JDSS **Journal of Development and Social Sciences**

www.jdss.org.pk

RESEARCH PAPER

Ideology Construction through Ideological Warfare: A Critical Discourse Analysis of Imran Khan and Narendra Modi's Speeches at UNGA

[1] Ammara Farhan *   [2] Muhammad Shahbaz   [3] Raja Muhammad Ishtiaq Khan

1. PhD Scholar, Department of English, GC Women University Sialkot, Punjab, Pakistan
2. Assistant Professor, Department of English, GC Women University Sialkot, Punjab, Pakistan
3. Lecturer, Deanship of Preparatory Years, Majmaah University, AlZulfi Campus, KSA

PAPER INFO	ABSTRACT
 *Corresponding Author: ammara.farhan531@gmail.com	Political discourses can help in understanding political ideologies and agendas of people hidden beneath the surface level meaning of words. These ideologies, implicit and explicit, reveal political motives within contextual parameters and settings. This paper aims to identify the elements of commonality and difference in the speeches of Pakistani Prime Minister, Imran Khan and his Indian counterpart, Mr. Narendra Modi at the 75th session of United Nations General Assembly and analyze their respective political ideologies and foreign policy narratives as portrayed through their choices of words in these speeches. Application of critical discourse analysis through significant theoretical frameworks reveal that ideological underpinnings in both the speeches are distinct and common agenda is rare despite imminent conflicting issues awaiting resolution. Their speeches are loaded with particular type of words and agendas that suit the narrative of their particular regional and international discourse. Critical discourse analysis of these speeches demonstrates a lack of convergent ideas creating challenges in resolution of issues faced by these neighboring states.

Introduction

Home Language plays an important role in community for share communication (Shahbaz & Khan, 2017; Khan et al; 2018, 2020: Shahbaz et al., 2016). This paper aims to identify the elements of commonality and difference in the speeches of Pakistani Prime minister, Imran Khan and his Indian counterpart, Mr. Narendra Modi. The two leaders are spear heading neighboring states in south Asia. The two neighboring states have a long history of estranged relationships primarily on the basis of the unresolved issue of the state of Jammu and Kashmir which is awaiting a plebiscite ever since the two states emerged on the world map in 1947. It would be interesting to see how the key political leaders endeavor to construct socio political ideology at an opportune forum such as United Nations General Assembly .For the purpose, the study analyses the political discourse of the two Heads of states and utilizes Critical Discourse analysis as a method of inquiry.

Discourse has the ability to reproduce ideology (Fairclough, 1992). Those who have the ability to shape the public opinion can approach the power structures in discourse to an optimum effect. Political speeches, parliamentary debates, media interviews and shows, and political advertising are some of the specimens of political discourse (van Dijk, 1997). Political speech, being a political genre, can offer reflection into political ideologies and manifest implicit agenda. Wodak (2004) believes that political speeches can produce and reproduce beliefs, opinions, and ideologies. These offer political text structures as well political contexts.Discourse analysis is a type of inquiry that focuses on the relationship between written or spoken language and its social context (Potter and Edward, 1998). Its objective is to gain an understanding of how language is employed in everyday settings (Achugar, 2017). When conducting discourse analysis,one may wish to concentrate on the objectives and impacts of various types of language (Uzokova, 2020).

Literature Review

Text, apart from being a mere collection of words in a varied and diverse order, is an instrument, specimen and subject for analysis. Text when actualized within a particular context is termed as discourse (Nasri, 2018). Discourse is an umbrella with different dimensions and layers of meaning (Titscher, 2000) and a resource for a multitude of theoretical perspectives. Critical discourse Analysis (CDA) studies text and talk (Van Dijk, 2004) within contextual parameters and the way power is exercised through discourse. Discourse, language within a context, may act as a tool and medium for exploitation and manipulation by social actors within a contextual and communal setting and be a manifestation of ideological constructions and hegemonic establishments prevalent within a particular society.CDA helps in decoding the 'cognitive collaboration' (van Dijk, 2006: p.733) playing at so many levels during the production, processing and reception of discourse.

There are various landmark studies in the discipline that have subsequently attributed CDA its interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary status. Taking language as a form of social practice, the three-dimensional model by Fairclough (1989) is widely utilized due its interdisciplinary harmony and applicability in a myriad of contexts. It opens a window for probing the production and reception processes of a discourse within a social context by describing, interpreting and explaining it in detail.

CDA is a 'social approach to linguistics' which recognized power relations as 'a central theoretical issue' and text as the 'main unit of analysis' (Kress, 1989a). Van Dijk's socio-cognitive approach terms discourse as a semantic and cognitive phenomenon; the context not a social but a socio-cognitive phenomenon. Contexts are subjective and develop over the course of an interaction and evolve according to the ongoing subjective interpretation of communicative events.

Political speech is a specific genre constituting the generic knowledge and the specific context model (Van Dijk, 2007) within an epistemic community. Consequently, speeches tend to reflect distinct political ideologies at a conscious or subconscious level. Van Dijk's ideological square is a quest to identify and interpret ideological underpinnings within a particular text and enable an in-depth ideological analysis to express various

ideological stances. The idea is to emphasize positive things about Us; emphasize negative things about Them; de-emphasize negative things about Us; de-emphasize positive things about Them. this is a way forward to a broader contextual strategy of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation. The terms Us has a positive while the term Them has a negative connotation. A political text, such as a speech can be analyzed for its utilization of the Us and Them dichotomy. The polarization between the two reveals implicit and explicit political ideologies.

There is a frank realization of multifarious aspects of fuzzy boundaries in discourse studies and CDA is no exception. One of the criticisms levelled against CDA is its methodological and disciplinary lack of definition. The present study attempts to address the criticism by maintaining a firm footing in terms of textual evidence for all observations and analysis and refraining from generalisation. Textual analysis is carried out by text mining keywords that are studied in comparative analysis in both the speeches. Social interpretation is based on established theoretical frameworks and conclusions are drawn over potent textual evidence.

Material and Methods

The methodology incorporates keyword analysis at contextual and comparative level. A keywords sample is generated wherein keywords are enlisted in terms of Keyness value showcasing top thirty keywords from both speeches. The software used for the purpose is Antconc 3.5.8 (Windows 2019). The reference corpus used is the Brown University Standard Corpus for Present day American English which is used for the scientific study of the frequency and distribution of word categories in everyday language. The key words are analyzed comparatively in terms of their utilization in different socio political contexts by studying the concordances and frequency.

The theoretical frameworks utilized for the purpose are Fairclough's three dimensional model (1989, 1995)and Van Dijk's Ideological Square (2000). Fairclough's model provides three layers of analysis i.e. textual, discursive and social. For socio political and ideological analysis, Van Dijk's Ideological Square is thoroughly utilized as a conceptual framework in order to look for any polarization or binary oppositions existing dichotomously.

Results and Discussion

Concordance Analysis

For the purpose, a sample comprising of top thirty keywords (Table 1) in terms of Keyness value is examined for discursive processing. The comparison of the keywords reveals that elements of commonality are rare. The only words that are commonly used by both political actors are 'India', 'countries' and 'world'.

At comparative level, the keywords concordance results show the usage of the word 'India' in contexts such as 'the vision of a self-reliant India'; 'trust upon India'; 'India be kept out of the decision-making' ; 'India initiated 'International Day of Yoga'' in Narendra Modi's speech. There is no direct address to any state or Head of state. The reference is made indirectly through expressions such as 'in our neighborhood'; 'from

India's neighborhood'. There is emphasis on various areas of achievement such as 'Tuberculosis free India'; 'the pharmaceutical industry of India'; 'the contribution of India in the United Nations'; 'India's cultural heritage, tradition'.

Table 1
Comparative Analysis of Keyness in Speeches

Imran Khan's Speech		Narendra Modi's Speech	
Keyness	**Keywords**	**Keyness**	**Keywords**
+129.06	Muslim	+493.4	India
+126.09	Islam	+130.44	Excellency
+117.74	We	+128.3	Nations
+109.24	Muslims	+97.61	World
+108.04	Kashmir	+90.98	United
+108.03	Pakistan	+75.68	Global
+105.33	India	+71.2	Today
+96.03	pbuh	+57.08	Country
+84.02	Modi	+46.55	Welfare
+78.73	prophet	+43.84	Pandemic
+72.02	islamophobia	+27.64	Its
+72.02	Kashmiris	+26.76	Countries
+72.02	RSS	+26.11	People
+65.97	countries	+25.73	Empowerment
+56.09	Our	+25.73	Humankind
+48.01	curfew	+25.73	Initiatives
+48.01	terrorism	+24.08	Hundreds
+43.01	terrorists	+23.63	Initiated
+39.37	radical	+22.67	Experiences
+38.48	leaders	+22.67	Largest
+36.84	World	+22.45	We
+36	medina	+21.92	Neighborhood
+36	plundered	+21.92	Vaccine
+36	Pulwama	+20.58	Anniversary
+36	radicalization	+19.39	Wars
+34.69	This	+19.29	Interests
+34.25	attacks	+19.01	Reliant
+32.48	Indian	+18.89	Always
+32	humans	+18.6	Also
+31.51	havens	+18.59	Reform

Figure 1: Concordance of 'India' by Narendra Modi

Figure 2: Concordance of 'India' by Imran Khan

On the other hand, contextual use of the word India in Imran Khan's speech presents utilizations in multiple contexts such as 'India as a huge market'; Muslims 'radicalized in India'. He opens up about his own 'relationship with India' by recalling 'great friends in India' and how he 'loved going to India'. He goes on to address Indian accusation of Pakistan keeping 'militant organizations' and Indian dismissal of human rights in Kashmir over this pretext. There is a mention of India laying blame on Pakistan on two occasions in the speech. Imran Khan goes on to voice his disappointment over 'zero response from India' in response to his peace keeping initiatives. The negative other representation is frequent and persistent in his political narrative.

The use of the word 'countries' in Modi's speech points to the repetitive positive portrayal of India through information such as India sending essential medicines to 'more than 150 countries' and intending to help 'all the countries'. He maintains that 'other

countries' may benefitfrom India's experiences on the road of development and that it has always set a good precedent. Imran Khan, on the other hand, in the utilization of the word 'countries', expresses concern over a possibility of a war between two 'nuclear countries' with reference to India and Pakistan. He hints at the ease with which money from poor countries is laundered to the rich countries. The money to be spent on 'human development' leaves poor countries and 'billions of dollars' go to rich countries in the safe havens. The 'political will' of rich countries, he maintains, should manifest and they must 'not allow this flight of capital'.

Figure 3: Concordance of 'countries' by Nagendra Modi

Figure 4: Concordance of 'countries' by Imran Khan

The third common keyword is 'world'. Pakistani prime minister expressed a wish to 'educate the world about Islam'; showed concern about the 1.3 billion Muslims in the world and the response of 'world community' over the atrocities levelled against them. He regards climate change as the most pressing issue faced by the world in general and Pakistan in particular and calls for a 'combined effort of the world' to tackle it by voicing his apprehension over the failure to gauge the 'urgency of the situation'. Corruption is regarded a 'devastating' issue and how it is 'impoverishing' the developing world.

The Indian prime minister uses the keyword 'world' in terms of 'welfare of the whole world' and repeats the expression five times. Similarly, the phrase 'the whole world' is repeated four times. This repetition of the utility of the said word in the communal sense is reflecting the proposition of working together for mutual benefit.

Figure 5: Concordance of 'world' by Narendra Modi

Figure 6: Concordance of 'world' by Imran Khan

At a comparative level, the textual evidence presents rare elements of commonality between the socio political narratives of the two political actors. Even the words commonly used by both (India, countries, world), when studied in context, reveal distinct approaches.

Frequency analysis

Word frequencies also, offer substantial insights into the political ideologies of both the political actors. In terms of frequency, Imran Khan uses the words 'India' 16 times and 'indian' 6 times. Whereas Narendra Modi does not mention Pakistan even once. Narendra Modi's uses the word 'India' 50 times and kept the thematic development focused upon India. Concordance Plot 1 shows the recurrent use of 'India' which is 50 times during the course of his speech. Never mentioning Pakistan even once is noticeable

when his counterpart mentions India and Indians 22 times in his speech. This points at the predominant preference for self-portrayaland careful avoidance of certain pressing subjects like Kashmir which is taken up by his counterpart repetitively. Imran Khan's reference to Kashmir and Kashmiris is 15 times in total as opposed to Modi's zero.

Figure 7: Concordance Plot of (India-Modi**)**

Top 5 most frequent words used by Imran Khan are 'Muslim', 'Islam', 'Kashmir', 'Pakistan' and 'India'. Whereas Narendra Modi's most frequent words are 'India', 'excellency', 'nations', 'world' and 'united'(Table 2). The preference and repeated appearance of these words reflect the underlying ideology and narrative intended to be built at such a forum. Imran Khan has a pro-Muslim and Islam agenda which he deliberates with explicit clarity. The trio of 'Kashmir', 'Pakistan' and 'India' is an evident consideration of the issue of Kashmir. Narendra Modi choses to remain focused upon India and its relations with other nations in general and calls for a united front for all.

Table 2
Frequency of Keywords

Imran Khan's Speech		Narendra Modi's Speech	
Keywords	**Frequency**	**Keywords**	**Frequency**
Muslim	12	India	50
Islam	12	excellency	11
Kashmir	9	nations	20
Pakistan	11	world	25
India	15	united	20
Modi	7	global	7
islamophobia	6	country	13
Kashmiris	6	welfare	7
terrorism	4	pandemic	4
radical	6	people	11
world	16	largest	4
radicalization	3	vaccine	2
Indian	6	wars	3
humans	4	reform	3

Macro Analysis

Positive Self-representation

Apart from keywords commonly shared by the two leaders which maintained distinct contextual and discursive patterns, the study further focuses on rest of the keywords in the selected sample to be studied in specific contexts through concordance

findings to find out self-representation and other representation and consequently understand the political ideologies and how these are constructed.

Narendra Modi stresses on 'interests of humankind' over 'self-interests' and 'vested interests'. His reference to 'people' in India is in terms of populace and access to healthcare. He uses the superlative 'largest' for India in the domains of democratization, vaccine production and micro financing scheme. There is a mention of 'wars' in contexts such as civil wars within India and the world being on the verge of a third world War. There is a persistent use of stylistic devices for the purpose of positive self-representation such as adjectives in contexts such as, 'the world's largest democracy'; 'more than 1.3 billion people of India'; 'unparalleled'. It can be safely concluded that Modi's narrative is largely positive self-representation.

Negative Other Representation

On the radar of Van Dijk's Ideological Square (2000), Imran Khan's narrative is a clear case of binary opposition, Us vs Them. It is an obvious case of negative- other representation wherein the identity of Them is clearly identifiable.

The polarization between the rich and poor countries is put in perspective. Imran khan broaches subjects such as 'Islamophobia', 'radical Islam', and 'terrorism'. He presses the need to educate the world about Islam. He negates the categorization of radical and moderate Muslims as there is none and 'radical fringes' exist in all societies. The western world linking Islam with terrorism is termed as alleged and baseless. The 'mantra of Islamic terrorism' is spun as an excuse for 'marginalizing Muslim communities'. He speaks of the failure of Muslimleaders to advocate their case in the world. He sees Pakistan as the 'eye of the storm' for being blamed for terrorist activities and the convenience with which it is done.

Discussion and Findings

The study offers substantial insights into the political ideologies of the prime ministers of India and Pakistan. The Indian prime minister has exercised caution and preferred politically correct stance. The thematic development in his speech is guarded and restrained. There is a repeated emphasis on areas and sectors where India has shown progression. The reference to India being the largest democracy and one of the most populated countries in the world is frequent. He seems to view the world as a large community which should work for its shared benefit. He addresses United Nations repeatedly with respect to stability, empowerment, composition, role, characters, members, performance, structures, reforms, efforts, ideals on 20 occasions. The ideological Us is emphasizing the positive and deemphasizing the negative. There is hardly any binary opposition and stark criticism.

On the contrary, his Pakistani counterpart speaks on sensitive and evolving issues like Islamophobia, radicalization, marginalization, terrorism, money laundering and climate change. The Us vs Them dichotomy is prevalent at many instances such as his reference to 'poor' and 'rich' countries; western leaders; Muslim leaders; developing countries; ruling elite; western society; Jewish community, Muslim community. Within Van Dijk's ideological square (2000), the focus is tilted towards emphasizing negative

things about Them. He points at hegemonic establishments within the spheres of wealth distribution, marginalization and radicalization on the basis of religion.

The ideological course in both accounts is distinct and definitive at individual level and divergent at comparative level. For two neighboring states with pressing matters of mutual interest, a dearth of convergent ideas is quite noticeable. It is difficult to ascertain what is more imminent, a lack of similitude or an abundance of dissimilitude.

References:

Achugar, M. (2017). Critical discourse analysis and history. In *The routledge handbook of critical discourse studies* (pp. 298-311). Routledge.

Asensio, J. L. (Ideology, Identity, and Power: The Linguistic Construction of the Voice of the Other in Two Immigration Short Stories. Odisea, 17. 119-138.

Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and Power*. Longman).

Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis*. Longman

Widdowson, H. G. (2004). *Text, Context, Pretext: Critical Issues in Discourse Analysis*, Oxford: Blackwell

Gee, J. P. (1999). *An introduction to Discourse Analysis Theory and Method*, Routledge.

Khan, R. M. I., Radzuan, N. R. M., Shahbaz, M., Ibrahim, A. H., & Mustafa, G. (2018). The role of vocabulary knowledge in speaking development of Saudi EFL learners. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ) Volume*, *9*. 406-418

Khan, R. M. I., Shahbaz, M., Kumar, T., & Khan, I. (2020). Investigating Reading Challenges Faced by EFL Learners at Elementary Level. *Register Journal*, *13*(2), 277-292.

Khan, R. M. I., Radzuan, N. R. M., Shahbaz, M., & Ibrahim, A. H. (2018). EFL Instructors' Perceptions on the Integration and Implementation of MALL in EFL Classes. *International Journal of Language Education and Applied Linguistics*, 39-50.

Nasri, M., Biria, R., & Karimi, M. (2018). Projecting gender identity in argumentative written discourse. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, *7*(3), 201-205.

Potter, J., & Edwards, D. (1996). Discourse analysis. In *Introducing psychological research* (pp. 419-425). Palgrave, London.

Shahbaz, M., Khan, M. S., Khan, R. M. I., & Mustafa, G. (2016). Role of self-perceived communication competence and communication apprehension for willingness to communicate in L1 and L2. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, *6*(1), 158-158.

Shahbaz, M., & Khan, R. M. I. (2017). Use of mobile immersion in foreign language teaching to enhance target language vocabulary learning. *MIER Journal of Educational Studies Trends & Practices*, 66-82.

Sinclair, J., &Coulthard, M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discours*e. In M. Coulthard, Advances in spoken and written discourse. OUP, London: UK.

Uzokova, S. (2020). Principles of Discourse Analysis in Linguistics. *Журналиностранныхязыков и лингвистики*, *1*(1), 7-12.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1997). *Political discourse and racism: Describing others in western parliaments.* In S. H. Riggins (Ed.), the language and politics of exclusion (pp. 31-64). London: Sage Publications.

Van Dijk, TA (2006). Ideology and discourse analysis. Journal of Political Ideologies, 11 (2): 115–140.