

LANGUAGE AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS: LINGUISTIC SUPPORT FOR OTHER ACADEMIC DISCIPLINES

Piotr Twardzisz

<https://doi.org/10.5817/CZ.MUNI.P210-9767-2020-11>

Abstract: This article outlines the content of an elective university course designed for domestic and international students, combining language and international relations. The course is intended to make students more sensitive to the linguistic intricacies of a specialist variety of English. The focus is on its written modes, particularly writing and reading academic (professional) texts dealing with complex foreign policy issues. As a result, students are expected to enhance their academic writing skills. The linguistic component of the course is backed up with a review of world affairs. Conversely, the field of international relations theory is enriched by a systematic study of language effects observed in the respective discourse. The interdisciplinarity of this enterprise benefits students with different academic and cultural backgrounds.

Keywords: fictivity, international relations, intertextuality, metaphor, metonymy, phraseology, specialist discourse, terminology

1 INTRODUCTION

Interdisciplinarity in teaching and research has been encouraged in academia in recent years. It has been common for numerous traditional core disciplines such as linguistics, psychology or sociology to expand, by incorporating modifying adjectives, into new, blended areas such as applied linguistics, cognitive psychology or political sociology, to name but a few. However, it has not been very easy to extend one traditional discipline by combining it with another one. While in theory any such combination is possible, in practice, the resulting mergers encounter various institutional obstacles. Conference organizers cannot always be persuaded to accept interdisciplinary paper proposals as these deviate from the conference core themes. Journal editors are not sure whether to accept submissions which thematically extend beyond the accepted borders of the key disciplines. Most impediments are usually motivated by different kinds of institutional and organizational factors. Universities increasingly encourage their lecturers to offer courses which, on the one hand, are directed at students from different fields of study and, on the other, broaden the horizons of students from one academic area. At any rate, interdisciplinarity in curriculum design is consonant with universities' mid- and long-term development strategies. It is meant to attract students from a variety of departments whose academic goals are constantly being reshaped.

One such disciplinary combination worth pursuing embraces linguistics and international relations. It makes perfect sense to combine language with international affairs as the latter is conducted mostly by means of the former. This article focuses on the relationship between these two areas of knowledge. Language embraces a variety of topics (e.g. word-formation, phonology, syntax, discourse analysis etc.) studied for a degree in (applied) linguistics or foreign language philology. A degree in international relations covers the main academic discipline and its neighbouring fields with their ongoing research and specialist literatures. It also implies media discourse, which involves both more popular types of content as well as highly informative and linguistically challenging texts. The combination of the two scholarly fields results in a unique common area whose discourse is referred to here as the *language of international relations*, or *language of IR* for short. It may be referred to as a genre, or, at least, a sub-genre. It caters to a wide spectrum of stakeholders: students, academics, researchers, (future) policy makers, pundits and practitioners in international relations (e.g. diplomats, journalists). Besides discussing the various components of the course, the article argues for a continuing dissemination of multi-topic courses driven by interdisciplinary research.

2 THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE LANGUAGE OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

These days, a profound knowledge of world affairs constitutes a measure of one's erudition. While English has been unanimously accepted as a *lingua franca* of diplomacy and international business, the knowledge of other "international" languages – French, Spanish, Russian, Arabic or Chinese – has been viewed as helpful, to say the least. Students of foreign languages and linguistics are the primary candidates to satisfy the language

requirement, though they lack a background in world politics. Students of international relations have the necessary theoretical foundation in international relations theory, although they need more specialized training in linguistics. Both groups of students may benefit from a course which blends linguistic tools, concepts and research methods with those of international relations theory and practice. The cross-fertilization of ideas from disciplines which do not meet on a daily basis results in a unique university offering, both attractive and challenging.

This article discusses the topics included in a one-semester, elective, university course, consisting of 30 contact hours. Students enrolling in this course are both domestic students and international ones who happen to attend University of Warsaw (UW), Poland, on a short- or long-term basis. The course is a general, university-level course, which means that it is directed at all students currently enrolled at UW. They may decide to take it at the undergraduate (BA), graduate (MA) or doctoral level for a given number of ECTS points. The students' fields of study and nationalities are diverse. Usually, about half of those enrolled are international students. It is both the growing numbers of the students enrolling and the positive end-of-the-course evaluations received that provide a stimulus for the lecturer to continue the course. While the syllabus and accompanying materials are refreshed before every new semester, the core content remains stable and will be discussed below.

2.1 A historical and terminological introduction

An elective and eclectic course of this kind requires a very thorough introduction, meaning a historical and terminological introduction. In fact, both history and terminology go hand in hand. Pivotal historical facts are full of indispensable terminology and key terms require a historical background without which they would not be comprehended.

Although modern international relations began much later, antiquity is when the roots of contemporary IR can be found. The primeval sense of togetherness was present in numerous tribal organizations, but the first documented institutionalized forms were known as the Greek city-state system (disintegrated by the middle of the fourth century BC), followed by the Roman Empire (gone by the fourth century AD). These organizations were replaced by the Western (Latin) Church, the Eastern (Orthodox) Church, and, from the seventh century, Islam. The last *player* was counterbalanced by Christianity, or Christendom, in Europe and further afield. All of these constituted early forms of institutionalized togetherness, which, for international relations, is a necessary prerequisite. Medieval Europe ushered in a new form of international relationships (cf. Musolf 2009, 2010). The modern concept of a political state was not yet in place, but thinkers such as Augustine and Thomas Aquinas were already fostering this idea to justify the concept of a *just war*.

All introductory textbooks in IR list the *Peace of Westphalia* of 1648 as the point in time at which the modern study of international relations was conceived. Since that time, the specialist lexicon has been enriched with such terms as *self-determination*, (state) *sovereignty*, *balance of power* and *non-interference* (in another state's domestic affairs). Other pivotal historical events with their terminologies which are reviewed are the French Revolution, the First World War and the Second World War. The terminological mine resulting from the Cold War (1946?–1991?) is well known (e.g., *arms race*, *Iron*

Curtain, nuclear world war, proxy war, psychological warfare, etc.). More recent decades have supplied the lexicons with endless lists of new terms such as *amorphous terrorism, cultural relativism, environmentalism, globalization, NATO expansion, postmodernism or sole superpower*. Interestingly, even the relevant time periods have not yet been given unique labels. Instead, rather unrevealing names such as the *post-Cold War* period (1991–2001) and the *post-post-Cold War* period (2001–) have been temporarily coined and used in the literature. The entire period since the end of WWII has been characterized by terminological and conceptual wealth.

Terminology is used in different periods, but it also characterizes particular schools of thought in the field. It is important that students are able to combine the major approaches to international relations with the concepts littering specialist texts. The accepted division of schools in IR is as follows: (1) realist, (2) pluralist (also liberal or rationalist) and (3) structuralist (also Marxist or revolutionist). Realism, the oldest tradition in IR, goes as far back as ancient China (Sun Tzu) and ancient Greece (Thucydides). It has dominated thinking about international relations in many places and for many years. Thanks to realism, the concept of a political state has surfaced as the most important entity (*actor*) in the international *arena*. As Brown and Ainley (2009: 70) put it, “realism offers a state-centric account of the world”. Students are exposed to a situation in which states – like players in a game – are in constant competition for power. The second IR school (rationalism) assumes more harmony and cooperation between actors of the international game. Ideally, people are more ready to cooperate and to limit their own objectives in favour of their society’s common good (Hugo Grotius, John Locke and John Stuart Mill). Here, states are not the only actors on the international *stage*. There are others, such as *non-, supra- or sub-state* actors, all eclipsing the traditional status and position of the state. The third IR model (structuralism etc.) has its roots in the theories of Rousseau, Kant and Marx as well as the radical theorists of the twentieth century. According to representatives of this school of thought, the existing unjust and corrupt international order needs to be revised and rebuilt (Stern 1998: 14). The issues of unjust power relations favouring the privileged over the underprivileged reverberate across this framework.

The terminological introduction cannot ignore Thomas Hobbes, the seventeenth-century English political writer. In his often-quoted *Leviathan* (Hobbes 1943), he contributed new concepts and new language, later to be exploited in the newly-born discipline of international relations. His basic concept is that of a *common power* “which will be able to defend its people from an invasion of foreigners and the injuries of one another” (Hobbes 1943: 89). Common power is a metaphorical concept which paves the way for a total novelty in the seventeenth century, namely a *sovereign state*. In return for providing security to its citizens, the sovereign state will expect its people to maintain a sense of shared identity and to remain loyal to this state. This covenant of all citizens is to produce a *commonwealth, an assembly of men, a union, a representative, or a Leviathan*, to use Hobbes’s terminology. The concept of *sovereignty* became a crucial term, designating a policy of *non-interference*. This principle, in turn, solidified the “development of the secular nation-state” (Griffiths et al. 2008: 299).

One more key term which is fundamental to this course is that of an *actor*. This concept is used either generically, to refer to any entity in the IR arena, or

specifically, to refer to two basic kinds of IR entities. In the first sense, an actor is any entity of international significance which appears in the global or regional context. In the second sense, actors are divided into *state-actors* (e.g., Bolivia, Somalia etc.) and *non-state-actors* (e.g., Al-Qaeda, the EU, Google, the UN etc.), also referred to as *other actors* (Hill 2003: 41). With the growing number and variety of non-state-actors, they are becoming a challenging topic for individual research conducted by students. Besides well-established *inter-governmental organizations (IGOs)* and *non-governmental organizations (NGOs)*, numerous other less classifiable entities (e.g., the *Arab street*, the *Pentagon*) can be singled out. The terminological distinction is also made between a *state* and a *nation*, especially that so-called *nation-states* are gradually disappearing.

Finally, the terminological introduction includes a repertoire of kinds of states. The student is confronted with the idea of statehood as a scalar phenomenon. The premier league of statehood includes terms such as: *super power*, *great power* and *middle power*. At the other end of this spectrum, the following terms are encountered: *vassal state*, *satellite*, *revisionist state*, *military dictatorship*, *maverick state*, *outlaw*, *outcast*, *pariah*, *failed state*, *villain state*, and *rogue state*. Interestingly for linguistic purposes, the adjective *rogue* is used in a number of contexts, for instance: *rogue formula*, *rogue framework*, *rogue concept* or *rogue threat* and many others.

It is important for this introduction that terminology intermingles with history or current affairs. An extralinguistic context has a priming function for any introductions and further discussions of the key terms.

2.2 The sources of language data

The course under discussion is data-based, or even data-driven. No matter which variant is more appropriate, language data permeate all classes and topics raised. Therefore, the collection of relevant and up-to-date language data constitutes an important stage in the preparation of this course. There is no single source from which the data are retrieved. The language extracts are drawn from multiple corpora, numerous specialist online venues and varied printed sources. The collection process requires a constant search for multifarious publications, both academic as well as more popular types. Also, the compilation of data is a long, drawn-out process, which, in this case, has taken a few years. The identification of language data to be included in the course must be correlated with the topics to be dealt with. Thus, different searches focus on specific linguistic issues: morphologically complex term formation, phraseology, metaphor or genre-characteristic grammatical constructions.

As far as academic sources are concerned, these can be divided into linguistic publications with a social turn and IR publications with a linguistic twist. There is a group of linguists who focus their research on the language of domestic and foreign affairs. Also, there is a camp of researchers within IR who analyse language as used by theorists and practitioners of international relations. Linguistic publications focusing on IR are, for example: Chilton & Ilyin (1993), Chilton & Lakoff (1995), Chilton (1996a) and Twardzisz (2013). IR publications which concentrate on language are, for example: Beer and Hariman (1996), Beer and De Landtsheer (2004) and Marks (2011). Researchers formally affiliated with either discipline have debated the same concepts: the *state is a container* metaphor, the *state is a person* metaphor, the *billiard-ball* model or

the *falling dominoes* theory. The content of this data-rich course shows the important role of language and linguistics in the study of international relations.

3 THE UBIQUITY OF METAPHOR AND METONYMY

The 1980s witnessed something that can be labelled a *metaphor revolution* in linguistics and other related areas. The highly acclaimed book *Metaphors We Live by* (Lakoff & Johnson 1980) “revolutionized” the study of metaphor (Steen 2009: 25). As a result, researching metaphor became “a highly attractive field of study in the twentieth century, and especially over the past twenty years” (Skorczyńska 2001: 43). In the mid-nineties, Goatly (1997: 4) reported that the number of books and publications from the 1970s in the area of metaphor resembled an “explosion”.

Both domestic politics and international relations are commonly assumed by metaphor linguists to be constructed metaphorically (Musolff 2004: 2). Similarly, the metaphor community within IR also believe that metaphor is ubiquitous in the discourse of IR (cf. Thornborrow 1993, Beer & De Landtsheer 2004, Marks 2011). IR language is held to be “replete with metaphors” (Shimko 2004: 200). Conceptual metaphor theorists believe that not only language is metaphorical, but also, if not primarily, our thinking and actions are motivated by metaphor. Thus, also foreign policy itself is understood as “metaphorical through and through” (Chilton & Lakoff 1995: 39).

Metaphor has become a convenient shorthand for simplifying numerous vague and esoteric concepts. The century-old concept of international security is thoroughly dealt with in Chilton (1996a, b) when he elaborates on so-called *security metaphors*. Rohrer in his (1991) paper enumerates an endless list of metaphors relating to *regional peace*, for example:

- (1) (a) *regional peace is a physical entity*
 (b) *regional peace is a building*
 (c) *regional peace is a machine*
 (d) *regional peace is a tool*
 (e) *regional peace is problem solving*
 (f) *regional peace is a contest*
 (g) *regional peace is gambling*
 (h) *regional peace is a movement toward*
 (i) *regional peace is a business agreement*
 (Rohrer 1991: 169–174)

The existence of the above metaphors is justified by even one sentence uttered in connection with the notion of regional peace and recorded in a particular source. However, it does not sound convincing that motivation for a given metaphor can be provided by one expression only.

Students are exposed to the simplifying function of metaphors which are particularly complex and abstract in the dynamic realm of IR. Metaphor researchers underline this simplifying and clarifying role of conceptual metaphor thanks to which comprehension is significantly facilitated (Chilton 1996a: 32, Thompson 1996: 187, Semino 2008: 90). Two other functions of metaphor in IR discourse – legitimizing

and hiding – are also outlined. Students benefit from eliciting convenient metaphorical vocabulary which enriches their advanced written assignments.

As the course in question is meant to facilitate academic writing in the field of international relations, students are exposed to two kinds of written tasks when dealing with metaphor. One of these is written elaboration of the explicit metaphors encountered in specialist texts. The other is the detection of metaphors concealed in texts and their written reconstruction. The literature devoted to the cold war period abounds in metaphors worth mastering: the *iron curtain*, the *state is a container* metaphor, the *state is a person* metaphor and others. For example, the *containment* metaphor is to be detected in a sentence such as:

(2) *Ideas and products **flow into** the United States freely, and **flow out** with equal ease.*

In the 1990s, the *containment* metaphor was reactivated in the context of the Serbian (and Croatian) concept of *ethnic cleansing*. The *state is a person* metaphor is concealed in a sentence such as:

(3) **China behaved** in a manner which suggested it wanted to expand its influence over Asia.

The literature in the post-cold war period is full of *animation*, *personification* and *de-personification* metaphors. These are extremely complex and require significant background knowledge to identify and further elaborate. *Personification* has become a convenient shorthand for any metaphorization by which human qualities are transferred to non-human entities. The opposite direction – *de-personification*, which consists in the removal of human features from humans – has attracted the attention of scholars in the post-post-cold war period (Ivie 2004: 79). Students are required to scour passages with mappings between terrorists and dangerous animals, parasites or insects (Charteris-Black 2006: 181–182). At the same time, students are requested to conduct a critical analysis of highly politicized metaphorizations imposed on the reader in linguistic literature concerning de-personification (cf. Twardzisz 2013: 111–114).

Metonymy, which is a related phenomenon, is analysed alongside metaphor effects. The combination of metaphor with metonymy, which occurs naturally in IR contexts, provides students with more challenging tasks when it comes to detecting and identifying each of them. In one of the activities, students are asked to provide metonymic templates for sentences given such as:

(4) (a) *Let's not allow Kosovo to become another Vietnam.*

(b) *Oklahoma City has left a lot of scars.*

Suggested metonymic template: *place for event*

(5) (a) *Clinton wanted to bomb Iraq.*

(b) *Bush may pull out of Kosovo.*

Suggested metonymic template: *controller for controlled*

(6) (a) *Wall Street is in a state of panic.*

(b) *The White House and Capitol Hill continue to squabble.*

Suggested metonymic template: *place for institution*

Awareness of how metonymy combines with metaphor is useful in writing advanced academic texts. Very sophisticated combinations may be obtained once appropriate proper names are combined with metaphorically used verbal phrases, for example:

- (7) **Russia may have thrown in the towel** on seeking to shape the immediate outcome significantly. (*Newsweek*, June 20, 1999)

The degree of freedom observed between a metaphorical verb and a proper name in the position of an active voice subject may be surprising. It is important for students aspiring to advanced academic writing to adopt numerous possible noun-verb combinations. The verb *see*, used in an extended sense, appears to be frequently used in IR contexts with metonymic proper names, for example:

- (8) **Brussels has seen** a series of parliamentary games.

Animation, or personification, on the verb accompanied by a metonymic proper name in the subject position is pervasive in IR specialist texts (cf. Twardzisz 2014, 2015), for example:

- (9) (a) *It's true that Kashmir is bleeding, but so is India.*
 (b) *Berlin is consciously trying to confront the history of the Holocaust.*
 (c) *Pyongyang is making missile threats.*

It is essential to keep the range of international actors open to allow a certain flexibility between the subject and the following verb, as in: *Aeroflot is fuming ...*, *the Kremlin is trying to force ...* or *Mercedes-Benz opened a dealership ...*. The intimate interplay between formally inanimate subjects and active verbs requires more research as it has not been explored thoroughly yet (cf. Master 1991). A cursory glimpse at selected sentences taken from publications in IR shows an increased prevalence of such constructions.

4 MORPHOLOGICAL PRODUCTIVITY

Another area that deserves a thorough survey in this course is that of word- or term-formation. Without a doubt, any competent writer of specialist texts in IR must master the skill of accommodating morphologically complex words in their writing.

Initially, students are exposed to *productive* word-formation patterns observed in IR discourse (cf. Plag et al. 1999). The most productive derivational areas are:

- (10) (a) the causative suffix *-ize* (e.g., *Iranize*, *Germanize*)
 (b) the *Nomina Actionis* suffix *-(iz)ation* (e.g., *Chileanization*)
 (c) the *Nomina Essendi* suffix *-ness* (e.g., *Polishness*)
 (d) the negating prefix *un-* (e.g., *un-French*)
 (e) the prefix *anti-* (e.g., *anti-British*)
 (f) the prefix *pro-* (e.g., *pro-China*)
 (g) the prefix *de-* (e.g., *de-Russification*)

There are several activities conducted in class regarding morphologically complex words in the specialist discourse of IR.

One consists in providing a paraphrase of a complex formation used in context. Students are asked to paraphrase the intended meanings of complex structures which they have never encountered before and whose meaning cannot be checked in dictionaries. Dictionaries are useful only partially when it comes to retrieving a very general sense, but not a more concrete meaning of a given construction. For example, a general sense of what the suffix *-ize* adds to a derivational base can be obtained from numerous dictionaries. However, this general sense only partially covers the meanings of rare formations such as *to Cubanize Venezuela*. The same applies to other affixed formations, for example, *the Iranization of Syria*, *to define Frenchness*, etc.

Another activity concentrates on the actual word-formation patterns, which students are requested to spell out as precisely as possible. On the basis of a certain input, students are to propose an assembly path which is to be followed in order to produce a fully-fledged novel formation needed in someone's specialist writing. The usual input consists of several selected constructions involving a morphologically complex formation, for example:

- (11) (a) *the **Chileanization** of copper*
 (b) *the **Belgianization** of Europe*
 (c) *the **Koreanization** of Western food*

On the basis of several such constructions, individual patterns like [[[Chile_N] an_{Adj}] ize_V] ation_N] can be proposed. Subsequently, on the basis of several such individual patterns, a more general schema is constructed: [[state/region] suffix_{Adj}] (iz)ation], with its intended meaning 'more of a given state/region'. Awareness of such patterns, local or general ones, allows students to approach the writing process more creatively. At the same time, established word-formation patterns serve as "local grammars" sanctioning the well-formedness of novel formations.

Yet another activity to be conducted in class is the morphological exploitation of one derivational base with several different affixes. This gives students a chance to create their own derivations to be accommodated in invented contexts, for example: (to) *Europeanize*, *Europeanization*, *Europeanness*, *anti-Europeanism*, *pro-Europeanism*, *un-European*, etc. As the frequency of use of attested formations fluctuates, students are encouraged to run their own frequency checks in online corpora, such as the *Corpus of Contemporary American English* (COCA) (Davies 2008–). Prior research shows that there are frequency differences exhibited by particular affixes appended to different names (cf. Twardzisz 2012a, Twardzisz & Nowosielska 2019).

5 FICTIVITY

Apart from actual participants and events, much of what is written about in IR discourse remains fictive (or virtual). Both academic and media publications contain numerous instances of fictivity. Interestingly, some linguists and IR theorists distinguish between some kind of actuality and fictivity, which host actual and fictive entities and events respectively. In cognitive linguistics, Langacker (1999) proposes that the majority of linguistic entities and processes are fictive rather than actual and they

occupy a so-called *fictive plane*, as opposed to an *actual plane*. Also, one of the major IR schools assumes a division similar to the one proposed in cognitive linguistics. It is common practice to draw a distinction between a *psychological* environment and an *operational* environment, as elaborated, among others, in Farrands (1989). A fictive plane corresponds to a psychological environment. The psychological environment constitutes the policy environment as foreign policy makers see, perceive and understand it.

Fictive entities litter IR written discourse to such an extent that they cannot be ignored. Consider a few examples of such entities:

- (12) (a) *a Taliban-controlled Afghanistan*
 (b) *an unstable Pakistan*
 (c) *a Palestinian Anwar Sadat*
 (d) *a tremulous Yasir Arafat*

In a sentence, a virtual entity such as *a tremulous Yasir Arafat* shows up in the following way.

- (13) *Jordan's King Hussein, bald and drawn after months of cancer treatments, said Clinton has "the tolerance and patience of Job." **A tremulous Yasir Arafat** called the president "a great leader of the world."* (Newsweek, Nov 9, 1998)

Students become acquainted with a sufficient amount of authentic data in which numerous such "deviations" from the norm are used. Some analytical work follows. On the basis of several occurrences of the name *Yasir Arafat* in its common noun use (*an increasingly frustrated Yasir Arafat* [YA₁], *a tremulous Yasir Arafat* [YA₂], *an outraged Yasir Arafat* [YA₃]), students establish a variable such as YA_N, which serves as a template for potential fictive conceptualizations derived from the base *Yasir Arafat*. Such a template (bearing any name) serves as an aid for students who produce their own extensions towards novel fictive entities and events (e.g., *France goes all the way down with Italy on ...*). An extensive discussion of other cases of fictivity in IR discourse can be found in Twardzisz (2012b).

6 PHRASEOLOGY

Language chunks, sequences, collocations and phrases, although not necessarily synonymous, play an important role in the construction of specialist texts. In this course, the phraseology component focuses on word sequences characteristic of IR discourse. The knowledge of such sequences is indispensable for competent writing in the discipline. Students are exposed to passages with phrases unique to IR content. They are required to combine scattered elements into sequences constituting fixed phrases, for example: *abuse of + power*, *oath of + allegiance*, *coercive + measures*, *axis of + evil*, *collective + security*, etc. Phraseological fine-tuning, or selecting the best collocate, appears to be a challenging task. Students identify the best suiting candidate out of a few available to complete a gapped sequence, for example: *arms / weapons + mass destruction*, *safe / secure + haven*, *best / most-favoured + state*, *loose / free + nukes* and so on.

7 CONCLUSIONS

Due to the limitations of space it is not possible to fully explore the content of the course in question and only its major themes and components have been laid out. One final topic which is dealt with but has not been mentioned is that of intertextuality. Elusive and multi-layered, intertextuality is an important aspect of specialist texts in IR. It also poses a pedagogic challenge to the instructor. While it is interesting and at times even entertaining to trace the discursive origins of the phrase *all the president's women*, it is not clear how class activities could be organized in an engaging and pedagogically sound manner. Some cases of intertextuality may be fun for students, but they should not be associated exclusively with amusement. However, many of the themes covered cause a smile (e.g., *Watergate* > *Monicagate*).

On the positive side of the ledger, the course is thematically diverse enough to keep everyone awake. It is linguistically challenging for most participants. Also, thanks to systematized input from the two disciplines, it broadens young people's horizons. On closer inspection, the course also reveals its weak points. One of them is its shortness. Given the amount of material to be presented and discussed, relatively little time is left for students' own research plus feedback. The classes so far have been mixed-ability groups, which constrains the instructor linguistically. As the language of instruction is English, the content of the course is overwhelmingly Anglocentric. It is desirable to linguistically diversify the content of a course which covers international issues. At any rate, interdisciplinary courses involving stimulating and challenging agendas should be offered more often than they are at present.

References

- Beer, F. A. and Hariman, R. (1996) 'Realism and rhetoric in international relations.' In: Beer, F. A. and Hariman, R. (eds) *Post-Realism: The Rhetorical Turn in International Relations*. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press. 1–34.
- Beer, F. A. and De Landtsheer, Ch. (eds) (2004) *Metaphorical World Politics*. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press. Brown, Ch. and Ainley, K. (2009) *Understanding International Relations*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Charteris-Black, J. (2006) *Politicians and Rhetoric: The Persuasive Power of Metaphor*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230501706>
- Chilton, P. and Ilyin, M. (1993) 'Metaphor in political discourse: The case of the "common European house".' *Discourse & Society* 4(1), 7–31. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926593004001002>
- Chilton, P. and Lakoff, G. (1995) 'Foreign policy by metaphor.' In: Schäffner, Ch. And Wenden, A. L. (eds) *Language and Peace*. Aldershot: Dartmouth. 37–59.
- Chilton, P. (1996a) *Security Metaphors: Cold War Discourse from Containment to Common House*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Chilton, P. (1996b) 'The meaning of security.' In: Beer, F. A. and Hariman, R. (eds) *Post-Realism: The Rhetorical Turn in International Relations*. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press. 193–216.

- Davies, M. (2008–) ‘The Corpus of Contemporary American English (560 million words) [COCA].’ <<https://www.english-corpora.org/coca/>>.
- Farrands, Ch. (1989) ‘The context of foreign policy systems: Environment and structure.’ In: Clarke, M. and White, B. (eds) *Understanding Foreign Policy. The Foreign Policy Systems Approach*. Aldershot: Edward Elgar. 84–108.
- Goatly, A. (1997) *The Language of Metaphors*. London and New York: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203210000>
- Griffiths, M., O’Callaghan, T. and Roach, S. C. (2008) *International Relations. The Key Concepts*, 2nd edition. London and New York: Routledge.
- Hill, Ch. (2003) *The Changing Politics of Foreign Policy*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hobbes, Th. (1943) *Leviathan*. London: J. M. Dent & Sons Ltd.
- Ivie, R. L. (2004) ‘Democracy, war, and decivilizing metaphors of American insecurity.’ In: Beer, F. A. and De Landtsheer, Ch. (eds) *Metaphorical World Politics*. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press. 75–90.
- Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. (1980) *Metaphors We Live by*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Langacker, R. W. (1999) ‘Virtual reality.’ *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences* 29(2), 77–103.
- Marks, M. P. (2011) *Metaphors in International Relations Theory*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230339187>
- Master, P. (1991) ‘Active verbs with inanimate subjects in scientific prose.’ *English for Specific Purposes* 10(1), 15–33. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0889-4906\(91\)90013-M](https://doi.org/10.1016/0889-4906(91)90013-M)
- Musulff, A. (2004) *Metaphor and Political Discourse: Analogical Reasoning in Debates about Europe*. London: Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230504516>
- Musulff, A. (2009) ‘Metaphor in the history of ideas and discourses: How can we interpret a medieval version of the *body-state* analogy?’ In: Musulff, A. and Zinken, J. (eds) *Metaphor and Discourse*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. 233–247. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230594647_15
- Musulff, A. (2010) ‘Political metaphor and *bodies politic*.’ In: Okulska, U. and Cap, P. (eds) *Perspectives in Politics and Discourse*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 23–41. <https://doi.org/10.1075/dapsac.36.05mus>
- Plag, I., Dalton-Puffer, Ch. and Baayen, H. (1999) ‘Morphological productivity across speech and writing.’ *English Language and Linguistics* 3(2), 209–228. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1360674399000222>
- Rohrer, T. (1991) ‘To plow the sea: Metaphors for regional peace in Latin America.’ *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity* 6(3), 163–181. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327868ms0603_2
- Semino, E. (2008) *Metaphor in Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shimko, K. L. (2004) ‘The power of metaphors and the metaphors of power: The United States in the cold war and after.’ In: Beer, F. A. and De Landtsheer, Ch. (eds) *Metaphorical World Politics*. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press. 199–215.
- Skorczyńska, H. (2001) ‘Metaphor in scientific business journals and business periodicals: An example of the scientific discourse popularisation.’ *Ibérica* 3, 43–60.

- Steen, G. J. (2009) 'Three kinds of metaphor in discourse: A linguistic taxonomy.' In: Musolff, A. and Zinken, J. (eds) *Metaphor and Discourse*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. 25–39. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230594647_3
- Stern, G. (1998) *The Structure of International Society: An Introduction to the Study of International Relations*. London and Washington: Pinter.
- Thompson, S. (1996) 'Politics without metaphors is like a fish without water.' In: Mio, J. S. and Katz, A. N. (eds) *Metaphor: Implications and Applications*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. 185–201. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315789316-11>
- Thornborrow, J. (1993) 'Metaphors of security: A comparison of representation in defence discourse in post-Cold-War France and Britain.' *Discourse & Society* 4(1), 99–119. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926593004001006>
- Twardzisz, P. (2012a) 'Derivational processes in the discourse of international relations. The case of press articles on international politics.' *Lodz Papers in Pragmatics* 8(2), 289–307. <https://doi.org/10.1515/lpp-2012-0015>
- Twardzisz, P. (2012b) 'Virtual reality in cognitive linguistics and the psychological environment in foreign policy analysis.' In: Hart, Ch. (ed.) *Selected Papers from UK-CLA Meetings* (vol. 1). 94–109. 10 November 2019 <http://www.uk-cla.org.uk/proceedings/volume_1>.
- Twardzisz, P. (2013) *The Language of Interstate Relations. In Search of Personification*. Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137332707>
- Twardzisz, P. (2014) 'Futile pursuits of metonymic targets in political and legal contexts.' *Linguistik online* 65(3), 87–103. 10 November 2019. <https://bop.unibe.ch/linguistik-online/issue/view/345>.
- Twardzisz, P. (2015) 'Identifying and measuring personification in journalistic discourse.' In: Kosecki, K. and Badio, J. (eds) *Empirical Methods in Language Studies*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang. 151–164.
- Twardzisz, P. and Nowosielska, B. (2019) 'The salience of local schemas in a productive word-formation process.' *Review of Cognitive Linguistics* 17(2), 359–382. <https://doi.org/10.1075/rcl.00039.twa>

Piotr Twardzisz is Associate Professor in the Institute of Applied Linguistics, University of Warsaw, Poland. His research interests focus on specialist languages, English for specific purposes, figurative language, word formation and corpus linguistics. His recent books are *The Language of Interstate Relations. In Search of Personification* (2013, Palgrave) and *Defining 'Eastern Europe'. A Semantic Inquiry into Political Terminology* (2018, Palgrave).

Address: Piotr Twardzisz, Institute of Applied Linguistics, University of Warsaw, ul. Dobra 55, 00-312 Warsaw, Poland. [e-mail: p.twardzisz@uw.edu.pl]