BEYOND BORDERS: A CRITICAL MEDIA DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF POLITICAL AND MILITARY LEADERS' LANGUAGE ON INDO-PAK RELATIONS

DR. SALMA UMBER,
Associate Professor, Department of Mass Communication, Government Collage University Faisalabad. (salmaumber@gcuf.edu.pk)

DR. SANA HAROON,
Lecturer, Department of Mass Communication, Government College University, Faisalabad. (sanash49@gmail.com) (correspondence)

ALI HASSAN,
PhD Scholar, Department of Mass Communication, Bahauddin Zakariya University Multan. (alihassan.phd.bzu@gmail.com)

DR. KHUDA BAKHS,
(Corresponding Author), Associate Professor, Department of Education, GC University Faisalabad email: khudabakhsh@gcuf.edu.pk

Abstract

This research adopts Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) as a theoretical framework to examine the discourses of political and military leaders in the context of Indo-Pak interactions. Utilizing the writings of linguists Ruth Wodak, Teun A. van Dijk, and Norman Fairclough, the study reveals the ways in which language, power, and ideology are inter-related. The analysis is guided by Fairclough's Three-Dimensional Model, which highlights the functions of text, discourse practice, and sociopolitical situation. Through an "Us vs. Them" paradigm, Van Dijk's Sociocognitive Approach investigates how cognitive processes shape language use. In particular, it looks at how social identities are constructed. The significance of context and intertextuality in revealing the historical and cultural aspects of discourse is emphasized by Wodak's Discourse-Historical Approach. Through the use of Critical Rhetoric Analysis, the study examines the ways in which military and political leaders create and alter discourses in order to sway public opinion. Pakistani leaders such as General Pervaiz Musharraf, General Ayub Khan, Nawaz Sharif, Fazl Ur Rehman, Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto, Shahid Khaqan Abbasi, and Benazir Bhutto are among those whose speeches and interviews are examined in this study. The results show that the ideology of democratic and military presidents diverge significantly. Military leaders use pronouns that highlight authority and unity, foregrounding ideas of strength, equality, and resistance against external dangers. Democratic leaders, on the other hand, emphasize shared experiences, cultural heritage, and harmonious cohabitation while utilizing inclusive pronouns that demonstrate a willingness for diplomatic resolutions. By exposing the tactics of positive self-representation and negative other representation, the analysis clarifies the power relationships that exist within Indo-Pak dialogue. Through the application of CDA, this study sheds light on the linguistic tactics used by leaders and reveals the underlying ideologies and power structures that influence language use in geopolitical discourse. The theoretical framework provides a basis for deciphering the intricacies of military and political discourses, hence enhancing comprehension of the sociolinguistic aspects of Indo-Pak relations.

*Keywords***:** Indo-Pak relations, critical discourse analysis, Norman Fairclough, linguistic strategies, military leaders, democratic leaders, diplomatic engagements, language and power, geopolitical discourse

1.   Introduction

In the context of Indo-Pak relations, this study critically examines the discourses expressed by political and military figures in Pakistan. The study uses Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) to expose the ideologies, power structures, and representations that underpin remarks and speeches taken from English-language publications. The chosen newspapers function as primary sources that enable an examination of the complex aspects of political and military communication. They also provide insights into the ways in which language is employed to sway public opinion and impact socio-political narratives. Deciphering the complex interactions between language, power, and ideology is important, particularly in the geopolitical setting of South Asia. The study intends to reveal the underlying socio-political factors that support the development of discourses and ideologies in the media by utilizing CDA. Furthermore, the study aims to clarify the ways in which these discourses shape public opinions, adding to a more comprehensive comprehension of Pakistan's sociopolitical environment. As the analysis goes on, the study will classify and break down discourses to find similarities and differences in the language used by political and military leaders. The study also explores the contextual elements that mold these discourses, recognizing the impact of political climates and historical occurrences on the language employed by public figures.

Numerous bloody conflicts have plagued human history, and every endeavor to eradicate them has been in vain. Every nation's ability to maintain global peace is in grave jeopardy due to nuclear testing and weapon manufacture. As both an instrument and a means of communication, language is essential in conflict. Taking up weapons and starting a war is not an option for any nation. Governments must provide an explanation for why they murder so many people and employ deadly force. As Hodges (2013) put it, "Humans never engage in war without the mediating force of discourse" (p. 3), which is why demonizing the enemy is a common tactic before going to war. Human behavior and intellect are shaped by language, which is more than just a means of communication. This means that how people see war whoever controls the vocabulary of war and peace controls both (Gay 2008).

The significance of language in our lives is paramount. Within a social setting, communication and interaction are the only functions of language. People in a human society use language to convey ideas, sentiments, and emotions to one another. The social act of language construction and definition of power relations in every civilization is discussed in detail by Janks (1997). Because language is constantly used to maintain supremacy, the connection between language and power is clear.

In the end, this study seeks to add to the corpus of knowledge in critical discourse studies by shedding light on the intricate relationships between language and power within the particular framework of Indo-Pak interactions. The research aims to provide a nuanced view on the ideologies and power structures entrenched in the discourses of political and military leaders by examining how they build and transmit their ideas.

1.1.   Scope of the Study

The title of this study, "Beyond Borders: A Critical Media Discourse Analysis of Political and Military Leaders' Language on Indo-Pak Relations," suggests that it will investigate the language used by political and military leaders regarding Indo-Pak relations in great detail. In order to shape public opinion and policy, prominent leaders from both countries used discursive tactics such as rhetoric, framing, and subtle nuances. This research aims to analyze media portrayals, speeches, and government declarations

in order to uncover biases, trends, and power dynamics that might influence the Indo-Pak debate. In addition, it seeks to illuminate the ways in which media narratives affect public opinion, diplomatic interactions, and the regional geopolitical environment as a whole. By conducting a thorough examination, this research hopes to shed light on how language plays a part in the Indo-Pak discourse. By doing so, it hopes to help us comprehend the significance of this for regional stability and diplomatic ties.

1.2.   Problem Statement

The paper tackles the urgent problem of Indo-Pak relations by acknowledging the critical importance of the language used by political and military leaders in determining public opinion and policy. Given the context of ongoing tensions and conflicts, it is crucial to thoroughly examine how these ties are presented in the media. At issue here are leaders' possible biases, framing tactics, and discursive strategies, all of which have the ability to either intensify or alleviate conflicts. The purpose of this research is to shed light on these linguistic processes so that readers may make informed decisions about the geopolitical landscape, public opinion, and the stability of the area as a whole in relation to India and Pakistan.

1.3.   Research Questions
1)   What are the key differences and similarities in the linguistic strategies employed by military and democratic leaders, as revealed through Huckin's analytic tools of Critical Discourse Analysis, in shaping narratives related to conflict, diplomacy, and mutual understanding between India and Pakistan?
2)   In what ways do democratic leaders, including Nawaz Sharif, Fazl Ur Rehman, Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto, Shahid Khaqan Abbasi, and Benazir Bhutto, utilize linguistic techniques such as framing, pronouns, and vocabulary to emphasize commonality, peace efforts, and shared values in their discourse on Indo-Pak relations?
3)   How do military leaders, specifically General Pervaiz Musharraf and General Ayub Khan, employ language strategies such as framing and the use of pronouns to portray military superiority and address conflicts in their statements on Indo-Pak relations?
2.   Literature Review

The power of one's words may be overwhelming in times of war. Politicians and leaders that choose to use armed force to implement their ideology rely heavily on language. Reyes defines legitimization as "the process by which speakers accredit or license a type of social behavior" (2011, 782). The process of legitimizing a behavior is providing an explanation for why it is acceptable.

The media has a significant role in the dissemination of the ideologies held by various social and political groups. In addition to reflecting a group's sociopolitical views, media discourses are a powerful instrument for molding society's social cognition, according to Yaghoobi (2009). Since the Indian subcontinent was divided, there has been an ideological divide between Pakistan and India, which has only been exacerbated by the media discourses of both nations (Saffee, 2016). About this matter, Saffee (2016) examined editorials published in Pakistani and Indian newspapers and found that both nations have been spreading their competing ideologies about the war on terror. In a similar vein, Raj and Rohini (2014) found that India uses editorial discourse to falsely accuse Pakistan and Kashmir of being involved in terrorism, while Pakistan uses editorial discourse to counter India's accusations. Based on their findings, Ali and Parveen (2015) conclude that Kashmir is at the heart of the dispute between Pakistan and India, and that editorials published by both countries' newspapers further inflame the situation by putting their countries' national interests ahead of all else.

2.1.   Theoretical Framework

The study employed Norman Fairclough's Three-Dimensional Model of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) as the primary theoretical framework. This model emphasizes the interconnectedness of text, discourse practice, and sociopolitical context in shaping language use.

2.2.   *Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA):*

The theoretical foundation for comprehending and evaluating political and military leaders' discourses in the context of Indo-Pak interactions is Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997; van Dijk, 1998). This interdisciplinary approach combines linguistic research with social theory to reveal the power structures, ideologies, and social practices embedded within language use (van Leeuwen & Wodak, 1999). Pioneered by linguists Norman Fairclough and Teun A. van Dijk, CDA offers a valuable framework for analyzing complex geopolitical dialogues.

2.3.   *Fairclough's Three-Dimensional Model of Power and Ideology:*

Norman Fairclough's seminal three-dimensional model highlights the intricate connections between language, power, and ideology (Fairclough, 1989). The first dimension involves analyzing texts to identify linguistic patterns and tactics used to convey meaning (Chilton, 2004). The second dimension delves into the social processes influencing discourse generation and interpretation, exploring how social practices shape language use (Fairclough, 1989). Finally, the third dimension expands the scope to encompass the broader sociopolitical context, examining how language interacts with power dynamics and the propagation of ideologies (Chilton, 2004).

2.4.   *Teun A. van Dijk's Sociocognitive Approach:*

Van Dijk's approach focuses on the mental processes through which individuals perceive and engage with social structures and power relations within discourse (van Dijk, 1995). He emphasizes how cognitive structures, including social representations, biases, and ideologies, shape language use (van Dijk, 2008). His work highlights how discourse both reflects and reproduces existing power imbalances and social injustices.

2.5.   *Social Identity Theory and the Us vs. Them Debate:*

Grounded in Social Identity Theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979), CDA investigates how language plays a crucial role in constructing social identities. This theory posits that individuals categorize themselves and others into social groups, fostering an "us vs. them" mentality (van Leeuwen & Wodak, 1999). Analyzing how leaders utilize this dynamic within political and military discourses sheds light on the rhetorical techniques employed to influence public opinion.

2.6.   *Context and Intertextuality:*

Ruth Wodak's Discourse-Historical Approach emphasizes the significance of context and intertextuality in discourse analysis (Wodak, 2003). It acknowledges that discourses are not isolated entities but are shaped by pre-existing texts and the broader sociopolitical environment (Fairclough, 1992). Examining discourses

from a historical and cultural perspective helps to reveal how language use is influenced by past events and prevailing social norms.

2.7.   *Language and Power*:

Fairclough argues that power not only operates through discourse but also exists behind it (Fairclough, 1989). This perspective acknowledges that power relations influence language choices, such as what is included or excluded (Chilton, 2004). In the context of political and military discourses, understanding the power dynamics behind language choices allows for a deeper interpretation of leaders' motives and intentions.

2.8.   *Manipulation and Persuasion*:

Fairclough further emphasizes the manipulative and persuasive functions of power within discourse (Fairclough, 1989). Recognizing that power dynamics influence language choices, including what is included and what is not, provides a critical lens through which to analyze the goals and motivations of leaders in political and military discourses.

2.9.   *Critical Rhetoric Analysis*:

CDA draws upon components of Critical Rhetoric Analysis to examine how discourses are deliberately constructed to control and persuade (van Leeuwen & Wodak, 1999). By analyzing the language choices, framing strategies, and persuasive tactics employed in political and military speeches, researchers can illuminate the rhetorical techniques used to sway public opinion (Fairclough, 1992). This diverse set of theoretical frameworks will guide the application of CDA to the analysis of political and military discourses in Pakistan. By scrutinizing the underlying ideologies, power dynamics, and social practices embedded within language construction, this study aims to illuminate the complexities of language use in the context of Indo-Pak relations.

3.   Methodology

Two prominent English-language newspapers in Pakistan were selected for analysis, Dawn and The News. These newspapers were chosen for their wide readership and representation of diverse political perspectives. Speeches and interviews of key political and military leaders were collected from the selected newspapers, focusing on discussions related to Indo-Pak relations. The time frame for data collection spanned several decades to capture evolving discourses. Fairclough's model guided the analysis process, which involved identifying linguistic features, discursive practices, and sociopolitical implications within the collected speeches and interviews. Emphasis was placed on language patterns, power dynamics, and shifts in discourse over time.

A comparative analysis was conducted to highlight variations in discourses between military and political leaders. Pronoun usage, vocabulary selection, and framing strategies were examined to discern ideological differences. Teun A. van Dijk's Sociocognitive Approach was incorporated to explore the cognitive structures behind language use. Attention was given to the representation of social groups, the

construction of identities, and the perpetuation of an "Us vs. Them" paradigm. Ruth Wodak's Discourse-Historical Approach was applied to contextualize the language within historical and sociopolitical dimensions. The analysis considered intertextuality and the impact of specific events on the evolution of discourses.

The findings were validated through cross-referencing with established theoretical frameworks and consulting relevant literature on CDA, geopolitical discourse, and language and power dynamics. Ethical considerations were taken into account to ensure the responsible use of language data. Proper citation and acknowledgment of sources were maintained, and the analysis focused on public speeches and interviews.

4.   Data Analysis
4.1.   General Pervaiz Musharraf's Statements

"In 2002, the entire military was on high alert. I, too, took the military forward. Come, let's fight, and fight well. So, one night, I knew they were planning limited air attacks in Azad Kashmir. We received this intelligence. I was the Air Chief at that time. I told him it's an open message, send it to everyone. If an attack comes, counter-attack immediately, select targets, and launch a second attack in the morning. I said send an open message; let's see if it comes. It didn't... Where are they coming from? Are they joking? We have our forces too. It's not a joke; we are not a small country, and you are a superpower"

"We expressed our commitment to ensure a peaceful settlement of all pending issues, including Jammu and Kashmir, to the satisfaction of both sides. We agreed that possible options for a peaceful negotiated settlement in this regard should continue to be pursued in a sincere spirit and purposeful manner"

4.2.   General Ayub Khan's Statements

"Our orders to our troops were clear: they will not open fire unless fired upon. If the flare has taken place, it must have been a provocation from the Indian side"

"My dear countrymen, greetings. The time has come for a test of the ten crore Pakistanis. This morning, the Indian army attacked Lahore from the side of Kashmir... This aggression is the culmination of aggressive steps taken continuously by the neighboring country for the past five months... Despite their relentless provocations, we dealt with it with patience and tolerance... India has made the situation even more dangerous... They have revealed the true nature of their impure intentions, which were already present in their hearts against Pakistan. Some of our friends did not know the mentality of the Indian rulers, and they thought that perhaps India, after all, would withdraw in the face of the whole subcontinent declaring war against it. We knew from the beginning that these weapons would be used against us, and time has proven this fact. Today, the Indian rulers have opened their hearts to their unholy intentions, which were already present in their hearts against Pakistan. We are taking the initiative to annihilate the enemy... Our brave and brave soldiers have taken the initiative to defend against the enemy's invasion"

4.3.   Nawaz Sharif's Statements

"We had the same culture, the same people, the same heritage, the same society; it's just that a border has come in between. The rest of us are members of the same society, with the same culture and background. In the defense or military, we do not want any kind of race; this misfortune exists that we both are part of the arms race, we have tried to move forward beyond each other"

"The respected governments shall intensify efforts to resolve all issues, including the issue of Jammu and Kashmir. The ice has broken, and I think both governments will be able to make further progress on all issues, including the issue of Kashmir"

4.4. Fazl Ur Rehman's Statement

"I went to India on the invitation of India's Jamiat Ulema, where I had discussions with all political parties, parties, religious parties, up to Hindu extremists... Why has there been so much tension in our relations? The only answer was an attack on our parliament. If someone attacks the parliament of India, it is an attack on the democracy of India"

4.5. Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto's Statement

"My people, Indian people are too poor to keep on fighting every 5 to 10 years. It's in the mutual interest of two countries that we do not get intoxicated by momentary gains and think of our tomorrow because our tomorrow is bound to come, a subcontinent that has a civilization of 5000 years. It must think in broad terms, in co-existing, not the victor and the vanquished."

4.6. Shahid Khaqan Abbasi's Statement

"The legitimate struggle for self-determination of the people of Jammu and Kashmir continues to be brutally suppressed by India's occupation forces. Unfortunately, from day one of its creation, Pakistan has faced unremitting hostility from its eastern neighbor... If India does venture across the yellow sea or acts upon its doctrine of limited war against Pakistan, it will evoke a strong and matching response"

4.7. Benazir Bhutto's Statement

"I want a Pakistan with peace with its neighbors... There was such a war game scenario, and I said no, this is wrong. If anything like this happens, it will be a big setback for Pakistan, and we will be forced to withdraw... it is not workable..."

The collected statements were analyzed using Huckin's (1997) analytic tools of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). The analysis involved categorizing the data according to the tools discussed in Huckin's model.

Framing Text

Table 1

Framing Text as a Whole

Category	Military Leaders	Democratic Leaders
Foregrounding	Military superiority, challenges	Commonality, peace efforts
Eastern neighbor	Focused on rivalry	Emphasized unity and shared values
Parliament	Highlighted strength	Mentioned as a symbol of unity

Table 2

Use of Pronouns

Category	Military Leaders	Democratic Leaders
Pronouns Used	"I," "they"	"We," "our"
Narrative Perspective	Authoritative	Inclusive

Table 3

Vocabulary

Category	Military Leaders	Democratic Leaders
Negative Terms	Provocation, counter-attack	Peace, intensify efforts, negotiation
Positive Terms	Dilair, bahadur jawano, lalkara	Mutual interest, co-existing

4.8. Differences between Ideologies

Foregrounding and Back grounding:

Military leaders emphasize their strength and equality. Democratic leaders stress commonalities and the pursuit of peaceful solutions.

Use of Pronouns: Military leaders use "I" and "they," emphasizing authority and separation. Democratic leaders use "we" and "our," promoting inclusivity and unity.

Vocabulary Items: Military leaders use aggressive terms. Democratic leaders choose moderate language promoting peace.

Similarities among Ideologies

Contextual Influence: The context, especially in times of tension or conflict, influences the discourse of both military and democratic leaders.

Positive Self-Representation and Negative Others Representation:

Both sides tend to highlight their positive aspects

5. Discussion

Using Huckin's Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) analytical tools, we can see that military and democratic leaders in India and Pakistan used different language strategies to shape narratives about the conflict, diplomacy, and mutual understanding. We can also see some similarities. The rhetoric is largely shaped by the remarks of military commanders, like as Generals Pervaiz Musharraf and Ayub Khan, and revolves on military might, difficulties, and competition. These commanders often put their troops' preparation and military might front and center, stressing the necessity for strong reactions. Democratic leaders, on the other hand, prioritize common ground, peace initiatives, and shared ideals; this includes

Benazir Bhutto, Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto, Fazl Ur Rehman, and Nawaz Sharif. Diplomacy, solidarity, and the pursuit of amicable discussions are major themes in their discourse.

Words like "I" and "they," which are first-person singular, are used by military commanders to emphasize their authority and personal viewpoints. By using first-person singular, the military commander emphasizes his or her position as the ultimate authority in times of crisis and furthers the impression of disconnection. Democratic leaders, in contrast, favor first-person plural pronouns such as "we" and "our," encouraging a narrative that is inclusive and suggests unity and joint responsibility. This language choice fosters a feeling of common goals and principles. "Provocation," "counter-attack," and military plaudits like "dilair" (brave) and "bahadur jawano" (brave troops) are common in the language used by military officials, who are known for their aggressive and forceful style of speech. A proactive and aggressive posture is emphasized by these phrases. Whenever possible, Democratic leaders try to use language that is moderate and conciliatory, such as "peace," "intensify efforts," and "negotiation." Their language is all about getting along, living in harmony, and finding peaceful solutions.

A response to the current environment is shown by both democratic and military leaders, regardless of their responsibilities, particularly during times of stress or war. The geopolitical climate and the pressing issues confronting the countries influence the remarks made by leaders in both domains. Leaders in both the military and the democratic camp have a tendency to extol the virtues of their own position or behavior. Democratic leaders highlight shared ideals and benign intents, while military commanders highlight preparedness and power. At the same time, each side tends to paint the other in a negative light, highlighting the other's perceived threats or provocations.

When it comes to Indo-Pak relations, military and democratic leaders use quite different framing, pronoun, and word methods. Democratic leaders place an emphasis on solidarity, diplomacy, and common principles, in contrast to their military counterparts who stress aggressiveness and power. Still, in response to the difficulties posed by the surrounding environment, both camps modify their rhetoric so that one group exaggerates its own merits while downplaying those of the other.

When discussing Indo-Pak relations, the democratic leaders of Pakistan—Nawaz Sharif, Fazl Ur Rehman, Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto, Shahid Khaqan Abbasi, and Benazir Bhutto—use a variety of language strategies to highlight shared principles, peaceful endeavors, and common ground. India and Pakistan share many cultural, historical, and social ideals, and democratic leaders in both countries often use framing strategies to highlight these similarities. They draw attention to the shared history, culture, and legacy of the two countries, demonstrating how closely related they are to one another and how they may be considered cousins. This way of looking at things helps to build a feeling of community by telling a story of how everything is interdependent. Becoming advocates for peace is another framing tactic they could do. Political leaders from the Democratic Party center their speeches on the need of ending the Kashmir problem via diplomatic means and peaceful discussions. As propagandists for harmonious cohabitation, they position themselves by highlighting the significance of discussion and compromise in settling conflicts.

Pronouns like "we" and "our" used by democratic leaders in the first person plural constantly show inclusion and a collaborative attitude. Their use of welcoming language highlights how everyone must do their part to achieve peace. This language choice fosters a feeling of solidarity among the people and indicates a joint effort to resolve disputes. Using first-person plural pronouns is another way to democratically express the people's desires and goals. These leaders demonstrate public responsibility and show that their diplomatic endeavors benefit the whole country by associating themselves with the national identity. In order to project an image of cooperation and amicability, democratic leaders purposefully use optimistic and conciliatory language. Words like "peace," "mutual interest," "co-

existing," and "negotiation" seem to be the backbone of their speech, suggesting that they are more interested in talking things out than fighting anything. A tone of collaboration and diplomacy is intended by this choice of words. Democratic leaders often use wording that helps to calm the atmosphere down when tensions are high. They provide an environment that is helpful for resolving conflicts by avoiding hostile language and instead using moderate phrases that show a desire to have a peaceful conversation.

Democratic leaders frame their discourse on Indo-Pak relations in a way that emphasizes commonalities, peace initiatives, and shared values via the use of certain pronouns and words. The goal of these leaders is to create an atmosphere that is friendly to conversation and dispute resolution by framing the story around unity, speaking in an inclusive manner, and using optimistic rhetoric.

Frequently highlighting military dominance and resolving disputes, military commanders such as General Pervaiz Musharraf and General Ayub Khan use strategic linguistic approaches to express their views on Indo-Pak relations. The linguistic methods used by these military commanders to portray power, authority, and their attitude to resolving geopolitical difficulties will be critically examined in this research, with a focus on framing and pronoun use. Framing tactics that emphasize military power are routinely used in his speeches. By using expressions like "fight well," "counter-attack immediately," and "launch a second attack," Musharraf presents the military in a proactive and aggressive light. Preparation for swift and decisive action in the face of foreign threats is central to the framing, which presents the military as an effective and formidable defense force. Statements made by Ayub Khan, who stresses the military's readiness for battle by outlining a strict chain of command and regulations of engagement, use similar framing tactics. The focus of the frame is on displaying command and control while giving the impression of being very competent in military matters.

Musharraf often frames his arguments in terms of the animosity between India and Pakistan. The reference to "limited air attacks in Azad Kashmir" together with the preparedness to launch a counterattack quickly establishes the war as a continuing battle in which military dominance is of paramount importance. The tone for an antagonistic story is established by this framing. Responding to provocations is the focal point of Ayub Khan's framing, which presents the military as disciplined and controlled until aggressiveness is present. Words like "provocation from the Indian side" paint wars as being started by other countries and their citizens, and they utilize this to their advantage while defending themselves militarily.

Utilizing first-person singular pronouns like "I" highlights Musharraf's commanding position as a commander in the military. In doing so, he presents himself as a leader who is both decisive and involved in the battlefield, as if there were no intermediary between his choices and the military's response. In the same way, Ayub Khan's comments use authoritative pronouns. Use of first-person singular pronouns, such as "Our orders," allows Ayub Khan to establish his authority, influence military strategy, and highlight his hands-on engagement in war decision-making. Referring to possible enemies using third-person pronouns like "they" establishes the military as separate and different. This wording choice helps to perpetuate a "us versus them" narrative, which in turn gives the impression that the military is apart from its enemies. Ayub Khan also creates a divide by referring to "the Indian side"; this helps to show the army as an independent body that reacts to outside forces. The language used here furthers the notion that Pakistan and its enemies are completely separate entities.

Military officials, like Generals Pervaiz Musharraf and Ayub Khan, carefully use pronouns and phrasing to project an image of military might, preparedness, and authority while discussing Indo-Pak relations. The narrative is shaped by the military's portrayal as a powerful force that can meet global difficulties head-on, thanks to the use of authoritative pronouns, confrontational framing of wars, and focus on military strength.

The study's theoretical framework is based on Norman Fairclough's Three-Dimensional Model of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). It acknowledges the complex relationship between text, discourse practice, and sociopolitical environment in shaping language usage. Using this paradigm, the study intends to get into the underlying meanings of the gathered remarks of democratic and military leaders on Indo-Pak ties. The interconnectedness of linguistic strategies, as revealed through Huckin's CDA analytic tools, with the larger sociopolitical context and the specific discourse practices within Indo-Pak relations can be better understood through Fairclough's framework, which offers a comprehensive lens for this examination. The power dynamics, ideologies, and discursive strategies of democratic and military leaders in building narratives can be better understood through this approach. It also helps to illuminate how language is used to influence public perception and diplomatic engagements within this intricate geopolitical relationship.

6.   Limitations of the Study

The study acknowledges the limitation of focusing on English-language newspapers, recognizing that other linguistic discourses may exist within different language communities. Additionally, the research is confined to the scope of available speeches and interviews in the selected newspapers.

7.   Conclusion

In summary, this study explores political and military leaders' discourses within the framework of Indo-Pak interactions using Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). Under the direction of theoretical frameworks put out by Ruth Wodak, Teun A. van Dijk, and Norman Fairclough, the study reveals the complex interactions between language, power, and ideology. Fairclough's Three-Dimensional Model provides a strong basis by highlighting the ways in which language is shaped by text, discourse practices, and sociopolitical situation. The sociocognitive approach of Van Dijk sheds light on the cognitive processes underlying language use, particularly when forming social identities under a "Us vs. Them" framework. Wodak's Discourse-Historical Approach highlights the role of context and intertextuality in unraveling historical and cultural dimensions.

Distinct ideological contrasts are revealed by the research through the analysis of speeches and interviews given by prominent Pakistani leaders, such as General Pervaiz Musharraf, General Ayub Khan, Nawaz Sharif, Fazl ur Rehman, Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto, Shahid Khaqan Abbasi, and Benazir Bhutto. Pronouns emphasizing authority and unity, military leaders place a premium on resistance, equality, and strength. Democratic leaders, on the other hand, place greater emphasis on shared values, cultural heritage, and harmonious cohabitation. They also use inclusive pronouns that suggest a desire for diplomatic solutions. The study illuminates the techniques of positive self-representation and negative other representation, illuminating the power relationships prevalent in Indo-Pak discourse. The subtle ways in which leaders use language to sway public opinion and mold geopolitical narratives are revealed by the linguistic analysis.

By examining the linguistic techniques that support political and military discourses, this study advances our knowledge of the sociolinguistic aspects of Indo-Pak relations via the lens of CDA. The theoretical underpinnings offer a strong framework for understanding these complexity and insightful information about how language shapes ideologies and power structures. In the end, this study acts as a springboard for more investigations into the intricate relationships that exist between language, power, and ideology in geopolitical discourse.

References

1. Chilton, P. (2004). Analyzing political discourse: Theoretical and methodological considerations. Palgrave Macmillan.
2. Fairclough, N. (1989). Language and power. Longman.
3. Fairclough, N. (1992). Discourse and social change. Polity Press.
4. Fairclough, N., & Wodak, R. (1997). Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language. Longman.
5. Gay, W. C. 2008. "Language of War and Peace, the." In Encyclopedia of Violence, Peace, & Conflict, 1115–1127. London: Elsevier. doi:10.1016/B978-012373985-8.00093-3.
6. Hodges, A., edited by. 2013. Discourses of War and Peace. Oxford University Press. doi:10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199937271.001.0001.
7. Janks, H. (1997). Critical discourse analysis as a research tool. Routledge.
8. Reyes, A. 2011. "Strategies of Legitimization in Political Discourse: From Words to Actions." Discourse & Society 22 (6): 781–807. doi:10.1177/0957926511419927
9. Saffee, A. (2016). Media and foreign policy discourse: A case of India-Pakistan relation. Institute of Strategic Studies. 36(1).
10. Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. Psychological Review, 86(1), 103-126.
11. Van Dijk, T. A. (1995). Discourse structures and cognitive access. In D. Boden & D. M. Richardson (Eds.), Discourse and cognition (pp. 49-82). John Benjamins Publishing Company.
12. Van Dijk, T. A. (1998). Ideology: A multidisciplinary approach. Sage Publications.
13. Van Dijk, T. A. (2008). Discourse and context: A sociocognitive approach. Cambridge University Press.
14. Van Leeuwen, T., & Wodak, R. (1999). Frames and narratives: The social construction of meaning. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
15. Wodak, R. (2003). Analyzing sociolinguistic variation: Introduction (2nd ed.). Mouton de Gruyter.
16. Yaghoobi, M. (2009). A critical discourse analysis of the selected Iranian and American printed media on the representations of Hizbullah-Israel war. Journal Of Intercultural Communication, (21). Retrieved from https://immi.se/intercultural/nr21/yaghoobi.htm