Lubna Umar*
Sarwat Rasul**
Umaima Kamran***

Metaphors of Terrorism in Political Discourse in Pakistan

ABSTRACT

This research provides an understanding of the manner in which Pakistani politicians construct the narrative of war using terrorism as a target domain. Based on the Critical Metaphor Approach given by Charteris-Black (2005), a critical metaphor analysis of discourse generated by politicians including Imran Khan, Benazir Bhutto, Nawaz Sharif, Asif Zardari and Pervez Musharraf in the post 9/11 scenario was carried out. Linguistic metaphorical expressions that give rise to conceptual metaphors constituting terrorism as war, cancer, enemy, deceptive force, expensive, living and growing force, natural phenomenon and elements gone astray are discussed. The study reveals how all selected politicians save Musharraf build upon the international narrative of terrorism while Musharraf alone provides a native concept viewing terrorism as an internal problem. Also, how a consensus for military action is constructed where leaders can act as warriors and heroes, glorifying their contributions, highlighting their achievements and presenting failures of others to arouse public sympathy.

Keywords: *Critical Metaphor Analysis, Metaphors, Political Discourse, Political Ideology, Terrorism*

* Lecturer, Department of English, Allama Iqbal Open University, Islamabad, Pakistan
** Associate Professor/Chairperson, Department of English, Fatima Jinnah Women University, Rawalpindi, Pakistan
*** Assistant Professor/Incharge, Department of English, Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad, Pakistan

Introduction

Extensive use of metaphorical language in everyday life indicates that we not only talk in metaphors, but most of our cognitive processes rely heavily on it. Thus, metaphors form a part of our conceptual system seemingly as an essential element of our language. In 1980, Lakoff & Johnson, for the first time, introduced 'conceptual metaphors' (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980) explaining the connection between language and cognition in their seminal book *'Metaphors We Live By'*, whereby their notion of "conceptual metaphors" came forward to provide the missing piece of the puzzle of how culture coheres into a cognitive *Gestalt*—a connective system of meaning (Danesi, 2013).

Metaphors have persuasive power as they represent an entirely different manner of viewing things resultantly providing a brand new perception of things. This is enacted by modelling different conceptual frameworks that consequently provide new expressions in language, considering the fact that spaces between words and their meaning present ample opportunity for multiple possibilities. The process of filling these inherent lexical gaps gives rise to metaphorical expressions, thus creating novel angles of viewing the same concept.

Terrorism, as a key topic in Pakistani political discourse following the onslaught of war on terror, resonates in both domestic and foreign policy discourse. Keeping in view the significance of the use of metaphorical expressions, the present study aims to explore its use and the conceptual metaphors they activate in political speeches of Pakistani politicians including Imran Khan, Benazir Bhutto (BB), Nawaz Sharif, Asif Zardari and Pervez Musharraf by analyzing metaphors pertaining to terrorism.

Five speeches each of five politicians both in Urdu and English langauge are selected for analysis while applying Critical Metaphor Analysis (CMA) approach given by Charteris-Black (2005). Inspired by Lakoff's, (1980) conceptual metaphor theory, CMA draws on the cognitive approach with a complete analysis of metaphor integrating its semantic, pragmatic and cognitive dimensions (Charteris-Black, 2005). Cognitive semantics and CMA, according to Charteris-Black (2011) are important linguistic contributions towards a theory of rhetoric and persuasion for political communication

Metaphorical expressions pertaining to terrorism for each politician in both English and Urdu language speeches are explained in order to understand how mental frames are built and consequently, based upon its semantic and pragmatic interpretation, provide information regarding the activation of conceptual metaphors in cognition. These conceptual metaphors are exclusively hand-picked from the discourse and interpreted, thus providing an insight into the beliefs and attitudes that the politicians

exhibit towards terrorism in Pakistan. Conceptual metaphors are indicated through the use of capital letters to differentiate them for linguistic metaphors. The analysis also aims to compare how the conceptualization of terrorism in Pakistani politics is structured in comparison to international notions. This provides us with the mindset of the Pakistani politicians towards the phenomenon as well as the manner in which their rhetoric is structured to persuade audience and legitimize political policies and actions.

Political Discourse

Political discourse is the discourse revolving around political actors, according to van Dijk, "the vast bulk of studies of political discourse is about the text and talk of professional politicians or political institutions, such as presidents and prime ministers and other members of government, parliament or political parties, at the local, national and international levels" (1998). Nature of political discourse can be understood by studying the way it is framed. Participants in political discourse are other-regulated: by the opposition, their policies, failures, media, etc. Highlighting demerits of the 'Other', painting them as evil provides space for projecting personal agenda of politicians through carefully framed, oftentimes heroic tales featuring policies, values, images of glorious traditions and bright future prospects. For instance, during his election campaign, Bush framed the narrative of values and security while Kerry framed his around economy and Iraq. Thus, values were sold to voters by the Republicans using culturally powerful issues such as gay marriages and abortions etc. and elections were won. The Republicans' election machine was termed as juggernaut, by a columnist of New York Times which means 'battleship' in German and denotes something that elicits blind devotion. The term is heavily laden with religious underpinnings as it is the title of the Hindu deity Krishna whose idol is marched on wheeled carts in an annual procession under the wheels of which people throw themselves to be crushed out of respect and worship. Political narratives are thus framed according to issues and attitudes of the political parties. Kerry, it was noted, was defined by the opponents as 'unfit for command' that ultimately proved correct (*Mihas*) (n.d.)

Political Ideology

In comparison to other discourses, political discourse is inherently ideological. Ideology is considered as the root of the social representation of groups (van Dijk, 1998) that includes any kind of socially shared mental representations including their discourse that serves as a means of production and perpetuation of ideology. They can be simply stated as sets of fundamental beliefs and

145

attitudes shared by a group, society and culture that allow them to form and legitimize opinions and actions in their domain of influence. Ideology is considered a fundamental characteristic of social existence that is exposed to minute analysis through a number of refined tools of analysis used by various disciplines in order to gain a deeper understanding.

Since politics is ideological in nature, so are its practices (Chilton & Schaffner, 2002). Political ideologies help us in the understanding of political discourses and political practices and also allow us to reproduce and perpetuate them. In order to study the relation between discourse and political ideology, it is essential to view the discourse structure along with contextual details (Duranti & Goodwin, 1992). Analysis reveals however, that this political situation is not enough, and would typically require a cognitive interface between situation and utterance. This creates, what van Dijk terms as "mental models" (2003) of the political situation that allow us to observe how participants experience, interpret and represent the political situation according to their viewpoint. While explaining mental models, van Dijk asserts that they are cognitive structures such as thoughts, knowledge, beliefs, interpretations, plans, attitudes or ideologies, that are essentially formed, dismantled, altered and even stored in memory and thus are a significant aspect of our cognitive process. (2006) These specific mental models are also termed as contexts, and are seen as how the situation is being defined subjectively by the participants involved in communication. Thus, political discourse is defined both in terms of its structure and context through which it is produced and comprehended, that is language in a socio-cultural milieu.

Pakistani Political Discourse

The Pakistani political discourse has changed as a direct consequence of post 9/11 scenario and the outcome has typically been highly socially consequential, thus bringing a large segment of the Pakistani society to question Pakistan's role in the US led war. The manner in which the politicians manipulate audience has been studied through analysis of political discourse. Benazir's last speech reveals iconographic images of the enemy and paints herself as a patriot to win wide approval from the audience. Benazir glorifies her party while providing a negative evaluation of others (Memon, Bughio, & Gopang, 2014). Similarly, Iqbal, while analyzing speeches of Pakistani politicians in pre and post-election times for the year 2013, claim that – since linguistic manipulation is exercised to win sympathies of the people – Pakistani politicians regularly attend to it. While comparing the frequency of occurrences, metaphorical expressions were less dynamic and fewer in number in Pakistani speeches than in those found in speeches of Barrack Obama (Iqbal, 2015). Metaphors in the Pakistani context, however, open a

window into cognition and an analysis provided in this study reveals aspects that were hitherto not studied before.

War Metaphors

War and/or conflict metaphors are very common as they awaken strong emotions and are more persuasive. Since drawing upon the instinctive emotions of the audience is a key feature of metaphor use (Ferrari, 2007) therefore, the conceptual domain of war has been used in other source domains such as 'war on poverty' 'waged' by the US government under Lyndon B. Johnson in the sixties and the 'war on drugs' under Richard Nixon in the seventies (Glover, 2002) has been employed by various politicians. The reason why it is so widely used is: "First, war is a widely and readily accessible concept; everyone knows what a war is. Second, war is a complex and multifaceted phenomenon. Since there are so many aspects of war, there are many dimensions along which something can be like a war" Keith Shimko (1995). According to Kruglanski, Crenshaw, Post & Victoroff, the essentials of the war metaphor include the fact that wars are fought between two states and the enemy is identifiable with opposing interest. Stakes are at the highest since existence of the state is threatened. The outcome is either victory or failure. Wars are about defending homelands as the Clausewitzian sense of 'total war', is given in which there is no compromise. Significant in the domestic political plain is the required national unity where nation mobilizes support. Any rebellion here is taken as being unpatriotic. The ultimate prescription in this backdrop is use of military force. The practices that are restricted in peacetime become necessary during wartime which leads to expansion of executive power accompanying the war metaphor (2008).

Simplifying the subject it frames, war metaphors typically reduce the concept to a point where the exclusive idea of defeating the enemy and winning is foregrounded. While all proposals aiming at problem resolution are discouraged, thus criticism towards the war interprets as "unpatriotic, cowardly and treacherous" (Spencer, 2012). Hartmann-Mahmud - while elaborating upon the only question that one is required to raise regarding feedback people are allowed in times of war – provides acceptable questions such as: "Are we winning?" "What weapons should be used to defeat the enemy?" "What war strategies should be applied?". Whereas, making inquiry into the war rationale, exhibition of concern for collateral damage or raising questions at the legitimacy of war is forbidden, lest it projects the perpetrators as wrong and consequently halts the war (2002).

Conceptual Metaphor of War

The conceptual metaphor WAR ON TERROR, coined by George W. Bush and his administration after the terrorist attacks from 11 September 2001 was also adopted by the Pakistani politicians for emotional appeal thus constructing opinion of their audience. Gaining prominence in world politics as the war came to be fought at various battlegrounds including Pakistan and Afghanistan with America as major player, the metaphor becomes culturally laden. Terrorism and counter terrorism is experienced differently cross-culturally, consequently its conceptualization remains different for the Americans and the Pakistani, which typically calls for a difference in its metaphorical manifestation. We shall explore how differently the concept is perceived in comparison to universal conceptualization of terrorism. However, while studying terrorism and counter terrorism, Spencer identifies four major conceptual metaphors by analyzing metaphors in British tabloid media discourse on terrorism from 2001 to 2005. These are: TERRORISM IS WAR; TERRORISM IS CRIME; TERRORISM IS UNCIVILISED EVIL; and TERRORISM IS DISEASE (Spencer, 2012). Further, Charteris-Black (2005) analyzes speeches of international politicians and proposes various conceptual metaphors such as TERRORISTS ARE DANGEROUS ANIMALS and TERRORISTS ARE PARASITES.

Analysis and Discussion

Terrorism as a conceptual domain recurs frequently in discourse produced by Pakistani politicians. This includes Imran Khan, Benazir Bhutto, Asif Zardari and Pervez Musharraf. Metaphors used by Khan activate the conceptual domain TERRORISM IS CANCER that contains the implied argument that every step taken to end it is legitimate. The knowledge of illness allows one to draw the information that a cure must be found for health to be restored. Illness metaphors are persuasive in nature as they can systematically be used in creating evaluation frameworks (Charteris-Black, 2005). An association of terrorism and illness activating a negative frame, consequently gives rise to the political argument in favor of every activity designed to eradicate the negative factor involved, which in this case would help restore health of the nation.

Terrorism… ye aik bimāri hai jo phailti jā rahi hai (S2H3)
Terrorism … it is a **disease** that is spreading

*Cancer ki jab tak hum **jar tak** nahi pohonchay ge, kāt ker nai nikālain ge, terrorism khatam nai hoga* (S2H4)

Until we don't reach the root of this cancer, until we don't cut it off, terrorism will not end

The metaphor TERRORISM IS CANCER, realized by words such as '*bimāri*', '*jar*', '*kāt ker*' and '*bari jar*' help conceive terrorism as a cancer that has sprouted its roots in the entire body thus necessitating absolute extraction, typically through surgery so the body recovers its original form. This helps in explaining terrorism as the target domain through the illness source domain, which essentially is an embodied experience allowing correspondence between both domains. There is a tendency to metaphorise events leading to problems. Thus it is natural that the problems in the political arena are conceptualized through the use of health metaphors by referring to various illnesses (Kövecses, 2002).

From data collected from his English speeches, Imran Khan typically makes indirect reference of terrorism as a phenomenon, however at two instances he employs the terms 'madness' and 'frenzy' to make sense of the phenomenon. The word 'frenzy' is used as a very strong evaluation of the health metaphor. Defined as "a temporary madness; a violent mental or emotional agitation; intense usually wild and often disorderly compulsive or agitated activity" (Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary), frenzy signifies extremism corresponded via mental illness conceptual domain. Extremism is a madness that creates violent emotional upheaval spasmodically with an equally intense aftermath. Embedded along the health metaphor is the personification metaphor that displays 'fanaticism' as a school of thought in terms of a human state of madness.

> What is **threatening us** right now is the polarization that has taken place in Pakistan because of war on terror (S1A33)

> We don't need an enemy this current radicalization may actually **sink us** (S3A14)

Further, in examples (S1A33) and (S3A14) given above, the use of personification helps conceptualize war fallout as a person. Khan successfully evokes personal feelings regarding the war and applies them upon the abstract phenomenon that is, the future fallouts of war.

While analyzing BB's political rhetoric, the study reveals a stance towards terrorism realized by the affects that terrorism has had upon her political life. TERRORISM IS WAR is one of the most famous frames employed in the political discourse internationally. The words used by BB to realize the concept of TERRORISM IS WAR are 'battled', 'bomb', 'assault', 'attacks', 'strike', and 'struck back'. War is seen comprising a victim (BB's political party), a villain (Taliban) and a territory (Pakistan), being fought along with a cause (reinstatement of constitution) that is so sacred that fighting becomes essential. Peter Sederberg (1995, pp. 299-300) argues that this concept leads

to its proponents to favor a repressive response. Therefore, the presence of war calls for a military response. BB's stance towards military actions, thus can be understood through the use of rhetoric.

Realising the importance of the war metaphor in the fight against terrorism, Jeffrey Simon, 1987, p. 9 cited in Spencer 2012) asserts: "Equating terrorism with war effectively ends any debate over whether military responses are justified: If a nation is at war it must respond militarily to attack". A military response therefore becomes logical (Bates, 2004) - while building public consent by creating an association between violence and war and collocate military offensive with victory - to solve problems posed by terrorist acts (Sarbin, 2003).

The other conceptual metaphor pertaining to terrorism as target domain that arises is; TERRORISTS ARE ANTI-STATE ENEMIES. She employs the metaphorical expression such as; 'topple my government', 'tracked down', 'hijack my religion', 'hijack America's plane' 'crush the PPP', 'distort essence of pluralism', 'I stood up', 'I am an obstacle', provide source domain of anti-state activities. Both the term 'anti-state' and 'enemy' predicate terrorism in a number of ways thus signifying grave political significance. Predicating terrorists as anti-state entities by portraying them as social outcasts - soldiers of the forces of evil and then creates a force of good in order to form dichotomies - that is, them (the out-group) and us (the in-group) (Lazar & Lazar, 2004). The presence of evil or bad automatically constitutes the self as the binary opposite as good and righteous (Ivie, 2004) therefore, the notion of being anti-state is interpreted as being lawful containing legitimate powers present to safeguard the country from the menace of terrorists.

The same concept is given by Zardari as TERRORISM IS OUR NATIONAL ENEMY and as TERRORISM IS AN OPPRESSOR. In political discourse, the government, Gibbs argues, is described through metaphors of 'body' and 'physical action' using personifications to suggest weakness in metaphorical terms (2006). Being a victim and targeted by terrorism gives rise to the victimization narrative that raises pathos for the nation and the innocent people who have lost their lives.

> Criminal terrorists **hijack my religion** just as they hijack America's planes (S2B3)

Another closely knitted concept that we find here is; TERRORISM IS A DECEPTIVE FORCE. Deception needs to be countered just as the forces of 'evil' as explained by Spencer (2012) need to be done, that is by inflicting upon them extreme counter measures such as military violence. When terrorism is a deceptive force and is the enemy of the Muslims then countering terrorism becomes, as Leach asserts: 'in a bizarre sense, a religiously sanctioned duty' (Leach, 1977). Thus countering terrorism is more of a religious obligation that

helps build up the morale of the public and validate public sacrifices. It is for this reason that the US President George Bush constructed the conflict as a "holy war" taking place between forces of "good" and "evil" (Sluka, 2009).

As already mentioned, there are multitudes of dimensions that are associated with war such as the allocation of funds in war efforts. It is argued by Susan Sontag that war-making is a phenomenon that is not to be viewed "realistically" that is, the expense and practical outcome associated with it are omitted whereas no amount of sacrifices is excessive (1989) and all unfair means however unlawful become legitimized. BB activates the conceptual metaphor FIGHTING TERRORISM IS EXPENSIVE.

The phrase 'paid the price' and 'price I paid' help explain the concept of the outcomes of war and highlights the sacrifices that BB had to offer personally. This experience is mapped upon war experiences and the price that she pays (sacrifice in terms of her political status and personal attack upon her) for goods (the safeguard of the country and reinstatement of peace) in return. This persuasive rhetorical device exalts BB's political status and adds substance to her words. As critical metaphor analysis allows us to 'demonstrate how particular discursive practices reflect socio-political power structures' (Charteris-Black, 2004) thus analyzing BB's rhetoric help in gaining a good insight into how terrorism pervades society to challenge democratic structures.

> During the Afghan-Soviet war, my country became the **breeding ground** for their psycho-political religious manipulation and exploitation (S1B10)

Conceptual metaphor TERRORISTS ARE ANIMALS is realized by the words 'breeding grounds' and 'resurface'. Terrorists, asserts Charteris-Black, slide from the 'Great Chain of Being' from hunted animals to parasites that are in need of total elimination and which gives the conceptual metaphor TERRORISTS ARE PARASITES (2005). Thus terrorists here are seen as parasites too that require free grounds where animals breed and reproduce by providing favorable temperature and atmosphere. The terrorists therefore are animals that have chosen Pakistan as their breeding ground due to favourable climatic conditions (as Afghanistan and Pakistan share similar climates) and also the situation (the lack of government writ in tribal areas) is also encourages the process.

According to Garcia (2010) while analyzing the political discourse of Jose Luis Rodriguez Zapatero, terrorism is portrayed with a negative evaluation as a ferocious animal, realized by the conceptual metaphor TERROR(ISM) IS AN ANIMAL. Charteris-Black asserts that animal features are used typically as a prototype to express danger to society (2004). The process of depersonification - while analyzing metaphorical language used by George W. Bush Junior - Charteris-Black asserts, activates a negative evaluation of the

conceptualization of terrorists as animals, vermin and insects exemplified below:

> *"Initially the terrorists **may burrow deeper** into caves and other entrenched hiding places. (7 October 2001)"*

He further points out that depersonification is employed to dehumanize the enemy and simultaneously as dangerous so that their destruction becomes necessary for the survival of the state, thus implying the conceptual metaphor TERRORISTS ARE DANGEROUS ANIMALS. In this context they are forsaken any claim to be treated like humans having human rights under international agreements (Charteris-Black, 2005).

Since 'we all make terrorism what (we say) it is' (Onuf, 2009), some examples conceive of it as TERRORISM IS NATURAL. This concept, realized by the words 'rained' and 'swirling' are associated with water in some way. It is a natural phenomenon that humans have no control over, resultantly, painting terrorists as a force much stronger than the average human and normally not in our control, the law enforcers or the politicians thus absolving them of the blame. Swirling–a phenomenon of the wind or the water where whirls of water or even air are formed with huge natural force - causes destruction and death. While analyzing Quranic text, nature imagery of this sort is used greatly to warn the disbelievers of the powers of God. In Islamic thought natural phenomenon such as rain, breeze, hail, high tides etc., are not to be taken for granted as the slightest increase in intensity typically transforms what was once a blessing into a disaster. According to a study of Quranic metaphors, Mohammad, elaborates how wind metaphors are employed to achieve two opposing functions that is, it is regarded as a source of welfare, fertility, and goodness and also as a source of punishment and evil simultaneously (2014).

> Yet the early decisions to arm, train, supply and legitimize the most extreme fanatics **sowed the seeds** for the 21st century terrorism that is now **swirling** around us (S1B42)

Life and death metaphors, Charteris-Black (2005) asserts, provide a very basic scale for evaluation that is based on a similar duality as that of day and night, good and evil, sickness and health etc. They are mythical archetypes that evaluate human experience as either negative or positive. BB employs this conceptual domain to understand the concept of terrorism by activating the concept TERRORISM IS A LIVE FORCE where the term 'father of Afghan Jihad' indicates that terrorism has a lineage that can be traced back to three decades. Since anything that is alive has to have parents as guardians and nurturers.

Zardari uses the phrases such as, 'roots of today's terrorism', 'reaping the bittersweet harvest sowed' and 'breeding grounds' to explain the concept of

terrorism similar to that of BB. The conceptual metaphor that arises here is TERRORISM IS A GROWING LIVING ORGANISM. Roots indicate having the ability to draw water and nutrition from the soil that it is growing whereas, reaping the harvest indicates that it has been carefully planted as a crop for which the land is mowed, ploughed, seeds planted and watered. Cameron asserts that terrorism is understood as developing just as a growing plant or animal where animal metaphors present a stronger image in comparison to plant metaphors (2010).

Nawaz Sharif, in his political speeches uses the words 'planted' and 'fertile ground' in the metaphorical expressions pertaining to plant metaphors that is similar to those used by BB and Zardari. These are used to understand the target domain terrorism/extremism in Pakistan. This activates the conceptual metaphor TERRORISM IS A PLANT. Sharif's use of metaphorical expressions indicates how terrorism is perceived to be as a plant that has found fertile ground (hilly, familiar and unguarded land) and has been planted (by the Pakistani military three decades back at the behest of the Americans). Water (collecting aid and ransom money) is being provided continuously that it has started to bear fruit (terrorist attacks).

Asif Ali Zardari uses various source domains for terrorism in his speeches as he needs to form a consensus regarding the danger that terrorism was posing for the country and therefore aroused the need to highlight party achievements by way of public sympathy, both for his party and for the nation. Zardari constructs terrorism as an evil force realized by the use of words such as 'haunts', 'horrors', 'forces of darkness' and 'forces of evil'. Giving rise to the conceptual metaphor TERRORISM IS AN EVIL FORCE. This is in resonance with one of the conceptual metaphors arising from Spencer's (2012) study regarding terrorism metaphors, that is, TERRORISM IS UNCIVILISED EVIL, hence necessitating eradication. Visited largely in relation to darkness, faithlessness, and ignorance, which is in all forms a hazard for humanity and must be tackled with, the forces of evil when placed within the Pakistani domain legalizes counterterrorism in all forms, essentially brute force, thus authenticating military operations, military spending and collateral damage in this scenario. The use of the word 'haunts' is realized as a phenomenon instigating apprehension whereby people are typically threatened existentially. Calling for various measures to ward off such haunts, exiting the location (accept defeat and flee) or cast counter spells (counter-terrorism) to regain territory are among the dominant ones.

> I am a grieving husband who has seen the mother of his children give her life fighting the menace of terrorism... that **haunts** the entire civilized world (S1D1)

Talking about the extremists, Musharraf presents an indigenized version of terrorism/terrorists that has not been used so far in the Pakistani political discourse. He activates the conceptual metaphor EXTREMISTS HAVE LOST THEIR WAY, realized by the use of *bhatkay hūay anāsir* which can be defined as the elements that have lost their way. These elements are talked as '***dīn ki rāh se bhatak ke'*** and ***dehshatgardi ka shikār.*** They have lost their way from the religious path and are now led astray. The word ***'shikār'*** essentially infer the presence of an external force, a predator, with all the attributes such as killer, slayer, hunter, preys upon individuals not walking the correct path. It does not in any manner, ostracize the terrorists as a foreign phenomenon, but typically draws upon knowledge of historical events responsible for their creation, that is, America, which is essentially the predator here feeding upon the locals (prey).

> In ***bhatkay hūay anāsir*** *ki soch badalnay mai hakūmat ka hāth batāen* (S2M7) Lend a hand to the government to change thoughts of these lost elements

> *Apnay hi log māray gaye jo **dīn ki rāh se bhatak ke** dehshatgardi ka shikār banay* (S2M3)

> Our own people who had wandered off from the religious path were killed and became targets of terrorism

Tagging their mental reserves, every politician furnishes the discourse with conceptual frames pertaining to terrorism that may either be a local or borrowed phenomenon. Analyzing use of metaphorical expressions, the study essentially presents how terrorism has shaped the political language and the motivation behind its use by mainstream Pakistani politicians.

Conclusion

From the discussion so far made, it can be safely concluded that metaphors can, at the same time, reveal and conceal facts that allow us to either focus on some aspect or hide others. Politicians in Pakistan have foregrounded certain elements of terrorism while concealing others by framing images and building narratives. Rather than highlighting the socio-economic factors affecting birth of terrorists and terrorism, massive collateral damage, drone attacks by the US that ignited hatred among people, the fallouts of war on terror in Pakistan, the politicians attempt to build national consensus towards a holistic and indefinite military action. The preferred metaphoric structures are observed to follow internationally built ideas of terrorism. For both BB and Zardari, the TERRORISM IS WAR frame allows them to act as warriors and heroes, whereas, the TERRORISM IS A DECEPTIVE FOCE/ENEMY/ ANIMAL

frame shows the reaction of the Pakistani politicians towards terrorists as an evil force let loose in the country while putting responsibility of saving the day, upon the shoulder of the leadership, glorifying the contributions while highlighting achievements and arousing public sympathy.

Most of the Pakistani politicians including BB, Zardari, and Khan while speaking about either the birth or growth of terrorism, make no mention of its causes, similarly neither do they address its elimination, nor talk about eradication of the roots that fan terrorism and consequence of war. Musharraf, however, brings in a native view that sees extremists as being lost from their path. This entails the information of extremists as part of the social fabric without creating a binary divide of 'us' and 'them' that the other politicians draw upon, leaves ample room for the process of reintegration of these lost elements back into mainstream while foregrounding the elements behind its origin.

Metaphors are important in politics as a lot depends upon the leader's oratory skills through which they evoke emotions of solidarity and unity. It is through the use of metaphors that emotions are heightened to build understanding and acceptance towards a complex phenomenon that may otherwise be difficult to decipher by the people without being aware of the fact. Words of leaders often have the power to convince the audience because of their persuasive nature. Moreover, their significance in the political arena increases due to the ability of employing a concrete domain to explain an abstract one and the scope it offers of highlighting some aspects of information while hiding what is not needed such as in the case of war on terror, only the possible outcome of war, that is, peace and security are highlighted while the information regarding the expenditure of war is held back.

References

Bates, B. R. (2004). Audiences, Metaphors, and the Persian Gulf War. *Communication Studies, 55*(3), 447-463.

Bhatia, A. (2006). Political Discourse Analysis of Political Press Conferences. (pp. 68-80). Thousand Oaks, London: Sage Publications.

Cameron, L. (2010). *Responding to the Risk of Terrorism: The Contribution of Metaphor*. Retrieved from http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0102-44502010000300010

Charteris-Black, J. (2004). *Corpus approaches to critical metaphor analysis* . New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Charteris-Black, J. (2005). *Politicians and Rhetoric: The Persuasive Power of Metaphor.* Basingstoke: Palgrave-MacMillan.

Charteris-Black, J. (2011). *Politicians and Rhetoric: The Persuasive power of Metaphors* (2nd ed.). New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Chilton, P., & Schaffner, C. (2002). Introduction: Themes and Principles in the Analysisof Political Discourse. In p. Chilton, & C. Schaffner, *Politics as Text and Talk: Analytical Aproaches to Political Dicourse (4th Ed). Discourse Approaches to Politics, Society and Culture.* Amsterdam: John Benjamin.

Cockcroft, R., & Cockcroft, S. (2005). *Persuading People: An Introduction to Rhetoric* (2nd ed.). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Cook, G. (1989). *Discourse.* USA: OxfordUniversity Press.

Danesi, M. (2013). On the Metaphorical Connectivity of Cultural Sign Systems. *Signs and Society* , *1*(1), 33-49.

Duranti, A., & Goodwin, C. (1992). *Rethinking Context: Language as an Interactive Phenomenon.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ferrari, F. (2007). Metaphor at work in the analysis of political discourse: investigating a 'preventive war' persuasion strategy. *Discourse & Society. Vol. 18, (5)* , 603-625.

Freeden, M. (2006). Ideology and Political Theory. . *Journal of Political Ideologies, vol (11)*, 3-22.

Gallup, G., G, J., & Cameron, P. A. (1992). Modality Specific Metaphors: Is Our Mental Machinery 'Colored' by a Visual Bias? *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity. Vol (7)*, 93–98.

García, M. J. (2010). Diagnosing Terrorism in Spain: Medical Metaphor in Presidential Discourse. *Southwest Journal of Linguistics, 29 (1)*, 53-73.

Gibbs, R. (2006). *Embodiment and Cognitive Science. .* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Glover, R. (2002). The War on ____. In J. Collins, & R. Glover , *Collateral Language: A User's Guide to America's New War* (pp. 207-22). New York: New York University Press.

Hartmann-Mahmud, L. (2002). War as Metaphor. *Peace Review, 14*(4), 427-432.

Iqbal, A. (2015, March). *Discourse Analysis of Prominent Politicians' Public Speeches: Pre and Post-Election 2013, Pakistan.* Retrieved from http://admin.umt.edu.pk/Media/Site/journals/SubSites/llr/F

Ivie, R. L. (2004). Democracy, war, and decivilizing metaphors of American insecurity. In F. A. Beer, & C. de Landtscheer , *Metaphorical global politics* (pp. 75-90). East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press.

Jones, J., & Peccei, J. S. (2004). Language and Politics . In I. Singh, & J. S. Peccei, *Language, society and power* (pp. 35-54). London: Routledge.

Kövecses, Z. (2002). *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Kruglanski, A., Crenshaw, M., Post, J., & Victoroff, J. (2008, December). What Should This Fight Be Called? Metaphors of Counterterrorism and Their Implications . *Psychological Science in the Public Interest , 8*(3), 97-133. Retrieved from http://www.psychologicalscience.org/journals/pspi/pspi_8_3_article.pdf

Lakoff, G., & Johnson. (1980). *Metaphors We Live By.*

Lazar, A., & Lazar, M. M. (2004). The discourse of the new world order: "out-casting" the double face of threat. *Discourse & Society, 15*(2-3), 223-42.

Leach, E. R. (1977). *Custom, Law, and Terrorist Violence.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Memon, N., Bughio, F. A., & Gopang, I. B. (2014). Critical Analysis of Political Discourse: A Study of Benazir Bhutto's Last Speech. *Balochistan Journal of Linguistics*, http://www.luawms.edu.pk/bjlvol2/5.pdf.

Merriam Webster Online Dictionary. (n.d.). Retrieved from http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/

Mihas, E. (n.d.). *Non Literal Language in Political Discourse.* Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228688889_Non-Literal_Language_in_Political_Discourse

Mohammad, M. T. (2014). The Metaphor of Nature in the Holy Quran: A Critical Metaphor Analysis (CMA). *Journal of Arabic and Human Sciences Qassim University, 7*(3), 83-100. Retrieved from

http://publications.qu.edu.sa/journals/6/articles/904/submission/copyedit/904-1512-1-CE.pdf

Onuf, N. (2009). Making Terrorism. *International Relations Vol 23(1)*, 53-60.

Sarbin, T. R. (2003). The Metaphor-to-Myth Transformation With Special Reference to the "War on Terrorism". *Peace and Conflict, 9*(2), 149-157.

Sederberg, P. C. (1995). Conciliation as Counter Terrorist Strategy. *Journal of Peace Research, 32*(3), 295–312.

Shimko, K. L. (1995). Foreign Policy Metaphors: Falling 'Dominos' and Drug 'Wars'. In L. Neack, J. A. Hey , & P. J. Haney, *Foreign Policy Analysis: Continuity and Change in its Second Generation. .(y Laura.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Sluka, J. (2009). The Contribution of Anthropology to Critical Terrorism Studies. In R. Jackson, M. B. Smyth, & J. Gunning, *Critical Terrorism Studies: A New Research Agenda* (pp. 138-55). London: Routledge.

Sontag, S. (1989). *Illness as a Metaphor and AIDS and its Metaphors.* New York: Doubleday.

Spencer, A. (2012). The Social Construction of Terrorism: Media, Metaphor and Policy Implications. *Journal of International Relations and Development*, 393-419. Retrieved from Retrieved from http://www.palgravejournals.com/jird/journal/v15/n3/pdf/j

Spencer, A. (2012). The Social Construction of Terrorism: Media, Metaphor and Policy Implications. *Journal of International Relations and Development, 15*(3), 393-419.

Steen, G., Dorst , L., Herrmann , B. J., & KaaL, A. (2010). Metaphor in usage. *Cognitive Linguistics. 21.*

Thompson, S. (1996). Politics without metaphor is like a fish without water. In J. S. Mio, & A. N. Katz, *Metaphor: Implications and Applications* (pp. 185-201). Mahway, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

van Dijk, T. A. (1998). *Ideology: A multidisciplinary approach.* London, UK: Sage Publications.

van Dijk, T. A. (2003). Text and context of parliamentary debates. In P. Bayley, *Cross cultural perspectives on parliamentary discourse* (pp. 339–372). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

van Dijk, T. A. (2006). *Sociocognitive Discourse Studies.* Retrieved June 13, 2018, from