

MORAL POLITICS IN 2019/2020 CROATIAN PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS

<https://doi.org/10.47960/2831-0322.2023.1.27.101>

Abstract

Political metaphor study has gained popularity in the last couple of decades with the emergence of Lakoff's Conceptual Metaphor Theory and even more with the Moral Politics Theory. This study examines the metaphors used in the Croatian presidential elections by the two top candidates: Kolinda Grabar-Kitarović and Zoran Milanović in the campaign rally speeches in Zagreb. The objective is to determine the presence and distribution of George Lakoff's Strict Father and Nurturant Parent paradigms of moral reasoning in the context of Croatian Politics and whether there is a link between family morality and metaphor choice. The research findings reveal positive evidence for Lakoff's MPT (Moral Politics Theory). Furthermore, it reveals that politicians reason in terms of the NATION IS A FAMILY metaphor when discussing domestic policy but reason in terms of NATION IS A PERSON when discussing foreign policy and war topics. Furthermore, the findings reveal that there is a link between the family models and ideology and metaphor choice.

Keywords: *conceptual metaphor theory; metaphors; moral politics; presidential elections; political speeches.*

Introduction

The world of politics revolves around power; its primary objective is acquiring, keeping, and sustaining power. In a democratic society, the only means by which politicians can get to this power is language. Their success depends on their ability to convey

DIANA LJUBIĆ*

ADRIAN BELJO**

IVANA
GRBAVAC***

Prethodno priopćenje

Preliminary communication

UDK: 324:172.1(497.5)

342.8(475.5)

Primljeno: 15. listopada
2022.

* Diana Ljubić, mag. philol. angl., diana.ljubic93@gmail.com

** Adrian Beljo, viši predavač, Edward Bernays University College, Zagreb, Croatia adrian.beljo@bernays.hr

*** dr. sc. Ivana Grbavac, izv. prof., Filozofski fakultet Sveučilišta u Mostaru, ivana.grbavac@ff.sum.ba

two elements, the persuasive and the aesthetic, thus recourse to metaphor seems to be the most efficient way to deliver a political message and metaphors indeed permeate political discourse. The significance of metaphor in political discourse has been given an extensive amount of academic attention over the past couple of decades from various perspectives such as cognitive linguistics, discourse analysis, sociolinguistics, and pragmatics. The trend started with the emergence of the field Cognitive Linguistics. The two most influential players in the field are George Lakoff, the father of the Conceptual Metaphor Theory and Charles Fillmore the father of Frame Semantics. Lakoff linked Fillmore's frames and metaphors to ideology and the struggle for power and took the CMT to a political dimension. One aspect of political metaphor study with which the academic world has been fascinated lately is Lakoff's Moral Politics Theory (MPT): the study of metaphorical moral reasoning of conservatives and liberals. The theory developed out of Lakoff's curiosity and determination to resolve what underlines the logic of conservatives and liberals and why attitudes on so many seemingly unrelated political issues group together into a left-right divide. He concluded that the two political systems of thought are grounded in family-based moralities, which are projected onto the domain of politics by the Nation-as Family metaphor. He prescribed conservative political orientation to the Strict Father model and the liberal to the Nurturant Parent Model.

This paper focuses on the conceptual metaphors used in the Croatian 2019/2020 presidential elections by Kolinda Grabar-Kitarović and Zoran Milanović in their campaign-rally speeches in light of the Moral Politics Theory. The two hypotheses are that (1) the two candidates gave primacy to different moral metaphors and (2) that they used different conceptual metaphors to frame issues due to their diverging family morality systems.

1. Metaphor

The term metaphor derives from the Greek expression *metapherein* which translates into "carry over" or "transfer" (Kovecses, 2010: 266). Conventionally, both in scholarly circles and in the popular mind, metaphors are perceived as a figure of speech that "carries" meaning from one concept to another implying a comparison. Metaphors are most famously known for their artistic

and rhetoric effect and have the reputation of being an imaginative, poetic, and ornamental device. They are intuitionally and initially interpreted as an anomaly, a deliberate and conscious use of words, reserved only for the most talented or eloquent speakers. From the traditional semantic perspective, there are three main classical views of metaphor:

1. *The comparison view* which can be traced back to ancient Greece and Aristotle who portrayed metaphor as an implicit comparison, a condensed or elliptic simile based on analogy. Aristotle described metaphor in terms of giving a thing a name that belongs to something else or transferring a noun from one object to another (Gibbs, 1994: 210).
2. *The substitution view* in which metaphor is seen as the substitution of one metaphoric expression for one literal expression with the same meaning; the metaphorical term stands in place of the literal term and the intended meaning of the statement resides within the literal term. The view holds that every metaphorical statement is equivalent to a literal statement. Metaphor is seen as a kind of puzzle that needs to be solved or a riddle that needs to be unravelled. As opposed to the previous view, emphasis is placed on alteration, i.e. a shift that occurs within metaphor comprehension, and not on transference (Black, 1955: 279-280).

Comparison view: A is like B

Substitution view: A is B → A is C

3. *The Interaction view* advocates that metaphors need to be understood within a context, that metaphor is not an isolated word, nor a substitution on a word level and attempts to bring within the field of standard semantics interpretive processes. According to Black, metaphorical meaning is reached via an interaction that occurs between two distinct subjects: the *principle subject* (the target) and the *subsidiary subject* (the source) and their “system(s) of associated commonplaces” (Black, 1955: 287). As the name of the approach implies, it is bidirectional: the influence is reciprocal, neither subject remains unchanged.

These three views do not have much currency in contemporary research on metaphor. Black’s idea, like the previous two, was not unquestioned; however, it did lay a foundation for theoretic development and proved to be catalyst to academics who became interested in metaphor’s ability to convey cognitive content.

1.1 Conceptual Metaphor Theory

The blossom of the field Cognitive Linguistics in the 1970s and Lakoff and Johnson's *Metaphors We Live By* (2003) put forward the Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT) which challenged all of the aspects of the traditional theory. It redefined the term metaphor, and launched a revolution within metaphor study that has prevailed in the last thirty years. The Conceptual Metaphor Theory is premised on the assumptions that (1) metaphor is conceptual, not linguistic, in nature; (2) metaphor is all pervasive, and is an unavoidable aspect of our everyday thought and language; (3) metaphors are used effortlessly on a daily basis by ordinary people, no special talent is required (4) the function of metaphor is not only ornamental: metaphor is a fundamental scheme by which people conceptualize the world; (5) cognition itself is metaphorical; and (6) metaphor is often not based on similarity (Kovecses, 2010: 11). According to Lakoff, metaphors are used so conventionally that they are barely acknowledged. They are a fundamental cornerstone in our cognition and govern and define our thoughts, our language, and consequently our actions.

Under the umbrella of the CMT, the essence of metaphor is understanding and experiencing one conceptual domain in terms of another conceptual domain via *mapping*; a conceptual domain referring to "any coherent organization of experience" (Kovecses, 2010: 4). There are two kinds of domains: the *source domain* which is typically a more concrete and accessible concept, and the *target domain* which is typically a more abstract, less tangible concept. A set of mappings bring into correspondence elements and the relations between the domains enabling us to transfer our knowledge and images from one domain to the other. Metaphorical mappings is partial, some of its aspects are activated, while others remain hidden. This is known as highlighting and hiding. In our attempt to understand the world, we logically conceptualize the vague concepts in terms of the more concrete ones, however the reverse conceptualization is not impossible, it just is not frequent and its purpose is always creating a special effect.

1.2 Linguistic vs. Conceptual Metaphor

However, a conceptual metaphor should be distinguished from a metaphorical linguistic expression. Kovecses explains the relationship between the two

phenomena: “the linguistic expressions (i.e., ways of talking) make explicit, or are manifestations of, the conceptual metaphors (i.e., ways of thinking)” (2010: 7). So, in other words, linguistic or verbal metaphors are surface reflections of conceptual metaphors, they stem from and are justified by underlying conceptual metaphors. Let us look at the following examples:

AN ARGUMENT IS WAR → conceptual metaphor

Your claims are <i>indefensible</i>	}	metaphorical linguistic expressions
He <i>attacked</i> every weak point in my argument		
I <i>demolished</i> his argument		

LIFE IS A GAMBLING GAME → conceptual metaphor

I’ll take my <i>chances</i>	}	metaphorical linguistic expressions
If you <i>play your cards right</i> , you can do it		
He’s a real <i>loser</i>		

2. Moral Politics Theory

There are two mainstream political worldviews at constant battle over authority in contemporary Western societies: the liberals and the conservatives. They are the two most influential political philosophies and ideologies since the post-Enlightenment era. The political divide is majorly a matter of ideologies and the role of the government. According to Lakoff (2016), the red/blue divide has become more vivid in the last couple decades with an increasing tension from both ends of the spectrum over controversial issues such as global warming, abortion, LGBT rights, and the status of religion. Protests, parades, immigration, terror attacks, mass shootings, and the computer revolution have paid their contribution to tribalism: to the “us-versus-them” attitude (Lakoff, 2016: 11).

The two camps are irreconcilable; they don’t understand each other: what is common sense to one is chaos to the other, and so, naturally, they advocate different policies. Lakoff’s Moral Politics Theory (MPT) accounts for the “schism between the left-learning and right learning camps in the US; the abysmal split between the conservative and progressive worldviews” (Lakoff and Wehling, 2016: 77-80). His MPT theory is premised on the assumption

that: (1) all politics is morally relevant and that liberals and conservatives have conflicting notions of what is morally right and what is morally wrong and each appeal to their morality in their politics; (2) a set of moral metaphors underline political positions; (3) these “moral-worldviews” are conceptually anchored in contrasting models of the family: the Strict Father and Nurturant Parent because we metaphorically reason about our nation in terms of a family; and (4) moral world-views affect political worldviews.

MPT is founded on the Embodied Cognition Theory. Lakoff claims that we cognitively map our primary experience of being governed, which is in our family by our first legitimate authority, our parents, to the notion of being governed in our country by our president (Lakoff and Wehling, 2016: 80-81). However, not all parents share the same parenting styles, and “whatever we might think is the right way to run a family becomes the right way to run the nation” (Lakoff and Wehling, 2016: 83-86). Consequently, our moral-worldview determines our political worldview.

In *Moral Politics*, George Lakoff (2016) describes the Strict Father and Nurturant Parent dichotomy. He attributes the patriarchal Strict Father model to conservatism. According to him, the highest priorities of this model are moral strength, respect for authority, and tough love. Anything that promotes “weakness” is immoral. The world is fundamentally harsh, dangerous, and a competitive place and it is the father’s responsibility, as the head of the house, to protect his family by preparing his children so that they can strive and thrive in such a difficult world. Children are believed to be naturally prone towards misbehaviour and self-indulgence and it is the father’s responsibility to develop moral strength, self-discipline, and self-reliance in his children. Only then will the children qualify to battle both internal and external evil forces of the world, and thus become successful competitors. The father disciplines his children by setting and enforcing strict rules and exercising his authority using punishments and rewards. Punishment for bad behaviour is perceived as key to good parenting and a sign of love and care because it builds character. The father (authority) is not to be questioned; communication and decision-making is hierarchical. Competition is a necessity because it encourages discipline, competence, strength. Giving children things that they haven’t earned, on the other hand, makes them dependant, incompetent, weak.

On the other hand, Lakoff based Liberalism on the Nurturant Parent model which emphasizes empathy, communal assistance, and unconditional love.

Strength is in the service of nurturance. The model is built on the assumption that children are born good, wanting to cooperate, and empathize with. Parents focus on mutual respect and open communication and discipline their children by modelling nurturance and respect. They encourage them to follow their dreams because the goal is to develop happy and altruistic children. That requires allowing the child to explore the range of ideas and options that the world offers. Cooperation is stressed rather than competition: “competition promotes aggression while cooperation appreciation for interdependence” (Lakoff, 2016: 87) and “interdependence is a non-hierarchical relationship” (Lakoff, 2016: 88). Authority should not come out of fear or dominance, instead should be a consequence of wisdom, judgment, empathy, nurture, love and respect for the parent etc.

Lakoff (2016) found that different metaphors for morality underline the reason of the two family ideologies. The metaphors that underline Strict Father morality:

- *Moral strength*: strength to forsake both external and internal evils (temptations) of this world. Anything that promotes or supports weakness is immoral, such as social programmes. People should be able to support themselves in the land of opportunity. “Evil must be fought not empathized with” (Lakoff, 2016: 64).
- *Moral authority*: parents know what’s best for the children and must exert authority by setting standards of behaviour & using punishments (Lakoff, 2016: 65).
- *Moral Order*: hierarchy (dominance) is natural and moral: God has authority over people; men over women; whites over non-whites; the U.S over other nations; Americans over other people; rich over the poor, etc. (Lakoff, 2016: 69).
- *Moral Boundaries*: moral behaviour is the only correct “path”. Immoral people are those who stray from the right path, and when they do they blur otherwise fixed moral boundaries and leave a trail for others who may be tempted to follow (Lakoff, 2016: 70).
- *Moral Essence*; the virtue (discipline, sobriety, chastity, etc.) or vices (sloth, lust, self-indulgence, etc.) that define a person, moral judgements (Lakoff, 2016: 72).
- *Moral Wholeness*: “natural, strict, uniform, unchanging standards of behaviour or overall unity of form that makes an entity strong and resistant to pressure...

immorality is seen as departure from that state... not holding together and therefore not being able to function” (Lakoff, 2016: 74).

- *Moral Purity*: moral impurities can ruin a society thus the society must be purged of corrupting individuals or practices. Immoral people must be isolated and removed so that their corrupting effect can be nullified (Lakoff, 2016: 75).
- *Moral Health*: immorality is a disease, it can spread through contact: the logic behind urban flight, segregated neighbourhoods, strong sentencing guidelines (Lakoff, 2016: 76).
- *Moral Self-Interest*: based on an economic idea; controlled market economies (socialist or communist) are impractical and immoral. If everyone pursues their own interests the whole group will be prosperous (Lakoff, 2016: 77).
- *Moral Self-Defence*: moral system must be defended above all. For example, Homosexuality and feminism are a threat because they violate moral order (Lakoff, 2016: 78).

The Nurturant Parent moral metaphors:

- *Morality as Empathy*: to be moral is to be empathic and promote a sense of well-being in others (Lakoff, 2016: 87).
- *Morality as Nurturance*: a parent who nurtures a child is moral (Lakoff, 2016: 90).
- *Moral Self-Nurturance*: you must take care of yourself before you can take care of others; taking care of yourself is a moral necessity (Lakoff, 2016: 91).
- *Morality as Social nurturance*: maintaining and mending social ties (Lakoff, 2016: 91-92).
- *Morality is Happiness*: “unhappy people are less likely to be compassionate than happy people” so happiness is encouraged in order to maintain nurturance (Lakoff, 2016: 92).
- *Morality as Self-Development*: development of positive skills in children so that they can nurture and help others (Lakoff, 2016: 93).
- *Morality as Fair Distribution*: fairness and equality between the parental figures and the children. Equality of distribution, opportunity, rights-based fairness, equal distribution of power (Lakoff, 2016: 94).
- *Moral Growth*: becoming more moral is growing. (Lakoff, 2016: 94)
- *Moral Strength to Nurture*: strength is in the service of nurturance, supporting and protecting the children (Lakoff, 2016: 95-96).

- *Nurturance and Business*: humane treatment of employees, creation of safe and humane workplace, social & ecological responsibility, fairness, etc. (Lakoff, 2016: 98).

2.1 Metaphorical Framing

Framing has become a key-word in Cognitive Metaphor Analyses since the 1980s with the realization that metaphor is not just a harmless rhetoric devise but an important mode of reasoning and its usage has skyrocketed in recent years, especially in the domain of political discourse which is widely recognized as inherently metaphorical.

According to Lakoff and Wehling (2016) frames are “cognitive configurations that structure our world knowledge and make sense of information [...] they establish what’s common sense to us- what we believe to be true about the world” (Lakoff and Wehling, 2016: 189). In other words, a frame is the mental picture, the associations that get activated every time we think about anything at all and if a word does not evoke a certain frame for us then we cannot make sense of it, it simply has no meaning to us (Lakoff and Wehling, 2016: 190).

Framing is the linguistic process by which people gain a particular understanding of an issue or change their thinking about an issue. Framing assumes that multiple descriptions of the same event are possible, and that differences in portrayal have impact on the construction of opinion and consequently action. Framing consists of the strategy of organization and filtering of information that allows us to make sense of the world.

Metaphors are powerful framing devices. Studies have found that applying different source domains to a single target domain affects the way we reason and act about it. Let’s take a look at Thibodeau and Boroditsky’s (2011) example CRIME IS A VIRUS vs. CRIME IS A BEAST in their article *Metaphors We Think With*. The results of their experiment reveal that metaphors systematically influenced how people approach crime: when the metaphor framed crime as a virus, participants proposed investigating the root causes and reform-oriented solutions such as “eradicating poverty and improving education” (Thibodeau and Boroditsky, 2011: 2), when the metaphor framed crime as a beast, on the other hand, participants proposed “catching and jailing criminals and enacting harsher enforcement laws” (Thibodeau and Boroditsky,

2011: 2). These different source domains generate important predispositions by means of highlighting certain aspects and deemphasize other aspects of the issue we reason about. This is where the power of metaphor resides, in the art of framing or activating certain frames.

However, according to Lakoff and Wehling (2016: 193-196), contradicting frames cannot be active at the same time. If political actors repeat over and over one single metaphor, the frame that it evokes becomes our primary way of viewing the question at hand, because frames, like metaphors, are prone to *synaptic strengthening*. This means that the more frequently a frame gets activated the more it gets engrained in our brains and the firmer it has a grip on our reasoning. Once a frame is entrenched it is hard to dispel. Any facts that are not in agreement with this frame will not be absorbed by our brain. Hence, this is why facts do not win elections, but dominating metaphors & frames which determine both what we can and what we cannot think, Lakoff argues (Lakoff and Wehling, 2016: 190-193).

3. Methodology

This study examines the conceptual metaphors used by the two top candidates of the 2019/2020 Croatian presidential elections, Zoran Milanović, the liberal and Kolinda Grabar-Kitarović, the conservative. The aim of this study is to determine whether the two candidates use different conceptual metaphors to frame issues based on Lakoff's Moral Politics Theory. Its aim is also to determine the presence of the Strict-Father and Nurturant Parent moral reasoning paradigms in the speeches of the two Croatian candidates.

Metaphor identification and analysis of conceptual metaphors can be approached either in a top-down or bottom-up fashion. The top-down approach involves the assumption of the presence of a conceptual metaphor and then the search for linguistic expressions whereas the bottom-up approach first involves the identification of metaphoric linguistic expressions and then the formulation of the conceptual mappings (Krennmayr, 2013: 7-8). A bottom-up, inductive, approach is used in this study to identify the conceptual metaphors.

The strict father vs. nurturant-parent metaphorical moral models can be identified at the level of words and concepts. Analysis at the level of words

includes identifying lexical items associated with the source domains of the two models, such as “*purity*”, “*strength*”, or “*support*” for example, and then testing if these items are indeed used metaphorically in moral statements in the political speech. Analysis at the level of concepts involves identifying the models by looking for references to general ideas associated with the two models such as “*understanding each other*”, or “*working hard*” for example (Brugman, Burgers and Vis, 2019: 5). In this study I primarily focused on concepts for the identification of the morality models. Finally, the metaphors from the left-wing and right-wing candidates were compared and contrasted. Special attention is paid to common issues and the metaphors used by the politicians to frame those issues.

The speeches were chosen from rallies in Zagreb. The speeches are approximately each thirty minutes long. The data were from YouTube and transcribed for the convenience of this analysis. The YouTube links of speeches are attached below in the *references* section.

4. Analysis

This section presents a number of examples of the way the analysis was done in the two speeches.¹

4.1 Kolinda Grabar-Kitarović in arena “Cibona”, Zagreb, December 19th, 2019

„Hvala vam na ovolikom odazivu u ovoj *dvorani koja pamti velike pobjede i nosi ime velikog pobjednika, velikog Zadranina Dražena Petrovića.*“

“Thank you for such a large turnout in this (sports) hall that remembers great victories and bears the name of the great winner, the great Zadar native, Dražen Petrović.”

- ARENA IS A PERSON
- POLITICS IS A GAME
- NAME IS AN OBJECT

¹ The examples are stated in Croatian language as it was originally said by the two candidates. The translations are available into English just for the general understanding. The metaphorical process is visible in Croatian language, sometimes also in English language. Translated by the author A. B.

„Danas smo ponovno ovdje *pobijediti za našu Hrvatsku*.“

“Today we are here again to win for our Croatia.”

- POLITICS IS A GAME

Zagreb je *posljednja etapa moje kampanje. Posljednja će postaja sutra biti Vukovar*.“

“Zagreb is the last stage of my campaign. The last stop tomorrow will be Vukovar.”

- POLITICAL ELECTION IS A JOURNEY
- CITIES ARE STATIONS

„Svaki hrvatski *kraj i zavičaj prisutan* je i u Zagrebu.“

“Every Croatian region and area is also present in Zagreb.”

- REGIONS ARE PEOPLE

„Zagreb *diše mirisima i gleda bojama* svih naših zavičaja. Tu je naš pisac, veliki pisac, August Šenoa napisao pjesmu ‘Budi svoj’. I zato *budi svoj, Zagrebe*.“ → *moral essence*

“Zagreb breathes the smells and looks with the colours of all our regions. This is where our writer, a great writer, August Šenoa wrote the poem ‘Be yourself’. And that’s why Zagreb, be yourself.”

- ZAGREB IS A PERSON

„Bio je to *početak promjena na bolje* u našoj domovini. *Sada taj trend moramo nastaviti još krupnijim koracima*.“

“It was the beginning of changes for the better in our homeland. Now we have to continue that trend with even bigger steps.”

- CHANGE IS JOURNEY (MOTION)
- POLITICS IS A STYLE
- POLITICS IS A JOURNEY

„Svi vi znate zašto, i zato molim vas, pozdravite *velikim pljeskom herojski Vukovar* i naše Vukovarce.“

“You all know why, and that’s why, please, greet with a big round of applause heroic Vukovar and our Vukovar residents.”

- BIG IS GOOD
- VUKOVAR IS A HERO (CITIES ARE PEOPLE)

„A ti, najbolji ste svi vi, svi vi koji ste mu vjerovali i slijedili ga kada se *stvarala i branila Hrvatska*.“ → *moral order*

“And the best is all of you, all of you who believed in him and followed him when Croatia was being created and defended.”

- CROATIA IS A BUILDING
- CROATIA IS THE VICTIM OF WAR (NATION IS A PERSON)

„Znamo što znači obitelj, znamo što znači ljubav za djecu i unuke. Upravo tu *obiteljsku Hrvatsku* želimo posebno *osnažiti*. *Politika mora služiti životu i obitelji* jer samo to *jamči razvoj, samo to jamči nam budućnost*.“

“We know what family means, we know what love means for children and grandchildren. It is precisely this Croatia family that we want to strengthen in particular. Politics must serve life and family because only that guarantees development, only that guarantees our future.”

- FAMILIAL CROATIA IS MORAL → *MORAL STRENGTH*
- POLITICS IS A SERVANT/ POLITICIANS ARE SERVANTS (LIFE AND FAMILY ARE MASTERS)
- NATION IS A PLANT (FAMILIAL POLITICS IS GARDENER)
- FUTURE IS MONEY (FAMILIAL POLITICS IS GUARANTOR)

„Hvala vama koji ste večeras došli izraziti potporu za moj program, za program *razvoja stabilnosti, sigurnosti, zajedništva*; za program još bolje Hrvatske.“

“Thank you for coming tonight to express your support for my programme, for the programme of development of stability, security, community; for the programme of an even better Croatia.”

- STABILITY, SAFETY, UNITY ARE PLANTS (PROGRAMME IS AN INGREDIENT)

„Kako nisam *pobjegla* kad me je Hrvatska najviše trebala.“ → *moral order*

“As I didn’t run away when Croatia needed me the most.”

- DECIEVING IS RUNNING AWAY (*motion*)

„Kako sam *radila* za Hrvatsku svim *srcem i znanjem*. Znete da *dišem za Hrvatsku bez kalkulacija*.“ → *moral order*

“As I worked for Croatia with all of my heart and knowledge. You know that I breathe for Croatia without calculations.”

- HEART IS TOOL
- KNOWLEDGE IS A TOOL
- LOVE IS A BREATH
- LOVE IS NOT AN ECONOMIC EXCHANGE

4.2 Zoran Milanović in arena “Tvornica”, Zagreb, November 9th, 2019

“Hvala vam što se došli i *idemo na jedno lijepo putovanje.*“

“Thank you for coming and let’s go on a nice journey.”

- POLITICS IS A JOURNEY

„Moje najveće oružje, moje najmoćnije oružje, će biti govor. To je ono što predsjednik ima, ako nema, ništa mu ne pomaže, a posebno ne veća ovlast.“

→ *moral authority of the nurturant*

“My greatest weapon, my most powerful weapon, will be speech. That’s what the president has, if he doesn’t have it, nothing will help him, especially not more power.”

- SPEECH IS A WEAPON/ POLITICS IS WAR
- SPEECH IS A POSSESSION
- POWER IS A TOOL

„Tu predsjednik republike može najviše, neumorno govoriti i ukazivati na probleme, greške, na probleme takozvanog *malog čovjeka*, šta god to značilo.“

→ *moral authority of the nurturant*

“This is where the president of the republic can achieve the most, talk tirelessly and point out problems, mistakes, problems of the so-called little man, whatever that means.”

- ORDINARY IS LITTLE

„Ovdje vam neću *pričati stvari* koje znam i znate da ne mogu ispuniti, odnosno, da sam znam da ih nikada neću moći *ispuniti*. Ne *natječem* se za premijera, *to vrijeme je prošlo.*“

“Here I will not tell you things that I know and you know that I cannot fulfil, that is, that I myself know that I will never be able to fulfil. I’m not running for prime minister, that time has passed.”

- PROMISES ARE CONTAINERS
- POLITICS IS A GAME
- TIME IS MOTION

„Ovlasti predsjednika republike su takve kakve jesu i u civiliziranoj, pristojnoj državi, sasvim dovoljno. Sve drugo, sva druga obećanja, sve druge *priče su put u autokraciju i tiraniju*, a protiv toga sam se *borio* i protiv toga ću se *boriti* neovisno o tome što mi život sutra donese.“ → *nurturant moral boundaries*

“The powers of the president of the republic are as they are in a civilized, respectable state, quite enough. Everything else, all other promises, all other stories are a path to autocracy and tyranny, and I fought against that and I will fight against that regardless of what life brings me tomorrow.”

- POLITICS IS A JOURNEY
- STORIES A PATHS/ AUTOCRACY AND TYRANNY ARE PLACES
- POLITICS IS A BATTLE
- LIFE IS A MYSTERY

„Oni koji su *dali svoje živote* – vječna im slava, onima koji su se borili i dali svoj doprinos – vječna zahvalnost, ali moramo *naprijed*.“

“Those who gave their lives – eternal glory to them, to those who fought and made their contribution – eternal gratitude, but we must move forward.”

- LIFE IS A GIFT
- LIFE IS A JOURNEY/ FORGETTING IS MOVING FORWARD

„Mi nakon trideset godina i dalje moramo *stvarati* ništa više nego samo normalnu *državu* u koju ćemo se *probuditi* za mjesec i po dana i reći: ovo je imalo i te kako smisla.“

“Even after thirty years, we still have to create nothing more than just a normal state to which we will wake up in a month and a half and say: this made so much sense.”

- COUNTRY IS A BUILDING/ POLITICIANS ARE BUILDERS
- OUR REALITY IS A (BAD) DREAM

„Država nije sama sebi smisao, *država* je tu da s njome budemo zadovoljni i da se u njoj *osjećamo sretno*.“ → *morality is happiness*

“The state is not its own meaning, the state is there for us to be satisfied with it and to feel happy in it.”

- COUNTRY IS A CONTAINER

„Hrvatska je država hrvatskog naroda, tako piše u Ustavu, ona je *nacionalna, etnička država*, ali to je simbolički *vrlo teška i nabijena stvar*. Međutim ona je isto tako država svih onih koji u njoj žive, spavaju, *traže sreću, uspijevaju ili ne uspijevaju*. *To su sve naši ljudi i za njih se treba boriti svakodnevno*.“ → *morality as fair distribution; morality as nurturance*

“Croatia is the state of the Croatian people, as it says in the Constitution, it is a national, ethical state, but it is symbolically a very difficult and charged matter. However, it is also the state of all those who live, sleep, seek happiness, succeed or fail in it. These are all our people and we have to fight for them every day.”

- NATIONAL AND ETHNIC MATTERS ARE HEAVY OBJECTS → HEAVY IS DIFFICULT
- CROATIA IS (EVERYBODY’S) HOUSE
- PEOPLE ARE POSSESSIONS
- POLITICS IS A BATTLE/SOCIAL EQUALITY IS A BATTLE

„To su *prava* na koja nitko nije pretjerano ponosan, to su *teški izbori* koji *stoje pred* ljudima, obiteljima i prije svega ženama s obzirom da *vidim i osjećam* što se događa u Hrvatskoj zadnjih nekoliko godina, vidim jedan trend naprosto memoricida, trend *sužavanja i pritiska* na *ljudska prava*, na prava žena što su *par excellence* ljudska prava.“ → *morality is empathy*

“These are rights that no one is overly proud of, they are difficult choices that people, families and above all women are faced with, given that I see and feel what has been happening in Croatia for the last few years, I see a trend of memoricide, a trend of narrowing of and pressure on human rights, on women’s rights, which are the human rights *par excellence*.”

- CHOICES ARE HEAVY OBJECTS → HEAVY IS DIFFICULT
- SEEING IS UNDERSTANDING
- HUMAN RIGHTS ARE OBJECTS

„Sudjelovao sam osobno prije dosta godina kada je Hrvatska vojska po prvi puta u ovom novom globalnom poretku odlazila daleko *izvan naših granica u misije* koje možda nisu ni posao, nisu predviđene kad je pisan i razmišljan Hrvatski ustav i sad imamo Hrvatsku vojsku širom svijeta tamo gdje joj po mom dubokom uvjerenju danas nije mjesto.“ → *moral boundaries*

“I personally participated many years ago when the Croatian Army for the first time in this new global order went far beyond our borders on missions that may not even be the task, they were not foreseen when the Croatian Constitution was written and contemplated about, and now we have the Croatian Army all over the world where, in my deep conviction, it has no place today.”

- COUNTRIES ARE CONTAINERS
- MISSIONS ARE DESTINATIONS

5. Results

Both candidates proved to follow the Strict Father and Nurturant Parent orientations which are first and foremost reflected in the candidates' use of issue topics:

Moral Themes	Issues	
Strict Father: <i>Kolinda Grabar-Kitarović</i>	<i>History/ Homeland War</i> <i>Family</i> <i>Economy</i> <i>Croats in Bosnia and Herzegovina</i>	<i>European Union</i> <i>Balkan</i> <i>Exodus</i> <i>Employment</i> <i>Immigrants</i> <i>Taxes</i>

Nurturant Parent: Zoran Milanović	<i>History/ Homeland war</i> <i>Croatian Justice System</i> <i>Corruption</i> <i>Minority groups and rights</i> <i>Foreign Policy</i> <i>Troops</i> <i>Migrants/ Immigration</i> <i>Working class</i> <i>Socio-economic gap</i> <i>European Union</i>	<i>Education</i> <i>Healthcare</i> <i>Openness</i> <i>Arms trade</i> <i>Technology and media</i> <i>Citizens</i> <i>Relationship with neighbouring nations</i> <i>Taxes</i> <i>Societal goals</i>
---------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

We can see, Milanović talked about twice as much issues than Grabar-Kitarović. There were not as much common issues as I would have hoped for, there are only four and those are: the homeland war, the European Union, immigrants, and taxes. The candidates used different metaphors to frame each those issues:

	Kolinda Grabar-Kitarović	Zoran Milanović
WAR	<i>FREE ELECTIONS</i> <i>WAR VETERANS ARE HEROES</i> <i>DECIEVING IS RUNNING AWAY</i> <i>WAR IS ACT OF MORALITY</i>	<i>HISTORY (WAR) IS A BURDEN</i> <i>WAR IS A GAME</i> <i>LIFE IS GIFT</i> <i>FORGETTING IS MOVING FORWARD</i> <i>WAR IS IMMORAL</i>
EU	<i>EU IS A HIGH-TABLE</i> <i>EU MEMBERS ARE GOOD COMPANY</i> <i>BALKAN IDEAS ARE ADVERSARIES</i>	<i>EU IS A HOUSE</i> <i>ANTIFACISM IS FOUNDATION</i> <i>EU IS A SHARK (predatory animal)</i> <i>MORAL ACTIONS ARE FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS</i> <i>EU IS A BATTLE FIELD</i>
IMMIGRANTS	<i>ILLEGAL MIGRATION</i> <i>MIGRANTS ARE INTRUDENRS</i> <i>POLITICS IS WAR</i>	<i>MIGRATION FLOWS ARE A THREAT</i> <i>MIGRANTION ISSUE IS A TACKLE</i> <i>MIGRANTS ARE A BURDEN (but one that must be carried)</i>

<p>TAXES</p>	<p>TAX REFORMS ARE FACTORY RESULTS ARE PRODUCTS (TAX REFORMS ARE MORAL)</p>	<p>TAX SYSTEM IS A CONTAINER DOING REFORMS IS RUMMAGING (<i>making a mess</i>) (TAX REFORMS ARE IMMORAL)</p>
--------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

The most significant and interesting difference between the left & right in Croatia is probably their outlook on the homeland war. From these metaphors we can see that liberals and conservatives in Croatia have totally different stances about the Homeland war and portray the event accordingly. Grabar-Kitarović did not hesitate to talk about it, the veterans, and damaged cities such as Vukovar, and when she did it was with a sense of pride. She uses the word “free” to frame elections, implying that Croats were *hostages* before the war and she frames our soldiers as heroes, *deceiving as running away* in Croatia’s time of need. From her metaphors we can conclude that for the typical conservative, *the homeland war is an act of morality*. Zoran Milanović on the other hand, did not linger on the topic. He used the metaphor WAR to a GAME, which in my opinion downplays the significance of it. He suggested that our HISTORY is a BURDEN and that *moving forward* (forgetting) is the right thing to do. His message frames *the war as an act of immorality*.

When talking about the EU, Grabar-Kitarović’s metaphors frame it as something you would want to be a part of, a privilege to be a part of with the metaphor EU is a HIGHT TABLE, while Milanović’s metaphors EU IS A SHARK and EU IS A BATTLEFIELD evokes a negative outlook, it may make one question the intentions of the EU and possibly reconsider membership.

Both candidates frame immigrants as a problem of a sort but their metaphors suggest different solutions to the problem: Grabar Kitarović uses the metaphor POLITICS IS A WAR, the solution being declaring a war to immigrants reflecting Strict Father logic, whereas Milanović’s MIGRANTS ARE A BURDEN implies that we ought to bare immigrants anyhow, reflecting the Nurturant Parent attitude.

The objective of the tax reform bills is to ease the tax burden on wages. Grabar-Kitarović is in favour of them and frames them as *factory* which produces good *results* and through the eyes of the conservative SF moral-worldview the tax reform is moral because “welfare is seen as taking away the incentive to work and thus promotes sloth” (Lakoff, 2016: 64). Milanović, on

the other hand, compares the reforms to *rummaging*, echoing the NP moral world-view because social programmes are seen by liberals as ways for the government to simultaneously help people (Lakoff, 2016: 219).

Milanović was very effective at communicating his liberal moral visions. Nurturant Parent morality is also echoed throughout the other issues he talked about such as minority groups & their rights, women's productive rights, worker's rights, socio-economic gap, healthcare & education, openness, technology & media, troops, and societal goals:

ISSUE	METAPHOR	MORALITY METAPHOR
MINORITY GROUPS AND RIGHTS	CROATIA IS EVERYONE'S HOUSE SOCIAL EQUALITY IS A BATTLE	Morality as fair distribution Morality as nurturance
WOMEN'S PRODUCTIVE RIGHTS	CHOICES ARE HEAVY OBJECTS CHOICES ARE OBSTACLES HUMAN RIGHTS ARE POSSESSIONS CHOICES ARE PATHS DESTINY IS A DESTINATION	Morality is empathy Morality is self-nurturance Morality is happiness
WORKER'S RIGHTS	MODERN POLITICS IS THE SHIELD OF WORKING CLASS OPENESS IS THE SHILED OF WORKING CLASS LABOUR MOVEMENT IS THE SEED/ MODERN POLITCS & OPENESS IS THE FRUIT	Nurturance and work
SOCIO-ECONOMIC GAP	(HIS) POLITICS IS A SOCIAL WORKER (HER) POLITICS IS AN ADVERSARY	Morality is equality Morality as social nurturance
HEALTHCARE & EDUCATION	HEALTHCARE AND EDUCATION ARE A DESTINATION HEALTHCARE IS A LINE OF DEFENCE	Morality is equality of opportunity

OPENNESS	<p>OPENESS IS STRENGTH</p> <p>OPENESS IS VALUE</p> <p>POLITICS IS A BATTLE/ OPPRESSION & TYRANNY ARE OPPONENTS</p> <p>POLITICS IS GARDENING/ SOCIETY IS A GARDEN/ OPRE- SSORS ARE PREDATORS (IN- TRUDERS) IN GARDEN</p>	<p>Moral strength to nurture</p> <p>Morality as social nurturance</p> <p>Morality as fair distribution</p>
TECHNOLOGY AND MEDIA	<p>DIGITAL REVOLUTION IS A LIQUID</p> <p>DIGITAL REVOLUTION IS A NATURAL DISASTER</p> <p>HATRED & INTOLERANCE ARE FIRE</p>	<p>Moral strength to nurture</p> <p>Morality is empathy</p>
SOCIETAL GOALS	<p>POLITICIANS ARE AUTHORS</p> <p>DIFFERENCES ARE PEOPLE</p> <p>DIVISION, PREJUDICE, HA- TRED ARE SEEDS</p>	<p>Moral empathy</p> <p>Morality as social nurturance</p> <p>Moral growth</p>
TROOPS	<p>MISSIONS ARE DESTINATI- ONS</p>	<p>Nurturant moral boundaries</p>

To the contrary to Milanović, Grabar-Kitarović's speech reflects the NATION IS PERSON metaphor more than it does the NATION IS A FAMILY metaphor. It was used whenever she talked about foreign policy: the Independence or Homeland war, the Balkan, the EU, and even the economy. The aim of this nation-person is to recover from the damage of communism and the leftists and become healthy and strong (economically and militarily) and prosper in the EU. However, the SF moral paradigm is still present in her speech but just not as explicit and prevalent as the NP is within Milanović's speech. Most of her speech rests on the Moral Order metaphor. It is also noteworthy to mention that some of the moral metaphors received a slightly different or additional sense in this NATION IS A PERSON, Croatian patriotic context:

- *Moral Strength*: Balkan is evil, Communism and leftist are evil, EU is good, etc.

- *Moral order*: Croatia people over other people, war veterans over people who didn't serve Croatia during warfare; Croatian workers over foreign employees. HDZ over other political organizations, etc.
- *Moral wholeness*: unity of all Croatian citizens in Croatia or abroad (in Bosnia and Herzegovina) (because Croats from abroad helped win the war).
- *Moral Self-defence*: protecting Croatia's interests, Croatian products, Croatian values.
- *Moral purity*: what is in the best interest of Croatia, serving Croatia/ Croatian people.
- *Moral boundaries*: staying within Croatia is moral/ abandoning Croatia is immoral.

Conclusion

Both of the hypotheses received empirical support together with the Moral Politics Theory. However, the MPT was more evident in Milanović's speech which displayed the Nurturant Parent morality, as we suspected. Kolinda Grabar-Kitarović's speech was mainly based on the NATION IS A PERSON metaphor. This can be attributed to her theme in which the key points are patriotism, unity, and references to the 1990s Independence or Homeland War, instead of universal conservative domestic policies. However, her theme is nothing unusual for a Croatian conservative. It can be credited to the unique Croatian historical background: the recent war, which regularly appears as the main theme of conservatives' speeches. Nevertheless, Grabar-Kitarović still displayed the Strict Father morality, but in a smaller proportion than Milanović did his Nurturant Parent. Her dominating morality metaphor was undoubtedly *Moral Order* which rays reached her other morality metaphors and influenced them. This may have attributed to the election outcome.

Anyhow, it appears that politicians reason in terms of NATION IS A FAMILY when the focus of their speech is domestic policy, whereas in terms of NATION IS A PERSON when the focus is on foreign policy and war topics.

Secondly, there is a link between family models or political ideology and conceptual metaphor choice. This can be best exemplified within common issues, where candidates used metaphors to frame diverging scenarios. But this is also evident in distinct issues in which metaphors echoed a moral paradigm.

In the end, we can confirm Lakoff's statement that politics is not about neutral rational discussion of issues but about what version of family-based morality we are going to have. Metaphors are a powerful tool in the political arena and it is important that we be aware of the agenda that lies behind metaphorical language, because metaphors can influence election outcomes.

The sources (the two speeches)

- Kolinda Grabar-Kitarović: Election campaign rally in arena "Cibona", Zagreb, December 19th, 2019. YouTube link: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IPbA_8h0CTI> (June 10, 2020)
- Zoran Milanović: Election campaign rally in arena "Tvornica", Zagreb, November 9th, 2019. YouTube link: <<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mJdO7qH3RE8>> (June 21, 2020)

References

- Black, Max (1955) "Metaphor", *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, New Series, Vol 55 (1954-1955), Blackwell Publishing on behalf of The Aristotelian Society, 273-294.
- Brugman, Britta – Burgers, Christian – Vis, Barbara (2019) *Metaphorical Framing in Political Discourse through Words vs. Concepts: A Meta-analysis*, UK Cognitive Linguistic Association. Retrieved from:
- <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/331980666_Metaphorical_framing_in_political_discourse_through_words_vs_concepts_A_meta-analysis> (May 15, 2020)
- Gibbs, Raymond (1994) *The Poetics of Mind: Figurative Thought, Language, and Understanding*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kovecses, Zoltan (2010) *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*, Second Edition, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Krennmayr, Tina (2013) *Top-down Versus Bottom-up Approaches to the Identification of Metaphor in Discourse*, Amsterdam: Vrije University.
- Lakoff, George (2016) *Moral Politics: How Liberals and Conservatives Think*, Third Edition, Chicago – London: The University of Chicago Press.

- Lakoff, George – Johnson, Mark (2003) *Metaphors We Live By*, London: The University of Chicago press.
- Lakoff, George – Wehling, Elisabeth (2016) *Your Brain's Politics: How the Science of Mind Explains the Political Divide*; 2016 digital version converted and published by Andrews UK Limited.
- Thibodeau, Paul – Boroditsky, Lera (2011) *Metaphors We Think With: The Role of Metaphor in Reasoning*, Stanford: Department of Psychology, Stanford University.

MORALNA POLITIKA U HRVATSKIM PREDSJEDNIČKIM IZBORIMA 2019./2020.

Sažetak

Proučavanje političkih metafora popularizirano je posljednjih nekoliko desetljeća pojavom Lakoffove teorije konceptualne metafore, a još više pojavom teorije moralne politike. Ovaj rad bavi se metaforama kojima su se na zadnjim hrvatskim predsjedničkim izborima služilo dvoje vodećih kandidata, Kolinda Grabar-Kitarović i Zoran Milanović, u svojim predizbornim govorima u Zagrebu. Cilj je rada odrediti prisutnost i rasprostranjenost Lakoffove Strict Father (engl. strogi otac) i Nurturant Parent (engl. brižni roditelj) paradigme moralnoga rasuđivanja u kontekstu hrvatske politike te odgovoriti na pitanje postoji li poveznica između obiteljskih moralnih vrijednosti i odabira metafore. Rezultati istraživanja pokazali su da postoje dokazi o Lakoffovoj teoriji o moralnoj politici (MPT). Osim toga rezultati ukazuju na to da političari razmišljaju u okviru metafore NACIJA JE OBITELJ pri razmatranju unutarnje politike i NACIJA JE OSOBA pri razmatranju vanjske politike i ratnih tema. Nadalje, rezultati istraživanja pokazuju da postoji poveznica između obiteljskih modela i ideologije te odabira metafore.

Ključne riječi: teorija konceptualne metafore; metafore; moralna politika; predsjednički izbori; predsjednički govori.