

## Critical Discourse Analysis of Violence in the Speeches of Pakistani Political Leaders

<sup>1</sup>Muhammad Shah Zaib Hayat, <sup>2</sup>Mahrugh Ali, <sup>3</sup>Rahat Sultan, <sup>4</sup>Dr. Nida Fatima, <sup>5</sup>Qurat-ul-Ain Ayyaz, <sup>6</sup>Dr. Sohail Akhtar

<sup>1,2</sup>. Lecturer, Department of English, University of Jhang, Jhang, Pakistan, <sup>3</sup>. Lecturer, Department of English, United College, Jhang, Punjab, Pakistan. <sup>4</sup>. Visiting Lecturer Political Science Government Graduate College for Women, Fazilpur <sup>5</sup>. Scholar M. Phil in English, Ghazi University, D.G. Khan <sup>6</sup>. Lecturer in History, Ghazi University, Dera Ghazi Khan

### ABSTRACT

*This is an analytical study of the discussion of opponents in the speeches of Pakistani politicians, in which it is observed that Political discourses are of much significance in the propagation of desired Political Ideologies. Through various phases of history, it is obvious that human beings have been representing self positively and others negatively. So the rhetoric of violence for negative other representation has been a prominent feature of political discourses. Similarly, the present research critically analysis the political speeches of five Pakistani politicians namely Imran Khan, Shahbaz Sharif, Asif Ali Zardari, Shaikh Rasheed Ahmad and Fazlur Rehman. The data for present research was collected from the fifteen speeches of these politicians (three speeches of each). The time span ranges from October 2015 to 11th November 2019 and the data have been collected from News Media channel's YouTube pages. The present research employees Van Dijk socio-cognitive modal and Wodak's 2001 modal of historical approach for the data. These models have been used in amended form, the rationale behind using the amended Modal the inclusion and exclusion of analytical categories present in the modal and in the speeches of the mentioned politicians. The level of analysis include word, sentence and discourse. The findings of the research reveal that war of words have been observed among the politicians, each of them has attempted to represent himself positively at the cost of others. The adjectives of derogative connotations have been used to represent the opponents. However, Mr. Khan has represented his opponents through his political discourse as the looters of national wealth likewise he has been represented as agents of Jews by Mr Rehman. Similarly, the war of words has also been observed in the political discourses of Shahbaz Sharif, Asif Ali Zardari, Shaikh Rasheed Ahmad and Fazlur Rehman. The research suggest that rhetoric of violence is a prominent feature of political discourses. This is done deliberately and ideologically for positive self and negative other representation.*

**Keywords:** Pakistan, Leaders, Speeches, violence, Discourse, etc.

## **Introduction**

People use different tools to achieve their goals according to relevant fields. In ancient times people fight against one another for conquering empires, lands and even to occupy areas. At that time they use different traditional weapons to fight with each other. Now in the present era, the art of war is changed, now traditional weapons like swords, spears and knives are replaced by the technical weapons like guns and bombs. The purpose of fighting is also linguistically changed. Now people use to fight for peaceful purposes like wining, achieving or for different goals in life. In the modern era one of the important fights which are fought in all countries is the 'War of Words' which is fought in politics. It is very different from the war of old days, as in old times the fighters called soldiers, conquers and kings, but in the fight for politics the fighters called politicians or members of a political party. Now instead of occupying the states or lands, the purpose of political war is to occupy or control the minds of people. For this purpose, they use language as linguistic weapons instead of spears, guns and bombs to defeat their opponents. Politicians use different linguistic devices as linguistic weapons to control the minds of people. They did so by changing the deep ideological bases in the minds of people by emphasizing on their ideology. The quality of speaking and understanding distinguish humans from animals. Humans have ability to decode the language and to get information about others through language. Every piece of language has a specific motive behind it. For the complete understanding of any linguistic expression one needs to decode that speech or writing. Politicians use language to make their ideology and stance effective and influential through which people can be influenced by their ideology. Most of the time language or speeches have two dimensional meanings such as, on the surface and beneath the surface meaning. For understanding of the meaning on these levels one needs critical examination and analysis of language.

## **Speech as Genre**

Speech is considered an important genre of discourse because professional speakers use formal lexical items to make it effective. Brown and Yule (1983) have defined discourse as "language in use". The choice of language is very important to make speech dominant and effective to control others. (Ayeomoni 2005) described that politics is done through language, hence language and politics are interconnected and cannot be separated. Every political expression is constructed and represented through language. In political speeches politicians or speakers employ different linguistic and discursive devices to control the cognition of people and to make people ready to behave according to them.

## **Political Rhetoric**

Aristotle has defined rhetoric as the art of persuasion by language through logic and other available linguistic resources. Rhetoric is a process of making a speech or language effective and persuasive to others. In this way political rhetoric mean representing one's political ideology in a way that it can persuade audience and attract them towards the speaker. Van Dijk (2006a) explained that the basic aim of political rhetoric is to control the minds of people or manipulation. Political rhetoric aims to propagate their ideology at various levels, hence it could be defined as a kind of linguistic hegemony. Beard presented that politicians make speeches to present or propagate their ideology and to make people believe on their ideology as they represented. He opines that the study of language and power aims to examine how language is helpful for the speakers in their aim to gain, exercise and keep power in social, political and cultural context. Persuasion is one of the important purpose or aim of political rhetoric. Van Dijk (1998) defined persuasion as the process of changing the opinions of listeners by controlling the deep structures of ideology in their minds through discourse.

### **Negative Other Representation**

Van Dijk (2011) explained that politicians in the struggle of power and dominance represent their political opponents negatively. The negative representation of others involves psychological derogation and dehumanization of political opponents. Through this they emphasize and propagate the negative aspects of others. Most of the times they farm a polarization which present themselves as good and positive while others as bad and negative people. He presented many other illustrations, by using those techniques and devices the politicians control the minds of people. Theorization is another important aspect of negative other representation. It is the way of negatively representing the out-groups.

### **Rhetoric of Violence**

Most of the times politics seems to be a war of words, politicians use violent linguistic devices to defame their political opponents. They use different violent linguistic items to defame or humiliate their opponents for their political gains. Hunter (2000) explained that rhetoric of violence is the use of negative criticism or derogatory language to attract people towards them. Through rhetoric of violence they represent others negatively so the people will dislike or hate others because of their negative aspects. As USAID (2006) found that politicians of Kosovo abuse and derogate their political opponents to get support of young people in elections. Jackman (2002) defined linguistic violence as language which involved derogation, defamation or humiliation of an individual or group.

### **Critical Discourse analysis**

Critical discourse analysis examines the relationship between language and social political and cultural context in which it occurs. The important aim of critical discourse analysis is to examine how language is participating in the reproduction and challenge of dominance. Fairclough (1989) explained that in the wider social, political and cultural context there is a tension between text and its perception. He calls it the ideologies embedded in the text. Hence critical discourse analysis focuses on the production and representation of different ideologies through language in wider social, cultural and political context. Fairclough (1993) has explained the basic functions of critical discourse analysis as it examines and analyze the relationship between discourse and social events and linguistic facets of social structure.

**Research Question:**

The following are the questions which this research will try to answer.

1. How is linguistic violence exercised in the political discourse of Pakistani politicians, Imran khan, Shahbaz Sharif, Asif Ali Zardari, Shaeikh Rasheed Ahmad and Moulana Fazlur Rehman?
2. How do these politicians vary in their stylistic features to exercise linguistic violence ?

**Literature Review**

This section presents a critical analysis of previously carried out researches in the related area of research to know where the gap for the present study lies. Sipra and Rashid (2008) conducted a research to analyze Socio-Political Perspectives of the Martin Luther King's speech "I have a Dream". They used Fairclough's three dimensional model to analyze his speech. The researchers preferred that Fairclough three dimensional model is suitable to identify variables like, social, cultural and political inequalities which are major concern of critical discourse analysis. They concluded that to get the intended purpose of speech, Martin Luther King used different stylistic devices in his speech. They further recommended that the models of Van Dijk and Wodak can also applied on the same nature of study. Junling (2010) did a critical discourse analysis of Obama's presidential address. The major objective of that study was to discover how he is practicing power and ideology in his speech through language to persuade people to support him and his policies. The researcher used M. k Halliday's systematic functional grammar. He analyzed the data on Halliday's ideation function, interpersonal function and textual function. He found that, Obama used different linguistic techniques to ensure audience that his policies were best. He also practiced modal verbs, tenses and first person pronouns to persuade his audience. He commented that to discover the essential relationship between language power and ideology, critical discourse analysis is the best theory to be applied.

Ghilzai (2017) conducted a research to analyze Imran khan's first speech at parliament as

opposition leader. This study aimed to describe what kind of linguistic techniques are being used by Imran Khan to express his ideology in the parliament, that how he emphasizing his ideology through discourse. Fairclough model of critical discourse analysis is applied to analyze the speech, which explains how power, ideology and linguistic hegemony are practiced in language. He analyzed the data on three stages as description of text, text and discursive practice, and its relationship with wider social and political context. He found that Imran Khan used different linguistics strategies to propagate his thought system most obvious as loyalty, modernism, vision and revolution. He used different phrases to attract people as, better Pakistan, fair elections, democratic political system etc. Through his speech the speaker wanted to ensure people that there are some suspicious people sitting in the government that's why he wanted to rebuild the whole system. Ahmad (2012) employed Van Dijk's Framework of critical discourse to analyze the speeches of Nawaz Sharif. The data for this study was collected from Dawn newspaper. The researcher investigated that how ex-prime minister using language in social and political context to ensure public that protest and strikes by opposition parties are dangerous for the economy of our country and these strikes must be stopped. Nusrat et al (2020) conducted her research to analyze Imran Khan speeches during Dharna. They applied Fairclough three dimensional model in their research. The basic purpose of that study was to examine the practice of power through Language in social and political context. They have analyzed the speeches of Imran Khan on the base of three dimensions of Fairclough model. This study concluded that Imran Khan propagated his ideology through use of personal pronouns as 'I' and 'we'. He also used Islamic references in his speeches to persuade people. The researcher recommended that besides Fairclough Model Van Dijk and Wodak's critical discourse analysis approaches can be applied to discover power and ideology in the use of language. N.Julianavnn (2014) conducted a research to analyze Ronald Reagan speech. The objective of the study was to discover how he is using political rhetoric to propagate his ideology against his opponents. The researcher concluded that Ronald Reagan is using political rhetoric as a form of propaganda against his political opponents to weaker their position in the view of public.

### **Paradigm of the study**

This study is qualitative in nature supported by content analysis. The researcher has qualitatively analyzed the speeches of selected politicians through model of critical discourse analysis discussed in this chapter in detail. The researcher has employed content analysis technique for documenting the frequency of occurring of various themes in the selected data.

### **Tools of Data Collection**

The data for this research has been collected from news channels YouTube pages. The speeches of politicians are existed on YouTube pages of news channels without editing in the context. Most of the speeches for analysis have been collected from Bol News channel and Duniya News YouTube page. First of all, the selected speeches of politicians have been downloaded from YouTube and then translated into English on Microsoft word to analyze them. The researcher has analyzed selected speeches critically and devised an amended model discussed in this chapter.

### **Delimitations of the study**

This study is delimited to the political speeches of Pakistani politicians. Fifteen speeches delivered by five Pakistani contemporary politicians named as, Shaeikh Rasheed Ahmad, Imran khan, Shahbaz Sharif, Fazlur Rehman and Asif Ali Zardari have been selected for analysis (three of each). These speeches are delivered during different political campaigns and during elections, against other political parties between 8 October, 2015 to 11 November, 2019, the selected speeches have been delivered in Urdu language and translated into English language. These speeches have been downloaded from mentioned news channels you tube pages.

Speech 1: Imran khan speech at Okara Jalsa bol news 17 December 2017

YouTube link: [https://youtu.be/LRIaIr3\\_9Qs](https://youtu.be/LRIaIr3_9Qs)"

Speech 2: Imran khan blasted Nawaz Sharif in Okara Dunya News 8 October 2015

YouTube link: <https://youtu.be/vfUBBSnHcIY>"

Speech 3: Shahbaz Sharif speech in PMLN Rally Lahore Dunya TV 29 October 2011

YouTube link: <https://youtu.be/NoIFiFmScCs>"

Speech 4: Sheikh Rasheed Speech in Tahir ul Qadri Dharna Lahore Bol News 17 January 2018

YouTube link: <https://youtu.be/uV355SR1ZTk>"

Speech 5: Sheikh Rasheed speech at PTI jalsa Minar ee Pakistan 29 April 2018

YouTube link: <https://youtu.be/Jg63HVOJrOc>"

Speech 6: Zardari goes ballistic against Nawaz Sharif in Jhang jalsa 21 April 2017

YouTube link: <https://youtu.be/RlbvT-M-rs>

[Speech 7: Mulana Fazlur Rehman speech in Azadi March Jalsa 1 November 2019](#)

YouTube link: <https://youtu.be/zdCiCjk45RQ>"

Speech 8: Imran khan speech at Raiwand Jalsa 30 September 2016

YouTube Link: "<https://youtu.be/BQqs02gH7KU>"

Speech 9: Sheikh Rasheed Speech at PTI jalsa in Islamabad 30 July 2017

YouTube Link: <https://youtu.be/IG-DCyEBVhg>

Speech 10: Asif Ali Zardari Speech in PPP JALSA in Lahore Feb 05, 2018

YouTube Link: "<https://youtu.be/oCfxopCSKxw>"

Speech 11: Asif Ali Zardari Speech in Tahir ul Qadri Jalsa 17 Jan 2018

YouTube link: "[https://youtu.be/Ax\\_fVifYe74](https://youtu.be/Ax_fVifYe74)"

Speech 12: Fazulur Rehman speech at in Islamabad in azadi march 11 Nov 2019

YouTube link: <https://youtu.be/k5nEHka2Cc8>"

Speech 13: Shahbaz shrif Speech in Islamabad at Azadi March 1 November 2019

YouTube link: <https://youtu.be/14QJOYnhdi4>"

Speech 14: Shahbaz shrif Speech at BureWala Jalsa 15 February 2018

YouTube link: [https://youtu.be/yJi2\\_v93-co](https://youtu.be/yJi2_v93-co)"

Speech 15: Fazulur Rehman Speech at Islamabad Azadi March 7 November 2019

YouTube link: <https://youtu.be/ACgUfxJvoIc>"

### **Theoretical Framework**

#### **Van Dijk's Approach of Critical Discourse Analysis**

Van Dijk (2004) explained that politics, ideology and discourse are interlinked to influence human consciousness to create a 'false consciousness' in human mind. He further explained that political discourse is highly ideological, and through the process of constructing and practicing discourse in the society, the politician's effects and controls human cognition. Politicians by emphasizing ideological alliances, similarities and differences construct their particular identity and power relations in the society. Different groups in the society to impose their ideologies and to propagate them can do discrimination of other out groups in political, racist and sexist ideologies.

He explained that politics, ideology and discourse are interlinked phenomena. As he earlier described that every text is constructed on two levels as 'micro vs. macro', he further explained that political discourse is embedded with ideology of political group, and that ideology can be understood by analyzing their discourse. The construction of political discourse either in the form of text or speech involve two levels as micro and macro level. Political discourse at macro level involves the ideology of a particular party in social and political context, they wanted to propagate or impose in the society, for example democracy, dictatorship, elections, corruption, progress, or change. These ideologies are hidden in the text, which most of the times not evident on surface level. These ideologies can be understood by deep analysis of the discourse. Micro level of political discourse is all about the presentation of the ideologies through use of effective linguistic strategies in text or speech. Macro level is the ideological or cognitive assumptions of a particular political party, while micro level is the way of presenting those assumptions with the help of language with the aim of demonstrating that their ideology is the best.



---

### **Positive self-representation VS Negative other representation**

Van Dijk (2004) explained that how different groups construct and re-present theirs and others identity in the society through discourse. In the struggle of power and dominance political groups in society form a polarization in the society, which works as a binary opposition as one is good and other is bad and unacceptable. The basic purpose of this binary opposition or polarization is to emphasize the positive aspects about in-group and to propagate negative aspects about others. They do so by highlighting and exaggerating the positive things about 'us' and negative things about 'them' to gain political appreciation to make their position strong in political context.

### **The ideological Square**

Van Dijk (2011) defined ideological square as manifestation of the group relations category of the ideology schema. Ideological square can be defined as a process of analyzing how different ideologies are being constructed in the text. Political ideologies are based on ideological square. It aims to examine the construction of the identity of in-groups vs. out-groups in discourse. It explains how different social and political groups are represented in the text or speech to cause inequalities and power relations in the society. It focuses how polarization has been used in the text to represent themselves positive and others negative. People and groups use positive ideological pronouns to present positive image of in-group members and use negative ideological pronouns for negative representation of others. He presented the four moves of ideological square as following as:

- To emphasize our good things
- Emphasize their bad things
- De-emphasize our bad things
- De-emphasize their good things

In political context it means that political parties always tend to present their image positively as much as possible at the cost of others. They always exaggerate all good things about themselves. They exaggerate and propagate the positive aspects, policies, ideology and other features of their party. By exaggerating and propagating, they want to make sure people that in the specific political context they are only worth believing and voting. On the same time through their discourse they propagate the negative aspects about others. They consider all the things wrong which is done by opponent political parties. This is the ideological representation of macro level of the text. Political parties never wanted to present their own negative aspects even they defend their mistakes and present them positively. And again respectively they criticize the positive aspects of others and



never wanted to represent them in a neutral way. They do so because political discourse is highly ideological and they wanted to enforce their ideologies in the society, through these polarized representations they want to control human mind, hence this process of manipulation involves social cognition. This process of controlling cognition is called social because it has been reconstructed by social and political groups. By emphasizing the negative image of political opponents, the politicians wanted to ensure people that other political parties are enemies of the nation. In this process of ideological struggle of negative representation of others they use derogatory and uncivilized language to humiliate or defame others which can be defined as verbal violence. It shows the importance of the ideological square and socio cognitive model of Van Dijk to understand that how Pakistani politicians are using linguistic techniques to manipulate and victimize (which can be defined as rhetoric of violence) their political opponents for political gains.

### **Categories of Ideological Analysis**

Van Dijk (2004) presented some of the important categories to analyze the text or speech. These categories explain how with the help of linguistic strategies individuals and groups impose their ideology on people. These categories provide a platform to analyze how ideologies are embedded in the text in the form of language. These are the linguistic techniques which have been used to draw, represent and to impose ideological assumptions in the society. Those illustrations are described as following;

#### **Actor Description**

Actor description means how different actors are represented in the text. In the text and speech there can be a polarized representation of in-groups and out-groups. Actor description focuses on how positive image of in-group members have been drawn in the text, and how negative identity and image of out-groups drawn the text. In any political discourse there can be many characters discussed, some of them from in-group members as allies and others from out-group members or opponents. In doing analysis to understand the ideology of the producer of discourse, it is important to consider actor description to uncover the hidden ideologies in the discourse.

#### **Authority**

Different social and political groups while producing discourse rely on different authorities; they use their selected notions which are according to their ideology. They do so to support their ideology, to make it attractive and likeable in the society. They use this technique according to situation and context. For example, in Pakistan, as it is a Muslim country, and people are very sensitive about religious issues, a politician can use the religious notions to increase his persuasion in the society. Political and other groups in the society use references and sayings from different

authorities according to the situation and context to leave greater impression on the minds of people.

### **Burden (Topos)**

In social and political context, speakers while arguing against out-groups, provide some evidences or arguments to support their ideology. These arguments have been used to provide sufficient reasons to accept their claims about others. In political context, leaders use different reports or evidences to make believe people about the negative aspects of their opponents.

### **Categorization**

Social and political groups categorize people on the basis of their social, political, cultural or other afflictions. They do a bias categorization by presenting positively the people who are having same ideology and thoughts while presenting negatively to those people who might be afflicted with other groups and not having the same ideologies or intentions. In political discourse it is a very common practice to categorizing in-groups as loyal to nation and categorizing others as enemies and disloyal to country. In politics the process of categorization is also based on the polarization of in-groups and out-groups.

### **Comparison**

Comparison is another important technique of emphasizing the superiority of a particular group. For dominance and support in the society the political leaders compare our good aspects with their bad aspects. They use different linguistic devices such as similes and metaphor to contrast a comparison about in-groups and out-groups. They use positive similes and metaphors for in-group's members and try to associate themselves with positive things, while they use negative metaphors and similes for out groups. For example, they can express themselves as a ray of hope, symbol of change and other positive attributions while they can represent out groups as danger, aliens or outsiders.

### **Consensus**

Consensus is a strategy used in political discourse by emphasizing on 'national interests. Politicians use this strategy to prove themselves as most faithful and loyal to national interests. On the same time, they try to persuade people that other political parties are not faithful to national integrity or even other political parties are treacherous or disloyal to national interests. In Pakistani political context it has been observed that talking about national interests is a very sensitive issue. There's a long history of problems between India and Pakistan. A political leader may accuse his opponent that he is having relationship and loyalties with India. The purpose of this kind of propaganda is to spread hate for his political opponents by using the matter of

national interests, because in Pakistan people having a great dislike and hate for India.

### **Counterfactuals**

Counterfactuals mean making people fearful for trusting on out-groups through discourse. Counterfactuals are negative supposition to persuade people about negative consequences of relying on others. Through this way politicians make fearful people about negative consequences of voting other political parties. They emphasize on negative consequences by saying 'what would happen if they relay or vote other political parties.

### **Disclaimers**

Disclaimers are the linguistic representation of the mental image about in-group and out-group. It is the linguistic representation of ideology in the form of binary representation of 'us vs them'. One of the important feature of disclaimers is face saving of 'us' by emphasizing on positive characteristics of In-group, while to prove themselves the only option, and face threatening of out-groups by exaggerating their negative characteristics.

### **Euphemism**

Generally, in politics euphemism can be described as political correctness. In politics speakers most of the times use derogatory language to represent the negative image of out groups but in some situations they realize that by using negative language about others may cause unpleasant reaction from audience. That's why at the place of harsh words they use mild words to represent others for positive self-image or to avoid the unpleasant reaction from people.

### **Evidentially**

Evidentially means using historical sayings, opinions, or selected facts to support their ideology in the process of percussion. People can use all available information from different resources, which can be helpful in proving their ideology right and good. They might use the same information that other groups are not following this; hence they are negative and bad. Simply we can say that evidentially is providing evidences based on historical or authoritative opinions or notions, to make their argument or stake more persuasive and effective.

### **Example/ illustration**

The basic purpose of political discourse is to persuade people about their ideology. Political leaders while constructing their discourse use different linguistic techniques to make it more persuasive, one of the important technique is to provide the examples or stories to prove themselves right. They use selected facts and stories which are related to their ideology. In this process of persuasion, the stories or examples which are based on facts and figures are the most effective illustrations to make people believe about 'ours' ideology. Politicians select those stories which put more emotional impact on the minds of listeners.

---

### **Generalization**

Generalization is a strong persuasive device used in political discourse. It means that representing the whole group negatively without solid facts and figures. It is the negative representation of whole group and its ideology, by abstract thoughts, allegations and prejudices rather than providing factual evidences. For example, in politics by telling about the corruption of a minister, propagating that the whole out-group party as corrupt, and thieves.

### **Hyperbole**

Hyperbole is propagation or exaggeration of the positive and negative aspects of a group. Most of the times in politics positive aspects of in-groups have been exaggerated to get more appreciation in the society. This process of persuasion also involves the face threatening of political opponents by telling their stereotypical negative aspects. This ideological binary representation enraptures human mind, and by this way they control the way of thinking of people about political situations.

### **Implication**

In political discourse some part of the text remains implicit or unsaid. There can be different social and political barriers because of those barriers a writer or speaker cannot say or write what he feels or believes about others. It means some part of the text has not been said but the writer/speaker tries to make people understand on the behalf of shared social and cultural knowledge. In every society there is a collective social and cultural understanding among people through which they can understand the background information of discourse which is not explicitly described in the discourse.

### **Irony**

Irony means making the allegations against political opponents more effective and persuasive by saying them ironically rather than directly. Political speakers can limited the surface meaning by using irony when there is something unfavorable about 'us' and deliver the information implicitly. While when there is something negative or unfavorable about them they represent it not only explicitly but by exaggeration. Irony can be used for multiple purposes as for hyperbole, exaggeration and repetition etc.

### **Lexicalization**

In every society there are some barriers to explain social and political thoughts. For describing those hidden ideologies speakers use different alternative words for those thoughts. They use different ways of expressing their thoughts depending upon position, goals or opinions of the speaker. They use appropriate selected words to deliver their thoughts according to context. It means explaining a concept through bunch of words rather than long sentences or paragraphs. Basic function of lexicalization is emphasizing ours 'good' and others 'bad', hence this technique

has ideological intentions. For example, in anti-immigrant discourse a speaker can use different words to deliver his negative ideology about immigrants for example he can use words as 'economic immigrants' or 'bogus asylum seekers'. These short words have much background knowledge but it has been expressed in some phrases instead of long explanations.

### **Metaphors**

Metaphor is a rhetorical device which compares the two different things by emphasizing on the same qualities of both. Metaphor is widely used in political and manipulative discourse. Politicians draw the comparisons to present their ideology about us and them. They draw the ideological differences and inequalities by comparing us with good and positive things as Quionez (2018) found that American president is using negative metaphors of animals, floods, danger etc, to present out groups negatively. On the same time, he has been using the positive metaphors like saviors, and hope for nation. In Pakistani political context different political parties use different metaphors to present their ideology such as the use lion, bat, and arrow to present them in election campaigns metaphorically.

### **National Self Glorification**

National Self Glorification means drawing in-groups ideology and principals according to national interests. Political leaders emphasize that whatever their party is doing that is for greater national cause. There can be a polarization in the political discourse to devalue the position of out-groups in the society by proving that the activities of out-groups are based on anti-nationalist agenda. For example, a political leader can claim that they hate a political party because their activities are not according to national glorification. They try to persuade people that opponent party's ideology can be dangerous to our nation.

### **Negative Other Representation**

Negative other representation means presenting others negative or bad. It is based on ideological assumptions of a group. In politics one party tries to derogate other political opponents by presenting their negative features. Through this way they try to get more votes and popularity at the cost of others. In general, we can say that politicians to increase their value and acceptance in the society and present others as much negative as possible in their speeches and discourse. They use different techniques to do so for example by name calling, hate speech, abusing, personal attacks, criticizing their policies, allegations, etc.

### **Norm expression**

Speakers in political discourse use different explicit norm expressive statements which can be product of political, social, racial, desires and discriminations. These norms could be based on group prejudices. The speakers express their thoughts as what we are? And how should people behave,

these illustrations are based on group prejudices to control people's thinking about us and others.

### **Number Game**

In discourse numbers, facts and figures have been considered as most credible resources of persuasion as they make opinion objective. Political leaders in their speeches and debates use statistical knowledge, figures, media and organizational reports to increase their claims or statements. This technique is useful to increase the credibility of speaker's statement.

### **Polarization**

Polarization is the polarized or biased division of in-group (us) and out-group (them). This concept of polarization has been driven from ideological assumptions of a particular group or its ideology. Political text or talk about other political parties is highly ideological and polarized. In political text and speech 'us' and 'them' has been presented as each other's opposites. This categorization is the division of good and bad on the basis of group afflictions with allies vs enemies. Ours 'us' is good and allies, while others are presented as bad, negative and enemies. Politicians through special use of language present themselves good, most trustable and reliable while present others as bad, untrustworthy, and unreliable.

### **Populism**

Populism is a kind of argumentation fallacy. It is a technique to decrease the value of out-groups by telling people that all the people hate out-groups because of their negative aspects. These kinds of remarks are based on exaggeration and fallacy to spread that political opponents are not worth voting because most of the public is against them.

### **Positive Self-Representation**

The process of controlling the minds of people in politics is the combination of two-way technique. First is to highlight and propagate the negative things about others to lower their position in the society, and the second technique has been used to exaggerate their positive aspects about in-group members to increase their popularity and acceptance in the country. They use different linguistic features such as face keeping or impression management traits for the positive presentation of themselves.

### **Presupposition**

During political speeches speakers not deliver all information explicitly, but they presupposed that people will understand it through the background information.

### **Vagueness**

Politicians in their political discourses use unclear or vague expressions. They use expressions which are not well defined. For example, vague quantifiers like (a lot, few), adverbs and adjectives which are vague for example thing, low, high etc.

**Victimization**

Victimization is involved the negative representation of out-groups. Political leaders do victimization by telling the hideous stories about opponents. Their purpose is to draw negative image of out groups as much as possible. They pass derogatory, abusive and hateful remarks about others. This type of representation causes violence in linguistic behavior of their followers, they also start using abusive and hateful language about other parties. Victimization of political opponents cause complete chaos and disturb the social order.

**Name calling**

In Political discourse politicians use negative nouns for the negative representation of others. These nouns have negative connotations and help them to draw negative estimation of others. The use of negative nouns for others also involved cultural metaphors for example in Pakistani political context calling others Motu gang, Chotu gang, Ali Baba forty thieves etc.

**Wodak's Historical approach**

Wodak (2001) explained that discourses are deeply rooted in history hence they are not simple to understand. For the analysis of political discourse the researcher or analyst must have deep knowledge of history because discourses are not only product of present but it's all about past and future. In political discourse politicians use references from history and past to prove their stance. The politicians use selected facts or historical events of past which are according to their ideology.

**Rhetoric of Violence**

Hunter (2000) explained in his article 'considering issues of rhetoric and violence' that rhetoric of violence is use of negative criticism and derogatory language to attract people towards their ideology. The politicians do so, because they know that when they represent the image of others negatively, people will automatically start disliking them, and accept the ideology of the speaker. In countries where education rate is low, especially the young generation can be attracted toward this kind of abusive and violent language. As USAID (2016) found that politicians in Kosovo uses hate speech to present them superior to others. They do so to get political support of young people by abusing and derogating their political opponents. Jackman (2002) in his article 'violence in social life' categorize different types of violence as one of them is 'verbal or linguistic Violence' he defined it as following

“Verbal or written actions that derogate, defame or humiliate an individual or group” (Jackman, 2002, p.37)

**Defamation of out-groups**

Defamation is the process of damaging one's reputation by presenting false allegations and stories about them. In the context of this study it means that telling the false stories of corruption and disloyalty of political opponents to defame their reputation. There can be different techniques of



defamation as libeling, character assassination, smearing etc.

### **Humiliating 'Others' and self-praising**

In general humiliation means the process of making an individual or group ashamed in the eyes of others by drawing derogatory and negative portray of out groups. In political context it means that to take down political opponents by abusing, and relating them with derogatory acts of corruption or other social ills. The process of humiliating others also involved the binary logic of 'us vs them' hence it means presenting others bad, ill natured, criminals, and common foes for nation. They do so to present others negative image as foil to their positive aspects and tend to praise all their policies and ideologies.

### **Manipulation**

In general manipulation is the artful way of controlling human cognition. It has been described as using unfair or insidious means to control human mind for personal benefits. Manipulation in politics means providing a false perception or standard to people, which controls their perception to think and behave in controlled way. Van Dijk (2006) presented manipulation as a triangular process involved power abuse, human cognition and discursive interaction. Manipulation is very important to consider in critical discourse analysis, to see how social ideologies are presented in the text to form power relations of dominance. In social context manipulation means to construct inequalities among different social groups. It is illegitimate dominance employed through language and discourse. Cognitive manipulation involves controlling human cognition by presentation of biased and propagated information, knowledge and ideologies, to make them think in intended way. Discursive manipulation means controlling human mind through presenting ideologies in the text as ideological square. Discursive manipulation is employed by emphasizing our good aspects and their negative aspects in the text.

### **Amended Modal**

The following amended modal has been devised for the present research because of the analytical categories which were found in the data and inclusion and exclusion has been done very carefully to devise this modal. So this is the contribution on the part of the researcher. The following analytical categories of the amended modal are as under.

#### **3.8.1 Table of analytical categories as amended model**

|                   |                 |               |
|-------------------|-----------------|---------------|
| ACTOR DESCRIPTION | AUTHORITY       | COMPARISON    |
| CONSENSUS         | COUNTERFACTUALS | EVIDENTIALITY |
| POSITIVE SELF     | METAPHOR        | NUMBER GAME   |

|                      |               |                               |
|----------------------|---------------|-------------------------------|
| REPRESENTATION       |               |                               |
| POLARIZATION         | VICTIMIZATION | NEGATIVE OTHER REPRESENTATION |
| RHETORIC OF VIOLENCE | CALLING NAME  | HISTORICAL APPROACH           |

### **Thematic Analysis of the speeches of Mr. Khan** **Extract From S1**

- *Pehly to ma yeh pochta hon kay tm nay kabhi zindagi mein tehreek chalai hay? Kia kabhi gedar tehreek chala sakta hy? Gedar joo buzdil admi hota hy who kabhi stand nhe ly sakta.*
- First of all, I would like to ask the question, have you ever started a movement in your life? Can the jackal ever run a movement? Jackal is a coward; he can never take a stand.

One of the examples is jackal and coward. The type of language shows solidarity with and distance from each other. A type of language a person uses for others illustrates his or her relationship with other person. Here animal metaphor has been used for Mr. Sharif and that is jackal. Which implies that he is cunning he is interest seeker, he is coward and he cares about nothing except his own interests.

### **Extract from S8**

- *Yeh jo Marriyam Nawaz ke motu gang hy, moty moty dashkary, roz tv pay a kay, har roz tv pay a kay bol rhy hoty hein, apny apko zaleel kr rhy hoty hein*
- This is the fat gang of Marriyam Nawaz, the fat Dashkary coming on TV every day, talking on TV every day, humiliating themselves.

This is another example of linguistic violence at the level of naming that not only Mr. Sharif, but also his entire family as Mrs. Nawaz is leading the gang, which is represented again as *Motu gang* and *Dashkary*, here the use of lexical item, *Dashkary* carries negative connotations because in Pakistani political context this word is most often used for well rogues, who are ever ready to do illegal things for the sake of money. Further it means absolute criminals and dacoits, who have every social evil. They have been represented fat and fat again which means they are not only physically but economically corrupt that they have did so much corruption and their fatness implies the amount of corruption they did.

### **Extract From S8**

- *Aap nay es jagah jalsa kiah hay, joo es waqt ka Firoon hay, aap nay Firoon ke taraf jalsa kiah. Ma apki daleeri Koo aj phir tehseen paish krta hon, ap nay khoof ka buut tora. Kyon kay yeh, main nay aj es liy yahan aa kr jalsa kia hy kay ab a kr yeh Firoon ke diwaren deikhen*

- You have held a meeting at this place; this place is the place of Pharaoh of this time. You have held meeting at Pharaoh's place. I commend your courage. You broke the idol of fear. Because of this I have come here today to hold a meeting so the walls of Pharaoh could see.

Another example from the speech of Mr. Khan can also be quoted, in this speech he has also represented Mr. Sharif violently or negatively. The discourse of this speech has also deeply rooted in history because here he metaphorically calls him the Pharaoh of the present time, assuming claiming that just like the Pharaoh which claimed to be God or all powerful and he did whether it was right or wrong. Similarly Mr. Sharif and their party is being compared as Pharaohs of Pakistan, which have been looting the Pakistan for more than sixty years. But the implied message which lies within the discourse is that how so ever powerful the Pharaoh was, he was destroyed same would be done with them.

### **Thematic Analysis of the speeches of Mr. Sharif**

#### **Extract From S3**

- *Yahan par meri behno or maon ko daikho, ao himat hy to ao, o Zardari madari ao, daikho yahan par kis tareeqy say yeh lakhon awam jholiyan utha kr tmhen baduen day rhy hein*
- Look at my sisters and mothers here, if you have the courage, come, o Zardari Madari. See how these millions of people are cursing you.

In political discourse analysis, the analysis of actor description is very important that how a speaker or writer is representing ours and others characters positively and negatively respectively. In political discourse most of the times political leaders present the characters of their opponents negatively. Here Mr. Sharif naming Mr. Zardari as *Madari* which means a man who plays tricks only and having no real face. *Madari* have also other negative connotations such as a person who is not serious, fraud or fake person. He is not reliable or trustworthy because he is only making people fool with his tricks and can not be believed. So here the use of word *Madari* shows that Mr. Sharif wanted to say that Mr. Zardari can not be believed so he must not be voted in upcoming elections.

Here Mr. Sharif as also represented Mr. Zardari as a tyrant and oppressor that people are so much oppressed because of his tyrant nature and they are cursing him and asking God to get rid of him. Hence at the level of naming the representation of Mr. Zardari by Mr. Sharif is a clear example of linguistic violence as it has been depicted by the use of words like O Zardari and Madari.

#### **Extract from S3**

- *Mery bhaio, buzurgo or behno es rab ee zuljal ke Qasm jis kay qabzy mein hamari jaan hy kay joo shaks es mulk ko din rat loot rha hy ... es ko phr main Zardari or madari, or esko kia kahon?*
- My brothers and sisters, I swear by the glorious lord in whose possession our souls are that whoever is looting to this country day and night... then I call him Zardari and madari, and what should I call him?

### **Extract from S3**

- *Enhon ny Arbon rupay Pakistan kay loot liy hein, enhon ny Pakistan ke tabahi kr di hay*
- They have looted billions of rupees from Pakistan, they have destroyed Pakistan.

Here are other examples of violence at the level of naming. Mr. Sharif in his speech represented Mr. Zardari as oppressor, hateful, looter, destroyer, robber and criminal. All these nouns have negative connotations that imply that Mr. Zardari is not trustworthy to be voted and is having all negative characteristics, and sum of all social evils, the purpose of this negative representation is obviously for political gains. He has been represented violently because all the adjectives carries negative connotations have been used to denote him and his personality.

### **Extract from S3**

- *Or aj waqt a gya hy kay Zardari tolaay ka ehtasab krna hy*
- And today it is the time to hold the Zardari gang accountable.
- *Zardari or es kay tooly Koo, Ali baaba chalis choron Koo ham bhagaen gay nahi, enko pakren gay nahi ham chain sy nahi baithen gay.*
- As long as Zardari and his gang Alibaba forty thieves, until we not chase and catch then, we will not sit peacefully.

Mr. Sharif has not only represented the negativity of Mr. Zardari and oppression of his tyrant regime but also presenting themselves as saviors of nation from these corrupt gang of Mr. Zardari and ensuring people that Mr. Sharif and his party as a loyal Pakistanis will kick out these criminals and they would have been caught and soon will be in jail with the help of PMLN.

Mr. Sharif has quoted an interesting reference from the story of Ali Baba and forty thieves, as in that old story when the thieves tries to kill Ali Baba who is a good man and protecting the secret wealth, the thieves themselves have been killed by the loyal servant girl of Ali Baba, Mr. Zardari and his entire party has been represented as those forty thieves who wanted to steal the secret wealth, same as according to Mr. Sharif, Mr. Zardari and his party wanted to loot, but as those forty thieves have been killed at the end because of the presence of a loyal servant, same will happened to Mr. Zardari because that loyal servant in the form of Mr. Sharif and his party is

presented and they very soon will catch Mr. Zardari and its thieves. They will meet their bad end.

### **Thematic Analysis of the speeches of Mr. Rasheed**

#### **Extract from S9**

- *Ak chor kay khilaf, ak daku kay khilaf, ak bay iman kay khilaf, aik dhoky baz kay khilaf, aik rayakar kay khilaf, aik makar kay khilaf, aik mulk dushman kay khilaf, Imran Khan ke qayadat mein, Allah tala nay apko fatah inayat ke hy.*
- In the leadership of Imran Khan Allah almighty has granted you victory against thief, against a robber, against a dishonest, against a deceiver, against a hypocrite, against the enemy of the country

In political discourse naming or actor description is very important because every discourse starts from naming, that how different characters have been presented in the discourse, and how they are being differentiated from us. Here in this extract Mr. Ahmad has named Mr. Shareef violently and negatively as a thief, robber, dishonest, deceiver, hypocrite and traitor, these nouns are examples of linguistic violence that how Mr. Ahmad has used the rhetoric of violence in his speech for political support in upcoming elections here through use of these violent lexical items Mr. Ahmad wanted to prove Mr. Shareef as an absolute criminal, who must not be trusted and voted in upcoming elections.

#### **Extract from S4**

- *Ma inshallah ak minute mein bat khatm krta hon, taa ky gooli andar ho or yeh dono chohy Jilandhar hon*
- I inshallah finish in one minute, so the pill will be inside and these two rats will be Jilandhar.

Here both brothers (Shahbaz Sharif and Nawaz Sharif) have been metaphorically represented as rats, as the rats have been considered as the destroyers which most of the time spoil the food, and to get rid of them people use different kind of poisons. So here both brothers (Nawaz Sharif and Shahbaz Sharif) have been represented as rats which imply that the both brothers are spoiling the wealth of nation through corruption and looting and they are destroyers and dirty like rats. So they must have been killed or poisoned to save the economy of the nation. Here the use of lexical item such as *pill will be inside* implies the use of force or poison to someone. Mr. Rasheed also implied that these two brothers are shameless and senseless, and like rats their only purpose is to spoil the food or to destroy the wealth. So they can only be rectified with iron hands therefore the metaphor of pill has been used and also the quick action has been required as it is implied by the “pill will be inside and both rats will be to Jilandhar”. As soon as the pill of accountability hits them, they will meet their end so pill, rats and Jilandhar have been used metaphorically to represent them negatively.

### **Thematic Analysis of the speeches of Mr. Zardari**

#### **Extract from S10**

- *Mery moula ab es say jaan chura. Ab es nasoor sy jaan chura, es awam ke jaan chura. Ta kay ham Pakistan Koo dobara bana saken.*
- So I say, my Lord, get rid of it now, get rid of this ulcer now, get rid of these people from him, get rid of these poor people from him, so we can rebuild Pakistan.

Here again Mr. Sharif has been negatively named as ulcer. The metaphorical representation of Mr. Sharif has negative connotations such as an ulcer is the symbol of various diseases such as cancer. As cancer internally harms the human, the same Mr. Sharif has done with this nation with his corruption. He looted everything from the country in order to satisfy his lust for money and hollowed the country internally. And as physical description of ulcer or fistula which is so bad and disgusting, here Mr. Sharif has been represented as an ulcer because he has committed so much crimes, and corruption that he became the symbol of absolute hate. And because of the presence of PPP and Mr. Zardari such a dirty man has been identified. And people are asking God to get rid of him because they all have identified him, as an absolute criminal that must be removed for progress, as an ulcer must be removed from body to become healthy again, in the same way Mr. Shsrif should have been removed from the seat of Prime Minister for the progress of country.

#### **Extract from S11**

- *Magar aak nasoor zaror hy hamary qareeb, yeh boht baraa nasoor hy, boht barri mushkil hy.*
  - But definitely there is an ulcer near; it's a big ulcer, a very difficult one.

This extract is from another speech of Mr. Zardari, in this extract he described Mr. Sharif in the same way again as an ulcer. Throw this representation Mr. Zardari implicated that the Pakistan wanted to make progress, people of Pakistan and we PPP wanted to make progress, but there's a big trouble in the way of progress of Pakistan. And that trouble is Mr. Sharif. Like an ulcer which weakens the healthy body, Mr. Sharif has weakened the country with his looting, corruption and wrong policies. It is a big ulcer means that, it's difficult to get rid of him, but we have to do this together, because we wanted to save Pakistan, we wanted to make it progress.

### **Thematic Analysis of the speeches of Mr. Rehman**

#### **Extract from S12**

- *Akhir asy log joo Hindustan say funds laity rahy hein, asy log jo Israel or magharbi duniya say arbon ky funds laity rahy hein... or eska hisab enhon ny election commission ko nhi dia.*
- After all people who have been taking funds from India , people who have been taking billions of funds from Israel and the Western World... and they didn't give an account to the election commission.

Here Mr. Rehman cited another evidence of Mr. Khan's corruption that he has taken billions of rupees as funds from other countries. Here he has also used the technique of consensus to show that Mr. Khan has been taking funds from the enemies of Pakistan as India and Israel. Here India, Israel and Western World has been used to present Mr. Khan as friend of these countries and they are helping him. So because he is getting funds from these countries, he will work for them not for Pakistan. So a person who has taken the funds from the countries which are the enemies of Pakistan, how that kind of person could be trusted? Mr. Rehman not only presented Mr. Khan as a person who has been misusing the funds given to our country by the other countries in the form of help, but he also alleged that he didn't provide any details of those billion of rupees to the election commission of Pakistan which implies that those funds have not been used legally. Either those funds have been used illegally or Mr. Khan has used that money for personal benefits and that's why he didn't provided any documents to the election commission of Pakistan. And he is hiding himself to answer in the court and election commission.

**Extract from S12**

- *Lakin hamari azadi mat cheno. Hamen America ka ghulam mat bnao. Hamen Europe ka ghulam mat bnao. Hamen ban ul aqwami malyati idaron ka ghulam mat bnao.*
- But don't take away our freedom. Don't make us slaves of America. Don't make us slaves of international financial institutions.

Mr. Rehman has not only criticized Mr. Khan on the basis of religion, here he has criticized him and his ministers because of their economic policies. By citing the reference from the past Mr. Rehman has explained that Mr. Khan use to say one day the Pakistan will be so prosperous under his government that people will come here to get job from outside countries, but instead of coming people two puppets of west has come. Through this representation he implied that the Governor of the State Bank of Pakistan and the chairman of federal board of revenue are the agents of IMF and other European economic institutions and countries which wanted to destabilize Pakistan and its economy. Mr. Khan has proven himself a traitor and loyal to western agendas by appointing these people. Their only purpose is to weaken the economy of Pakistan because they are the puppets of enemies of Pakistan. Here Mr. Rehman used the metaphor of snake which have many negative connotations such as snake metaphor has been used for hidden enemy. The use of snake metaphor implies that on the surface level Mr. Khan and his ministers are serving Pakistan but like a snake they are dangerous for the economy of Pakistan. Their sole concern is to make Pakistan's economy as a mortgage of west so they can pressurize them to control their state affairs. And they are doing this so easily because the Prime Minister of Pakistan is their puppet and slave. Mr. Rehman also



presented a hope here that how so ever dangerous are the intentions of Mr. Khan and his ministers, he will never succeed in his nefarious intentions against Pakistan because I and my party will stop them as loyal Pakistanis.

#### 4.2 Content Analysis

In the present research the researcher has employed content analysis research technique, in this regard he has counted the frequency of occurrence of lexical items through which one politician represented other negatively or violently. The politicians included in this research are Imran khan, Shahbaz Sharif, Asif Zardari, Shaikh Rasheed and Fazulur Rehman. The number of speeches that has been considered for the present research is three of each politician. The researcher has gone through the speeches and critically listened the lexical items which have been used for the negative representation of each other.

#### Findings of the research

The present study has aims at critical discourse analysis of the speeches of selected politicians of Pakistan to identify the use of violent linguistic items in their political speeches for the negative estimation of their political opponents. This study has identified the ways of representing others negatively by the selected politicians in their speeches.

The analysis of data reveals that the selected politicians has used the following linguistic devices from the Socio-cognitive model by Van dijk Actor description, Authority, Comparison, Consensus, Counterfactuals, Evidentially, Metaphor, Number Game, Polarization, Victimization, Negative other representation and positive self-representation. The following are the other included linguistic devices which have been utilized by the selected politicians to represent others violently, Calling Names, Wodak's Historical approach and Rhetoric of Violence.

The findings of the study reveal that all the selected politicians have used the rhetoric of violence in their speeches for others for example Mr. Khan has represented Mr. Sharif and other members of PMLN by using the derogatory language which is as jackal, crocodiles, Pharaoh, barking people, thugs, *Motu gang*, *Chotu gang*, boot polishers, courtiers, big dacoits, friends of Mr. Modi, mafia, thieves, corrupt, liars etc. In the speeches of Mr. Khan one of the most dominant themes is the corruption of others In his three speeches, on twenty seven occasions he has used violent linguistic items against his political opponents on the bases of corruption. Other dominant themes are incompetence of government, religio-political criticism and proving them disloyal on the basis of national interests.

Mr. Sharif has used derogatory linguistic items to represent his political opponents as O Zardari, *Madari* (Circus Man), looters, mafia, *manhos* (Evil man), beggar, thieves, thugs, bribers, gangsters, traitors, corrupt, hardship, brainless, IG of liars etc. In the three speeches of Mr. Sharif the most dominant themes are corruption and incompetence, on the bases of these two themes he

has victimized his political opponents on seventeen different occasions. Other important themes in his speeches are consensus and negative representation of others.

Mr. Zardari has used derogatory language to represent his political opponents as deceptive, cowards, shameless, Showbaz, dishonest, robbers, dramatists, illegitimate, national thief, beast, ulcer on earth, foolish, traitor, a big trouble etc. Consensus or proving his political opponents disloyal to national interests is the most dominant themes in the three selected speeches of Mr. Zardari as he has used this theme on eleven different occasions to represent his political opponents negatively. Other important themes in his speeches are tyranny of political opponents, incompetence of others and corruption of political opponents.

Mr. Rehman has employed violent linguistic and lexical items against Mr. Khan and his government as blasphemer, conspirators against end of prophethood, traitor, snakes, servants and flatterers of west, corrupt, illegitimat, stinking, incompetent, tyrant, big bustards, punishment of God, agents of Jews, representatives of west etc. In the three selected speeches of Mr. Rehman, there are different prominent themes on the basis of which he has used violent linguistic lexical items for his opponents. Illegitimate government is the most dominant theme which he has used on nine different occasions to present his opponents negatively. Other prominent themes are corruption, religion, consensus and incompetence which he has used on seven different occasions in his speeches.

Mr. Rasheed has used the derogatory linguistic items to represent his political opponents negatively as rats, cunning, liar, hypocrite, animal metaphor, dirty, nonsense, dishonest, traitor, thief, robber, shameless, cursing, pumpkins, diesel, snake, money launderer etc. The most prominent themes in the three speeches of Mr. Ahmad is to address his political opponents derogatorily on personal liking and disliking, he called his political opponents by many derogatory names on the basis of corruption, consensus, and even physical shape of the person. He used this trick of calling humiliating names of opponents one twelve different occasions. Other important themes are consensus, corruption and religio-political criticism.

### **Recommendations**

- A comparative study can be conducted on the speeches of Pakistani politicians and politicians from other countries as well to know how rhetoric of violence is exercised by the speakers of different countries for positive self and negative other representation.
- A psychological study can be conducted to analyze the effects of political speeches on the minds of people.
- Politicians should be given proper linguistic training as there are listened on huge level.

| Illustrations                        | IMRAN KHAN | SHAHBAZ SHARIF | ASIF ALI ZARDARI | SHAIKH RASHEED | FAZLURREH MAN |
|--------------------------------------|------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|---------------|
| <b>Actor description</b>             | 30         | 17             | 3                | 7              | 2             |
| <b>Authority</b>                     | 9          |                |                  | 1              | 3             |
| <b>Comparison</b>                    | 12         | 8              | 2                | 1              | 2             |
| <b>Consensus</b>                     | 2          | 4              | 9                | 8              | 14            |
| <b>Counterfactuals</b>               |            |                | 2                |                |               |
| <b>Evidentiality</b>                 | 8          | 2              |                  | 2              | 6             |
| <b>Metaphor</b>                      | 5          | 1              | 3                | 7              | 2             |
| <b>Number Game</b>                   | 26         | 14             | 3                | 5              | 14            |
| <b>Polarization</b>                  | 16         | 28             | 9                | 7              | 12            |
| <b>Victimization</b>                 | 21         | 12             | 3                | 12             | 5             |
| <b>Negative other representation</b> | 49         | 39             | 27               | 37             | 50            |
| <b>Positive Self Representation</b>  | 35         | 32             | 19               | 14             | 28            |

|                      |    |    |    |    |    |
|----------------------|----|----|----|----|----|
| Calling Names        | 15 | 16 | 7  | 13 | 13 |
| Historical Approach  | 4  | 9  | 1  | 4  | 6  |
| Rhetoric of violence | 20 | 22 | 11 | 24 | 11 |

## References

- Ahmad, S. (2012). Critical Discourse Analysis of Prime Minister's speeches on Harmful Aerial Vehicles (drones). *International Journal of Language and Linguistics* 1(2).
- Ayeomoni, Moses. (2005). A Linguistic–Stylistic Investigation of the Language of the Nigerian Political Elite. *Nebula* 2(2), 153-168.
- Beard, A. (2000), *The Language of Politics*. London: Routledge.
- Brown, G. and Yule, G. (1983), *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and Power*. London: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (1993). Critical Discourse Analysis and the Marketization of Public Discourse: The Universities. *Discourse & Society*, 4(2), 133-168.
- Fairclough, N. (1996). Rhetoric and Critical Discourse Analysis: A Reply to Titus Ensink. *Current Issues in Language and Society*, 3(3), 286-289.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. London: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analyzing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. London: Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis: A Critical Study of Language*. London/ NewYork: Longman.
- Ghilzai, S & Ayaz, M & Dekhrodi, A. (2017). A Critical Discourse Analysis of Imran Khan's First Speech in the Parliament. *Perspectives in language, Linguistics and Media*, 2(1), 149-167.
- Hunter, Lynette (2000). Considering Issues of Violence and Rhetoric. *Parallax*. 6 (2), 2–8.
- Jackman, M. (2002). Violence in Social Life. *Annual review of Sociology*, 28, 387-415.
- Junling, Wang. (2010). A Critical Discourse Analysis of Barack Obama's Speeches. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 1(3), 254-261.
- N, Julianavnn. (2014). Discourse Analysis: Ronald Reagan's Evil Empire Speech. *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics*, 4(1), 166-181.
- Nusrat, A & Sardaraz, K & Shehzadi, Ms. (2020). Critical Discourse Analysis of Imran Khan Dharna Speeches in Socio-Political Perspective. *Sir Syed Journal of Education and Social Research*, 3(1), 9-19.
- Sipra, M & Rasheed, A. (2013). Critical Discourse Analysis of Martin Luther King's Speech in Socio-Political Perspective. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 4(1), 27-33
- USAID (2016). The influence of hate speech as a political tool on the youth of Kosovo. *International Foundation for electoral system*.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2011). Discourse studies and hermeneutics. *Discourse Studies*, 13(5), 609-621.
- Van Dijk, T.A. (2006). Politics, Ideology, and Discourse. *Encyclopedia of Language & Linguistics*. 2, 728-740.
- Van Dijk, T.A (2004). Politics, Ideology and Discourse. *Encyclopedia of Language and Discourse*, 2, 728-740.
- Van Dijk, T.A. (1998). *Ideology: A multidisciplinary approach*. Sage Publications Inc.
- Wodak, R.(2001). *Methods of critical discourse analysis*. London: Thousand Oaks – New Delhi: Sage Publications.