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1. Introduction

On the 18th of September, 2014 the Scottish public voted whether or not Scotland should become an independent country. Before this date, Scotland had been part of Great Britain since 1707 with its own church, had had the Scottish National Party which aimed for an independent Scotland since 1934, and its own parliament from 1999 onwards. Prior to the vote massive campaigns for and against independence took place in Scotland. The Yes campaign, led by the Scottish National Party (SNP) and the then First Minister of Scotland and leader of SNP, Alex Salmond, rallied for independence. The Better Together campaign, led by the Scottish Labour Party including Douglas Alexander, the Secretary of State for Scotland, wanted Scotland to remain a part of Great Britain.

Both campaigns were actively trying to convince the voters to side with their views. Politicians from both camps held numerous speeches to the press and the public in an effort to persuade the voters to their camps. Contrary to most modern national independence votes, the people of Scotland voted against independence. This sparked a national dialogue on how the Better Together campaign had managed to persuade more voters on their side and why the Yes campaign had failed to convince fewer voters despite a long national history of pursuing independence and a well-documented desire to regain independence from England.

The aim of this thesis is to study two campaign speeches; one from each campaign. These speeches precede the vote and, therefore, aim to convince the listeners to vote for the side the speaker represents. The thesis will show how this is done through constructing certain political myths and discourses and within them, a certain type of Scottish national identity and Scotland as a nation. To examine the speeches and to study the discourses both campaigners construct with their words, I will use Critical Metaphor Analysis and Political Discourse Analysis. I will look at the textual communication in the speeches, in other words, the word choices that the speakers make. More specifically, I will be examining the metaphors, negative-positive semantic pairs and personal pronouns that the speakers use. The research question of this study is: What kinds of discourses and myths do the speakers construct through using metaphors, personal pronouns and semantic pairs?

As the result of the vote was historically so unusual and in many ways unexpected, I feel a deeper look into the way the voters were persuaded or not persuaded, as is more the case here, to vote for their country’s independence is in order. In addition, the vote was of great interest to other nations because of the results’ effect on the British economy and British national security, amongst other
things. Furthermore, one of the selling points of the Better Together campaign was a promise that the UK would remain a part of the EU. However, as Britain recently voted to leave the European Union but the votes in Scotland were noticeably for staying in the EU, there was immediate talk about a possible second Scottish independence referendum. If it will take place in the next two years, it is crucial to understand what happened in the first referendum’s political discourse so that the political parties and voters alike can learn from their past mistakes. It is for these reason that it is critical to take a detailed look at how the two campaigns and their two representatives from different Scottish political parties spoke about Scotland as a nation and Scottish people and their national identity. Furthermore, it is important to find out how the speakers legitimise their own party’s policies and action and delegitimised those of the opponent.

I will first introduce the theoretical framework of Cognitive Semantics Approach, Critical Metaphor Analysis and Political Discourse Analysis and key units of the analysis as well as previous studies conducted to research national identity and political discourses. Then I will discuss the research design including data and the research process. Next, I will present the analysis with answers to the research question. After this, I will explain what the results of my research are and discuss their implications and finally, I will conclude the research by reflecting on its success and validity and give suggestions for further research topics.
2. Theoretical framework

In this section, I will introduce and explicate the cognitive semantics approach, which is used to interpret, explain and understand the metaphors in the speeches. I will also introduce essential concepts used in this research as well as the methodology that springs out of the theoretical approaches. I will then present studies which have been previously conducted on either Scottish identity and nationhood, or other national identities and nationhoods as well as previous studies researching the use of metaphors, semantic polarisation and personal pronouns in political discourse.

2.1. Cognitive semantics approach

This study uses the cognitive semantic approach to explain the results of the analysis. The approach was developed by Lakoff and Johnson in *Metaphors we live by* (1980) and developed and modified in later work (e.g. Lakoff & Johnson 1999; Lakoff 1987, 1993 and 2002; Lakoff & Turner 1989; Johnson 1987). The approach is based on three basic ideas of cognitive science: 1. The mind is inherently embodied, 2. Thought is mostly unconscious and 3. Abstract concepts are largely metaphorical. What follows now is a detailed explanation of each idea.

What Lakoff and Johnson (1999) mean when they claim the mind is inherently embodied is that, contrary to the tradition of faculty psychology and in line with the evolutionary view, reason is not disembodied, a separate function that is independent of our perception, motion, emotion and other bodily functions, but actually arises from the nature of our brains, bodies and bodily experience. Reason is shaped crucially by the peculiarities of our human bodies (two eyes, ears, feet, hands, laying down when sleeping, standing up when awake etc.), the intricate details of the neural structures of our brains (all neural beings must categorise) and by the specifics of our everyday functioning in the world. Our minds are embodied in a way that our conceptual systems largely draw upon the commonalities of our bodies and of the environments we live in. (Lakoff & Johnson, 1999, p. 6.)

All neural beings must categorise their surroundings. They do this by sensing their surroundings, moving themselves and manipulating objects around them. How they are able to sense, move and manipulate in relation to their surroundings defines how they categorise these surroundings.

Categorisation has been integral to our survival, for instance, we have had to categorise food under
what to eat and what not to eat, animals under which are dangerous and which are not and potential partners under ones that can provide and ones that cannot. Categorisation is not, for the largest part, conscious reasoning. Most categories have been formed through functioning in the world. Our brains and bodies determine which kinds of categories we have and the structure of those categories. For example, the way we are able to move and detect and observe the movement of others play a big role in our conceptual system. Because categories are formed through embodiment, they are part of our experience. Categories are, therefore, not formed as a result of our experiences, but they are an integral part of forming our experiences. (Lakoff & Johnson, 1999.)

According to Lakoff & Johnson, (1999) categories, concepts and our experiences are inseparable. Concepts are neural structures which allow us to mentally characterise our categories and reason about them, and human categories are conceptualised in terms on prototypes. Social stereotypes enable us to make quick judgements, usually about other people. Salient examples, i.e. well-known examples, are used to make probability judgements. Reasoning based on prototypes forms a large part of our reasoning and in order for us to be able to function in everyday life, we build rich conceptual structures for our categories and reason about them. (Lakoff & Johnson, 1999.) Concepts are concepts due to their inferential capacities and “an embodied concept is a neural structure that is actually part of, or makes use of, the sensimotor system of our brain. Much of conceptual inference is, therefore, sensimotor inference” (Lakoff & Johnson, 1999, p. 20). All this means that the location of our reason is the same as the location of our perception and motor control, and therefore, reason, and bodily functions are inseparable (Lakoff & Johnson, 1999).

Before describing what Lakoff and Johnson mean by thought is mostly unconscious, it is necessary to clarify that they define (1999) cognitive as ”any mental operations and structures that are involved in language, meaning, perception, conceptual systems and reasons” as well as “aspects of our sensimotor system which contribute to our abilities to conceptualize and to reason” (p.12). Lakoff and Johnson (1999) explain that cognitive science studies conceptual systems. Thought operates largely beneath the level of cognitive awareness. For example, when we are having a conversation, we unconsciously, i.e. without noticing or focusing on it, access memories, comprehend streams of sounds, assign structures to sentences, pick out words and give them meaning, frame what is said, construct mental images, fill in gaps in the discourse, notice and interpret the other participants’ body language and plan what we are going to say. All of these cognitive actions apply to just saying one sentence. We are not only unaware of these actions and
processes taking place, they are actually inaccessible to the conscious awareness and control. (Lakoff & Johnson, 1999.)

Our unconscious conceptual system works like a “hidden hand” which shapes how we conceptualise all aspects of our experience. The hidden hand constitutes our unreflective common sense by creating abstract entities such as friendship, failures and freedom in our cognitive unconsciousness and gives form to the metaphysics built in our ordinary conceptual systems. For instance, when we think of the self in terms of a higher, rational self and a lower, irrational self and of a conceptual struggle these two parts of our self are having, this fundamentally metaphorical understanding of the self is seen as common sense experience and it is rooted in our unconscious conceptual system. (Lakoff & Johnson, 1999.)

Lakoff and Johnson (1980) base the third and final idea that abstract concepts are largely metaphorical on their linguistic evidence findings, according to which metaphor is pervasive in life, in thought and in action as well as language. The whole conceptual system based on which people act and think has a fundamentally metaphorical nature, and that conceptual system affects how we define everyday realities. The conceptual system is not explicit and we are not aware of it. Since language is one area in which the conceptual system is evident, by analysing language, the system can be explained. (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980.)

A metaphor has two linguistic domains, namely the source domain where it normally occurs and the target domain where it does not normally occur (Charteris-Black, 2005.) For example, in Alex Salmond’s speech the phrase “Scotland has gone down a better route”, the source domain is travelling and the target domain is the Scottish nation moving forward, developing. Metaphor is also dependent on our expectations and based on our previous experience of language. It is a relative phenomenon because different people have different experiences of language and will, therefore, give different meanings to words. From henceforward, as per the linguistic tradition, the source metaphors will be written in capital letters.

Lakoff and Johnson (1980) list three different kinds of metaphors; Structural metaphors, orientational metaphors and ontological metaphors. As the conceptual system is largely metaphorical, the metaphors we use structure how we perceive and think and what we do. “The essence of metaphor is understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another”. (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p 5). For example, the structural source metaphor ARGUMENT IS WAR
entails expressions such as winning/losing, defending, hitting the target and taking cover when thinking of, talking about or performing the action of arguing. If an argument is perceived in terms of war, it is instantly perceived as a negative, destructive and unwanted action, whereas if it was perceived in terms of dancing, it would be seen as more positive, interactional, connecting and desirable action. In addition to perception, the source metaphor of ARGUMENT IS WAR structures the actions we perform when arguing. We verbally attack and defend, we see the person we argue with as an opponent, we take sides etc., and even though war and arguing are not similar, an argument is partially structured, understood, performed and talked about in terms of war. It is normal to refer to the action of arguing in terms of war in our culture. (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980.)

Metaphorical concepts such as ARGUMENT IS WAR are systematic and, therefore, the language used to talk about that aspect of the concept is systematic. For example, the source metaphor TIME IS MONEY entails also metaphors like TIME IS A LIMITED RESOURCE and TIME IS A VALUABLE COMMODITY, thus these three metaphors form a system of conceptual metaphors. Because we act like time is money, we perceive of it that way, for example, hotel rooms rates are by the hour, wages are based on an hourly rate or salaries on a monthly rate, mobile phone bills are based on the minutes used to talk etc. The systemacity of metaphorical concepts enables people to view a thing, such as an argument, in terms of another thing, such as war, and in this process, omit other possible ways of viewing an argument, for example, as dance. Therefore, certain aspects are highlighted and hidden in metaphors resulting in viewing the thing, such as argument, as destructive interaction instead of co-operating or rebuilding interaction. (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980.) This is very essential in political discourse, as the carefully chosen in group metaphors and rhetorical strategies depict the in-group in a positive way and the out-group, the opponent, in a negative way. For example, in her speeches, Thatcher used animal and parasite metaphors when talking about the Labour Party and metaphors of medicine when talking about the Conservative Party (Charteris-Black, 2005). Metaphorical structures are always partial, otherwise arguing would actually be war, not only like it.

Orientational metaphors organise a whole system of concepts with respect to one another. They are called orientational because most of them involve a spatial orientation such as up-down, in-out or front-back. According to Lakoff and Johnson (1980), these metaphors are born out of human body’s characters and from how human bodies function. For example, the orientational metaphors of CONSCIOUS IS UP, UNCONSCIOUS IS DOWN in “I woke up” and “I fell asleep” come from the simple physical fact that human beings tend to lay down when they sleep and tend to stand up or
be in another kind of upright physical position when they are awake. Health, having control and more are also up, while death, being controlled and less are down and so forth, thus all orientational metaphors can be linked to human physical and cultural experiences. A metaphor, therefore, always has an experiential basis which defines understanding the workings of the metaphor. (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980.) The different experiential basis of metaphors explains why to fall in love is considered a good thing even though downwards movement is generally seen as negative, e.g. I feel low, don’t stoop to his level, we fell out etc. In the case of love, however, the experiential basis could be that love is an unconscious and uncontrollable act, a feeling so strong that it absorbs us into it and makes us physically descend into it.

In addition to structural and orientational metaphors, there are also ontological metaphors which refer to entity and substance metaphors as well as container metaphors such as “I’m a little rusty, I cannot operate today”, in which the MIND IS A MACHINE, “I relayed the message he gave me”, in which the MESSAGE IS AN ENTITY IN A CONTAINER which you can pass on via a channel or “inflation is lowering the standard of life”, in which INFLATION IS AN ENTITY WITH ACTION. Such ontological metaphors help us at least try and rationally deal with our experiences.

Personification is a subcategory of ontological metaphors and enables people to understand a wide variety of experiences with nonhuman entities in terms of human motivations, characteristics and action. It is very revealing which aspects of the personification are picked out for the metaphors. (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980.) For example, in her speeches, Thatcher described how the Labour crushed the policy and the Conservatives rebuilt the policy, thus making Labour a person doing something destructive and the Conservatives a person who created something new, and by doing so, validating the actions and policies of the Conservative government and justifying the government’s actions and decision making (Charteris-Black, 2005).

If we look at metaphors and their experiential basis, we can find out the most fundamental concepts and values of any given culture. For example, in the Western culture TIME IS MONEY (don’t waste your time, thank you for your time, I’m running out of time), MORE IS BETTER, GOOD IS UP. Less is better is not applicable, except for in recent downshifting subcultures, where DOWN IS GOOD, LESS IS BETTER, time is not given value through money and so on. Lakoff and Johnson (1980) state that “In general, which values are given priority is partly a matter of the subculture one lives in and partly a matter of personal values” (p. 23) and this priorisation speaks volumes of the value of the person using the metaphor.
2.2. Critical Metaphor Analysis and Critical Discourse Analysis

Critical Metaphor Analysis, from here onwards referred to as CMA, is a methodology used to identify and describe political myths. Analysing the metaphors politicians use is essential to differentiating myth from reality. CMA reveals that evaluations implied by political myths are either positive or negative and it is a method for understanding how political myths communicate ideology. Systematic use of metaphor is part of an ideology because metaphor mediates between myth and ideology and identifying the conceptual basis of metaphors is a way of explaining the negative or positive associations that underlie the metaphor (Charteris-Black, 2004, p.24). For example, in this study Alex Salmond uses metaphors of restricted movement and touch to create a myth of a hero being held in captivity by his oppressor but wanting to break free and by doing so, communicates an ideology of freedom and autonomy.

Flood (1996) refers to political myth as “an ideologically marked narrative which purports to give a true account of a set of past, present or predicted political events and which is accepted as valid in its essentials by a social group” (p.44). Geiss (1987) defines political myth as “an empirical, but usually not verifiable explanatory thesis that presupposes a simple causal theory of political events and enjoys wide public support” (p.29).

Edelman’s three most often used political myths are reiterated by Geiss (1987) as follows:

1. The myth of the Conspirational Enemy. This myth entails that a hostile out-group is plotting against the in-group.
2. The Valiant Leader myth. This myth entails a benevolent political leader who is effective in saving people from danger by showing courage and aggression and by overcoming difficulties.
3. The United We Stand myth which entails that a group can win their enemies by obeying their leader and sacrificing for them.

All three myths present a discourse of legitimation where there is a threat, a response to the threat and a valiant leader emerging (Charteris-Black, 2005). Legitimation of certain behavior or characteristics is one of the main functions of metaphor in political language. Graham, Keenan and Dowd (2004) identify four legitimation strategies in speeches by political leaders. These are 1) appeals to a “good” legitimate power source, 2) appeals to history or historical mythology, 3) the construction of a thoroughly evil Other, and 4) appeals for uniting behind a legitimate power.
source. However, a very important function of metaphors in political discourses alongside with legitimisation is delegitimation. Chilton (2004, p.47) defines delegitimation as acts of negative other representations, blaming, scapegoating, marginalising, excluding, attacking the moral character of some individuals or group, attacking the communicative cooperation of the other and attacking the rationality and sanity of the other. The very extreme of deligimitation is to completely deny the humanness of the other. Political speeches usually use metaphor to both legitimise and and delegitimise and to create a clear difference between us and them. In both of the speeches I study almost as much space and time is dedicated to crediting “us” as is dedicated to discrediting “them”.

To illustrate why all of the above is necessary to explain when defining the role of CMA and to emphasise the importance of analysing metaphors in my study of political speeches, I will quote Charteris-Black (2005, p.13): “Ideology appeals to us through consciously formed set of beliefs, attitudes and values, whereas myth appeals to our emotions through unconsciously formed set of beliefs and values. Metaphor, then, mediates between these conscious and unconscious means of persuasion to create a moral perspective of life and is, therefore, a central strategy for legitimisation in political speeches”.

On a more practical note, CMA is an approach of analysing metaphors which aims to identify the intentions underlying language use (Charteris-Black, 2005). The approach entails three stages: 1. Metaphors are identified, 2. Metaphors are interpreted and 3. Metaphors are explained. Next, I will describe each stage in detail.

To identify a metaphor one has to first define what a metaphor is. Charteris-Black (2004, p.21) states that a metaphor is “a linguistic representation that results from the shift in the use of a word or phrase from the context or domain in which it is expected to occur, thereby causing semantic tension”. Semantic tension in metaphors is caused by either reification or personification. Reification means referring to something abstract by using a word or phrase that refers to something concrete in another context. For example, Alex Salmond talks about “releasing the potential” of the Scottish people, depicting the potential as some kind of an entity (animal?) that has been captured and that the SNP will help set free. Personification means using a word or phrase that refers to something inanimate but which in other contexts refers to something animate. For instance, Alex Salmond talks about the Scottish nation as “walking tall among the nation of the earth”.

Charteris-Black (2005) states that semantic tension makes metaphor a linguistic phenomenon with pragmatic and cognitive characteristics and any word or phrase can be a metaphor if its context
makes it one. The pragmatic character of a metaphor comes from the fact that it is motivated by the underlying purpose of persuasion (Charteris-Black, 2005.) Persuasion is one of the very core purposes of political speeches, especially in the two speeches I analysed in this research as the speakers are trying to persuade the listeners to vote a certain way, i.e. to take a certain kind of action.

A metaphor receives its cognitive character because it may cause a shift in a person’s conceptual system and a metaphor itself is caused by a shift in the conceptual system. This conceptual shift refers to a psychological association between the original attributes of the word, or the source domain, and the attributes of the target domain i.e. the new attributes of the word. The association is based on the metaphor creating similarities between two domains that have not been previously perceived to be similar. (Charteris-Black, 2005.) For example, before the birth of the metaphor “pot calling the kettle black”, cooking equipment was not linked to a person being hypocritical and dismissing the similarities in their own, unfavourable behaviour or personal characteristics in comparison to others. The association is also determined according to the values of the culture the metaphor is used in (Charteris-Black, 2005). This is a crucial point in my research because I was particularly keen to find out how the two speakers build the discourses of nationality and national cultures always have certain shared values on which they are build and to which, I presumed, the two speakers heavily lean on in their speeches.

Metaphors are especially rich ground for analysis as they are not just a literary device, but they may be a key factor in differentiating representations in any domain, literary or non-literary (Fairclough, 1995). For example, Montgomery, Tolson and Garton (as cited in Fairclough, 1995) have discussed the metaphorisation of elections as war and how this shapes the electoral campaign and the way the media cover the elections. According to the political cognition theory (e.g. Fiske & Kinder, 1981; Sniderman, 1993), which uses the cognitive psychology’s information model, people need political maps or themes which simplify the vast supply of political information. Metaphors function as these political maps by providing a lot of information in a condensed, simplified and understandable form.

Even though the political cognition theory is an interesting approach, to interpret the metaphors I used the cognitive semantics approach, created by Lakoff and Johnson (1980). I have explained this approach in detail previously, but I will quickly summarise the main idea of the approach here. According to the cognitive semantics approach, the human mind is inherently embodied, thought is
mostly unconscious and abstract concepts are largely metaphorical (Lakoff & Johnson, 1999, p. 3). Charteris-Black (2005) states that “the value of the cognitive semantic approach is that it permits comparisons to be made on how metaphor is used differently by political leaders and to identify metaphors that are common to them all” (p. 29). In addition, according to Edelman (1971), “Each metaphor can be a subtle way of highlighting what one wants to believe and avoiding what one does not wish to face” (p. 67). This makes the cognitive semantic approach a perfect theoretical framework for my research as I am specifically interested in the similarities and differences of the discourses of nationality and nationhood the two politicians build and it will be important to identify, interpret and explain them.

The final stage of CMA is to explain the metaphors and more specifically the ideologies which underlie the language use and choices. According to Charteris-Black (2005), CMA enables us to identify which metaphors are chosen and why these metaphors are chosen by illustrating how they create political myths. I will explain and discuss the ideologies behind the speeches’ metaphors in the Analysis and Discussion chapters of this study. I will also compare the differences and similarities in metaphors used by the campaigns and the discourses and political myths they create in the Discussion chapter in an effort to explain why the Better Together campaign’s metaphors seemed to be more effective than the Yes campaign’s metaphors as Mio (1997) argues that rather than researching whether or not metaphors are generally effective, research should focus on specific areas in which metaphors are effective.

As I only used two under twenty minute speeches as my data and metaphors as elements of rhetorical strategy need other rhetorical strategies to be successful in political discourse, I wanted to include other units of analysis in the research. I also wanted to guarantee a valid and comprehensive research result. Therefore, in addition to metaphors, I analysed negative-positive semantic pairs, i.e. semantic polarisation, and personal pronouns. The speeches match the speakers’ personal views and values as well as their political beliefs and these are all reflected in the word choices of the speakers. I could not use Critical Metaphor Analysis to interpret pronouns or semantic polarisation, but Political Discourse Analysis (henceforth referred to as PDA) was an extremely suitable method for the other two rhetoric strategies as the method is used to analyse different elements of political discourse, including pronouns and semantic polarisation in speeches and text. The method was also easy to combine with CMA because both methods aim to reveal the underlying ideologies of political language, one by looking at political myths, and the other by looking at political discourses.
PDA is a method that analyses the text and talk of professional politicians or political institutions but also text and talk produced by the recipients in political communication events. Using PDA, a researcher can focus on the nature of the activities and practices accomplished by political text and talk which have political functions and implication. PDA can be used to analyse things such as political institutions, organisations, groups, actors, processes, relations, actions, systems, values and ideologies. The aim of my research was to explain the ideology and values underlying the language in the speeches. Therefore, in my research PDA is used to analyse political values and ideologies. These two cannot be separated, as according to Van Dijk (1997), “Ideological groups and categories will especially also define themselves (and their goals) in terms of their most cherished (preferential) values” (p.16). Political values are broader basic belief systems that underlie and organise the shared social representations of groups and their members. The units which PDA analyses include political pronouns, which are typical deictic for political context and their categories reflect inclusion and exclusion principles.(Van Dijk, 1997.)

PDA is a field of discourse analysis which has the critical characteristics of Critical Discourse Analysis (henceforth referred to as CDA), but it cannot be directly reduced to CDA. PDA is similar to CDA insofar that they both focus on the subject positions, political solutions and social realities that the discourses make possible, and not on the sole content of the discourse. CDA further examines who the discourses benefit and who they oppress. (Augoustinos & Every, 2008.) Furthermore, the aim of CDA is to illuminate the linguistic discursive dimensions of social and cultural phenomena. The approach states that discourses are not only built in social practices but they also build the social world. The discursive practices contribute to the creation and reproduction of unequal power relations between social groups. CDA is typed as critical, because it aims to reveal these unequal power relations and it is committed to social change. (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002.) My study certainly has a critical point of view to it, as political campaign speeches oftentimes paint the opposition as the oppressor or an otherwise unwanted agent, and there is an undeniable element of power inequality when one group is depicted as a the powerful beneficiary and another is depicted as being oppressed by the powerful beneficiary group. However, I did not solely concentrate on the power implications in the discourses, rather, they were notified in the analysis and results, but they did not predefine the premises of my research.

I also wanted to look at personal pronouns in the speeches because, as Allen (2007) argues “it is in the politicians’ interest to appear multi-faceted in order to appeal to a diverse audience and a careful pronoun choice is one way of achieving this aim” (p.3). Wodak (2005) also sees pronouns as words which can be used to cause the interpreters to develop thoughts of group identity, coalitions and
parties as insiders or as outsiders. It is this identity I wanted to examine to establish which roles the subjects and objects in the speech are given and what actions are attached to these particular identities and roles. Furthermore, personal pronouns are interlinked with semantic polarisation in political communication as the *us vs. them* set-up is what a lot of political speeches are based on.

Semantic and ideological polarisation is very common in political speeches, where *we/us/our* are depicted in a positive light and *them/the others* in a negative way. This semantic polarisation is functional and effective in the competition for votes, support and for political survival and legitimisation. Personal pronouns are, therefore, used as political manipulation of syntactic style and express underlying meanings in sentence structures and they indicate exclusion and inclusion which reflect partisan strategies of power in the political process.(Van Dijk, 1997.) For example, Douglas Alexander uses *we* interchangeably to refer to the Scottish people and the Scottish Labour Party in his speech.

Both personal pronouns and semantic polarisation as additional units of analysis to metaphor helped me establish how the speakers use the themes of identification, solidarity, inclusion and exclusion to drive home their ideology and persuade the listeners to vote for their cause. They also aim for legitimisation and deligitimation and hence, are interlinked with the use of metaphor in political speeches, because inclusion and exclusion usually entail legitimisation of the in-group and delegitimation of the out-group.

2.3. Previous research

National identity and nationality have been studied in various different political contexts and discourses. Augoustinos and Every (2008) conducted a study in which they compared the ways ‘Australia’ is constructed and used in parliamentary speeches on asylum seekers by people who are for and against asylum seekers. They wanted to point out the flexibility of national discourse by including speeches from people both pro and against asylum seekers. Augoustinos and Every (2008) used Critical Discourse Analysis to examine the discourses constructed in the speeches to define whether asylum seekers were deemed a threat or a benefit, whether Australia’s generosity was viewed as undeniable or a tarnished image and whether Australia provided fairness for some or all.
They found that, for example, in speeches against asylum seekers Australia was constructed as a country under a threat (to resources, a criminal threat, a threat of terrorism), and that these threats were centered around asylum seekers. These speeches talked about Australia as *quite a small country*, Australia having *no choice* but to accept criminal immigrants into their *community* and, referring to 9/11 in the U.S., called for *vigilance* and emphasised the importance of *sovereignty* of Australia. In speeches for asylum seekers, the relationship between asylum seekers and the Australian nation was portrayed as positive, beneficial and essential to Australia. These speeches talked about *great contributions* of asylum seekers, Australia as a *beneficiary* of skilled asylum seekers and migration programs as one of Australia’s *greatest nation-building effort*.

Augoustinos and Every (2008) concluded that the asylum seeker advocates constructed a form of inclusive nationalism that is grounded in common goals and common values. In these discourses, inclusivity was embedded in national interest, character and values. Those against asylum seekers constructed Australia as under threat and emphasised Australia’s national sovereignty. The study demonstrated how the same constructions of national identity could be used for both inclusive and exclusive purposes.

Mohd Don, Knowled and Kwait (2010) performed a critical discourse analysis on Malaysian nationhood and national identity by collecting a vast corpus of 2,6 million words from speeches between 1983 and 1991 by the Malaysian Prime Minister Tun Mahathir, as well as using government policies as data. They wanted to look at the political elite discourse in the light of multiethnic population and globalisation, and did this by focusing on the lexical patterns which constructed Malaysian nationhood and national identity. They argued that linguistic corpus studies could also be done on a high level, focusing on discourse, rather than on a low level, focusing on things such as grammatical tagging. Mohd Don et al. (2010) examined key words, collocates and clusters in government policies and the Prime Minister’s speeches.

The Prime Minister’s speeches contained key words such as *nation, our/we, people, effort, development, industry, race* and *value*. Mohd Don et al. (2010) found that the most common key word *nation* was used in collocation with words such as *we/our, advanced, economy, people, industry, Islam, Malaysia, and development*, and in word clusters such as *in our nation* and *in this nation*, thus constructing a common national identity that includes the speaker as well as the listeners and emphasises economic development and growth. They also found that the key words formed a network of keywords, in which there was notable overlapping of collocates and word
clusters, for example the word nation appeared with the words Islam, Malaysia and people which were emotionally charged and concerned with traditional values, but it also appeared with the words economy, development and government, which were more concerned with the modern world and practical realities. (Mohd Don et al., 2010.)

The study’s findings of indications implicit in the texts agreed with the explicit policy statements of the Malaysian government, in which positive terms were used when describing Malaysian national unity, for example unity in diversity, a nation at peace with itself, living in full harmony and full and fair partnership, thus contributing to the inclusive discourse of nationhood and national identity. The statement also associated the concept on nation with economics when it referred to national unity as a means to sustain economic growth. The research examined the possibility of spin in the government policies, which went in accordance with the Prime Minister’s speeches and his individual views on Malaysian nationhood.

Sheryl Prentice (2010) combined corpus linguistic technique of automated semantic tagging with discourse analysis to study the social attitudes towards Scottish independence. She used a three-million-word corpus, which was built from a pro-independence discussion forum online. Prentice used corpus studies and Critical Discourse Analysis as CDA has been criticised for its subjectivity (e.g. Sharrock & Anderson, 1981) and its generalisability, questionable reliability and representativeness as it uses only a small number of texts (e.g. Fowler 1996; Stubbs, 1997). Prentice, therefore, started her research by collecting a vast corpus of words form an online discussion forum, and proceeded to use a corpus analysis program to establish key concepts and their collocates in her data. Next, she used CDA to conduct a detailed analysis of linguistic and argumentation strategies in the data. More accurately, Prentice used the discourse – historical approach of CDA which aims to establish themes in a given discourse and discusses how these themes contribute to a particular power relationship and/or ideological standpoint (Reisigl & Wodak, 2009).

From the data, Prentice (2010) established discursive constructions of 1. Social actors, 2. Objects, phenomena and events and 3. Actions and processes. She then continued to examine the discursive characterisations or qualifications of these constructions. In more detail, Prentice examined the constructive and perpetuation discursive strategies as well as the transformative discursive strategies and examined which micro argumentation strategies in the form of topoi (traditional themes or motives) were used according to the key words and collocates’ analysis. She found, for
example, that the topos of difference was utilised with the use of such words as *different, another, else* and personal pronouns as well as geographical names such as *Scotland, Scots, Brits and Highlander* with collocates such as *country and nation*. This topos seeks to emphasise the difference between groups and Prentice found that the Scottish nationalists on the discussion forum were very keen on preserving and creating separate national identities of the Scottish and the English. She also found that the topos of culture (for example words referring to language, speech and grammar) was used in arguments in which Scotland’s independence was implied as the means to revamp or maintain Scottish identity and culture. The topos of reality, i.e. stating that because reality is something, certain action or decision should follow, was also used, for example, one commentator stated that since Scotland was a country and a nation, it should become independent like Norway, Iceland and Denmark.

Prentice concluded that her findings supported recent social attitude surveys according to which there was distrust of the UK government and a feeling of cultural difference from the English. She also found that the argumentation strategies used in the online discussion forum indicated a general view that Scotland’s identity will become stronger and it will be transformed in a positive way if Scotland becomes independent. In addition, she found that the transformation of Scotland from a subservient to an independent country was done by devaluing the Labour Party and emphasising the positive outcome of change, and that whilst the discussions emphasised the positive sides of an independent Scotland, they did not use argumentation strategies which aimed to dismantle the British identity, and it was barely mentioned in the conversations. Therefore, Prentice drew a conclusion that the Scottish nationalists expressed hatred towards government in general, dissatisfaction towards Scotland’s current situation and a desire for pride and self-worth and in doing so, concentrated more on the possible positive future than the past.

Leith (2008) examined the representations of Scottishness and Scotland in the SNP manifestos from the 1970’s until 2005. Leith (2008) analysed the rhetoric content and focus and specifically, the usage of terms which incorporated a sense group/national identity and territorial belonging, i.e. projections of Scottishness or Scotland. He found that whilst the territorial definition Scotland remained a constant, the depiction of Scottishness shifted immensely throughout the decades from being ethnic and exclusive to being civic and inclusive. He also found that whereas in the 1970’s the manifestos depicted the English as the other very strongly and focused on Scottishness only including those born in Scotland or being immediate Scots descents, in the 1990’s the manifestos used personification in the form of Sean Connery’s personal message, emphasised a sense of history
but also the future and depicted the Scottish society as multicultural. The manifestos also concentrated on the Scotland as a territorial location, not Scottishness as ethnicity. In the 2000’s, a wide range of sense of Scottishness continued, and the depiction of the other had shifted from the other being the English to being the political establishment such as the Labour, the Conservatives and “London”. The tone of the manifestos was modern and inclusive, emphasising Scotland, not Scottishness. Leith concluded that the SNP lacked ethnic character, but that would not be a continuing feature of the party’s positioning. (Leith, 2008.)

Metaphors have been studied in political texts and discourse previously in vast numbers. Charteris-Black’s (2005) research is very essential to this thesis as it is his work that I largely base my research structure on and it is for this reason I will describe his analysis at length in the following pages. Charteris-Black examined political leaders’ speeches at length using Critical Metaphor Analysis in Politicians and Rhetoric (2005). He collected a corpus of several speeches by Winston Churchill, Margaret Thatcher, Tony Blair, Martin Luther King Jr., Bill Clinton and George W. Bush and used the cognitive semantics approach to explain the metaphors in the speeches. I will not list the research structure of each speech here, but will present a summary of the source metaphors of each speaker as well as the reasons the speakers used these metaphors.

Charteris-Black (2005) analysed Churchill’s speeches which were given between 1940 and 1943 and notes that Churchill used source metaphors of embodiment where states were human-like actors and international, political and military affairs were personal hopes and anxieties. He also found such conceptual metaphors as THE SPIRIT IS AN OCEAN, where he referred to the British culture and history, EVOLUTION IS A NARRATIVE and HUMAN PROGRESS IS A JOURNEY, where he indicated that movement towards a desirable social goal is difficult but worth the effort and SAFETY/HOPE IS LIGHT, DANGER/FEAR IS DARKNESS, which entailed that KNOWING IS SEEING. For example, Churchill said: “History with its flickering lamp stumbles along the trail”, indicating that HISTORY IS A PERSON, LIFE IS A JOURNEY and UNDERSTANDING IS SEEING. Churchill used metaphors for two pragmatic purposes; to heighten emotional tension and to portray himself as a judgmental, and therefore, successful leader. He used metaphors to create a heroic myth where Hitler and Germany were depicted as the forces of evil and Britain and its Allies as forces of good, therefore justifying the sacrifices of the British people and the actions of the British military and its Allies. (Charteris-Black, 2005.)
Charteris-Black (2005) analysed fourteen speeches Martin Luther King Jr. gave at major rallies, speeches and sermons. He found that King used conceptual metaphors such as THE CIVIL RIGHTS MOVEMENT IS A SPIRITUAL JOURNEY, POLITICAL STRUGGLE IS A LANDSCAPE and SEGREGATION IS AN ILLNESS, SLAVERY AND PRISON to create a messianic myth, where he was Jesus and the audience the chosen people. The messianic myth entailed that suffering is a necessary experience for a chosen people because it demonstrates that this is indeed a mythical struggle and therefore, legitimised the object of attaining political, social and economic equality by positioning the Civil Rights in their spiritual basis. For example, King said: “Whenever you get out of Egypt, you always confront a little tension, you always confront a little temporary setback….the road to freedom is difficult”. (Charteris-Black, 2005.)

In the eleven Party Conference speeches that Margaret Thatcher delivered as the leader of the Conservative Party in 1977-1987, Charteris-Black (2005) found that Thatcher used metaphors of journey, health, religion and morality, life and death, animals and master-servant to create a political myth of Boedicia, where she depicted herself as a heroic female warrior who will battle for the survival of capitalist institutions. The myth entailed that Conservative politics are moral, a life force, medicine, unimpeded movement and where the state is viewed as a servant, whereas the Labour socialism politics are sinful, a death force, a disease, impeded movement and the state was viewed as the master. For example, Thatcher said: “Labour’s real prescription for Britain is the disease half the world is struggling to cure” and “So it’s back to square one for the Socialist. The Labour Leopard can’t change its spots- even if it sometimes thinks wistfully of a blue rinse”. (Charteris-Black, 2005.)

In Bill Clinton’s State of the Union speeches and inaugural addresses, which together comprised a corpus of over 50,000 words, Charteris-Black (2005) found strong use of image restoration rhetoric. The time the speeches were given was after Clinton had been caught having an affair with Monica Lewinsky and campaigned to be re-elected as the president of the United States, so image restoration was required to make the American people trust Clinton again. Clinton managed to convince the public by using the semantic tension of individual metaphors to reflect individual psychological tensions that any individual could empathise with. These metaphors were then gathered into contrasting clusters of metaphors. He used the source metaphors of creation and construction and destruction, life, birth, rebirth and death as well as journey and religion metaphors. The conceptual metaphors in his speeches were that GOOD GOVERNING IS CREATING, BAD GOVERNING IS DESTROYING. For example, Clinton said: “And so tonight, let us resolve to
continue the journey of renewal, to create more and better jobs”. By using metaphors of life, rebirth and creativity, Clinton portrayed his policies in a positive light, by using metaphors of journeys he evoked nostalgia and by using metaphors of religion he portrayed himself as trustworthy and as a spiritual leader and evoked historical myths. He also used metaphors from the domain of sports, for instance, to portray him as everyman; a normal American male with similar interests and passions as any other American man. In addition, he used the notion of everyday heroes by talking about individual American citizens as heroes and thus transformed everyday individuals into heroic icons. (Charteris-Black, 2005.)

Tony Blair gave the fourteen analysed speeches at a time when Britain, together with the U.S., was at war in Iraq. Charteris-Black (2005) found that Blair used the rhetoric of legitimation to create the myth of an epic battle of good and evil to justify the war in Iraq. The good was Britain and the U.S., the bad Saddam Hussein’s regime. He used ethical discourse and source metaphors of journey, creation, construction and life, destruction and death as well as personification to form the conceptual metaphors that GOOD GOVERNING IS CREATING and BAD GOVERNING IS DESTROYING, MORALITY IS CONFLICT and POLITICS IS ETHICS. For example, Blair said: “So I do not claim Britain is transformed. I do say the foundations of a New Britain are being laid” and “Their aim was to stimulate militant fundamentalism; to separate the United States from its allies and to bring our way of life and our economics to their knees”. (Charteris-Black, 2005.)

In the fifteen speeches by George W. Bush that Charteris-Black (2005) analysed, Bush used metaphors on crime and punishment, story, journey, finance and personification and depersonification to create the conceptual metaphors of NATION IS A PERSON, POLITICS IS ETHICS, TERRORISTS ARE DANGEROUS ANIMALS OR PARASITES, MORAL ACTIONS ARE FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS and the USA IS A MORAL LEADER. He used these metaphors to create the rhetoric of moral accounting to legitimise the U.S. government’s war on terror. A good example of depersonification is his description of the terrorists as animals, for example: “It’s an enemy that likes to hide and burrow and their network is extensive…..But we’re going to smoke them out”. (Charteris-Black, 2005.)

Charteris- Black (2004) also conducted a corpus studies and used Critical Metaphor Analysis to analyse building metaphors in the British political party manifestos and American presidential speeches. He found that building metaphors were rather prevalent in the British political party manifestos and that they emphasised “progress towards long-term social goals, carry a strong
positive connotation, and call for patience and cooperation from the electorate (Charteris-Black, 2004, p.71), thus connoting the building metaphors with the future. He also found that the building metaphors used in the American presidential speeches indicated that WORTHWHILE ACTIVITY IS BUILDING and SOCIETY IS A BUILDING and building metaphors were used to portray the president as someone likeable who shares the same dreams and hopes as the voters.

Interested in Charteris-Black’s 2004 study, Wei-Lu Lun and Ahrens (2008) have looked at metaphors in the speeches of Taiwanese presidents in a corpus studies combined with Critical Discourse Analysis. The study used 95 speeches from four Taiwanese presidents between 1954 and 2006 as data. Wei-Lun Lu and Ahrens were specifically interested in comparing their findings to those of Charteris-Black (2004) as they argue that Charteris-Black’s findings are socio-culturally dependent on his use of British party manifestos as data and cannot be generalised for all political texts. The study of the Taiwanese presidents’ speeches found two cultural- specific metaphor patterns in the speeches. First, it found retrospective building metaphors, which depicted a country as a building. This metaphor entailed that the past achievements of the country are its cornerstones in that a building is founded on cornerstones, and a country bases its establishment on past achievements. In addition, the founders of the country are its builders. The underlying frame of retrospective building metaphors emphasised past establishment and glory of laborious national founders. (Wei-Lun Lu & Ahrens, 2008, p.392.)

Secondly, the study found reconstruction metaphors, which viewed the country as an old building in need of reconstruction or as a new building which needed to be built. The reconstruction metaphors indicated that some kind of repairing of the country was needed, as it had been demolished by the previous administration, in the Taiwanese case, by the communists. The metaphors also indicated that the citizens are the rebuilders of the country. In connection to the reconstructive metaphors, a hortative tone was used to encourage the citizens to work for future country development. (Wei-Lun Lu & Ahrens, 2008.)

The study also concluded that, contrary to Charteris-Black’s findings, building metaphors were not very common in the Taiwanese presidents’ speeches and that reconstruction metaphors were more common than retrospective metaphors. In fact, at the times when the country was not in need of rebuilding, other metaphors, such as farming and journey metaphors, were common in the speeches instead and building metaphors were completely omitted from the presidential speeches.
There is an extensive array of other previous studies done on metaphor use by politicians and political leaders (e.g. Chilton, 1996; Chilton & Ilying, 1993; Gavriely-Nuri, 2009; Howe, 1988; Jansen & Sabo, 1994; Lakoff, 1991; Semino & Masi, 1996; Straehle, Weiss, Wodak, Muntigl, & Sedlak, 1999; Thornborrow, 1993 and Voss, Kennet, Wiley, & Schooler, 1992). Political metaphors have also been studied in the media reporting of political issues (e.g. Musolff, 2000, 2001; Santa Ana, 1999; Pancake, 1993 and Ziken, 1993) and political parties’ discourses through metaphor have been studied previously by, for example, Lakoff (2002).

The Scottish referendum has been studied from different angles and scientific disciplines, for example Henderson, Jeffrey and Liñeira (2015) examined the political attitudes to the union in England, Scotland and Wales after the referendum. They used public opinion data to explore constitutional preferences and perceptions on national grievances as well as the role of national identity in structuring preferences. The study found that there was considerable demand for nationally demarcated forms of government in the UK and that these constitutional preferences related closely to national identity, but also to appeals to national interest.

In addition, studies have looked at the role of religion in the referendum vote, (Bonney, 2013) the aftermath of the referendum and its influence on constitutional geography in the UK (Clifford & Morphet, 2015), its implications to legislation in the UK and Europe (e.g. McEwen & Petersohn, 2015; Olmos Giupponi & Hofmeister 2015) and how the referendum was represented in online discussion forums (Quinlan, Shepard, & Paterson, 2015).
3. Research design

This research used a combination of Critical Metaphor Analysis and Political Discourse Analysis to analyse two campaign speeches. The aim of this study was to examine the discursive construction of nationhood and national identity, and to compare the discourses and political myths built in both speeches to better understand what ideologies underlie the speeches, and what kind of nationhood and national identity the speakers present to the listeners. More specifically, this research aimed to answer the question of what kinds of discourses and myths the speakers construct through using metaphors, personal pronouns and semantic pairs.

Because a metaphor’s meaning depends on the cultural values, beliefs and attitudes the listener or reader possesses, it was inevitable that there was an element of subjectivity in my research. However, I aimed to base my interpretation on objective analysis by close and critical textual analysis of two speeches which presumably had opposing ideologies and representations of Scottish national identity and nationhood. Therefore, by using comparative study combined with Critical Metaphor Analysis and Political Discourse Analysis, I aimed to provide as objective a process and results as is possible in qualitative research, as discourse is better understood when compared to an opposing discourse.

3.1. The data

The data in this research consisted of two political speeches. The first was held by the Yes Campaign’s leader Alex Salmond at the Scottish National Party Conference on the 12th of April, 2014, a little over five months before the vote took place. The second was held by the a Scottish Labour Party politician and UK Shadow Foreign Secretary Douglas Alexander at the University of Glasgow on the 4th of March, 2014, about six months prior to the vote. Both speeches were already transcribed and the transcriptions were available online. I first planned to analyse a speech by Better Together campaign leader Alistair Darling and to transcribe his speech from video footage found on the internet. However, the sound on the footage was at times of such poor quality due to the speech having been recorded with a video camera placed amongst the audience that I decided to use the already transcribed speech of Douglas Alexander to assure a 100% accurate data. I did send an email to Alistair Darling’s office asking for the speech’s transcript so that I would get a 100% clear data, but I did not get a reply.
I chose these two speeches as there were very little speeches given before the vote available online and I wanted to use speeches that were long enough to have a sufficient amount of metaphors, personal pronouns and semantic pairs to perform an analysis that was extensive enough for a Master’s Thesis. I also chose these two speeches because they were somewhat comprehensible whereas the content of some speeches online where partly swallowed by the audience’s response. I did a very thorough qualitative examination of the content of the two speeches, hence the body of data sufficed. It is for these reasons I feel the chosen data is enough to do valid discourse analysis and answer my research questions in depth.

The aim of the study was to examine the textual construction and content of the speeches, not the actual speech events, speakers’ styles, non-verbal communication, or the reactions the speeches had on the listeners. I chose to focus on the textual construction of the speeches as I wanted to examine the speeches’ linguistic structure and word choices critically and. In addition, I wanted to concentrate on the discourses and myths the speakers construct themselves and the kind of social reality those discourses and myths uphold. Naturally my interpretations of the text were affected by my subjective views and attitudes, but in order to bring as much objectivity to the interpretation as possible, I included speeches from both campaigns. I also wanted to emphasise the analysis of metaphors in my research because they are crucial in creating persuasive discourses and legitimacy in political speeches and, according to Charteris-Black (2005), “critical awareness of how discourse is used to persuade and to create legitimacy is an important area of knowledge for those who wish to engage within a democracy” (p.31).

I chose to use political speeches as data because word choices are a cognitive process and most often an unconscious decision in normal, everyday communication situations. In political speeches, however, word choices are carefully made and pre-mediated to reflect a certain type of ideology and view of the world, identities and social relations. It is this intentional and skillfully structured nature of the speeches that makes them a very transparent and yielding data for Critical Metaphor Analysis. However, as far as successful political rhetorical strategies are concerned, combining metaphors with other rhetorical strategies such as the use of personal pronouns and semantic pairs makes all strategies more persuasive as they are more difficult to detect and less explicit. This in turn results in the listener concentrating more on what is being said, i.e. the message, and less on how it is being said. If the rhetorical strategy is too obvious, the listener is disenchanted and perceives the speaker as the actor that he or she is. It is for this reason that political speeches, the two in this research included, always combine multiple rhetorical strategies and it is for this same
reason that this research did not only analyse metaphors out of context, but studied two additional and parallel rhetorical strategies, personal pronouns and semantic polarisation, as well.

Another reason why I chose to analyse political speeches is that they are usually very dramatic, even theatrical, in their attempt to appeal to the listeners’ emotions and logic and set out to convince the listeners to support or vote the cause of the speaker. Political speeches do not spare any acceptable means of appealing to their listeners; if advertising is the tip of the iceberg, then political rhetoric, including political speeches, is the huge frozen construct hidden underwater. These dramatic appeals to emotion and sense are reflected in the text of the speeches as much as they are reflected in the manner of delivering the speeches. Political campaign speeches also always feature a strong us/them positioning which makes them excellent data for a comparative research. What something is, is defined through what it is not. This is illustrated beautifully in the case of these two political speeches, on both sides.

I could have also analysed political discourses in materials such as interviews, campaign materials, media coverage and internet chatrooms, but as I was especially interested in first hand political talk and text, this ruled out media coverage and internet chatrooms. Campaign materials would have been an option, but they would not have provided me with as rich data for metaphors, as they tend to be more factual and informational rather than solely concentrate on persuasion. Interviews of the two politicians would have given me first hand data with some metaphors, personal pronouns and semantic polarisation, but would have lacked the rhetorical grandeur and dramatic arch of a political speech.

3.2. The process of the analysis

The analysis process proceeded so that I printed out the speech transcriptions, identified and highlighted all metaphors, personal pronouns and semantic polarisation in the papers, categorised and counted the metaphors according to their source metaphors, interpreted the metaphors using cognitive semantics approach, and explained what political myths and in turn, ideologies, they created. Then I looked at what inclusion and exclusion was performed with the personal pronouns and semantic polarisation and what kinds discourses and group identities were create with their use. Next, based on my findings from the personal pronouns and semantic polarisation I formed discourses on Scottish and British national identity and explained which ideologies were manifested
in the discourses. Finally, I combined the results on ideologies and compared the ideologies to each other.
4. The analysis

In this section I will answer my research question by first defining the political myths and discourses the two politicians construct in their speeches and then examining and explicating the metaphors, pronouns and semantic polarisations which were used to construct the myths and discourses in Alex Salmond’s Yes- campaign speech held at the SNP conference and Douglas Alexander’s speech held at Glasgow University.

4.1. Alex Salmond’s speech

Alex Salmond creates a political myth of a victim/proud hero, where Scotland as a nation is the victim of the British oppressor, but becomes a hero when he breaks free from the oppressor’s captivity, journeys towards independency with honorable and noble aspirations, takes charge and builds an independent Scotland and by doing so, shows the rest of the world what a morally sound, inclusive and fair community it is. The villain and oppressor of the story is the UK government, and the Scottish Labour Party are the villain’s minions. The discourses that Salmond constructs with his choice of words are of autonomy, liberation and self-sufficiency.

4.1.1. Metaphors

According to my calculations, Salmond uses 89 metaphors. The most popular metaphors that Alex Salmon uses in his speech are personification with 32 instances, journey metaphors with six instances, creation and construction, conflict, religion and morality and life and death with five instances each. Other metaphors he used were plants (4), finance (4), business (4), light and darkness (3), sports (3), animals (1), crime and punishment (1), weather (1), sea (1), music (1) and handicrafts (1) related metaphors.

When Salmond uses personification, he often refers to the Scottish nation as a person and talks about the nation that does things such as walks tall, faces a choice and holds its future in its hands. That nation would also, once it gained its independence, join the family of other nations, so the family in Alex Salmond’s speech comprises of nations and Scotland would be a member of that family once it became independent. This inclusion in the family of nations in Salmond’s rhetoric addresses the need to belong to a group or a community as an independent state that would no longer officially belong to the rest of the UK. He also refers to SNP as a person when he talks about
the how the SNP will campaign against it \textit{with every fibre of our being}. Scotland as a person and as a member of a family of nations is illustrated well in the following excerpt:

(1)  
\textit{Let us build a nation that carries itself with pride and humility in equal measure.  
That looks to its own but gives of itself to the world as much as it possibly can.  
Which yields to no one in compassion and to no one in ambition.  
And that, come independence day, walks tall among the nations of the Earth- on that day, and on every day thereafter.}

By using the source metaphor of NATION IS A PERSON, Alex Salmond is then able to give the nation feelings, beliefs, thoughts and actions, all shared, collective and undisputed. He also aims to give the voters a tool with which to comprehend Scotland as a nation and Scottish people as an entity and to legitimise the actions of SNP and a future independent Scotland by referring to them with positive and desired human actions and attributions.

Furthermore, Alex Salmond also uses personification in the form of touch metaphors in his speech. He uses the expression \textit{taking…..in our own hands} three times when describing \textit{we/us/Scottish people/Scottish public} in his 15 minute speech to create an image where the people of Scotland have control of their lives in their own fingertips, not in Westminster Establishment or another elusive government body, and in practice, not in theory. As a contrast to this, he describes Westminster as \textit{out of touch with the people and losing touch with reality, out of touch with young people, handing out punishments to the poor and the disabled, and fighting hard to maintain its grip on Scotland.} He describes the Labour Party \textit{as hand in glove with Westminster} and as a party that has \textit{lost touch with the values of Labour voters} and the Tories as \textit{forcing through a costly, confusing and harmful top-down re-organisation.} His metaphors involving hands and touch are used to describe connection or the lack of it, intellectual or emotional closeness and distance and control. According to Chilton (2004), spatial concepts in political discourses are important as what is described as near the speaker is morally and legally good and what is described as distant from the speaker is morally and legally bad. SNP has control by having things in their hands, and ARE the Scottish people, not only close or attuned to them. The Labour Party, on the other hand, has connection only with Westminster, but is far removed from the Scottish people. The Westminster Establishment has no connection or closeness with the Scottish people, but despite this, has undisputed and somewhat forceful control over their lives. This is clearly an unwanted structure which needs to change and
the action to bring this change about is breaking free from the Westminster control. To express the action that would follow gaining freedom from Westminster government, Alex Salmond uses metaphors of freedom and movement such as *release the potential of Scottish people, mobilise all the talents* and the SNP being *part of a greater movement*. He also uses restricted movement metaphors when talking about extra costs the Scottish people are paying under the Westminster government, for example, *crippling costs and these costs as a barrier to work, the real route out of poverty*.

Similarly to President Clinton, (Charteris- Black, 2005) Alex Salmond uses the source metaphors of GOOD GOVERNING IS CREATING and BAD GOVERNING IS DESTROYING when he refers to Westminster government actions with metaphors describing destruction or creating unwanted things: “So the days of wasting talent and denying opportunity must end...So we will stop the poverty-creating policies”, and uses positive metaphors of creation and building to describe the actions of an independent Scottish government:

(2)

*Westminster wants to renew a weapons system that can destroy the world.*

*In an independent Scotland we will build a system of childcare that will be the envy of the world.*

Salmond uses creation and building to express what the social aims of an independent Scotland are and would be: *The Scotland we are seeking to build will be an equal Scotland, building a new and better Scotland, to build a new and resilient economy, to create jobs and opportunities, to build a fairer and more prosperous country, to create a fairer society and building a better future* and by using words such as new, better, fairer and more prosperous when talking about Scotland, he indicates that Scotland, in its present state, is not doing well under the UK government, which is a government dismantling the welfare state and running Scotland down.

The source metaphor of LIFE IS A JOURNEY and LONGTERM PURPOSEFUL ACTIVITIES ARE JOURNEYS are also in use in Salmond’s speech. He describes the Labour Party leaders as having *lost their way*, but an independent Scotland as a *beacon of hope, gone down a better route* (compared to the Tories and Westminster) and work as *the real route out of poverty*. He also describes how the Scottish *people are coming towards us* (*us = the SNP*), how we *prepare to move forward* and how *our ambitions must go further*. These metaphors expand the personification metaphors further, while also denote Scotland’s abstract, thoroughly mapped-out journey towards
their goal of being independent, as well as Scotland functioning as a guiding example to the world. The metaphors also indicate the source metaphors of FORWARD IS GOOD and STOPPING IS BAD as well as FORWARD IS PROGRESS.

Salmond also uses the source metaphor of NATION IS A BUSINESS and DOWN IS BAD when describing the Tories running Scotland down and the Scottish people running their own country. When talking about the Tories’ action, he uses the negative expression of running something DOWN, finishing something in a destructive way. When talking about the Scottish people running their own country, the business metaphor denotes a positive sense of control. In a similar vein, he exclaims how we more than pay our way, the NHS will never be up for sale and how in an independent Scotland, with control of our budget, our resources and taxation, we can invest far more into our children’s future, using finance metaphors to further indicate self-sufficiency and with the source metaphor of MORAL ACTIONS ARE FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS, investing into the children’s future is seen as a moral, right thing to do.

Alex Salmond uses metaphors like put our faith into Westminster and we practice what we preach which are related to religion and morality to indicate action based purely on belief, not facts and to indicate living the way one tells others to live i.e. being a moral being. Alex Salmond uses metaphors involving religion and life when he talks about Scotland and the country’s rich spirit and political public meetings being revived because of the SNP. Using life metaphors denotes positive images of creating something new or re-energising something old.

Salmond uses one striking handicrafts metaphor when he talks about Scotland as an inclusive, multicultural nation: “There are many different colours and threads woven in to the Scottish tartan and we celebrate them all”. This is an immensely skillful and strategic metaphor, as it combines the history of Scotland and the Gaelic tradition (the Scottish tartan) with the modern, multicultural society (many different colours and threads), as well as denotes inclusion (woven in to) and acceptance of differences (and we celebrate them all). In addition, handicrafts are associated with skill and precision. Other nostalgia-evoking metaphors related to arts and handicrafts with historical references Salmond uses include drumming up a crowd for the UK Prime Minister and giving a cast iron guarantee to remove weapons of mass destruction from an independent Scotland.

Alex Salmond continues with familiar themes when he uses metaphors involving botany and plants as he talks about the hotbed of Scottish sciences and how the Labour campaign failed to present the
BBC their *grassroot* campaign. The first metaphors denotes cultivation and growth, whilst the second continues to indicate how official and out of touch with the normal Scottish people the Labour campaign is and how there are no normal Scottish people campaigning for staying in the UK.

Salmond uses one instance of de-personification when he talks about the Westminster government meeting in the Shell Oil premises: “*Big Oil meets big government with small ideas*”. He points out the outdated metaphor use of the Better together campaign when he ridicules their use of the old *Forces of darkness* metaphor by indicating the forces of darkness are popular culture fictional characters such as Darth Vader, the Klingons and Lex Luthor. He also remarks on the use of charities warning of a “*poverty storm engulfing Scotland*” thus using the weather and sea metaphor that indicates inevitability and chaos that the charities used, but by doing so, indicating that other institutional bodies in Scotland are concerned about the current financial state of the country.

4.1.2. Personal pronouns and semantic polarisation

Alex Salmond uses the personal pronoun *we* when he refers to his political party, and describes them as *ordinary members of the SNP*, but also as *most privileged members of the SNP*. By doing this, he identifies himself and his party members as ordinary people, like anyone else, just like any other member of the SNP, but emphasises the historical and rare situation since the founding of the party in 1934 that the SNP members have the privilege to be in, i.e. voting whether or not Scotland will become independent. He continues with saying that *we are a part of a greater movement, we have control and power, we can do better, for and by our people, we are going to take our future in our own hands*, thus describing himself and his party as part of the people of Scotland who are actively participating in making Scotland the country they want it to be and who are creating their own future as opposed to being dictated what their future is like. With the use of the personal pronouns Salmond constructs a common national identity, one that he as the speaker and his listeners are a part of.

When Alex Salmond uses the personal pronouns *they* or *them*, he refers to the Labour Party, but when referring to the British government, more often than not he does not use the personal pronouns *them*, he uses the official names of *Westminster Establishment* and *London Cabinet* and refers to it as *a system, big government, David Cameron’s government* and *Westminster government*. By doing so, he distances these entities further by using the official names which also
include their location, and reminds the listeners that they are not merely detached from the Scottish people on a mental level, but they are also geographically distant. Calling the government a system takes it further away from comprising of human beings and indicates more of a strict, unchanging organisation.

It is not hard to find positive-negative semantic pairs in a political speech, as they are used explicitly to contrast the speaker’s party with the opposition. Alex Salmond describes the contrast of the Scottish and UK cabinet meetings as follows:

(3)

*What a contrast.*
*We met in Porthlethen church hall in a public meeting with hundreds of people.*
*The London Cabinet met in private behind the security screen in the HQ of Shell Oil.*
*Big oil meets big government with small ideas.*

He explicitly describes the two meetings as contrasting, pairing up *we* with *The London Cabinet*, *public* with *private*, *Porthlethen church hall* with *HQ of Shell Oil* and *big oil* and *big government* with *small ideas*. He does this to convey several things; the Scottish Cabinet are there for the people, meeting in an ordinary place which was open to public, with presumably low costs as well with the church being a non-profit institution, thus constructing the Scottish Cabinet meeting as inclusive, ordinary and economic. In contrast, he describes the London Cabinet as exclusive as the meeting was held in private, somewhat secretive, as the meeting was held behind security screens and not ordinary or economic as the meeting was held in the premises of an oil industry giant.

Salmond also uses very clear semantic polarisation to differentiate the SNP and Westminster as well as the two campaigns in his speech. When talking about action directed at Scotland as a nation or Scotland’s services in connection to the SNP, he uses positive, inclusive and generative words *build up, open* and *build*, whilst when describing the actions of Westminster, he uses the contrasting *run down, privatize* and *dismantle*, which indicate negativity, exclusion, destruction and bringing action to an end, for example:

(4)

*This is the difference:*
*The Westminster Establishment: Telling Scots what we can’t do, running Scotland down*
*The Scottish National Party: Stressing what we can do, building Scotland up.*
and

(5)

At the Westminster the NHS is being softened up for privatization. The Tories are forcing through a costly, confusing and harmful top-down re-organisation. Nurses are being denied the pay-rise they deserve. We reject the free market in health. We’ve abolished prescription charges. And nurses in Scotland are getting their recommended pay-rise.

He describes the Yes campaign as hopeful, positive and uplifting and the Better Together campaign as miserable, negative, depressing, thoroughly boring, totally laughable, and completely ludicrous. He also uses the expression the No campaign, and doom sayers instead of using the Better Together campaign. This is done to create semantic oppositions of no and yes, and to underline the Better Together campaign’s negative and fear-inducing character.

At the end of his speech, he further reinforces an independent Scotland’s autonomy and self-control

(6)

And this referendum will be won when we, as a people, no longer feel the need to ask of others: tell me what will happen to us”.

It will be won when we, as the people of Scotland say: We are going to take our future into our own hands”

and by doing so contrasts and replaces the being at the mercy of others with Scotland taking control of its future.

4.2. Douglas Alexander’s speech

Douglas Alexander constructs a political myth of a fallen but re-emerged moral leader and hero who is at war with an conniving, immoral, incoherent and weak opponent, but who, despite past mistakes and failures for which he accounts for with stories, succeeds in leading Scotland to working together with the rest of the UK and avoiding breaking up the family that UK is. By doing this, the hero shows the rest of the world that the UK is an inclusive and tolerant family with values of based on cooperation, solidarity and working together. The moral leader and hero in the myth is the Labour Party, and the villain who alternates between being a coward, a turn-coat and a liar is the SNP. The discourses that Douglas Alexander constructs with his choice of words are those of collectivism, solidarity and caring.
4.2.1 Metaphors

According to my calculations, Douglas Alexander’s speech has 129 metaphors. He is an avid user of personification with 27 instances, story metaphors with 18 instances, buildings and conflict metaphors with 14 instances each, journey metaphors with 11 instances and religion& morality and creation& construction metaphors with 8 instances each. In addition, he uses metaphors from the fields of finance (6), sea (4), plants (3), bonds & ties (3) and light & darkness (3), business (2), life& death (2), animals (1), freedom & slavery (1), weather (1), handicrafts (1) and crime & punishment (1). Alexander also speaks openly about the use of metaphors in his speech, wondering, if either campaign has found the metaphor that truly resonates with the Scottish people.

When Alexander uses personification, he depicts the UK as a family and political parties as people, thus drawing from the common political source metaphors of NATION IS A FAMILY and POLITICAL PARTY IS A PERSON (e.g. Charteric-Black, 2005). He refers to Scotland leaving the UK as permanent break-up, damaging divorce, prospective divorce and separation and so makes the countries in the UK parents. The children in the family are the neglected twins: childcare and social care. He also uses the term neighbour to create an image of Scotland and the rest of the UK countries as persons living together in a community:

(7)
How do we help each other to be the neighbours we would want to be rather than conclude that we should just walk away and leave our neighbours to struggle on their own?

By referring to the UK as a family and Scotland leaving the UK as a damaging divorce, Alexander expresses traditional family values and appeals to the listeners’ emotions by constructing an image of a family breaking up because Scotland cannot be a supportive and cooperating neighbour and would rather walk away. Walking away implies a selfish and unhelpful act and an attitude of giving up. In another example Alexander describes his Scottish father’s patriotism as:

(8)
a living sense of who he is, and where he is, formed by relationships with hundreds of other Scots, borne out of thousands of historical and political events and inherited over hundreds of years.

In this description patriotism is inherited, which indicated it’s passed down in families and it is also positively associated with life as it is a living sense and borne out something. Furthermore,
Alexander uses personification when talking about a nation’s wellbeing, each of us are usually best placed to solve our problems with the helping hand of others, embracing political nationalism and the Labour Party shaking off Thatcherism as well as being that voice of hope in the Scottish conversation. According to Charteris-Black (2005, p. 40): “Personification is persuasive as it evokes our attitudes, beliefs and feelings about people and applies them to our attitudes, feelings and beliefs about abstract political entities”. Alexander’s use of personification is text-book when he explains the Labour Party’s lack of success in previous years:

(9)

We paid a price because the trust that Scotland had previously placed in us to cradle and shape Scotland’s hopes, fears and dreams and ambitions was found wanting.

In this sentence, Alexander depicts Scotland as a person, a child, with hopes, fears, dreams and ambitions and the Labour Party as a parent or caregiver who failed to cradle and shape the child’s hopes etc.. This is a very potent use of the family metaphor and an interesting one because it constructs a political party as a parent/caregiver and the people of a nation as the child, creating a strong dynamic of dependency but also describing the parent failing to parent the child in an appropriate manner. Alexander appeals to the listener’s emotions and trusts that the listeners know that all parents have sometimes failed at parenting and, therefore the Labour Party’s failure can be understood as a human error: they did their best, but still failed, they learned from their mistake and are open about it. The attributes that Alexander gives to the Labour Party through personification are those of a brave, caring person. Alexander’s use of helping hand of others further implies collective and caring values and the family values expressed in the divorce metaphor are in line with this discourse of collectivism and caring. In accordance with the family metaphors, Alexander uses metaphors of ties and bonds to describe the connection between Scotland and Britain: Social pressures weakening the bonds of place and belonging, the political debate speaking of deeper ties, the symbolic ties between Scotland and UK and the strong family ties stretching back over though centuries. The source metaphor being HUMAN CONNECTION IS A BOND OR TIE and a tie or a bond keeps things, in this case humans, together and is in connection to the source metaphor of CLOSE IS GOOD AND MORAL. To cut a bond or a tie is to sever and destroy a connection and become distant.

Douglas Alexander uses story metaphors widely when talking about the national story, our national political narrative, and the Labour Party’s story. He derives these metaphors from the source
metaphors of EVOLUTION IS A NARRATIVE and POLITICAL ACTION IS STORY WRITING. The story metaphors indicate that stories have a predetermined plot with heroes and villains, a dramatic arch with a crisis, catharsis and a happy ending. Alexander describes the Labour Party’s policy Alexander expresses his party’s successes and failures by saying:

(10)
_We rewrote the statute book but we did not, alas, rewrite our storybook. We took the fight to the struggles of the day, but failed to identify those of tomorrow and articulate the path for the next generation._

and

(11)
_And the familiar, unchanged story we told began to lose its resonance in a changing Scotland._

By doing this, he gives writing one’s story an element of control; one can rewrite their story if it is not to one’s liking. Therefore, the Labour Party can reclaim its place in the Scottish politics by giving a full account of its past mistakes and rewriting their story, i.e. changing, developing and modernising their action. He gives the Better Together campaign the important task of telling the story of the United Kingdom and challenging the myths that pass as facts from others, it is the task of each of Scotland’s parties to tell their respective stories. Alexander also uses story metaphors when talking about Scotland’s history, referring it to as the national story being shared, our national political narrative told and talking about the heroes in the story being Labour Party politicians who gave voice not only to our concerns but also our hopes, the familiar villain being Thatcherism and describing the national political narrative as:

(12)
_Not a narrative, incidentally, that stopped at Berwick or Carlisle, far from it. Our struggle was a collective one shared with Consett, Corby and Ebbw Vale._

Berwick is located on the East coast of Scotland, Carlisle in the North of England, both on the border of Scotland and England. Consett is located in the North of England, Corby in the middle of England and Ebbw Vale in Wales. By using these geographical locations Alexander describes how Scotland’s political struggle to beat Thatcherism and Conservative politics was a shared attempt taking place all over the UK and makes Scotland, England and Wales allies fighting against a common enemy, the Conservatives. In another example, he talks about the Second World War and says: “…this suffering was shared by our people- the people of Coventry, Belfast, Cardiff and East end of London.” and in this historical and nostalgic context depicts the countries of the UK an
entity, a victim, which suffered under the same villain, the Nazis. In the first example, Alexander builds an image of the UK where opponents are not nations or geographical entities, but political entities and in the second, the opponent is not geographically or politically within the UK at all. These images make Scotland leaving the UK a meaningless effort and legitimise staying a part of the UK. Furthermore, they deconstruct the SNP’s rhetoric of England or UK government as being the enemy as the UK had had a Labour government from 1997-2010, a coalition government after that and a Conservative government only from 2015 onwards. According to Alexander’s rhetoric, the common enemy the whole of UK as an entity should be fighting is the Conservatives, not each other as countries.

When talking about Scotland’s story, Alexander leans on the EVOLUTION IS A NARRATIVE source metaphor and evokes emotions with nostalgia by referring to the old tradition of storytelling. Contrary to the Scottish Labour Party’s positive story of learning from past mistakes and changing with the times, Alexander describes SNP’s actions very differently:

(13)

Nationalism in Scotland attempts to provide a simple and simplistic morality tale of Scots being held back by whoever is the chosen “other” of the day. It is a tale that ignores causality and fault; it misinterprets our shared history and at times, our shared responsibility.

He calls progress, possibility and uplift the SNP’s constructed narrative and says that there is a darker side to their discourse than that of choosing which bits of the old British state they want to keep. It is worth noticing that in Alexander’s rhetoric the Labour Party tells and rewriters a story but the SNP provides a tale, as a tale is more simplistic and straightforward and a story a more complex dramatic construct. Alexander constructs the SNP’s actions through tale telling as incoherent, simplifying, misinterpreting and ignorant.

Lakoff (2008) states that one source metaphor for communication is THINKING IS MOVING and communication provides a guided tour along a path of thought. Alexander uses this source metaphor literally with the expression articulate the path, and simultaneously links journey metaphors together with communication metaphors. Alexander uses two source metaphors concerning journey and moving: FORWARD IS GOOD and LONG TERM PURPOSEFUL ACTIVITIES ARE JOURNEYS. He talks of the Labour Party helping shape Scotland’s journey again, moving with the times, offering a better way forward, Scottish people from all walks of life, and The SNP offering independence as the only route to the changes you want to see. Charteris-
Black (2004) suggests that just as much as individual purposes, social purposes can be seen as destinations. Therefore, Alexander’s use of the Labour Party helping shape Scotland’s journey and offering a better way forward bear underlying ideas of the Labour Party sharing Scotland’s social purposeful activities and helping Scotland reaching its destination on this journey. In Alexander’s rhetoric the destination is staying a part of the UK and building a UK wide community which supports solidarity, cooperation and tolerance.

Douglas Alexander uses the source metaphor of POLITICS IS WAR in his speech when describing the Labour Party being under attack from the SNP, taking the fight to the struggle of the day, talking about the party’s triumphs and defeats, and stating that “this referendum is not, in fact, a party political fight. It is a conflict between the sovereign will of the Scottish people and the settled will of the SNP”. The hero in the conflict is the Labour Party and the loser and coward is the SNP, which Alexander describes as retreating from the harsh light of scrutiny to the dubious refuge of victimhood, seeking refuge in the emotions of grievance and the misplaced identity of victimhood and the white paper the SNP released as being intellectually less of a white paper, and more like a white flag. In these instances, Alexander depicts the SNP as refugees fleeing the political conflict and hiding behind a constructed identity of being victims but at the same time surrendering to their political opponent.

A metaphor usually reserved for refugees or immigrants, namely that of natural disasters and weather, is also used by Alexander when describing the SNP campaign, support and policies: the current chaos engulfing the nationalists over the key issues of Sterling and Europe, nationalist tide that six months after their historic victory was still running strong, the crisis engulfing the reassurance strategy devised by the Nationalists to try and win this referendum and the support the SNP had received with ebbs and flows over the last 40 years. Describing chaos and crisis engulfing the SNP creates a very bleak, out- of-control image of the SNP’s campaign and policies as well as denotes inevitability; nature runs its course, there is nothing a man can do about it. The term engulf also means to completely cover or surround, so the SNP is not only partly in crisis or chaos, it is completely surrounded and covered by them. Describing the SNP’s support as the tide, with ebbs and flows denotes continuous change; the support goes up and down but is not sustained or continuous and like the tide, it is not controllable. Describing the nationalists as a tide further creates an image of the SNP as a force of nature, rising and covering things up but then, inevitably, also receding and going down.
Continuing with Alexander’s metaphor use concerning political strategies and policies, a very common source metaphor (e.g. Charteris-Black, 2005; Wei-Lun Lu& Ahrens, 2008) in his speech is POLITICAL STRATEGIES ARE BUILDINGS. He describes the SNP strategy having been reduced to a rubble, how the strategy lies in ruins, is collapsing under its own falsehood, and the SNP is seeking to annex the sense of confidence of economic strength to their definition of Scotland and its destiny. He continues to talk about restructuring of the industries and the architecture of devolution. Alexander combines personification and building metaphor, as he describes how the SNP strategy has run- very fast- into a brick wall of facts. He also talks about the Labour Party’s electoral roof finally coming in at the 2011 elections and Labour in government delivering much more than frame for the new constitutional framework for Britain. He describes building a common life, states that the public services are how we build our community and society, and asks if the SNP are up for the challenge of building and sustaining a good society. In the last three instances he draws from the source metaphor of SOCIETY IS A BUILDING. Therefore, the action connected with the SNP is a badly built building falling down under its own weight and with the Labour Party only a roof coming in, but the party building a community and society. He also states: “Understand this: the solidarity built within these islands is a moral example to the world.”, making solidarity another object of building and making building solidarity a moral action to be admired by the rest of the world.

Alexander uses a finance metaphor to express the differences but undeniable unity of Scotland and Britain by talking about the old Labour politicians who never saw a contradiction in working for a better Scotland and a better Britain. Two sides of the same coin. By saying Participants want to know that their political leaders understand not just the cost of everything but the value of living, Alexander assimilates the financial costs of living for citizens with the abstract value that is placed on living and calls for the political party leaders to understand that both should be regarded as important when drawing up policies. This statement places soft values on par with hard values. He also states that caring for our neighbour by investing in people through prioritising full employment and higher wages is one of the five instincts that should be central to the Scottish Labour’s sense of hope. The source metaphor here is MORAL ACTIONS ARE FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS, so investing into the Scottish people is the right thing to do and this moral action to induce a sense of hope is high on the list of the Labour Party’s agenda. The Scottish Labour also paid a price because the Scottish people no longer trusted the party. Therefore, the Labour Party got their punishment for losing the Scottish people’s trust, they morally suffered. He describes the SNP selling the Scottish
people short on every level, indicating a dishonest transaction where the SNP acted in an immoral way by giving the Scottish people less than what they metaphorically paid for.

Douglas Alexander only uses NATION IS A BUSINESS source metaphor a few times. He does it when he talks about the way people used to perceive the Labour Party, as “running everything” from Westminster to the local council, but was not seen as running them in ways that were moving with the times. This perception of Labour running the nation as a business is located in the past and is not Alexander’s own view, but his idea of how the old Labour was perceived.

Alexander uses some metaphors to do with religion when talking about the SNP. He says they are on a freedom crusade and they are preaching to the already converted. The first metaphor indicates being on a journey solely based on faith, not facts, and a journey which aims to change people’s beliefs about Scotland needing freedom and not currently having it under the UK government. The other metaphor denotes the SNP talking about their agenda to those who already agree with them.

There is only one occasion where Alexander uses a metaphor to do with animals, and that is when he describes the resistance towards the Labour Party changing the nature of the Scottish society for the better. He says all these changes are now taken for granted, but were resisted teeth and nail at the time. The same metaphor was also used by Thatcher in her speeches to describe the Labour Party’s animal-like fighting tactic (Charteris- Black, 2005). In his speech, Alexander does not specify who the opponents to the change were, but they were not the Labour politicians in Scotland.

Douglas Alexander uses metaphors of light and darkness when he talks about the SNP party retrieving from the harsh light of scrutiny, and trying to change the conversation away from the reality of prospective divorce seeing the light of day. In both instances the source metaphor is LIGHT IS KNOWLEDGE. In the first sentence the SNP is trying to avoid their strategy being exposed to thorough examination which would then lead to knowledge of how faulty and incoherent their strategy is. In the second sentence, the SNP is trying to steer the public conversation away from the knowledge of what would really happen if Scotland and Britain separated.

Alexander uses a plants metaphor to describe the social pressures of Scotland having deeper roots and describes the SNP thinking it can cherry-pick the parts of Britain it wants to keep if Scotland becomes independent. In the first example indicates a longer history and in the second, Alexander wants to express how easily the SNP thinks they will be able to choose what they keep of Britain.
He also uses the orientational metaphor of DEEP IS KNOWLEDGE and DEEP IS EMOTIONAL when describes the vote as deeply personal, and calls for deeper ties and deeper questions, deep fundamental questions to be answered about who the Scottish people are and deeper conversations to be had about the vote. By using the word deep, Alexander denotes that to make a well-informed decision on their votes, the Scottish people need to get more knowledge and Alexander is the one to answer them in his speech.

Alexander uses one handicrafts metaphor to explain how the UK benefits from it multicultural compound: The UK, precisely because of its component nations and our mosaic of traditions, is the best size, the best mix and the best partnership for these islands. Interestingly, he chooses a form of handicrafts that originates from ancient Greece. He also uses the term pooling and sharing of resources and risks as if these abstract things were concrete entities which can be easily gathered and evenly distributed across the whole of UK.

4.2.2. Pronouns and semantic polarisation

Douglas Alexander uses the following pronouns and descriptions when talking about the Scottish Labour Party: The party of which I am a representative of, Labour, Scottish Labour, my party, only true National Party of Scotland and Labour fold. In accordance with using building, story and conflict metaphors, Alexander describes the Labour Party as follows: A strong Scottish parliament has for decades been part of the Scottish Labour’s DNA and that as the authors of devolution we should also be its defenders and developers. In this statement he gives his party the roles of the author of a story, defender in a conflict and developer, which can refer to buildings but also to abstract development.

He refers to the Scottish National Party as SNP, a more deft and populist opponent than the Conservatives, but most often as the Nationalists. Alex Salmond is also Mr Salmond or their party leadership. In one instance he also uses personification to refer to the nationalists: “Nationalism in Scotland attempts to provide....” and in this case uses personification as a way to depict the SNP as a political entity, an ideology, not a political party consisting of people. The UK government is Westminster, Government in Westminster and the government of the rest of the UK. When he talks about Scottish people, Alexander includes himself and gives Scots many positive attributes: “We are proud Scots, complete in our sense of who we are and where we are from. Nationalists, to be frank, were regarded a bit odd.”, thus indicating that the Scottish identity is not incomplete or
unsure, that the Scottish people do not need to question their national identity and there is no need for a nationalist party. Unlike with his own party, to which he refers to often was the Scottish Labour, Alexander does not use the full name of the opponent, the Scottish National Party, but only refers to them as the nationalists. It could be interpreted as him wanting to steer the listeners’ focus away from the opponent being also Scottish and focusing on their perceived extreme political agenda.

Alexander uses *we* in two ways; to refer to the Scottish people and to refer to the Scottish Labour Party. This intermixed usage of the inclusive pronoun is not a coincidence. By using *we* interchangeably, Alexander creates the idea that Scottish people are the Scottish Labour Party and vice versa, as the following excerpt illustrates:

(14)

*Are we up to the challenge of building and sustaining a good society in austere times? How do we help each other to be the neighbours we would want to be rather than conclude that we should just walk away and leave our neighbours to struggle on their own? And if this is, as I believe, the defining challenge for our nation, how best should we as Scottish Labour respond?*

Alexander uses a lot of semantic polarisation, mostly to demonstrate the goodness of Labour Party and the badness of SNP, but also to express that there is no juxtaposition in being a Scot but belonging to the UK:

(15)

*To my parents’ generation, pride in our Scottish identity never required a denial of that part of the identity that is British.*

In this sentence, juxtaposes *pride* of being Scottish with *denial* of being British and makes Scotland separating from the UK unnecessary as the Scottish identity can entail both, being a proud Scot and belonging to the UK. He describes the referendum as *a conflict between the sovereign will of the Scottish people and settled will of the SNP* and by doing so, juxtaposing the Scottish people’s will against the SNP’s will.
He describes the SNP’s action with the following semantic polarisations (marked in bold letters):

(16)

The party of bravehearts have become the feint-hearts.

They didn’t find their courage, they lost their nerve.

They decided their best hope was to say “Everything will change” to their core supporters and activists, while suggesting that “Nothing will change” to the unconvinced majority.

It perhaps would be funny if it were not so serious. Laughable if it were not so insulting.

Their case, in stark contrast to a freedom crusade is that a vote for separation poses no risk at all.

At a deeper psychological level, the Nationalist’s two messages- one relentlessly positive, the other relentlessly negative- actually rely upon each other.

Having so often told others not to lecture Scotland the Nationalist politicians now find themselves taking to the airwaves to lecture others on what is in their national interest.

In these examples, Alexander constructs an image of an opponent who lost their nerve, tells people what they want to hear, is ridiculous, insulting, cowardly, deceiving and contradicting. He paints a picture of a very untrustworthy and unbalanced political party. When comparing SNP and Labour, Alexander uses contradictions such as these:

(17)

Where a reckless and wrong white paper is confronted by the right and radical way forward.

The real prospect of desirable rather than damaging change.

A political battle between the idea of working together and the idea of walking away.

How do we help each other to be the neighbours we would want to be rather than conclude that we should just walk away and leave our neighbours to struggle on their own?

Are we in or out? Should we stay or shall we go?

Let us reject a damaging divorce and instead vote for the best of both worlds.
But the majority does not regard independence as the route to achieve the changes we want to see. The changes we want for our families and our nation are different from the changes the nationalists demand.

In these examples, Alexander own Labour Party is right and radical, helps each other to be good neighbours, offers desirable change, works together, wants to see change and stays. The SNP, then, is reckless and wrong, offers damaging change, walks away and leaves a neighbour to struggle on their own, wants a damaging divorce and demands changes. Furthermore, when Alexander talks about the Labour offering “Not a partnership set in stone or viewed through nostalgic eyes. An evolving, compact, fit for purpose and ready to collaborate and co-operative in new and innovative ways”, he indicates that the Labour Party is for developing, future-orientated, flexible and collaborating in evolving the partnership between Scotland and the UK. Therefore, he recognises that there is need for change and development, but does not see Scotland becoming independent a necessity to implement the changes and initiate the development.
5. Discussion

In this chapter, I will define what kinds of images of Scotland and Scottishness the speakers construct with political myths and discourses. I will compare the two speakers’ myths and discourses and analyse what types of ideologies and values are manifested in them. I will also compare my study’s results to those of previous studies and discuss the challenges of my research.

Edelman’s three most often used political myths are reiterated by Geiss (1987) as follows: The myth of the Conspirational Enemy where a hostile out-group is plotting against the in-group, the Valiant Leader myth which entails a benevolent political leader who is effective in saving people from danger by showing courage and aggression and by overcoming difficulties and The United We Stand myth which entails that a group can win their enemies by obeying their leader and sacrificing for them. In both speeches of this research, Scotland is depicted as a hero in charge of their own destiny whilst the rest of the world watches the hero’s actions in admiration. Who the hero is, what heroic action is, who the villain is and who belongs in the hero’s community are constructed from different actions, attributes and communities in each speech.

In Alex Salmond’s speech all three of Edelman’s myths are in use. The hero and valiant leader (Scotland/SNP) breaks free from the control of the conspirational enemy of Westminster government, the entity that is holding the hero back, and reaches its full potential by releasing its talent and potential and builds a country that is equal, inclusive and independent but part of a greater community of other countries (see example 1 in the analysis). Taking control of one’s future and demanding freedom are seen as heroic and moral actions, whereas keeping someone under control and dictating their actions is seen as villainous and immoral.

Douglas Alexander’s narrative also entails all three myths. In Douglas Alexander’s speech the hero and valiant leader (Labour Party/Scotland) stays with their family and helps their struggling neighbour, and together they build a community based on solidarity, cooperation and tolerance. The conspirational enemy in this story is changing, as it used to be the Conservatives all around Britain but it now is the SNP as a cowardly and deceiving character. Staying and helping a neighbour is seen as heroic and moral action whereas walking away and destroying a family is seen as villainous and immoral (see example 7 in the analysis).
My conclusion is that it was hard for the Scottish people to identify as being victims of an oppressor or a part of a family of outside nations and therefore, the crucial need to belong to a larger entity or community was not fulfilled in Salmond’s rhetoric, whereas it was much easier for the Scottish people to identify with being a persistent hero and belonging to the familiar community of the UK. I will use the family metaphor to explicate the differences of the two speakers: Salmond’s Scotland is a child/teenager who is becoming independent, finding its own feet, distancing itself from the parents and creating a family of its own choosing. Alexander’s Scotland is a responsible grown-up who does not need to go and find himself, but instead stays with the family through tough times and helps the struggling neighbours. Salmond’s selling point is being liberated and being autonomous, Alexander’s selling point is that staying together is better than being alone. The latter selling point, not surprisingly, resonated more with the fairly family-orientated Scottish culture and the adult demographic of the voters.

Both speakers depict a Scottish society that is inclusive and tolerant to different traditions and cultures. Salmond describes an independent Scotland that is proud, ambitious and self-sufficient and has a great education and childcare system, which both guarantee the citizens a chance to work. Alexander describes a cooperating Scotland which is proud and ambitious and has a great childcare and social care system, which both guarantee the citizens a chance to work. Both speakers emphasise the possibility of working as a sign of a healthy, functional society. Both speakers recognise the demand for changes in the Scottish society and talk about a Scottish society which exists in the future and which can be built and created. However, the builders in Salmond’s narrative are only the Scottish people themselves and in Alexander’s narrative the Scottish people in collaboration with the rest of the people in the UK.

Salmond’s Scottish people are responsible, proud, compassionate, ambitious and humble. The Scottish nation looks to its own, gives of itself, mobilises its talent, releases its potential, builds a better Scotland and a fairer society and a human community where self-determination is a noble thing. According to Salmond, Scotland as part of the UK is a prisoner and a servant and as an independent nation is an autonomous land of achievement. Alexander’s Scottish people are ambitious, aspirational, proud and complete in their identities. According to Alexander, within the UK is a helping neighbour but as an independent nation, it is a family-destroyer.

According to Mio (1997): “Because we are limited in our ability to process information, selection must be made to attend to only information that we are interested in, are drawn to, understand
already, and so forth” (p. 117). Hence, using personification and metaphors involving the human body or its actions such as walking, touching, travelling, story-telling, doing handicrafts as well as botany, both speakers attempt to appeal to the listeners by using metaphors involving familiar themes, words and actions from their lives that they can relate to, process and understand. While doing this, both speakers are also creating their chosen political myths.

As can be seen in examples 1 and 4 in the analysis, both speakers use metaphors of building and creating to denote the making of a society and community and metaphors of journeying to describe evolution and purposeful social actions as well as arriving at a desired social goal. The speaker’s party functions as the guide on the journey. The idea of making a journey to reach a destination is a familiar, everyday action for most of us and by using journeying to explain the abstract moving towards social and shared goals helps the listeners understand the otherwise slightly peculiar concept of shared social goals of a society. The building metaphors also refer to the future very strongly as both speakers talk about the Scottish nation and society that would be built after the vote.

Both also use personification to describe a nation as a person. Referring to Scotland as a living, breathing entity that can perform positive, transformative and generative human functions such as building, creating and changing creates an idea of an entity and denotes unity, co-operation and inclusiveness. Furthermore, by paralleling political action with human action and making a political party or nation a person, different kinds of abstract action can be legitimised. This political action was required to build a house for the family. This political action was required to put food on the table for the family. This political action is required to keep the family together, and this political action was required to care for the children in the family. Voters can empathise with these political actions being a necessity when they are presented as the actions of a parent. Salmond answers to the basic human needs of being connected and belonging with Scotland belonging to the family of other nations, Alexander with Scotland belonging to the family of UK.

While Salmond uses metaphors of hands and body in a negative way to describe being controlled and restricted by the Westminster, and in a positive way to describe having control oneself, Alexander uses metaphors of conflict to describe the political battle and negative metaphors of disintegrating buildings to describe the demise of the SNP. Using the concept of conflict and war to describe a political battle legitimises political actions, which can be very radical and aggressive. One has the right to self-defense in a conflict. One has the right to strategise, to outsmart the enemy,
to counter-attack and to use force. Different laws and rules apply to wars and conflicts, they are about survival and protecting one’s own. With war and conflict metaphors, Alexander creates special circumstances whereby special action is required and understandable. Furthermore, by describing his opponent as a refugee, he takes away their autonomy, control, power and self-determination and puts them at the mercy of the kindness of others.

The common use of buildings as political actions or strategies makes political strategies more approachable and their structure an understandable one for the voters. When Alexander describes a political strategy laying in ruins, the listener inevitably sees an image of a faulty building falling down or being destroyed, and understands the current state of the strategy much better than if Alexander had merely described the strategy as bad or dysfunctional.

He also uses metaphors of story to denote taking control of one’s destiny. Storytelling is one of the oldest traditions of human kind since we developed language and storytelling has been used throughout times to make sense out of and rationally comprehend life. Stories give a clear timeline to actions, clear roles to the characters and a clear plotline. It also suggests a somewhat predictable and preset storyline.

Both speakers combine historical values with modern times by describing the variety of traditions and cultures in Scotland/Britain with handicrafts metaphors; Salmond uses the weaving of a traditional Scottish tartan, Alexander the ancient Greek art form of mosaic. Both also use metaphors of botany to denote abstract growth and cultivation of abstract things such as skills.

Alexander uses metaphors that depict a feminine and caring society and worldview by using metaphors of family and children, storytelling and neighbourliness. When using the metaphor of family and neighbours, he uses the most familiar theme of connection and community that any person can know. The family unit is not an unfamiliar concept to the adult listeners and the connection and belonging described with the family and tie/bond metaphors is an emotional one that every person wishes for. Everyone has a biological mother and father; everyone is, or at least wishes to be, a part of some sort of a family.

Alexander also explains his party’s previous mistakes and unpopularity with story metaphors by giving an explicit full account of their mistakes and then remarking, that they did not, alas, rewrite their own story. By being seemingly open about Labour’s past mistakes, he creates a discourse of
moral accounting which, not surprisingly, only applies to the Labour Party, not the SNP. Therefore the SNP is not granted any mistakes but instead their mistakes are thoroughly examined and highlighted.

Even though Salmond talks about developing childcare and cutting down costs, he concentrates more on creating a picture of a strong, independent and proud society, where looking after each other is not the main point, but being free and releasing the talent and potential of people is. Salmond uses metaphors that depict an ambitious and autonomous society and ideology.

As is evident in examples 3, 4, 16 and 17 in the analysis, true to the tradition of political smear campaigning, both speakers depict their political opponent in a bad light. With the use of semantic polarisation Salmond clearly juxtaposes Scotland and the SNP’s superiority and their positive action with the negativity and negative action of the Westminster Establishment and the Scottish Labour Party. He describes the future independent Scottish nation as inclusive, equal, fair, wealthy, resilient and as a modern human community with a self-sufficient economy and the Scottish people as active, in control, proud, responsible, committed, talented and energetic. This discourse of autonomy, which is grounded in courage and liberation, is beneficial to the SNP and oppressing to the Labour Party, which is described as detached from the Scottish people, and the Westminster Establishment, which is described as distant, exclusive and forcefully controlling. Furthermore, Salmond describes the Better together campaign as negative, miserable and ridiculous.

With semantic polarisation, Alexander depicts the SNP as cowardly, unreliable and incoherent. He chooses metaphors of destruction, a derelict building and refugees to describe the actions and policies of the SNP. He describes the Scottish people as proud, ambitious and cooperative and the Scottish nation as inclusive, supportive and equal. His discourse of collaboration is beneficial to Scottish Labour and UK government, but oppressing to the SNP. The allocation of time to each topic is also very reflective of the speaker’s orientation. In proportion to the length of their speeches, Alexander uses most time to smear the SNP and to go through the Scottish Labour’s history, and Salmond uses most time to talk about the SNP’s positive campaign and what a future independent Scotland would be like.

Interestingly, metaphors from Alex Salmond’s themes are also used on the SNP’s website (www.snp.org): The human action of walking or moving is used in metaphors when talking about Scotland: moving forward, taking steps and taking the first steps on the road to recovery. The
building metaphor was used extensively on the website as well, for example: *firm foundations to build on as we move into a new phase for our nation and I want to build a nation that nurtures its talent.* Mothering metaphors were also used on many occasions: *A Learning Scotland, where people strive to develop new skills, nurture their talents and Scotland that nurtures its creative talent.* Handicrafts metaphor was used in connection with culture, and it was again used to denote intertwining, being a tight part of an entity; *Culture is an integral part of Scotland’s economy and it runs like a golden thread through so much of what is good in our society.* The website used personification and one metaphor to do with touching as well: *We face these unprecedented financial challenges without the powers that other countries have at their disposal and The health service touches the life of every person in our country. It is at the very heart of our public services.* One gardening/botany metaphor appeared: *We can enhance the Bill and give our nation the freedom it needs to flourish by taking on more responsibilities here in Scotland.* The SNP website further proves that the SNP has chosen these metaphors of personification, botany, handicrafts and journeying to build a discourse of autonomy, closeness and ambition and in addition uses metaphors from areas of life that a vast majority of the Scottish people can relate to. It is worth noticing that the SNP website now uses metaphors of family and caring, but Salmond did not use them in his 2014 speech.

The metaphors used on the Scottish Labour Party website (www.scottishlabour.co.uk) are also in line with those that Alexander uses. The website advertises a skills match with *whatever your skills, we want our party to be a home for them.* Further family metaphors include Hardie, a Scottish Labour politician *giving birth to a new and radical force in Scottish politics and the Scottish Labour Party amalgamating with its sister party.* The story metaphor is in use when the website talks about the *story of a campaign and how the story unfolded* as well as the *unsung heroes* of the party. The website also describes the hero *laying the foundations* of Scotland’s post-war *reconstruction.* The names of the campaigns on the website support the chosen discourse of caring and collectivism: *KidsnotCuts, HousetoHome, We care and Refugees welcome.* The Scottish Labour Party is also fighting for equality and social justice and describes how the Brexit referendum was *forced upon them by the Conservatives* and continues the smear campaign against the SNP on the website by, amongst other things, calling Nicola Sturgeon, the First Minister of Scotland and SNP’s current leader, a liar. Therefore, the Scottish Labour Party chooses to use metaphors of story, family and building to create a discourse of collectivity and caring throughout their political narrative.
My results also supported some of the findings of previous studies on national identity and political discourses mentioned in the theoretical framework of this study. Similarly to the study of Australia as a nation is political speeches (Augustinos & Every, 2008), both speakers in my study constructed a form of inclusive nationalism that is grounded in common goals and values. Both narratives also embedded inclusivity, ambition and pride in the national interest, characters and values. However, Salmond constructed Scotland under restrictions and limitations posed by the UK whereas Alexander constructed a Scotland where national identity was not in any way threatened by being part of the UK. Therefore, my study supports Augustino and Every’s (2008) conclusions that the same construction of national identity can be used for both inclusive and exclusive purposes.

Also similarly to the study of the Malaysian Prime Minister’s speeches and government policies by Mohn Don et al. (2010), I found that Alexander used national unity as a means to sustain economic growth. My findings also party support those of Prentice (2010) who studied online discussions on Scottish independence as Alex Salmond also presented Scotland’s identity becoming stronger and transformed in a positive way if Scotland became independent. Furthermore, Salmond also did not focus on dismantling the British identity but focused on devaluing the Labour Party, emphasised the positive outcome of change and concentrated on the possible possible future rather than the past. My results also support Leith’s (2008) findings according to which in the 2000’s the SNP’s “other” was a political establishment (Salmond’s “other” was the Labour and Westminster) and the tone of the SNP was modern and inclusive.

Both speakers constructed myths of heroes similarly to Churchill and both used the same metaphors as Clinton and Blair had used in their speeches (Charteris-Black, 2005). Furthermore, Charteris-Black (2004) concluded that building metaphors were rather prevalent in British political party manifestos and my results fully support this conclusion as both speakers used an ample amount of building and buildings metaphors. Because both political party websites use the same source metaphors as the speakers in their campaign speeches, I think my results can be generalised to apply to the Scottish Labour and Scottish Nationalist Party political discourses. They cannot, however, be generalised to apply to different cultures or Nationalist or Labour parties in different cultures on nations.

The research method in itself worked well for my data and with the chosen theory. As the theory and method had previously been applied in a similar study by Charteris-Black (2005), I had very little doubts about the functionality of the method. I did, however, experience difficulties in
counting metaphors and structuring the text of how to present the results in a coherent format. Also, due to forming discourses based on very little data I felt like I was making sweeping statements. Furthermore, the speeches concentrated more on talking about what makes the political party great and the opponent bad, which is maybe what I should have concentrated on in my analysis more alongside national identity. I could have used a theory about identities as another tool to decipher the results, but it would have been a much wider psychological sciences research and for which my knowledge of psychology as a science would have needed to be much more comprehensive.
5. Conclusion

The aim of my study was to find out which metaphors, personal pronouns and semantic polarisations two politicians from the opposing Yes and Better together campaigns used in their speeches. Based on these findings, I aimed to form political myths and discourses and examined how nationhood and nationality were constructed in the myths and discourses in the speeches. The final aim of my study was to compare the findings of each speech to establish the reason why the Better together campaign appealed to and resonated with the voters more than the Yes campaign did.

I found that whilst both speakers used metaphors that are fairly common in political discourse, they both favoured different metaphors to construct a desired discourse. The common metaphors they used were metaphors about journey, human body/personification, and building/creating. In addition to this, Alex Salmond from the Yes campaign used metaphors of hands and touch, unrestricted and restricted movement. Salmond built a myth of a victim breaking free from the oppressor’s captivity and becoming a hero, claiming his place as an autonomous entity in the family of nations and created discourses of autonomy and individualism. Douglas Alexander from the Better together campaign used metaphors of family and story and built a political myth of a selfless hero staying in a tough situation to help his struggling neighbour and working together with the other members of the UK family and built discourses of collectivism and caring. The results indicate that the narrative and rhetoric based on family values, collectivism, caring and cooperation resonated better with the Scottish voters than did the narrative and rhetoric based on individualism, freedom and autonomy.

There are a few things I could have done better in this research. Firstly, I could have spent more time digging literature on political discourse so that I would have had deeper knowledge of the kind of discourse I was about to start analysing as it is very different from the discourse of everyday life. If I were to continue this study further, a successful doctoral thesis, for example, would require much deeper knowledge of political discourse and political sciences.

Secondly, I should have been more meticulous when counting the metaphors from the speeches, as I now feel that there are some I might have missed or placed in incorrect source metaphors. If I did the research again, I would use a corpus analysis program and calculate all the metaphors and pronouns with it. Thirdly, I would reserve more time to conduct the analysis and write the analysis
and discussion sections of the paper. I underestimated the time I required to make sense of my own findings and to come up with a coherent and capturing way to present them.

Fourthly, I could have also used Lakoff’s studies about Conservative politicians using the strict father metaphors and Liberal politicians using caring mother metaphors to interpret my research results. However, I did not become familiar with this side of his studies until my analysis was almost ready, so I only scraped the surface of his findings on feminism vs. masculinity in political discourse.

In the light of the current political changes in Finland, it would be most interesting to expand this study to Finnish political speeches and compare the findings of Scottish and Finnish ideological use of metaphors, personal pronouns and semantic polarisation. It would be of extreme importance socio-culturally to illuminate the purpose and goals of certain metaphors in the Finnish political speeches and texts as the results of the last parliamentary elections were somewhat surprising to my understanding. Thus, finding out under which familiar themes and ideologies the political parties were and are building their communications on would help understand why the Finnish population voted as they did.

In addition, the recent Brexit vote for the UK to leave the EU has created a situation where Scotland might have the right to set up a new referendum for independence. If this were to happen, it would be extremely fruitful to conduct a similar research on the political myths and discourses used in the campaign speeches given before the vote and to compare the narratives of the first and second vote to see if the narratives have evolved. As immigration and the question of inclusiveness was a major spearhead in the Brexit vote, it would also be very useful to analyse how Britishness was constructed in the campaign speeches and campaign materials prior to the Brexit vote taking place. The Brexit vote was initiated by the Conservative Party and therefore it would be important for the sake of comparative research to analyse their narrative on nationhood and Britishness and to compare it to how the Labour Party in the UK and the SNP in Scotland construct national identity.

Furthermore, the upcoming American Presidential elections would provide an example of another culture and party politics constructing nationality and national identity, as one of the key issues in the Presidential campaigns has been the question of who is a true American, who should be included in being an American, who should be allowed to stay in America, who “the other” is in the story of America and what kind of leadership America needs to become “great again”. A very
ambitious idea for further research would be to include all four campaigning situations and speeches from them: the Scottish independence vote, the Finnish parliamentary elections, The Brexit vote and the American Presidential elections and to conduct a research in which the party political narratives within countries would be compared to each other but also the cultural narratives of the different nationalities would be compared to each other. This study would be a cross-disciplinary study combining linguistic studies, political studies and cultural studies and it would most certainly be a topical and important research that would partly explain why the worrying worldwide political trend of extreme nationalism and cultural intolerance has appealed to voters in different elections over the last decade. It would be of great interest to me to find out what similarities and differences extreme nationalist narratives across cultures have in their narratives and how they legitimise their policies and actions in their given culture.
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