## Imran Khan and Z.A. Bhutto: A Comparative Analysis of Pakistani Political Speeches

* Sarah Anjum, PhD Scholar (Corresponding Author)

** Muhammad Sabboor Hussain, Assistant Professor

***Abstract***

*Critical Discourse Analysis elucidates the text, language, social customs, hidden agendas, and linguistic twists. Politicians manipulate language in such a way that people's sentiments and emotions connect with politicians. In political debates, CDA has been used to showcase the speech style behind all these and every sort of discourse that can be employed to control the sentiment expressed to the audience (Roffee, 2016). Fairclough's study of the three-dimensional model: text, discursive practices, and societal practices influenced this study. This research examines how political speeches by Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto and Imran Khan are constructed and how ideology emerges. Various linguistic tools have been investigated to uncover hidden agendas. The major findings in Imran Khan's power projection are his excessive use of religious and political implications and personal pronouns to gain and show his power. Power is discovered to be constructed via language, ideology, society, and political practices. Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto's speech focuses on the right of countries to self-determination. Both UN speeches were watershed moments in Pakistani history, reflecting existing political ideologies and societal factors. The speeches demonstrate how language can build persuasive arguments and communicate important ideas beyond words.*

**Keywords**:  Discourse; Hidden Agenda; ideology; Fairclough; Religious and Political Implications; Critical Discourse Analysis

## Introduction

Politics is a power struggle that may be utilized to enforce predefined socioeconomic, cultural, and political ideas. (Kapur, 2022). Language is vital in executing such exercises/ideas. It is responsible for importing and executing practices and enabling the audience to respond. Politicians manipulate language, molding it to gain sympathy, supporters, and power. Politics constructs, builds, and restores power. A few members of society are responsible for creating or dismantling the general public's beliefs. These manipulators could be writers, orators, politicians, or actors. They change the ideology of the public through their speech, acting, or discussion on television or social platforms. The public discourse is used as an instrument for the propagation of societal strength. (Van Dijk, 1997). Political discourse is the major source of shaping the general public's opinion in general discourse (Nusrat et al., 2020). The power structure can only be attained by those capable enough to change the opinions of others.

Politicians, through political speeches, try to manipulate and construct an ideology that suits and supports their cause. It is a kind of discourse that generates and propagates beliefs, opinions, and ideologies. (Wodak & Fairclough, 2013). Therefore, political speech could be analyzed to understand the hidden ideology and language responsible for the power generation and shift in the ideology of the public. Politics is the struggle for power to put several institutional, financial, and sociocultural concepts into motion (Bayram, 2010). Language plays a role as a dynamic tool to attain all these ideas. It is believed that politicians intend to motivate the audience about the rationality of their political rights (Chimbarange et al., 2013). They try to change the political ideology of the masses and support their beliefs and ideologies.

## Aim and Objectives of the Study

The study deals with the speeches of Imran Khan and Z.A. Bhutto to analyze the social, political, and historical background behind them through critical discourse analysis (CDA). The purpose of the study is to understand the language spoken by the political head of the state and the hidden agendas behind it. Nowadays, language is not considered a simple way of interpreting reality; rather, it constructs reality (Taiwo, 2007).

*    GC Women University, Sialkot Email: sarahanjum89@gmail.com
**   GC Women University, Sialkot Email: saboor.hussain@gcwus.edu.pk

Pakistan is a nation that has been through much political turmoil. Our nation's roots are also amalgamated with the colonizers' ideologies. This research aims to explore the implications of the speeches of the political heads of Pakistan. It explores how people respond to the speeches of IK and Z.A. Bhutto textually and socially. This study aims to link the speeches of Imran Khan and Z.A. Bhutto with the social aspects or attitudes of society and to analyze them at a micro and macro level, how people deal with the words used in their speeches, and how they project those words. This research aims to explore the language used by the political heads of a nation. The language concerning the power and hidden motives is responsible for creating people's ideology and how they react towards that speech. Following are the objectives of the study:

1. To explore ideologies and political agendas beyond the surface of discourse.
2. By utilizing the framework of Fairclough, what political strategies does IK and Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto use to change people's perceptions?

**Research Questions**

1. What political strategies Imran Khan and Z.A. Bhutto have used in political speeches to get into power?
2. Can the formal words of political speakers need to cite religious references for the masses to respond?

**Research Methodology**

Imran Khan's and Z.A. Bhutto's speeches on different occasions have been selected for data analysis. They were gathered via the Internet. A Critical Discourse Analysis has been done on the selected speeches to reveal the ideology, persuasive strategies, and religious implications through Fairclough's three-dimensional approach. It is a qualitative approach.

**Significance of the Study**

The current study sheds light on how the speeches and dialogues of people affect others. Political figures are very important in any nation. IK and Z.A. Bhutto, being the heads of state, their speeches are of immense importance. Their speeches shed light on the root analysis of how language creates an ideology of the nation and deal with the segregation issue of the nation. This study will further help the researchers pinpoint the language responsible for the rift generated within society because of the persuasive tactics of the political heads.

As most of Pakistan's population is illiterate, this research will enable us to understand the persuasive devices and political strategies responsible for changing the perception and ideology of the public. It will be fruitful for people to understand the manipulative language and religious implications used by politicians in their public addresses to gain sympathy and support. The way the 'God Card' is linked with political achievement and strength has also been highlighted in this research.

CDA is a multi-disciplinary approach that has helped fulfill all the socio-political aspects of this research. Fairclough's three-dimensional approach has been applied to understanding the hidden agendas and persuasive devices used in the political speeches of Imran Khan and Z.A. Bhutto. It has helped investigate the language, political discourse, and religious implications used in the text of the political address. It reveals the relationship between power, language, and society.

**Literature Review**

The literature review focuses on the definition of CDA and its various dimensions. Also, the researchers purport to explore the connection between language, power, and politics. Furthermore, the researchers intend to discuss the religious implications politicians use in their speeches. There are ample reasons which trigger politicians to use language to gain the trust and sympathy of their voters. The focal point is to highlight the previous works of the researchers and the conclusions they have inferred from the political speeches. Several studies have been undertaken to understand the hidden agenda behind the sugar-coated words presented by their political heads.

CDA is the study of a language in such a way that it is viewed in terms of social practices. It is a method that integrates language research and societal theory (Fairclough, 1992). It tries to analyze how power is misused, exploited, and utilized. The (non-linguistic) social practice and the linguistic practice are intertwined and scrutinize how societal power relations are established and reinforced through language (Fairclough, 1995). It varies significantly from discourse analysis in that it focuses on power imbalances, manipulation, exploitation, and socioeconomic disparities in areas such as education (Blommaert & Bulcaen, 2000). Discourse often includes numerous kinds of retaliation or counter-power to discursive dominance (Van Dijk, 1995).

CDA has been used for political speeches act, to highlight the rhetoric behind these, and any form of speech that may be used to manipulate the impression given to the audience (Roffee, 2016). A modern institute of discourse analysis notes that it concerns the relationship between power and prejudice in political languages (Luke, 1995). Politicians recurrently come to power through the use of skilled rhetorical techniques; they understand how to effectively utilize language to try and convince people to support specific political goals (Jones & Peccei, 2004). The politicians twist language in such a way that the people start believing in them and make them believe in the imaginary world that is presented to them. A language can either create or deconstruct reality. Political controversy is a partial controversy and partial controversy over language (Fairclough, 2002). Politicians use such language that it clouds the judgment of common people. It triggers cultural change as a trigger for broader social change (Fairclough, 2002). This language transition is immensely important because language would be analyzed for political analysis. Language can be utilized to shape regulations, form coalitions, and formulate and spread core beliefs that demonstrate political coalitions, legal systems, and government forms (Romagnuolo, 2009).

Several researchers have conducted research trying to elaborate on the hidden agendas and power in political speeches. Politicians try to create an illusion for the public through speeches and manipulate the public through religious rhetoric. Some recent research studies are mentioned below to highlight the work already done in this field.

Firstly, Wang (2010) analyzed American President Barack Obama's speeches using CDA and Systematic Functional Linguistics (Wang, 2010). He examined them from the point of transitivity and modality. His analysis concluded that Obama uses easy words in short sentences rather than large sentences full of difficult words to try to shorten the distance between the audience and himself. Moreover, Obama tries to arouse the American people's confidence in him and his government. Using simple tense, he bridges the past and presents with the future. The transitivity analysis projected that a process of doing' (Wang, 2010) had been used to explain what the government is doing and will be doing during its regime. Obama used such modal verbs, which enabled his audience to understand him in a much better way. His easy language ensured that people from all walks of life could understand him and his ideology and consider themselves part of the change he would bring.

Secondly, Sharififar and Rahimi (2015) worked to survey the linguistic spin in the political speeches of Obama and Rouhani. They wanted to analyze how these presidents used language to project their manifestation of power, their projection of ideology, and policies through language. Their political speeches were delivered on the UN platform. They applied Halliday's systematic functional linguistics. They revealed various features like the words and sentence structure used by both political figures were different. Obama applied colloquial language, consisting of easy words in short sentences, whereas Rouhani used more difficult words, mixing hard and formal words (Sharififar & Rahimi, 2015). Both political figures included the material processes as a process of 'doing' and 'happening' more than other processes. The modal verbs were used to represent firm plans and to persuade the public to show firm belief in the government. The most prominent factor in the speeches was the usage of personal pronouns, i.e., the use of 'we' which created a sense of intimacy and harmony among the listeners and their speakers.

Sarfo and Krampa (2012) analyzed various political speeches of American politicians Bush and Obama on terrorism. Their research is based on Van Dijk's approach to CDA. The main objective was to determine linguistic resources used to project terrorism and anti-terrorism. The researchers found that 'verbs' and 'nouns' were the vocabulary items responsible for projecting terrorism and anti-terrorism. They included noun phrases, verb phrases, adjectival phrases, adverbial phrases, prepositional phrases, and clauses. They revealed in their study that both Obama and Bush carefully and intentionally selected specific forms, words, and expressions to make a specific impact on their listeners. Power as the direct authority, psychological manipulation, and context regulation were common themes in both Obama's and Bush's speeches.

By utilizing the Socio-cognitive approach to CDA, Bughio, (2014) analyzed the ideologies basis of Benazir Bhutto's speeches. The linguistic features that are responsible for the creation of such ideologies have been brought into focus. These features were responsible for generating power relations and dominating the masses of the country. He concluded that Benazir Bhutto, through her speech, deliberately attacked the audience's minds to control them.

Moreover, Khalil et al., (2017) explored the speech of the political leader Imran Khan which was delivered two days before the general elections (2013) in Pakistan. The researchers tried to uncover the ideologies which were the backbone of the speech. The researchers made interrogation of various linguistic tools. They concluded that Imran Khan used persuasive linguistic strategies to change people's political views and persuaded them to support his political struggle.

Furthermore, from the theoretical perspective of Fairclough and Van Dijk, the political strategies of Imran Khan were analyzed by Rauf et al. (2019). They investigated the covert ideologies hidden under the contextual facets. They tried to understand the linguistical elements that promoted his ideology and stimulated the youth and less privileged to play their part in society. They deduced from a cumulative linguistic and textual analysis that Khan had established an advantageous political identity in his radical party while also leveling numerous allegations against opposing political groups, thereby presenting others' political images as biased, unfair, and corrupt.

A qualitative speech act analysis of Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto and Imran Khan's UN speeches is done to investigate the functions of speakers in projecting leadership messages (Zamir et al., 2021). The study employs an exploratory research design. The researchers employed Austin's Speech Act Theory and Searle's Speech Act features. The study found that representative acts were frequently used, accounting for a higher percentage of all speech acts. It implies that in the representative role of the speeches, there is a greater emphasis on the reality of the spoken suggestions.

**Methodology**
This research is based on descriptive and analytical analysis. It is based on a qualitative approach. With the procedures and techniques mentioned in CDA, the speeches of IK and Z.A. Bhutto have been analyzed. The linguistic choices and political and religious elements mentioned in the speeches are analyzed to understand the hidden ideologies behind the sugar-coated words. Fairclough's three-dimensional approach has been used on the selected speeches for analysis. Selective speeches have been analyzed for the researchers' convenience. The selected speeches of Imran Khan were delivered in Urdu, yet the prominent newspaper printed them in English for the understanding of Native English Speakers, whereas Z.A. Bhutto delivered speeches in English. Both politicians held state office in different eras. Z.A. Bhutto first acquired the presidential office and later held the prime ministerial one. The same set of speeches was selected to create harmony and link between the two speakers.

This research is more target-oriented, as the goal is to obtain the objectives by analyzing the selected speeches. The study undergoes the qualitative perspective, as meaning is the ultimate focus of the research. In such research, social practices, along with discursive practices, are responsible for the interpretation of the text.

This research explains the social as well as the educational realm. As most of the population of Pakistan is unschooled, they need to be guided to gain the ideologies behind the political speeches and addresses. Therefore, it will enable them to understand the political strategies and ideologies responsible for influencing the masses. It will also enable people to see through the manipulation of the politicians triggered by using religious implications.

Fairclough's approach provides discursive and social analysis of the text; therefore, it has helped to understand the language and hidden ideologies of the political addresses. It has enabled us to find the relationship between power and language, political speeches, and religious implications. It has also tried to project the role of language as a powerful tool to inject opinions and ideologies and mold them the way politicians want to endure.

**Data Analysis**
As the addresses comprise prominent political leaders, the content is available on the Internet, print, and mass media. The addresses were broadcast on national and international platforms. Therefore, the concern regarding authenticity is minimal.

Two speeches delivered by Imran Khan have been selected by the researchers for analysis. Both speeches are different in nature. The first speech is an inaugural speech delivered after successfully attaining the office of the head of the government. It was a rather elaborate speech. It was addressed to the nation in August 2018 in Islamabad. He attained this opportunity to deliver an inaugural speech after the political struggle of 22 years. This was the address of a former renowned cricketer of Pakistan and a struggling politician. This speech comprises approximately 62 paragraphs. (https://dunyanews.tv/en/Pakistan/453434-Prime-Minister-Imran-Khan-first-address-complete-speech-text). The second speech was addressed to the United Nations in September 2019 in New

_____

York. This address presented an overview of the problems faced by Pakistan during those times. This address was delivered in English https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uyaQgnQCQ5k&t=24s

Two speeches delivered by Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto have been selected. Both of them are different. As both politicians belong to different eras, the speeches are selected in terms of sets, i.e., the nature of the speeches of both politicians are the same. The president of Pakistan delivered the first speech in December 1971 https://bhutto.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/First-address-to-the-Nation-as-President-of-Pakistan-December-20-1974.mp3. The second speech was also delivered in December 1971, but it was delivered at the Security Council 1971 https://bhutto.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/Zulfikar-Ali-Bhuttos-Speech-at-the-Security-Council-Meeting-December-12-1971-.mp3.

Both speeches delivered by Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto were delivered in English. The selected speeches go through the analysis via Fairclough's three-dimensional approach. These paragraphs will enable the researcher to highlight the political strategies, linguistic choices, and religious implications responsible for power generation and change in the opinion of the masses. They will lead to a better understanding of the role of language, power, and religion in political discourse.

## Discussion

### Textual Analysis (Set-1):

Imran Khan and Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto formally addressed the nation, employing elevated language, parallelism, emotive language, and repetition as rhetorical devices. Both incorporated statistics and factual statements to endear the rational side of the audience. Bhutto reiterated the need for the country to unite during a crisis. Whereas, using inclusive language, i.e., 'we' and 'us', he also stressed the importance of collective national efforts.

### Discursive Practices (Set-1):

Bhutto emphasized pride and national unity. 'Pakistani' term was used in his speech to depict Pakistan's shared identity. He also represented his party's political ideology and stressed the values and power of democracy. In comparison, Imran Khan stressed the importance of governance accountability, transparency, and justice. He also highlighted the economic challenges faced by the nation, adhering to empowering the marginalized and affected members of society.

### Social Practices (Set-1):

Bhutto's speech came at a critical juncture in the country's history: The country was at a border dispute with India, and East Pakistan had recently seceded to form Bangladesh. As he addressed issues such as national integration, democracy, and the need for economic development, Bhutto's speech depicted the socioeconomic and political realities of the time. In comparison, Imran Khan's speech at the United Nations General Assembly in New York reflected current political and social realities. He spoke about issues that affect nations across the globe, like climate change, economic hardship, and inequality. He also pointed out the value of tackling the fundamental causes of both terrorism and conflict.

When comparing the two speeches, Imran Khan's speech became a catchphrase for a new golden age of governance in Pakistan, with an obsessive focus on equity, transparency, and the emancipation of society's oppressed communities. His speech expressed both his political viewpoint and the social context within which it was promised to deliver. The speech is still investigated and debated as a defining moment in Pakistan's history. Furthermore, amid a crisis, Bhutto's speech was a powerful call for unity and national pride. His speech reflected both his political ideology and the social context whereby it was delivered. The speech is still discussed and analyzed as a pivotal moment in Pakistan's history.

### Textual Analysis (Set-2):

Both Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto and Imran Khan used formal language in their speech to the United Nations. They both used influential phrases and rhetorical devices, i.e., repetitive content and emotive language, to illustrate their point of view. Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto utilized illustrations and figures to back up his claims and appeal to the rational side of the audience. In contrast, Imran Khan used rhetorical devices to emphasize the value of accountability and collective action in addressing justice in administration.

### Discursive Practices (Set-2):

Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto stressed the importance of decolonization and the right of all countries to self-determination in his speech. He began by emphasizing the importance of establishing more just and

_____
equitable global relations, and he urged a stop to the exploitation of developing nations by industrial nations. Whereas peace, social justice, and long-term development were all highlighted in Imran Khan's speech. He also acknowledged the adverse effects of colonialism and imperialism on developing economies and proposed an equitable and egalitarian international order.

**Social Practices (Set-2):**
Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto's speech to the United Nations General Assembly reflected the economic, political, and social difficulties and challenges of the time. He addressed global issues like the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, nuclear disarmament, and the Cold War at the time. On the other hand, Imran Khan's speech at the United Nations General Assembly represented present-day social and political realities. He addressed problems influencing nations worldwide, such as the environment, poverty, and inequality. He also emphasized the significance of tackling the underlying causes of violent action and terrorist attacks.

In terms of comparison, both speeches stress the importance of justice and equality inside this world order and critically evaluate developing-country exploitation. Imran Khan's speech, on the other hand, focuses on mainstream issues such as environmental degradation and poverty, whereas Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto's speech reflects both the political and historical context. Imran Khan's speech reinforces global cooperation, whereas Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto's speech concentrates on countries' right to self-determination. Both speeches are turning point occasions in Pakistani history, reflecting existing political philosophies and societal factors. The speeches show how language can be used to construct persuasive arguments and converse important ideas that go beyond the words themselves.

**Conclusion**
Critical Discourse Analysis is a type of discourse that analyze language as a social practice. It not only focuses on the linguistic aspect of the language but on the power-building elements. It tries to reveal language not only as a medium of conversation but as a medium of power generator and manifesto of ideology. The tools of CDA enable the researcher to reveal the hidden ideology and agenda.

Politics is basically an effort to gain power (Chilton, 2004); power is everywhere, not because it embraces everything but because it comes from everything (Foucault, 1979); politics is a social practice through which power is gained (Fairclough, 1989). Several researchers have applied Fairclough's method to reveal the political discourse. A similar attempt has been made in this research as well.

The ratio of religious references and language is greater in the inaugural speech of Imran Khan than in others. Religious implications are used to gain public support and approval from all. IK's speeches are filled with ample religious citations. Although PTI is a secular party, the projection of religious inclination is a discursive strategy to gain the sympathy of the entire nation.

The tone of both speeches is similar. Despite the difference between the two speeches, Imran Khan's focus remains on the previous governments' follies. The blame game continued between the governments, and the speaker tried to build trust by creating a negative representation of them rather than presenting solutions to the problems.

Imran Khan's speeches have a slight religious slant, while Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto represents a secular party. Imran Khan's political speeches encompass more religious references than Bhutto's. Instead of reading from a script, both politicians spoke from the heart. They used discursive practices to arouse the emotions of national and international audiences and to highlight the ideologies represented by their political parties. This area of study has yet to involve all the speeches of Imran Khan and Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto. Future researchers can incorporate all the speeches to add to the research poll and stretch the boundaries of the present research.

**References**
Bayram, F. (2010). IDEOLOGY AND POLITICAL DISCOURSE: A CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF ERDOGAN'S POLITICAL SPEECH. *Annual review of education, communication & language sciences*, *p. 7*.
Blommaert, J., & Bulcaen, C. (2000). Critical discourse analysis. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, *29*(1), 447–466.
Bughio, F. A. (2014). Critical analysis of political discourse: A study of Benazir Bhutto's last speech. *Balochistan Journal of Linguistics*, 2, 79-95.
Chilton, P. A. (2004). *Analyzing political discourse: Theory and practice*. Psychology Press.

Chimbarange, A., Takavarasha, P., & Kombe, F. (2013). A Critical Discourse Analysis of President Mugabe's 2002 Address to the World Summit on Sustainable Development. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, *3*(9), 227-288.

Fairclough, N. (1989). Language and Power‖ Longman. In: London.

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change* (Vol. 10). Polity Press Cambridge.

Fairclough, N. (1995). (1995b) Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language. London: Longman.

Fairclough, N. (2002). *New Labour, new language?* Routledge.

Foucault, M. (1979). The history of sexuality, An introduction, Vol. 1, London: Allen Lane. *R. Hurley Trans*.

Kapur, A. C. (2022). *Principles of political science*. S. Chand Publishing.

Khalil, U., Islam, M., Chattha, S. A., & Qazalbash, F. (2017). Persuasion and Political Discourse: A Critical Discourse Analysis of Imran Khan's Election Speech (2013). *Pakistan Vision*, *18*(2), 193-210.

Luke, A. (1995). Chapter 1: Text and Discourse in Education: An Introduction to Critical Discourse Analysis. *Review of Research in Education*, *21*(1), 3–48. https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732 x021001003

Nusrat, A., Khan, S., & Shehzadi, M. S. (2020). Critical Discourse Analysis of Imran Khan Dharna Speeches in Socio-Political Perspective. *sjesr*, *3*(1), 9-19.

Rauf, A., Sajjad, F., & Malghani, M. (2019). Ideology,(Mis) perceptions and (Re) construction of Political Identities: A Critical Discourse Analysis of Imran Khan's Political Speeches. *Global Social Sciences Review*, *4*(1), 295-303.

Roffee, J. (2016). Rhetoric, Aboriginal Australians and the Northern Territory intervention: A socio-legal investigation into pre-legislative argumentation. *International Journal for Crime, Justice and Social Democracy*, *5*(1), 131.

Romagnuolo, A. (2009). Political discourse in translation: A corpus-based perspective on presidential inaugurals. *Translation and Interpreting Studies. The Journal of the American Translation and Interpreting Studies Association*, *4*(1), 1-30.

Sarfo, E., & Krampa, E. A. (2012). Language at War: A Critical Discourse Analysis of Speeches of Bush and Obama on Terrorism. *International Journal of Social Sciences & Education*, *3*(2).

Sharififar, M., & Rahimi, E. (2015). Critical discourse analysis of political speeches: A case study of Obama's and Rouhani's speeches at UN. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *5*(2), 343-349.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1995). Aims of critical discourse analysis. *Japanese Discourse*, *1*(1), 17-28.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1997). What is political discourse analysis? *Belgian Journal of Linguistics*, *11*(1), 11-52.

Wang, J. (2010). A critical discourse analysis of Barack Obama's speeches. *Journal of language teaching and Research*, *1*(3), 254–261.

Wodak, R., & Fairclough, N. (2013). *Critical discourse analysis*. Sage London.

Zamir, N., Cheema, B. A., & Jahan, J. (2021). A Quantitative Speech Act Analysis of Imran Khan and Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto's UN Speech. *PSYCHOLOGY AND EDUCATION*, *58*(2), 3386-3397.