

THE LANGUAGE OF WAR: LOSS GAIN METAPHORICAL FRAMING IN THE CONTEXT OF THE WAR ON TERROR

Shuja Ahmad[♥]

Abstract

War has always been an important issue in philosophy. Very many philosophers have discussed different aspects of war. This paper, using Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT) as theoretical frame work, focuses on the language of war. It discusses 'War is Business' metaphor that ensues Loss Gain framing - informing public/audience that going into conflict/war is gain and not going is loss; winning war is gain and losing war is loss; status quo is risk; enemy's loss is our gain and our gain is enemy's loss. Moreover, helping the refugees and providing aid to the victims is narrated as, Corporate Social Responsibility. Loss gain framing, like other framings, blocks criticism on the pretext that critics don't want our gain and if we accept their arguments then there would be losses. This paper explains the way loss gain framing works in times of war and conflict. It focuses on the way this framing was instrumental in the context of the War on Terror in Afghanistan. The argument is: in the context of 9/11 leaders of both sides, especially Tony Blair, defined and framed the War on Terror in a way that it appeared that not going into war would entail great future losses.

Key Words: Language of War, Metaphor, Frame, Framing, War on Terror, Loss Gain

Introduction

Wars bring mass human suffering, murder and destruction, mass displacement of people, economic recession and a great harm to the environment; therefore, it has always been an important issue in philosophy. From Plato to modern times very many philosophers have discussed: What is war? What causes war? What moral values should be followed in war?

[♥] Assistant Professor, Department of Philosophy, University of Peshawar. Email: shuja_ahmad@uop.edu.pk

What makes a war just? However, there are many other aspects of war and philosophers should explore and discuss those aspects too¹. This paper using conceptual metaphor theory (CMT) discusses the use of language that evokes Loss Gain Framing in the context of war in general and the War on Terror (WOT) in Afghanistan in particular.

The paper is purposefully divided into two parts. The first part, discussing the methodology, briefly explains metaphors and framing. It delineates War is Business metaphor and Loss Gain framing. Moreover, it explains the way this framing can be instrumental in explaining a situation, specially war and conflict, as business activity. The second part of the paper argues that this framing was instrumental in the War on Terror. Leaders of the both sides were using this framing to persuade their followers for war. It mainly focuses on the narrative of the Prime Minister Tony Blair that he puts forth soon after 9/11. The reason is that a lot of people/critics were arguing that Britain has nothing to do with the war on terror, for the 9/11 attacks were not carried out on England. However, since England is a very close ally of United States of America, therefore they had to be very active partner of the grand alliance. In such a situation the Prime Minister informed the people of Britain about the future losses connected to not helping the partners and not fighting against the Taliban and Osama.

Metaphors, Frames and Loss Gain Framing

Lakoff, Johnson, Zoltan and other cognitive linguists argue that we are not consciously aware that the cognitive system we live by is mostly metaphorical- metaphor/ metaphorical understanding means, "...understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another."² For example, we do not know consciously that we understand Love in terms of a Journey, Arguments in terms of War, Life in terms of Purposeful Journey, Time in terms of Money/ Precious things. Similarly we, unknowingly, understand and conceptualize Banks in terms of Trees and Countries in terms of Families or Persons etc.

Since, concepts and ideas are expressed in language; therefore, a careful understanding of language reveals the way our conceptual structure looks like³. The following metaphorical expressions will make this point clear.

1. I have *lost* her- Life is a Journey- Now the person we think we have lost may be around us, we may see her everyday- still we say, 'I have *lost* her'. The reason is that we see life as a journey- we *meet* people in this journey;

¹ Moseley, Alexander, *A Philosophy of War*, (Algora Publishing New York, 2002): 1-5

² Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, (The University of Chicago Press, 1980): 5

³ Ibid p.4

we *lost* them; we *go along* with them; *part ways* with people; meet *strangers*; *miss* the bus or train; *wait* for someone that she will *come back*.

2. I have *given* you enough time- Time is Money- although we are normally not aware of the fact that we understand time in terms of money, but it becomes evident when we listen to metaphorical expressions such as: *budget* your time, *spend* your time carefully, *no more* time for you.

A metaphor consists of two domains: A Target domain and a Source domain. We understand target domain in terms of the source domain.⁴ In, A Country is a Family- Target domain is Country and Family is the source domain. Our *children* are dying in war; the great scientist is proud *son* of this nation- the metaphor is A Country is a Family. For rich concepts such as Time, Life, Love, War, we have more than one conceptual mapping. For example: 'Do not *waste* my time'- Time is Money; but, 'Time has *come*', 'Time will *decide*'- Time is a Person.

The metaphors originate and become part of our consciousness by doing different activities in life. For example, Journey, when we travel we clearly know that this activity has a goal/ destination. We have to follow a route. We meet people when traveling. Some of them have same destinations. Sometimes the road is smooth and sometimes it's difficult and bumpy. We have guides in a journey who keep on telling us about the right directions. 'Journey', is a delineated and clear concept. It, as a source domain, can help us understand less delineated concept such as life (target domain). Similarly, we have a clear and delineated concept of Family that we have gathered through our experiences. We live in a family, have siblings, and parents. We have a set of values our families live by. People sacrifice their lives for their families. Sons/daughters do big things and make their families proud and bring honor to their families. Family can be a good source domain and can help us understand target domains such as Country.

Fillmore explains a frame as,

By the term 'frame' I have in mind any system of concepts related in such a way that to understand any one of them you have to understand the whole structure in which it fits; when one of the things in such a structure is introduced into a text, or into a conversation, all of the others are automatically made available.⁵

⁴ Zolthan Kovecses. *Metaphor: A Practical introduction*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010): 4

⁵ Fillmore Charles J. *Frame Semantics: Cognitive Linguistics: Basic Reading*: edited by Dirk Geeraerts, (New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2006): 273, (originally published in 1982 in *Linguistics in the Morning Calm*, Linguistic Society of Korea (ed.), 111-137. Seoul: Hanshin publishing. Reprinted with permission) (accessed June 22, 2009)

For example: War- it is not just another word. It is a frame, a system of many concepts connected to each other such as: army, tanks, enemy, drone attacks, destroy, friendly fire, refugees, internally displaced people, missiles, surrender etc. When any of these concepts are introduced in a conversation the frame of War gets evoked. For instance, if we get the information, “10 people died in the drone attack”, the frame of war gets evoked and different concepts related to war by design/ unconsciously comes in our mind.

Lakoff and Johnson reveal, “... the conceptual frames that inhabit our cognitive unconscious *contribute semantically* to the meanings of words and sentences.”⁶ Lakoff defines a frame as a conceptual/mental structure that shapes our world view. Consequently, he argues, “...they [frames] shape the goals we seek, the plans we make, the way we act, and what counts as a good or bad outcome of our actions.”⁷

In political discourse framing plays a very important role. While talking about an event, politicians/ leaders consciously select some developments, images and facts about the event promoting a specific interpretation about the event and ordinary audience do not notice this. They use specific metaphors that don't let the audience think about other dimensions of the event.⁸ And when they successfully frame a specific interpretation of an event in the minds of their audience it becomes very difficult to erase that framing from their minds.

Framing is critical because a frame, once established in the mind of the reader (or listener, viewer, etc.) leads that person almost inevitably to the conclusion desired by the framer, and it blocks consideration of other possible facts and interpretations.⁹

This reveals that the response of ordinary public towards any event depends on how the event has been framed. This is how framers can control the thinking of their audience. They can make them infer conclusions of their choice- they can make them think and argue about an event the way they want them to. Once a frame gets established in our minds it's very

⁶ Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson. *Philosophy in the Flesh- The Embodied Mind and its Challenges to Western Thought*. (Basic Books, A Member of the Perseus Books Group, 1999): 116

⁷ Lakoff, George, *Don't think of an Elephant!*. (Chelsea Green Publishibg, White River Junction, Vermont, 2004): xv

⁸ Norris Pippa, Montague Kern, and Marion Just; Framing Terrorism: Published in, *Framing Terrorism- The News Media, the Government and the Public*, Edited by Pippa, Montague Kern, and Marion Just. (New York: Routledge, 2003): 11 (accessed April 6, 2009)

⁹ Lakoff George, <https://changethis.com/manifesto/show/5.GeorgeLakoff> (accessed on July 7, 2018)

difficult to change and replace it; it blocks critical and rational thinking since one cannot think anything that is against the framing.

Most of our day to day metaphors and frames originate from business and economic activities and transactions in the world. In a business activity we have two or more than two parties. The purpose/goal/aim of any business activity is gain. Loss is considered to be very highly undesirable outcome. We have partners in business and have rivals and enemies. Our partners help us towards gain and we help them reciprocally. Our rivals/ enemies work for their own gain. So, business and economic activities are clear concepts that we develop while having experiences in the world. They help us understand those concepts that are less delineated. We use this as a metaphor in our day to day life. That is why we listen to metaphorical expressions such as: he is an *ATM*; *Moral accounting*; this person is *indebted* to another person (not in terms of money but in terms of some favor); Non state actors can be strategic *assets* for a state etc. Besides *credit*, *debit*, *balance sheet*, *accounts*, *assets*, one of the central things in all business and economic transactions and activities is Loss Gain- One can say the whole activity revolves around it.

While doing business one has to look for gain and has to work on a strategy to avoid losses- therefore, one has to be very careful in making decisions such as: when to invest, whom to invest with, about business partners, about rivals, about timing of a business transaction. Moreover, your gain may be your rival's/ enemy's loss- their gain can be your loss- if your business partner is in danger then you are also vulnerable. Furthermore, big businessmen/companies have to show that they have a concern for the social good and environment i.e., they fulfill their Corporate Social Responsibility.

Loss gain framing is a very effective way to portray a situation as a business or economic transaction. The target audience of this framing are people who see and understand different activities in the world as business activities. In times of war and conflict leaders/ people at the helm of affairs use Loss Gain framing to portray war/ conflict as a business or economic activity. In order to persuade people for war they inform them that going into conflict/war is gain and not going is loss; winning war is gain and losing war is loss; status quo is risk; if one of the partner is in danger, all of us are in danger; not helping the partners in times of danger will expose us to future losses; enemy's loss is our gain and our gain is enemy's loss. Moreover, innocent people who suffer because of the war should be taken care of.¹⁰

¹⁰ Interestingly, in 'he attacked my argument', the metaphor is 'Argument is War', War is the source domain and 'Argument' is the target domain. However, this paper reveals that in times of war and conflict, leaders can frame war as a business activity. This way they

Loss Gain Framing in the Context of the War on Terror

In war and conflict the most common framings are: Good versus Evil, Believers versus Infidel, Us versus Them. Since, a big population of the world believes in the existence of Good and Evil forces. Most of the movies, dramas, stories and cartoons revolve around a struggle between good and evil. Believer versus Infidel is another available framing. It is mostly present in religious societies. It requires more religious diction. Similarly, any conflict can be framed as a struggle between Us and Them and the audience may have to choose one of the sides, “Either you are with us or with enemies” is an example in the context of 9/11. President Bush declared that the world has been divided in to two sides, US and the Terrorist, and the world was asked to choose one of the sides- Remaining neutral was not an option. Taliban and Osama framed the events of 9/11 as divine retribution and declared that the world has been divided into two sides, Believers and Infidels- Obviously there was no neutral ground. But not all people see the world as a place where there is a struggle between good and evil or between believers and infidels. Their world view sees and understands the world as a marketplace. They see different activities in the world as economic transactions- such people do not buy Good versus Evil, Believer versus Infidel or Us versus Them framing. For instance The Prime Minister Tony Blair on October 2, 2001 addressing the concern of such people and persuading them for war said,

I know that here in Britain people are anxious, even a little frightened...They worry about the economy and talk of recession. And, of course there are dangers; it is a new situation. But the fundamentals of the US, British and European economies are strong.¹¹

Obviously, here he is neither referring to the people who are afraid of Evil taking over the world, nor he is addressing to a world view where there is a struggle between believers and infidels. He is specifically talking to the people who think in terms of economy and business. Leaders and framers in order to persuade such people for war use metaphors that evoke Loss Gain framing. Gain and loss framing, writes Wolfe, influences the way people define situational outcomes. For example, objectives of Operation Enduring Freedom, he opines, were to eliminate terrorist targets in Afghanistan to prevent future losses.¹² Similarly, in case of Iraq war, public was told that Iraq has WMDs and is a threat to USA and to rest of the world. Not attacking Iraq would mean great losses in future. Moreover, War on

portray ‘War’ as a target domain which is understood in terms of a source domain ‘Business activity’.

¹¹ Blair, Full Text: *Tony Blair’s Speech*, www.gurdian.co.uk, October2 , 2001

¹² Wolfe, Mackiewicz Wojtek, *Winning the War of Words- Selling Terror from Afghanistan to Iraq* (Praeger Security International, 2008): 45

Terror was framed as a war that will end future wars making the world, particularly America, a safer place; moreover, it would promote democracy and freedom- Gains of the war.

According to Wolfe, Positive self- concept and positive national or social identity are psychological needs of human beings. Most of the human beings like to think of themselves as good people doing things for right reasons. This may explain, Wolfe argues, the use of loss/gain framing in justifying war. Loss framing works since we, being rational, want to protect ourselves, and gain framing persuades us on emotional level justifying war to save and help other human beings and to spread democracy.¹³

Use of loss gain framing is very common in war and political discourse. For instance, Lakoff argues that the First Iraq war was a panorama of metaphors. Iraq was portrayed to be ‘sitting on the economic life line’ by the then secretary of state- President Bush (Senior) portrayed Saddam as ‘Stranglehold’ on the economy of USA. Moreover, he writes that normally decision about going into war or not is like a ‘cost- benefit’ analysis- where war is justified on the bases of its gains and it is argued that going into war is gain and not going into war is loss.¹⁴

President Bush, in order to persuade citizenry for the war on Iraq argued on January 29, 2002 and informed the world that some regimes were seeking Weapons of Mass Destruction and the danger was growing,

They could provide these arms to terrorists.... They could attack our allies or attempt to blackmail the United States. In any of these cases, the price of indifference would be catastrophic.¹⁵

The President informed people that terrorist regimes were seeking WMD. If they ‘gain’ WMDs then the ‘loss’ of USA and the rest of the world will be catastrophic. They could hand over these weapons to other terrorists (Read partners). Losses would include: an attack on USA or an ally with WMD, blackmailing of America. Blackmailing, in this context, also evokes a frame: enemy is trying to get strength which will become our weakness. They will exploit us and make us do whatever they want to- in the business of war they will have an upper hand. We will have to surrender before them. The entailment effects are that if we remain indifferent and do not fight them there will be a big loss in the future. But if we fight and win this war we can avoid losses, which obviously is a gain. Besides other gains, President Bush and his allies informed the world that the war would not only save America

¹³ Wolfe, Mackiewicz Wojtek, *Winning the War of Wards- Selling Terror from Afghanistan to Iraq* (Praeger Security International, 2008): 46

¹⁴ George Lakoff, *Metaphor and War: The Metaphor System to Justify War in the Gulf* (Part 1) *Viet Nam Generation Journal & Newsletter* 3(3), (November 1991)

¹⁵ Bush (January 29, 2002)

and her allies, but also the people of Afghanistan and Iraq, since, people of these countries are ruled by tyrants and living a very miserable life- social and moral responsibility of good businessmen would be fulfilled.

The President informed about the return of the money he wants to 'invest' in the war that would be reflected in the budget which he intends to send to the Congress,

My budget supports three great goals for America: We will win this war; we'll protect our homeland; and we will revive our economy.¹⁶

The return/gains of the investment are clear: The United States of America will win the war on terror, the homeland will be protected and the investment will refresh the economy of the country. Obviously, it is a good strategy from a business point of view.

A pro Taliban News Paper, besides other framing, framed the discussion as the loss of our enemy is our gain i.e., if our enemy is suffering losses especially financial then it is getting weaker and weaker and finally it will be defeated. Following are some excerpts to exhibit how the news paper framed the discussion. Words at work had been: 'declined', 'shocked', 'bankrupt', 'unemployed', 'bearish', 'destruction', 'indebted' etc.

American oil reserves have declined up to 246 million barrels. America experts are shocked to notice a decline of 37 million barrel of refined oil.¹⁷ (Translation, mine)

One of the effects of attacking Afghanistan is that American economy is going down; their oil reserves have declined up to 246 million barrels. Lakoff and Johnson argue that truth is something related to our framing and if truth doesn't fit in a frame then it is the frame that stays, truth bounces off.¹⁸ They whole discussion in Afghanistan was framed in such a way that people believed in all such false information.

America could not absorb the shock of 9/11. American company World Com bankrupt, 85 thousand unemployed.¹⁹(Translation, mine)

Again a great loss; the attack of 9/11 have shaken the foundations of American economy and now we are noticing 'bankruptcy' and 'unemployment' - enemies' loss is our gain.

American, European and Asian markets show bearish

¹⁶ Bush (January 29, 2002)

¹⁷ *Zarb – e- Momin*, Dated: December 6-12, 2002

¹⁸ Lakoff, *Don't think of an Elephant! Know your Values and Frame the Debate* (Chelsea Green Publishing Company, 2004): 17 (accessed April 6, 2009)

¹⁹ *Zarb – e- Momin*, Dated: July 26- August 1, 2002

trend. London, Tokyo, Frankfurt, Paris, stock markets cannot be saved from destruction.²⁰ (Translation, mine)

This explains that not only America, but all the allies of USA are facing severe economic losses. The present situation will result into crash of the stock markets- one can notice the level of disinformation and propaganda.

After 9/11 western world is facing the problem of unemployment. French Telecommunication Company has fired 13 thousand employees and next year it will fire another 39 thousand.²¹ (Translation, mine)

Effect of America policies- American export declined 94 billion dollars.²² (Translation, mine)

Imagine- 94 billion dollars loss is the effect of American policy. This narrates that enemy is suffering serious financial losses because of their own policies.

America will lose 10 trillion dollars in Iraq war.²³ (Translation, mine)

America has lost 2 trillion dollar in Iraq war. Another news says, America is the most indebted country- debt is 1400 billion.²⁴ (Translation, mine)

All these excerpts demonstrate that America and allies are facing great financial losses. These losses were somehow connected to 9/11. The framing effects are: if someone is losing money then he/she is getting weaker. If a country is losing money and her citizens are getting unemployed then the country is getting weaker day by day. Her citizens will criticize the policies. This situation is a gain situation for the enemy. The more the enemy gets weaker the easier it is to defeat it.

Tony Blair's Version

There exists abundant literature that reveals that the Prime Minister Tony Blair used metaphors that evoked loss gain framing. This framing was instrumental in the context of the War on Terror to persuade people for war.

²⁰ *Zarb-e Momin* July 26- August 1, 2002

²¹ *Zarb-e Momin*: September 27- October 3, 2002

²² *Zarb-e Momin*: July 11-17, 2003

²³ *Zarb-e Momin*: February 28- March 6, 2003

²⁴ *Zarb-e Momin*: November 5-11, 2004

Following scripts from some speeches, delivered soon after 9/11 by Toney Blair are taken into account to demonstrate that he used loss gain framing to provide a strong justification for Britain to go into the war.

Tony Blair, informed British citizenry on October 2, 2001:

The biggest drugs hoard in the world is in Afghanistan, controlled by the Taliban. Ninety per cent of the heroin on British streets originates in Afghanistan. The arms the Taliban are buying today are paid for with the lives of young British people buying their drugs on British streets.²⁵

This reveals that one of the justifications Tony Blair presented before British citizenry had been: we are in loss. Taliban are in gain in two ways: they sell drugs and make our youth suffer and then they buy arms from the money earned by selling these drugs. This highlights Taliban as businessmen/ enemies of British people who deal in drugs. Britain is paying the price of heroin in the form of lives of British youth. Taliban buy weapons from drug money and kill innocent people and threaten British people. This framing highlights the losses to Britain because of Taliban. It provides a very good justification for Britain to actively participate in the war

On October 8, 2001, the Prime Minister said:

We in Britain have the most direct interest in defeating such terror....if not stopped, the terrorists will do it again, this time possibly in Britain. We know that it was an attack on economic confidence...eradicating this threat is crucial to global economic confidence ...the Taliban regime is largely funded by the drugs trade, and that 90 per cent of the heroin on British streets originates in Afghanistan.²⁶

Perhaps, it was difficult for the Prime Minister to persuade British citizenry to enter into a war that had nothing to do with them directly. The Prime Minister framed the war on terror as something that has 'intimate' effects on British people in their everyday concerns; for once again he informed that Taliban are responsible for the 90 percent of the heroin that British people are addicted to, since it originates in Afghanistan. The list of losses after 9/11, besides other losses, includes an attack on 'global economic confidence'- 9/11 attacks were framed as an attack on global economy. Highlighting, again, how 9/11 is closely related with ordinary British citizens, for an attack on 'global economy' will surely affect British people. Moreover, if Taliban are not defeated, they will hit the world again. The PM informed, possibly the next target of terrorists is Britain- a great

²⁵ Blair, Full Text: *Tony Blair's Speech*, www.gurdian.co.uk, October 2, 2001

²⁶ Blair, Prime Minister's Statements to the House of Common, October 8, 2001, www.number10.gov.uk

future loss. Gains after waging a war and defeating Taliban includes: global economic confidence will be regained; drugs will go away; our country and our economy will be protected. Not going into war will risk them all. Moreover, critics of war do not want to avoid future losses. Perhaps, they want the enemy to gain. They are not patriots and do not want to save British youth etc. The entailment effect is- do not listen to them.

The Prime Minister framed Taliban and al Qaeda as business partners. He informed the people that Taliban have provided safe heaven to Osama to establish camps to train terrorist under an agreement,

They jointly exploit the Afghan drugs trade. In return for active Al Qaida support the Taliban allow Al Qaida to operate freely, including planning, training and preparing for terrorist activity. In addition they provide security for the stockpiles of drugs.²⁷

Since, Taliban and Al Qaeda are business partners working for each other's profit; obviously, they cannot go against each other's interest. Their business of drugs is flourishing. They are gaining from the business; their gain is Britain's loss since this business is killing British people.

This gives a very sound justification for war. Therefore, on 8 October, 2001 he narrated: to protect ourselves from these losses the United Kingdom has to take active part in the war by sending troops for military action

[The military action] is to protect our country, our people, our economy, our way of life. It is not a struggle remote from our everyday concerns. It touches them intimately.²⁸

The metaphorical understanding is that the military action, as a business activity, is a necessary action since if not conducted then there would be losses such as: loss of people, loss of economy and loss of the way of life people of Britain are enjoying. Most importantly, the war is going to affect our routine daily activities, it is not far- as if the attacks were on Britain. The Prime Minister's framing effectively made the war on terror Britain's war. The obvious entailment effects have been: Not fighting the war is not an option since the consequence will be great future losses of the British people.

The Prime Minister also disclosed that the good forces of the world are very well aware of the Corporate Social Responsibility. He informed about the appeal of the UN for \$584m to protect the needs of people of who are vulnerable in and around Afghanistan.

²⁷ Blair, Full Text of the *Tony Blair's speech to the parliament*, October 4, 2001 www.theguardian.com

²⁸ Blair, Prime Minister's Statements to the House of Common, October 8, 2001, www.number10.gov.uk

The British government has contributed £25 million, nearly all of which has already been allocated to UN and other agencies. We have also made available a further £11m for support for the poorest communities in Pakistan, especially those most directly affected by the influx of refugees... We will do what we can to minimise the suffering of the Afghan people as a result of the conflict; and we commit ourselves to work with them afterwards inside and outside Afghanistan to ensure a better, more peaceful future, free from the repression and dictatorship that is their present existence.²⁹

The metaphorical understanding is Britain is fulfilling her social responsibility in times of war. The prime Minister has contributed 25 million pounds for the people who will suffer because of the war. He has also provided another 11 million pounds for the refugees and poor communities in the neighboring country Pakistan. Fulfilling the social responsibility he has pledged to minimize the sufferings of the innocent Afghan people that are going to suffer because of the war. Above all, a commitment to work for future gains that include: a peaceful future and freedom of Afghan people from dictatorship and repression.

Conclusion

Politicians have to use different metaphors and frames to persuade people of different world views. For example, they use language that evokes religious frame to persuade religious people. People, who think in terms of morality and politics, are framed by moral politics and war metaphors. Those who get influenced by movies and stories, villain versus hero frames are used and for those who believe in evil, good versus evil frames are there. For those who do not believe in evil and think in terms of economics, they have to use loss-gain metaphors- War is an Economic/ Business Activity. The entailment effects of Business metaphor and loss gain framing, in the context of war, are:

War is an Economic Activity/ Business.

Enemies are Business rivals and competitors.

Our friends are our partners.

Enemy's friends are also our business rivals and competitors.

The purpose of the activity is to gain as much as one can.

One should act on a strategy that helps in avoiding present and future losses.

Enemies' gain is our loss and vice versa.

If one of the partners is under attack than all the partners are exposed to losses- therefore, we cannot leave our partners in times

²⁹ Blair, Full Text of the *Tony Blair's speech to the parliament*, October 4, 2001 www.theguardian.com

of war, conflict and threat.

Dictators, Taliban and leaders of Al Qaeda in the context of 9/11, are the businessmen who work only for their personal gains. Their business is dangerous and harmful for the civilized world. It is the duty of good people to close their business.

While one should work for gain and avoid losses, one should not forget the social responsibility- helping refugees, providing them aid, food, medicine and shelter. Moreover, if a country is ruled by dictators then it is the responsibility of the good people to liberate them.

Words that evoke loss gain framing are: price, *budget, declined, shocked, bankrupt, unemployed, bearish, destruction, indebted recession, economic confidence, global economy, employees, minimize, poor, contribute, support, pounds, dollars, fund, drugs, trade, paid, company, exports, goal, revive, oil reserves, shocked, debt, bearish, market, selling and buying* etc.

The above discussion reveals that there exists literature that demonstrates that politicians and leaders, especially Tony Blair, in the context of 9/11 used metaphors and words that evoked Loss Gain framing. The purpose was to influence and shape the perceptions and judgments of the people who think in terms of money and economy. This framing was also instrumental in silencing the critics; since, critics were dubbed as people who neither see the gains that would follow if the enemy was attacked nor losses (both present and future) that would follow if the enemy was not attacked and eliminated.

Bibliography

- Blair, Full Text: *Tony Blair's Speech*, www.gurdian.co.uk, October 2, 2001
- Blair, Full Text of the *Tony Blair's Speech to the Parliament*, October 4, 2001 www.theguardian.com
- Blair, *Prime Minister's Statements to the House of Common*, October 8, 2001, www.number10.gov.uk
- Blair, Full Text of the *Tony Blair's speech to the parliament*, October 4, 2001 www.theguardian.com
- Bush, *President Delivers State of the Union Address*: January 29, 2002 available on <http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news>
- Fillmore Charles J. Frame Semantics. In Dirk Geeraerts Ed. , *Cognitive Linguistics: Basic Reading*, (New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2006). (Originally Published in 1982 in *Linguistics in the Morning Calm*,

- Linguistic Society of Korea (ed.), 111-137. Seoul: Hanshin publishing. Reprinted with permission) (accessed June 22, 2009)
- Lakoff, George, Metaphor and War: The Metaphor System to Justify War in the Gulf (Part 1) *Viet Nam Generation Journal & Newsletter*, 3(3), November 1991
- Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson. *Metaphors We Live By*. The University of Chicago Press, 1980
- Lakoff George and Mark Johnson. *Philosophy in the Flesh- The Embodied Mind and its Challenges to western Thought*. Basic Books, 1999
- Lakoff, George. *Don't think of an Elephant! Know your Values and Frame the Debate*. Chelsea Green Publishing, White River Junction, Vermont, 2004
- Lakoff George. *George Lakoff Manifesto*. 2004 <https://changethis.com/manifesto/show/5.GeorgeLakoff> (accessed on July 7, 2018)
- Moseley, Alexander. *A Philosophy of War*. New York: Algora Publishing, 2002
- Norris, P., M. Kern, and M.R. Just. *Framing Terrorism: The News Media, the Government, and the Public*. Routledge, 2003. (accessed April 6, 2009)
- Wolfe, Mackiewicz Wojtek, *Winning the War of Wards- Selling Terror from Afghanistan to Iraq*. Praeger Security International, 2008
- Zolthan Kovecses. *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2010
- Zarb-e Momin*: December 6-12, 2002
- Zarb-e Momin*: July 26- August 1, 2002
- Zarb-e Momin*: July 26- August 1, 2002
- Zarb-e Momin*: September 27- October 3, 2002
- Zarb-e Momin*: July 11-17, 2003
- Zarb-e Momin*: February 28- March 6, 2003
- Zarb-e Momin*: November 5-11, 2004