

AN EXPLORATION OF IDEOLOGY THROUGH THE STUDY OF DISCOURSES IN “PAKISTAN: A PERSONAL HISTORY” BY IMRAN KHAN

¹Humera Sharif ¹

The University of Lahore, Lahore

h_ravian@live.com

ABSTRACT: This study is conducted to explore the ideology of the writer in “Pakistan: A personal history”. The analysis has been carried out by the application of Fairclough’s term “discourses” mentioned in the second dimension of his model. The findings of the paper provide a detailed account of discursive formation and discursive strategies. Investigation of Discursive strategies gives a long list of discourses that writer normalizes or eliminates in order to represent his ideology such as Cartesian discourse or tylerist discourse respectively. All in all, author believes in true Islamic democratic system as only remedy for the broken nervous system of the country. Eventually, this study can help out in exposing, impartially, the truth of political discourse. Hence, it can trigger positive social change.

Keywords: Discourses, ideology, discursive strategies, social actors

INTRODUCTION

The most important element by which CDA is differentiated from other forms of discourse analysis lies in its attribute of ‘critical’. ‘Critical’ stands for connections and causes which are hidden in the discourse. The researcher [1] suggests “critical is used in the special sense of aiming to show up connections which may be hidden from people such as the connections between language, power and ideology”.

The concept of ideology is central in CDA and politics. Ideology is defined in terms of basic belief system shared by the members of group. In Ideology and Politics, the researcher [2] defines it as “attitude towards change”. Now, either we need change or not, in any case belief is involved. Ideology basically serves politics as a significant player of change.

A significant focus of the paper is to study the discourses used in text in order to enact ideology. As one of its central objectives, CDA considers the linguistics (discourse) choices that a text producer selects as potential medium by which ideological concepts and import of that particular discourse situation can be reproduced. The researchers [3] and [4] conveniently elaborate and use the term “working assumption” that “any part of any language text, spoken or written, simultaneously constitutes representations, relations, and identities”. It is further explained as discourse represents particular world views, social relations between people and particular social; identities according to the purpose, context and addressees of the text. Thus, CDA in this paper, as a research method, centers on understanding the ideological scheming of discourse and also aims to produce a critique of how discourse operates to affect certain agendas.

All in all, CDA involves in uncovering ideological agendas emerging from the discourses produced in formal and informal exchanges.

LITERATURE REVIEW

CDA and Political Ideology

CDA refers to the way of understanding the social world drawn from critical theory. Within the critical discourse analysis, reality is understood constructed by various social forces. The researcher [5] argues that what makes discourse analysis “critical” is the explanation of the ways in which unequal power relations and ideological agendas are produced and naturalized in discourse. Political discourse is sub-category of discourse in general. Political discourse is not

only concerned with the political text structure but also with the political context as the researcher [6] describes that political actors are not only meant to speak in certain ways, rather “there is a need for cognitive collaboration between situations and talk or text that is a context” [6]. Thus CDA becomes a useful research method in the domain of political science in order to explore ideology of particular political group.

Members of political groups have shared belief system but it does not mean that components of beliefs connecting members of one group do not exist in another group of politics. It may part of other belief system. The researcher [2] describes it as ‘ideological pluralism’ i.e. there is no purest form of ideologies. Ideologies have asymmetric structures and some of their principles are advanced by more than one ideology. One individual may constitute a combination of *multiple ideologies* such as religious ideology, social ideology, economic and political ideology etc. so, political discourse may enact multiple ideological identities of a politician. As politician claims for being true well-wisher of every domain of social life that is why his political discourse is constituted by the combination of every type of ideology related to all domains of society. It is also significant to explain that ideologies are defined as socially shared representations of groups, so these are foundations of group attitudes and other beliefs. It also means that political ideology of one member does not varies at large from other members of the same political group. Here comes “qualitative and quantitative differences between the beliefs of an individual and of group. It is explained as it is not necessary that every belief of a group is shared by every member of the same group or the belief entertaining the individual’s belief is part of group belief system. Usually, two ideologies are expressed in the text of politicians: *professional ideologies* that underlie their functioning as politicians, secondly, *socio-political ideologies* they relate to as members of political parties or social groups. Regarding ideologically functioning, the researcher [2] summarizes the *components of ideology*: description (D), analysis (A), moral prescriptions (Pm), technical prescriptions (Pt), Implements (I), rejections (R). Hence, one first of all notices and describes the phenomenon, then analyses. Furthermore, he makes final decision according to moral norms and prone it according to technical possibilities what to do and what not.

But in real life it is quite complicated and perhaps difficult to accomplish as analysis and description within moral prescription may be prejudiced. Hence, according to [2], there are chances for the bifurcation of ideologies as prescription depends on strict moral codes but conversely, political actions require the goals contrary to it. Resultantly, conflict arises between ideology and action instead of ideology itself.

To know what one believes, pertains to '*ideological mentality*' a term coined by the researcher [7] and suggested in 'Ideology and Social Network: the politics of social policy diffuses in Brazil. For this purpose it is necessary to look into minds of politician. Hence, while speaking of mentality; one is never far from the analysis of language used to speak out the beliefs. Thus, if one politician regularly criticizes other politician for "not listening to the voice of the people", then we may assume that basic norm defining ideology of first mentioned politician is "listening to the voice of people"

Language use in professing political ideology

It is evidently clear now that political ideological discourse analysis is not merely to discover underlying political ideologies, but also to systematically link structures of political discourse (context and text) with structures of political ideologies. A number of discursive strategies and structures work together to express enact and reproduce ideologies in discourse. Here, it is significant to mention that only variable structures of discourse are ideologically "marked". It means that only contextual structures are influenced by ideologies because obligatory, grammatical structures are same for all speakers of the language so cannot be ideologically marked. Furthermore, some variable structures are more ideologically sensitive than others.

The language can be used for many political purposes. The main purpose of politician is to persuade as the researcher [8] forward that this purpose can be achieved by following three linguistic elements.

1. *Presupposition*: background assumptions embedded within a sentence or phrase.
2. *Implicature*: shared knowledge between the speaker and hearer and embedded within more than one sentence. (as suggested by the researcher [9]).
3. *Persuasive Language*: use of rhetorical language (metaphors, hyperboles to emphasize or de-emphasize ideological meanings) Rhetoric is "the art of using language so as to persuade or influence others; the body of rules to be observed by a speaker or writer in order that he express himself with eloquence" (Oxford English Dictionary). More skillful use of rhetoric makes the politicians more successful as they are closer to achieve the aim of persuading recipients of the validity of their political ideologies.

To analyze a politician's language, various discursive elements and strategies require attention as summarized here from the researcher [4]:

- 1) How are persons named and referred to linguistically?
- 2) What traits, characteristics, qualities and features are attributed to them?
- 3) What argumentation scheme is used by politicians to justify and legitimize the exclusion, discrimination, suppression and exploitation of others?

4) What are the arguments behind the labels mentioned in point three?

5) Are the respective labels articulated overtly? Are these intensified or mitigated? Is it a good way of positive self-representation and negative other representation.

6) Use personal stories and anecdotes in order to stress their efficiency

7) Use style appropriate to their interests

In sum, politicians are webbed in the art of emotional exploitation of their recipients. They use all the good lexical items to justify their patriotism and honesty. Furthermore, all the negative sort of things such as emotions of fear, anger and scorn are attributed to opposition by using negative vocabulary.

Theoretical Framework

CDA's major contribution to discourse analysis is to bring together social and linguistics analysis. Hence, it aims at integrating macro analysis of social structure with micro analysis of action. The researcher [10] suggests that CDA's effectiveness has to be in its ability to analyze 'social' in conjunction with linguistics micro analysis. The researcher [5] explains that this analysis is "accompanied by a principled and transparent shunting back and forth between micro and macro level".

For this purpose of critical discourse analysis a number of approaches are presented such as researcher's [11] Discourse Historical approach that claims, "discourse is always historical connected synchronically and diachronically with other communicative events which are happening at the same time or which have happened before". The researcher's [6] idiosyncratic approach is said to combine socio-cognitive approach of [4] and socio-semiotic approach of [1]. Though, these approaches have significant contribution to CDA yet most perfect work was offered by [1]. He presented amalgamation of linguistic and social theories for accurate analysis. His concept of discourse analysis integrated linguistic definition of discourse presented in the work of Halliday with socio-theoretical concepts from Foucault's work.

The researcher [1] presented three dimensional frameworks for the critical discourse analysis of any given piece of discourse. The stages of the model are descriptive, interpretation and explanation. These three stages provide analysis in these respective parts: text, discourse practice and social practice.

Discourses, he elaborates, after the explanation of concrete or abstract processes represent particular stance on social events by normalizing certain discourses. The researcher [9] explains, ".....and indeed the discourses they are associated with are ideological". Furthermore, discourses are represented by lexical elements within text (hyponymy, synonymy, antonyms, collocation and metaphors etc.) or grammatical processes

The researcher [9] describes, "Different discourses are different perspective of the world". Though there are many other ways to represent world, but, we "consider it generally, from the perspective of different relationships between various discourses in the text". A text consisted on different chains of events, located in same social practice with various social elements may differ in various discourses drawn on

text. Moreover, discourses are drawn ‘overtly or covertly at subdiscoursal level.’[1]. Hence, particular stance of the text producer is implicit in his choice of adopting specific discourse that is explained by the representation of social events and social elements.

The researcher [9] describes that corresponding to textual analysis; discourses can be interpreted in two ways:

- 1) Identify the main parts of the world (including areas of social life) which are represented- main themes.
- 2) Identify the particular perspective and angle or point of view from which they are represented.

Important Linguistic Terms

The discursive formation:

As pointed out by the researcher [5], an essential feature of critical discourse analysis is a concern for connecting local events and processes to broader social relations. In Foucault’s work, the discursive formation provides this conceptual link. For Foucault, a discourse formation is recognized by regularity formed by seemingly unconnected groups of statements. Thus, a discursive formation connects the text to the social by connecting statements to broader world views as well as to other statements within and across texts, time, and place.

Discursive strategies:

Foucault identified a set of strategies by which a discourse constitutes its object. These strategies normalize certain subjectivities and exclude others. Strategies of normalization and exclusion may be recognized as comparing, ranking, classifying, hierarchizing, and dividing.

Discursive effects:

Foucault argued that discourses are not just instruments of power, but may also be effects of power. Discourse is not only an instrument of regulation but a hindrance, a stumbling block, a point of resistance and a starting point for an opposing strategy. Hence, one important aim of CDA is to examine effects of discourse strategies.

Synonymy:

Linguistic equivalence is called as synonymy.

Antonym:

The words which are opposite in meanings is called as antonym.

Hyponymy and Hypernymy:

It shows the relationship between words i.e. parent child relationship. It is when words relate to one general category.

Metonymy:

Metonymy is, “A word is used for something related to that which it usually refers to”[12]. For example, eye for gaze, skirt for girl and white house instead of the representative members living inside. As explained in “white house ordered” instead of “president Obama ordered”. The term may be confused by ‘synecdoche’ (meronymy) that is “part-whole relationship” [12].

Social actors:

Social actors are social agents who act in their volition. Hence, only animate or human can be social actors while inanimate objects can never be actors. The researcher [13] describes that abstract entities and objects can also be social actors.

Grammatical metaphor:

The term is introduced by the researcher [12]. He describes grammatical metaphors as meanings in terms of grammar instead of words. In this particular type processes are represented as entities instead of their original essence of process. Nominalization is type of grammatical metaphor that transfers process into an agent.

Impersonalization:

The researcher [14] describes that in the use of ‘impersonalization’ one avoids referring to a person explicitly or it is the “use of constructions lacking a specific human agent”. They further explain that by not using real names, persons are degraded from their original respect and the purpose is “to make message more acceptable”

Hybridization

For the interpretation of different discourses drawn upon a text, *inter discursive* analysis is significant. Hybridization is when a third discourse emerges out of the integration of two discourses.

ANALYSIS:

DISCOURSES, REPRESENTATION AND IDEOLOGY Research Questions:

- How do discourses represent social practices and eventually help out in finding the ideology in the text?
- What are the discursive strategies used in the text?
- How the context of desired political views has been constructed and reconstructed by the author?

Considering these questions the discourse analysis is explained here.

This text written by the political leader of an emerging party is concerned about ‘future of Pakistan’. Thereby, it integrates variety of discourses related to different institutions of social life in Pakistan, headed by State government. One discourse is *political-religion discourse* besides some other discourses regarding different social practices. Author maps out Islam on ‘democracy’ and ‘a set of simple legal principles’. Initially, it seems the ‘*Discourse of Fundamentalism*’ as contrary to ‘*Discourse of Secularism*’. It is similar to the researcher’s [15] ‘*Islamic Nationalist Discourse*’. It presents only Islam (excluding modernism) as an ‘agent’ and an abstract force who teaches ‘democracy’ as an abstract set of values for governing the world. Other evidence to this discourse is the naming process for anti-religious political system i.e. ‘Western toadies of Islam’ for Pakistani secularist, ‘liberal fanatics’ for secularists and for secularism ‘dualism’. Further analysis brings on ‘*Discourse of Secular Nationalist*’ i.e. anti-Islam by attributing advocates of Islamic state, all the characteristics used by secularists; such as ‘myth making Mullas’, ‘religious zealots’, ‘ancient desert flock’, ‘reactionaries mullas’, ‘hermits or ascetics’, ‘conservative thinkers’ and ‘primitive creed’. Their resultant contribution to life is associated with ‘stagnation’, ‘uniform social life’, ‘uniform version of Islam’, ‘retrogressive’ and ‘medieval attitude’. It highlights the features of secularist discourse by explaining all the abstract processes dragging the world back to ancient times as a result of ‘conservative Islamic’ agents

and all the progressive processes to west i.e. Western secularism such as ‘modernity’, ‘highest ideals’, ‘innovation’, ‘progressive creation’ etc. author does not prefer any one of these two discourse types of government system rather he just highlights plus and negatives of both of these discourses and prefer the third one.

A close analysis of text eliminates both of the above given discourse types and traces the normalization of third discourse: *‘Islamic cum Patriotic’*. Here, patriotism resembles feature of secularism and lies in running the affairs of government and raising the nation up to the competition of modernity enough to make it progressive. It is evident when author advocates the *integration* of both the above mentioned discourses. Its core feature is the use of vocabulary such as ‘integrated version of Islam’ of ‘modernity’ and ‘traditionalism’ ‘fusion of Islamic ideals and scientific progress’, ‘evolution of both religion and culture’, ‘move forward religion and culture’, ‘enlightened Islam’. ‘Realm of public morality’ is the bridge to cover the gulf between two schools of thoughts (secularists and Islamists nationalists). This discourse builds up a ‘cum’ between tradition and modernity, fundamentalism and secularism, medieval attitudes and highest ideals. Hence, it favours ‘enlightened Islam’ for state governance, where ‘enlightened’ stands for ‘secularism’.

As the author is the Pakistani Political leader so discourses must be interpreted in the context of Pakistani politics. Author calls secular spirit as liberal fanatics and in Pakistani political context, it is further, specified as *‘Pakistani liberal fanatics’* as converse to *‘religious fundamentalists’*. Summing up the views of the researcher’s [16], it is *‘Discourse of MQM’* when it comes to the terms of ‘discourse of secular Nationalists’ as MQM believes that Islam is incompatible with modernity. Author eliminates this discourse type. Conversely, he normalizes the *‘Discourse of Islamic cum Patriotic’* that vocalizes *‘Discourse of JI’* [16]. Ideology of JI is, actually, based on vision of Maulana Maududi so it is *‘Discourse of Maududi’* (though it is no more in practice as described by the researcher [17]). The researcher [9] calls it *‘Cartesian discourse of the Subject’*.

For the interpretation of different discourses drawn upon a text, *inter discursive* analysis is significant. It is explained as hybridization of discourses. *Two main discourses integrated in the text are religious discourse and political discourse.* Former is an ideal code of life with ethical and moral values, concerning equality of humans, their rights and duties. Elements of religious discourse (spirituality) are foreign to materialism that is peculiar to political discourse. Materialism demands adjustments and adaptability according to needs in order to compete at the global level or local state. In this west race human rights are often neglected. Considering these issues, these two discourses are hybridized in reconstruction of politics into religion as materialism cum morality. It combines two abstract processes of spirituality and worldliness. Hence, to run affairs of the world under a set of moral and ethical values, actually, *‘Discourse of Islamist cum Patriotic’* more specifically *‘Discourse of Maududi’* is legitimized (ideology).

Now the question arises how these discourse are drawn upon. According to [9], “distinguishing features of discourses are

likely to be features of vocabulary” and the “rewording draws upon and evokes the way of structuring the world associated with this discourse rather than setting up a new relation”. This process is called as representation by lexicalization. Important terminology for the interpretation of the text is synonym, antonym, collocation, hyponymy, meronymy etc.

‘Discourse of religious fundamentalism’ evokes in the text from semantic relations of *synonymy* such as ‘traditionalism’. This view of traditionalism transforms into other lexemes with same meanings as ‘retrogressive’ and conservative thinkers of Islam’ is its promoters. It further gets support by the use of similar semantic relations such as, ‘myth making Mullahs’ ‘ancient desert flock’ primitive creed’ etc. *Process* of traditionalism has been described by ‘stagnation’. It stands for something that accepts no change rather stuck to uniformity. Thus, it has been reworded as ‘uniform life’ and uniform version of life’. *‘Discourse of secularism’* has number of connotations with the same meanings. Its process of ‘modernity’ gets supported by ‘innovation’ and reworded as ‘progressive creation’. Whereas *‘Discourse of Islamic cum Patriotic’* or more specifically, *‘Discourse of Maududi’* (the term has been taken from *‘Religion and Politics in South Asia’*, Riaz, 17) contains synonyms as ‘integrated’ and ‘fusion’ of modernity and traditionalism.

Antonyms are at core of the text to evoke other type of discourses. For example, ‘stagnation’ has its rival ‘innovation’, ‘uniform social life’ and ‘uniform version of Islam’ legitimizes discourse of Islamist’ and in return evokes ‘discourse of secularism’ by the use of antonyms as ‘progressive creation’ and ‘scientific progress’.

‘Discourse of Islamic cum Patriotism’ is a polemical relationship between two more discourse types. These are *‘Discourse of Islamic Democracy’* and *‘Dominant Discourse’*. Former is *hyponym* of *‘Discourse of Democracy’*. In text, it is evident in analogical relation between ‘democracy’ and ‘freedom’, ‘dictatorship’ and ‘coercion’. All the agony associated with dictatorship i.e. suppression, suffered, growing pains evokes discourse of democracy. It narrows down to *‘Discourse of Islamic Democracy’* by the description of ‘Islam’ as an agent of teaching ‘democracy’. Speech of Holy Prophet (PBUH) at sacred ‘place of Madina’ triggers spirit of democracy in the vocabulary ‘freedom of speech’, and ‘citizen’s right’.

All the pleasant semantic relationship of equivalence amongst the words freedom, citizen’s right and freedom of speech and their traces in Prophet’s speech and their antagonistic relationship to suppression, suffering and pains legitimize the *‘Discourse of Islamic Democracy’* that clues the particular ideology of integration of Islam in democratic political system.

Whereby *‘Dominant Discourse’* complies with *‘Patriotic Discourse’* on the aspects that differ from the angle as mentioned above. Here it excludes issues of ethnicity and hence, is converse to *‘Discourse of Ethnicity’* and equal to *‘Discourse of Nationalism’* (the terms have been taken from the researcher [18].) One feature of ‘dominant discourse’ is ‘equality of races, and classes’ along with accentuating modernism offered by secularism to make the nation progressive. ‘Tolerance’ of ‘Minorities’ and ‘Legitimacy’ of other ‘faiths’ discourages existence of ‘ethnicity’. It provides

positive sensational feelings to experiencers. Furthermore, relationship between the verbs of negation and entities of nominalization assert the 'patriotic discourse' as 'prohibits' diminishes the 'race and class distinction' and 'hatred towards minorities and Muslim sects' is mapped out as 'worst aspect'. Thus, 'equality', 'tolerance' and 'legitimacy' have semantic equivalence of positive connotations for minority and ethnic rights. Their antonym is 'worst aspect'. These semantic relations normalize 'Dominant Discourse'.

Resultantly, 'Discourse of Islamic Democracy' and 'Patriotic Discourse' mix up into 'Islamic cum Patriotic Discourse'. It has been legitimized by rewording of same features associated with various aspects of social practices.

Relationship of hypernymy and hyponymy, though, exists within the elements of one particular discourse but in this text this relationship seems to be existed within various discourses as well. Two more discourse types normalized are: 'Discourse of Left wing' and 'Discourse of Antagonism'. These are hyponyms of 'Islamic cum Patriotic' discourse.

"Pakistan has become a failing state" is the evidence of 'Discourse of left wing' (term used by the researcher [9]) that speaks against ruling party i.e. right wing and machinery in power. The similar statement was given by a member of leftwing, Pakistan People's Party, in one session of National assembly in 2013, "Pakistan has become failed state". In text, the characteristic of this discourse is inclusion of 'agents' engaged in corruption of processes of social events. The naming process for 'agents' of government have the connotations of 'cruelty' and 'corruption'. For this cause concrete objects 'power wielders' have been mapped on abstract values 'loot, plunder' etc.

Semantic equivalence of synonyms exists in the naming process and the activities associated with them. 'Power wielders' are perceived same as 'ruling oligarchies' and 'ruling elite', 'bureaucracy', 'feudal', 'the lumbering giants', and 'crooks'. The meaning of 'cruelty and corruption' are enhanced by the use of verbs explaining the tyranny such as 'suppression', 'ruined', 'fuels corruption', 'cursed', 'loot and plunder'. Moreover, use of attributes legitimizes the 'Discourse of left wing'. These attributes 'vested interest' and 'hungry for money and power' enhances the negative impression of right wing party. Attribute of 'the lumbering giant' makes the effect of cruelty felt as more severe. The discourse of left wing has been drawn upon by the hyponymy relationship existing in the lexemes. 'Authoritarian rule' is hypernym of 'suppression', 'ruined', 'loot and plunder', 'cursed', 'coercion'.

'Discourse of antagonism' (a term used by the researcher [9]) is evident in author's views about foreign policy. The ironical argument, "every solution to Pakistan's problems is imported" is against the protagonists (rightwing party) who consider it necessary or are compelled to take foreign advises. 'A cowed nation' is the name used in text for this dependence upon 'foreign aid'. The statement that correlates 'western intrusion' and the growth of 'extremists' is statement of antagonistic and has been given against the policies of protagonists, who allow foreign interference. This foreign intrusion is further, supported by its hyponym 'crutches from the US'.

The phrase 'a cowed nation' gives the glimpses of 'Discourse of Imperialism' that considers all the colonized below the rationality and far away from enlightenment and hence, degrades them to primitiveness (a characteristic associated with animals).

Discourse of antagonism and leftwing hybridized themselves in the third discourse 'Discourse of Compassion' (term used in 'Western Spectacle of Governance and the Emergence of Humanitarian World politics', Aaltola, 19). Rhetoric of pain and agony that is evident in above mentioned both discourses legitimize this discourse of compassion. It explains the pitiable condition of 'objects', in other words 'sufferers' as a result of the 'agents' activities' in the two previous mentioned discourses. Concrete objects 'poor people' are under the influence of abstract processes of tyranny of powerful and cruel 'agents'. 'Discourse of compassion' is evident in the 'hidden suffering evident in verbs 'unbearable', 'deprivation', 'marginalization', 'oppressed', 'wronged' etc. Antonym relationship between underlying volunteer ruthlessness associated with powerful people and unwillingness of 'voiceless' to be subjected to this harshness makes the 'poor people' experiencer and 'the lumbering giant' as agent of cruelty.

'Discourse of Social Cohesion' "represents people...in terms of their feelings (sense of unease, inequality and polarization) and their hopes and aspirations" [9]. Hence, above mentioned 'Discourse of Compassion' aims at manifesting 'social cohesion'. It is, at core, moral and human discourse. Strand of humanity is *covert* in 'discourse of compassion' that vocalizes 'equality, fair play, and justice. Voice for morality in the lexemes as 'truth, bravery', 'human rights', and 'realm of public morality' brings up the 'discourse of social cohesion'. Besides, the condemnation of social disorder, desperation and disillusionment by the use of *antonyms* of lexemes meant for social cohesion i.e. 'unfair' (social system), 'unjust' (economy), 'gaping ethical values' strongly favour the 'discourse of social cohesion'.

'Education' being one significant element of social cohesion represents 'Discourse of Education' in the whole text, implicitly or explicitly. In this discourse semantic equivalence manifests between concrete and abstract objects, as obvious in 'informed public', 'education', 'school system', 'madrssas', 'private and public' (education sector). It further specifies into 'Discourse of Equality of Education' or 'Discourse of Westernized Education System' when it comes to the terms of condemnation of quality disparities prevailing in the three tier system of education in Pakistan as evoked in 'madrssas', 'English'(private) and 'Urdu' (public) medium.

Discourse of education' is *hypernymy* of 'Discourse of Renaissance', 'Discourse of Westernized Education System' and 'Discourse of Bhutto's Nationalism' and author eliminates second mentioned discourse type. 'Discourse of Renaissance' has been, explicitly, vocalized in 'European Renaissance and Reformation' and 'Westernized Education System'. It is *hypernym* of 'acquisition of knowledge', 'discoveries of Modern world', 'rational, academic and scientific interaction', in which meanings of renaissance are implicit. Whereby, 'Discourse of Anti-Nationalism' are implicit in condemnation of results of Bhutto's Nationalism

i.e. ‘production of Bureaucratic Behemoth’ and ‘collapsed’ (state education), and ‘corruption’ (in education system). Other constitutive block of society is economic management so ‘*Discourse of economy*’ is, actually, ‘*Discourse of Administrative Management*’ and it eliminates the ‘*Discourse of Tylarist management*’ (scientific management) (a term used by the researcher [9]) from the text. Former focuses on the management of economy in all institutions under the state control while the later mentioned management is hierarchical. It suggests that the supreme will administer higher and that higher will lead lower and so on. Supreme has nothing to do with lower one directly. *Discourse of economy* is implicit in ‘crippling inflation’ with highlights of mismanagement in budget allocation, and tax collection. Additionally, follies of the economic system have been brought on the surface by semantic equivalence of synonyms amongst ‘corruption’, ‘bribes’, ‘injustices’, ‘loan (to rich) ‘written off’, ‘Lack of audit’, lack of ‘people’s consultation’. All these vocabulary items have semantic correlation to one feature of ‘*Discourse of New Capitalism*’ that puts stress on just and fair economic system. The use of all these lexemes put responsibility of management on state government legitimizing the ‘*Discourse of administrative management*’ instead of ‘*Discourse of Tylarist Management*’ (cf. [9]). It is hyponym of ‘*Discourse of Traditional state Centered*’ (Fairclough, 2003) that focuses on the management of economy within the boundaries of Pakistan instead of globalization. Contrary to it is the ‘*Discourse of Governance*’ (Fairclough 2003) that provides “framework for global governance and...prescribes changes in governing in terms of ‘transparency’ and ‘accountability’” (Fairclough: 9). Author eliminates this discourse and hence method of governance (*ideology*).

‘*Discourse of Feminism*’ is evident in the condemnation of subjugating women by the use of phrases as ‘exploitation of women’ and women as property’. It raises the voice for women’s liberation and gives them the ‘right to fulfill their potential’. It eliminates the ‘*Discourse of Patriarchal*’ [21] that considers ‘women to be sexually permissive’ and ‘property’.

In a nut shell, these *discourses represent variety of social practices* (politics, religion, education, societal issues, economy, women rights, and foreign relations). It explains the different types of social practices that are possible in the particular domain. It, further elaborates particular view point of author regarding these social domains. Amongst the multiple number of discourses author normalizes specific discourses that deal political performance from one angle and eliminates the other one. These particular types of selected discourses present his ideology in order to run and handle these social practices under the umbrella of politics.

Table: 1. Discursive Strategies

Discursive Formation	Discursive Strategies	
	Normalizing Discourse	Eliminating Discourse
Islam is a set of legal principles and teaches democracy. It	Discourse of Islamic democracy	Discourse of secularism Discourse of fundamentalism

should be integrated with modernism.		Discourse of dictatorship
The race, class and ethnicity distinction should be diminished. Minorities have equal rights.	Nationalist, dominant, and patriotic discourse.	Discourse of ethnicity.
Politicians are plundering the country and Pakistan has become failing state.	Discourse of Left wing	Discourse of Right wing
We are transformed to cowed nation under US clutches.	Discourse of antagonist.	Discourse of protagonist
The three tier system should be integrated, West should be beaten in its own game and institutions should be rendered autonomy.	Discourse of Western education and discourse of anti-nationalism.	Discourse of fundamentalism and Discourse of nationalism.
There should be an audit system for loan spending and text allocation.	Discourse of administrative management.	Discourse of Tylarist management.

Succinctly, the discourses of education, religion, politics, foreign affairs social cohesion and economy are not merely the discourses or representation of social practices rather they represent his belief system how these aspects of society should be practiced. Though, he moves between global and local space and time yet he presents the policies only for the political system of Pakistan. Global elements are drawn just for the sake of comparison, references, and examples or to enhance the persuasive power.

CRITICAL DISCUSSION

In this text, author produces different discourses and moves between the global and local social events. Discourses and their different types have represented what are being socially practiced and how they can be improved. In this section their ‘critical’ analysis will explain author’s ideas of what and how should be practiced in these spheres of life. All the discrete discourses and discourse types’ analysis has driven into ‘critical’ evaluation of author’s ideology. Here is the detailed discussion of ideology.

All the inspirations, author gets, are from the ‘spiritual founding father’ (Allama Iqbal) of Pakistan. So, the ideological framework of the author revolves around the philosophy of Allama Iqbal. He believes, “*Though, Iqbal lived in a historical context that was different from ours in several ways, what he said remains profoundly relevant to us, and to our times*”. He puts stress on Iqbal’s vision as a permanent ‘comprehensive blueprint’ for all the time.

Stress on Iqbal's concept of justice, individuality and Khudi is spread throughout the chapter. KhwajaJamshed Butt disagrees with his concept of 'khudi'. For him, khudi stands for 'ego' (obsessed by oneself). In the launching ceremony of the book, author persuades people to end up with 'ego'. Hence, for Mr. Jamshed it is against Iqbal's philosophy. According to him, as author centralizes his ideology on 'Khudi' in his book but in his speech tends to abolish it. He uses the word 'Mein (I)' and argues that to make progress, one must release himself from this 'Mein'. Thus, it entails confusion in his ideology. I assert that Mr. Jamshed is wrong in his notion of 'khudi'. Actually, Iqbal's concept of 'Khudi' revolves around 'selfhood' (believe or certain of oneself) not ego. While, author's 'Mein' mean 'I' stands for 'ego'. The explanation is evident in the following examples.

Khudi Ki Shokhi-o-Tundi Mein Kubr-O-NaazNahin

Jo Naaz Ho BhiTo Be-Lazzat- E-NiazNahin

Translating is as 'in the coquetry and fierceness of the self, there is no pride, there are no airs.

Even if there are airs, then they are not without the pleasure of submission'.

It abolishes the element of ego from his concept of 'khudi', even it does include; it is just for self- protection.

Ho Agar Khdnigar-O-Khudgar-O-KhudgeerKhudi

Ye BhiMimkinHaiKeTuMout Se BhiMer Na Sake

If the ego is self-preserving, self-creating and self-sustaining

Then it is possible that even death cannot make you die.

This is exactly what author promotes in his book. He indorses and stimulates Muslims to break the shell of ego and adopt the Western innovative ways to compete the world and "to beat West in its own game". Its explanation is carried on in the domain of education. For author 'khudi' is self-esteem as he condemns 'clutches from US' as a bolt on nation's self-esteem.

Furthermore, first three components of ideology, as summarized in literature review are followed in his ideology: he *describes* the phenomenon (that prevails in whole of the chapter regarding his every viewpoint), then *analysis* it and thirdly, offers the *prescriptions* under the light of moral and ethical values. So far as last three components (*Technical Prescription, Implementation and Rejection*) are regarded, these are related to practices of ideology in real life and can only be worked out while analyzing author's role in his political tenure but this is not the objective of this thesis. So figured out by first three components, it is summarized that *restructuring of 'moral and ethical' values along with 'integrating vision of Quran' to change 'ground realities' in the light of 'constant framework' are at the core of Iqbal's philosophy of life and hence Author's ideas.*

In his '*Discourse of Islamic Democracy*' author also tries to inform his readers '*democracy*' (ideological pluralism) as the best political system while appealing to Pakistani nation's emotions by referring to 'Father of Pakistan' as he states, "*Islam and its ideals have taught democracy*". He matches it with Iqbal's 'spiritual democracy' to make his ideology of democratic political system more *acceptable*. Here, he manifests confusion in his ideology as he argues, "*we can learn from the way democracy has given freedom to most of the western world*". It contradicts Iqbal's perception of Western democratic system in 'Mashriq o Maghrib'. Iqbal

believes that democratic system in West has snatched freedom of people and all power resides in center.

YahanMarz Ka SababHaiGhulami-O-Taqleed

WahanMarz Ka SabbaHaiNizam-e- Jamhoori

Slavery, slavishness, the root of our (East)

Disease; of theirs (West), that Demon holds all power.

Tu Ne KyaDekhaNahinMaghrib Ka JamhooriNizam

ChehraRoshan, AndroonChangaiz Se Tareek Tar!

Have you not observed the democratic system of the West?

With a brilliant exterior, its interior is darker than Genghis's.

He, furthermore, forwards his ideology about the *functioning of democratic system.*

Discourse of Social Cohesion' imparts his ideology of '*social cohesion*' that builds up on three pillars: *equality, justice and fair play*. Direct reporting from Quaid's speech stresses its importance, "*Islam taught equality, justice and fair play*". It should be flowing in the every vein of social blood stream, from basic rights of defense to equality of education and economy expanded over the rights of minorities.

Social cohesion primarily depends upon the idea of *nation united into one (Discourse of Patriotism, Dominant Discourse)*. He emphasizes his ideology of formation one nation in his *reference* of bitter historical fact of *Loss of East Pakistan* that was the result of '*sense of deprivation and marginalization*' and is still preventing '*national identity*'.

So, *his ideology is that every province of the country should be provided with the equal rights of livings and spirit of provincialism should be raised to the spirit of federalism*. It is only possible by breaking the power block of political elites and feudal and distribute the equality to every strata.

To bring social prosperity, his *ideology* also aims at breaking up the 'status quo' and demolishing the feudal system that is obvious in his '*Discourse of left wing*'. He moves to the *opposition block as he states that it is the feudal system that has 'cursed us' and brought 'unfair social system' to us*. He explains it further by providing *authentic evidences* of their unchecked authority to crush poor people when he *refers* to the damaging effects of 2010 flood water diverted by these feudal from their lands to poor people's. Hence, it implies another's ideology of '*managing flood*' and '*implementation of laws*' for feudal as well. He *supports* it further, throwing light on the upheaval brought by their access above the reach of law that is 'corruption' and 'enormous rich poor divide', where 'enormous' is used to enhance the realization of destructive effects of this unequal division by feudal and politicians and makes the ideology readily acceptable. This inequality is extended over the women folk also as he states, "*The powerful in rural areas, treat the women from poor families as their property*". Hence, the ideology here can be assumed that gender equality is also necessary to build up fair social system.

Moreover, he explains his ideology about two major departments as, "*Two of the most corrupt government departments are police and judiciary*" and also that "*without independent judiciary we will not have true democracy*". So, his idea is that these two departments should be independent and corruption free and also moves forward his implied suggestions in order to reform them. "*Whenever there is a talk of reform, we are told that governments have no money either to give adequate salaries or to modernize the two*

departments...to build more courts for expounding public". First of all, *there should be increase in salaries* so that injustices brought through bribes could be eliminated because out of lower wages people are unable to meet their needs so they impart their favour to people who gives them more bribe, resultantly, the justice is based on money instead of right. Secondly, it is necessary to *equip them modern system of investigation, and modern technologies* to bring forward solid evidences against criminals. Thirdly, as per population size *more courts* are required to provide justice within short span of time. Apart from the more courts he suggests, "*We need to revive panchayat and Jirga system to liberate our rural areas from oppressive feudal and empower people at grass root*". His ideology is explicit that this system of justice is important in order to shatter the shackles of powerful elites of the society and secondly liberate people from unjust detention. Hence, author provides a comprehensive ideology for justice system with full sense of security.

He, furthermore, strongly condemns militancy against the minorities. He explicitly describes his ideology, "*that religious dogma should not be used to spread prejudice, intolerance and sectarianism*". He makes it *persuasive* by referring to Quaid's speech for minorities of Pakistan, "You are free...You are free to go to your mosque and another place of worship..." . He makes his ideology strong, referring to the life of our Holy Prophet (PBUH) who has many examples of intolerance to other religions. Moreover, he *incorporates* the last sermon of Holy Prophet (PBUH) that was meant for '*universal human rights*'. Hence, it is implied that all the explicitly and implicitly mentioned rights for people of Pakistan are also meant for other religious minorities in Pakistan and all around the globe. In this speech he especially mentioned a class while missing others "...*And your slaves...they are the servants of the Lord and are not to be treated harshly*". It expresses his ideology that *there should be policy to check the power of employers regarding harsh treatment of the servants*.

Apart from individual's right of defense, other basic rights are provoked in the text. "*Succession...governments are unable to deliver even the most basic services like healthcare and education*". So, he explicitly advocates the right of every ordinary man on healthcare and education. Education being of utmost importance as it gives them right to pace with the developing world and realization of their rights as individuals also.

Education is primarily important to make people realized of their rights. He *draws* example from West where "*people are fully aware of their rights*". He pronounces its role in making people aware by sketching the conspiracy of ruling elites resembling them to Turkish power as, "knowledge was their enemy because it will teach their subjects how bad the ruler's conduct was". Hence, *his ideology to advocate the importance of education to inform public of their rights* becomes readily *acceptable* when he discloses the bitter facts. Along with, he provides a tip to win the race between East and West for spreading Islam or 'confining Islam to private spheres' respectively. He gives reference of Iqbal's lecture on 'Reconstruction of religious thought in Islam' to pronounce his ideology '*Islamic ways of life is threat for West*'. Though,

apparently, he neutrally describes two school of thoughts to reflect beat game against West: to beat west in its own game whose proponent, he gives an example, is Sir Sayyed Ahmad Khan and second is Madrassas, yet the use of lexemes reflect his favour for the former mentioned. For this purpose of *persuasion* he uses *metaphor* of 'narrow version' and 'older' for the teachings of Madrassa, and their Islam as 'stripped off' from the modernism, resultantly, they will be failed to beat West. Whereby, he attributes the first one with the honour to 'revive fortunes' of Muslims by promoting Western knowledge with the integration of Islamic values. Distinguishing between two school of thoughts, religious fundamentalists (advocate of religious education stripped off modern developments) and liberal fanatics, he adopts '*Discourse of Western system of education*'. His ideology consists on integration of both i.e. '*Western style education developed in our own Islamic culture*'. He supports his idea by the example from history "*From the Aborigines of Australia to the Indian's of the Americas and most of the Africa, the local people fell between two school in the name of modernization*", he inclines that bringing up totally 'alien culture' sprouts devastation. The most destructive aspect of this 'alien culture' is split of identity. Author states, "Only in the minds of Westernized English speaking people... there is confusion of identity". Thus, the historical facts sketched into the text along with contemporary local practice of education system; show his ideology of developing Western education system but in our own culture.

For the improved education system he provides some *policies* as, "*the elite that consumes most of the educational resources is incapable of providing intellectual leadership*", "*the Urdu medium schooling system has collapsed after decades of being starved of government attention and funds*". It implies that education sector should be provided enough funds and resources so that poor people could get their children standard education instead of sending them to madrassas, cursed by poverty. *Government should introduce one curriculum and enough funds, in short, 'state education' but not 'state control'*.

State control brings corruption to education sector as it deprives schools from the authority to 'hire or fire' the teachers on the basis of their abilities. His '*Discourse of Bhutto's anti Nationalism*' draws this ideology. He gives *reference* of Bhutto's Nationalism and makes it strongly *persuasive* by the quote of SabihaMansoor, "*Bhutto's Nationalism of schools created a bureaucratic behemoth. The lumbering giant grew larger and presented more opportunities for corruption*".

For competent education system, apart from the uniform education system, author describes some other policies as, "*Today when Pakistani youth...need of comprehensive and deep education based upon Iqbal's multifaceted philosophies*", and "...*core message of his poetry...justice and the dignity of selfhood has been excluded from the public discourse*". Thus, it accentuates his ideology of *incorporating Iqbal's teachings and philosophies, especially 'Khudi' and 'justice'*, in education curriculum of Pakistan.

To preserve resources of knowledge, author stresses the importance of libraries. "*The quest for knowledge was reflected in the libraries of education*". His implied proud in

describing the rich collection of books in libraries of Baghdad (150,000 volumes) and in Cordoba, Al Hakim's library (400,000 to 600,000 volumes)pronounces the ideology of *establishing libraries and enrich them with valuable resources of knowledge*.

'*Discourse of administrative Management*' proposes some ideas to manage economic upheavals. 'We have never learned to live within our own means', it assumes that *we are blessed with rich internal resources to manage economy and if we are able to utilize it properly, we do not need foreign aid*. To persuade his ideology, he provides readers with the facts of flood of 2010 about which he argues, with his own example of collecting 2 billion rupees, that recovery was possible from within the country yet we extended our begging bowls. He provides the **solution** to utilize our means as "*greatest asset of a nation is its people*" and "*we need to harness their (people) potential*" that implies his ideology that we need to provide our people the opportunities to serve the country with comfortable return of their services. He persuades for this purpose exploding the bitter facts that "here the rich get green cards and poor go to gulf turmoil" in order to get good salaries. So, *his view point is that brain drain should be stopped by offering good salaries to people*. To increase the salaries we need to *enrich our economic atmosphere*. It is also possible as he gives the detailed account of our land riches such as copper and gold reserves. Rich agriculture land, mineral resources and overseas community etc. All are being wasted out of mismanagement. *His ideology is that we can utilize the abilities of 'overseas community' in order to harness these natural resources. Secondly, unemployed will get employment*. Hence, both would be benefitted. Secondly, "An army of disenfranchised and angry people...could instead be an energetic labour force but...less is spent on their education". *It explicitly describes that unemployment could do away with by educating people instead of 'crutches from US'*.

His ironical statements in the '*Discourse of Antagonism*' against the foreign aid give the assumption that he is *antagonistic to the policy of begging bowls in front of IMF and US*. He is also against the '*Western interference in East*' that is a blow hit to sovereignty of any country. So, *defending Pakistan against West is his ideology*, also stated by PMLN (ideological pluralism). Secondly, it causes severe outcomes in the form of production of extremism, especially in Pakistan. In this regard, he convincingly, appeals to the feelings of common man when he gives the reference of "War on terror". "*The number of religious fanatics is growing day by day; thanks to the war on terror*". So, *his ideology is that war on terror should be demolished in order to save the country from extremism*.

CONCLUSION

All in all, the critical analysis of different types of discourses in the representation of social practices have helped us in drawing the detailed account of author's political ideology. The whole crux of ideology is lodged in Islamic Democracy'. Mr. Jamshed comments on his ideology are that he talks about '*democracy*' but practically struggles for '*Aristocracy*'. Succinctly, the discourses of education, religion, politics, foreign affairs social cohesion and economy are not merely the discourses or representation of social practices rather they represent his ideology how these aspects of society should be practiced. In order to achieve this objective he remains antagonist and member of left wing as he exposes the true face of the corrupted leadership of Pakistan. Though, he moves between global and local space and time yet he presents the policies only for the political system of Pakistan. Global elements are drawn just for the sake of comparison. Moreover it is evident that all of his ideology is not explicit rather we need to implicitly assume it somewhere.

REFERENCES

- [1] Fairclough, N. (1995) *Critical Discourse Analysis*, London: Longman.
- [2] Seliger, M.(1976) *Ideology and politics*. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd.
- [3] Fairclough, N.(2002)*Discourse and social change*, London: Polity Press.
- [4] Wodak, R. (2001) *Discourse and Discrimination*, New York, Routledge.
- [5] Lemke, J. (1995) *Textual politics: Discourse and social dynamics*. London: Taylor and Francis.
- [6] Dijk, T.A. V. (2006) Critical discourse analysis. *Journal of Discourse and society*, 18(P. 20)
- [7] Sartori, G. (1969) From the Sociology of Politics to Political Sociology. Retrieved September 12, 2013
- [8] Jones, J. and Peccei, J. S. (2004)*Language and politics*, in Thomas, L. (ed), *Language, Society and Power*. New York: Routledge.
- [9] Fairclough, N. *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis of social research*. New York: Routledge.
- [10] Pennycook, A.(1994) *Incommensurable discourse*. *Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 15, No.2. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 112-118.
- [11] Wodak, R. and Ludwig, Ch. (1999)*Challenges in changing world: Issues in critical discourse analysis*. Vienna: Passagenverlag.
- [12] Halliday, M. A. K. (1994) *An introduction to functional grammar*. UK: Edward Arnold Publishers.[14] Baker, Paul & Ellece, Sibonile (2011) *Key terms in discourse analysis*. UK: Continuum.
- [15] Javaid, Nasim A. (1999) *Islam's political culture: Religion and politics in predivided Pakistan*. United States: University of Texas Press.
- [16] Khan, N. (2010)*Muhajir militancy in Pakistan: Violence and transformation in Karachi*. New York: Routledge.

- [17] Riaz, Ali. (2010) *Religion and Politics in South Asia*. New York: Routledge.
- [18] Nizamani, Haider K. (2000) *The Roots of rhetoric: Politics of nuclear weapon in India and Pakistan*. United States: PraegerPublisher.
- [20] Aaltola, M. (2009). *Western spectacle of governance and the emergence of humanitarian world politics*. UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- [21] Veer. P. (1994)*Religious nationalism: Hindus and Muslims in India*. University of California Press.