Representation Of Vehemence In Speeches Of Political Party Leaders: A Critical Discourse Analysis

Muhammad Nasir[1], Mahvish Jamil[2], Muhammad Ishaq[3], Riffat Naz Akhtar[4], Anisa Fatima[5], Dr. Munawar Amin[6]

Abstract

The dissemination of desired political ideologies greatly benefits from political debates. People have been observing throughout history that while some have portrayed themselves negatively, humans have generally done the opposite. Therefore, vehemence as a rhetoric for the dehumanization of others has been a common element of political speech. Similar to this, the current study has critically examined the political speeches of Imran Khan, Shahbaz Sharif, and Asif Ali Zardari. The data for present research was collected from the nine speeches of these politicians (three speeches of each). The time span ranges from October 2015 to 11th November 2019 and the data was collected from News Media channel's YouTube pages. Van Dijk sociocognitive model and Wodak's 2001 historical approach model are used in the current study to analyze the data. These models have been modified; the addition and removal of analytical categories found in the model and in the speeches of the cited politicians serves as justification for utilizing the modified model. Word, sentence, and discourse levels are among the analytic levels. The research's conclusions highlight the verbal sparring among politicians, who have all made an effort to project a favorable image of themselves at the expense of others. Adjectives with negative connotations have been employed to characterize the opposition. However, Mr. Khan has painted his opponents in his political discourse as thieves of the nation's wealth. Similar contradictions were noted in the political speeches of, Shahbaz Sharif and Asif Ali Zardari. The present research concludes that political discourse frequently uses vehement rhetoric. This is done on purpose and with ideological intent to discredit their opponents by projecting a positive picture of themselves and a negative reflection of others.

Keywords *Ideology, Power dynamics, Demonization, Hegemony, Political mobilization.*

1. Introduction

Critical discourse analysis tends to investigate how different ideologies and identities are constructed in the text. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is a powerful tool for analyzing political discourse, as it examines the ways in which language reflects, reinforces, and challenges power relations within society. Political discourse, encompassing speeches, debates, policies, and media representations, is a primary site where power dynamics and ideological battles are played out. CDA focuses on how language is used to exercise, maintain, and challenge power. In political discourse, this involves analyzing how

---

[1] Lecturer at Institute of Southern Punjab Multan.

[2] Lecturer at Punjab Group of Colleges Multan.

[3] Lecturer at Govt. Graduate College near Civil Lines Khanewal.

[4] Govt. School Teacher at Govt. Girls Primary School Kassowal.

[5] English School Teacher at LGS Mian Channu.

[6] Assistant Professor at Institute of Southern Punjab Multan.

politicians use language to assert authority, shape public opinion, and legitimize their actions. Partridge (2012) defined it as exploring the relationship between language, and social and political context. Critical discourse analysis focuses on different issues in the society and how language is contributing towards those issues, such as gender, ethnicity identity and cultural differences. Breeze (2011) explained how people understand and view the world. It depends on discourse practice in the society. Discourse constructs the way we perceive the world, society and people around. CDA is different from discourse analysis as Blommaert and Bulcean (2000) explained critical discourse analysis as it examines how linguistic use in media, education and politics have ability and cause manipulation and exploitation in society. Every communication either in the form of writing or speech have certain intended intentions in a social, cultural and political context. Every use of language has a specific thought behind, to influence the targeted audience. Critical discourse analysis discovers those hidden ideologies in the text, and the ways of influencing people. Fairclough (1993) explained the objectives of critical discourse analysis that it aims to discover the relationship between (a) discursive practice, events and texts, and (b) wider social and cultural structures, relations and processes. It examines how a particular writer or speaker is shaping language to influence audience, and what are the intended thoughts and ideologies behind that particular discourse.

People utilize various tools to achieve their objectives based on their respective fields. In ancient times, individuals fought to conquer empires, lands, and territories using traditional weapons. In the modern era, nature of warfare has evolved; traditional weapons like swords, spears, and knives have been replaced by guns and bombs. The reasons for fighting have also changed, often now pursued for goals like winning or achieving specific life objectives. One significant form of conflict today, prevalent in all countries, is the "War of Words" in politics. Unlike historical battles fought by soldiers, conquerors, and kings, political battles are waged by politicians or party members. Instead of seizing states or lands, the goal of political conflict is to influence people's minds. Politicians use language as their primary weapon, employing various linguistic strategies to sway public opinion by emphasizing their ideologies. The ability to speak and understand language distinguishes humans from animals, enabling us to decode messages and gain information. Every piece of language has a specific purpose. To fully grasp any linguistic expression, one must decode the speech or writing. Politicians use language to effectively and powerfully convey their ideologies, often embedding deeper meanings that require critical examination and analysis to fully understand.

Political rhetoric refers to the strategic use of language by politicians to persuade, influence, and shape public opinion. Through carefully crafted speeches, statements, and messages, politicians aim to advance their agendas, gain support, and achieve their goals. This form of communication often involves the use of rhetorical devices, emotional appeals, and persuasive techniques to make their ideas more compelling and to sway the audience in their favor. Political rhetoric is a crucial tool in the art of politics, enabling leaders to connect with their constituents, address societal issues, and navigate the complex landscape of public discourse. 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 (2000) presented that politicians make speeches to presentor 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.

The rhetoric of violence is a critical field of study that examines how language and communication are used to convey, justify, and propagate violent actions and ideologies. This form of rhetoric often manifests in political discourse, media, literature, and everyday

speech, reflecting and shaping societal attitudes towards violence. By analyzing the language used to describe and promote violence, scholars can uncover underlying power dynamics, cultural norms, and ideological stances that perpetuate conflict and aggression. The rhetoric of violence not only involves explicit calls to action but also includes subtle and implicit messages that normalize or legitimize violent behavior. Understanding this rhetoric is essential for addressing the roots of violence in society and fostering more peaceful and constructive forms of communication. 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 violentlinguistic 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 theyrepresent others negatively so the people will dislike or hate others because of their negative aspects. As USAID (2016) 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 (CDA) is a multidisciplinary approach to studying language and its relationship to power, ideology, and society. It involves examining the ways in which discourse—written, spoken, or visual communication—reflects, reinforces, and challenges social structures and power dynamics. CDA aims to reveal the hidden meanings and implications of language use, often focusing on issues such as inequality, discrimination, and social justice.

Norman Fairclough is a prominent figure in the field of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). His work has been influential in shaping the theoretical and methodological foundations of CDA. Fairclough's approach to CDA emphasizes the interconnectedness of language, power, and society, and he provides a framework for analyzing how discourse shapes and is shaped by social practices and structures. In applying Fairclough's CDA, researchers typically follow a systematic process that includes:

- Identifying a specific discourse or set of texts to analyze.

- Conducting a detailed linguistic analysis of the texts.

- Investigating the discursive practices involved in the production and reception of the texts.

- Relating the findings to broader social and cultural contexts to understand how the discourse contributes to power relations and ideological processes.

Fairclough's work provides a robust framework for understanding the complex relationship between language, power, and society, making CDA a powerful tool for analyzing and critiquing social inequalities and injustices.

1.1 Objectives

1. To investigate whether offensive language is being used to depict other people.
2. To determine how specific stylistic techniques reduce the out-group's evaluation.

1.2 Significance of the Study

As far as the researcher is aware, no comparison analysis of the speeches given by the five major figures (Imran Khan, Shahbaz Sharif and Asif Ali Zardari) from the standpoint of linguistic aggression. Furthermore, the study's utilization of a designed research modality is another noteworthy aspect. Another important factor that sets apart the current study from

previous studies is the duration of the data collection. To the best of the researcher's knowledge, the Urdu speeches given by the aforementioned politicians have also not been revised. Thus, the significance of the research is justified by all of the above mentioned points.

1.3 Delimitations of the Study

The present study is delimited to the selected speeches of three politicians. And only Urdu speeches of these politicians have been downloaded from news channels' YouTube pages.

2. Literature Review

The representation of violence in political speeches is a critical area of study, especially in the context of Pakistan, where political discourse often reflects and influences the socio-political climate. This literature review aims to examine existing research on the representation of violence in the speeches of Pakistani political leaders, employing Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) as the primary analytical framework. CDA is particularly useful for this purpose as it provides tools to uncover the underlying power dynamics and ideological constructs in political rhetoric.

Anwer et al (2015) critically analyzed the speeches of Quaid-i-Azam delivered on11 August 1947. The objective of this study the objective of this study was to uncoverthe hidden ideologies in his address as a founder of newborn nation. The data for this study was analyzed qualitatively by using Fairclough critical discourse analysis model. The textual analysis shows that Quaid used different linguistic devices as wording, re-wording hyponymy, and other linguistic techniques, to show social evilsin country. The basic theme of the Quaid as discovered by researcher was to provide anew way for nation to walk on. Khan et al. (2017) analyzed the print media advertisement in CDA viewpoints for ideological discursivity. Ramzan and Khan (2019) studied the stereotyped ideological construction of Nawabs in CDA viewpoints. Ramzan et al. (2020) analyzed print media discourse statements in light of speech act theory for ideological purposes. Nawaz et al. (2021) studied the ideological representation in comparison among three different languages. Bhutto and Ramzan (2021) analyzed gender issues, feminine injustice, and media discourse in light of Qur'anic verses in CDA viewpoints. Ramzan et al. (2021) analyzed politicians' statements in light of CDA.

Research conducted by Ammanullah (2018) titled as ' Governing abuse of free speech during elections in Pakistan '. He conducted this study to analyze abuse of hatespeech during election in relation with hate speech laws in Pakistan. He concluded that hate speech increases during elections to get political advantages against opponents. Politicians use religious, national, racial, cast and other sensitive issues to defame political opponents. This abusive or free speech can be observed during the polls of 2017 in Pakistan.

A research has been conducted by USAID in 2016 titled as "The influence of hate speech as a political tool on the youth of Kosovo ". The basic objective of this study was to analyze the effects of politicians' hate speech on the youth of Kosovo. The data for this research is collected from six focus groups from different areas of Kosovo. The researcher discovered that in Kosovo, hate speech is used to humiliate or discriminate against others having different social and political backgrounds or afflictions. The participants observed most of the hate speech on media broadcasts and social media during television debates and protests. Most of the respondents of focus groups claimed that, most of the times politicians use hate speech to get political advantages over opponents. Their aim of using hate speech is showingthemselves superior to their opponents. Through the opinion of respondents, the researcher concluded that hate speech have ability to effect youth badly especially people who are living in poor economic conditions. It can encourage them to perform violence and protests. The researcher recommended that further study can be done to understand how hate speech or verbal violence is responsible for promoting violence and

chaos in society.

Cabrejas (2014) employed Van Dijk's CDA framework to explore positive self evaluation and negative other evaluation in pre-election political debates. She concluded in her research that the different evaluative devices have been used effectively by the politicians to win the electoral votes in elections. They did so by deprecating the opposing party to reduce their chances of winning, and the same time by highlighting and propagating the positive aspects of their party. They represented themselves as the people who believe in widely accepted ideologies in the countryand others as people who are practicing the disgustive and hateful ideologies in the country.

Language discursiveness of Imran Khan's speech persudes audience (Ramzan et al., 2023). Khalil et al (2017) conducted a research which aimed to explore how politicians use language to propagate their ideology. The researcher has analyzed the speech of Imran khan, which he delivered two days before the general elections of 2013 in Pakistan. The researcher has employed the analytical framework of Fairclough which he proposed in 1995. The researcher found through this study that political discourses are often embedded with political ideologies. Most of these ideologies are located in the discourse in an explicit way. Moreover he found that political leaders employ different linguistic devices and techniques to influence people about their ideology.

Quinonez (2018) employed critical discourse analysis and corpus linguistics to analyze anti-immigrant rhetoric in Trump's more than 100 speeches. Through her study she discovered that Trump is using dehumanizing and derogatory language to defame and humiliate immigrants. Trump uses strange metaphors of animals, danger and floods to represent immigrants negatively. Through these linguistic techniques, Trump wanted to impose his ideology of fear about immigrants that they are very dangerous for our country, as they are collective enemy to the nation. On the same time with positive attributions he is proving himself as a savior or ultimate hope to national interests. He wanted to prove that 'us' are the saviors and hope for nation, while 'them' are the potential criminals. He generalized about Mexican immigrants arecriminals, drug dealers and rapists to propagate his point of view about them.

Malghani et al (2019) conducted a research to critically analyze the manifestos of Pakistani political parties. The study aimed that how different manifestos of Pakistani political parties are influencing the cognition of people. The researcher has employed the Socio-Cognitive model of Van Dijk for the analysis of the data. This study revealsthat to achieve desired political hegemony the politicians by using language propagatethe positive aspects of their party and the negative aspects of others. And by creating a binary division of positive self-representation and negative other representation they control the cognition of people.

Akbar et al (2019) employed Van Dijk's model of critical discourse analysis to qualitatively analyze the pre and post-election speeches of Donald Trump. The objective of the study was to find, what is the intention behind the Trump's negative representation of immigrants and Syrian refugees? Whether he is representing them negativity to gain electoral advantages or it is the part of his ideology. Through the analysis of the data the researcher unfolded that Trump's negative representation of 'others' is more than electoral strategy, it is the part of his personal ideology and opinion, and through negative representation of others he wanted to emphasize his personal opinion.

Augstina et al (2020) conducted a research to analyze use of verbal violence in political campaigns in regional Presidential elections in DKI Jakarta. The researchers employed Sociological content analysis model based on typological work steps to analyze data qualitatively. They observed that during presidential election campaigns of 2017 in DKI verbal violence has been used in different forms as insults, defamation, labeling,

threatening, forcing, yelling and humiliating. The researcher concluded that it can be said that through the use of verbal violence the political leaders wanted to bring down their opponents. They wanted to persuade people by negative representation of political opponents.

Inayat (2019) utilized Van Dijk model to analyze Imran khan's pre and post-election speeches, to discover the hidden ideologies or persuasive devices in his speeches. The purpose of this study was to uncover the hidden ideologies in the speeches to control or to change the minds of people. He found that Imran khan the leader of PTI using different linguistic strategies to demonstrate his ideology and power, such as negative presentation of 'them' and positive representation of 'us'. He also did victimization of his political opponents through language. He also employed positive implicatures to present his positive image and negative implicatures to defame or humiliate his political opponents. The researcher recommended that a detailed study can be conducted to analyze how politicians are changing the minds of people especially of uneducated people through negative representation of others.

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 farm of propaganda against his political opponents to weaker their position in the view of public.

3. Research Methodology

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. The data for this research has been collected from news channels You-tube 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 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.

Van Dijk (1988) insisted that in politics, politicians wanted to gain control over human mind to make them think and behave in a specific way. They not only use linguistic techniques and strategies for persuasion but also wanted them to behave in aspecific way. He explained that language is a medium of the process of influencing, manipulation and persuasion. Politicians most of the time propagate their ideology through different linguistic devices to construct inequalities and power relations in thesociety. The specific use of language by an individual or group, contributes towards the construction of unequal relationships of power in community which may cause further social and political issues in society. He (1985) explained that ideology through text not only represents reality but it constructs the reality. Most of the times ideology has been defined as 'false consciousness', because most of the ideologies have been constructed with the help of discourse and language. 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.

4. Data Analysis
The researchers have comparatively analyzed the speeches of three selected politicians

(Imran Khan, Shahbaz Sharif and Asif Ali Zardari) through a devised model. The researchers analyzed the speeches to investigate how politicians linguistically representing others negative and on which thematic grounds they are emphasizing the concept of the otherization in their speeches. It also deals withthe content analysis of the data, through which the researchers have aimed to quantify the frequency of occurrence of negative representation of others in each speech. The researchers have presented the frequency of occurrence of negative other representation in the farm of charts.

Fairclough (2003) argues that, no use of language is politics free and the politics start right from the level of 'Naming' the way a person names others is highlyideological and full of political tricks. Similarly here in the speeches of Mr. Khan, Mr.Khan's speeches have been selected for the present research; we see the use of highly ideological words in the form of naming which he uses for Mr. Sharif (Nawaz Sharif),Mr. Sharif (Shahbaz Sharif) and other PMLN leaders.

- Gedron kay opar to yeh mashoor hay kay jb gedar ke moot ati hay to whoshehr ke tarf bhagta hay
- It is well known that when a jackal is near to die, it runs to the city.

And another example when a jackal is near to death runs to the city, which implies that the days of corruption of both Mr. Sharif's (Nawaz Sharif and Shahbaz Sharif) have been numbered. Now they are running towards the cities and in the cities me and my party is very much alive, and no sooner as they enter the city they will be caught, and they will be sentenced to death. So here the use of animal metaphor 'Jackal' represents both brothers Mr. Sharifs (Nawaz Sharif and Shahbaz Sharif) negatively on the part of Mr. Khan.

- Kyon kay yeh magarmach es mulk ka pesa chori kr kay bahir lay jaty hein, or karty kya hein, sary idaaron par qabza kar kay baithy hoy hein, dakoun koo bary bary uhdon par bithaya howa hy, enko bhi khila dety hein.
- Because these crocodiles steal the money of this country and take it out, and what they do is occupy all the institutions, the dacoits are sitting in high positions, they also fed them.

Here again Mr. Khan has used the animal and derogatory metaphor for Mr. Sharif,his family and PMLN and metaphorically represented them as crocodiles, as crocodiles have negative connotations. For example their only concern is to eat, they share the meat to each other, here the use of word crocodiles for Mr. Sharif and it's party implies that they are the most corrupt and hateful people, they have beenstealing the money all the time, as crocodiles only concern is to eat, and Mr. Sharif's has placed the people like himself on high positions. They are also of same nature likecrocodiles, he also share the meat with them and all enjoys to live on looted money.

- Yeh joo nawaz sharif ka Motu gang tha, Motu gang, aak Chotu gang Chotugang logon Koo lut.ta hy, yeh Motu gang hy jo awam kay pesy kay opar akcorrupt tareen khandan ko pohchany kaliy nikly hoy hein.
- This was Nawaz Sharif's "Motu Gang", the Motu Gang. There is a small gang, a small gang used to rob people; it is a fat gang that went out on publicmoney to deliver to the most corrupt family.

Here again Mr. Sharifs, their party and the bureaucracy which have been helping them has been named as Motu gang and Chotu gang. Again they have been represented violently at the level of naming. Yeh Sharif khandan or un kay yeh bhonkny waly

- This sharif family and their barking people

- Jo Nawaz Sharif kr rha hy apni chori bachany kaliy, apni corruption bachanykaliy kr rha hy…
- Whatever Nawaz Sharif is Doing he is doing to save is theft, to save hiscorruption

They have been represented violently at the level of naming again as barking people, thieves, bribers etc. All these words carry negative connotations. And all the words which carry negative connotations have been deliberately used by Mr. Khan to represent them violently before the people by employing the rhetoric of violence.

- Jab Musharaf nay pakar kar tmhen jail mein dal dia tha, tum muhida kar kaySaudi Arab chaly gay thy, or phr jb waps ay to phr us nay pakr kar bhej dia
  …. Tumhary log aj kehty hein kay ham lohy ky chany hein yeh sab jhuk gaythay
- When Musharraf caught you and put you in jail, you made a deal and went toSaudi Arabia. And then when you came back, he grabbed you and sent you away. Your people today say that we are made of iron or grains of iron, theyall bowed down.

Another example in this regard is bow down (in Urdu Jhuk janan). It implies that these two brothers are highly interest seekers, and to gain their interests they can go toevery extent, and can do everything. At the same time we can quote here that Ruth Wodak Argues that discourses are deeply rooted in history, without knowing history

we can not understand or decode the discourses, same is the case here, the discourse under analysis which is the speech of Mr. Khan against Mr. Sharif (Nawaz Sharif) andMr. Sharif (Shahbaz Sharif). The real chunk of the language is (jhuk jana), It implies the regime of (Ex) president Musharaf took over the country and put Mr. Sharifs behind the bars. They were trialed in the courts and probably they were going to get the punishment and than they signed an agreement which here has been represented as jhuk jaana. Than they were deported to Saudi Arabia, and there they lived for long time, in this way Mr. khan trying to represent them negatively by showing their history, by showing their past character, past looting and the present character before the people to let them know that in the forth coming election instead of voting these two looters, they should cast votes in favor of him or his party.

Comparison is a technique which is used in political discourse by contrasting the two side of same person negatively, that what one pretends to be and in actual what one is. The same technique has been used here by Mr. khan that PMLN leaders always present them as "grains of iron" (hard to digest) which symbolizes that they are very rightful people and they will always stand firmly with right, no oppression or pressure can put them down but on the other hand situation is totally different, Mr. khan presented them as cowards and people who always bowed down in pressure. Forsupporting his stance as earlier discussed he has given the example of their deals with Mr. Musharaf, that they are hypocrite and there is a vast difference between their self representation and their reality.

- Kon say nizam mein aap sou logon Koo gooliyan maren choda Koo halak krdein, Shahbaz Sharif tumhary din giny hoy hein.
- In which system do you shoot 100 people, kill 14 and… Shahbaz Sharif yourdays are numbered…

Politics is a blame game, so here different tricks have been used by citing reference from present and the past, same technique has been used by Mr. Khan to represent Mr. Sharif and Mr. Sanaullah negativity by associating them with dacoits, killers, shameless, heartless, and liars.

So the list of adjectives used by Mr. Khan to represent Mr. Sharif (Nawaz Sharif),Mr. Sharif (Shahbaz Sharif), Mr. Abbasi, Mr. Sanaullah and whole this party carries negative

connotations which implies that Mr. Khan's speech is full of rhetoric of violence and blame game, and the use of these words which carries negative connotations implies that Mr. khan has represented thoroughly negative image of PMLN and its heads.

Van dijk (2006) argued that ideology, politics and discourse are interconnected toeach other. Political discourse is the product of social cognition of one specific group about others, in the same way that particular political discourse has been designed with the help of different linguistic devices to affect the cognition of its listeners and readers. So through discourse analysis and thematic analysis we can not only uncover the implied ideologies of political parties but also can identify the ways of constructing and propagating those ideological assumptions.

- Agar ab ham nay mian ko chhor dia to shayd Allah bhi maaf na kary, es liy kay yeh qomi chor hy, yeh awam ka chor hy, gharebon ka chor hy, mazdoron ka chor hy, yeh hariyon ka chor hy, es nay haariyon ka haq khaya hy, es ny awam ka haq khaya hy.
- If we leave Mian now, maybe Allah will not forgive us, because he is a national thief, he is a thief of people, he is a thief of poor, he is a thief of the workers, he is a thief of the presents, he has eaten the rights of the peasants, and he has eaten the rights of the people.

In every political discourse the technique of actor description is important, because it is the base of ideological assumptions embedded in the text. Here Mr. Zardari has represented Mr. Sharif negatively as a thief. He has implicated that Mr. Sharif is the leader of all thieves. He has not only looted the wealth of country but of every single individual either he is a worker or peasant. Hence he is the eater of the rights of every single individual and a national thief. Through this negative representation he wanted to send a message to public that there is a difference between presence and reality that Mr. Sharif who is the Prime Minister of the country,but actually he is the looter of nation, the looter of peasants and workers. Here Mr. Zardari has used another technique which is counterfactuals, which means making people fearful about what happened if they rely on others. Here Mr. Zardari not only represented Mr. Sharif as national thief but warned them if they didn't took notice of this, or if they still believe and vote him in next elections, the God will not forgive them and they will be again punished by God. Because Mr. Sharif is an oppressor and tyrant that God also hates him, so the public should also hate him.

- Or asy insan Koo meny kaha kay yeh dharti pay boht nasoor ho chuka hy, abyeh dharti esko maaf nahi kary gi.
- And I told such a man that has become ulcer on earth. Now this earth will notforgive him.

- Mery moula ab es say jaan chura. Ab es nasoor sy jaan chura, es awam kejaan 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.

- Magar aak nasoor zaror hy hamary qareeb, yeh boht baraa nasoor hy, bohtbarri 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 describedMr. 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 isa 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.

4.2 Content Analysis

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

4.2.1 Content analysis table of the Speeches of Imran khan

Speaker Speech Code	Speech Against	Duration	Frequency of occurrence of violent linguistic items
Imran Khan's Speech S1	Against Nawaz Sharif and PMLn	43 minutes 07 Seconds	95 times
Imran Khan's Speech S2	Against Nawaz Sharif and its party	23 Minutes 35 Seconds	43 times
Imran Khan's Speech S3	Against Nawaz Sharif and his government	1 Hour 13 Minutes	147 times

Total Frequency of negative criticism in Three Selected speechesS1+S2+S3= 95+43+147= 285
AVERAGE = 285/3 = 95 Times per Speech

4.2.2 Content analysis table of the Speeches of Shahbaz Sharif

Speaker Speech Code	Speech Against	Duration	Frequency of occurrence of violent linguistic items

Shahbaz Sharif's Speech S1	Against PPP	30 Minutes 51 Seconds	100 Times
Shahbaz Sharif's Speech S2	Against PTI	16 Minutes 44 Seconds	64 Times
Shahbaz Sharif's Speech S3	PMLN VS PTI AND PPP	17 Minutes	32 Times

Total number of negative criticism in three selected speechesS1+ S2 +S3 = Total negative Representation of other 100+64+32 = 196
Average = 196 / 3 = 65 Times per Speech

4.2.3 Content analysis of the Speeches of Asif Ali Zardari

Speaker Speech Code	Speech Against	Duration	Frequency of occurrence of violent linguistic items
Mr.Asif Zardari's Speech S1	Against PMLN	9 Minutes 24 Seconds	33 Times
Mr.Asif Zardari's Speech S2	Against PMLN	19 Minutes 43 Seconds	57 Times
Mr.Asif Zardari's Speech S3	Against PMLN	8 Minutes 35 Seconds	30 Times

Total number of negative criticism in three selected speeches

S1+ S2+S3 = Total negative Representation of others 33+57+30=120Average = 120/ 3 = 40 times negative Representation per Speech
     The content analysis of the data reveals that all the three selected politicians have used various linguistic devices for the negative representation of their political opponents. They negatively represented their political opponents at various occasions in their speeches for example Mr. Khan has negatively represented Mr. Sharif, his partand his government as average of 95 times per speech. The examples of the use of rhetoric of violence for others by Mr. Khan are as, jackal, Pharaoh, barking people, thugs, Chotu gang, Motu gang, mafia, thieves, corrupt, dacoits etc. Mr. Khan has usedthese violent linguistic items on the basis of these thematic grounds corruption, incompetence of government, religio-political criticism and national interests. Mr. Sharif has represented his political opponents negatively as average of 65times per speech. He also used rhetoric of violence in his speeches for the negative representation of Mr. Zardari and Mr. Khan and his government as, Madari, manhos, mafia, thugs, gangsters, traitors, beggar, brainless, liars, incompetent

etc. Corruption, incompetence and consensus are the important themes on the basis of these themes he has used rhetoric of violence for others.

Similarly, Mr. Zardari has represented his political opponents negatively as averageof 40 times per speech. He has employed the rhetoric of violence in his speeches to present his political opponents derogatively as deceptive, shameless, cowards, robbers, beast, ulcer, daramatists, showbaz etc. The important themes which have been discussed in the speeches of Mr. Zardari are national interests or consensus, tyranny of government, incompetence of others and corruption.

5. Findings and Conclusion

The present research has aimed to identify the use of violent linguistic items which have been used by selected politicians (Imran Khan, Shahbaz Sharif and Asif Ali Zardari) of Pakistan in their speeches. The researchers have used the term 'rhetoric of violence' because the analysis and findingof the present research has examined that the selected politicians are using violent, abusive and hateful language against each other. And by the negative representation of out groups they have tried to dehumanize and victimize others for their political gains. 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 representedMr. Sharif and other members of PMLN by using the derogatory language which is asjackal, 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.

5.2 Recommendations

Comparative research on the speeches of politicians from Pakistan and other nations can be done to understand how speakers of other nations employ violent rhetoric for both positive and negative self-and other-representation.

References

Agustina & Gani, Erizal & Nurizzati, Nurizzati & Liusti, SitiAinim (2020). Typology of Verbal Violence in Political Discourse: Codification of Sociolinguistics. Journal of Advanced Research in Dynamical and Control Systems presents peer-reviewed survey and original research articles, 12(6), 928-938.

Akbar, Noor & Abbas, Nawal. (2019). Negative Other-Representation in American Political

Speeches. International Journal of English Linguistics. 9(2), 113- 127.

Ammanullah, M. (2018). Governing Abuse of Free Speech during Elections in Pakistan. A Research Journal of South Asian Studies, 33(1), 239-251.

Anwar, M.N & Ahmad, N & Ali, M. (2015). "Critical Discourse Analysis of Quaid-e-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah's (11th August, 1947) Speech in theFirst Constituent Assembly of Pakistan". A Research Journal of SouthAsian Studies, 30(1), 159-173.

Beard, A. (2000), The Language of Politics. London: Routledge.

Bhutto, J., and Ramzan. M. (2021). "ENGLISH: Verses of Quran, Gender Issues, Feminine Injustice, and Media Transmission - CDA of Pakistani Press Reports. Rahatulquloob 5 (2), 111-26. https://doi.org/10.51411/rahat.5.2.2021/316.

Bloomaert, J., and Bulcaen, C. (2000). Critical discourse analysis. Annual Review of Anthropology 29, 447–466.

Breeze, R. 2011. Critical discourse analysis and its critics. Pragmatics 21(4), 493–525.

Cabrejas-Peñuelas, Ana. (2014). Positive self-evaluation versus negative other-evaluation in the political genre of pre-election debates. Discourse and Society, 25(2), 159-185.

Fairclough, N. (1993). Critical Discourse Analysis and the Marketization of PublicDiscourse: The Universities. Discourse & Society, 4(2), 133-168.

Fairclough, N. (2003). Analyzing discourse: Textual analysis for social research. London: Routledge.

Hunter, Lynette (2000). Considering Issues of Violence and Rhetoric. Parallax. 6 (2), 2–8.

Inayat, Arslan. (2019). Discourse of Power: Critical Discourse Analysis of Imran Khan's pre- and Post-Election Speeches. (Graduation thesis, University of Gujrat).

Jackman, M. (2002). Violence in Social Life. Annual review of Sociology, 28, 387- 415.

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

Khan, M.A., Ramzan, M.M., Dar, S R. (2017) Deconstruction of Ideological Discursivity in Pakistani Print Media Advertisements from CDA Perspective Erevna: The Journal of Linguistics and Literature,1(1),56-79.

Malghani, M. & Akhtar, S. & Farooqi, F. (2019). Analysis of Political Discourse inPakistani Party Manifestos. Global Social Sciences Review, Humanity only,4(2) 231-237.

Nawaz, S., Aqeel, M., Ramzan,M., Rehman,M., Tanoli,Z.A.,(2021). Language Representation and Ideological Stance of Brahui in Comparison with Urdu and English Newspapers Headlines, Harf-O-Sukhan, 5(4) ,267-293.

N, Julianavnn. (2014). Discourse Analysis: Ronald Reagan's Evil Empire Speech. Open Journal of Modern Linguistics, 4(1), 166-181.

Partridge, Brian. (2012). Discourse Analysis: An Introduction (2ed.). London: Bloomsbury Academy.

Quinonez, Erika Sabrina. (2018). (Un) Welcome to America: A critical discourse analysis of anti-immigrant rhetoric in Trump's speeches and conservative main stream media. (Masters thesis, California State University, San Bernardino)

Ramzan, M., Khan, M.A., (2019).CDA of Balochistan Newspapers Headlines- A Study of Nawabs' Stereotyped Ideological Constructions. Annual Research Journal 'Hankén', XI, 27-41.

Ramzan, M. Qureshi, A.B., Samad, A. Sultan, N. (2021) Politics as Rhetoric: A Discourse Analysis of Selected Pakistani Politicians Press Statements. Humanities & Social Sciences Reviews, 9(3) ,1063-1070.

Ramzan, M., Awan, H.J., Ramzan, M., and Maharvi, H., (2020) Comparative Pragmatic Study of Print media discourse in Balochistan newspapers headlines, Al-Burz, Volume 12, Issue 01

Ramzan, M., Javaid, Z. K., & Khan, M. A. (2023). Psychological Discursiveness in Language Use of Imran Khan's Speech on National Issues. Global Language Review, VIII (II), 214-225. https://doi.org/10.31703/glr.2023(VIII-II).19

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. (1988). News as discourse. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Van Dijk, T.A. (2006). Discourse and Power. Houndsmills: Palgrave

Van Dijk, T.A. (2006a). Politics, Ideology, and Discourse. Encyclopedia ofLanguage & Linguistics. 2, 728-740.

Wodak, R.(2001). Methods of critical discourse analysis. London: Thousand Oaks – New Delhi: Sage Publications.