# Conflict Management through War Metaphors in 2013 Kenyan Presidential Campaign Speeches

Norah Mose[1*]    Lilian Magonya[2]    Benson Ojwang'[2]
1.Department of Linguistics, Maseno University, Private Bag, Maseno, Kenya
2.Faculty, Department of Linguistics, Maseno University, Private Bag, Maseno, Kenya

**Abstract**
Political campaigns employ war metaphors that bring forth the resemblance between the rigours of war and the struggle to occupy electoral offices. In this regard, the political candidates are soldiers, the constituents are the battle grounds, campaigns are war strategies and victory or loss in an election is victory or defeat in war. While most linguistic studies focus on use of war metaphors as strategies for winning elections, this paper examines how such metaphors have been employed in conflict management in election. The aim of the paper was therefore, to analyze war metaphors employed in conflict management in the 2013 Kenyan presidential campaign speeches. The objective of the paper was to establish if the war metaphors used in the 2013 Kenyan presidential campaign speeches to urge people to avert violence were relevant to the people of Tarakwa, Uasin Gishu County, Kenya. To achieve this, four presidential campaign speeches from sampled presidential campaign candidates namely Uhuru Kenyatta, Raila Odinga, Musalia Mudavadi and Martha Karua between 1st September, 2012 and 2nd March, 2013 were presented to four focus group discussions, conducted in Chagaiya, Kipkurere, Tarakwa and Languise within Uasin Gishu County, Kenya. The focus group discussion participants commented on the relevance of the war metaphors in conflict management. Data was analyzed within the precincts of relevance theory propounded by Dan Sperber and Deirdre Wilson (1995). This paper established that presidential candidates employed conceptual metaphors which drew a resemblance relationship between war and elections such as CONSTITUENTS ARE BATTLE FRONTS, CHILDREN ARE SOLDIERS and CONCEDING DEFEAT IS TO ACCEPT ELECTION RESULTS to not only dissociate with violence, but to also urge the electorates to avert violence during elections. In addition, though these metaphors were relevant in conflict management, the electorate were skeptical on the motives of the presidential candidates' use of the metaphors. Despite these, the metaphors were important in shaping voters' understanding of conflict management through dissociation with war.
**Keywords:** War metaphors, Conflict, Conflict Management, Relevance, elections, campaign speeches.

## 1.   Introduction

Metaphors are ingrained in our day to day discourse that we hardly notice when we use them or are used by other people. Often, we use metaphors to represent our different experiences, and as Magonya and Oloo (2015) put it, metaphors and human experiences are interlaced such that the conceptualization of phenomenon is vividly captured by our embodied cognition with metaphors. Metaphors contain a cross- domain mapping in the conceptual system to understand or think of one thing in terms of something else (Lakoff, 1993). In light of this, Ling (2010) conceives of a metaphor as a basic cognitive structure which helps us understand a relatively abstract concept by means of a more concrete concept. This way metaphors have found expression in political rhetoric and public discourse owing to the way politicians use them extensively to make politics less abstract and more tangible to the citizens or to voters (Thomas & Wareing, 1999). So commonplace, frequent and pervasive have many of the metaphors used in daily discourse and political discourse become that they are scarcely recognized as metaphors (Thomas & Wareing, 1999). However, whichever way they are used they structure our understanding of political, social and economic issues. These aspects of life are not devoid of struggle, and as Ling (2010) argues, the domain of war is employed metaphorically for all types of human struggle and conflict. Ling (2010) adds that war metaphors have become an indispensable part of language as realized in linguistic metaphors including *besiege, fight for, attack, battle* and *fend off* used by ordinary people in everyday speech or writing.

Linguistic metaphors have been examined in political discourse analyses as conceptual metaphors in examples including POLITICS IS A BATTLE, POLITICS IS WAR and ELECTION IS A BATTLE (Taiwo, 2010; Burnes, 2011; Otieno, 2016). In these works, focus has been on the election campaign activities which are portrayed as rigorous and conflictual. In this regard, Otieno (2016) opines that people have been structured to think that election is a battle to be won. So deeply ingrained is the image of war in political elections that in Kenya, political campaigns in the run-up to general elections cause fear and uncertainties among the electorate. Indeed, varying magnitudes of conflict have marred elections since the advent of multiparty elections in Kenya in 1992 with the exception of 2013 elections.

The 2013 elections were relatively calm, a situation that was applauded by the citizens of Kenya and international community (Elder, Stigant & Claes, 2014). This is against the backdrop of election-related violence

in the preceding multiparty elections where the presidency had taken a big share of the blame for acts of atrocities before, during and after the elections (Rutten & Owuor, 2010). According to Rutten and Owuor (2010), the presidency is heavily contested due to its association with gains to the ethnic group the president hails from. This struggle culminates to ethno-political violence which Cho, Connors, Fatima, & Yalim (2015) argue is the prize for the presidency. In this paper, election-related violence is defined as "acts that seek to determine, delay, or otherwise influence an electoral process through violence, assault, thuggery and intimidation amongst other negative political behaviours. The violence may manifest during pre-election, election and post-election stage and can be either physical or psychological dimension or both" [sic] (Owino, 2013: 63). Conflict is defined as "disagreement between two or more parties in which one perceive(s) a denial of a right, resources, or absence of capacity to obtain justice which leads to anger, hurt, hate and possibly verbal and violent actions and reactions resulting in damage to person(s), emotionally and physically and/or property" (Persaud & Turner, 2007: 417). The goal of conflict management is to reduce or control conflict volatility (Shinar, 2003). Since the basic concern of this paper is use of war metaphors in conflict management in political elections, it is imperative to first locate the study within the spectrum of war metaphors in elections at the same time defining the term metaphor and linking it to relevance theory.

The study of metaphors can be traced to Aristotle who regarded metaphors as a matter of language in a traditional way (Lakoff, 1980). A metaphor lends itself to a linguistic cross-fertilization description, whereby the word that is used for one thing is applied to something else (Miller, 1979). Lakoff and Johnson (1980) encapsulate this phenomenon in conceptual metaphor theory where the transference of meaning corresponds to the source domain and the target domain. In the conceptual metaphor theory, Lakoff and Johnson (1980) argue that a metaphor is a conceptual phenomenon rather than a language phenomenon and that people's ordinary conceptual system, in which they both think and act, is metaphorical in nature. Contrary to Lakoff and Johnson (1980), Grice, in the 1970s, viewed metaphors as a deliberate violation of the maxim of quality or truthfulness, and therefore a deviation from the norm (Saeed, 2003).

Stemming from conceptual metaphor theory, ARGUMENT IS WAR conceptual metaphor has become influential in the analyses of war metaphors in politics, sports, diseases, love and business. The concept "argument" in ARGUMENT IS WAR conceptual metaphor, Lakoff and Johnson (1980:4) argue is reflected in the everyday language by a wide variety of expressions such as "your claims are indefensible" and "he shot down all my arguments". ARGUMENT IS WAR conceptual metaphor involves a mapping relationship where the source domain is mapped onto target domain. In this example, "argument" is the target domain, while "war" is the source domain. The mapping relationship in conceptual metaphor theory was later challenged by Sperber and Wilson (1995) in relevance theory as a metarepresentation involving interpretive relations between the propositional form of an utterance and the thought they represent or resemble. In relevance theory, the expectation of optimal relevance makes one search for more implications without which the use of a metaphor could not be justified. In this paper, relevance theory was employed in the analysis of the relevance of the 2013 Kenyan presidential speeches regarding conflict management.

Studies on political discourse take the view that metaphors play an immense rhetorical and persuasive role in politics. Confirming this, using newspaper data and website coverage of 1997 Taiwanese elections, Wei (2001) observes that political discussion is inherently metaphorical evident in the presidential and vice-presidential candidates use of "war", "revenge" and "a journey to spiritual awakening" metaphors to promote their visibility, political ideals and political ideologies. Compared to the present study, there was struggle resembling army combat among the presidential candidates who discredit the "other" and exalt "oneself" through waging political wars, punctuated with vengeance in discovering that perhaps they had not been valued by, say, the government or the coalitions they had been.

Blending critical discourse analysis and cognitive linguistics theories, Taiwo (2010) discusses metaphoric expressions in the Nigerian political discourse. Guided by Lakoff's and Johnson's (1980) conceptual metaphor theory, Taiwo (2010) identified three target domains as sources of conceptual metaphors in the data. These include the NATION, POLITICIANS and POLITICS mapped as a family or a person; battle and a journey and a builder respectively in the NATION AS A FAMILY, POLITICS AS A JOURNEY and POLITICIAN AS A BUILDER conceptual metaphors respectively. Taiwo (2010) argued that metaphors helped shape the structure of political categorization and argumentation in addition to politicians fulfilling their persuasive and rhetoric goals in political discourse. In this regard, the aforementioned benign conceptual metaphors shape our perception of politics by depicting the positive side of politics. In the same vein, POLITICS IS A GAME conceptual metaphor presents politics as a rule bound phenomenon in which the best team wins. On the flip side, however, POLITICS IS A DIRTY GAME conceptual metaphor which reverberated in the former Kenyan president, Daniel Moi, speeches maligned politics implying that politicians could engage in verbal combat, physical fighting and evil political strategies to gain political mileage. This was mapped at a larger scale in the election-related violence of 1992, 1997, 2002 and 2007 which confirms the resemblance of politics to war or POLITICS IS WAR conceptual metaphor Ling (2010) delves on.

Applying Lakoff's and Johnson's (1980) ARGUMENT IS WAR conceptual metaphor, Ling (2010) observes that politics is a common daily occurrence conceptualized as POLITICS IS WAR. Ling (2010) presents an often-heard mapping of politics into war in expressions such as "a political election is a battle on a battlefield", "politicians are soldiers", "political strategies are war strategies", and "the outcome of politics is the outcome of war". The examples Ling (2010) provides respectively include, first, "The main election *battleground* now would seem to be the political interviews on television. Second, "President Delors also came *under fire* from Tory MPs. Third, "…ambitious labour politicians will have to apply the same strategies that lend national elections to internal party contests". Fourth, "National politics, by contrasts, has become all too predictable: the republicans win the White House; the Democrats hold Congress". In the same vein, in the 2008 press reports on Pakistani parliamentary elections and Obama's election, the concept ELECTION IS A BATTLE was expressed as "victory" and "defeat" in English and "victoire" and "defaite" in French (Burnes, 2011). Underlying the "victory" and "defeat" nexus is the notion that in a battle, there is a winner and a loser, so it is the same with elections. The mapping of an election into a battle, Burnes (2011), exemplifies is comparable to the resemblance relationship between the propositional content of the utterance containing the concept "election" and the thought of "war" it resembles in relevance theory.

In Kenya, Michira (2014) observes that Raila Odinga used football commentary metaphors to illustrate the political contest between him and his team, Coalition for Restoration of Democracy (CORD), and the opposing team led by Uhuru Kenyatta. The struggle between the two contenders portrayed as teams and brought forth using a football metaphor by Michira (2014) compares with the resemblance relationship of the propositional form in the utterance contained by the term football and the thought represented by election in the present study. Though Michira (2014) brings forth the team spirit in football among team members, the image of war is inevitable in the competition between Raila's and Kenyatta's teams. In the commentary, Raila portrays his team as being physically fit and employing passes which leave the other team falling all over the place with Raila, a striker, eventually scoring the winning goal.

From the literature review, it is evident that metaphors have permeated the political discourse and are derived from day to day phenomena. Depending on the comparison, linguistic cross-fertilization, mappings or resemblances made, these metaphors are drawn from and structure our understanding of political, social and economic issues. It is from this understanding that people fathom politics and politicians depending on the choices of metaphors made. The literature review confirms the view that politicians use metaphors to make politics more concrete to the citizens and voters (Thomas and Wareing, 1999). By employing war metaphors, for instance, politicians draw resemblance between war, battle strategies and winning on one hand, and politics, campaigns and victory on the other hand. While it emerges that politics is driven by winning an election, the possibility of violence in the course of an election cannot be down played, a situation that translates real war into politics. Also, the possibility of averting an impending conflict cannot be overlooked. This paper therefore, sought to address the relevance of war metaphors in conflict management in the 2013 Kenyan presidential campaign speeches to the residents of Tarakwa, Uasin Gishu County, Kenya. The objective of the paper was to establish if the war metaphors used by the presidential candidate to urge people to avert violence were relevant to the people of Tarakwa.

## 2.  Relevance theory

Relevance theory was propounded by Sperber and Wilson (1995) and its goal is to explain how a hearer infers the speaker's meaning on the basis of the evidence provided. The central claim is that the expectations of relevance raised by an utterance are precise and predictable enough to guide the hearer towards the speaker's meaning. Sperber and Wilson (1995) argue that a speaker attracts a hearer's attention by a stimulus and distinctly shows the hearer that the speaker wants to communicate something. The stimulus that attracts the hearer's attention is called ostensive stimulus, and has both an informative intention and a communicative intention. The former is the intention to inform the hearer of something while the latter is the intention to inform the hearer of one's informative intention (Sperber & Wilson, 1995). Relevance theory has two descriptive principles derived from these intentions:

a)  The cognitive principle of relevance states that human cognition tends to be geared towards maximization of relevance.
b)  The Communicative principle of relevance states that every act of ostensive communication communicates a presumption of its own optimal relevance.

On expounding these principles, Wilson and Sperber (2012) assert that relevance is the potential property not only of utterances and other observable phenomenon, but of thought, memories and conclusions of inferences, and any external stimulus or internal representation which provides an input to cognitive process is relevant to an individual. Thus, according to the cognitive principle of relevance, human cognitive resource tends to process an input which is the most relevant in the available inputs. An input (a sight, a sound, an utterance, a memory) is relevant to an individual when it connects with background information he has available to yield a

conclusion that matters to him (Sperber & Wilson, 1995). In relevance-theoretic terms, this conclusion is referred to as positive cognitive effects while the background information is referred to as contextual assumption. According to Sperber and Wilson (1995) a positive cognitive effect is a worthwhile difference to the individual's representation of the world, for example, a true conclusion. False conclusions are not worth having because they are negative cognitive effects. Wilson and Sperber (2004) observe that the most important type of cognitive effect achieved by processing an input in a context is contextual implication, a conclusion deducible from the input and the context together. To arrive at a contextual implication, Wilson and Sperber (2004) give an example, where on seeing one's train arriving, she might look at the watch, access her knowledge of the train timetable, and derive the contextual implication that her train is late. Other types of cognitive effects include the strengthening, revision or abandonment of available assumptions. On exemplifying abandonment of assumptions, Wilson and Sperber (2004) argue that the sight of the train arriving late might confirm one's impression that the services are deteriorating, or make one change her plans to do some shopping on the way to work.

The second principle, communicative principle of relevance, together with the notion of optimal relevance are the key to relevance-theoretic pragmatics. According to Sperber and Wilson (2012) an ostensive stimulus creates a presumption of relevance. The notion of optimal relevance is meant to spell out what the audience of an act of ostensive communication is entitled to expect in terms of effort and effect (Sperber & Wilson, 2012). Optimal relevance is further defined in terms of two clauses:

a) The ostensive stimulus is relevant enough for it to be worth the addressee's effort to process it.
b) The ostensive stimulus is the most relevant one compatible with the communicator's abilities and preferences (Sperber & Wilson, 1995).

According to (a) Sperber and Wilson (2012) argue that the audience is entitled to expect the ostensive stimulus to be at least relevant enough to be worth processing. This implies that in order to satisfy the presumption of relevance conveyed by an ostensive stimulus, the audience may have to draw stronger conclusion than would otherwise have been warranted. For example, if you just happen to notice my empty glass, you may be entitled to conclude that I might like a drink on one hand; if I wave it about in front of you, you would generally be justified in drawing the stronger conclusion that I would like a drink, on the other hand (Sperber & Wilson, 1995). According to (b), Sperber and Wilson (2012) claim that the audience of an ostensive stimulus is entitled to even higher expectation than in (a). This is because the speaker wants to be understood and she must, within her own capabilities and preferences, make her ostensive stimulus as easy as possible for the audience to understand, and to provide evidence not just for the cognitive effects which, by holding his attention, will help her achieve her goal (Wilson & Sperber, 2004).

Relevance is assessed in terms of the cognitive effect and processing effort (Wilson, 2007). At this points, Sperber and Wilson [7] observe that maximal relevance has a high cognitive effect with low processing effort and summarize the relevance theoretic comprehension procedure in two clauses (Wilson & Sperber, 2004).

a) Follow a path of least effort in computing cognitive effects: test interpretive hypothesis (disambiguation, reference resolutions and implicatures) in order of accessibility.
b) Stop when the expectations of relevance are satisfied.

In addition to the foregoing outline of relevance theory, Sperber and Wilson (1995) point to two fundamentally different uses of language: descriptive and interpretive. Descriptive use is use of truth-conditional while interpretive use is use of resemblance. When used interpretively, utterances represent the thoughts of a speaker. This means that utterances are interpretations or interpretive expressions of the thoughts that the speaker wants to communicate with emphasis being how much a hearer faithfully reproduces the expression of thoughts of the speaker (Sperber & Wilson, 1995). According to Sperber and Wilson (1995) interpretive use plays a fundamental role in the analysis of non-literal utterances. One non-literal use this paper focuses on is metaphor.

Metaphors, are metarepresentations involving interpretive relations between the propositional form of an utterance and the thought they represent or resemble. However, they are less-than-literal representations of the speaker's thought (Wilson & Sperber, 2004). Sperber and Wilson (1995) add that in interpreting the concepts conveyed by metaphors, relevance theory does not default to literal interpretation but simply towards the interpretation, whether literal, loose or metaphoric, most relevant to the context in which communication occurs. Sperber and Wilson (1995) use an illustration where one is shocked to see John's room very filthy and untidy to the extent that one cannot stand it: *This room is a pigsty* (Sperber & Wilson, 1995: 236).

This conventional metaphor gives John easy access to an encyclopeadic schema with the dominant assumption like *pigsties are filthy and untidy* (Sperber & Wilson, 1995:236). Given the presumption of optimal relevance, John draws the implication that *the room is filthy and untidy* (Sperber & Wilson, 1995:236). The expectation of optimal relevance makes John search for more implications without which the use of the metaphor could not be justified; for example, by saying that this filthiness and untidiness are beyond the norm, that he is being blamed for the filthiness and untidiness of his room. In the first case, the hearer's responsibilities in trying to construct the implicatures are greater, but will have more poetic effects. According to Sperber and Wilson (1995), John's extra effort to process the utterance is offset by contextual effects achieved. Metaphors

can have weak or strong implicatures depending on whether the cognitive effects recovered are broad or narrow respectively (Sperber & Wilson, 1995). For Wilson and Sperber (2004), a proposition is strongly implicated if its recovery is essential in order to arrive at an implication that satisfies the expectations of relevance raised by an utterance itself. It is, however, weakly implicated if its recovery helps with the construction of an interpretation that is relevant in the expected way, but is not itself essential because the utterance suggests a range of similar possible implicatures any of which would do. Sperber and Wilson (1995: 236), on this note, point out that "a good creative metaphor is precisely one in which a variety of contextual effects can be retained and understood as weakly implicated by the speaker". Sperber and Wilson (1995) add that the search for relevance may result in literalness of metaphor.

## 3.    Materials and Methods

This paper is part of an ongoing PhD research of Mose which focuses on conflict management in the 2013 Kenyan presidential campaign speeches from the pragmatics standpoint. The study was qualitative, employed analytic research design and was conducted in Tarakwa County Assembly Ward in Uasin Gishu County, Kenya. The study population were the 37,683 residents of Tarakwa (Uasin Gishu County Integrated Development plan for 2013 to 2018) and the eight presidential candidates of Kenya in 2013 namely Uhuru Kenyatta of Jubilee Alliance, Raila Odinga of Coalition for Restoration of Democracy (CORD), Musalia Mudavadi of Amani National Congress Coalition, Peter Kenneth of Eagle Alliance, Martha Karua of National Rainbow Coalition (NARC) Kenya, Paul Muite of Safina, James Ole Kiyiapi of Restore and Build Kenya and Abduba Dida of Alliance for Real Change (ARK). The population of campaign speeches delivered by the purposively sampled candidates namely Uhuru Kenyatta, Raila Odinga Musalia Mudavadi and Martha Karua between 1$^{st}$ September, 2012 and 2$^{nd}$ March, 2013 when presidential candidates started intensifying their campaigns to the final official campaign day respectively was 150. This is according to CITIZEN TV, NTV, and UHURUTV that were accessed on the You Tube. 20 speeches delivered by the sampled candidates were also purposively sampled. Tarakwa was purposively sampled because it had been a hot-spot for election-related violence since 1992, the advent of multiparty elections in Kenya with the exception of 2013 elections (Uasin Gishu County Integrated Development plan for 2013 to 2018).

Four focus group discussions (FGD) were conducted in Tarakwa. The inclusion criteria required FGD participants to be at least 25 years, residents of Tarakwa from 2007 to 2013 and from the different ethnic groups found in Tarakwa, each with the common characteristics relating to conflict management in 2013 elections. This homogeneity enabled participants to share ideas and participate freely in the discussion, and the researcher to manage the sessions (Jayanth & Nelson, 2012). To facilitate the discussions, Kiswahili was used and only participants who spoke Kiswahili or English or both were sampled. The FGD participants watched one campaign speech from each of the four sampled candidates lasting between 4 to 7 minutes. Campaign speeches delivered in Kiswahili were translated into English for purposes of analysis using semantically equivalent terms to cater for semantic loss.

Data was analyzed within the tenets of relevance theory. With their attention directed to war metaphors, the participants interpreted the relevance of these metaphors in conflict management in 2013 Kenyan elections. The presidential candidates' utterances regarding conflict management were the ostensive stimulus or the input of a cognitive process which the FGD participants interpreted. In this paper, the abbreviations PC1, PC2, PC3 and PC4 symbolize the presidential candidates Uhuru, Raila, Mudavadi and Karua respectively. T1, T2, T3 and T4 symbolize the FGD responses from Chagaiya, Kipkurere, Languise and Tarakwa sub-locations of Tarakwa, Uasin Gishu County, Kenya respectively and data obtained from the presidential speeches and FGD are numbered sequentially.

## 4.    Results and Discussions

This section presents the results and discussions of conflict management through war metaphors in the 2013 presidential campaign speeches. The FGD participants were required to interpret ARGUMENT IS WAR conceptual metaphor used in the classic example by Lakoff and Johnson (1980) which in Sperber and Wilson (1995) is a conventional metaphor:

1) It is violence of every kind; either verbal or physical violence thereby lacking peace.          (T2)
2) To argue and deny others peace, like          me depriving others peace.          (T4)
3) It brings very bad images of deaths, destruction….          (T1)

The FGD participants' encyclopeadic schema of "argument" was violence of every kind and denying others peace with the implication that violence and lack of peace lead to death and destruction. The interpretations indicated that the propositional form was weakly implicated and pointed at violence in election, giving a further implication that violence is brought about by politicians who argue, insult one another and threaten others during campaigns. As a result, their followers make good the propositional contents of the utterances which may cause deaths and destruction of property. In Sperber and Wilson (1995) words, the

recovery of weak implicatures helps with the construction of an interpretation that is relevant in the expected way, but is not itself essential because the utterance suggests a range of similar possible implicatures any of which would do. Looked at this way, there is no doubt an interpretive relationship or resemblance between the propositional form of the utterance and the thought they resemble exists. This is not the case with Lakoff and Johnson (1980) who regard "argument" as a target domain and war as a source domain in ARGUMENT IS WAR conceptual metaphor.

This implication leads to a further search of interpretation relationship of the resemblance between politics and death which yield the conventional metaphor "politics is war". An interpretation of this metaphor requires access to an encyclopeadic schema and assumptions. For instance, in war, people fight and die and in the past elections in Kenya, there had been ethno-political violence respectively with the competition for the office of presidency being largely blamed for election-related violence which has resulted in loss of lives (Cho, *et. al.,* 2014). This kind of a competition is reflected in Lakoff (1991) refined COMPETITION IS WAR conceptual metaphor. Njogu (2009) collection of post-election violence narratives points out that the Kalenjin living in Burnt Forest (Tarakwa) had threatened the Kikuyu with death and eviction if Kibaki won the presidential election. Thus, the resemblance between the propositional content in argument and its resemblance to violence which lead to death can be compared to war scenario. In this scenario, the FGD participants regarded argument as violence. In this case when politicians, compared to army commanders, argue, their followers who are compared to soldiers take cue and engage in physical violence. In war, some people are injured, others die and property is destroyed. This war scenario was captured in utterance (4).

4) In the end, what happened when they refused to accept, isn't it <u>blood</u> that <u>shed</u> here? (PC1)

In 2007, the presidential results were disputed on account of rigging something that triggered the 2007/2008 post-election violence. The interpretation of "blood shed" in (4) gave the FGD participants access to encyclopeadic entries involving blood oozing after a cut on the body with the contextual assumptions in (5):

5) These are the clashes that led to **people killing each** other and stealing from each other, and that is why I am saying Kenya should be peaceful.                                    (T1)

FGD participants' response in (5) answers the PC1's question. PC1 makes manifest the contextual assumptions that the cause of 2007/2008 was presidential result dispute. This implies there was an argument between two candidates over who won which portends the presidential candidates in question were soldiers from two sides who took war to the battle field or the constituents. At the battle field, there was blood shed which translated to the deaths of the constituents. Utterance (5) shows the deaths that can result in war if the two warring sides do not reach an agreement. To dissociate with (5), utterance (6) was a declaration of ceasefire interpreted as (7).

6) And there is no day again we would like to see the **blood of the citizens shedding again** because of politics.                                                              (PC3)

7) You know when **blood sheds it is death**. He is talking about avoidance of another violence.
(T4)

In (7), the FGD participants brought out the resemblance between blood shedding in the propositional form and death which is the thought it resembled. There is also an indication of ceasefire declaration in "avoidance of another violence". "Blood shed" and "violence" in election resemble death and war. However, in (7) there was an intention of breaking this sequence through declaration of a ceasefire. Another utterance with this intention was (8):

8) We want our name which is **Amani Coalition** to work in election issues so that **blood will not shed** at all as it shed that time.                                    (PC3)

In (8), the dissociation of the presidential candidate with election-related violence resembled the declaration of ceasefire by army commanders upon noticing that further war pursuit will lead to deaths of the civilians. The party name *Amani* "Peace" resembled peace pact declaring one's side non-involvement with war which would prevent war outbreak such as the 2007/2008 post-election violence. FGD participants' argued:

9) When there is violence a lot of problems emerge, people kill each other and blood sheds.
(T2)

The response in (9) brings out the resemblance between war scenario and its aftermaths on one hand, and election-related violence and the shedding of people's blood on the other hand. The FGD participants made it clear that shedding blood is the result of people killing each other which is an aftermath of war.

Another utterance that brought out the resemblance between war and election-related violence was (10).

10) If a politician tells you youth to go and **fight**, tell him "take **your wife and children** to the **battle front**".
PC1

Regarding (10) the FGD participants' accessed the contextual assumptions (11):

11) We fought among ourselves…. We remained without shelter…the rich people (politicians)...took flights and enjoyed their wealth abroad…                                      (T2)

Literary, PC1 made mutually manifest assumptions such as in the previous elections, the youth had been incited to perpetrate violence, and when it escalated, politicians took off on planes leaving the electorate to suffer. The

propositional content of (10) bore a resemblance with war scenario which was strongly implicated. According to Sperber and Wilson (1995), a proposition is strongly implicated if its recovery is essential in order to arrive at an implication that satisfies the expectations of relevance raised by an utterance itself. In addition, the search for relevance may result in literalness of metaphor (Sperber & Wilson, 2004). According to Lakoff and Johnson (1980), (11) will yield ELECTION VIOLENCE IS PLACING WIVES AND CHILDREN IN THE BATTLE FRONT conceptual metaphor which translates to resemblance or interpretation relationship in relevance theory. There was a resemblance in the propositional form of utterance (10) and the thought they resemble in the following dichotomies: politicians and army commanders; wife (and children) and soldiers; outsiders or the enemy and the opponent; battle front and the constituents, and electioneering and war These resemblances brought out the organization of the army battalion in the event of war. However, PC1 in (10) told the constituents not to be recruited into such battalions. In the contextual assumption (11) fighting was almost literal in that people took weapons and fought the vulnerable outsiders. Jenkins (2012) unravels the notion of outsider as an immigrant guest who had come to settle in a place that is not their ancestor's home. Hence, since this fighting PC1 alludes to is associated with winning an election, it is also embedded in the conventional metaphor "election is conflict" in relevance theory.

In (10), the FGD participants accessed contextual assumptions regarding violence in elections which backs the interpretative relationship involving resemblance. This paper is of the view that the relevance of these metaphors was justified through constant reminders in the contextual discourse to the people about war making people die and lose property at previous elections. Therefore, dissociation with these old contextual assumptions was necessary so that new and stronger assumptions that will make people avert conflict in 2013 elections could suffice. For instance, while PC1 urged the youth to turn down politicians' offers to fight, PC4 reminded people:

12) **Foolish work** (fighting/war) is left for the weak and their children                          (PC4)

The FGD participants' observation of violence in elections augured well with those made about (10). The phrase "foolish work" implied fighting anyhow without any strategy in place resulting in deaths of the poor people. It is worth noting that the rich incited the poor to stir violence in past election while they (the rich) do not take place. An FGD participant noted (13):

13) When retired president (Mwai Kibaki) and Raila Odinga, because they are not the ones who were fighting, there reached a time they took tea together…. Sometimes, we should use our brains because the politicians use political science to divide us and once they reach the end they look back and say we can play with the people to achieve our ends.               (T2)

In (13), there is an indication that politicians do not themselves fight but they incite the poor people to engage in fighting. After the war, they sit together partaking tea and laughing at the folly of fighting and killing each other. From this observation, the respondent stressed that they should use their brains. In Lakoff and Johnson (1980) conceptual metaphor theory, use of brain to avert an impending violence can be summed up in INTELLECT AND WIT ARE USEFUL CONFLICT MANAGEMENT STRATEGY conceptual metaphor. In relevance theory, looking at fighting as foolish work entails an interpretive relationship between fighting and the poor people who are incited to do the vice as unvalued. As a cliché, "foolish work" was left implicit because PC4 intended it to reach the audience as weakly implicated as possible for them to reflect on the numerous meanings associated with foolish work. Leaving an utterance implicit is for stylistic purpose especially when the hearer can be trusted to interpret it (Sperber & Wilson, 1995). However, the cognitive effects gleaned are broad and hence weak implicature which characterize a good metaphor.

The FGD participant also observed that politicians divided the poor people, an observation that confirms the ethnically oriented Kenyan politics which captures WAR IS DIVISIVE conceptual metaphors. Such a division resembles the different sides of armies engaged in war. Divisive politics are the main strategies for perpetrating tribal politics which translate to election-related conflict. As observed in (13), politicians play with people's psyche through divisive politics making POLITICS IS A GAME OF MANIPULATING PEOPLE'S MIND conceptual metaphor apply. In this case the propositional form conveyed in the utterance of the respondent concerning playing is an interpretation resembling a game of manipulating people to engage in fighting.

Use of metaphors in conflict management in the presidential campaign speeches also entailed a study of winning and losing in war and how the soldiers react in either case as reflected in the propositions forms in (14) and (15) depicting election.

14) We have said that in the unlikely event that we are defeated we will accept the results.

(PC2)

15) I know we will not be defeated. But if we will be defeated, we will concede defeat. (PC2)

The war metaphors "defeat" and "concede defeat" employed in (14) and (15) were interpreted as in (16) and (17) by the FGD participants:

16) PC2 saw elections like war. If people go to war, if you are defeated, you accept.  (T3)

17) It seems that if you are defeated, you will not accept, now it is better if he can offer advice in advance

so that if you are defeated you accept defeat. Do not refuse to accept to avoid arguments.
                                                                                                      (T2)

The participants underscored the resemblance relationship in the propositional form containing defeat which depicts war as the thought represented by losing in an election. Constructing this implicature, entailed a metarepresentation involving the resemblance between war, soldiers, commander, defeat and conceding defeat on one hand with election, party supporters, party leader, loss in election and accepting election results respectively on the other hand. PC2 showed the readiness of his battalion, of which he was part, to engage in a war combat with the enemy and being prepared for any outcome: a win or a defeat. On defeat, they were ready to withdraw troops from the battle field. This comparison necessitated accessing mutually manifest contextual assumptions regarding the immediate cause of the 2007/2008 post-election violence. In the people's encyclopeadic entry, this meant that the presidential candidates were influential in restraining their supporters from engaging in violence as revealed by FGD participants. Despite this, FGD participants' expectation of relevance of the war metaphor "concede defeat" in conflict management in the elections was abandoned as depicted in (18) and (19).

18) PC2 is trying from afar to caution his opponents. Secondly, PC2 had hopes that in this election he could win… he repeats "If I will not win…" meaning he is not hundred percent sure. He sees himself in the race but thinks they will rig again… if anything happens he will have a way of claiming…. But PC2 himself had something in him like contempt. If you see the way he is saying: "if we will be defeated we will follow the legal channel" meaning that he is neither hot nor cold.                          (T2)

19) But you know if someone is defeated he must complain. He will not shake your hand because you have won. He must complain.                                                                   (T3)

The FGD participants argued that PC2's use of the war term "conceding defeat" was superficial, defensive, skeptical, contemptuous and therefore dissociative with conflict management agenda. In (17), the utterance "in the unlikely event that we are defeated" conveyed PC2 unwillingness to accept defeat. Combined with the contextual assumptions accessed by the participants "he sees himself in a race but thinks they will rig again …. he was cautioning his competitors", it emerges that PC2 was not committed to the truth of the propositional content "we will concede defeat". This situation brings to the fore the resemblance between race or competition, which are in the sports domain and politics. Lakoff and Johnson (1980) captures this resemblance in CONTESTING FOR A POLITICAL SEAT IS A RACE conceptual metaphor in the generic metaphor SPORTS IS WAR. Skepticism was also extended to PC3 in (20):

20) I have cold water I will pour on Jubilee; I will pour on CORD, I cool them. Then, us as Amani, we drive and bring you together.                                                          PC3

The FGD participants regarded PC3's utterances as selfish as the primary intention was for self-campaign. However, looked at critically, PC3 alluded to flaring of tempers between PC1 and PC2. He therefore, declares himself the neutral candidate, using the metaphor of "cold water", who will lower the political temperatures. In this view, there was a resemblance between the proposition form of the utterance containing "cold water" and the thought it represented which was cooling political temperatures and by extension contributing to conflict management.

## 5.   Conclusions

In 2013 Kenyan presidential campaign speeches, war metaphors were employed in pursuit of conflict management. The war metaphors brought out metarepresentations involving the interpretive relations of the propositional forms put forth in military war set up and the thought represented by elections. This was captured in the conventional metaphor "election is war" encapsulated in ELECTION IS WAR conceptual metaphor. Elective politics that contribute to conflict were captured in an interpretive resemblance included in POLITICS IS DIVISIVE conceptual metaphor typified by tribalism. Divisive politics are manipulative to the poor as revealed in POLITICS IS A GAME OF MANIPULATING PEOPLE'S MIND. This has resulted in election violence involving the poor as captured in ELECTION VIOLENCE IS PLACING WIVES AND CHILDREN IN THE BATTLE FRONT conceptual metaphors derived from previous elections' contextual assumptions. The interpretive relationship between war and elections was dichotomized in the resemblances involved in POLITICIANS ARE ARMY COMMANDERS, WIFE AND CHILDREN ARE SOLDIERS, OUTSIDERS ARE ENEMIES/OPPONENTS, BATTLE FRONTS ARE THE CONSTITUENTS and DEFEAT IS LOSS IN ELECTION.

As a conflict management strategy, the relevance of these metaphors was embedded in dissociation with acts of atrocity. Because these acts are unvalued, they are left for the poor people as captured in the resemblance between war and the poor in FOOLISH WORK (WAR) IS FOR THE POOR. Therefore, to avoid being manipulated by the rich politicians to engage in war, INTELLECT AND WIT ARE USEFUL CONFLICT MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES. Altercations among politicians raise temperatures and the likelihood of violence. Thus cold water lowers political temperatures as depicted in COLD WATER COOLS POLITICAL

TEMPERATURES. Otherwise, the effects of election-related violence as in war include bloodshed or death as captured in DEATH IS BLOODSHED. Victory or loss in election resembles winning or losing in war. There is only one winner in election, so the other contestants have to accept the results which resembles the side of the army which wins while the other concede defeat respectively. Conceding defeat resembles calling a truce by accepting election results.

Presidential campaign speeches in regard to conflict management in the 2013 election employed war metaphors which evoked militarism, urged people to avert war and declaring ceasefire. However, owing to the fact that politicians' primary interest is winning an election, uses of such metaphors was also viewed as a scheme to achieve personal interest or a cover up in case the elections did not turn up as expected. This way, the expectations of relevance in use of such metaphors in conflict management was abandoned. In conclusion, war metaphors form an integral part of the political campaign discourse. These metaphors also shape our understanding of conflict management for discussions on peace time situations are anchored on war times as Burnes (2011) puts it.

**ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

**References**
Burnes, S. (2011). Metaphors of conflict in press reports of elections. *Studies in variation and change in English.* Volume 7.Http://helsinki.fi/varieng/series/volume/07/. Retrieved on 12th September, 2016

Cho, Y. S. Connors, E. Fatima, F &Yalim, U. (2015). Preventing post-election violence based on the Kenyan experience. Department of State: United States of America.

CITIZEN TV. 2012, December, 8th. http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dvhsxbokfOY.

Elder, C., Stigant, S., Claes, J. (2014). Elections and violent conflict in Kenya: Making prevention stick. Washington: United States Institute of Peace .http://.www.usip.org/../election-and-violent conflict-in-Kenya. Retrieved on 23rd September, 2016

Independent Electoral and Boundaries Commission atlas (2012). http://www.scribd.com/doc/8501258 2/IEBC-Atlas-of-the-Proposed-Constituency- County-Assembly-Wards#scribd. Retrieved on 8th January, 2015.

Jayanth, M. & Nelson, J. (2002). *Savvy Decision Making: An Administrators guide to using focus groups in schools.* California: Corwin Press. Inc.

Jenkins, S. (2012). Ethnicity, violence, and the immigrant-guest metaphor in Kenya. *African affairs.* 111: 575-576.

Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ling, S. (2010). A cognitive study of war metaphors in five main areas of everyday English: Politics, business, sport, disease and love. Kristianstad University: School of teacher education. http://www.divaa-portal-org/smash/pdf. Retrieved on 23rd September, 2016

Magonya, L. & Oloo, P. (2015). What get mapped onto what in the sex is a football game metaphor in Kenyan HIV/AIDS campaign posters. *Linguistics and literature studies* 3(4): 141-161. Http://www.hrpup.org. Retrieved on 16th February, 2017.

Michira, J. N. (2014). The language of politics: A CDA of the 2013 Kenyan presidential campaign discourse. *International Journal of Education and Research.* 2 (1) 1-18.

Miller, E. F. (1979). Metaphor and political Knowledge. *The American political review* 73(1): 155-170.

Njogu, K. (Ed) (2009). Healing the wound: Personal narratives about the 2007 post-election violence. Nairobi: Twaweza Communications.

NTV. 2013, February, 26th http://www. youtube.com/watch?v=QFbB7KuzcOQ.

NTV. 2013, March, 2nd. http://www.youtube.com/watch?=33AetRn2J38.

Otieno, R. F. (2016). Metaphors in political discourse: A review of selected studies. *International jounal of English and literature.* 7(2): 21-26. Http://www.academic.journals.org/IJEL . Retrieved on 13th January, 2017

Owino, C. O. (2013). Socio-economic status of the youth in Kenya: Implications for peaceful elections. K. Njogu. (Ed.) *Youth and peaceful elections in Kenya.* African Books Collective. pp. 55-.https://books.google.co.ke/books?id=5w2vgDhWP.election.related+violence+definition. Retrieved on 20th February, 2017.

Persuad, G. & Turner, T. (2007) Educat ion and conflict resolution for democratization: Economic develop ment and governance in Guyana. In C. H., Grant &

Rutten, M &Owuor, S. (2010). Weapons of mass destruction: Land, ethnicity and the 2007 elections in Kenya. In Kagwanja, P. & R. Southal. New York: Institute of Social and Economic Research.

Saeed, J. I. (2003). *Semantics* (2nd Ed.) Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Limited.

Shinar, D. (2003). The peace process in cultural conflict: The role of the media. *Conflict and communication online.* 2(1) 1-10.

Sperber, D. & Wilson, D. (1995). *Relevance: Communication & cognition.* (2nd Ed). Oxford: Blackwell.

Sperber, D. & Wilson, D. (2012) *Meaning and relevance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Taiwo, R. (2010). Metaphors in Nigerian political discourse. Obafemi Awololo University Nigeria.

Thomas, L. & Wareing, S. (1999). *Language, society and power:An introduction.* London: Routledge.

Uasin Gishu County Integrated Plan 2013-2018. (2013). Retrieved from http://www.Kenyampya.com.userfile s.pdf. Retrieved on 8th January, 2015.

UHURUTV. 2013 January, 23rd. http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sY6mLAAQXo.

Wei, J. M. (2001). The pragmatics of Metaphors in Taiwanese politics in virtual missiles: Metaphors and allusions in Taiwanese political campaigns. United States: Lexington Books.

Wilson D. & Sperber, D. (2004). Relevance Theory. In L. W. Horn &G. Ward (Eds.). *Handbook of pragmatics* (pp.602-632). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wilson, D. (2007) "Pragmatic theory". (PLIN 2002). Retrieved from http://www.readinglists.ucl.ac.uk/mo dules/plin2002.html.. Retrieved on 18th February, 2016.

**Appendix: 2013 Kenyan Presidential Campaign Speeches**
**PC1 Speech**
How are you!

We as Jubilee members, our first aim is to ensure that we have brought peace in our nation of Kenya. Secondly, to ensure we have unity of all Kenyans so that together we can expand our economy. And we should ensure that every Kenyan wherever he is he is proud of his nation. Our fellows, us, our politics are not of insults. We know that the youth are the majority in our nation of Kenya, and when they are many, we want a government that will serve them, but not to use them the way the youth have been used badly in the past.

Our fellows, we know that as leaders if we cooperate, and say that there is no hatred among us and we will not put hatred on the assets of the citizens of Kenya. It is a lot we will achieve. Our fellows, we want to ensure that we have dealt with poverty in our nation of Kenya.

The thing that has spoilt our country is the politics of quarrels and politics of hatred. We have said that those are over, because our fellows those politics are the ones that have brought poverty in our nation of Kenya. Leaders are seeking trouble but do not care about the welfare of the ordinary citizens of this republic of Kenya. Our fellows we want a change.

Therefore, our fellows when we are here we want to say, when we are here tribal politics to end. We want now to have politics that all of us we will discover ourselves as Kenyans knowing that problems are problems and do not know tribes. And I am telling you this, my fellows, there are those who would have liked to name Kenya this tribe this tribe but I know that the blood that circulates among us all is red. When you go to the hospital, does the doctor ask you your tribe before treating you? Please my fellows, let us stop those tribal politics.

We unite as Kenyans, we dialogue as Kenyans and I have no doubt if we do that we will achieve many good things for our nation of Kenya.

As I come to the end, my fellows I want to tell you one thing. It is said that there will be trouble in this Kenya of ours when elections come. Do you believe that? I want to say this, those who want trouble it is up to them. We know that Kenyans are for peace. And as we are going for elections I want to urge any Kenyan wherever he is, you cast your vote, go home, rest and be calm. There is no need for war. The vote is the one that will decide. What will the vote do? The vote is the one that will decide. If a leader tries to tell you, "You, youth, go fight". You tell him "take you children and your wife to go to the battle front. Leave us alone, we want peace in our nation".

And I know, if we do this our fellows, because that is the objective of Jubilee alliance, we want to ensure that the economy moves from being and economy that is run from the top, but rather one that is run from the grassroots. We want to know that our success will not be based on whether our economy has grown by 12 or 13% but by the way we have reduced poverty.

I want to assure you that our alliance has united Kenyans from every place, every corner of our republic of Kenya. Our alliance has united old men, it has united the youth, and mostly, it has united women….

UHURUTV. 2013 January, 23rd. http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sY6mLAAQXo

**PC2 Speech**

We want ninety-minute match. No extra time, no extra time. We are saying we want peace. We want peaceful elections. And we said, if we are defeated we will concede defeat. I know we will not be defeated. But if we will be defeated, we will concede defeat.

We are resting our case today. We are saying that we are finishing today here. Monday. Thirty –six hours are remaining. The match will be for the citizens now. The citizens have remained with the match to play on

Monday and we want ninety-minute match. No extra time.

As you can see, the Kenyan people are peaceful. Even last time, they were very peaceful. They were only provoked through the rigging that took place at the KICC.

We hope and we hope that there will be no rigging this time. As CORD Coalition, we have given you the undertaking that we will respect the outcome of these elections. We have said that in the unlikely event that we are defeated we will accept the results. If there is any anomalies we will pass even through the legal channel. We will go to the courts and we are urging all our supports to be peaceful because we are winning the elections. Every Kenyan with1 a vote, whether old, lame, sick to be carried and be taken to cast a vote.

NTV. 2013, March, 2nd. http://www.youtube.com/watch?=33AetRn2J38

**PC3 Speech**

Those who grow flowers here, here at Timau, where do those flowers go? Those who grow coffee, where does the coffee go? The tea leaves that is near this place, where does it go?

And when those many tourists come here, where do they come from? If someone says that we have no use of other countries, where will he want you to sell your coffee?  We want our name which is Amani Coalition to work in election issues so that blood will not pour at all as it poured that time.

Our brothers are seeking votes. They are seeking votes. But sometimes if you look at politics, if you look at the way they are looking at each other, you would see that if they meet in a corner at night, may be one will not leave the other. So I am saying watch me properly. If Jubilee is burning on this side, if CORD burning on this side, I have cold water I will pour on Jubilee, I will pour on CORD to calm. Then, us as Amani, we drive and bring you together.

NTV. 2013, February, 26th http://www. youtube.com/watch?v=QFbB7KuzcOQ

**PC4 Speech**

The issue of unity so that we can be one community is very important. You saw during post-election violence many people were evicted and here a number of people from these two counties of yours, were second to be driven away, with people from Central being number one. But who was evicted? Let us say the truth. It is not the rich people from these communities. It is the helpless. Even where they were evicted, there are still rich people from these two communities who have what? Land. If your land is big, it is as if when the people are told to cause destruction, it is as if we are shaken by the wealth. The rich person was left the way he is. The poor person with a house he built with difficulty, because he sweated so much to find the two or three iron sheets he put on the roof. Even the things he has in the house do not cost much, but those are his things in this world. He does not have others. That is the one whose things were burnt.

The one with a house and a lot of wealth and money in the bank such that if his home is touched he will build another, that was not touched. And what unity if the cattle a person sees at a neighbours' place has not been returned? Every leader, every Kenyan, we have a responsibility of telling Kenyans to stay peacefully because if you cause incitement, it is the poor who fight among themselves. Leaders look and see that it is a movie they are watching. You people of Nyamira County, the youth of Nyamira, if you say in Nyamira there will be peace and there will be no violence of any type, that is how it will be. Therefore, I am asking every county, Kenyans to decide. We want peace so that we can, each person, fend for himself. If we depend on the one that is brought during elections, we will eat it in one day or two days, and five years which is one thousand eight hundred and about fifty days, you will suffer because you do not eat the campaign money. You depend on the sweat of your hands.

CITIZEN TV. 2012, December, 8th. http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dvhsxbokfOY.