1 An Introduction to the "Warring with Words" Project

Michael Hanne

Introduction

"When a surgeon . . . cuts and cleans and amputates, and the wound bleeds, do we say to him your hands are stained with blood? Or do we thank him for saving the patient?" were the rhetorical questions posed in early June 2012 by Syrian president Bashar al-Assad, to justify the actions of his security forces, accused by international observers of torture and mass murder (Borger, 2012a). Grotesquely inappropriate though these questions will seem to most readers, Assad is, of course, far from unique among modern political leaders in using a medical metaphor to frame a questionable military or political intervention as not merely defensible but professional and praiseworthy. Terms such as "surgical strike" (Bissett, 2002), "shock treatment" (De Leonardis, 2008), and "ethnic cleansing" (Ahmed, 2010), have become all too familiar medical euphemisms over the last 20 years for state and communal violence. Global antiterrorist raids are regularly justified on the basis that "terrorism is a cancer that has long since metastasized" (Heiler, 2001). (There is an especially sick irony in the fact that Assad, himself, was trained as a doctor and embarked on advanced medical training in London, before being recalled to Syria in 1994, on the accidental death of his brother, to be groomed to take over from his father as president.)

The metaphor employed by Assad entails an implied narrative: of infection introduced from outside and/or of a carcinoma that has formed within the body politic, of exceptional measures being taken at the direction of "the doctor" to deal with these threats, of pain to be experienced by the citizen cells populating the body, and of a promise of eventual restoration of health. With such a metaphor and its associated narrative, the speaker offers a frame, or cognitive lens, through which the audience is invited to view the topic. Much of the power of the metaphor lies in its capacity to evoke an analogical narrative, without making that narrative so explicit that its aptness can easily be challenged. ("How many more amputations before the patient dies?")

The "Warring with Words" project, of which this volume is the culmination, sprang from the recognition that over the last 10 years or so researchers have increasingly focused on the key role played by narrative and by metaphor in

every aspect of political theory and practice. The aspiration of this volume, and of the symposium at Claremont Graduate University in March 2012 of which it is the fruit, has been to bring together a team of eminent scholars to document more or less comprehensively current thinking on the many ways in which narrative and metaphor function as cognitive and rhetorical instruments in discourse around politics, both domestic and international. In addition to revised versions of the papers presented at the symposium, this volume includes chapters specially written on topics not covered at the symposium itself. We are above all seeking to integrate the narrative and the metaphor perspectives, which have previously been studied separately.

In this chapter I aim to identify the many strands of work on narrative and metaphor in politics, to identify the sources for each strand in the wider fields of narrative studies and metaphor studies of the last 30 years, and to illustrate some of the ways in which the two perspectives may be effectively integrated, to achieve what I have previously called "binocular vision," that is, looking equally at a subject area through both a narrative lens and a metaphor lens (Hanne, 2011). In the early part of the chapter, I shall continually return to medical metaphors and narratives, which probably constitute the most prominent and durable strand, to illustrate their extreme polyvalence.

Medical Metaphors and Narratives

Medical metaphors are regularly employed by political leaders, not only to justify their own actions, but to denigrate others and, more generally, to shape political discourse in their favor. So, for instance, British prime minister Margaret Thatcher referred to her Labour Party opponents as quack doctors whose supposed remedies would only exacerbate the country's sickness: "Labour's real prescription for Britain is the disease half the world is struggling to cure" (October 1989, quoted in Charteris-Black, 2005, p. 102). In the words of Michael Orsini and Paul Saurette (2011),

> The use of medical metaphors in politics is a well-honed rhetorical strategy. We talk of "diagnosing" political and social ills; of government having to "prescribe tough medicine"; and of politicians "sugar-coating" policies the public doesn't want to swallow. Sometimes these metaphors help clarify the political world. Other times the rhetorical comparison hides more truth than it reveals. (p. 125)

Whereas much use of narrative and metaphor by political actors is consciously emotive and so manipulative (Dunbar, 2001), certain metaphors are in general circulation, and politicians themselves may, to a considerable extent, be entangled in a web of narratives and metaphors of which they are not wholly conscious. Medical metaphors, especially, circulate widely in political discussion in the media and become part of general political discourse. A fine article

on Haiti for the *New York Times* by journalist and political commentator Mark Danner is headlined, "To *heal* Haiti, look to history not nature" (2010, *New York Times*, my emphasis).[1] And, in an article for the *Guardian* on the implications of the Dayton Accord for the recovery of Bosnia after the wars in former Yugoslavia, Julian Borger (2012b) uses an extraordinarily vivid and effective medical simile: "Like a hastily applied plaster cast, it healed the wounds at the expense of setting Bosnia's bones at distorted, disfiguring angles" (p. 1).

More generally, the phrases "a healthy society" (usually, to be aspired to), or "a sick society" (referring to an existing situation in need of treatment) are in widespread circulation. A striking example is to be found in the famous Long Telegram sent to the US administration in Washington in 1946 by George Kennan, when he was American chargé d'affaires in Moscow. He first outlined the official Soviet view of capitalism in the West—that it bore "within itself germs of creeping disease" and was destined to collapse from internal convulsions and the rising power of socialism. Kennan's (1946) recommendation for future US policy towards the USSR was that "Much depends on health and vigor of our own society. World communism is like a malignant parasite which feeds only on diseased tissue. This is point at which domestic and foreign policy meet." (In these statements, he slips easily, as we all do, between metaphor and simile and, for that reason, in this chapter when discussing metaphor, I shall also be referring to the other tropes, including simile, metonymy, and synecdoche, which involve thinking by analogy in a political context.) Today, in retrospect, after the eventual collapse of communism, it is especially remarkable that Kennan had no sense that Soviet communism itself might be mortally ill.

Grand Claims for Metaphor and Narrative in Politics

Political discourse in the modern era is saturated with medical and other metaphors. In fact, it has been suggested by some scholars of politics that metaphors are the prime means by which politicians and citizens alike conceptualize, and act in, political situations. In their outstanding work *Metaphorical World Politics*, Francis A. Beer and Christ'l De Landtsheer (2004) assert that "[w]orld politics are metaphorically imagined and articulated. . . . Metaphors are significant condensation symbols of similarity and difference, inside-outside, self-other. Metaphors prime audiences and frame issues; they organize communities and cooperation; they stimulate division and conflict; they mobilize support and opposition. Domestic and international leadership and power are the subjects and the stakes in the struggle for meaning embedded in metaphorical world politics" (p. x). More specifically, Lori D. Bougher, a contributor to this volume, argues that citizens employ "metaphorical reasoning" to make sense of the abstractions and condense the complexities of the political world (Bougher, 2012). "The more abstract, complex, or unfamiliar the topic, the more likely metaphorical reasoning will be employed" (Bougher, 2012, p. 148). And, in the words of Edward Slingerland and colleagues, "metaphors guide reasoning,

focus normative reactions, and create or dissipate motivations" (Slingerland, Blanchard, & Boyd-Judson, 2007). Moreover, according to anthropologist Cris Shore (1997), the influence of metaphors "is greatest when they appear natural and normal, thereby escaping our attention" (p. 150). (See also Thompson, 1996). Metaphors feature in the "struggle for meaning" in politics among political leaders, citizens, and the media.

Equally grand claims have been made for the role of narrative in politics by scholars such as Phillip L. Hammack (a contributor to this volume) and Andrew Pilecki (2012), who assert that "our political existence is fundamentally storied" (p. 97) and that political psychology is best understood in terms of a narrative framework. They highlight the role of narrative in constructing our political identity, both individual and collective, in the development of group solidarity through shared stories, and in the emergence of movements of resistance against oppressive power. They introduce the concept of "narrative engagement—that members of society engage with collective stories of what it means to inhabit a particular political entity, be it a nation-state, a resistance movement, or a political party" (Hammack & Pilecki, 2012, p. 77). They follow Bakhtin in asserting that we "navigate a polyphonic context in which multiple storylines circulate and compete for dominance and primacy in individual appropriation" (Hammack & Pilecki, 2012, p. 79). They underline the way in which leaders weave narratives relating to their personal political development into the larger narratives they construct "to frame particular political issues and to motivate adherence to a particular political agenda." (Hammack & Pilecki, 2012, p. 80). Political narratives, like political metaphors, are passed around the triangle: political protagonists, citizens, and the media.

The grand claims of Beer and De Landtshheer on the metaphor side and Hammack and Pilecki on the narrative side were, it should be said, to a considerable extent foreshadowed by Murray Edelman as early as 1971 in his *Politics as symbolic action*, where he explicitly linked metaphor and narrative. He wrote, "Metaphors and myths are devices for simplifying and giving meaning to complex and bewildering sets of observations that evoke concern. Political events and trends are typically complex and ambiguous, and they become foci of anxiety" (Edelman, 1971, p. 65).

How Narrative and Metaphor Frame Thinking in Political Contexts

Interlinked though I suggest they are, narrative and metaphor frame our political thinking in somewhat different ways. Narrative is an interpretive device, which directs our attention to events (past, present, and future), agents, sequence, spatial and social context, and causality, in the form of a more or less unified plot. Metaphor offers a way of viewing, of seeing one item (often an abstract concept) in terms of another (often concrete). Metaphor is, on the surface at least, intuitive and atemporal and, in the words of Philip Wheelwright (1962),

offers "an angle of vision, a perspective, through which reality can be held in a certain way, a unique way, not entirely commensurate with any other way" (p. 170).[2] Nevertheless, it will be argued that, in political discourse, narrative and metaphor both have cognitive and emotive dimensions, that we regularly slip backwards and forwards between the two, and that this oscillation has generally been neglected by researchers.

Modern Narrative and Metaphor Studies in Wider Context

Attention to narrative and metaphor in politics stems originally, of course, from the broad claims over the last thirty years that narrative and metaphor are "primary cognitive instruments" (Mink, 1978, p. 131) by which we interpret experience. On the narrative side, we have assertions concerning the crucial role of narrative by such thinkers as Alasdair MacIntyre (1981), Jerome Bruner (1986, 1987, 2003), and Theodore Sarbin (1986). Sarbin sums up their conclusions in stating that "human beings think, perceive, imagine and make moral choices according to narrative structure" (1986, p. 8). On the other side, we have the assertions concerning the importance of metaphor by philosophers from Aristotle to Nietzsche, Stephen Pepper, and Kenneth Burke and in the last 50 years by philosophers, psychologists and linguists, such as Paul Ricoeur (1977), Andrew Ortony (1979), and George Lakoff and Mark Johnson (1980), culminating in the latter's assertion that "[O]ur ordinary conceptual thinking, in terms of which we both think and act, is fundamentally metaphorical in nature" (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p. 3).

These parallel grand claims for narrative and for metaphor might be seen as complementing each other. Nevertheless, narrative studies and metaphor studies have evolved rather separately over the last 30 years and there have been few attempts to integrate them. Just a handful of thinkers have considered the two together and insisted that there is a strong connection between these devices. So Dan Cohen (1998) makes the nicely simple claim that metaphors are compressed narratives and that narratives are extended metaphors. Paul Ricoeur (1983–1985), who wrote major separate works on narrative and on metaphor, makes the more sophisticated assertion that "the meaning-effects produced by each of them belong to the same basic phenomenon of semantic innovation" (vol. 1, p. ix). Whereas metaphor "grasps together" items from different domains, narrative "grasps together" events into a newly invented plot (Ricoeur, 1983–1985, vol. 1, p. x). Both, then, are connective devices, and Deirdre (formerly Donald) McCloskey (1990) makes the intriguing suggestion that the relationship between them is "antiphonal" in the sense that, in any given situation, metaphor answers the questions that narrative cannot answer and narrative answers the questions that metaphor cannot answer. (See my article "Getting to Know the Neighbours: When Plot Meets Knot," Hanne, 1999, for further exploration of this connection.)[3] In this chapter, I aim to demonstrate the multiplicity of relationships between narrative and metaphor in the

political context, in which examples may be found to illustrate the validity of all three claims.

Medical Metaphors and Narratives in 20th-Century Politics

Medical metaphors and narratives had a generally disreputable history in the 20th century, noted most particularly in Nazi speeches and documents, where undesirable groups were defined as "bugs" and there was discussion of how to "burn down to the raw flesh the ulcers of our internal well-poisoning" and "to root out all symptoms of disease and germs of destruction that threatened the political health of the state" (Szasz, 2001, p. 145). The fact that the Nazis undertook actual medical experimentation and torture on groups they regarded as undesirable illustrates a point I shall be making regularly in this chapter about the ease with which metaphors may become literalized in practice (see the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, www.ushmm.org/wlc/en/article.php?ModuleId=10005168). Sadly, as Ilan Pappé (2004) points out, such metaphors have continued to be found in speeches and documents since 1945, including, ironically, documents written in modern Israel, one of which defined the Palestinian Arab population of Galilee as "a cancer in the Jewish body that had to be curbed and contained" (p. 227).

Nevertheless, it is also true that distinguished political leaders such as Martin Luther King, Jr. and Nelson Mandela have made regular and skillful use of medical metaphors in their speeches and writings. So, early in his campaigning, Martin Luther King, Jr. projected this vivid mini-narrative: "old man segregation is on his deathbed. But history has shown that social systems have a great last-minute breathing power and the guardians of the *status quo* are always on hand with their oxygen tents to keep the old order alive" (10 April, 1957, quoted in Charteris-Black, 2005, p. 78). On other occasions, he used a more conventional metaphor and narrative scenario: "Segregation is a cancer in the body politic, which must be removed before our democratic health can be realized" (23 June, 1963, quoted in Charteris-Black, 2005, p. 78). Nelson Mandela, in his inaugural speech as president of South Africa and, many times since, has referred to the "healing of the wounds" caused by apartheid. On a more theoretical level, Orsini and Saurette (2011) ask whether the notion of "the political placebo effect" is useful for understanding "important and observable effects other than those that would be predicted by" dominant theories (p. 125). On a rather lighter note, it is intriguing to find peace and conflict studies specialist John Paul Lederach (2005) arguing that peace agreements at the end of a conflict are "social and political antacids, temporary acid reducers that create an exit for symptomatic problems and an opportunity to create a way to work on repeated patterns and cycles of destructive relationships" (p. 48; quoted by Min, 2005). Much more dramatically, in the field of environmental politics, some activists have made the emotive claim that human beings as a whole are a "cancer on the planet." One of the strongest proponents of this metaphor

unpacks its narrative implications in detail, concluding that "[a] cancerous tumor continues to grow even as its expropriation of nutrients and disruption of vital functions causes its host to waste away. Similarly, human societies undermine their own long-term viability by depleting and fouling the environment. With civilization as with cancer, initial success begets self-defeating excess" (MacDougall, 1996, p. 82). The emotive power of the metaphor in this instance derives largely from the fact that it is employed to refer to all of us, rather than to some group of Others.

It should be evident that there is great diversity of application of the medical metaphor-and-narrative combination. Sometimes, it arises on a theoretical level, sometimes in the realm of practical politics. Sometimes the emphasis is on "disease," sometimes on "treatment." Sometimes the sickness is represented as originating from outside, sometimes from within.

Opposing Sets of Narratives and Metaphors

There is, I suggest, a constant competition in progress among contrasting narratives and metaphors, employed to frame political issues. Although this has long been obvious in relation to narrative, in the context, for instance, of competing narratives advanced by political candidates about what they have achieved and aim to achieve, the point was first made in relation to metaphors, I believe, in 1971 by Murray Edelman, who wrote "alternative metaphors compete to define particular political issues; but the metaphor that is officially disseminated usually enjoys a significant advantage. It is the first definition of the issue most people receive" (pp. 71–72).[4] Any new narrative-metaphor formulation initiated by a politician may be adopted or repudiated by the media and by political commentators. Inducing commentators to adopt such metaphors must be a major achievement for any political leader. I shall refer later to the extraordinary success that George W. Bush had in selling the phrase "War on Terror" to the media and the general public. Again, in the words of Edelman (1971), "Political opposition frequently rallies around a competing metaphorical definition, of course. For those who accept it, this definition similarly becomes a continuing bulwark of conformity to the position of the group in question" (Edelman, 1971, p. 72). So, in relation to systems of healthcare, George Annas (1995) has pointed out that the "market" metaphors offered by commentators on the right (with the keywords "choice," "freedom," "competition") are increasingly countered on the left by metaphors of "ecology" (with keywords "community," "sustainability," "quality," etc.).

It is worth noting that antagonistic groups will often select a metaphorical description or slogan for themselves whose antithesis is self-condemnatory—and not the description actually chosen by those who oppose them. So, for instance, those who are "pro-life" imply that their opponents are "pro-death," whereas those opponents describe themselves as "pro-choice," thereby suggesting that those on the other side are "anti-choice."

One of the most successful rhetorical tactics in politics is to formulate a metaphor for the opposing group, which can be readily ridiculed. A fine example of such a metaphor is "trickle-down economics," a term brandished by politicians on the left to ridicule right-wing economics which those on the right have almost never embraced in relation to domestic politics (Sowell, 2012), although it was regularly used in a positive sense in relation to the economies of developing countries (Aghion & Bolton, 1997). Mitt Romney, in the first debate with Barack Obama in the 2012 presidential campaign, turned this metaphorical weapon back against those who had used it to attack his economic policies, when he accused Obama and the Democrats of favoring "trickle-down *government*" (emphasis added; Jensen & Talev, 2012). John Kenneth Galbraith (1982) made "trickle-down economics" sound even less feasible by employing the late-19th-century term, the "horse and sparrow" theory, whereby "If you feed the horse enough oats, some will pass through to the road for the sparrows."

Strong Metaphors Generate Strong Narratives

Unconventional or "strong" metaphors, and metaphors used in surprising ways, such as the "old man segregation" and the "humanity as cancer" metaphors quoted earlier, may enable creativity, provide novel insights, generate new knowledge, or, of course, provoke a hostile reaction. Donald Schön (1979) points to the use of the disease metaphor of "urban blight" in town planning, and shows that it necessarily tends to entail the policy narrative of "radical surgery," rather than a more moderate intervention. Indeed, it has been suggested that striking new metaphors actually change the schema through which we gain new knowledge (Petrie & Oshlag, 1993). It is also true that any single cluster of narratives and metaphors (such as the medical cluster) may be employed, as we have seen, to contrary purposes by opposing groups. Moreover, as Kenneth Burke (1953) was one of the first to point out in his *Rhetoric of Motives*, while a metaphor shines light on one feature of a situation, it may obscure or distort the perception of other features. In the words of Murray Edelman (1971), again, "[p]olitical metaphors . . . create and filter out value premises. They highlight the benefits that flow from a course of action and erase its unfortunate concomitants, helping speaker and listeners to conceal disturbing implications from themselves" (p. 70). So, with his metaphor of military action as surgery, Assad invites his audience to share his perspective on the actions of his military, thereby ignoring their brutality. Nevertheless, it seems highly unlikely that anyone who did not already share his view would be persuaded by this metaphor.

The "Body Politic" in the History of Political Theory

Up to this point, I have referred especially to metaphors and narratives derived from medicine, because they are employed in modern practical politics and its reporting. But these metaphors and narratives clearly grew out of political

theory representing the state as a human body, going back to the Middle Ages and earlier. The notion of the body politic was first fully developed by 12th-century theologian John of Salisbury (Guilfoy, 2008; Musolff, 2009). For John, the state was best regarded as a body, with the prince as its "head," the senate being the heart, and the church being the soul. Every social group corresponded to one or another part of the body, right down to the peasants and craftsmen, who were the feet. The body metaphor not only captures notions of structure and hierarchy but also has narrative implications for the health of the society. As Andreas Musolff (2009) points out, John cited the Biblical "if your eye or your foot offend you, root it out and cast it away from you" (Matthew 18:9) to justify "*amputation* and elimination" of anyone who rebels against the divinely directed monarchical state (p. 241), a grim precedent, we may now see, for Assad's description of his policies.

Over the following centuries, the "body politic" metaphor came to be interpreted and reworked with different emphases, by thinkers from Jean Gerson to Christine de Pizane, and from Thomas Hobbes to Thomas Paine. So, whereas Gerson emphasized the authority of the princely head over the rest of the body politic, de Pizane underlined the organic dependence of all parts on each other. Such theorization evolved, and was taken up for practical purposes by rulers and political thinkers in different ways over the following centuries (Nederman, 2007; Nederman & Shogimen, 2011). In a fascinating recent essay, Kathryn Banks (2009) illustrates the extraordinary adaptability of the "body" metaphor in late-16th- and 17th-century European thought, with political unrest being sometimes represented as a disease resulting from a failure of coordination of the body's limbs or organs and sometimes from a lack of the required balance among the Galenic "humors" making up the body. (See also Musolff, 2010). At a certain moment, it was even suggested that the health of the French nation could only be assured by its being "bled" with the murder of the king (Banks, 2009, p. 209). In the early 17th century in Britain, the metaphor of the body politic was used by King James I to emphasize the complete dependence of the body on its "head" (the monarch), but when the (literal) head of King Charles was removed by execution, the metaphor of the body politic survived in modified form, with parliament being referred to as "the soul" of the new Commonwealth (Anon note, 1997, p. 1841). Thomas Hobbes, writing *Leviathan* in the context of the English Civil War, depicts the Commonwealth as a kind of artificial "body," visually represented in the famous frontispiece, whose "head" (which, in Hobbes's view should still be a monarch) will prevent warfare among the humans who make it up. (See also Skinner & Squillacote, 2010.)

Moving on another century and more, with the founding of the US, it has been suggested by several thinkers that the metaphor of the machine, designed by humans, with its "checks and balances" and "levers" took over from the metaphor of the divinely designed body that prevailed in Britain. More thorough research has shown, however, that the two metaphors coexisted in both

Britain and the US during the 18th century (Anon note, 1997). This overlap occurred, in part, because, in the 18th century, the body itself came to be represented increasingly in terms of a machine, made up of "pumps," circulating blood and other fluids through the system. As we shall see repeatedly in the discussion that follows, key metaphors in politics are almost always polyvalent, in that they are capable of being adopted and adapted for a great variety of purposes. Michael Sinding, in his chapter for this volume, takes up the complex question of images of the body politic in the 18th century.

While some commentators suggest that the metaphor of the body politic has, in large part, faded from common use, others have argued that it is still very much alive and pernicious. It seems that the medieval and Renaissance "body politic" metaphor has become blended with Pasteur's metaphor of the body as "under attack" from infectious and other diseases. Skinner and Squillacote (2010), developing the ideas of Hannah Arendt and Emily Martin, argue that this blended metaphor has generated rigid binaries of "healthy/sick" and "clean/dirty," which encourage Western states to see themselves as constantly under threat from, and by implication in a defensive war with, societies which live by other values.

Operating at a tangent with these conceptions of the modern state are the metaphors that represent the state as a named, idealized, sometimes eroticized, female body. In her chapter for this volume, Chiara Bottici refers to the mythical figure of Marianne, symbolizing the French Republic (supposedly threatened by Islamic conceptions of women in society) and, in their chapter, James H. Liu and Sammyh S. Khan discuss the utilization by Indian nationalists of the image of India as a maternal body. (See also McKean 1998.)[5] Critique amongst feminist scholars of the instrumental use of the image of the nation as female body is well summed up by Jan Jindy Pettman (1996): "Eroticizing the nation/country as a loved woman's body leads to associating sexual danger with boundary transgression" (p. 188). The woman-nation does not desire; rather she is an object of desire, which can "materialize in competition between different men for control . . . a triangle, a love story, a fairy tale is often constructed, necessitating a villain, a victim, and a hero" (Pettman, 1996, p. 188). Krista Scott (1999) adds the crucial point: "Rape as a very real and horrible act of war, formerly regarded as an insult to the men of the nation, is now beginning to be recognized as a human rights violation of a very specifically gendered nature." And, returning to the specific case of India, journalist Charukesi Ramadurai (2004) writes, "there has always been a celebration of the nation's female body—and of her citizens' male gaze—beneath the seeming veneration is the need for possession and dominance."[6]

Proliferation of Medical Metaphors in Modern Politics

The proliferation of metaphors in the modern era portraying the national leader as a doctor, charged with prescribing medicine that is unpleasant but necessary,

or employing surgery, to keep the political body healthy has run in step with scientific advances in biomedicine, and specifically with the proliferation of war metaphors in the discourse of western medicine, first in reference to infectious diseases, but then in reference to cancer (Fuks, 2009). (See also my paper on narrative and metaphor in medicine; Hanne, 2011).

This is only one example of the fact, little recognized by linguists, that the transmission of meaning in metaphor is not always unidirectional. That is, the source analog can be used as a target, but the target too can act as source. Indeed, when two-way transmission occurs, there often arises a feedback effect, raising the intensity of the metaphorical effect in both directions. Deborah Tannen (1998) and others have argued that the everyday language and culture of the US, in particular, have become saturated with war metaphors—with "war on poverty," " war on drugs" being some of the best-known early examples—and that this, in turn, has tended to normalize war (in the literal sense) in our minds.

I have focused, up to this point, primarily on metaphors and narratives derived from medicine, which, as I have said, make up only one of the many seams of metaphor and narrative in political discourse (although probably the richest) to have been studied in recent years. I have sought to demonstrate, through intensive discussion of this one combination of metaphors and narratives, not only their ubiquity in political practice, theory, and comment but also the extraordinary range of political purposes for which, and rhetorical operations in which, they feature. Among the many other metaphors employed by politicians, by citizens, by political theorists and in reporting and comment on politics with which we are familiar are those of means of transport,[7] theater, sport, family relations, mechanics, accounting, music, and so forth, all of which receive appropriate mention in the pages that follow.

Scope of This Project

On several grounds, the task we have set ourselves in "Warring with Words" is very challenging. In the first place, even from this brief foray into medical metaphors and narratives, it will be evident that work on narrative and metaphor in politics has been undertaken from a range of disciplinary perspectives and on a range of specific areas and topics, by political philosophers (e.g., Guilfoy), anthropologists (e.g., Shore), international relations specialists (e.g., Beer), linguists (e.g., Charteris-Black), communication scholars (e.g., Feldman & De Landtsheer), feminist commentators (e.g., Pettman), policy specialists (e.g., Schön), and political psychologists (e.g., Hammack). They, in turn, have drawn their inspiration from work in wider narrative studies and metaphor studies by a great range of thinkers in different disciplines. Equally, it will be clear that, while some researchers focus on domestic politics, others concentrate on international relations, and while some take a primarily theoretical perspective, others pursue practical objectives, such as peacemaking. Moreover, as should be evident from the examples of research just referred to, scholars tend, with

few exceptions, to follow either the narrative path or the metaphor path—rarely both.

The aim of the "Warring with Words" project is to bring this diverse array of scholars into conversation with each other—a face-to-face conversation in the context of the Claremont symposium, and a virtual conversation in the context of this volume. Given the extreme diversity of the material to be incorporated into this chapter, deciding on its organization posed a major challenge. It seemed to make sense to arrange it in three sections:

- First, there is discussion of the grand narrative schemata and grand metaphor frames at work in public debate around politics.
- Second, it focuses on some of the explanatory narratives and conceptual metaphors employed by scholars and commentators for interpreting and theorizing about domestic and international politics.
- Third, there is a survey of the many ways in which politicians, activists, journalists and citizens, seek to "do things with narrative and metaphor," the multiple narratives and metaphors in circulation, and their dynamic interaction, the use of narrative and metaphor in predicting, planning, reasoning, persuading, campaigning, and, more generally, capturing the discursive space in politics.

Inevitably there will turn out to be considerable interchange of ideas among the three levels, facilitated by those working in the media. So, for instance, politicians, who operate on what is identified here as the third, everyday practical level, are constantly mining the grand narratives and grand metaphors of the first level, as well as the explanatory narratives and metaphors envisaged by scholars on the second level, for the purpose of arguing their case, both domestically and internationally.

Because of the extreme range of topics discussed, in this chapter I inevitably skim over the depth and detail of theory in each area, seeking to illustrate the broad topography of the field with a variety of concrete examples. I leave it to my colleagues, in the specialist essays that follow, to contribute the theoretical substance on each topic. Similarly, this chapter does not aim to be encyclopedic in its bibliographical reference, preferring to list key current works, which will, in turn, lead the reader to additional bibliographical sources.

Grand Narrative Schemata and Grand Metaphor Frames

"Political Myths" and Their Associated Metaphors

As a number of political philosophers have emphasized over the last 40 years, political events on both the domestic and the international level are in large part shaped by the grand ideological narratives, taken for reality and shared by members of a society or group, which serve as "cognitive lenses" in terms of

which citizens view the (political) world (Bennett, 1980; Bottici, 2007; Edelman, 1967, 1971, 1975; Flood, 2002; Hammack, 2011). These have come to be called "political myths," not in the simple sense of silly stories that are widely shared (e.g. "Barack Obama wasn't born in the US"), but in the sense of grand narratives which serve to frame a people's understanding of its own history and character. They vary by country, culture, period, and community, but some have proved remarkably durable. Examples offered by Bottici (2007) include the American myth of the Founding Fathers, the myth of the French Revolution, and the Italian myth of the "Resistance" against Nazi-Fascism. This use of the term "grand narratives" is not to be confused with Lyotard's (1984) use of the same term to refer to philosophical theories in narrative form, such as "historical progress," "the knowability of everything in science," and so on, which he sees as having lost credibility in the postmodern period.

Although "political myths" do embody some historical events, they are distinguished primarily by the perspective and emplotment given to those events. In this respect, theorists of political myth are drawing on the findings of researchers on narrative in a more general sense, who have long asserted that the prime characteristic of narrative is that it offers a perspective on the events it recounts (Gee, 1991) and that those events have been arranged into a plot (Brooks, 1984). Bottici (2007), a contributor to this volume, has highlighted the fact that political myths are not singular entities that have been definitively stated at one point in time, but are interrelational and constantly undergoing reproduction, reinterpretation, and retransmission for application to new circumstances.

A nation is likely to maintain several such myths, which operate alongside each other, and political leaders will, in different circumstances, draw on one or another of them and, when possible, lock them together. Among the myths that have held sway in the US over the last 200 years, some of the most significant have been those of American Exceptionalism, Manifest Destiny, and Civilization versus Barbarism. The concept of Manifest Destiny was first elaborated by influential journalist John L. O'Sullivan (1845) in the 1840s to justify American claims for the territories of Oregon and Texas in such declarations as "[a]nd that claim is by the right of our manifest destiny to overspread and to possess the whole of the continent which Providence has given us for the development of the great experiment of liberty and federated self-government entrusted to us" (O'Sullivan, 1845). Historian William E. Weeks has shown that the concept has built into it a bundle of claims about the virtue of the American people, its mission to spread its institutions, and its destiny under God to do so (Weeks, 1996, p. 61). It not only referred back to stories of the religious inspiration of the first European settlers and the Declaration of Independence, but also forward to American expansion across the whole North American landmass. As has been pointed out by many commentators, the concept has since then been utilized instrumentally to define the US's ideal image of itself and so frame and legitimate many of its (foreign) policies for a great variety

of political purposes, right up to the justifications of the invasions of Iraq and Afghanistan by both Presidents Bush, father and son (see, e.g., Esch, 2010). A cluster of narratives has been condensed into the phrase "Manifest Destiny," which now has a great range of possible applications. Obviously, the peoples who have been subjected to the military and political actions legitimated by this grand narrative and metaphor, in the first instance, Native Americans, have their own sets of very different political myths and metaphors, concerning the same events, which will often be invisible to the dominant population.

Indigenous peoples, who have experienced invasion and colonization, strive to maintain political myths and metaphors, which will link accounts of their ancient origins and metaphors of identity with their experiences of more recent traumatic events. In my country, New Zealand, the indigenous Maori people suffered dispossession of much of their land, language, and culture in the 19th century and early 20th century at the hands of European settlers. Each tribe has its own history of the processes, including fraud, trickery, and war, by which their land was appropriated. But, in their claims for restitution over the last 30 years, a driving concept, with both narrative and metaphorical force, is that they are *tangata whenua*, meaning "people of the land." The term *whenua*, which they use for "land," also refers to the "placenta" or "afterbirth." This usage recalls the traditional narratives recounting the birth of humans from mother earth, which is ritually commemorated in the tradition of burying the placenta of a newborn baby in the soil from which its family comes (see www.maoridictionary.co.nz/index.cfm?dictionaryKeywords=tangata+whenua&search.x=36&search.y=11&search=search&n=1&idiom=&phrase=&proverb=&loan=). Similarly, a key concept in Maori culture is *whakapapa*, usually translated as "genealogy" and so often thought of by Europeans as identical with their notion of "family tree." But the term actually refers to the layers of rock or (mother) earth on which a person's identity is based. It is hard to imagine more vital images of linkage to the land that was stolen from them. Many indigenous peoples see themselves as having this kind of connection to the land on which they and their ancestors have lived, and similar metaphors are built into the political myths with which they face those who have colonized them.

Narratives and Metaphors of Identity

Understanding of the nature of political myths has been greatly enabled by the work of cognitive and social psychologists around the narrative component in our sense of personal identity (Bruner 1987; Damasio 1999; and others) and the work of sociologists and political psychologists on the national and communal stories with which people identify ("imagined communities" in the words of Benedict Anderson, 1991) and within which they imagine themselves (Anderson, 1991; Connerton 1989). Such shared stories serve to define not only national identity, but also communal identity on a much smaller scale. So, Ernest Renan (1990), in an 1882 essay, "What Is a Nation?", pointed out that

under Turkish rule, in a single city, such as Salonika or Smyrna, you might find "five or six communities each of which has its own memories and which have almost nothing in common" (p. 11). Much the same was true of many Indian cities under the British Raj. Such communal narratives or collective memories are mediated by forces including family and personal experience, social class, media, culture, and religious institutions. They play a major role in fostering international and communal conflicts.

Nations and groups in antagonistic relations generally hold to contrary and competing grand political narratives and metaphors of identity, which interpret situations and events in ways that justify their own position. Examples that may be cited are almost endless. Liu and Khan, in their chapter for this collection, examine the narratives and metaphors for Indian identity offered by those struggling for independence in the first half of the 20th century. Western politicians and Islamist groups hold to contrary myths to express their understanding of Middle Eastern issues (Bottici & Challand 2006), and parties to the civil war in Yugoslavia have done the same. So, for instance, a crucial component of modern Serbian nationalism has been the myth of continuous Serb resistance to Ottoman rule since the Battle of Kosovo in 1389. I was personally confronted by the emergence of another political myth when I visited Croatia, another of the states into which Yugoslavia disintegrated, shortly after the breakup, where I was presented with a new school history book, which declared that the Croats, who had previously been referred to as an indistinguishable portion of the South Slav migrant tribes that arrived in the region in the late 6th century, were now described as a distinct people who had originally come from Persia. This amendment to the previously accepted history tends, of course, to offer greater legitimacy to the recently completed move to the independence of Croatia.

Phillip L. Hammack (2011) illustrates vividly the way in which the grand narrative of identity that any group tells of itself blends personal experience with shared narratives. So, he shows how the collective narrative shared by many young Israelis today is an amalgam of fragments derived from Biblical stories of the Jewish people, from the narrative of the diaspora, the Holocaust, and family experience in the state of Israel, whereas the collective narrative of most young Palestinians is an amalgam of fragments derived from strands of political Islam and from their experience of successive occupations, Turkish, British, and now Jewish. Whereas young Israelis "narrate redemptive stories," the "Palestinian life stories assume a tragic form that appropriates the national narrative of collective loss and continued failure to achieve independence" (Hammack, 2011; Hammack & Pilecki, 2012, p. 9). Molly Andrews (2007) is another scholar who has worked extensively on the intersection of personal and communal narratives of political experience.

Associated with the grand narratives of identity are a series of metaphors, often culturally specific, relating to fundamental beliefs about human existence, and social structure and organization. Two of the most durable such metaphors are found in Chinese culture, in which the metaphor of the state as

patriarchal family, deriving from Confucius and of society as musical harmony pervade the political history of East Asia to this day. It is noteworthy that the term "harmonious society" was still a central concept in the policies of Hu Jintao (Perris, 1983; Ringmar, 2008). Martin Gannon and others have sought to identify single metaphors that, to some degree, encapsulate the attitudes and political ideas of each country. So, Gannon (2001) identifies the "Dance of Shiva" as offering a key image of circularity in biological, family, and social existence for Indian culture. Ireland is epitomized by the metaphor of "Conversation" and Britain by the metaphor of the typical, self-contained British house. In the West, the body metaphors and the machine metaphors, already discussed, have been augmented by numerous secondary metaphors—usually binary—relating to gender, religion, ethnicity, and so on. Metaphors of purity and contamination (often associated with the image of the nation as woman) are to be found in the political and religious discourse of many cultures. These metaphors are susceptible to being adapted to present conflict with another community or nation in narrative terms as an epic battle between good and evil, purity and impurity, true religion and the infidel, and/or freedom and enslavement (Charteris-Black, 2005). Such culture-specific narratives and associated metaphors come to serve as reference items that may be utilized by communal and national leaders for their own purposes. Indeed, they do not function as stable entities, but are constantly renegotiated.

Although more work has been done on the narratives and metaphors associated with conflict between ethnic and religious communities, much the same phenomenon is in operation in debate between antagonistic political parties or groups. In many cases, it is a matter of one party or faction embracing a particular narrative–metaphor formulation and the other embracing a contrasting formulation. So, for instance, on the domestic level, it is clear that, in many settler nations, notably the US, those advocating assimilation of all migrants have long maintained the "melting pot" metaphor, whereas those advocating multiculturalism have opted for metaphors such as "mosaic," "salad bowl," or "patchwork quilt" (Halstead 2007).

Reservoirs of Narratives and Metaphors on Which Opposing Sides Can Draw

However, as Robert Reich, political economist and labor secretary in Bill Clinton's first administration, explained 25 years ago, some nations or communities formulate and hold on to a set of narrative schemata (with associated metaphors) which representatives of competing parties can draw on equally. In his *Tales of a new America* (1987), he outlined four "morality tales" to which Americans of all political persuasions intuitively refer: "the mob at the gates," "the triumphant individual," "the benevolent community," and "the rot at the top." The notion that the same basic stories serve as a common reservoir on which opposing groups may draw for very different political purposes is

especially important. So the tale of "the benevolent community" may be told by Democrats to highlight the desirability of a comprehensive health and social welfare program, which will serve those who encounter misfortune, whereas the same tale may be told by Republicans to show that, because we all look after our neighbors on an individual basis, there is no need for a socialized system. Crucial in the context of the present discussion is the way in which these tales come to be distilled down to phrases that are essentially *metaphorical*, for example, "the mob at the gates" and "the rot at the top," and it is this fact that makes them so open to multiple interpretations (Reich, 1987). The "rot at the top" metaphor has most recently been utilized especially to refer to bankers! The intersection of narrative and metaphor occurs at many points, including metaphors occurring as "lexical triggers," often in metaphorical form (e.g., light vs. dark) which set off one of the repository of narratives (Esch, 2010, p. 376).

It has been argued by Chiara Bottici and Benoit Challand (2010) that the "clash of civilizations" hypothesis proposed by Samuel Huntington in the mid-1990s is less a valid description of the nature of conflicts in the current period than a political myth to which, like Reich's (1987) four tales, opposing groups subscribe, but in contrasting ways. On the Western side, Islam is widely represented in the media as fanatical, opposed to modernity, and barbaric, whereas, influential Muslim sources represent the West as idolatrous, materialistic, and imperialistic (Bottici, in this volume).

Research Programs on Narrative and Metaphor by American Intelligence Agencies

The importance of narrative and metaphor in politics has been affirmed in a startling manner recently through initiatives by two American intelligence research agencies. Early in 2011, the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) launched a project titled "Narrative Networks" to explore the relevance of narrative to national security. Meanwhile, a second intelligence research agency, the Intelligence Advanced Research Projects Activity (IARPA), announced a multimillion-dollar Metaphor Program to develop software for "recognizing, defining and categorizing" metaphor patterns in key languages (including Iranian Farsi and Russian) which might offer insight into the cultural beliefs and worldview of their speakers (IARPA, 2011). The two agencies have invited the collaboration of researchers from disciplines as diverse as political science, cognitive linguistics, narrative analysis, neuroscience, language research, cultural anthropology, and computational linguistics in developing instruments that might be of practical utility to the intelligence agencies.

The DARPA narrative project starts from the recognition that "[n]arratives exert a powerful influence on human thoughts and behavior. They consolidate memory, shape emotions, cue heuristics and biases in judgment, influence

in-group/out-group distinctions, and may affect the fundamental contents of personal identity" (DARPA, 2011). So it is claimed that "stories are important in security contexts: for example, they change the course of insurgencies, frame negotiations, play a role in political radicalization, influence the methods and goals of violent social movements, and are likely play a role in clinical conditions important to the military such as post-traumatic stress disorder" (ibid.). It is not easy to tell how aware the originators of the project are of current work on political myth or how likely it is that the researchers will engage with the concept. Researchers are expected to "revolutionize the study of narratives and narrative influence by advancing narrative analysis and neuroscience so as to create new narrative influence sensors, doubling status quo capacity to forecast narrative influence" (DARPA, 2011). Given the technological bias of this invitation to researchers, it is unclear how much they are likely to explore the potentially very fruitful area of political myth, not only the myths propounded in countries seen as hostile to the US but also, at least as important, the myths that are so frequently embodied in the international attitudes and policy of the US itself.

The IARPA (2011) project "will exploit the fact that metaphors are pervasive in everyday talk and reveal the underlying beliefs and worldviews of members of a culture." It aims to "develop automated tools and techniques for recognizing, defining and categorizing linguistic metaphors associated with target concepts and found in large amounts of native-language text." It will then seek to "characterize differing cultural perspectives associated with case studies of the types of interest to the Intelligence Community" (IARPA, 2011). Commentators suggest it will especially examine the part played by metaphors in fostering terrorism and insurgency (Madrigal, 2011). The grand cultural–political metaphors held by people in other cultures and nations, which I have referred to earlier, should be of the greatest possible interest to the originators of the project. Yet here, too, it seems that the agency, in emphasizing technological analysis of "large amounts of text" in key languages has missed several crucial points. The push to automization, assuming, as it does, that language is static and that human beings work as simple stimulus-response machines, ignores some of the fundamental findings of cognitive science.[8] Insight into the constantly shifting grand metaphors through which politicians and citizens of other countries frame their political thinking and behavior is almost certainly more readily gained from specialists in the culture, language, history, and politics of the countries concerned. Moreover, it appears that they, too, are missing the point that it is just as important and illuminating to analyze and evaluate the grand metaphors of their own culture and country.

Explanatory Narratives and Conceptual Metaphors Used by Scholars of Politics

Only quite recently have scholars working in the various subfields of political studies come to examine critically the narratives and the metaphors that they

themselves employ in theorizing about politics and interpreting political situations and events. Here, too, studies on metaphor have generally been conducted separately from studies on narrative.

Narrative in the Writing of Political History

Work on the narrative side stems from the fundamental challenge faced by political historians and commentators of explaining how a major event, whether in a domestic or international context, occurred—let alone of predicting how a situation might develop in the future. How did the transition from the apartheid regime to a multiracial democracy occur in South Africa? How did the collapse of the communist regimes in the USSR and Eastern Europe occur? How precisely did the Global Financial Crisis (GFC) come about, and why was it predicted by so few economists? And, looking to the future, when and how will the world emerge from the GFC? When and how will the terrible conflict in Syria end? According to Suganami (2008), the importance and problematic nature of narrative as explanation is often neglected in international relations, but much the same may be said of domestic politics. (See also Fasolt, 2004; Roberts, 2008.)

While historians long asserted that their profession involved reconstructing the past as it actually was, it has increasingly been acknowledged (Dray, 1971; White, 1984; Fasolt, 2004; etc.) that story forms are largely imposed on inherently shapeless and shifting events by narrators who must select from an infinite number of events and shape them in the light of a specific ideological framework (Miller, 1995; Suganami, 2008). In the words of philosopher of history Robert Anchor (1987), the function of narrative is to make "meaningful totalities out of scattered events by means of a plot or storyline" (pp. 133–134). It follows that radically different narrative interpretations may be imposed by commentators on a single cluster of events. As Suganami points out, conflicting narratives of "the same event" are likely to start from different points and to respond to different questions "and this is largely an issue of politics and ethics" (Suganami, 2008, p. 342). Nevertheless, an historical narrative will generally be presented as "coherent, meaningful, and relevant for the theoretical purposes the author specifies" (Wolfgram & Stevens, 2007). Suganami (2008) asserts that the three components of narrative explanation of political events are "chance coincidences, mechanistic processes and human acts" (p. 334). In assessing the validity of any particular account of events, we need to examine not only which data the commentator has included, and which excluded in that account, but the narrative devices, especially perspective, employed in its construction. One of the most vivid illustrations of multiple narratives that have been constructed around "the same event" is to be found in the numerous books written in the 1990s purporting to explain the origins of the war in Bosnia, each of which selects and recounts events differently. David Campbell (1998) offers a brilliant review of ten such books in his article "Metabosnia: Narratives of

the Bosnian War." He concludes that, while it makes sense to "give greater credence to those accounts which are more comprehensive, or more self-reflexive about their own presuppositions" (Campbell, 1998, p. 279), no single narrative will emerge as the only plausible one. He therefore follows Nietzsche in advocating that "only through the clash of competing narratives are we likely to assemble justifiable knowledge" (Campbell, 1998, p. 281).

To take up another of the cases referred to earlier, there has been much debate around how large a role Western powers, and especially the US under the presidency of Ronald Reagan, played in the fall of the Berlin Wall and the collapse of the Soviet Union, and how much that collapse was due rather to internal economic and social factors and the personal intervention of Mikhail Gorbachev. Behind such narratives lie broader theoretical debates over the attribution of agency, causality, and motivation versus structure in such narratives (Zashin & Chapman, 1974). As I wrote this section, in the weeks preceding the 2012 presidential election, there was ongoing debate in the US about whether the slowness of the American economic recovery since 2008 was the consequence primarily of inadequate policies on the part of President Obama, obstructionism by the Republicans in Congress, or of economic and political factors mainly outside the control of American politicians.

Metaphors in Political Theory and Analysis and the Narratives They Entail

Research on metaphors employed by political analysts and theorists has probably been even more wide-ranging than research on the narrative side. Major recent works are Michael P. Marks's (2011) *Metaphors in international relations theory* and Terrell Carver and Jernej Pikalo's (2008) edited volume *Political language and metaphor: Interpreting and changing the world*, the latter dipping into areas of both international and domestic politics. (See also Okulska & Cap, 2010, *Perspectives in politics and discourse*.) Central to their discussions is the assertion that metaphors are employed not merely for adornment or persuasion, but as constitutive elements in the theory itself. In the words of Carver and Pikalo, "[m]etaphors . . . inform and structure thinking on discourses and contexts" (2008, p. 4). These two works sketch considerable portions of the history of political theory in terms of the metaphors which have dominated in different periods. See, for instance, Pikalo's (2008) account of the shifts in European theory in the eighteenth century between organic and mechanical metaphors. And indeed, they point out that the names of many theories related to politics take the form of metaphors: "game" theory, "chaos" theory, "constructivist" theory, and so on. (On chaos theory in political science, see Font & Régis, 2006.)

In addition, they show how each of the schools of political theory in the modern period tends to adhere to a different set of key conceptual metaphors. So, for instance, the Realist school of international relations adheres to the

metaphor, coined by Hobbes in *Leviathan*, of states as "billiard balls" which collide with each other from time to time (Marks, 2011, p. 6). According to this metaphor, there are no good or bad states and "[o]nly the hard exteriors touch, and heavier or faster moving ones push others out of the way" (Burton, 1972, p. 28). (The "domino theory" of the Cold War period was, in a sense, an adaptation of this metaphor.) By contrast, the Liberal school sees international relations as a "web" or "cobweb" in which relations among states are in the form of intertwined threads (Marks, 2011, p. 6). The Constructivist School of international relations, which rejects the materialist theory (and metaphors) of both the Realists and the Liberals, appreciates, indeed encourages, the proliferation of metaphors, insisting that each metaphor takes its part in "constructing" the world it purports to describe: whether they are metaphors of the state as "container," "motion," "leverage," "balance of power," "sphere of influence" (and other mechanical metaphors); "the body," "family," "evolution" (and other biological and social metaphors); politics as a stage, with actors, and "theatres of war"; politics in terms of "profit and loss"; and so forth. Moreover, any single metaphor or metaphor cluster in the realm of political theory may generate a great variety of interpretations and narrative implications. Richard Little (2007), for instance, has shown that the notion of "balance of power" between nations, far from being an unambiguous reality, is a metaphor, which has been understood and applied in a wide range of different ways over the last 500 years.

Metaphors in Economics and the Narratives They Entail

Much interesting work on the metaphors employed in economics has been undertaken by economists with a background in the study of rhetoric. The key figures in this research are Deirdre McCloskey (1985, 1990, 1994, 2006, 2010), Philip Mirowski (1989), and Arjo Klamer (Klamer & Leonard 1994; Klamer 2009; Klamer & McCloskey 1991). It was McCloskey, in the early 1980s, who initiated discussion of "the rhetoric of economics." In the late 1980s, Mirowski argued that neoclassical economics was founded on (archaic) metaphors deriving from 19th-century physics. Klamer has surveyed the wide range of metaphors employed in economics. With Thomas C. Leonard, he has written a fascinating overview of the field, entitled "So what's an economic metaphor?" (Klamer & Leonard, 1994). They assert that metaphors function in economic discourse in four main ways: as heuristic devices we all, economists and laypeople, employ to conceptualize fresh ideas; as constitutive devices directly employed in theorizing; as pedagogical devices for communicating abstract concepts to laypeople; and as devices for persuading the general public of the desirability of this or that policy.

It would be both inappropriate and impossible to attempt to catalogue and analyze their rich findings here, and I shall limit myself rather to a brief summary of the reservoir of metaphors and narratives (some, but not all, originally generated by economists) on which politicians draw in discussing their policies

and records, and on which activists and the general public draw in discussion of economic matters.

We find three major clusters of metaphors in traditional discourse around economics: metaphors of engineering/physics, organic/body metaphors, and social metaphors. So, in the engineering/physics dimension, we talk of "price mechanisms," "equilibrium," "elasticities," "inflation," "policy instruments," "accelerators," "rise and fall in GNP," "pump priming," "overheating," and so on and so on. In the "organic" dimension, we speak of the economy being "sick," "healthy" or "unhealthy," "suffering," "in recovery," and of "economic prescriptions," among others. Of course, the metaphor of "the market" is neither mechanical nor organic; it is social, evoking, as it does, a vision of growers bringing to a town center the fruit and vegetables they have produced and making them available to willing consumers who will buy them on the basis of quality and price. So, "production and consumption," "supply and demand," "rational choice," "consumer satisfaction," and so forth are the buzzwords. Another key social metaphor, that of the journey, with its "ups and downs," "deviations," and "crossroads," more than any of the other clusters perhaps, obviously entails a range of possible narratives. Of course, many common notions in economics may be read as deriving from two clusters. So the concepts of "consumption" and "overheating" may be thought of as both mechanical and organic, whereas "social engineering" explicitly combines two clusters.

I shall leave further discussion of economic metaphors and narratives to the next major section of this chapter, where I shall seek to describe the main ways in which politicians, activists, and the public employ instrumentally the metaphors and narratives for the economy coined by economists.

Contesting Conventional Narratives and Metaphors

Some of the most interesting work on narrative and metaphor in political theory has been undertaken by scholars in indigenous and third-world studies, gender studies, and peace and conflict studies. They not only critique the metaphors and narratives conventionally employed in economics and international relations but also offer alternative metaphors and alternative narratives to represent more adequately the situation and experience of poor nations and marginalized groups. So Amartya Sen (1999) highlights the way in which the metaphor "development" has been identified exclusively with growth in GDP, industrialization, and social modernization, omitting reference to the freedoms (political freedoms, economic facilities, social opportunities, transparency guarantees, and protective security) which he sees as the goals to which development should aspire. In addition, he draws attention to the narrative and metaphorical inadequacy of most explanations of the incidence of hunger globally: "For the elimination of hunger in the modern world, it is crucial to understand the causations of famines in an adequately broad way, and not just in terms of some mechanical balance of food and population" (Sen, 1999, p. 161).

Similarly, feminist international relations specialists, such as Cynthia Enloe (1990), J. Ann Tickner (2001), Christine Sylvester (2013), and Annick T. R. Wibben (2011; a contributor to this project), underline the way in which conventional security studies narratives, focused as they are on high diplomacy, neglect the involvement of women and children as victims of state violence, ignore the possibility that women might influence state policies, and, more generally, fail to ask how the "security" of women, physical and psychological, might be better assured (Chisem, 2011). A number of scholars, especially feminist political scientists, have stressed the need to look behind the grand narratives of international politics and security, to seek out and record the complex and highly differentiated stories of personal experience, which frequently contradict, or at least complicate, the grand narratives (e.g., Chilton, 1996; Andrews, 2007; Wibben, 2011). Others have explored the implications of the use of terminology derived from drama in international relations (e.g., Sylvester, 2003). Scholars working in peace and conflict studies direct attention to the ways in which nations are drawn into conflict situations by the adoption of irreconcilable narratives of history and identity, spurred on by politicians and military leaders using inflammatory metaphors and narrative scenarios, and may be assisted to mend their relations likewise by mediators making skilful use of narrative and metaphor.

I shall detail and explore these kinds of critical and creative work by scholars in the following, final section of this chapter.

How Politicians, Activists, Journalists, and Citizens Seek to "Do Things With Narrative and Metaphor"

Making Sense of Politics With Narratives and Metaphors

Citizens need narrative to make sense of the political world. The narratives they create, or which are supplied to them respond to the questions, "What has happened? What is happening? How do I fit into this story? What might/should happen?" But they also need to fit those narratives into the grander narratives with which their social lives are framed. In the words of J. Hillis Miller (1995), "[t]he human capacity to tell stories is one way men and women collectively build a significant and orderly world around them" (p. 67). Equally, they need metaphors, to answer the questions, "What is this situation like? What model can I apply to this situation to think about how it might be resolved?" And, again, such metaphors will derive from, or need to be reconciled with, the grand metaphors through which they perceive their lives. In the words of Seth Thompson (1986), "Politics without metaphors is like a fish without water" (p. 185). In her chapter for this volume, Lori D. Bougher develops a comprehensive argument about the heuristic role of both narrative and metaphor in what she calls "civic cognition" and its implications for the education of citizens.

Although politicians exploit the need of citizens for political narratives and for metaphors, sometimes, but not always, effectively, and sometimes, but not always unscrupulously, they also need narratives and metaphors themselves to make sense of the political world. Unlikely though it may seem, politicians sometimes actually subscribe to the narratives and metaphors they utter.

Narrative, Metaphor, and Persuasion

The relevance of both narrative and metaphor to political persuasion is strong. Just as Ted Cohen (1979) represents metaphor as inviting the addressee to "intimacy," so Ross Chambers (1984) refers to the "seductive" power of narrative. While narrative draws the audience into understanding a situation in terms of the characters, agency, motivation, and causal connections proposed by the author, so metaphor draws the audience into viewing the situation through the conceptual lens proposed by the person who utters it. Politicians and activists seek to frame public thinking and discourse in relation to their actions and policies (past, present, and future) by the selection of narratives and metaphors, which will crystallize, often in simplified form, the situations in which they are embroiled. More generally, they compete with their rivals to capture the discursive space in politics. So, linguistics scholar George Lakoff and coauthor Elisabeth Wehling (2012) have recently published *The Little Blue Book: The Essential Guide to Thinking and Talking Democratic*, in which they assert that Democrats need to rework the language (especially the metaphors) of politics on their own terms: "They (conservatives) frame public debate in their own language over the whole range of issues. . . . And once they get the public thinking their way, they can control the media, elect their candidates, pass their legislation, and create a new status quo" (p. 62).

On the international level, too, governments interact with each other, whether in collaborative or antagonistic fashion largely by means of narrative and metaphor. Any pronouncement by a leader on international issues has both a domestic audience, in his or her own country, and an audience, of both politicians and citizens, in other countries. There have been comprehensive studies of the repertoire of metaphors employed by leading politicians and political activists in their speeches and writings, most notably *Politicians and rhetoric: The persuasive power of metaphor* by Jonathan Charteris-Black (2005), in which he examines the utterances of figures from Winston Churchill to Tony Blair, and from Martin Luther King, Jr. to George W. Bush, as they have sought to establish their ethical integrity, heighten the emotional impact of their message, and communicate their policies. Charteris-Black treats the stories told by each political figure as secondary to the metaphors they use, focusing especially on the way in which the use of a metaphor by a politician (e.g., of a country being "swamped" by immigrants) may trigger a political myth (that immigrants will come to outnumber natives; 2005, p. 23).

There have also been studies of narrative and metaphor in terms of their relevance to the psychology (including psychopathology) of political leaders. Ralph Pettman (2011), in his *Psychopathology and world politics*, explores the

role of deluded narratives and metaphors in maintaining not only the self-belief of unhinged national leaders, but also the hold they have over their followers. (Perhaps Bashar Al-Assad really *does* believe that he is the "surgeon" fighting to save the life of his people? See also Robins & Post, 1997.)

Metaphor and Narrative in Public Debate About Economics

Returning to the clusters of metaphors for the economy generated by economists, it has been suggested by some commentators that politicians and activists on the left adhere primarily to the "engineering" metaphors (favoring, as they generally do, government interventions in such areas as regulation and taxation), whereas those on the right prefer the organic metaphors (as they expect a "sick" economy to recover if only the "fresh air" of deregulation is assured). See, for instance, a blog by P. Rosenberg (2011), titled "The Economy Is a Machine, Not a Body: The Unseen Power of Metaphors in Guiding How We Think Could Be Key to Escaping from a Prolonged Economic Crisis." Illuminating usage on the other side, John Papola and Russ Roberts (2011) produced a wonderful rap spoof "Fight of the Century," in which their caricature of F. A. Hayek, chants, "The economy's us, we don't need a mechanic/Put away the wrenches, the economy's organic" (see http://econstories.tv/2011/04/28/fight-of-the-century-music-video/). Nevertheless, a glance at public discussions about the economy, such as the policy statements of the Republican and Democrat candidates in the 2012 US presidential election reveals a more confused picture. While Mitt Romney's team certainly spoke of the economy as being "weak" and "anemic," of government spending as "bloated," of the need for "a budget framework that does not threaten our fiscal health" and for "a healthy financial system," it also referred to "the wrenches that the Obama administration has thrown into the economy," its tendency to "ratchet up permanently the size of government," and the need to "reignite the job-creating engine of the United States" and "repair the nation's tax code." It also regularly employed metaphors from the "journey" cluster, referring to the need to get the economy "back on the rails," to the way in which, under previous Republican administrations, "[a]fter we hit bad patches, as in the early years of Ronald Reagan's presidency, the economy came roaring back," and to the Republican candidate having an economic "road map" for the future.

Interestingly, the Democrats employed all of the same metaphor clusters—mechanical, organic and social—but with a different weighting and effect. The social metaphors were particularly prominent. In some of his speeches about the domestic economy, Barack Obama wove rich tapestries of narrative and metaphor, which drew on domains outside those to which economists themselves refer. At the start of a major speech in Osawatomie, Kansas, in late 2011, Barack Obama, began by asserting "I have roots here" and went on to weave together story elements from the lives of his maternal grandparents in World War II ("He was a soldier in Patton's army; she was a worker on a bomber assembly line"), their belief "in an America where hard work paid off, and responsibility was rewarded, and anyone could make it if they tried" and the

rise of "the largest middle class and the strongest economy that the world has ever known." Then he sought to tell the story of the decline of the American middle class:

> the basic bargain that made this country great has eroded. Long before the recession hit, hard work stopped paying off for too many people. Fewer and fewer of the folks who contributed to the success of our economy actually benefited from that success. Those at the very top grew wealthier from their incomes and investments—wealthier than before. But everyone else struggled with costs that were growing and paychecks that weren't . . . (Obama, 2011)

So the current crisis did not come out of the blue and, in his account of its origins, he inserted a host of homely metaphors: "for many years, credit cards and home equity loans *papered over* this harsh reality. But in 2008, *the house of cards collapsed* . . . innocent, hardworking Americans who had met their responsibilities . . . were still *left holding the bag*" (Obama, 2011, my italics). The Republicans, he said, "want to go back to the same policies that *stacked the deck* against middle-class Americans for way too many years. Their philosophy is simple: We are better off when everybody is left to fend for themselves and play by their own rules" (Obama, 2011). Although Obama was directly addressing the middle-class citizens of Kansas, he was actually seeking to communicate with those who see themselves as middle class, all over the country, including those with jobs and those who have become unemployed, those who have retained their houses, and those who have lost their homes. Through both the narrative fragments and the metaphors, he was seeking to build both a collective memory and a collective vision for the future with a large portion of the American population. (In their chapter for this volume, Cris Shore and Susan Wright highlight the contrasting narratives and metaphors employed by George W. Bush and Barack Obama in international affairs.)

One of the most striking specific contrasts in the use of a single metaphor between the utterances of Romney and Obama relates to the term *family*. Romney and the Republicans (and especially the Tea Party movement) have used the term to refer to their mandatory ideal of a heterosexual married (Christian) couple and their children and make a quite misleading analogy between the economics of a government and the economics of running a household. Obama, by contrast, regularly employs the term in a strongly metaphorical sense to encompass the American population as a whole, in all its ethnic, political, social, and sexual diversity.

A dramatic metaphor from the social (journeying) cluster which recurred regularly in the economic discourse of both major parties towards that of the "fiscal cliff" which the US faced at the end of 2012 (resulting in tax increases, spending cuts, and a corresponding reduction in the budget deficit) if new legislation was not agreed. George Lakoff, 2012, wrote a wonderful little blog, titled "Why It's Hard to Replace the Metaphor of the 'Fiscal Cliff,'" discussing

Paul Krugman's suggestion that the real danger of the present situation is the Republicans' proposal for an "austerity bomb" and Robert Reich's recommendation that "bungee-jumping over the fiscal cliff" would be a better strategy (Lakoff, 2012). Another, homely, typically American, metaphor on which the two parties have diametrically opposed views is that of the economic "pie." For those on the right, the priority is to "grow the pie" (on the assumption that all will benefit from that growth), whereas those on the left focus more on the fairness of the distribution of the pie, whether it is growing or shrinking.

Within western economies, there is wide agreement that "the market" is a key factor in economic prosperity. The major disagreement concerns the extent to which the functioning of the market should be regulated by legislation and be counterbalanced by social considerations. For those on the right, the term "market" is used as if it denoted a literal (indeed unquestionable) reality. A major objection from those on the left is the way in which, by a further metaphorical leap, it is applied (again often unquestioningly) to fields such as healthcare and education. So the hospital patient and the school or university student are now "customers" or "clients" who are offered "consumer choice" among competing institutions, which should be obliged to lay out their wares in front of them. This process has reached the point where the concept of "the citizen" has been split into the very different concepts of "stakeholder" and "consumer" (Patterson, 1998; Yeager, 2011). Political and economic theorists should doubtless take some responsibility for the tendency to employ metaphor in such reductive and literalizing ways. It is noticeable that economists who seek to debunk neoclassical economics regularly deploy analogies with the history of other disciplines to illustrate how backward their opponents are. So economist Steve Keen (2011), for instance, asserts, "The reason they continue with this delusion [free market economics] is for the same reason that astronomers stuck with the Ptolemaic version of the solar system long after anomalies were discovered between the theory's predictions and observation: it's all they know, and their whole world is organized around it" (Pilkington, 2011).[9] I look forward eagerly to the undergraduate economics textbook long promised by Deirdre McCloskey, Arjo Klamer, and others titled *The Economic Conversation*, now projected to be published by Palgrave/Macmillan in 2014.

Environmental and third-world activists have developed their own traditions of metaphor (and narrative) usage in relation to economic and associated issues (Luks, 1998). I have already referred to Amartya Sen's (1999) critique of the terms "growth" and "development" as they have been conventionally used, without reference to human rights and fair distribution of wealth. By and large, the metaphors they employ link the organic and the social domains, to assert that human beings should see themselves as members of a fragile ecological system which encompasses all of humanity and the physical world—and the term *system* is used in an organic, rather than mechanical sense. The terms *renewable*, *sustainable*, *interdependence*, *depletion or degradation of natural resources*, and *species extinction* recur (United Nations Environment Program, 2011).

Politicians Employ Narrative and Metaphor in Relation to International Conflicts

When politicians speak on international topics, they are generally addressing both a domestic and a foreign audience, and the latter may be divided between the specialists (politicians, diplomats or businesspeople) and a more general foreign audience. One of the difficulties of such speeches is that a narrative or a cluster of metaphors may work well with one of those audiences and badly with another. One of the most striking modern examples of a metaphor that hit the wrong note for a large part of the foreign audience (as well as many in the domestic audience) was that chosen by President George W. Bush in announcing the first retaliatory action after the attacks of September 11 2001, "[t]his *crusade*," which was understood, not surprisingly, by many Muslims who may have had no sympathy for Al-Qaeda, as foreshadowing a general attack on Islam.

By contrast, President Obama used a speech in Cairo in May 2009 to try to set the relationship between the US and the countries of the Middle East on a new and more positive footing. As with the Osawatomie speech, he wove together narrative fragments of several different kinds to remarkable effect. He spoke of the 1,000-year history of the Islamic institutions of learning that hosted him; centuries of coexistence and cooperation between Middle Eastern countries and the West, but also the history of conflict and religious wars; the regrettable reality of Western colonialism in the Middle East in the 20th century; the growing sense among Muslims that the West is hostile to Islam; the attacks on US soil of 9/11; his own early personal positive familiarity with Islam, growing up in Indonesia; the curious fact that Morocco was the first nation in 1796 to recognize the newly established US. With this composite narrative he sought to evoke a context in which a positive relationship between the US and the countries of the Middle East might seem feasible. The initial response from political leaders in the region (with the exception of the leadership in Iran) was very positive. How it was received in Kansas, I do not know.

Political actors may seek to build a relatively sustained narrative (as Obama did in his Cairo speech) or they may make a series of brief narrative utterances, whether in statement or question form, which do not constitute a complete narrative. This was the tactic of Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad when he made his notorious speech attacking the US and the West to the United Nations on September 22, 2011. Cleverly, he mixes statements; for example, "Approximately, three billion people of the world live on less than 2.5 dollars a day, and over a billion people live without having even one sufficient meal on a daily basis" and questions, for example, "Who abducted forcefully tens of millions of people from their homes in Africa and other regions of the world during the dark period of slavery, making them a victim of their materialistic greed?" and a reference to the assistance the US and Britain had previously given to Saddam Hussein in the war between Iraq and Iran, all of which it was

difficult for anyone to contradict, with statements, which few could accept, doubting the reality of the Holocaust and alluding to "the mysterious September 11 incident," in such a way as to suggest that the latter was orchestrated by the US administration to offer a pretext for attacking Afghanistan and Iraq.

On occasions, a metaphorical term will come to circulate widely in one part of the world in relation to events in another part, with those who use it assuming wrongly that the protagonists in those events have used it about themselves. A prime current example is the term *Arab Spring*, which was apparently coined by American commentator Marc Lynch in the journal *Foreign Policy* in January 2011 and was taken up generally in the West. As Arab politics scholar Joseph Massad has pointed out, the term used by activists in the various states of North Africa and the Middle East is rather "the Arab Revolution" (Massad, 2012). Moreover, Massad asserts that "[t]he dubbing of the uprisings in the Arab world by western governments and media as 'Arab Spring' . . . was not simply an arbitrary or even seasonal choice of nomenclature, but rather a US strategy of controlling their aims and goals." The West was illegitimately seeking to associate itself with, and even take some credit for, uprisings against regimes that had actually "served US interests faithfully for a long time" (Massad, 2012).

It has been pointed out that political leaders will often construct metaphor clusters in an international context, whose ambiguity they exploit in the defense of their actions and policies. One of the most vivid examples of this is detailed by Dalia Gavriely-Nuri (2010), who catalogues the many ways in which successive Israeli leaders have employed the phrase "extend the hand of peace" to justify their policies towards the Palestinians and Lebanon. From its first articulation in "The Declaration of the Establishment of the State of Israel" (1948), "it has been repeated endlessly in speeches made by Israeli political leaders . . . While expressing the sincere will to make peace, use of the metaphor simultaneously demonstrates moral superiority, feelings of deprivation, latent threats, and recognition of its handiness for creating a positive image abroad" (Gavriely-Nuri, 2010, p. 449). The extreme elasticity of its use by different Israeli leaders is best illustrated in the words of Moshe Dayan and Yitzchak Rabin. Following Israel's victory in the 1967 Six-Day War, Dayan made the essentially self-contradictory declaration: "We have returned to the most sacred of our holy places. We have returned in order never to be separated again . . . To our Arab neighbors, we extend, even at this hour—and especially at this hour—our hand in peace" (quoted in Gavriely-Nuri, 2008, p. 458). Rabin used "a creative and picturesque version of the metaphor" (Gavriely-Nuri's words) in response to a Palestinian terror attack just a year after signing the Oslo Accords in 1993: "Our hand is always extended in peace but its fingers are always on the trigger" (quoted in Gavriely-Nuri, 2008, p. 458). The phrase "extend our hand in peace" has, she asserts, become a public relations phrase, which will be picked up by Israel's supporters internationally as a sign of their good faith. She goes on to point out that, by 2002, Yasser Arafat "had learned

to use the metaphor's connotations to turn the tables on the Israelis" (Gavriely-Nuri, 2008, p. 461). Leaders on both sides were asserting that their sincere offers of peace were meeting with no response.

One of the moments that most fully challenge politicians' rhetorical powers is when they take a nation into war—or into a form of military intervention that they choose not to call war. In recent times, examples of the former would include the first President Bush taking the US into the First War in Iraq, and the second President Bush and British prime minister Tony Blair taking their countries into wars in both Afghanistan and Iraq, and an example of the latter is the US intervention in Haiti after the earthquake. The narratives they constructed and the metaphors, old or new, which they employed played crucial roles in their attempts to legitimate their actions and persuade the leaders of other countries and their own citizens. In the case of the First Iraq War, George Lakoff (2003) was one of the first to highlight the role of metaphor in the president's justification of the war. "Metaphors can kill. The discourse over whether to go to war in the Gulf was a panorama of metaphor" (Lakoff, 2003). He drew attention to the reliance on the "widespread, relatively fixed set of metaphors" of cost-benefit and the implicit underlying metaphors of politics as business and morality as accounting (ibid.). In addition, there was the process of personification, by which Iraq was identified with Saddam Hussein and the war was represented as a form of hand-to-hand combat. "Thus, the US sought to 'push Iraq back out of Kuwait' or 'deal the enemy a heavy blow,' or 'deliver a knockout punch'" (ibid.). (As Charteris-Black, 2005, indicates, the identification of the whole population of Iraq with its government actually involves a process of depersonification, which tends to make the killing of non-military citizens more acceptable.) Lakoff also pointed out that elements from the typical fairy tale were applied to the war. In referring to the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait as "rape," Bush evoked the stock figures of narratology: Saddam Hussein as villain, Kuwait as victim, the United States and its partners as heroic rescuers, Saudi Arabia as benevolent helper etc., though many of us had difficulty in seeing the corrupt royal family in Kuwait as a damsel in distress (Lakoff, 2003). In the case of the Second Iraq War, there has been much criticism of the lack of truthfulness of the narrative by which the second President Bush justified the invasion, especially the claims that Saddam Hussein was building up new weapons of mass destruction and that Al-Qaeda was active in Iraq and of the amnesia shown by the American and British leadership about their earlier support for Saddam Hussein, now judged villainous, during the Iran–Iraq war. In addition, Bush's confidence that the "liberation" of Iraq would be achieved quickly and (relatively) painlessly proved misplaced.

In initiating military intervention, US administrations have often combined narrative and metaphor in formulae by which they deny that the present case will follow the pattern of some earlier (disastrous) intervention; for example, "this will not be another Vietnam," and intervening in Haiti after the earthquake "will not be like Somalia" (Freeman, 2009). It is likewise regularly argued that

the failure to intervene at an early point in a conflict situation would involve Munich-like appeasement (Thompson, 1996, p. 192).

The rhetorical strategy of reductive identification of a country with its leader or even with a faction within its government, for example, Iran with President Ahmadinejad or Palestinians with the Hamas leadership, is particularly common (Wendt, 1992). It is found in the extraordinary statement by presidential candidate Romney that "the Palestinians have no interest whatsoever in establishing peace" (Stein, 2012).

A key metaphorical formula that has circulated over the last 11 years has been "the War on Terror." Its acceptance by most of the media and, consequently, by a high proportion of ordinary citizens is, to say the least, alarming. There has, in fact, been little recognition that the phrase is indeed a metaphor—the tendency is rather to understand it literally. There have, even so, been several significant attempts at deconstruction of the metaphor. Stuart Croft, for instance, sees the phrase as embodying a meta-narrative with four main elements: (1) the construction of the enemy as a bunch of evil-doers who attacked innocent U.S. citizens because they hate freedom and democracy; (2) the idea that no one within the federal government should be blamed for what happened on September 11, 2001; (3) the claim that the United States has the sacred mission to fight for freedom and justice; (4) the belief this fight should take a global form, under the leadership of the United States but with strong international support (Croft, 2006).

More specifically, and currently, there is much discussion of the implications for counter-terrorist activity of the various metaphors chosen to represent terrorism (Kruglanski, Crenshaw, Post, & Victoroff, 2007). One of the most interesting examples is the paper by Kruglanski et al. (2007) who analyze the very different metaphors for describing the phenomenon of terrorism itself: as "war," as "disease," as "crime," as "product of prejudice." They argue that each of these four main metaphors generates a corresponding metaphor for counter-terrorism: "defensive war," "containment of social epidemic," "law enforcement," "process of prejudice reduction," each with its own narrative entailment and its own strengths and weaknesses (Kruglanski et al., 2007). Consequently, they argue that, rather than seizing on any one of them as the single appropriate metaphor, it is desirable to move between them in a critical and analytical way.

Another demanding situation is maintaining antagonism or rivalry towards another country, where a frozen metaphor and/or competing analogical narratives are often employed. So, for instance, the terms *Cold War* and *arms race* were employed on both sides to refer to the more than 40-year period of tension between the countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the Soviet Union and its allies. As Edelman (1971) explains, each side held to a myth that "revolves around hostile plotters and benevolent leaders, and both factions carefully plan the future and can shape it according to their plans" (p. 77). President Ronald Reagan significantly altered this relationship when, in 1983, he first used the term *Evil Empire* for the USSR. The characterization

demeaned the Soviet Union and angered Soviet leaders. For his American audience, the phrase evoked equally science fiction and biblical associations—it is significant that his very first recorded use of it was in a speech on March 8, 1983 to the National Association of Evangelicals in Orlando, Florida. Reagan said,

> They preach the supremacy of the state, declare its omnipotence over individual man and predict its eventual domination of all peoples on the Earth. They are the focus of evil in the modern world. . . . So, in your discussions of the nuclear freeze proposals, I urge you to beware the temptation of pride, the temptation of blithely declaring yourselves above it all and label both sides equally at fault, to ignore the facts of history and the aggressive impulses of an evil empire, to simply call the arms race a giant misunderstanding and thereby remove yourself from the struggle between right and wrong and good and evil. (Reagan, 1983)

The Soviet Union, for its part, alleged that the United States was an imperialist superpower seeking to dominate the entire world, and that it was fighting against the US in the name of humanity. (On occasions, Soviet leaders referred to their relationship with the West in less grand and more colloquial metaphorical terms. So, Nikita Khruschchev declared in a speech in Yugoslavia on August 24 1963, "Berlin is the testicle of the West. When I want the West to scream, I squeeze on Berlin.")

One of the most interesting pairs of narrative/metaphorical formulations relating to situations of long-term international antagonism is to be found in the way in which Castro's administration in Cuba and successive administrations in the US have represented their relationship. It has been pointed out that

> Cuban leaders often characterize the relationship with the metaphor of David and Goliath, which conveys the image of a small, valiant defender facing an enormous aggressor. American leaders invoke images of Gulliver and the Lilliputians, in which the giant is benign and honorable. He chooses to suffer the pinpricks that the little people occasionally inflict on him rather than destroy the attackers, which he could do easily, because the giant's intention is to help them not kill them. (Brenner & Castro, 2000, p. 236)

One of the more bizarre metaphorical characterizations of a group of nations is George W. Bush's representation in his 2002 State of the Nation speech of N. Korea, Iran and Iraq as an "Axis of Evil" of nations which contributed to terrorism and sought weapons of mass destruction. The phrase suggested a parallel with the alliance among the Axis powers of the Second World War and also (like Reagan's "Evil Empire") a biblical reference. Matt Bonham has studied this phrase in detail. He and his coauthor highlight the oddness of suggesting that

there was some kind of alliance between the governments of Iran and Iraq, which had long been at war with each other and a third, very distant nation, North Korea, with which neither had strong relations (Heradtsveit & Bonham, 2007). They underline the fact that Bush's wish was to present to the American public the case in a very few words for the war to dislodge Saddam Hussein, which he would initiate the following year (Heradtsveit & Bonham, 2007).

The Iranian leadership was particularly offended by the associations of this phrase, seeing it as indicating the US administration's preoccupation with glossing over its true motivations, especially its religious and economic inspirations, for involvement in the Middle East. Other commentators have drawn attention to the tendency for the Chinese and American governments to misunderstand metaphors used by the other. L. Su (2004) writes of the challenge for Westerners in understanding Chinese metaphorical idioms that derive from a specific historical or mythical event, whereas Edward Slingerland and others (2007) look at the specific case of diplomatic communications over the collision in 2001 of an American and a Chinese plane over international waters. They points to a mismatch between the Chinese metaphors, which depicted them as "victims" and the American metaphors which depicted the situation as involving a "game" requiring "a technical fix" (Slingerland et al., 2007). In Slingerland et al.'s (2007) words, "[a]s long as neither side acknowledged the contingent nature of their own framing, nor the competing metaphorical frame of the other, then consequently, each counterpart's attitudes and behavior must only have seemed irrationally hysterical or brutally insensitive to the other" (p. 73).

Narratives and Metaphors of Collaboration, Solidarity, and Negotiation

There are other situations of interaction and negotiation, in which national leaders employ narrative and metaphor in collaborative enterprises. Research on this topic mostly focuses on the conceptual metaphors involved in international collaboration. The chapter by one of the contributors to this volume, Michael P. Marks, concerns the conceptual metaphors involved in international collaboration in the broad sense (see also Docherty, 2004). Work has also been done on the role of metaphor in shaping the identity of the United Nations. Researcher Lisa J. McEntee-Atalianis (2011), who examined speeches by the secretary-general of one of its agencies, found that metaphors were basically organized in binary, polarized form to represent the organization as seeking to promote a series of positive objectives and to protect its members against the negative forces threatening it. The agency itself is anthropomorphized through metaphors associated with personhood, caring and responsibility, natural life cycle, and family. Its activities are depicted using image schemas implying a range of narratives of journey, construction, and war (against global threats of illegal and disruptive activities).

One of the richest areas for research has been that of the metaphors that have been employed by politicians and officials in the various countries of the European Union to describe the processes of development and integration in the organization. So, Paul Chilton and Mikhail Ilyin (1993) have pointed out that, when representatives of different countries use the term "common European house" to refer to the EU, each will tend to be referring back to the shape which houses typically take in their own country, which varies from the apartment block to the single family home.[10] Cris Shore (1997) catalogues the metaphors employed within the EU to refer to integration under the headings "journeying" (in some cases by road, in others by rail—which allows for countries to be derailed—even by bicycle, sometimes with a predetermined destination, sometimes with the destination still to be determined); "engineering" (with one or more countries serving as the "dynamo"); "container" (with countries being included or excluded); and "organic" (where the union grows and evolves). "Far from being simply window-dressing, used to embellish the political process with colorful imagery," writes Shore, "I suggest that these metaphors are central to the process of imagining and conceptualizing Europe. . . they are also key weapons in a struggle to direct and control the European agenda" (1997, p. 127). He poses a series of important questions, including "Whose interests are served by these metaphors of Europe? To what extent do they work as instruments of power? How do they lend legitimacy and authority to particular conceptions of Europe, while imposing silence or closure on other conceptions?"

Iseult Honohan (2008) explores the range of metaphors used to refer to solidarity, both within a nation and among nations. She points out that metaphors of "family" and "kinship" tend to suggest a bounded, unitary image and that the "friendship" and "team" metaphors imply the existence of an enemy, or at least an opposing group. She looks for alternative metaphors which take better account of diversity within and between nations. She sees the "archipelago" metaphor proposed by C. Kukathas as having some positive features, but still as suggesting that the individual islands of the archipelago are bounded. Her preference is for "social capital," partly because it recasts social connection in the terms of the dominant field of economics, but also because it underlines the value of multiple voluntary associations for building generalized trust. And, as she says, "[p]art of the success of 'social capital' may lie in the implicit ambiguity as to whether it is a kind of capital that belongs to society or an individual social resource" (Honohan, p. 78; see also Bartkus & Davis, 2009).

Aboriginal Australian lawyer Noel Pearson (2007) takes up the specific issue of identity in a multicultural society: "We need a better metaphor for popular comprehension of how people with varied identities come together to form a united nation," proposing "*layers* of identity." Unlike most commentators, in his proposal he explicitly shows how this metaphor entails (or is entailed by) a narrative: "The merging of unity and diversity in any nation requires a narrative that explains how assimilation into a national community, based on values

and institutions that have their basis in a particular history, is consistent with respect and tolerance for many layers of bridging and bonding identities within the nation" (Pearson, 2007; see also Halstead, 2007).

We are very familiar with the use of metaphors for different sorts of relations between countries. Alliances between countries are often referred to in terms of "friendship," "partnership," "commonwealth," and so on. Colonizers regularly referred to themselves as playing a "parental," "educational" or "guardian" role towards subject peoples, over whose land they sometimes established "protectorates." Governments may have good or bad relations with their "neighbors," among others.

Changing relations between governments are often expressed and, indeed, negotiated in metaphorical terms. In his chapter for this volume, Jeffery Scott Mio identifies three possible options when a negotiator is faced with a powerful metaphor in debate: ignore the metaphor, defeat the metaphor by means of another, or extend the metaphor, to turn it back against the speaker (p. 239). He argues, that "metaphor extension" may be the most effective tactic.

Narrative and Metaphor in Policy Making

A number of specialists in policy studies have focused on the role of metaphor in policy-making, drawing attention to the fact that the metaphor selected to define any problem tends to determine the policy options that will be investigated to resolve it (e.g. Schön, 1979; Thibodeau and Boroditsky, 2011; Yanow, 2000). Such options usually expand into narrative scenarios. As will be clear from cases already cited, this will be equally evident in the context of domestic problem solving (e.g., dealing with crime [Thibodeau & Boroditsky, 2011] or urban decay [Schön, 1979]), and in the context of international problem solving (e.g. the US dealing with terrorism.) This is not to say that policy makers should abandon the use of metaphors. In the words of Seth Thompson (1996), "the simplifying and clarifying function of metaphors makes policy decisions possible . . . metaphor is necessary to link tangible means to intangible ends" (p. 194). In addition to metaphors that positively frame a policy, however, there are metaphors employed, often to devastating effect, to undermine the policy of an opponent. In attacking the original healthcare reform proposal of the Clinton administration, those opposed to the plan on the grounds that some features of it would be overly bureaucratic came up with a pair of metaphors which dominated and quickly ended discussion of it. It was, they said, a system "with the compassion of the IRS and the efficiency of the Post Office" (Thompson, 1996, p. 195). From the perspective of an outsider such as myself, a curious feature of American debate around policy making in relation to such fields as health care and gun control is the unwillingness of politicians, voters, and the media to register and learn lessons from the narratives of nations whose policies in that field have been more successful.

Narrative and Metaphor in Peacemaking

There has been major interest, too, among peace activists and scholars of international relations in exploring the relevance of metaphor and narrative not only, as we have seen, to fomenting discord resulting in war, but also to making and maintaining peace. Most striking have been the initiatives to bring together scholars and citizens from countries and communities, which have formerly been at war, to see if they can rework the mutually exclusive narratives held by the various parties to the conflict into a single, multifaceted narrative comprehensible and acceptable to all. Charles Ingrao of Purdue University, for instance, has sought to contribute to future peace among the states of former Yugoslavia by bringing together more than 250 scholars from the Balkans, Europe and the United States for this purpose (Ingrao & Emmett, 2012; see also Bajraktari & Serwer, 2006). Phillip L. Hammack (2011) has studied initiatives for peacemaking in Israel/Palestine that have brought young Jewish Israelis and young Palestinians together to exchange narratives. Funk and Said (2004) explore the broader issue of whether it may be possible for mediators to assist representatives of Islam and of the West, if not to agree on a common narrative, at least to come to see the complementarity of the narratives to which they hold. "Islam and the West are truly between stories—between the stories of the past, and the story they must create. All who identify with Islam and with the West can become coauthors of this new story" (Funk & Said, 2004, p. 26).

Meanwhile, specialists in peace and conflict studies have also come to underline the utility of metaphor in peacemaking and in negotiation between parties in conflict (in political and other contexts). They emphasize the value of studying the metaphors employed by the various parties and by mediators, of seeking to replace the metaphors of war and violence with more neutral metaphors (e.g., conflict as game), and positive metaphors (e.g., conflict as tide, or dance, or continental divide, peace building as web weaving, peace builders as yeast, etc.; Min, 2004). (See www.beyondintractability.org for a valuable list of resources on the role of narrative and metaphor in conflict studies and resolution.) Martin Luther King, Jr. in his "I have a dream" speech of 1963 looked forward to being able "to transform the jangling discords of our world [often misquoted as "nation"] into a beautiful symphony of brotherhood." Jayne Seminare Docherty (2004) is one of very few writers on conflict studies to underline the role of both narrative and metaphor in war making and peacemaking.

Most attempts at peacemaking on the official level have used less creative metaphors, such as the "Roadmap for Peace" in the Israel–Palestine conflict, proposed in 2002–2003 by the US, the European Union, Russia, and the United Nations. The eventual goal of the plan was to achieve the vision of two states, a secure state of Israel and an independent, peaceful, democratic Palestinian state. The road map had the merit of proposing a staged series of actions on both sides, which would take the opposing parties along the "road" to eventual peace. As is well known, the first phase, which was supposed to include the end

to Palestinian violence, Palestinian political reform, Israeli withdrawal from Palestinian cities and freeze on settlement expansion, and Palestinian elections, was never fully implemented. The reasons for this included a refusal on the part of Ariel Sharon to implement the freeze on expansion of Israeli settlement in the Occupied Territories and the refusal of Hamas to implement a ceasefire. Over the following months and years, the plan collapsed. This, it may be said, reveals a weakness in the linear image of a road map: if the first stage of the journey is not completed, then there is no possibility of the remaining stages being accomplished.

Narrative and Metaphor in Election Campaigns

In election campaigns, especially presidential campaigns, the candidates, with the assistance of their speechwriters and backers, seek to construct images of themselves by means of narrative and metaphor, which will display them to best advantage, not only in terms of their political record and policies for the future but also in terms of their personal lives. Meanwhile, they strive, again largely by means of narrative and metaphor, to construct images of their opponent which suggest unreliability, mendacity, privilege, and so on. I am writing just a few weeks after the 2012 US presidential election, and it has been fascinating to see the two main candidates spinning narratives and fashioning metaphors for these purposes.

In mid-2010, in the run-up to the congressional elections, the website Global Language Monitor, which monitors news, blogs, and social networks, announced that the number one political buzzword was *narrative*. Although it may no longer hold quite so strong a position, it certainly continues to be a key term and concept in the political media. Its significance in the campaign context consists largely in the need for candidates and parties to build relatively simple narratives about their respective records and policies for the future that will, at as many points as possible, touch the self-narratives, including economic, moral and religious narratives, of a large proportion of voters. Two years later, in the run-up to the 2012 elections, the site's president Paul J. J. Payack wrote that it had observed profound differences between the actual concerns of the public and the political narratives of both parties. Interestingly, he notes that both candidates failed to respond to one of the top current buzzwords, the metaphorical expression "toxic politics" (Payack, 2012).[11]

Mitt Romney's speech accepting the Republican candidacy (which can be found at www.npr.org/2012/08/30/160357612/transcript-mitt-romneys-acceptance-speech) was designed "to convince Americans that his values were the same as theirs—that they could trust him just as much as trust where he wants to take the country." As a sympathetic commentator described it,

> he didn't so much give a speech but instead unveiled stories that allowed his listeners to see greater depth to the fabric of the man that Romney

> is—versus the man of which they may have read. Less a titan than a family man, Romney spoke of a life with children not unlike the lives of voters he seeks. Just as importantly, he addressed the economic conditions of viewers, not of a faceless economy. From their unemployment to their children's education, Romney spoke of people, not numbers. (Del Beccaro, 2012)

Obama's 2012 acceptance speech was organized around the metaphor of the two candidates offering divergent paths. Obama presented his record as demonstrating his endeavors to stimulate the economy, to save major industries, to ensure educational opportunities and adequate health care for all, and his opponent's record and program as failing on all those issues. He ended by declaring, almost in the gospel mode of Martin Luther King, Jr.

> America, I never said this journey would be easy, and I won't promise that now. Yes, our path is harder—but it leads to a better place. Yes our road is longer—but we travel it together. We don't turn back. We leave no one behind. We pull each other up. We draw strength from our victories, and we learn from our mistakes, but we keep our eyes fixed on that distant horizon, knowing that providence is with us, and that we are surely blessed to be citizens of the greatest nation on earth. (Obama, 2012)

In the first debate between Obama and Romney, it was interesting to find that Romney had appropriated the "two paths" metaphor. One of the contributors to this volume, Jeffery Scott Mio, has undertaken a piece of research, with other scholars, which suggests that candidates who use metaphor liberally are consistently seen as having more charisma than those who employ metaphor less (Mio, Riggio, Levin, & Reese, 2005). Given Obama's much greater propensity to use metaphor, it was interesting to see the 2012 election result bearing out that claim.

Narrative, Metaphor, and the Media

A rich store of metaphors is employed to describe the ideal role of the media in a democracy. I found the following descriptors in a single article by a respected commentator for the United Nations: "watchdog," "guardian of public interest," "conduit between governors and governed," serving to "inform, educate and engage the public," and "provide a culture of community conversation by activating inquiry on serious public issues," "buttressing and deepening democracy," and giving "voice to all sides of a conflict." The media may, however, "fan the flames of discord," be "manipulated," and "hobbled by stringent laws, monopolistic ownership and sometimes brute force" (Coronel, 2004).

Then there is the question of how journalists themselves employ narrative and metaphor in their own work and, as importantly, record and critique the narratives and metaphors utilized by politicians. The challenge of providing an

adequate narrative in relation to political events or situations is faced not only by historians writing of the past but by journalists and political commentators writing of ongoing situations. Crucial factors in determining the adequacy of a narrative report of a political situation are the energy and rigor with which information is collected, the extent to which views on all sides have been canvassed, the chronological starting point chosen, and the overall shape given to the story. In a conversation later in this volume, journalist and media professor Mark Danner talks of the way in which he, as a journalist, often thinks he knows "the true story" about a conflict situation before he visits the country concerned, but usually finds he must abandon that story once he has arrived there, and construct a fresh narrative which takes account of all he sees and hears there. To take a single instance, he explains how, in attempting to understand the miserable situation of Haitians in modern times, he felt he had to go back 250 years and retrace the history of external interventions (especially by the US) over successive years. Among the many temptations faced by those who work in the media are to repeat and recycle uncritically the partial or misleading narratives passed to them by politicians and the military (for instance, narratives around Saddam Hussein's retention of weapons of mass destruction), and Danner insists on the need for journalists to constantly question and critique the narratives offered them by governments and corporations. There has been a good deal of discussion, for instance, of the pros and cons of having journalists "embedded" with the troops in Iraq and Afghanistan, especially the difficulty they experience in gaining a broader perspective on the military and political situation in the country. (See, for instance, the blog for *The New York Times* of journalist Stephen Farrell, 2010, titled "Embedistan.")

Early in this chapter, I cited several examples of striking metaphors coined by journalists to illuminate a political situation. A specialist on the former Yugoslavia told me the other day (2013) that he could not imagine a more accurate image of the peace settlement which came out of the Dayton Accord than Julian Borger's: "Like a hastily applied plaster cast, it healed the wounds at the expense of setting Bosnia's bones at distorted, disfiguring angles" (Borger, 2012b). Only too often, however, journalists rely on banal, clichéd metaphors in their reporting and comment (for instance, of the "presidential race," "arm wrestle," etc.). There is, I have suggested, a specific responsibility on journalists to critique the often overly simple, sometimes downright deceptive, metaphors propagated by politicians and officials (for instance, that of the War on Terror). Mark Danner, in our conversation in this volume, explains the way in which he both critiques official or conventional narratives and metaphors and creates fresh narratives and fresh metaphors to capture the essence of a situation.

Conclusion

The broad message of this chapter concerns the need to be alert to the power of both narrative and metaphor in every form of political discourse. In the first

place, we need to be aware of their manipulation by politicians. Roy Peter Clark (2012), an American writer, editor, teacher of writing and president of the Poynter Institute for Media Studies, claims that we need "a professional Narrative Watcher" to "reveal how political parties and others seeking power use verifiable facts, half-truths, and misinformation to tell stories designed to promote their own interests." At the same time, we should scrutinize the political narratives and metaphors to which we ourselves subscribe. Australian aboriginal lawyer Noel Pearson (2007) asserted, "We often become prisoners of our own metaphors. Humans need metaphors to communicate and when metaphors work to capture complexity, they are wonderful. When they are inadequate they are worse than useless: they hold our collective imaginations captive and constrained." (See also Skinner & Squillacote, 2010).

The great American philosopher Martha Nussbaum (1997) has argued that, if we are all to participate fully in a democratic society, we must, first, develop the capacity for critical examination of our own ideas and traditions and, second see ourselves as human beings bound to all other human beings by ties of recognition and concern. Behind these two requirements she insists lies a third: the need for us all to develop "narrative imagination"—the capacity both to generate and to comprehend complex narrative (Nussbum, 1997). In the light of the "Warring with Words" project, I would like to add a fourth requirement: the ability to critique simplistic and dishonest metaphors employed by politicians and the media and to generate, and acknowledge the value of, multiple metaphors for any situation, so as to facilitate creative thinking about the issue in hand. (See also Baumer, Sinclair, & Tomlinson, 2010). Beyond that, I suggest the importance for us all to be constantly aware of the dynamic and varied relationship between narrative and metaphor in the political context.

Notes

1 Danner makes the point, in the conversation recorded for this book, that the title was almost certainly chosen by a *New York Times* subeditor, rather than himself.
2 For a sound introduction to narrative and narrative studies, see H. Porter Abbott (2002). For comprehensive coverage of most subfields within narrative studies, see Herman, Jahn, and Ryan (2010). For an introduction to metaphor, see Kövecses (2003). The nearest we have to an encyclopedic work on metaphor studies is Gibbs (2008).
3 In that article, I mistakenly asserted that Ricoeur made no explicit links between narrative and metaphor.
4 See also H. M. Drucker (1970).
5 For a discussion of the figure of Wonder Woman and the representation of the US, see Mitra Emad (2006).
6 Similarly, see Nussbaum (2004).
7 The second most durable political metaphor is almost certainly that of 'the ship of state', first outlined by Plato in Book 6 of the *Republic*. It, too, has been employed over the centuries to a host of different political purposes, with one of the most interesting recent examples being the claim that the role of government should be 'steering, rather than rowing' (Osborne and Gaebler, 1993).

8 I owe this observation to Phillip L. Hammack.
9 He makes a second analogy with physicists who resisted Planck's quantum theory.
10 The "European house" metaphor has taken on another dimension with the current economic crisis. So, for instance, British prime minister David Cameron countered the demands of Conservative colleagues who pressed for the UK to leave the EU at the start of the Eurocrisis, by saying that he found it "utterly indecent, threatening to move out of a street, just at the moment when your neighbor's house is on fire. Instead, you must help extinguishing the fire" (Cuperus, 2011).
11 The adjective *toxic* came to prominence in recent politics when "toxic debt" was seen to be a major contributing factors in the in the Global Financial Crisis.

References

Aghion, P., & Bolton, P. (1997, April). A theory of trickle-down growth and development. *The Review of Economic Studies, 64* (2), 151–172

Ahmadinejad, M. (2011, September 23). Address by H. E. Dr. Mahmoud Ahmadinejad President of the Islamic Republic of Iran Before the 66th Session of the United Nations General Assembly. Retrieved at http://publicintelligence.net/mahmoud-ahmadinejad-speech-to-un-general-assembly-transcript-september-22–2011/

Ahmed, A. S. (1995). "Ethnic cleansing": A metaphor for our time? *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 18* (1), 1–25.

Anchor, R. (1987). Narrativity and the transformation of historical consciousness. *Clio 16* (2), 121–137.

Anderson, B. O'G. (1991). *Imagined communities: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism* (Rev. and extended ed.). London: Verso.

Andrews, M. (2007). *Shaping history: Narratives of political change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Annas, G. (1995, March 16). Reframing the debate on health care reform by replacing our metaphors. *The New England Journal of Medicine, 332* (11), 744–747.

Anon note. (1997). Organic and mechanical metaphors in late eighteenth-century American political thought. *Harvard Law Review 110* (8), 1832–1849.

Bajraktari, Y., & Serwer, D. (2006). Explaining the Yugoslav catastrophe: The quest for a common narrative (United States Institute for Peace). Retrieved from: www.usip.org/publications/explaining-yugoslav-catastrophe-quest-common-narrative

Banks, K. (2009). Interpretations of the body politic and of natural bodies in late sixteenth-century France. In A. Musolff & Jörg Zinken (Eds.), *Metaphor and Discourse* (pp. 233–247). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bartkus, V. O., & Davis, J. H. (2009). *Social capital: Reaching out, reaching in.* Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Baumer, E. P. S., Sinclair, J., & Tomlinson, B. (2010). "America is like Metamucil": Fostering critical thinking and creative thinking about metaphor in political blogs. In *Proceedings of the 28th international conference on human factors in computing systems (CHI 2010)* (pp. 1437–1446). Atlanta: ACM Press.

Beer, F. A., & De Landtsheer, C. (2004). Metaphorical war and peace. In F. A. Beer & C. De Landtsheer (Eds.), *Metaphorical world politics* (pp. 111–120). East Lansing: Michigan University Press.

Bennett, W. L. (1980, December). Myth, ritual, and political control, *Journal of Communication, 30* (4), 166–179.

Bissett, A. (2002, November). *Surgical strikes: Ideological weaponry.* Paper presented at the sixth ETHICOMP international conference on the social and ethical impacts of information and communication technologies, Universidade Lusiada, Lisbon, Portugal. Retrieved from www.ccsr.cse.dmu.ac.uk/conferences/ethicomp/ethicomp2002/abstracts/8.html

Borger, J. (2012a, June 8). Assad compares army's role to surgeon saving a patient. *The Guardian Weekly*, p. 5.

Borger, J. (2012b, April 4). Bosnian war 20 years on: Peace holds but conflict continues to haunt. *The Guardian Weekly*, pp. 1 and 5.

Bottici, C. (2007). *A philosophy of political myth.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bottici, C., & Challand, B. (2010). *The myth of the clash of civilizations.* New York: Routledge.

Bougher, L. D. (2012). The case for metaphor in political reasoning and cognition. *Political Psychology, 33* (1), 145–163.

Brenner, P., & Castro, S. (2009). David and Gulliver: Fifty years of competing metaphors in the Cuban-United States relationship. *Diplomacy & Statecraft, 20* (2), 236–257.

Brooks, P. (1984). *Reading for the plot: Design and intention in narrative.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bruner J. (1986). *Actual minds, possible worlds*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bruner, J. (1987). Life as narrative. *Social Research, 54*, 11–32.

Bruner, J. (2003). *Making stories: Law, literature, life.* Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.

Burke, K. (1953). *A rhetoric of motives.* New York: Prentice-Hall.

Burton, J. W. (1972). *World society.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Campbell, D. (1998). Metabosnia: Narratives of the Bosnian War. *Review of International Studies, 24*, 261–281.

Carver, T., & Pikalo, J. (Eds). (2008). *Political language and metaphor: Interpreting and changing the world.* London and New York: Routledge.

Chambers, R. (1984). *Narrative seduction and the power of fiction.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Charteris-Black, J. (2005). *Politicians and rhetoric: The persuasive power of metaphor.* Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Chilton, P. (1996). *Security metaphor: Cold War discourse from containment to common house.* New York: Peter Lang.

Chilton, P., & Ilyin, M. (1993). Metaphor in political discourse: The case of the "common European house." *Discourse and Society, 4* (1), 7–31.

Chisem, J. (2011, May 14). Security studies and the marginalization of women and gender structures. Retrieved at www.e-ir.info/2011/05/14/security-studies-and-the-marginalisation-of-women-and-gender-structures/

Clark, R. P. (2012, February 21). How "narrative" moved from literature to politics and what this means for covering candidates. *Poynter.* Retrieved at www.poynter.org/how-tos/newsgathering-storytelling/writing-tools/162834/how-narrative-moved-from-literature-to-politics-what-this-means-for-covering-candidates/

Cohen, D. H. (1998). Schoolhouses, jailhouses and the house of being: The tragedy of philosophy's metaphors, *Metaphilosophy*, 29, 6–19.

Cohen, T. (1979) Metaphor and the cultivation of intimacy. In S. Sacks (Ed.), *On metaphor* (pp. 1–10). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Connerton, P. (1989). *How societies remember*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Coronel, S. S. (2004). The role of the media in deepening democracy. United Nations Online Network in Public Administration and Finance, 28 December, 2007. Retrieved at http://unpan1.un.org/intradoc/groups/public/documents/un/unpan010194.pdf

Croft, S. (2006). *Culture, crisis and America's war on terror.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cuperus, R. (2011, 8 November). Europe's burning house. Column in *Social Europe Journal.* Retrieved at www.social-europe.eu/2011/11/europes-burning-house/

Damasio, A. (1999). *The feeling of what happens: Body and emotion in the making of consciousness.* New York: Harcourt Brace.

Danner, M. (2009). *Stripping bare the body: politics, violence, war*. New York: Nation Books.

Danner, M. (2010, January 21). To heal Haiti, look to history, not nature. *New York Times.* Retrieved at www.nytimes.com/2010/01/22/opinion/22danner.html?pagewanted=all

DARPA (2011, October 7). *Broad Agency announcement. Narrative networks* (DSO DARPA-BAA-12–03). Retrieved from http://darpa.mil/opportunities/solicitations/dso_solicitations.aspx

Del Beccaro, T. (2012, September 3). The essential value connection in Romney's acceptance speech. Retrieved from www.forbes.com/sites/realspin/2012/09/03/the-essential-value-connection-in-romneys-acceptance-speech/

De Leonardis, F. (2008). War as a medicine: the medical metaphor in contemporary Italian political language. *Social Semiotics*, *18* (1), 33–45

Docherty, J. S. (2004). Narratives, metaphors and negotiation. *Marquette Law Review*, *87* (4), 847–851.

Dray, W. H. (1971). On the nature and role of narrative in historiography, *History and Theory*, *10*, 153–171.

Drucker, H. M. (1970). Just analogies?: The place of analogies in political thinking, *Political Studies*, *18* (4), 448–460.

Dunbar, K. (2001). The analogical paradox: Why analogy is so easy in naturalistic settings, yet so difficult in the psychological laboratory. In D. Gentner, K. Holyoak, & B. Kokinov (Eds.), *The analogical mind: Perspectives from cognitive science* (pp. 313–334). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Edelman, M. (1967). Myth, metaphors and political conformity. *Psychiatry*, *30*(3), 217–228.

Edelman, M. (1975) Language, myths, and rhetoric. *Trans-Action*, *12*, 14–21.

Edelman, M. (1971). *Politics as symbolic action*. New York: Academic Press.

Emad, M. (2006). Reading WonderWoman's body: Mythologies of gender and nation. *Journal of Popular Culture*, *39*, 954–984. Retrieved from www.d.umn.edu/~memad/EmadWonderWomanJrnlPopCulture06.pdf

Enloe, C. (1990). *Bananas, beaches and bases: Making feminist sense of international politics.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Esch, J. (2010). Legitimizing the "War on Terror": Political myth in official-level rhetoric. *Political Psychology*, *311* (3), 357–391.

Farrell, S. (2010, June 25). Embedistan. *New York Times.* Retrieved from http://atwar.blogs.nytimes.com/2010/06/25/embedistan-2/

Fasolt, C. (2004). *The limits of history.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Feldman, O., & De Landtsheer, O. (1998). *Politically speaking: a worldwide examination of language used in the public sphere.* Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Flood, C. (2002). *Political myth: A theoretical introduction.* New York: Garland.

Font, J. P. P., & Régis, D. (2006, July). *Chaos theory and its application in political science*. Paper delivered at IPSA—AISP Congress Fukuoka, Japan. Retrieved from http://dev.ulb.ac.be/sciencespo/dossiers_membres/dandoy-regis/fichiers/dandoy-regis-publication18.pdf

Freeman, R. (2009, April, 19). Is Iraq another Vietnam? Actually, it may become much worse. Retrieved January 23, 2014, from www.commondreams.org/views04/0419-11.htm.

Fuks, A. (2009, July). *The military metaphors of modern medicine.* Paper presented at the conference on Health, Illness, and Disease, Oxford, UK. Retrieved from www.inter-disciplinary.net/wp-content/uploads/2009/06/hid_fuks.pdf

Funk, N. C., & Said, A. Z. (2004). Islam and the West: Narratives of conflict and conflict transformation. *International Journal of Peace Studies*, *9* (1), 1–26.

Galbraith, J. K. (1982, February 4). Recession economics. *New York Review of Books 29* (1). Retrieved from www.nybooks.com/articles/archives/1982/feb/04/recession-economics/?pagination=false

Gannon, M. J. (2001). *Working across cultures: Applications and exercises.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gavriely-Nuri, D. (2008). If both opponents "extend hands in peace"—Why don't they meet? Mythic metaphors and cultural codes in the Israeli peace discourse. *Journal of Language and Politics*, *9* (3), 449–468.

Gee, J. P. (1991), Memory and myth: A perspective on narrative. In A. McCabe & Carole C. Peterson (Eds.), *Developing narrative structure* (pp. 1–25). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Gibbs, R. (Ed., 2008). *The Cambridge handbook of metaphor and thought.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Global Language Monitor. Retrieved from www.languagemonitor.com/category/politics/

Guilfoy, K. (2008). John of Salisbury. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy.* Retrieved from http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2008/entries/john-salisbury/

Halstead, J. M. (2007). Multicultural metaphors. In K. Roth & I. Gur-Ze'ev (Eds.), *Education in the era of globalization* (pp. 146–160). Dordrecht: Springer.

Hammack, P. L. (2011). *Narrative and the politics of identity: The cultural psychology of Israeli and Palestinian youth.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hammack, P. L., & Pilecki, A. (2012). Narrative as a root metaphor for political psychology. *Political Psychology*, 33 (1), 75–103.

Hanne, M. (1999). Getting to know the neighbours: When plot meets knot. *Canadian Review of Comparative Literature*, *26* (1), 36–50.

Hanne, M. (2011, Fall). The binocular vision project: An introduction. *Genre*, *44* (3), 223–237.

Heiler, R. (2001, September 20). On metaphors and the importance of being thorough. The news behind the news. Institute for Advanced Strategic and Political Studies, Israel. Retrieved from www.israeleconomy.org/nbn/nbn422sp.htm

Heradstveit, D., & Bonham, G. M. (2007). What the Axis of Evil metaphor did to Iran. *Middle East Journal*, *61* (3), 421–440.

Herman, D., Jahn, M., & Ryan, M.-L. (Eds.). (2010), *Routledge encyclopedia of narrative theory.* London and New York: Routledge.

Honohan, I. (2008). Metaphors of solidarity. In T. Carver & J. Pikalo (Eds.), *Political language and metaphor: Interpreting and changing the world* (pp. 69–82). London and New York: Routledge.

Intelligence Advanced Research Projects Activity. (2011, May 20). *Broad agency announcement, IARPA-BAA-11–04, Metaphor program, incisive analysis.* Retrieved from www.iarpa.gov/Programs/ia/Metaphor/solicitation_metaphor.html

Ingrao, C. & Emmett, T. A. (Eds.) (2012). *Confronting the Yugoslav controversies: A scholars' initiative* (2nd ed.). West Lafayette, Indiana: Purdue University Press.

Jensen, K., & Talev, M. (2012, October 4). Romney in debate says Obama favors "trickle-down" government. *Bloomberg*. Retrieved from www.bloomberg.com/news/2012–10–03/romney-gets-chance-to-shift-race-in-debate-tonight-with-obama.html

Kennan, G. F. (1946, February). The long telegram. Retrieved from http://wps.prenhall.com/wps/media/objects/108/110880/ch26_a1_d1.pdf

King, M. L., Jr. (1963, August 28). "I have a dream" speech. Retrieved from www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/mlkihaveadream.htm

Klamer, A., & Leonard, T.C. (1994). So what's an economic metaphor? In P. Mirowski (Ed.), *Natural images in economics* (pp. 20–51). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Klamer, A., & McCloskey, D. M. (1991). Accounting as the master metaphor of economics. *European Accounting Review*, *1*, 146-160.

Klamer, A. (2009). Rhetoric. In J. Peil & I. V. Staverin (Eds.), *Handbook of economics and ethics*. (pp. 449–454). Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.

Kövecses, Z. (2003). *Metaphor: A practical introduction.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kruglanski, A. W., Crenshaw, M., Post, J. M. & Victoroff, J. (2008). What should this fight be called? Metaphors of counterrorism and their implications, *Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 8* (3), 97–133.

Khrushchev, N. (1963, August 24). Nikita Khruschev. Retrieved from http://en.wikiquote.org/wiki/Nikita_Khrushchev

La Ferla, R. (2005, 20 October) Families confront a perilous world. *New York Times*. Retrieved from www.nytimes.com/2005/10/20/fashion/thursdaystyles/20TEENS.html?pagewanted=print

Lakoff, G. (2003, March 18). Metaphor and war: The metaphor system used to justify war in the gulf (1991) and Metaphor and war, again. *AlterNet*. Retrieved from www.alternet.org/story/15414/

Lakoff, G. (2012, December 3). Why it's hard to replace the metaphor of the "fiscal cliff." *Huffington Post.* Retrieved from www.huffingtonpost.com/george-lakoff/why-its-hard-to-replace-t_b_2230577.html

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago and London: Chicago University Press.

Lakoff, G. & Wehling, E. (2012). *The little blue book: The essential guide to thinking and talking democratic.* New York: Simon and Schuster.

Lederach, J. P. (2005). *The moral imagination: The art and soul of building peace.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Little, R. (2007). *The balance of power in international relations: Metaphors, myths and models*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Luks, F. (1998). The rhetorics of ecological economics. *Ecological Economics, 26* (2), 139–149.

Lyotard, J-F. (1984). *The postmodern condition: A report on knowledge* (G. Bennington & B. Massumi, Trans.). Minneapolios: University of Minnesota Press.

MacDougall, A. K. (1996 Fall). Humans as cancer. *Wild Earth*, pp. 81–88.

MacIntyre, A. (1981). *After virtue: A study in moral theory.* London: Duckworth.

Madrigal, A. (2011, May 25). Why are spy researchers building a "metaphor program"? *The Atlantic.* Retrieved from www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2011/05/why-are-spy-researchers-building-a-metaphor-program/239402/

Marks, M. P. (2011). *Metaphors in international relations theory.* New York: Palgrave/Macmillan.

Massad, J. (2012, August 29). The "Arab Spring" and other American seasons. *Aljazeera.* Retrieved from www.aljazeera.com/indepth/opinion/2012/08/201282972539153865.html

McCloskey, D. (1985). *The rhetoric of economics.* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

McCloskey, D. (1990). Storytelling in economics. In C. Nash (Ed.), *Narrative in culture: The uses of storytelling in the sciences, philosophy and literature* (pp. 5–22). London and New York: Routledge.

McCloskey, D. (1994). *Knowledge and persuasion in economics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McCloskey, D. (2006). *The bourgeois virtues: Ethics for an age of commerce.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

McCloskey, D. (2010). *Bourgeois dignity: Why economics can't explain the modern world.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

McEntee-Atalianis, J. L. (2011). The role of metaphor in shaping the identity and agenda of the United Nations: The imagining of an international community and international threat. *Discourse and Communication*, *5* (4), 393–412.

McKean, L. (1996). Bharat Mata: Mother India and her militant matriots. In: J.S. Hawley & D. M. Wulff (Eds.), *Devi: goddesses of India* (pp. 250–280). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Miller, J. H. (1995). Narrative. In F. Lentricchia & T.McCaughlin (Eds.), *Critical terms for literary study* (2nd ed., pp. 66–79). Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Min, X. (2005, July). Metaphors. In G. Burgess & H. Burgess (Eds.), *Beyond intractability*. Conflict Information Consortium, University of Colorado, Boulder. Retrieved from www.beyondintractability.org/bi-essay/metaphors

Mink, L. O. (1978). Narrative form as a cognitive instrument. In R. H. Canary & H. Kozicki (Eds.), *The writing of history: Literary form and historical understanding* (pp. 129–149). Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Mio, J. S. (1996). Metaphor, politics, and persuasion. In J. S. Mio & A. N. Katz, *Metaphor: implications and applications* (pp. 127–146). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Mio, J. S., Riggio, R. E., Levin, S., & Reese, R. (2005). Presidential leadership and charisma: The effects of metaphor, *The Leadership Quarterly*, *16*, 287–294.

Mirowski, P. (1989). *More heat than light: Economics as social physics: Physics as nature's economics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Moyers, B. (1993) Why are the media important? In S. Biagi (Ed.), *Media reader: Perspectives on mass media industries, effects, and issues* (2nd ed., pp. 3–5). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Musolff, A. (2009). Metaphor in the history of ideas and discourses: How can we interpret a medieval version of the *body-state* analogy. In A. Musolff & Jörg Zinken (Eds.), *Metaphor and discourse* (pp. 233–247). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Musolff, A. (2010). Political metaphor and *bodies politic*. In U. Okulska & P. Cap (Eds.), *Perspectives in politics and discourse* (pp. 23–41). Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Nederman, C. J. (2007, October). Christine de Pizan and Jean Gerson on the body politic: The limits of intellectual influence. Paper given at the Medieval Studies Working Group, France-Chicago Center, and Department of Political Science, University of Chicago, Chicago. Retrieved from http://ptw.uchicago.edu/Nederman07.pdf

Nederman, C. J., & Shogimen, T. (2011). Best medicine? Medical education, practice and metaphor in John of Salisbury's *Policraticus and Metalogicon*. *Viator, 42* (1), 55–74.

Nussbaum, M. (1997). Narrative imagination. In *Cultivating humanity* (pp. 85–112). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Nussbaum, M. (2004). Body of the nation: Why women were mutilated in Gujarat. *Boston Review, 29* (3), 33–38.

Obama, B. (2011). Full text of President Obama's economic speech in Osawatomie, Kans. Retrieved at http://articles.washingtonpost.com/2011–12–06/politics/35285189_1_hard-work-strongest-economy-osawatomie-high

Obama, B. (2012, September 6). Transcript: President Obama's convention speech. Retrieved from www.npr.org/2012/09/06/160713941/transcript-president-obamas-convention-speech

Okulska, U., & Cap, P. (2010). *Perspectives in politics and discourse.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Orsini, M., & Saurette, P. (2011). "Take two and vote in the morning": Reflections on the political placebo effect. *The Journal of Mind-Body Regulation, 1* (3), 125–137. Retrieved from http://mbr.synergiesprairies.ca/mbr/index.php/mbr/article/view/478

Ortony, A. (Ed.). (1979). *Metaphor and thought.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Osborne, D., & Gaebler, T. (1993) *Reinventing government: How the entrepreneurial spirit is transforming the public sector.* New York: Plume.

O'Sullivan, J. (1845). Annexation. *United States Magazine and Democratic Review 17* (1), 5–10. Retrieved from http://web.grinnell.edu/courses/HIS/f01/HIS202–01/Documents/OSullivan.html

Papola, J., & Roberts, R. (2011). *Fight of the century*. Retrieved from http://econstories.tv/2011/04/28/fight-of-the-century-music-video/.

Pappé, I. (2004). *A history of modern Palestine: One land, two peoples*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Patterson, P. M. (1998). Market metaphors and political vocabularies: The case of the marginalized citizen. *Public Productivity & Management Review*, 22 (2), 220–231.

Payack, P. J. J. (2012, July). Campaign narratives at odds with voters' concerns. Retrieved from http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/presidential-campaign/237529-campaign-narratives-at-odds-with-voters-concerns

Pearson, N. (2007, September 29). Identity on parade, *The Australian*. Retrieved from www.theaustralian.com.au/news/opinion/identity-on-parade/story-e6frg786–1111114527117

Perris, A. (1983). Music as propaganda: Art at the command of doctrine in the People's Republic of China. *Ethnomusicology, 27* (1), 1–28.

Petrie, H. G., & Oshlag, R. S. (1993). Metaphor and learning. In A. Ortony (Eds.), *Metaphor and thought* (pp. 579–609). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pettman, J. J. (1996). *Worlding women: a feminist international politics*. London and New York: Routledge.

Pettman, R. (2011). *Psychopathology and world politics*. London: Imperial College Press.

Pikalo, J. (2008). Mechanical metaphors in politics. In T. Carver & J. Pikalo (Eds.), *Political language and metaphor: Interpreting and changing the world* (pp. 41–54). London and New York: Routledge.

Pilkington, P. (2011). Debunking economics: An interview with Steve Keen: Part 1. Retrieved January 5, 2014, from www.nakedcapitalism.com/2011/11/philip-pilkington-debunking-economics-%E2%80%93-an-interview-with-steve-keen-%E2%80%93-part.html

Porter Abbott, H. (2002). *The Cambridge introduction to narrative*. Cambridge, UK, and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ramadurai, C. (2004). Life and times of Bharat Mata. Retrieved from http://charukesi.com/blog/2004/09/07/life-and-times-of-bharat-mata/

Reagan, R. (1983, March 8). President Reagan's speech before the National Association of Evangelicals. Retrieved from www.reagan.utexas.edu/archives/speeches/1983/30883b.htm

Reich, R. (1987). *Tales of a new America.* New York: Times Books.

Renan, E. (1990). "What is a nation?" In Bhabha, H. (Ed.), *Nation and narration* (pp. 8–22). London: Routledge.

Ricoeur, P. (1977). *The rule of metaphor: Multi-disciplinary studies of the creation of meaning in language* (R. Czerny, Trans., with Kathleen McLaughlin and John Costello). Toronto and Buffalo: University of Toronto Press.

Ricoeur, P. (1983–85). *Time and narrative*. 3 vol. (Kathleen McLaughlin & David Pellauer, Trans.). Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Ringmar, E. (2008). Metaphors of social order. In T. Carver & J. Pikalo (Eds.), *Political language and metaphor: Interpreting and changing the world* (pp. 57–68). London and New York: Routledge.

Robins, R. S., & Post, J. (1997). *Political paranoia: the psychopolitics of hatred.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Roberts, G. (2006). History, theory and the narrative turn in IR. *Review of International Studies, 32*, 703–714.

Rosenberg, P. (2011, 24 August). The economy is a machine, not a body: The unseen power of metaphors in guiding how we think could be key to escaping from a prolonged economic crisis. *Aljazeera.* Retrieved from www.aljazeera.com/indepth/opinion/2011/08/201182110224238492 2.html

Sarbin, T. R. (1986). The narrative as a root metaphor for psychology. In T. R. Sarbin (Ed.), *Narrative psychology: The storied nature of human conduct* (pp. 3–21). New York: Praeger.

Schön, D. (1979). Generative metaphor: A perspective on problem-setting in social policy. In A. Ortony (Ed.), *Metaphor and thought* (pp. 254–83). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Scott, K. (1999). Imagined bodies, imagined communities: Feminism, nationalism, and body metaphors Retrieved from www.feministezine.com/feminist/modern/Imagined-Bodies-Imagined-Communities.html

Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Shore, C. (1997). Metaphors of Europe: Integration and the politics of language. In C. Shore & S. Nugent, *Anthropology and cultural studies* (pp. 126–159). London and Chicago: Pluto Press.

Skinner, D., & Squillacote, R. (2010). New bodies: Beyond illness, dirt, vermin and other metaphors of terror. In U. Okulska & P. Cap (Eds.), *Perspectives in politics and discourse* (pp. 43–60). Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Slingerland, E., Blanchard, E. M., & Boyd-Judson, L. (2007). Collision with China: Conceptual metaphor analysis, somatic marking, and the EP-3 Incident. *International Studies Quarterly, 51* (1), 53–77.

Sowell, T. (2012). "Trickle down" theory and "tax cuts for the rich." Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press. Retrieved from www.webcitation.org/6AvD7JHEC

Stein, S. (2012, September 18). Mitt Romney video: "Palestinians Have No Interest Whatsoever In Establishing Peace." *The Huffington Post.* Retrieved from www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/09/18/mitt-romney-palestine-video_n_1892862.html

Su, L. (2004), Cultural effects as seen in Chinese metaphors, *Intercultural communication Studies, 13* (3), 61–66.

Suganami, H. (2008). Narrative explanation and international relations: Back to basics. *Millennium—Journal of International Studies, 37* (2), 327–356.

Sylvester, C. (2003). Dramaturgies of violence in international relations [Editorial]. *Borderlands*, 2 (2). Retrieved from www.borderlands.net.au/vol2no2_2003/sylvester_editorial.htm

Sylvester, C. (2013). *War as experience: Contributions from international relations and feminist analysis.* London: Routledge.

Szasz, T. (2001). *Pharmacracy: Medicine and politics in America.* Westport CT: Praeger Publishers.

Tannen, D. (1998). *The argument culture: Moving from debate to dialogue.* New York: Random House.

Thibodeau, P. H., & Boroditsky, L. (2011). Metaphors we think with: The role of metaphor in reasoning. *PLoS ONE, 6* (2), e16782. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0016782

Thompson, S. (1996). Politics without metaphors is like a fish without water. In J. S. Mio & A. N. Katz (Eds.), *Metaphor: Implications and applications* (pp. 185–201). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Tickner, J. A. (2001). *Gendering world politics: Issues and approaches in the post-cold war era.* New York: Columbia University Press.

UNEP (2011). Towards a green economy: Pathways to sustainable development and poverty eradication:-A synthesis for policy makers. Retrieved January 4, 2014, from www.unep.org/greeneconomy

Weeks, W. E. (1996). *Building the continental empire: American expansion from the Revolution to the Civil War.* Chicago: Ivan R. Dee.

Wendt, A. (1992). The state as person in international theory, *Review of International Studies, 31*, 289–316.

Wheelwright, P. (1962). *Metaphor and reality.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

White, H. (1984). The question of narrative in contemporary historical thought. *History and Theory, 23*, 1–33.

Wibben, A. (2011). *Feminist security studies: A narrative approach.* Abingdon: Routledge.

Wolfgram, W. C. & Stevens, C. (2007, February). *The uses of historical narrative: Events and non-events in the field of international relations.* Paper presented at the annual

meeting of the International Studies Association 48th Annual Convention, Hilton Chicago, Chicago. Retrieved from www.allacademic.com/meta/p179116_index.html

Yanow, D. (2000). *Conducting interpretive policy analysis.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Yeager, L. B. (2011). *Is the market a test of truth and beauty? Essays in political economy*. Auburn, AL: Ludwig von Mises Institute.

Zashin, E., & Chapman, P. C. (1974). The uses of metaphor and analogy: Toward a renewal of political language. *The Journal of Politics*, *36*, 290–326.