left alone or killed.*

Here a conservative MP uses the conceptual metaphor in its typical function<sup>25</sup> of creating a frame of reference within which what applies to dangerous snakes should be applied to people. Here the choice of metaphor determines the choice of the solution.

The animal abuse term was also used about the British Prime Minister, Mrs Margaret Thatcher, when she was called *the President's [Mr Reagan's] poodle*. However, in her interview for the BBC radio *World This Weekend* reported in *The Times* she overcame the reference frame she was being placed within by her critics and said:

- (78) *'I don't think I would make a very good poodle, and I am not,' she said. 'I might be more a sort of a bulldog.'*

Then she proposed her own frame and added:

- (79) *'There is no question of dancing to someone else's tune. We looked at the tune and we agreed that it should be played.'*

In this way she showed her high command of rhetorical skills, an ability to reframe political discourse to her own advantage.

The animal labels did not exhaust the repertoire of enemy vilification, which also included reference to insanity, when President Reagan was reported to have called Colonel Gaddafi a *mad dog*; and Colonel Gaddafi was reported to have referred to Mr Reagan and Mrs Thatcher as *that crazy man* and *that crazy woman*.

---

<sup>25</sup> This function of conceptual metaphor has been investigated at length by Schön (1993). He calls this type of metaphor generative metaphor.

It was accusations of excessive emotionality, though, which appeared consistently in the texts:

- (80) ...*Europeans dislike the Gaddafi regime, abhor and condemn terrorism and wish to take firm measures against it, but (that) launching military strikes against Tripoli would be 'emotional' and liable to lead to further terrorist acts in West Europe*, as one official put it.  
*Mr Cyril Townsend (Bexleyheath, C): Most of the recent terrorist incidents involving the Middle East are due to the Abu Nidal group rather than Libya. Many of us are deeply troubled by her uncritical support for the US which has grossly over-reacted to provocation. Does she not agree that over-reaction would only fuel terrorism, bitterness and bloodshed?*  
*Mr Jack Ashley (Stoke-on-Trent South Lab): No country in the world has a better record for firm, intelligent and calculated responses to terrorism than we have. It is therefore incredible, in the light of that record, that she should associate us with the emotional spasm by President Reagan.*  
*West Germany is also urging Washington to desist from 'emotional' action.*

In examples in (80) emotionality is contrasted with *firm, intelligent and calculated responses* and condemned as inappropriate. Ironically, these reservations against emotionality are often surrounded by highly emotional vocabulary, such as *abhor, bitterness* and *bloodshed*. It is difficult to decide whether speakers using such contradictory elements in their speech believe that emotional political speech is appropriate, while what they call emotional political decision making is inappropriate, or simply they cannot resist the temptation of achieving emotional impact on their addressees.

Occasionally some of the metaphor-based expressions are not just used in isolation and abandoned, but, as shown in the examples of *dangerous snake, President's poodle* and *dancing to someone else's tune*, they become creatively elaborated, in this way contributing to the structure of discourse, as shown in the text fragments below.

- (81a) *Indeed military action will tear even more deeply into the wounds of the Middle East.*

(81b) *One can choose one's friends in one's own image and to one's precise individual preference. One does not have that luxury with super-power allies and nuclear deterrents.*

(81c) *Without Mrs Thatcher the trend towards Fortress America would have been accelerated.*

*It is sentiment more than necessity that impels the US to defend us. If there was a war between Russia and the West fortress America would be in no greater danger of nuclear destruction than it is at present. If no nuclear weapons were used America would be absolutely safe. The Russians could not get large numbers of troops across the Bering Straits. There is no chance of their being able to do a Hannibal over the Alps on the US.*

In (81a) the POLITICAL ENTITY IS A PERSON metaphor is employed for a strong emotional effect that the phrase *tearing even more deeply into the wounds* may create in the readers, amplifying the critique of the military action and placing the Middle East in the position of a victim (see the Innocent Victim Myth of Lakoff 1992, Chapter Three, Section 7). In (81b) the same conceptual metaphor underlies the idiom *to choose one's friends in one's own image*. The idiom, however, becomes negated by the following sentence, so that the analogy between human relationships and international relations is denied. Of course, it could not be denied if it was not, in the first place, evoked. The passages quoted in (81c) come from different places of one article "And if the eagle should fly? / Implications of a US military withdrawal from Western Europe" by Woodrow Wyatt, which is structured around the image of AMERICA IS A FORTRESS. Here, the underlying conceptual metaphor STATE IS A HOME is elaborated into STATE IS A FORTRESS, and the whole argument of the article is structured around this notion. Generally, the entire text is rhetorically very rich, starting with the headline, in which the eagle metonymically stands for America, and continuing with an intertextual historical reference to an ancient Carthaginian military leader Hannibal.

### 2.5.1. Isolated metaphors

Similarly to previous subcorpora, the data on Libya from *The Times* show an intricate embroiling of the concepts of WAR, POLITICS and DISPUTE.

- (82a) *There is, in truth, a mutual incomprehension between Arabs and Americans that the US-Libyan confrontation is already accentuating.*  
(Mapping: Air Raids are A Means of Accentuating Incomprehension in a Dispute)
- (82b) *Then no sooner had Tory backbenchers gunned down the Shops Bill than the bombs and guns of US F111 warplanes were in rather more serious action against the cities of Libya.*  
*Mr Neil Kinnock will deliver an all-out onslaught against the Government's practical support for the American attack.*  
*The Kremlin's caution, for the second time in a month, was well disguised behind a barrage from the news agency TASS, which described the US action as 'barbarous and totally unjustified aggression'.*  
*In a stinging new attack on the United States for its recent air raids on Libya, Mr Mikhail Gorbachev, the Soviet leader, warned in a Kremlin speech that a similar crisis over Syria or Iran could break out at any moment.*  
(Mapping: A Violent Speech is A Military Attack)

In (82a) the international relations between Arabs and Americans are construed of in terms of DISPUTE, as if an air raid were a person taking part in a conversation, accentuating the lack of understanding between the interlocutors. The examples in (82b) draw on the lexical field of war. In the first example, the author is clearly well aware of the associations that the use of *gunned down* can activate and uses the phrase in a pun-like fashion, aiming at achieving an aesthetic effect. The remaining three instances in (82b) can be considered fossilised figurative expressions, with limited emotional appeal, perhaps with the exception of the *onslaught* reactivated with the strengthening modifier *all-out*.

A close reading of the texts identified a number of expressions which seem to be motivated by conceptual metaphors. None of these expressions, though, was in any way re-activated. They are listed in (87) below.

- (83) PERSON IS AN ANIMAL: *Reagan Administration hawks; as free people they have not let themselves be cowed by threats of violence; [i]t [the US] is bristling with new threats, now not only to Libya, but also to Syria and Iran;*  
(Conceptual metaphors: NATION/STATE IS A PERSON+PERSON IS AN ANIMAL)

WAR IS GARDENING/FARMING: *to plant bombs*; (Mapping: Bombs are Seeds)

A NATION/STATE IS PERSON: *a substantial measure of European backing; nobody in London would be surprised if America struck against Libya (+HAND-TO-HAND COMBAT); [*t*]he lack of a friendship treaty makes it easier for Moscow now to leave Libya to the mercy of US warplanes without losing face (+ metonymy: CAPITAL FOR A STATE); *Much of the optimism among Western governments about the chances of averting a serious new East-West clash stems from the difficult relationship between the Kremlin and Colonel Gaddafi, who is one of its closest allies in the Arab world.* (+HAND-TO-HAND COMBAT, +metonymy: THE SEAT OF THE GOVERNMENT FOR THE STATE)*

WAR IS A HAND-TO-HAND COMBAT: *strike, combat, hit back, to give a warning knock*

STATE IS A HOME: *Even this, however, arouses unease among the Greeks, Italians and Spaniards, who have most to lose from a war on their doorstep; [*d*]emands from within the Government that Libya should 'clean up its house' – the words were in the article written by a cousin of Colonel Gaddafi – have been coupled with further Libyan assurances of undying friendship with the Soviet Union* (+CLEANING, NATION/STATE IS A PERSON)

WAR IS A LESSON: *Was not the American air attack intended to 'teach Gaddafi a lesson'?*

HISTORY IS A TEACHER: *Commentators are already outlining the lesson of the Libyan crisis in which we are still embroiled;*<sup>26</sup>

RELIGION: *If he [President Reagan] goes through with a military strike, he will alienate his European allies, give a martyr's status to the Libyan leader in the Arab world, and fail to halt terrorism anyway;*(Mapping: A Politician is A Martyr)

WILD WEST: *the fact that the United States decided to use direct military action against Libya will confirm in the Soviet Union the image of President Reagan as a trigger-happy cowboy who does not*

---

<sup>26</sup> Here, similarly to the reporting of the Falklands crisis, the British learn a lesson (HISTORY IS A TEACHER conceptual metaphor), while Americans, as in the paper by Sandikcioglu (2000) analysing the representation of the Iraqis in the American reporting of the Gulf War, teach a lesson, this time to the Libyans.

*flinch at attacking civilian targets;* (Mapping: President Reagan is A Trigger-happy Cowboy)

WAR IS BUSINESS: *'There are three more members of his family down here,' one of the group said. 'We will pay back the Americans for this.'* (Mapping: War is Balancing the Sheets, possible interference from the MORALITY IS RETRIBUTION conceptual metaphor posited in Lakoff (1996))

WAR IS MEDICINE: *The Americans had indeed bombed a heavily populated residential area of Tripoli and had killed and wounded civilians; if nothing else, it proved that all the talk of 'surgical bombing' was, as usual in the Middle East, a myth; Mr Neil Kinnock said that without doubt Colonel Gaddafi was a malignancy;* (Mappings: Air Raids are Surgical Operations, The Enemy is a Tumour)

WORLD WAR II: *their execution had been 'in retaliation for the new Nazi policy spearheaded by the international terrorist Reagan and his decision to launch aggression on the Arab people in Libya'.* (Mapping: The Enemy is the Nazi)

WAR IS A MACHINE: *Mrs Thatcher has not merely protected the Alliance from corrosion but enhanced British influence on Washington within it; Mr Douglas Hurd, the Home Secretary, said that the West's machinery for fighting terrorism and crime had 'moved decisively into higher gear';* (Mapping: Military Alliance is a Machine)

All the above expressions, although they can be traced back to certain conceptual metaphors, are highly inactive. Even those which are clearly marked as figurative with quotes, or embedded in a tuning device, as in *the image of President Reagan as a trigger-happy cowboy*, do not seem to perform any important discursive function.

### **2.5.3. Other rhetorical strategies**

In the case of the reports of the American air raids on Libya, just like in the case of the Falklands crisis reporting, a text testifying to what I call self-conscious journalism was identified. It reads:

(84) *The Times has taken a very different and broadly favourable view of the wisdom and morality of the Libyan raid and of Britain's role in it. But a newspaper which finds itself in marked disagreement with the opinions of its readers must seriously address their concerns if it is to have any hope of influencing them.*

In this passage from the leading article of April 18<sup>th</sup> 1986, the author admits the discrepancy between the newspaper's stance and its readers' opinions, as well as makes a mission statement amounting to an acknowledgement of the fact that the aim of the newspaper is not so much reporting facts, as influencing the public opinion.

There are three intertextual references in the present corpus. First, to another ancient sign: the Trojan Horse, which is used to refer to Britain as the American Trojan Horse in the EU, in a veiled way implying that supporting the US against the predominant tendency in the EU is a deception. The second is a reference to a popular culture film hero, when President Reagan is referred to as a 'Rambo' *persona*.<sup>27</sup> Here the analogy creates an image of the American president as a person who favours military action. The third intertextual reference is attributed to 'one Moscow diplomat', who said *there will be an awful lot of sound and fury, but I would be surprised if they tried to raise the temperature*. Here it seems that both the quote from *Macbeth* and the use of expression building upon WAR IS A NATURAL FORCE (FIRE) have predominantly an aesthetic purpose, they are a play on words identifying the speaker as eloquent.

## 2.6. Trybuna Ludu on the Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan (1988-1989)

The selection of texts for the analysis was designed to cover about a month around the announcement of the withdrawal (May 15<sup>th</sup> 1988) and about a month around the official completion of the withdrawal (according to *Trybuna Ludu* Feb 15<sup>th</sup> 1989).<sup>28</sup> This sample of texts is the smallest in the present study.

---

<sup>27</sup> The quotes are used to mark out the name, clearly stressing its figurative nature (see Goatly 1997 and Cameron – Deignan 2003).

<sup>28</sup> Grant (1994) gives Feb 3rd 1989 as the date of the completion of the withdrawal.

### 2.6.1. Paragraph-structuring metaphor

The small size of the corpus is probably the reason why only one discourse-structuring metaphor could be identified here. The conceptual metaphor is AFGHANISTAN IS A MAZE WITH A WALLED-IN EXIT. It appears as a title of a commentary and is then repeated in the conclusion:

- (85) *Okoliczności te powodują, że afgański labirynt ma nadal zamurowane jedyne wyjście. Jeśli mur tego nikt rozsądny nie przełamie, krajowi grożą dalsze nieszczęścia bratobójczej, niszczycielskiej wojny. ‘These circumstances are the reason why the Afghan maze still has its only exit walled-in. If this wall is not pulled down, the country will be threatened by further misfortunes of fratricidal, destructive war’.*

This metaphor highlights the difficult political and military situation Afghanistan is in. The pulling down of the wall is a call for a new solution.

### 2.6.2. Isolated metaphors

This image of an insurmountable wall is one of the most enduring images of the period. It produces interesting effects, that is, the same metaphor re-appears in different places in discourse, but remains unrelated to previous occurrences. For example, in another text the same image is instantiated by the following phrase:

- (86) *Ślepy zaułek – tak charakteryzują obserwatorzy polityczni rozwój wydarzeń w szeregach afgańskiej opozycji, która zebrała się na radzie konsultacyjnej – Szurze, w pakistańskim mieście Rawalpindi. ‘A dead end – this is how political observers characterise the situation of the Afghan opposition who have gathered at a council – Sura – in the Pakistan city of Rawalpindi’.*

Similarly to the reporting of the American air raids on Libya, the dominant leitmotif of the commentaries is the vilification of the USA. Here it is contrasted with the USSR being construed in metaphoric terms as a friend and neighbour of Afghanistan (actualisation of STATE IS A PERSON

metaphor). Such bi-polar metaphoric construal of international politics is discussed in detail by Chilton – Lakoff (1995).

All the usual metaphors construing war in terms of NATURAL FORCES, SHOW, GAME, HAND-TO-HAND COMBAT also appear in these reports, but they do not perform a textual function in their structure. There is, however, one more interesting case that I would like to discuss at some length. That is the picture of social life based on military fighting as the main form of activity:

- (87) *KC KPZR wyraża przekonanie, że każdy z weteranów, którzy powrócili z Afganistanu, będzie z taką samą ofiarnością wykonywał nowe zadania. Ich energia jest potrzebna przebudowie, sprawie odnowy socjalizmu, obrony jego zdobyczy. Partia – głosi orędzie – wierzy w was, pokłada w was nadzieję, wzywa was do pierwszych szeregów walki o rewolucyjne przeobrażenia społeczeństwa radzieckiego. ‘The CC [Central Committee] of the CPSU [Communist Party of the Soviet Union] is convinced that every veteran who has come back from Afghanistan will perform new tasks with equal dedication. Their energy is needed in the restructuring, the renewal of socialism, the defence of its gains. The Party – the address goes – believes in you, pins its hopes on you, calls you to the first line of the fight for a revolutionary transformation of the Soviet society’.*

This rhetoric creates a picture of a society of soldiers whose main objective both in times of war and in times of peace is fight.<sup>29</sup> It seems to be an actualisation of the PEACE IS WAR conceptual metaphor. The expression *Peace is War and War is Peace* was one of the Party slogans used in Orwell’s 1984. This image of the world may imply that society is expected to function as if it were at war all the time (cold war), so that it must be ready for hardships and sacrifice. Such society has also its enemy externalised, which should contribute to its unity (see Hassner 1996, Chapter Three, Section 3). This representation of the world blurs the distinction between war and peace and creates a feeling of life under constant threat.

---

<sup>29</sup> Eubanks (1999) discusses the results of a focus group study of the BUSINESS IS WAR metaphor conducted in the US and quotes a licensing story, in which the respondent claims that the metaphor was more appropriate when the veterans of the Second World War and Korean War worked in business, but is less appropriate for the generation of the 1990s managers, who have no war experience.

### 2.6.3. Other rhetorical strategies

The sample also contains a text which shows the attitude of the Polish journalists of the era to the mass media, which is in stark contrast to that represented by the British (see the sections on *The Times*). There is no space for self-conscious pondering on the role and ethics of journalism. Quite to the contrary, the function of the mass media is conceived of as giving the truth to the people:

- (88) *Wyjście ostatnich oddziałów radzieckich z Afganistanu obserwowałem w Moskwie patrząc w telewizor i prowadząc niekończące się rozmowy z różnymi ludźmi. Telewizyjny obraz nie kłamał. 'I observed the withdrawal of the last Soviet units from Afghanistan in Moscow, watching television and incessantly talking to other people. The television picture did not lie'.*

The most remarkable foil to this conviction was a political graffiti, popular in the 1980s, which read *Telewizja kłamie* 'Television lies'. Apparently such a possibility did not occur to the *TL* Moscow correspondent.

## 2.7. Rzeczpospolita on the Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan (1988-1989)

As was the case with the reporting of the American air raids on Libya, many of the texts in both *TL* and *Rz* were very similar (e.g. the report from the press conference of gen. Liziczow<sup>30</sup>). Some of the texts, though, were original and appeared only in *Rzeczpospolita*, for instance a report by a PAP correspondent Krzysztof Mroziewicz (also writing for *Trybuna Ludu*) from May 16th 1988, in which he interviews a Soviet APC captain, who describes the atrocities performed on the Soviet soldiers.

Also the construction of the enemy in *Rzeczpospolita* seems slightly different from that in *TL*, as in the latter the alliances were presented along the following lines: the Soviet Army was helping their neighbour, the Afghan government, to consolidate the revolutionary gains of socialism. The major enemy was the US, supplying the opposition with weap-

---

<sup>30</sup> This conference, and the numbers quoted by the General are also reported in *The Times*.

ons and training. In *Rzeczpospolita*, however, the opposition was not construed solely as the internal problem of the Afghan government, but as a threat to the Soviet army as well.

Unfortunately for the major objective of this chapter, which is to compare and contrast the conceptual metaphors motivating language use in war reports in two languages, only a handful of dead metaphoric expressions was identified; consider (91) below:

(89) *Droga do pokoju w Afganistanie – nikt temu nie przeczy – będzie długa i najeżona przeszkodami.* ‘The road to peace in Afghanistan – nobody denies that – will be long and full of (lit. bristling with) obstacles’ (POLITICS/WAR IS A JOURNEY)

*Armia rządowa w ciągu kilku lat walki z siłami opozycji wyrosła jednak na sprawną, dobrze uzbrojoną i wyszkoloną.* ‘The government army over several years of fighting with the opposition forces has become (lit. grown up) efficient, well equipped and well trained.’ (AN INSTITUTION IS A PERSON, mapping: Army is a Person Growing Up)

*W operacji oczyszczania z sił rebelianckich szlaku Kabul – Salang zginąć miało – jak podała afgańska Agencja Bachtar setki rebeliantów z ugrupowania Masuda.* ‘In an a mopping-up operation the Kabul – Salang route of the rebel forces, according to the Bachtar Agency, hundreds of rebels from Masud’s group died’. (MILITARY OPERATION IS CLEANING).

The possible underlying conceptual metaphors could of course not be posited on such scarce evidence, but have been identified and discussed in other studies.<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup> See Lakoff (1992, in Chapter Three, Section 6) and Chilton – Lakoff (1995) on politics, and Hughes (1988, see Chapter Two, Section 4) on social cleansing, though he does not discuss it in terms of CMT, but rather as a case of euphemism at the level of language.

## **2.8. The Times on the Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan (1988-1989)**

The corpus of articles analysed in this section comes from *The Times Archive online*, the key word ‘Afghanistan’ was searched for in the same two periods as those delineated for *Trybuna Ludu*, i.e. May 7<sup>th</sup> 1988 – June 2<sup>nd</sup> 1988 and Jan 28<sup>th</sup> 1989 – March 3<sup>rd</sup> 1989. The search rendered 52 and 74 articles for each period respectively. Out of these, 88 were selected as concentrating on the withdrawal of the Soviet army from Afghanistan and on the general situation in Afghanistan at the time.

### **2.8.1. Paragraph-structuring metaphors**

In two cases conceptual metaphors constitute a frame of reference for longer stretches of text and are effectively elaborated. In the first case, the Source Domain is that of ANIMAL:

(90) *‘If the Najibullah regime adopts a porcupine stance, it may be a lot more difficult for the fox, in the form of the guerrillas, to dislodge it than wishful thinking has led some people to expect,’ a European military expert said.*

(Conceptual metaphor: AN INSTITUTION IS AN ANIMAL, mappings:  
Najibullah Regime is a Porcupine, The Guerrilla is a Fox)

Here a military expert uses the reference to two animals to illustrate the point he is making. The metaphor serves both as an ornament and as a strengthening of the argument through an analogy to the animal world, in which a prickly porcupine, although itself not a particularly aggressive or powerful animal, cannot be easily defeated. The fox – guerrilla tactics, which was so efficient against a regular army occupying a large and mountainous terrain – may not be equally rewarding.

The following excerpt shows a far less skilful use of metaphorical expression motivated by WAR IS MEDICINE conceptual metaphor:

(91) *The “bleeding wound” that Mr Gorbachev inherited when he came to power nearly four years ago has been lanced, but it is far from*

*healed.* (SOVIET INTERVENTION IN AFGHANISTAN IS A BLEEDING WOUND FOR THE SOVIET SOCIETY conceptual metaphor)

While it is quite obvious that a festering wound can be lanced in the hope of bringing relief and healing it, it is difficult to see why anyone would lance rather than stitch a bleeding wound. The expression seems to be a misguided blending of two phrases *lancing a boil* and *dressing a wound*. (91) can be yet another testimony to the claim I have made earlier in this chapter, namely that occasionally the journalists get carried away by their language and lose control over the particular phrasing they use.

### 2.8.2. Isolated metaphors

The discourse frames described above rested on the use of national symbols and emotional, evaluative vocabulary. Example (92) below is construed around the THE WESTERNER IS A TEACHER conceptual metaphor, in which the Soviets are given a lesson.

(92) *The second motive was simply to teach Moscow that further extensions of the Soviet Union's power beyond its frontiers would meet a strong response, and that Moscow would pay a heavy price. That lesson has been learnt, and the price extracted.*

Here the LESSON metaphor<sup>32</sup> is intermingled with the BUSINESS metaphor, which appeared regularly in the analysed texts, as evidenced in (93) below:

(93) *Moscow's heavy price for eight-year conflict; The Soviet Union has had to pay a heavy price for waging war in Afghanistan for more than eight years. The figure of 15,000 dead, acknowledged by Moscow on Thursday and confirmed by Western intelligence sources, provides a reliable indication of the human price paid.*

---

<sup>32</sup> It must be mentioned that the LESSON metaphor underlies several linguistic expressions in which the Soviets are described as learning a lesson through gaining experience rather than being taught by someone who knows what is right.

*In a speech showing just how little was achieved at the cost of more than 13,000 Soviet lives,*

(Mapping: Human Life is a Price in a Business Transaction)

In these examples human lives are reduced to figures in statistics; however, probably because the figures are frighteningly high, the powerful appeal of the sheer figures is not diminished. Although this type of conceptual metaphor usually hides the human suffering of the deceased and of the bereaved families, it does not seem to work this way here.

There is an example in the data in which the WAR IS BUSINESS conceptual metaphor spans three different concepts: the economy, human lives and politics, so that in this case the human losses are effectively downplayed as yet another item on the balance sheet. This impression is further strengthened by the use of a slightly dismissive word *adventure*.

(94) *The withdrawal will mark the end of a Soviet adventure that eventually proved as costly in economic and human terms at home, as it was politically costly abroad.*

Personification is one of the most pervading types of metaphor in the present corpus. It is most often applied to cities which become heroes standing their ground in war (95a) and confronted by a personified regime, government or army (95b):

(95a) *The threat to Jalalabad seems to have abated, as the deadline set by the Mujahidin for it to fall has passed.*

*Kabul wrestles with refugee crisis*

*should it [Najibullah's government] fail to maintain a grip on Kabul.*

*Kabul edgy after first street battle*

*Rebels tighten their noose on Kabul (headline, Feb 10<sup>th</sup>, 1989)*

*Kandahar is especially vulnerable because of the distance between the city and its airport, which the Mujahidin plan to attack shortly.*

(95b) *the ability of the 40,000-strong Afghan Army to survive on its own' no accurate assessment of the life expectancy of the regime can be made until the winter ends.*

The personified cities thus can feel threatened, edgy or vulnerable and they stand up to a hand-to-hand combat, in which they wrestle, or have a

noose tightened around them. The personified army becomes a single entity, and as such a single organism it is or is not capable of survival. In the same vein the regime can boast of life expectancy. All of these expressions seem to refer back to the underlying conceptual metaphor, which is so well entrenched that it probably escapes the notice of most of the readers. It is also not exploited by the journalists. There is only one example in which the metaphor NATION IS A PERSON is creatively elaborated on in a reference made by Mrs Thatcher to the words of Lord Palmerstone, the 19<sup>th</sup>-century British Foreign Secretary and later British Prime Minister:

- (96) *Lord Palmerstone's words about nations having no permanent friends or allies but only permanent interests have become almost a commonplace of Anglo-Soviet relations since they were quoted by Mrs Thatcher during Mr Gorbachev's first visit to London.*

Here the metaphor is employed to construct a cynical political argument.

In the data there are further examples of what may be considered the blurring of the concepts of 'war' and 'diplomacy', where war vocabulary is applied to non-military situations, but also when the reference is unclear, so that the word may be equally well implicating military or diplomatic action.

- (97a) *When we signed the accord, we pledged we would not take part in combat operations during the withdrawal if not attacked. But if we are, we will react in a corresponding way. We can see there are attempts to torpedo the agreements, and this would have serious negative consequences.*  
*But the exercise, witnessed by a media circus of more than 100, backfired because of the elaborate security precautions needed to protect both the Soviet and Afghan participants from attack, not only from the Muslim rebels who have vowed to keep on fighting, but also as a result of bitter splits inside the PDPA.*
- (97b) *Rebels attack morale rather than cities [Najibullah] conducting a "peace offensive" called National Reconciliation on behalf of Moscow since January 1987.*
- (97c) *Already locked into their own struggle with the fundamentalists, whose dream of an Islamic theocratic state conflicts with their own preference for a restoration of the traditional monarchy, the moderates saw a chance to win an important victory over the fundamentalists.*

In (97a) the words from the semantic field of war are used literally (*take part in combat operations, attacked, attack, fighting*) and figuratively (*to torpedo the arguments, [the ceremony] backfired*) side by side. It can be considered, I believe, as evidence of the weakening of their metaphoricity, so that they become bleached, and then eventually regarded as polysemous items, whose metaphorical origin can be reconstructed but may not be active at every use.<sup>33</sup>

In (97b) there are two instances of a slightly different status. The first example is evidently a pun, utilizing both the figurative and the literal implications of the word *attack* quite intentionally. The second example employs an oxymoron *peace offensive* deliberately with the aim of ridiculing the plan dubbed *National Reconciliation*, which clearly appeared dishonest and ineffective to the author of the article.

Excerpt in (97c) is a perfect instance of such a use of vocabulary with military undertones that it may well transform itself from a description of a diplomatic conflict into one of military nature.

### **2.8.3. Other rhetorical strategies**

Unlike the reporting in *Rzeczpospolita*, which was constructed around the antagonism between the Soviets and the Americans, *The Times* built its presentation of the situation around four participants: with the Soviets playing the lead, the Afghans the support, and the Americans and British given the cameos. The representations of the four involved nations were not based on any particular metaphors, with the exception of the necessary personification, which is analysed later. The framing of the Soviets was definitely less aggressive than that of the Americans in *TL*, but was nevertheless biased. A representative example of such a subtle bias are the references to the analogy between the Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan and the evacuation of the American embassy from Saigon in 1975, quoted in (98):

(98) *Kabul-based Western diplomats have been angered by what they see as recent false analogies drawn in sections of the media with the*

---

<sup>33</sup> Another possible interpretation is to call such uses as evidence of context-triggered source (Semino 2006).

*fall of Saigon in 1975 and the shaming exit of the last US helicopters with South Vietnamese officials desperately fighting for a place. They point out that the unforgettable scenes took place two years after the departure of American troops and after Saigon was conquered by North Vietnam.*

*The Soviet military was spared the humiliating confusion of the American flight from Saigon. The final stages of the Soviet retreat were completed with a degree of order and precision that would have dignified the Imperial Russian Army. As befits the commanding officer, the Commander in Chief, Lt-General Viktor Gromov, was the last to cross into Soviet territory, minutes before the midday deadline.*

The first excerpt comes from an article of May 27<sup>th</sup> 1988 by Christopher Walker from Kabul. Here the parallel is denied on the basis of the argument that the beginning of the Soviet pull-out cannot be compared to what happened in Vietnam. In the second excerpt from a leading article published on Feb 16<sup>th</sup> 1989, a day after the official completion of the Soviet withdrawal, the Soviet officers could not be awarded the recognition for minimising self-losses and conducting a well-ordered retreat, as in the first sentence they 'are spared the humiliating confusion'. They did not earn the dignified retreat but rather were spared the humiliation. Placed in a position of a syntactic Patient, they are not the Agents of the successful operation, merely the beneficiaries. The following two sentences through their lofty reference to the Imperial Russian Army and the elevated style marked by the use of such words as *dignified* and *befits*, carry undertones of irony.<sup>34</sup> Although the correlation at the level of states and the military command seemed inappropriate to *The Times* journalists, the correspondence between the soldiers' experiences seemed more fitting, so that in the same leading article there is the following passage:

---

<sup>34</sup> Andreas Musolff (p.c.) disputes my interpretation of the second passage and claims that the thrust of the passage is that the USSR was 'spared the humiliating confusion', and that the edge of the comment is against the US. I agree with the perspective on the US, but my point is exactly that the USSR were 'spared the humiliation' rather than that they efficiently conducted a military operation.

- (99) *The Soviet Union now has a generation of young people whose lives have been overshadowed by the Afghan war, much as the Vietnam war overshadowed the lives of a generation of Americans. Their response has been similar. Many have become disaffected; some have turned to pacifism, others to drugs, yet others to vigilantism.*

When the analogy allows for an appreciation of the Soviet military skill, it is denied, but when it reinforces the potentially disruptive effects of war, it is endorsed.

Similarly to the Polish reporting of the departure of the British fleet for the Falklands, the British reporting of the Soviet homecoming employs the Glory of War Myth and the THEATRE metaphor to create a sarcastic distance, which allows the reporters as if to see through the ceremonious pomp. In (100) below the tension of the relatives expecting the return of another group of soldiers in the border town of Teremez, and the pompous welcome by the orchestra are contrasted with the image of a bleak truck column transporting useless junk:

- (100) *Eventually headlights on the bridge signalled the arrival of the day's column, as the band dutifully struck up with the "Defence of the Motherland" and a motley collection of about 20 army trucks approached. Most were carrying junk bits of old engines, spare tyres and old oil drums.*

The Glory of War Myth reduced to a handful of empty symbols, such as 'Mother Russia', 'red carnations' and the 'traditional loaves of bread', as well as slogans alien to the readers of *The Times* like 'internationalist duty', its strangeness further emphasised with the use of the quotation marks, emerges from the following passage:

- (101) *Mother Russia' stages joyous border welcome; The column then drew up in front of a reviewing stand where it was addressed by local party officials and a cluster of generals. The men were told that they had come back after fulfilling their "internationalist duty" in Afghanistan, and that Mother Russia would accord them special respect for their courage and heroism.*

*This message was reinforced by the slogans on the vehicles which declared: “We have fulfilled the Motherland’s order”, “Hello Motherland” and “Motherland, meet your sons”.*

*After the ceremony the soldiers were briefly mobbed by journalists and local Uzbek women offering them red carnations, the chance to send a telegram home and traditional loaves of bread, the word “peace” baked on top.*

The picture above strikes one with its foreignness and artificiality, while the fragment below, although attributed to a despatch from a Soviet journalist of *Komsomolskaya Pravda*, is a clear mockery, ridiculing the spectacle into which such political and military operations can be transformed:

(102) *Soviet general will sign off with soliloquy*

*FROM EDWARD GORMAN, TERMEZ, SOVIET UZBEKISTAN*

*Lieutenant-General Boris Gromov, the Soviet Commander-in-Chief in Afghanistan, will be the last Kremlin soldier to leave the country, according to Mikhail Kozhukov, veteran war correspondent of the newspaper Komsomolskaya Pravda.*

*In a despatch yesterday he reported: “On February 15 at 10am local time, Lieutenant-General Boris Gromov will be the last to cross the bridge. He will pass without looking back. Then he will stop and ‘deliver a speech’, but just to himself. It will last one minute, seven seconds. It will not be written down nor listened to.”*

The use of meticulous detail (*[the speech] will last one minute, seven seconds*) in combination with the future tense adds to the sense of the surreal of the predicted scene.

The disdain also rings in phrases such as

(103) *He [one Western military source] added: “One should be wary against portraying this as the Soviet Army slinking out with their tail between their legs.” (AN INSTITUTION IS A PERSON + PERSON IS AN ANIMAL conceptual metaphors)*

*Everywhere the signs of the final ignominious Soviet departure are to be seen.*

*It was fitting that the last Soviet soldiers to leave Kabul sneaked out under cover of darkness on Tuesday night, with no ceremony and no*

*attempt to put a brave face on their withdrawal. Like the other re-treating troops encountered by Western journalists, their main emotion was an undisguised sense of relief.*

The negating of the scornful predication in the first sentence does not annul the frame (Lakoff 2003, see footnote 83) in which the Soviets are depicted in such derogatory terms as the mad dog Colonel Gaddafi in President Reagan's and Vice-President Bush's wording referred to in Section 2.5.1.

Despite the cancelling of the Saigon analogy in the text of May 27<sup>th</sup> 1988, on Feb. 15<sup>th</sup> 1989 Christopher Walker evaluates the Soviet withdrawal as *ignominious*.<sup>35</sup> In the third excerpt the Soviets are mocked for not staging a ceremony, although many other ritual departures and welcomes were reported in an equally supercilious manner.

The secretive nature of the Soviet actions evoked by the verb *sneaked out* above is also exploited for the construction of the Soviets as unreliable and deceitful, as evidenced in the quotes below:

(104) *Mr Gorbachev, during his 20-minute outburst against the US summit stand, also cited alleged violations by the Americans and Pakistan of the Geneva accord, signed in April and aimed at withdrawing all Soviet troops from Afghanistan.*  
*Behind a smokescreen of public denials, the Kremlin is striving to create a pro-Moscow buffer zone in neighbouring provinces of northern Afghanistan,*  
*There was truth in its words, but not the whole truth. [About Pravda report on withdrawal]*

In the first sentence Gorbachev is depicted as emotionally overreacting. The other two sentences show the Soviets as mendacious. The same accusations were levelled at President Reagan and the Americans in the case of the *TL* reports on the American air raids on Libya, in some of the parliamentary reports in *The Times* on the same issue, and in the American construal of Saddam Hussein as analysed in Sandikcioglu (2000, see Chapter Three, Section 7). Clearly, such accusations are a typical constituent of enemy vilification.

---

<sup>35</sup> The leading article with 'sparing the humiliating confusion' discussed above appeared on the following day.

The last element of the representation of the Soviets in *The Times* reporting of their withdrawal from Afghanistan consists in portraying them in such a prosaic situation as window shopping, which for them, living in the economy of deficit at home, was a glimpse of another world:

(105) *In the Chicken Street bazaar, where off-duty Soviet soldiers often came to ogle the cornucopia of consumer goods never available at home, none was to be seen yesterday for the first time in years. Another salesman was openly contemptuous of the occupying army which, until a few weeks ago, had 20,000 men committed to guarding Kabul alone. "The Red soldiers had no money and no manners. I had no time for them at all they seemed like peasants to me," he said.*

The implication here is that the consumer goods offered in the Kabul Bazaar are more advanced technologically than what the Soviets can acquire at home. It may suggest that the Afghan traders are more civilised than the barbarian Soviets.

The fragment published on Feb 16<sup>th</sup> 1989 and referring to the *cornucopia of consumer goods* provides a stark contrast for a different description of the Kabul shops, which appeared on Feb 27<sup>th</sup> 1989 and which runs as follows:

(106) *Among staple items now unobtainable or available only at black-market prices well out of the reach of most Afghans are petrol, paraffin, sugar, ghee (edible cooking fat), eggs and meat. Nan, the flat bread which is the mainstay of Afghan cooking, is rationed severely. In recent blizzards there have been reports of people freezing to death in bread queues. Among the black-market prices charged in the capital, where the average civil service salary is less than Pounds 30 a month, were sugar at Pounds 5 a lb, petrol Pounds 20 for 20 litres and meat at Pounds 4 a lb.*

Either the Kabul of the time was a city of such startling discrepancies, which is not impossible, or the first fragment might be an exaggeration designed to ridicule the Soviet soldiers.

The Afghans, as is the case in (98) above, are often framed as the victims of the Soviet occupation. The government army is referred to as *A*

*ragbag army awaiting the final showdown and appears as completely incompetent:*

(107) *The primitive nature of the Afghan military machine was demonstrated by the facilities at the checkpoint at the village of Tangiye Pol-i-Charki where our car was halted. Water was being drawn from a well and the only cooking equipment was a rusty charcoal grill. On the hillsides some of the hundreds of Soviet tanks left to the Afghan Army were silhouetted on the snowy skyline, a basic error that made them easy targets as one Westerner with military experience pointed out.*

Despite such derogatory evaluation, when a broader perspective is applied the image of a humanitarian catastrophe predominates:

(108) *A member of the small UN team still in Kabul said: "Now that the Russians have gone, this has become very much a human story rather than one about East versus West."*

The Americans fare no better in the picture of the world emerging from *The Times*. When it comes to creating political forecasts on the future of Najibullah's government, they are referred to as the *gung-ho Americans* refusing to be realistic, while President Reagan is so puerile that instead of a briefing before a diplomatic journey he is shown films:

(109) *They are showing films about Russia to President Reagan to help put him in the mood for next week's trip to Moscow. For the sake of a happy summit, they had better keep him away from Rambo III.*

The only reasonable nation on the scene are the British. Unlike the Americans, they are capable of accurate political calculation, as suggested in (110a), as well as unprecedented selfless sacrifice, in contrast to the Soviets (110b):

(110a) *The British, who have the best record among Western diplomatic missions for the accuracy of their forecasts about the volatile Afghan situation, are more cautious*

(110b) *Now that the Russians have gone, many of the most severe casualties in Afghanistan's continuing "dirty war" are being treated by a three-strong British volunteer surgical team, working in nightmare conditions in a heavily fortified Red Cross hospital which treats the wounded from either side.*

*Because of the shoot-to-kill curfew ordered by the beleaguered Afghan Government, the British team have to travel the 100 yards between the hospital and their sand-bagged lodgings after dark in a Jeep flying a large, illuminated Red Cross flag and driving at a snail's pace.*

*In the finest tradition of Florence Nightingale and others from Britain tending the wounded on battlefields far from home, the three have maintained an unflappability and sense of humour that has impressed both the poorly equipped Afghan hospital workers and the handful of other foreign volunteers alike.*

To non-British ears 'the finest tradition of Florence Nightingale' may sound a bit exulted, but the journalist's intention seems to be quite solemn. Apparently, such national symbolic references as 'Mother Russia' mentioned before, do not carry a similar positive emotional impact on the non-Russian addressees.

This section closes with a longer fragment which, as was already the case with *The Times* reporting of the Falklands and Libyan conflicts, falls under what I call self-conscious journalism:

(111) *The other shells, being farther off, had hooted as they fell. This one screamed as it passed over the Mujahidin position on the ridge to explode on the plain behind, not far from a village which is still inhabited.*

*Looking towards the houses, the American journalist crouching beside me growled: "What a lousy death blown up for someone else's photo opportunity."*

*This is all that the minor artillery duel really was. For the benefit of three cameramen, the group of Mujahidin from Maulavi Yunis Khalis's faction of the Hezb-i Islami party at the post near the village of Muhmand fired three shells from a Russian 120mm gun at a government battery on a hill guarding Jalalabad.*

This text testifies to the ethical dilemmas that war reporters must face when performing their profession, when such lofty quandaries as impartiality or reliability come second to the simple responsibility for one's documentary's subjects, and to the intense feeling of absurdity of filming or reporting other people's death and suffering.

## **2.9. Trybuna on the war on terror**

As the size of the Polish newspapers and newspaper articles increased significantly between the 1980s and 2001, only two thirds of texts underwent close reading in the qualitative analysis. The samples of texts were collected from the newspaper between October 1<sup>st</sup> 2001 and December 21<sup>st</sup> 2001.

### **2.9.1. Isolated metaphors**

Similarly to the previous analysis, the present one also identified references to the Glory of War Myth (especially in President Bush's speech reprinted in *Trybuna*), and such metaphors as WAR IS A THEATRE/FILM, WAR IS A GAME OF CHESS, WAR IS CLEANING, WAR IS A NATURAL FORCE. Still, the words which may be considered evidence for these metaphors are usually highly polysemous (see also Chapter Five on indicators of conceptual metaphor), and no evidence of any discourse-structuring clusters have been found in the texts signed by Polish journalists. Occasionally the metaphor seems to be reactivated as a result of elaboration, as in the example below:

(112) *Jaki czarny scenariusz napisze życie? Tych scenariuszy nie szczędzili hollywoodzcy twórcy: były łodzie podwodne nafaszerowane ładunkami atomowymi, bomby mogące zniszczyć milionowe metropolie. To naprawdę jest już wojna XXI wieku. 'What black scenario will life write? Hollywood artists did not spare us such scenarios: there were submarines stuffed with nuclear fuses, bombs which could destroy metropolises with millions of inhabitants. This really is a 21st century war.'*

In this excerpt the Vehicle is explored in order to cast some light on the Topic. In this way the conceptual categories underlying both the Vehicle and the Target merge to create a category of things that require scenarios, in the way suggested by Glucksberg (2003).<sup>36</sup>

Sometimes an entire sentence, and not just a part of it, activates the source domain of a conceptual metaphor, so that its meaning can be interpreted and its evaluative power appreciated only in the context of other sentences, which allow us to reconstruct the target of the metaphor:

- (113) *Ten pierwszy atak ma sprzyjać temu, by to nie Amerykanie i Anglicy mieli sami ścigać terrorystów po terytorium Afganistanu. Ta partia jest rozgrywana po mistrzowsku. USA chcą działać przy współpracy ludności miejscowej, a nie przeciw niej, jak to czynili tam Rosjanie, a wcześniej Amerykanie w Wietnamie.* ‘This first attack is designed in such a way so that the Americans and the English would not have to chase the terrorists in Afghanistan by themselves. This round of the game is played in a masterly fashion. The USA wants to act in cooperation with the local population and not against them, as the Russians did, and prior to that as the Americans did in Vietnam.’

Although in this example the metaphor adds to the intensity of the argument, it is not exploited in any other part of the article.

The metaphor WAR IS MEDICINE, which appeared in the 1986 reporting of the American air raids on Libya by *Rzeczpospolita*, was there clearly attributed to a non-Polish speaker, a Ghana UN representative, who referred ironically to an American claim on ‘surgical bombing’. In 2001 the expression does not need to be flagged off with the hedge ‘the so-called’, but its appropriateness is brought into question again:

- (114) [*Zygmunt Słomkowski, journalist:*] *Uderzenia są jednak chirurgiczne, gdyż cele bomb i rakiet to lotniska, stacje radarowe, obrona przeciwlotnicza, stanowiska dowodzenia itp. Nie dotyczy to ludności. [Dr Piotr Balcerowicz, a pundit in Oriental Studies] Mam nadzieję, że uderzenia będą chirurgiczne, ale już została zbombardowana elektrownia zaopatrująca Kabul w energię. W wyniku tego uderzenia będą cierpieli mieszkańcy stolicy. Bombardowania doprowadzą*

---

<sup>36</sup> Analysing the “My lawyer is a shark” utterance, Glucksberg (2003) suggests that metaphors of this type are categorical assertions.

*do zwiększenia fali uchodźców, a także do klęski głodu. W Afganistanie już odczuwa się brak żywności i duża część ludności egzystuje dzięki pomocy zewnętrznej.*

'The strikes are surgical, as the targets for bombs and rockets are airfields, radar stations, air defence, command posts, etc. They do not affect the civilians.

I hope that the strikes will be surgical, but the Kabul power station has already been bombed. As a result, the inhabitants of the capital will suffer. The bombings will lead to increasing the wave of refugees and starvation. Afghanistan already experiences food shortages and much of the population depends on international aid'.

Here the respondent accepts the conceptual metaphor suggested by the journalist, but formulates his answer in such a way as to put it in doubt. The linguistic expression as such, unlike in the 1980s, seems to be well-established in the language.

A metaphor which did not appear in the analysed Polish war reports of the 1980s is WAR IS A HUNT. I am not claiming that it has suddenly appeared as a translation from English language sources. The common collocations extending the meaning of *polowanie* 'hunt' in Polish are *polowanie na męża* 'hunting for a husband', and *polowanie na sensację* 'hunting for a scoop' (*Mały Słownik Języka Polskiego PWN [MSJP PWN]* 1969). Another word from the same semantic field, i.e. *oblawa* 'hunt', because of Kaczmarek's<sup>37</sup> song *Oblawa* 'Manhunt', may seem more likely to be used about police action rather than military operation; however *MSJP PWN* (1969) states that it can be used both in reference to the police and military action.

In the reports of the war with Al Qaeda in Afghanistan in 2001 this metaphor has been elaborated to the extent that it structured an entire paragraph of a text. As the article concerned the types of American forces to be used in Afghanistan, it was most likely translated from the American sources, so that its wording could have been influenced by the original text:

---

<sup>37</sup> Jacek Kaczmarek (1957-2004) was a Polish poet, singer and writer. He is considered to have been the Solidarity bard, the voice of the Opposition in the 1980s Poland. His songs circulated through the underground publishers. *Oblawa* 'Manhunt' is an adaptation of the song *Ochota na volkov* 'A hunt for the wolves' by Vladimir Vysotsky.

(115) *Jednym z najważniejszych zadań, jakie stoją przed siłami specjalnymi w Afganistanie, jest bezpośrednio uderzenie w terrorystów Al-Kaidy, a przede wszystkim w jej przywódców, w tym Osamę bin Ladena. Jeden z planów przewiduje wypłoszenie ich z kryjówek i schwytanie, a w razie konieczności fizyczną eliminację podczas próby wyrwania się amerykańskiej obławie, nawet poza granicami Afganistanu. Niezależnie od wyników operacji na terenie tego państwa, polowanie na terrorystów nie może zakończyć się tylko na nim. To zaś oznacza rozciągnięcie antyterrorystycznej wojny, choćby ograniczonej, na kolejne kraje. Niewątpliwie będzie to wojna sił specjalnych.*

‘One of the most important tasks that the special forces face in Afghanistan is a direct strike at the Al Qaeda terrorists, in particular at its leaders and Osama bin Laden. One of the plans involves flushing them out from their hiding places and capturing them; when necessary it also involves elimination in the case of their attempt to break free of the American hunt, even outside the Afghan borders. Independently of the results of the operation in this country, the hunt for terrorists cannot stop there. This entails spreading the anti-terrorist war, even if limited, on other countries. Undoubtedly, it will be a special forces war’.

(WAR IS A HUNT, THE ENEMY IS AN ANIMAL conceptual metaphors)

In this excerpt, the enemy, Al Qaeda terrorists, is rhetorically degraded to the level of animals, a common stylistic means in a propagandist vilification of the enemy.

### 2.9.2. Other rhetorical strategies

Unlike in one of the texts of the 1980s, in 2001 the journalists do not believe that they have an unrestricted access to information, or that ‘the television picture does not lie’. Urszula Piwowar-Lesman in her article “Dawkowanie informacji” [‘Dosing information’] criticizes American journalists for co-operating with the American government and the military and not striving for unvarnished news. She construes a dichotomy between the Western, biased journalists and the Al-Jazeera television channel, which through this juxtaposition seems to be a more impartial source.

## 2.10. The Times on the war on terror

The corpus of articles analysed in this section comes from *The Times Archive online*, the key words *Afghanistan* and *terrorism* were searched for in the same period as that delineated for *Trybuna Ludu*, i.e. Oct. 1<sup>st</sup> 2001 – Dec. 21<sup>st</sup> 2001. From several hundred articles submitted as a result of the search, 124 were selected as most pertinent to the war on terror conducted in Afghanistan. The choice was based on the content of the summaries provided for each article.

### 2.10.1. Paragraph-structuring metaphors

Of the analysed articles, two were built around one conceptual metaphor. The first was a feature article by Simon Jenkins classified as opinion and a commentary under the title “Real hawks would not dispatch the bombers” published on Oct. 03<sup>rd</sup> 2001. The structuring conceptual metaphor POLITICIANS ARE HAWKS OR DOVES was activated already in the title. *Real* is the key word here, as Jenkins defines the term in accord with his own political vision, contesting the usual association of *hawks* with aggression and speed. He juxtaposes *hawks* with *the defeatists*, who only later are dubbed as *doves-in-khaki*. Musolff (p.c.) sees a two-fold distinction here: one between *doves* and *doves-in-khaki* and another between *hawks* and *real hawks*. This differentiation allows the author to contrast *real doves*, i.e. outspoken pacifists with the *doves-in-khaki*, i.e. cowardly military men, who bomb Iraq but refrain from a land operation. The *real hawks* in opposition to *so-so hawks* and *the doves-in-khaki* would invade Iraq. The metaphor, POLITICIANS ARE HAWKS OR DOVES, elaborated in paragraphs two and three (see below), is then employed as a discourse-structuring device.

(116) *Since that man, Osama bin Laden, is last reported to be hiding in the Pamir Mountains, he is no easy prey. To be a good hawk has meant caution. It has meant exploiting the global shock after September 11 and translating it into an alliance capable of united action. It has meant pursuing accomplices, demonstrating vigilance and sometimes making strange friends. It has meant isolating and bringing pressure on those who harbour terrorists. Hawkism over the past three weeks has been the acceptable face of interventionism.*

*And the defeatists? They are not the apologists for the Taliban, an insignificant group. They are those whose reckless use of military power is so often counter-productive. They are the doves-in-khaki, the militarists who have kept Saddam Hussein and his regime secure by bombing his country each week.*

If we were to plot the occurrences of *hawks* and *hovering over the prey*, *doves-in-khaki*, *no easy prey*, as the phrases related to the dominant concept, we would receive a distribution which shows that the use of the word *hawks* and the related phrases cluster at the beginning of the article in order to set the frame of reference (Koller's 2003 scene setting). In the body of the text the references are less frequent. In the final paragraph the phrase appears again as if to close the frame.

The entire article is saturated with metaphorically used expressions, the motivation of which is not limited to the dominant source domain. In paragraphs 6 and 11 the Wild West Myth is activated through the use of such expressions as *trigger-happy Bill Clinton* and "*dead or alive*". In paragraph 7 *blitzkrieg* triggers the associations with the Second World War. In Paragraph 13 *hawks* are contrasted with yet another metaphorical category, that of a slave to US militarism. Overall, the discourse structure is here based on a dominant conceptual metaphor POLITICIANS ARE HAWKS OR DOVES. Simon Jenkins, a prominent right-wing commentator, uses this metaphor, together with the other supporting metaphors to criticise the *trigger-happy Clinton*, for employing, what neoconservatives consider, half measures, i.e. for not being interventionist enough.<sup>38</sup>

The second article built around a conceptual metaphor is again a feature categorised as a cover story. It is an article "Counsel of war" by Christopher Andrew published on Oct. 4<sup>th</sup> 2001. It is based on the conceptual metaphor HISTORY IS A TEACHER and implies that we should not only learn from our own life experience, as all higher organisms do, but also from the past experience of other people. This assumption underlies the whole of our education system, and is so common that it hardly seems metaphorical. In the present article the author argues that intelligence information should not be disclosed to the public, as it weakens the intelligence system and serves the enemy. In doing so, he advocates that even though the Western societies are democratic, its citizens should rely on

---

<sup>38</sup> Andreas Musolff (2006, p.c.) has pointed it out to me.

the better judgement of the national leaders, as keeping the public informed in detail about classified intelligence operations he considers counter-productive. To support his argument he draws a parallel with the functioning of Bletchley Park during the Second World War. The following expressions scattered in the text construct the HISTORY LESSON scene:

- (117) *The lesson, obvious to all who worked at Bletchley Park, is to stop telling bin Laden anything about the intelligence operations against him.*  
*Sadly, there is no sign that the lesson has been learnt.*  
*Past experience suggests that this simple lesson will not be learnt easily.*  
*The time has come to relearn the lessons of Bletchley Park and the Ultra secret.*

The article starts as an informative review of two books about Bletchley Park, or perhaps a history essay about it. Only as late as in paragraph 12 (out of 40) is the conceptual metaphor activated. Similarly to the previous article, the image appears in the final sentence to provide a structural closure to the text. In the body of the text, other historical references are made to the Korean War, and to the Falklands War to provide further illustration of the argument. Ironically, information on the new intelligence technologies are provided by the editors in the following sections of the newspaper undermining the very argument put forward by Andrew.

The same metaphor appears in a few other articles when, for example, *the lesson of Somalia* or *the lesson of the Gulf War* are mentioned. In these cases, however, its textual function is limited to one paragraph only.

### **2.10.2. Isolated metaphors**

Several phrases used in these articles can indicate the reliance on mappings between the WAR and the DISPUTE domains as shown in (118):

- (118) *PRESIDENT Bush fired another warning shot across the bows of Iraq and Iran yesterday by naming America's 22 most wanted terrorists, including men believed to be sheltering there.*  
*He got a real rocket, but the damage was done.*

... *poor Sir Michael was just one victim of the US Defence Secretary's need to fire off a few tension-relieving rounds.*

These three examples draw on the WAR domain and employ multi-word expressions, some of them clearly idiomatic. I assume that because of their length they have better chances of invoking the concept of war than single word expressions bleached through overuse, such as *attack*.

The word *front* seems to occupy the middle of the scale between easily activated metaphors and dead metaphors. It is variously modified to indicate whether military or non military action is referred to. *A different front* referred to the war propaganda, and *humanitarian front* to organizing refugee camps before the launching of air strikes in Afghanistan; there were also *political* and *diplomatic fronts*. The best example of the diversity of *front* is in the sentence below:

(119) *This military action is a part of our campaign against terrorism, another front in a war that has already been joined through diplomacy, intelligence, the freezing of financial assets and the arrests of known terrorists by law enforcement agents in 38 countries.*

The phrase *another front* reappears in the analysed texts 3 times and is used to frame the bombing of Afghanistan as one among many measures taken against the terrorists, and not as war as such. In this way the word acquires a general ring to it and ceases to evoke, it seems to me, the military conceptualisation unequivocally. Simultaneously, the word collocates with *line*, *lines* 12 times, when it is used in a clearly military context.

Several phrases originating in the military lexical field, apart from *humanitarian front*, are used to describe the relief aid, which gives them a slightly ironic tinge, as in *US plans to bomb Afghans with food* and *the US "guns and butter" strategy*, a modification of the *stick and carrot* saying. These rhetorical strategies employing the conceptual metaphor X IS WAR in war reports can be linked to the phenomenon of the context-triggered source discussed by Semino (2006).

A dominating metaphoric linguistic pattern used specifically in the reporting of a war against bin Laden and al Qaeda, also identified in the Polish press, is that based on the conceptual metaphors WAR IS A HUNT, PERSON IS AN ANIMAL. It is evident in the use of such phrases as those in (120):

(120) *to snare bin Laden, to smoke his men out of their hiding places they will chase bin Laden from cave to cave, the terrorists may burrow deeper into caves, The hunt for him [bin Laden], to hunt down those responsible, evade the dagnet, the task of smoking out the al-Qaeda network, risky task of ferreting out bin Laden*

The word *hunt* is used 15 times in the corpus. This linguistic strategy is again a part of the enemy vilification technique, by means of which the enemy is degraded, dehumanised and therefore not deserving respect or humanitarian treatment. Such wording may enhance the inhuman behaviour towards future detainees in the interment camps of Abu Ghraib and Guantanamo.

Other vilification methods differ in the use of particular words, but not in general concepts from those identified in other war reports. Thus, Osama bin Laden is described as *a bullet-eyed and belligerent, rabid revolutionary, [making] a calculated gesture of contempt for America*. The Taliban are referred to as a *regime [which] has been brutal and destructive to the point of insanity*. Terrorism is framed as *Random acts by people who will occasionally act out their particular derangement in a violent way. Those are criminal actions to be handed by law enforcement*. The selected examples presented here all point to the familiar domains common in the vilification procedures, such as INSANITY, BRUTALITY, CRIMINALITY. It is not difficult to make a link between *mad dog* Gaddafi and *the rabid revolutionary* bin Laden in the anti-terrorist pro-American propaganda, as well as between the anti-terrorist pro-American accusations of insanity, brutality and criminality ascribed to the Taliban, and the anti-American accusations of the same nature forwarded by *TL* in 1986. The strategies remain the same, only the subject of vilification alters with the change of the political scene, or perspective.

The domain of LAW (or CRIME, or CRIMINALITY) is employed not only to portray the enemy, but also to frame the entire war on terror. The Western leaders and the mass media made an effort to construct this international conflict as a persecution of criminals, not as a war between nation-states or between the West and the Orient. Such an approach is evident in the frequent use of the *crim\*(-e/s, -inal/s)* morpheme (33 hits). It is also indirectly supported by the dichotomy between the representation of casualties:

(121) [Gingrich:] *After the 1996 attack on Kobar Towers in Saudi Arabia, where 19 of our military personnel were murdered, we failed to apply the necessary pressure to force the Saudi Government to deal with terrorists based on their soil.* (TERRORISM IS A CRIME conceptual metaphor)

*He [Rumsfeld] can be brutally frank, as he has been when discussing the deaths of civilians. "There's no question but that when one is engaged militarily, there is going to be unintended loss of life. It has always been the case. It certainly will be the case in this instance. And there's no question but that I and anyone involved regrets the unintended loss of life," he said.*

*Bob Marshall-Andrews (Lab, Medway) said that to try bin Laden at an international court, even in his absence, would signal to the Islamic world that he was accused of an international crime against humanity.* (TERRORISM IS A CRIME conceptual metaphor)

In these examples killing American military personnel and American civilians is described as *a crime*, while killing Afghan civilians as *an unintended loss of life*, the key difference being the intentionality and declared regret on the part of the perpetrators. However, if the deaths of the civilians *ha[ve] always been the case [and] will be the case in this instance*, it seems a bit cynical to claim that regret significantly changes the qualification of the action. The change seems to apply at the verbal level, not the factual level.

Construing the war on terror as a law-enforcing operation invites the use of the Wild West rhetoric, where the good sheriff persecutes the evil criminals. Such vague references ring in generating "most wanted" lists and setting a price on the heads of the Al Qaeda leaders.

These efforts are sometimes contradicted by the policy makers themselves (see 122), which adds to the general conceptual confusion, which resulted from the war on terror:

(122) *We were at war, but we insisted on reacting as if these were problems for the criminal justice system. Terrorism of this kind is not a law enforcement problem. It is a diplomatic, military, and intelligence agency problem.*

The conceptualisation problem appeared at the very onset of the war on terror policy-building and -reporting, when President Bush used the word

*crusade*. In the period analysed here he is trying to clarify the issue and with much determination denies that the war has any religious or cultural innuendoes (see Silberstein 2002, see Chapter Three, Section 7). Simultaneously, however, he uses religiously loaded vocabulary,<sup>39</sup> e. g. *This is not a war between Christianity or Judaism and Islam. This is a war between good and evil*. Some journalists refer to terrorism as *a snake*, a clear biblical reference to the Devil; they also talk about *Campaign Objectives ... described by one aide as a "policy bible" or the Prodigal son [who] poses a crude threat to House of Saud*. These failures to conform to the self-proposed conceptualisation may be an indication of the dominating power of the conceptualisation by bin Laden and his supporters, who clearly refer to *the American soldiers of Satan*, and freely use religious analogies, as shown in (123):

- (123) *"The Devil is America, and the British Government," said Abdullah Khan, 23.*  
*"It is Bush and Blair I blame for Muslims going to fight. They are being provoked to do it by those two Great Satans."*

This conceptual, definitional problem is also pronounced in an article devoted to the meeting of British Muslim scholars in Birmingham. In the article, M. Faizul-Aqtab Siddiqi, president-general of the International Muslim Organisation, was explaining the meaning of *jihad*, and the difference between *jihad* and *qitaal*. According to him *jihad* is a peaceful and law-abiding struggle against injustice, while *qitaal* is a rise against oppressors which, however, can only be called for by leaders of state.

There are also references to other types of war conceptualisations in the analysed texts, such as WAR IS A DISEASE and WAR IS A NIGHTMARE (see the discussion of Janion and Wiśniewski in Chapter Three, Section 5).

- (124) *Without the UN, we can never have a just end to the Afghan nightmare. Historically, we know that the civil wars that have plagued Afghanistan tend to close down in the winter months.*

These references, however, did not extend beyond one sentence and did not seem to influence the representation of the war in larger stretches of text.

---

<sup>39</sup> See also Charteris-Black (2004) who claims that POLITICS IS RELIGION is a dominant metaphor in American political discourse.

The last element of the representation of war in the selected articles that needs to be mentioned are the historical analogies to World War II and to the Spanish War. Just like in the Polish reporting, World War II seems to be a pivot of our understanding and conceptualising of war as such. When it comes to the Spanish War, though, it does not seem to occupy much space in Polish imagery or the mythic pantheon.

This section closes with a discussion of the discrepancy between the self-conscious journalism and ornamental use of metaphorical phrases. An entire article by Robert Oakley is devoted to the uncovering of the news-making processes<sup>40</sup> and discusses the tension created by the requirements of 24 hour news coverage. It also points out that politicians try to influence the representation of the government objectives in the media, putting the journalists' impartiality to test. The broadcasting of the news practically world-wide places an additional strain on anchors and media pundits to word their comments in a way acceptable to a wide range of non-homogenous audiences, often identifying with the opposing sides of the conflict. At the same time some uses of metaphorical or intertextually informed phrases seem to perform a solely ornamental function. Such expressions are presented in (125):

(125) *But however meticulously US and British special forces draw squares on Ordnance Survey maps and comb them mile by mile, his enemies within may in the end be his [bin Laden's] nemesis... Apocalypse now?; Reportage; War on terror (headline)*

In either case, the possible analogy pointed at by the underlined words is not elaborated. It seems to work like a witty bon mot with no consequences for article structure or line of argumentation.

### 3. A summary of the qualitative analysis of war reports

The analysis of the war reports from the 1980s and from 2001 published in *Trybuna Ludu*, *Rzeczpospolita*, and *The Times* show that the concepts of 'politics', 'diplomacy' and 'war' remain in an intricate relationship.

---

<sup>40</sup> Robin Oakley: "Conflicts rage in covering the war 24 hours a day", *The Times* Oct 19<sup>th</sup> 2006.

Both in the Polish and British press articles, two perspectives on the meaning of 'politics' are most commonly adopted. First, politics is considered as a superordinate, general term covering both diplomacy and war. Second, it is used as a synonym of diplomacy and antonym of war. This dual nature of the concept contributes to its rhetorical exploitation. That is, in some texts, its reference is vague and wavers between politics=diplomacy at the subordinate (basic) level, and politics as an instantiation of the superordinate level. In such cases, when uttered by politicians, these words can be interpreted either as a warning of imminent military action or as sustaining the proposal for a diplomatic solution. Such indeterminacy does not contribute to efficient communication.

In war reporting, or to be more exact in war propaganda, narrative construal of identity and massive analogising, metaphor and non-metaphor motivated, flourishes in a necessary step in persuading the public to war, that is in an enemy vilification routine. There is a common set of negatively evaluated labels that are used to refer to the enemy in order to disparage them. The reservoir of these abuse terms consists of a set of metaphors mapping the enemy onto discredited categories or categories considered inappropriate for the participants of the political process (THE ENEMY IS AN ANIMAL, THE ENEMY IS A PIRATE, THE ENEMY IS THE NAZI). Much of the vilification is achieved through the use of emotionally loaded attributive terms, such as *emotional*,<sup>41</sup> *deceitful*, *criminal*, *brutal*. These attributes often form dichotomous<sup>42</sup> series with the attributes predicated of the self, such as *rational*, *honest*, *lawful* etc. This repertoire is used by the British about the Argentines in the Falklands War; by the Poles about the Americans in the air raids on Libya and during the Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan; by the British (and Americans, as reported in *The Times*) about the Libyans; by the British about the Soviets withdrawing from Afghanistan; and by the Polish and the British about the Taliban in 2001. This observation places Sandikcioglu's (2000) article in a wider perspective. That is, the rhetorical strategies used by the American media to debase the Oriental were not developed solely for the purpose of denigrating one specific group of people. Quite to the contrary, it is a frame persistently used in enemy vilification. It is the enemy which is the variable, the strategies are by default.

---

<sup>41</sup> On the rhetoric of emotional control in American discourse see Lutz (1996).

<sup>42</sup> On the use of categorisation and the dichotomous series in the media construction of self and other see Fowler (1996).

A similar process, that is one of employing the same construal but with shifting perspective, can be noticed in the use of the Glory of War Myth in combination with WAR IS A THEATRE metaphor. In the *Trybuna Ludu* reporting of the British fleet setting off to the Falklands, and in the British coverage of the Soviet arrival in Termez from Afghanistan, the same tones of scorn could be discerned. Evidently, the Glory of War Myth requires an emotional attachment to the nation's specific identity-building narratives and symbols. For outsiders, who could not have developed any emotional link with the foreign nation-constructing codes, the Myth, stripped of its emotional power, seems odd if not downright ridiculous.

The shift in perspectivizing that I propose here is not the same process as frame-shifting in discourse as described in Coulson (2001). The major discrepancy here is that the addressees of the mass media construal of the events are two different groups of recipients for the two different perspectives. The readers of *Trybuna Ludu* and the readers of *The Times* of the 1980s do not inhabit the same discourse space. In 2001, though, the situation changed so that to a greater extent the evaluation and the framing of the events in both discourse spaces coincided.

Cases of the Coulsonian frame-shifting could also be observed in my data. First, when the supporters and the critics of the military solution of the Falklands crisis both used the same metaphorical frame WAR IS BUSINESS, but they employed a different perspective, i.e. the supporters emphasised the glorious nature of sacrificing one's life for one's country, while the critics avoided the Glory of War Myth and construed war as a calamity. Next, Mrs Thatcher effectively used frame shifting in the discourse on the American air raids on Libya, when she reframed herself as a bulldog rather than a poodle of Mr Reagan, and suggested her own framing of the situation ('dancing to the tune of our choosing').

The conceptual metaphors underlying some of the expressions in the analysed articles performed several functions. First, they were used as framing devices structuring entire texts (THE FALKLANDS WAR IS A THEATRE, AMERICAN AIR RAIDS ON LIBYA ARE A DISPUTE, THE USA IS THE WORLD SHERIFF, AMERICAN AIR RAIDS ON LIBYA ARE TEACHING A LESSON TO THE LIBYANS, AMERICA IS A FORTRESS, NAJIBULLAH'S REGIME IS A PORCUPINE, WAR ON TERROR IS A HUNT FOR BIN LADEN). In this way conceptual metaphors contributed to the discourse cohesion and often also served as the basis of argument through analogy, or as illustrations strengthening the points made. In some cases, the metaphor did not domi-

nate the entire text, but permeated the discourse, reappearing in a number of texts, but without much influence on the text structure (AFGHANISTAN IS A MAZE WITH A WALLED-IN EXIT in example (86); example (85) is a case of a structural metaphor).

Second, conceptual metaphors were used to increase the expressive power of texts. Their aim was to arouse emotions in the readers and through empathy to induce the feeling of unity in the nation. Third, within the vilification of the enemy strategy, the role of the metaphors consisted in evaluation. A reference to a metaphor-based scenario increased the intensity of the evaluation activating all the analogous frames and narratives related to the metaphor (e.g. AMERICAN AIR RAIDS ON LIBYA ARE NAZI AIR RAIDS ON POLAND). Finally, the metaphors performed an ornamental function, especially when used by the speakers who wanted to stress their own eloquence (*the gunning down of the Shops Bill*).

The same functions have also been performed by other devices, for example, the emotional appeal of the text could be increased by saturating it with emotionally loaded, but non-metaphorical vocabulary, such as terms of emotion (*concern, solemnity, hysterically*), verbs of negative valuation (*accuse, condemn*) or value-laden propaganda key words (*jingoism, progressive, colonial, junta, liberty*, etc.). The aesthetic function could also be expressed through intertextuality (e.g. the quotation from *Macbeth* by a Moscow diplomat). The unexpectedly high emotionality of the texts analysed lends further support to Silberstein's (2002) claim that the mass media do not so much report the facts as construe emotions, which apparently sell better than facts in the mass media market.

The last two issues I would like to emphasize here are what I call self-conscious journalism and slips of the pen. The *Trybuna Ludu* and *Rzeczpospolita* journalists of the 1980s showed minimal if any awareness of the mass media as the fourth estate. Probably after years of totalitarian censorship, which controlled not only what should not be, but also what had to be published, they viewed the media as a mere channel for the official propaganda. Quite to the contrary, the British journalists appeared highly self-conscious.<sup>43</sup> In some articles they discussed the role of war reporters and the question of journalists' impartiality, in others they talked about the public mission of the media in educating society and explaining

---

<sup>43</sup> On the sense of public mission in the British media as opposed to the sense of commercial entrepreneurship in the US see Gripsrud (1998: 24–26).

the motifs behind the government's policy. Finally, they touched upon the ethical dilemma that reporters of human suffering and death must face, i.e. whether they should limit themselves to professional coverage of the news or should try and alleviate the pain they witnessed.

The slips of the pen that could be spotted in the analysed materials appeared when the journalists seemed to be carried away by their words, so that logic and coherence were sacrificed for the lofty, metaphor- or emotion- imbued wording, as when *a bleeding wound is lanced* (*The Times*) or *an unprecedented action* is reminiscent of the past (*Trybuna Ludu*). Sometimes the choice of words seemed to contradict the intention, as was the case with the *authors of the Tuesday rape* and the euphemisms used about the aim of the American air raids on Libya (both from *Trybuna Ludu*). I believe that these slips are a testimony to the time pressure that the journalists have to face, as well as an indication that not all the words used and published were carefully chosen to construct a predetermined representation of the world. Quite often the journalists may be falling prey to certain word patterns, which do not necessarily have to be the best means of expressing their personal or their newspaper's stance.

On a theoretical level, the analyses conducted in the present chapter unambiguously demonstrate that Conceptual Metaphor Theory can provide a concise as well as in-depth comparative overview of the similarities and differences in the political culture and international perspectives of the media in various countries.

The main focus of the present chapter was the investigation of the domain of WAR as a target of metaphors in press reports. At a theoretical level, as presented in Chapter One, WAR could be seen within the force dynamic model of Talmy as consisting of three elements: (1) the Agonist and the Antagonist, (2) force tendency and (3) the balance of strengths between the interactants. However, the analyses presented above showed that the major thrust of metaphorical representations was directed towards the Participants of the conflict only. It took a form of the enemy vilification strategy. This strategy has a built-in dichotomy, which can be represented by an axiological axis with 'the enemy' occupying the negative pole and 'us' occupying the positive pole. The identification of the enemy seems vital for this type of discourse, as one nation was always represented in such negative terms, regardless of the fact whether the country of the reporter took part in the conflict.

The recurring metaphor referring to the concept of 'war' as a whole rather than to its elements was the WAR IS A THEATRE metaphor strengthening the Glory of the War Myth. The only other metaphor that did not implicitly or explicitly focus on the participants of the conflict was WAR IS A DISPUTE metaphor, which placed WAR in a complex network with POLITICS and DIPLOMACY.

The analyses presented above seem to indicate that , at least within the newspaper war reports, the constituent element of the WAR domain that was targeted by conceptual metaphors most frequently and with a widest variety of sources was the participant of the war, in particular the enemy.