



Metaphors of War and Construction of National Identity: A Critical Discourse Analysis of Democratic and Republican Speeches of American Electoral Candidates (2024)

¹Dr. Nazia Anwar -Email- nazia.anwar@uog.edu.pk

²Isha Razzaq Butt -Email- isharazzaq13@gmail.com

³Aqsa Rani -Email- aqsa28574@gmail.com

¹Lecturer, University of Gujrat

²M Phil Scholar, University of Gujrat

³M Phil Scholar, University of Gujrat

Article Details:

Received on 19 Spet 2025

Accepted on 09 Oct 2025

Published on 12 Oct, 2025

Corresponding Authors*:

Abstract

This research examines the use of war metaphors in construction of national identity and political ideology in the 2024 electoral speeches of Donald Trump and Kamala Harris. Utilizing Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and Conceptual Metaphor Theory, this study investigates how linguistic and rhetorical tools reflect and reproduce ideological distinctions between Republican and Democratic narratives. The campaign speeches of both candidates are analyzed focusing on how Trump's discourse is constructed through war metaphors and described as the battle to survive; on the other hand, Harris's messaging employs construction metaphors to illustrate unity, rebuilding, and collective progress. Using qualitative textual analysis that employs Fairclough's three-dimensional model of CDA, the findings show that Trump's metaphors bolster a narrative of nationalism and defensive patriotism that develops an "us versus them" ideology, while Harris's metaphors contribute to inclusivity, democratic restoration, and moral renewal. The analysis, particularly comparing the metaphors across both candidates reveals how metaphorical framing serves as a discursive instrument of legitimizing power and building American identity in a polarized political environment. This research adds to our understanding of the role of political language in the construction of ideological worldviews, while simultaneously underlining the importance and power of metaphor in delineating contemporary narratives of nationhood. Identifying such nationhood in American democracy is imperative.

Keywords: Metaphor, identity, democratic, republican, speeches, electoral candidates



1. INTRODUCTION

Politically, utterances about the world are one of the most powerful instruments used to construct, contest and legitimize ideologies. In democratic societies, electoral speeches perform a range of functions i.e. providing means of persuasion as well as an opportunity to symbolically engage in a negotiation about national identities, core values and ideological convictions linguistically. Using their choice of words and metaphors, political leaders frame their perspectives in front of the world and use language to justify their responses to issues and appeal to the emotive dimension of their voters. Metaphor is a significant linguistic and cognitive mechanism which allows politicians to engage voters' emotions by conveying their intent about a complex ideological concept using a publically familiar experience that has naturally emotional salience (Cameron, 2017). Therefore, political metaphors also work as interpretative frameworks in how audience is understood by reframing the national challenges, the audience are contemplating the relevant boundaries about being a citizen (Anderson, 2006). The American presidential election in 2024 is a familiar example, whereby the competing ideological meanings around political language were forcefully (and politely) fixed to Donald Trump (Republican) and Kamala Harris (Democrat), who each illustrate different discursive strategies to articulate distinctly contradictory visions of their version of America. For example, Trump makes use of metaphors of war to frame political competition as if engaged in a battlefield, where winning and vanquishing the "enemy" is to "Save" the country. The language of Trump is littered with phrases such as "we are fighting for our country" or "we will defeat the corrupt establishment", reinforcing a narrative of collective struggle against existential threats, perpetuated by external and internal enemies. By contrast, Harris's discourse demonstrates a significant amount of metaphorical language of construction and renewal, such as "America is a house that we rebuild", or "America is a foundation that we strengthen." These ways of speaking expose significant differences between the two candidates perspectives on the roles of citizens and of political leaders to preserve national identity (Charteris-Black, 2021).

Studying these metaphors is important because political language does not only reflect social reality but also creates social reality. Previous studies have shown that metaphors are ideologically important as they normalize particular ways of seeing the world and justify power relations (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980). However, the specific ways contemporary American politicians utilize metaphors to construct a national identity has yet to be explored. Much of the research on political metaphors has focused on prior elections, or on the European context (Musolff, 2004; Charteris-Black, 2011). The 2024 U.S. election context, shaped by a post-pandemic recovery, polarization and moral anxieties provides an important opportunity to critique how language is utilized strategically to unify or divide citizens. This study will contribute to the understanding of how metaphors are utilized as discursive functions that embody political ideologies and reimagine American identity during a time of transition. This study will examine and compare Donald Trump's and Kamala Harris's discourse strategies in their electoral speeches, and produce a comparative analysis of how the war metaphor is used differently to frame their political ideologies. Additionally, the study will explore the broader implications of metaphors in constructing and legitimating the concept of American national identity. This study is motivated by the principles of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), which understands the ways linguistic choices relate to power and ideology within the socio-



political context of the election. Through an analysis of the work of metaphor towards larger ideological underpinnings, the study engages with the tension between language, thought, and political identity.

This research is built on theoretical ground in Fairclough's (1995) model of Critical Discourse Analysis. Fairclough defines discourse as a type of social practice, included in a shared understanding of the power and ideology. It leads to investigating the way political texts both reflect institutional ideology and reproduce social hierarchies. Linger under this is the protection of Conceptual Metaphor Theory, (Lakoff & Johnson 1980), which explains how metaphorical reasoning structure abstract political concepts. This combination allows us to provide a thorough examination of the way both Trump and Harris's discourse constructs moral narratives of national identity, leadership and belonging. Finally, the analysis will highlight how metaphorical language in political speeches are a site of ideological struggle. By using the war and construction metaphor, it will show how respective versions of America was linguistically produced and sustained through emotional attachments to the metaphor. Furthermore, it illustrates the power of discourse to frame the nation's moral subjectivity and shape citizen's orientations towards unity or division. We expect the results of this study will enrich the field of political linguistics, and develop critical consciousness of metaphor usage and their effects on our understanding of democracy, public trust and the symbolic construction of American identity in the 21st century.

1.1 Research Objectives

- To compare and contrast the application of discourse strategies by Donald Trump and Kamala Harris in their electoral speeches.
- To identify the difference in the use of war metaphors by the two candidates to frame their political ideologies and to interpret its effect in the construction, representation and legitimization of national identity of Americans.

1.2 Research Questions

1. What discursive strategies have been used by Kamala Harris and Donald Trump in their electoral speeches (2024) to represent Democratic and Republican ideologies?
2. How does the two candidates differ in the use of war metaphors to frame their political ideologies and how does it affect the construction, representation and legitimization of national identity of Americans?

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Metaphor and Political Discourse

Metaphor is not just a decorative feature of political language but is a key cognitive and ideological device. In their work, Lakoff and Johnson (1980) have demonstrated the manner in which metaphors orient how we understand abstract realities, recasting political concerns as emotionally engaging narratives. In political discourse, metaphors play an important role in constructing perceptions of moral order and legitimacy by undergoing a translation from complex policies into experiential language. Charteris-Black (2011) has explained that politicians use metaphors to induce an emotional response and justify their authority and values while at the same time eliding the relationship between political ideology and the beliefs of the general public. Electoral campaigns in the United States are frequently framed by metaphors of war, with phrases like "the fight for freedom" or "the battle for the nation" being used to characterize politics as a kind of moral battle. In her work, Keating (2021) has illustrated the way the presidential candidates of the 2016



election have utilized metaphors of crisis and victory, equating the immediacy of intervention to national salvation while Gyuró (2015) shows that metaphors were employed to blend personal leadership with collective restoration during the acceptance speeches. Each of these instances demonstrates how metaphors construct the ideological realities to position political leaders as either protector or innovator of national identity. The current study attempts to build on this tradition by examining how both Trump and Harris in 2024 are employing metaphors of war and reconstruction to define divergent visions of nationhood in America.

2.2 Critical Discourse Analysis and Ideology

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) offers the theoretical framework for unpacking the ideological work of language. Fairclough (1995) views discourse as a social practice where aspects of language reflect and reproduce power relations. Studies using CDA focus on how grammatical, lexical and rhetorical decisions reproduce inequality or resistance in institutions. Van Dijk (2006) further argues that ideological language makes divisions in which "we" are good and "they" are bad and maintains these distinctions to enforce dominance or solidarity. Metaphors in political language are part of the ideological framework because they organize thinking around selective moral framing. Musolff (2004) in his analysis of European political debates, noticed how metaphors about the body and disease are used to justify institutional reforms in political speeches. Similarly, Parker (2014) discusses how U.S. language after 9/11 was rife metaphorical framing of defense and healing to create a collective American identity. Both of these studies demonstrate that metaphors do not operate in a neutral way; they naturalize dominance and political hierarchies through ideology embedded in common language. This study uses Fairclough's three-dimensional model to show how Trump's, on one hand, militarized discourse and Harris', on the other hand, reconstructive discourse encodes ideological differences in discourse that contributes to our understanding of national identity in the context of the 2024 U.S. election.

2.3 National Identity and Political Communication

National identity develops from discourse that forms a sense of community and shared moral values among the members. Anderson (2006) defines the nation as an "imagined community" linked by stories and symbols that citizens take up from communication we practice. Political discourse is essential to maintain this imagined whole. Coe and Neumann (2011) have instituted that political discourse in U.S. presidential communication establishes American identity by driving contrast with "foreign others," which serves to re-establish internal cohesion. Streich (2009) finds that nationalism was tied to moral defense through metaphors of contamination and purity in political discourse in early 20th-century speeches. In addition, Lapka (2023) shows more recently that metaphors like machine and war in the 2020 campaign demonstrate association of governance as a mechanical machine in need of repair, placing collective responsibility back into the organization and stability of the nation. In a similar linguistic context, Anwar and Butt (2024) have discussed that choices in lexicon in the context of English newspapers in Pakistan illustrate how language choice participates in ideological identity formation. Collectively, each of these articles show that when leaders use metaphors - from home to familial loyalties to battle, they present linguistically a blueprint for the leader to communicate what it means to embrace the "nation." Metaphors are employed to build not



only a description of political reality, but also create an emotional tie for members' moral ideals of unity, resilience, and progress.

2.4. Metaphors of War and Construction in Political Rhetoric

War metaphors are prominent in political discourse because they evoke urgency, conflict and moral struggle (Li et al., 2023; Iqbal & Hussain., 2017). Lakoff (1991) argues that war metaphors frame political disagreement as battles between good and evil; they transform abstract policy discussions into moral dilemmas. For example, rhetoric from Trump's campaign has included variant phrases like "I am fighting for America's survival," which had positioned opponents as existential threats. In contrast, Harris frequently invokes building metaphors such as "we need to rebuild democracy" or, "we are laying new foundations" to demonstrate her emphasis on repair and healing. Charteris-Black (2021) has argued that construction (or building) metaphors create an image of inclusion and hope, which are tied to progressivism and collective renewal. Hussain, Iqbal, and Tariq (2020) have also unearthed that speakers move intermittently between warlike imagery to constructive imagery. This indicates a universal rhetorical pattern; one that does not appear to be culturally determined. Variances in syntax and lexicon also shape authority and empathy in political texts, as shown in the work by Anwar, Butt, and Zuree (2023). Thus, the tensions created between war and construction metaphors provides a dual moral order based in either defense and oppression or rebuilding and cooperation. Including war metaphors against building metaphors in Trump and Harris' discourse exposes language construction as an important component in constructing ideological stories of American identity.

4.5. Gaps in Research and Theoretical Implications

While there is significant scholarship on political metaphor, few studies have directly compared the use of metaphor in terms of war and construction within the 2024 U.S. election. Much of that prior scholarship focused on presidential elections from before 2020 or in localized contexts (Hutcheson, Domke, Billeaudéaux, & Garland, 2004; Prabhakaran, Rei, & Shutova, 2021). Additionally, there are limited studies on how these metaphors may contribute to the establishment of national identity in an increasingly polarized American landscape. The recent work by Anwar & Butt (2022, 2023) demonstrates how lexical framing and stylistic differences represent ideology and identity, both of which are useful insights that could be drawn upon in the analysis of political discourse in the Western context. Present study uses a combination of Fairclough's (1995) Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) methodology and Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) Conceptual Metaphor Theory, as means of exploring how metaphor can operate as a linguistic, cognitive and ideological activity simultaneously. By way of illustration, the study has considered Donald Trump's confrontational linguistic choices in relation to Kamala Harris's use of constructive language to demonstrate how metaphor serves to, not only reflect but continue to support and sustain competing political realities. The theoretical implications are about showing that metaphor can serve as a product of cognition in conjunction with nondiscursive instruments of power while it works to mediate between personal experience and collective belief. Through this perspective, the research considers a metaphor as a significant way to understand how discourse has an ability to shape the moral imagination of the nation.



3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

This study utilizes a qualitative research design structure based in Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) to understand how metaphors of war and construction shape the construction of national identity in the 2024 electoral speeches produced by Donald Trump and Kamala Harris. CDA provides an analytical lens for unpacking the ideological assumptions embedded in linguistic forms in order to explain how discourse reproduces or resists relations of power (Fairclough, 1995; van Dijk, 2008). The study examines the textual and social dimensions of political discourse through an analytical lens focused on how language plays a part in the construction of political ideologies and national identity in contemporary American politics. A comparative design structure allowed for an examination of differences and similarities in the discursive strategies of Trump and Harris. This methodological approach allows for deep analysis of how Democratic and Republican ideologies are linguistically mobilized through metaphorical framing. As the study considers language in context, one that is political and cultural, it attempts to adopt an interpretivist paradigm (Wodak & Meyer, 2016), one which emphasises meaning, context and power.

3.2 Data Collection

The study has taken data from selected official campaign speeches by Donald Trump and Kamala Harris during the election campaign in 2024. The speeches have either been sourced from verified campaign sources such as the C-SPAN political archive, campaign websites and also from YouTube recordings of televised rally events and conventions. For the analysis, this study has selected six speeches to provide a relatively balanced sample of the major events that has occurred between February and September (2024) of the campaign; three speeches for Harris and three speeches for Trump. The chosen speeches were selected because of their thematic connection to national identity and political ideology. Each of the transcripts was downloaded, transcribed word for word (where appropriate), and edited for accuracy linguistically. Any paralinguistic features such as repetition, intonation and audience response were also noted because they contribute to the persuasive and ideological effect of political discourse (Charteris-Black, 2014).

3.3 Analytical Framework

The analysis is guided by Norman Fairclough's (1995) three-dimensional framework of CDA (critical discourse analysis) which encompasses the textual analysis, discursive practice and social practice.

- Textual analysis offers an insight into the linguistic aspects of the candidates' speech, such as metaphor, choice of lexical items, modality and pronouns. In particular, war-related metaphors (such as fight, battle, attack) and construction-related metaphors (such as build, repair, foundation) were highlighted as we sought to better understand their ability to fundamentally structure how the audience's perception and ideology were developed.
- Discursive practice examines how each candidate's use of language prompted particular interactions with the mediated public response, including how supporters echoed or re-framed the metaphors into public discourse.
- Social practice has located the linguistic choices of each candidate within a much larger ideological context i.e. nationalism, populism and democratic pluralism to highlight how their discourse was involved in participating in framing collective identity and



legitimizing state power. Overall, this has provided the analysis with a framework that interpreted the linguistic analysis of the candidates' speech as doing both reflecting, and constructing the particular political realities. This is congruent with CDA's aim to connect text and power (Wodak, 2011).

3.3 Data Analysis Procedure

Following the transcription, the data were coded using a manual inductive method thematically. Each speech was read multiple times to identify recurring metaphors and ideological patterns. The codes such as the nation-as-battlefield, nation-as-home, protector-leadership and unity-through-diversity were derived directly from the data. The codes were further organized into five umbrella themes which will be discussed in the analysis section. The identification of metaphors followed the Metaphor Identification Procedure (MIP) set out by the Pragglejaz Group (2007) to establish a systematic process of detection and interpretation of metaphorical expressions. The coded data was compared between both candidates for contrasts in metaphorical framing and ideological intent. The researcher also mapped the data for credibility through peer debriefing and iterative reading to verify interpretations and apply reflexivity (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

4. DATA ANALYSIS

Theme 1: The Nation as a Battlefield

In Trump's campaign speeches from 2024, America's status as a nation at war and the militarized language used to signal to his supporters that politics must be thought of as a struggle to survive. He states, "We are under attack from inside" and declares that "we will fight like warriors to save our country." Language such as "the enemy is destroying our borders" and "every patriot must stand on the front line" politicizes civic engagement in dramatized visions of armed defense. Verbs such as fight, defend, win and conquer are repeated throughout the speeches and frame politics as war rather than political dialogue. The metaphors circulate in the midst of rallies with supporters chanting at rallies "fight back" or "defend America," reproducing the war frame outside of the speech event itself. This circulation of a discourse strengthens a shared collective identity, suggesting loyalty is a duty of military service. Framing thus conflates political opposition and threat towards the nation, allowing for justifiable aggression toward political dissenters. On the societal level, this rhetoric of war normalizes a continuous crisis frame that positions an American identity as embattled and militant. Battlefield language normalizes the idea that democracy requires continuous conflict, creating a notion of patriotism that is defended on fear and exclusion. In this way, unity emerges only through conflict and citizenship becomes associated with an ability to fight for the survival of the nation.

Theme 2: The Nation as a Home to Rebuild

The speeches of Kamala Harris in 2024 emphasize the nation's shared home in need of tending and reconstruction, contrasting with Trump's wartime rhetoric. She regularly states, "We will rebuild what's been broken," and "Our nation is our home, and every voice belongs in it." In a different rally, she announces, "It is time to repair the cracks in our democracy and chart a new foundation for our future." The home, repair and construction metaphors all work to shift the focus away from fighting an enemy and towards healing divisions. The repetition of "Let's build bridges not walls," and "Together we restore the soul of America," also invites citizens into a collective act of creation. Citizens respond by reiterating "rebuild," and "together," further perpetuating the metaphor of the home as a collective discourse. When citizens speak back, they respond to the emotional experience



evoked by building bridges, restoring a sense of home rather than shared combat. The socially sanctioned discourse aligns with democratic articulation of inclusion and moral obligation. Using the nation-as-home framing, the concept of civic cooperation and compassion can be legitimized and normalized rather than relying on militarized nationalism as a form of belonging. Furthermore it frames Harris as a caretaker-leader who rebuilds rather than defends. She positions Americans to see unity in communal rebuilding rather than a forced conformity. In this discourse national identity is fluid, plural and nurturing when it is phrased through ideas of exchange not ideas of wars and fears. Through national identity discourse Harris communicates gratitude and respect for ethnic diversity of all Americans.

Theme 3: Leadership as Protector versus Builder

Trump's campaign language frames leadership as militant protection. For example, he states, "I am your shield," "I alone will defend you from chaos," and "We will crush those who threaten our freedom." He uses modal verbs i.e. must, will, cannot, allow as representations of unquestioned authority, signifying the leader as the commander of orders. This framing creates an dependency on a singular protector, putting strength in domination. Supporters chant "Save America," lending support to the equation of leadership with defense. In contrast, Harris constructs leadership as collective building. She tells us, "We will build the America we deserve," "Leadership means bringing people together to bring change," and "The progress we make will require every hand at work." By using the cooperative pronoun we, Harris lessens authority and instead promotes participation over obedience. Her campaign visuals workers rebuilding homes and families planting trees extend the metaphor from language to the constructed symbolic imagery, allowing people's identification as constructively engaged citizens. Socially, these metaphors represent two contrasting ideological models; Trump's leadership model rests in competing hierarchical protectorate against Harris's participatory builder. The protector metaphor draws authority from fear and crisis which links leadership to masculine aggression. The builder metaphor draws strength from trust and collaboration which links leadership to shared empowerment. Although they differ linguistically and symbolically, both support a reconstruction of what it means to lead and therefore, what it means to belong to the American nation.

Theme 4: Unity through Division versus Unity through Diversity

Trump's rhetoric creates unity by segregating the population into moral camps. At one rally he said, "It's us versus the corrupt elite," adding, "We are one people, standing up to the radical left." Facing the crowd, he said when it comes to America, "You either stand with us, or you stand against us." This statement disintegrates into a moral claim that distinguishes political difference into moral opposition and gets at the crux of his imaginary social contract. Even when he claims at other rallies, "We will unite our nation," he tries to shun out the rebels into minors. The incessant repetition of us/them, patriots/traitors, winners/losers translates inclusion now into conditional allegiance toward the common threat. Harris treats unity in a different way by using the plural marker 'we' as "We can only move forward together." These metaphors of bridges, threads and paths define diversity as connection and intersection rather than division. Her supporters responded to Harris's image in the social media sphere by using #StrongerTogether. Within a broader social frame, Trump's unity reflects the authoritarian nationalism of solidarity enforced through exclusion, while Harris represents a vision that hopefully reflects democratic pluralism, in



which difference is a strength to belonging to the country. Both representations are mapped through competing metaphors that reflect contrasting national imaginations: one purifying by oppositions and one solidified by multiplicity. There is no escaping that language works here not merely to describe unity but creates the moral architecture through which Americans imagine who belongs.

Theme 5: Emotion and Moral Framing in National Identity

Both candidates strategically employ emotion to shape ideas about national morality. For example, Trump leverages fear and anger through hyperbolic statements. His repetition of "never" and "must" reinforces the intensity of the moral claim he is making that he is a virtuous avenger restoring moral order. Emotion at this point becomes similarly weaponized to rationalize exclusion and hostility. Conversely, Harris's emotional metaphor draws on safety and healing. She frequently exclaims "Hope is our greatest act of defiance," "We will heal the heart of this nation," and "Let love of country guide our progress." The repeated use of heal, hope and love conspires to create a compassionate nationalism that underscores empathy. In addition, her speeches use soft crescendos and pauses that enhance the sincere affective aspects of her speech. The audience responses of cheers, tears and chants of "Yes we can rebuild!" push the emotional framing of the discourse beyond language and into shared experience. At the cultural level, these emotional frames permit the continued viability of divergent moral orders. Trump's anger promotes a moral absolutism through vengeance; Harris's hope cleared a moral order of care and responsibility. Emotion then serves as a mechanism for both frame a collective consciousness and legitimate an ideology. Each candidate thereby reimagines an American identity through the affective framing of competing discourses: one born out of defiance and fear; the other borne out of compassion and resilience.

5. CONCLUSION

The analysis indicates that metaphors are a significant part of the interaction of political ideologies and national identity in American electoral discourse. Donald Trump's discourse in the 2024 campaign has relied heavily on metaphors of war to frame politics as battle between patriots and their enemies. Trump's remarks to, "fight like warriors," "crush those who threaten us," and "defend our borders," have constructed an embattled national identity rooted in fear and protectionism that aligns with the populist narrative of division along lines of moral absolutism (Lakoff, 2016). On the other hand, Harris' discourse has utilized the construction and repair metaphors, which included, "rebuild," "repair the cracks in our democracy," and "lay new foundations." These metaphors have framed the nation not as a battlefield but were positioned as a home undergoing repairs. If Trump's discourse aligned with values of exclusion and division, Harris's rhetoric has established repairing values of inclusion and collaboration. While these two discourses have demonstrated the differing ideological frames of war and construction, they also illustrate how metaphors embody ideological struggles between authoritarian nationalism and democratic pluralism. Ultimately, the research has confirmed that political language is not merely descriptive but constitutive as it constructs social reality and affects the ways citizens imagine their role in the fabric of the nation (Charteris-Black, 2019). In summary, constructing the war metaphors were used as powerful linguistic devices through which political candidates similarly shaped ideologies and national identity. Fairclough's critical discourse model provides insights into how Trump and Harris's 2024 electoral speeches



highlight competing models of America: one is defensive, combative, and hierarchical while the second is inclusive and rebuilding.

Trump's language produces a national identity founded in vigilance, heroism and confrontation. His war metaphors maintain a sense of ongoing crisis that provides a rationale for strong leadership while excluding ideological opponents. Likewise, Trump's discourse resembles the populist rhetoric we have become accustomed to in contemporary right-wing movements where "the people" mobilize against fictitious dangers (Moffit, 2020). This construction fosters togetherness through fear and moral dichotomy and transforms citizens into soldiers in a political war. Meanwhile, Harris's construction-based metaphors delineate the nation as a collective project that requires rebuilding through empathy and collaboration. Her discourse invites participatory citizenship whilst framing leadership as collective rather than authoritative. This is reflective of democratic discourses of inclusion and moral responsibility (Chilton, 2017). The metaphor of repair not only complicates the division story but appropriately reframes strength as care and restoration. Through this framing of language, Harris creates an America based on diversity, compassion and collective responsibility. On a larger societal level, the work demonstrates that metaphors are at the core of political cognition--they simplify complex realities and create emotional salience out of ideologies like the far-right (Musolff, 2016). Both candidates have utilized the metaphors intentionally to connect language with national emotion: Trump has evoked anger and defiance and Harris has invoked hope and healing. Such emotional appeals have accomplished the connection of the discourse to moral action that legitimizes particular political values and regulates collective imagination. In conclusion, the study adds to the discourse studies by demonstrating that metaphors in CDA can mark the ideological process of language. Emphasis is placed on the view that national identity is not a stable essence but rather a linguistic construction that is perpetually negotiated through political discourse. Future research may further this investigation to consider how audiences interpret the framing, how the framing is reproduced in the media, and how the framing may differ across cultures. Comprehending the interplay of weaponized or humanized language employed by leaders is critical to enhancing democratic literacy and critical awareness within political dialogue.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, B. (2006). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism* (Rev. ed.). Verso.
- Anwar, N., & Butt, I. R. (2022). Lexical framing and ideological discourse in South Asian media. *Journal of Language and Society*, 5(2), 145-160.
- Anwar, N., & Butt, I. R. (2024). The variant use of verb in Pakistani English newspapers. *Indus Journal of Social Sciences*, 2(2), 289-299.
- Anwar, N., Butt, I. R., & Zuree, S. (2023). Stylistic variation and ideology in Pakistani political texts. *Indus Journal of Social Sciences*, 2(1), 55-70.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101.* <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp0630a>*
- Cameron, L. (2017). *Metaphor in political discourse: Analogical reasoning and the construction of identity*. Bloomsbury Academic.
- Charteris-Black, J. (2011). *Politicians and rhetoric: The persuasive power of metaphor* (2nd ed.). Palgrave Macmillan.



- Charteris-Black, J. (2014). *Analysing political speeches: Rhetoric, discourse and metaphor*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Charteris-Black, J. (2019). *Metaphors of Brexit: No cherry-picking*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Charteris-Black, J. (2021). *Analysing political speeches: Rhetoric, discourse and metaphor* (2nd ed.). Bloomsbury Academic.
- Chilton, P. (2017). *Deictic space theory of language and cognition*. Routledge.
- Coe, K., & Neumann, R. (2011). Finding foreigners in American national identity: Presidential discourse, people, and the international community. *International Journal of Communication*, 5, 872–895.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. Longman.
- Gyuró, M. (2015). Construction of national identity: Power in acceptance speeches. *Discourse and Interaction*, 8(1), 21–40.
- Hussain, A., Iqbal, J., & Tariq, M. (2020). Political metaphors: An analysis of contemporary Pakistani politicians' interviews. *Journal of Political Studies*, 27(2), 45–59.
- Hutcheson, J., Domke, D., Billeaudéaux, D., & Garland, P. (2004). U.S. national identity, political elites, and a patriotic press following September 11. *Political Communication*, 21(1), 27–50.
- Iqbal, M. Z., & Hussain, S. (2017). Reporting Sectarian Incidents: Examining the Escalatory and De-Escalatory Discourses in the Pakistan News Media. *J. Pol. Stud.*, 24, 469.
- Keating, J. (2021). Populist discourse and active metaphors in the 2016 U.S. presidential elections. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 18(4), 517–534.*
- Lakoff, G. (1991). Metaphor and war: The metaphor system used to justify war in the Gulf. *Peace Research*, 23(2–3), 25–32.
- Lakoff, G. (2016). *Moral politics: How liberals and conservatives think* (3rd ed.). University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. University of Chicago Press.
- Lapka, O. (2023). Machine metaphors in 2020 USA electioneering campaign: A cognitive aspect. *Studies about Languages*, 43, 65–78.
- Li, M., Hussain, S., Barkat, S., & Bostan, H. (2025). Online harassment and trolling of political journalists in Pakistan. *Journalism Practice*, 19(7), 1499–1516.
- Moffitt, B. (2020). *Populism*. Polity Press.
- Musolff, A. (2004). *Metaphor and political discourse: Analogical reasoning in debates about Europe*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Musolff, A. (2016). *Political metaphor analysis: Discourse and scenarios*. Bloomsbury Academic.
- Parker, R. A. (2014). *Discursive construction of post-9/11 American national identity: United by "the enemy."* George Mason University.
- Prabhakaran, V., Rei, M., & Shutova, E. (2021). How metaphors impact political discourse: A large-scale topic-agnostic study using neural metaphor detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.00100*.
- Pragglejaz Group. (2007). MIP: A method for identifying metaphorically used words in discourse. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 22(1), 1–39.*
https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327868ms2201_1*
- Streich, G. W. (2009). Discourses of American national identity: Echoes and lessons from the 1910s–1920s. *Citizenship Studies*, 13(3), 267–287.



- Van Dijk, T. A. (2006). Ideology and discourse analysis. *Journal of Political Ideologies*, 11(2), 115–140.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2008). *Discourse and power*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wodak, R. (2011). *The discourse of politics in action: Politics as usual*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2016). *Methods of critical discourse studies* (3rd ed.). SAGE.