



RESEARCH ARTICLE

An Exploration of Power Play and Struggle for Hegemony in Imran Khan's Pakistan: A Personal History

Humera Sharif^{1*}, Asad Habib², Liaqat Ali Mohsin³, Hizbullah Khan^{4*}^{1,2,3,4} The University of Lahore, Lahore, Pakistan

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT
Received: May 26, 2024	This study has been conducted to probe the power play and struggle for hegemony in the selected text. The objective has been accomplished by the application of the concept of power in discourse and the power behind discourse provided by Fairclough in Language and Power (2003). Three key mechanisms i.e., universal acceptance, inculcation, and communication (Fairclough: 2003) are explored to study the concept of power. The chapter has been selected from the book Pakistan: A Personal History written by Imran Khan (2011). The findings suggest that inculcation can explore the main force of power behind the discourse i.e., the West maintaining its power in Pakistan. Furthermore, mechanisms of communication indicate Imran Khan's use of discursive strategies that indicate power in the text as an attempt to emancipate the nation from its oppressed state. This process of power-play eventually supports Khan in his struggle for hegemony against his opponents by the mechanism of universal acceptance. Hence, the paper looks into the role of language in maintaining or changing the existing social phenomenon. Resultantly, it can trigger positive social change.
Accepted: Jul 22, 2024	
Keywords	
Power	
Hegemony	
Political Discourse	
Critical Discourse Analysis	
*Corresponding Author	
Humera.sharif@ell.uol.edu.pk	
khizbullah410@gmail.com	

INTRODUCTION

Manipulating language to execute political function is an integral part of politics around the globe, including in Pakistan. Chilton (2004) argues that there is a strong relationship between the use of language and politics. He also describes that the success of politics dramatically depends on the language. Ashok (2002) and Levitt (2017) argue that politicians use political rhetoric to persuade people to get their desired actions from people. Hence, it is not viable to separate language from the study of politics (Althusser, 2014). Considering the significant and the key role of language in politics, this study aims to analyze the rhetorical strategies used by Khan in the political text. Moreover, it explores the struggle for power and hegemony in contemporary Pakistani politics.

"The multidimensionality of political discourse has attracted much attention from discourse analysts" (Bhatia, 2010). Van Dijk (2006) describes the interpretation and explanation of a political talk as fundamental to the aims of critical discourse analysis. At the same time, a discourse containing political content at the national or international level is a political talk (Kvist, 2016, Fairclough, 2013). Moreover, an insight into political discourse requires a discourse analytical approach to reveal the linguistic contents expressed in the political text in various forms and uncover the implicit meanings. Hence, with discourse analysis, this study attempts to explore and uncover the hidden motives behind linguistic manipulation.

The existence of politics is impossible without the use of language. Jones et al. (1994) describe that various techniques are used to get our ways, such as persuasion, arguments, power, dominance, threats and manipulations (main concerns of politics also). Book writing by politicians is one of the techniques (Rose, 2006). This study focuses on Imran Khan's book

Political discourse is significant and described as the vehicle for power struggle and hegemony (Fairclough, 2013). Politics, indubitably, is a power struggle, and language is the most effective tool to exercise power. Resultantly, the aspects of language and power relationship cannot be ignored. Fairclough (2003) describes that in discourse, power is played by using various persuasive techniques; mind control strategies are enacted and exercised in discourse. Political power can not prevail without the use of persuasive techniques. Dupre (2010) explains that by its very nature, politics requires choices to be formulated, options to be weighed, and decisions to be made.

Power is a challenging interplay strongly influencing our lives (Røberg et al., 2017a, 2017b). It can transform right into duty. Edelman (1977) argues that a powerholder is a person "who can exercise influence outside the context of formal proceedings (thus wielding) real power". Fairclough (2003) in *Language and Power* persuasively argues that linguistic and sociopolitical context and conventions enact and exercise power in such a way that they produce and are reproduced the discursive sources of power; they can challenge and transform existing power relations and struggles. He further distinguishes the physical power and mind control as influencing through coercion and hegemony defined as manufacturing consent.

Hegemony is the process that is the beauty of democracy and works like glue in a society discouraging the use of physical force (Gramsci, 1971). Negotiation and consent are two essential concepts of hegemony that make it easy for the authoritative person to make his vision acceptable as beliefs and values do not develop accidentally and on a freeway. These are neither imposed from above nor forcefully injected into souls (Fairclough, 2003). This study explores the struggle for hegemony by Pakistani politicians at the national and international levels and investigates how language functions effectively as a source of power.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Critical discourse analysis refers to the ways of understanding the social world drawn by critical theory (Fairclough, 2013). It investigates critically social inequality as it is expressed, signalled, constituted and legitimized by language. Dijk (2009) describes that CDA reveals the discursive force of power, dominance, inequality and bias. Furthermore, 'C' in CDA stands for the critical insight into the obscure causes and unrevealed connections between language, power and ideology. It explains the ways unequal power relations are produced, reproduced, and naturalized in the discourse.

Fairclough (2003) argues that the term critical in CDA is often associated with studying power relations produced and reproduced by the use of language. With a particular focus on the role of discourse in the production and reproduction of power abuse or domination, CDA dissects language from the perspective that language has a crucial role in transforming power into right and obedience into duty. It also works in two ways. It may create power and become an area where power can be applied. Dijk (2009) suggests that CDA "is a discourse analytical research that primarily studies the way social power abuse, dominance, and inequality are enacted, reproduced, and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context. Language is not powerful in its own; it gains power by the use influential people make out of it. With such dissident research, critical discourse analysis takes exact position, and thus goes to understand, expose, and ultimately to resist social inequality." Considering all these possibilities, it works to reveal how dominated groups are manipulated. It goes consistent with their interest. CDA critically analyzes the language of those who reside in the corridors of power and chooses the perspective of the dominated people and those who suffer. CDA considers the experiences and opinions of the members of the oppressor group seriously and supports their

struggle against inequality and power abuse (Røberg et al., 2017a, 2017b). However, for flawless critical discourse analysis of power, the concept of power itself is necessary to make clear.

Power is a complex and abstract idea, and it has a significant influence on our lives. It is the "ability of its holders to exact compliance or obedience of other individuals to their will". (The New Fontana Dictionary of Modern Thoughts, 1999, pg.678). Edelman (1977, pg.123) defines a powerholder as exercising his influence and wields his real power outside the context of formal proceedings.

Crucial to the notion of power in the discourse is, more specifically, the social power of groups or institutions (Levitt, 2017). Social power is defined in terms of control. Possessing more or less power, these groups may control, more or less, the acts and minds of other groups as a whole or few members of those groups. It is vital to note that power is never absolute (Kwist, 2016). It varies in degree, more or less. Moreover, having power and exercising power are pretty different from each other. In *Political Concepts: A Reconstruction* (1981), Oppenheim explains three types of exercising socializing power. 1) Influencing relates itself to social relationships. Simon (Gramsci's *Political Thought*: 1982) also identifies power as social relations. He suggests that social relations are also relations of power. In society, dominant or privileged groups of people tend to influence the actions of the oppressed (Foucault, 1995). The actions of less powerful people have controlled rather perceptions, beliefs, values and ideologies are also influenced by the influential group. "Dominant groups dominate the lives of others even shaping their beliefs" (Gramsci's *Political Thought*: Simon: 1982). Oppenheim argues that strong communities of social structures tend to influence less powerful parts of society by persuading in written or verbal discourse. He successfully gives a clear picture of the distinction between rational persuasion and manipulation. The aforementioned happens when influential groups control actions or perceptions of the less powerful community by providing true, honest and factual information; the second concept owes its existence to misleading and deceiving by concocting and fabricating the stories and facts. Repeated persuasion may slide over manipulation (Oppenheim: *Political Concepts*: 1981). In this game, oppressors are unable, psychologically, to choose and perceive specific other alternatives. Brainwashing is central terminology to manipulation.

The second subcategory of power is coercion, which pertains to physical power (Fairclough, 2003). It can be explained in terms of restraining someone from performing specific actions. Thus, the threats of legal or moral sanctions can be embodied within the domain of coercion. Hart (1958, p95) describes, "if we have an obligation to do something there is some sense in which.....we are or may be compelled to do it." Moreover, it is generally associated with the military.

It has been explained earlier that power and control are interchangeable, and influence and coercion explain it. Oppenheim's third type of power is out of the concept of control, and that is punishing. Galbraith (1983) describes the idea of punishment as "is most commonly applied to a situation in which deprivation or unpleasant experience is deliberately imposed by one party on another because of an actual or supposed misdeed which is knowingly and intentionally committed by the latter."

In *Language and Power*, Fairclough (2003) explains the distinction between two primary forms of power, "the exercise of power through coercion of various sources including physical violence, and the exercise of power through the manufacture of consent to or at least acquiescence towards it". His concept of manufacturing consent means to persuade people by strong ideological points such as social control by 'constant doses of news' to the public.

In *Language and Power*, he explains power works in two ways: power in discourse and power behind discourse. The former, described as orders of discourse, is controlled deliberately. Only interest-driven types of social practices and discourses are adopted and normalized in the text; those contrary to interest are eliminated. Power in discourse means the influential participants controlling,

constraining and deciding the participation of non-powerful participants in the text. Fairclough in *Language and Power* (2003) focuses upon significant linguistic elements, i.e. Causality and Nominalization.

Causality: means who is causing something to happen and who is doing what to whom.

Nominalization: is used when a process is expressed as a noun, and the doers or the subject is left unspecified.

Fairclough (2003) presents a broader framework giving a comprehensive account of longer-term tendencies resulting in the social struggle over discourse. It includes three major constraints used by powerful participants exercised over the contribution or participation of non-powerful participants in discourse.

Constraints	Structural effects
Contents	What is said or done (knowledge & belief)
Subjects	The social relationships people enter into discourse
Relations	Subject position people occupy (social identities)

Thinking about these constraints in relatively immediate and concrete terms is a matter of power in discourse, whereas, as a matter of power behind discourse these constraints are a matter of 'Structural and long term ways'. Fairclough (2003) describes, "Whole social order of discourse is put together and held together as a hidden effect of power". The power behind discourse is the stake in power that controls over orders of discourse and is a powerful mechanism for sustaining and reproducing power (Kvist, 2016).

To achieve the coordination and commonality of the structural effects of control over discourse author follows a mechanism as described by Fairclough (2003). First is 'Universal Acceptance', explained as the author adopts the discourse and advocates the universally accepted practices, and there is no alternative contrary to the listeners' belief. The second is 'Inculcation' which is imposed as the power behind discourse in the form of hidden power. It is the mechanism of power holders who attempt to naturalize partial and interested practices to maintain control. The third mechanism is 'Communication', achieved through rational communication and debates. This is the mechanism of emancipation and struggles against domination.

In a nutshell, the above-drawn picture of control and power gives a general insight into how discourse controls dominance and the production and reproduction of inequality (Kvist, 2016). It is also crucial to mention here that politics is the primary power domain. Politicians exert power to control people's minds by persuasion or manipulation (Gramsci, 1971).

Power being the core organizing theme of the domain of politics has been much debated in political science. Ketznelson and Milner (2002) in *Political Science: State of the Discipline* present two concepts central to the role of power in politics, proposed by Weber and Marx. Weber (1946) treats power to control the actions of others, conforming to their preferences. Conversely, Marx argues that politics is the cover for pervasive inequality and privilege. He suggests that focusing only on superficial conflicts (as in political science) neglects power as agenda-setting and shaping world views and language itself. This is also argued in critical discourse analysis by Luuka (1997), Gramsci (1971), Foucault (1995), Fairclough (2003), and Wodak (2005). Hence, the concept given by Marx links up the idea of power in political discourse with Politics, on the one hand, and Critical Discourse Analysis, on the other hand. It may be best explained as political science is often superficial in its analysis. Thereby, interpretations of language and linguistic terminology are fundamental to a deep analysis of political discourse.

Political Discourse

Political discourse is another wing of the general term 'discourse'. It has its own linguistic pattern forming a specific structure; along with the discourse pattern, a situational and political context needs cognitive collaboration. Speaking and delivering a talk in a particular way and synchronizing the situation with context are fundamentals of political discourse. (Dijk, 2006, p.733). Hence, acting as an MP, Prime Minister, party leader or party worker will be a relevant context category in political discourse perceived by people. Furthermore, politics is mainly concerned with power, whether to make decisions, undermine competitors' values, or control people's behaviour and minds to control ideologies and beliefs to win the hegemony race.

Hegemony and Dominance

In political science, hegemony is leadership. It seeks ordinate power by achieving political, economic and military leadership. Adamson (Hegemony and Revolution:1980: 170) describes two definitions presented by Gramsci on the concept of hegemony. First, "Hegemony is an overcoming of economic-cooperative". Secondly, "It means the consensual basis of an existing political system within civil society". Gramsci (1971) presents the difference between hegemony and domination. Domination is ruled by the use of force. Hence these two concepts agree with Fairclough's types of power, i.e., power through consent and power of coercion. Fairclough (2003, pg. 45) quotes (butler et al. 2000), "The hegemony struggle between political forces can be seen as partially a contention over the claims of their particular vision and representation of the world having universal status". Resultantly, politicians try to universalize their leadership claiming their ideologies to be more applicable and profitable for the people. Hence, presenting a particular belief system and ideology in political leadership is the mechanism and process of exercising power and gaining hegemony (Althusser, 2014).

METHODOLOGY

The study was aimed to study the author's attitude and behaviour to control the minds of readers, so it was qualitative in nature. The data was collected only from one chapter, "Rediscovering Iqbal: Pakistan's Symbol and a Template for our Future", selected from Pakistan: A personal history written by Imran Khan (2011). The collected data described the phenomenon of power in a democracy. The research aimed to explain the sociopolitical phenomenon in society.

The tool of data analysis was Fairclough's concept of power. Two significant dimensions of power described by Fairclough (2003) are 'power in discourse' and 'power behind discourse'. Section 2 explains the concept of power by Fairclough (2003). Moreover, the text has worked out Gramsci's idea of hegemony cited by Adamson (1980).

ANALYSIS AND CRITICAL DISCUSSION

When we talk about CDA, power is central to it, as explained in section 2. Whereby, work of ideology described by Fairclough (2003) is hegemony, so the objectives and research questions included are how Khan (2011) uses power to control the text and context representation. Secondly, how he struggles for hegemony in text representation plays a crucial role in getting dominance over others and shaping and reshaping the social context. All the issues are at the core of debates to trigger the change in societies. Thereby, this section answers both questions.

Power and Discourses

Section 2 explains the power skeleton working in discourse from the perspectives of Dijk (2005) and Fairclough (2003). Later mentioned has talked about different forms of power: coercion and persuasive power, and power in discourse and power behind discourse. The analysis of power in discourse and power behind discourse in the selected text for the study is as follows.

Power in Discourse

Fairclough (2003: 46) describes that power in discourse deals with the participation of powerful persons to constrain the participation of non-powerful people. Discourse is the site of social struggle. The author of the selected text (Khan, 2011) has complete control over orders of discourse. The given lines provide a comprehensive account of power in discourse. Section 2 explains three types of constraints; control over contents, relations and subjects.

Analysis (Lines # 361-392)

Injustices in the economy, Pakistan a failing state, international aid, grossly unfair social system, feudal system, loot and plunder and negligence of education are the masses' beliefs about the rulers of the country. It is evident in the lines that the Discourse is presented by the opposition of the ruling party. The author of the text deliberately presents the contents causing disrepute to those in corridors of power.

Khan (2011) also presents a gross picture of social relations, i.e., ruler-mass relationships. Rulers have been presented with all the connotations of cruelty and brutality, such as 'the lumbering giants', 'crooks', 'feudal', 'dictators', 'Unjust society', and 'the elite neglecting quality education for masses'. At the same time, the public's relationship to these so-called leaders is shown as being 'crushed' as their food or creatures, deprived of humanity down to the animals as a 'cowed nation' becoming 'accustomed to the crutches from US'.

All the subject positions are occupied by the pitiless rulers, dictators, looters, and plunder; the public is passive and is shown subjugated. The entire unjust social phenomenon is caused by ruthless authorities brutally assassinating the masses of Pakistan. It reflects the causality process from those who reside in the corridors of power to the naive public.

This analysis elaborates on the inclusion and exclusion, active or passive role of particular social agents. Most of the time Pakistani nation is excluded and is inactive in its role. The nation is 'subjugated by the authoritarian rule'. Khan deliberately uses this sort of expression that brings particular social orders in the text and is enough to show the existing power structures in the society. The author also has a control to express specific processes and activities and their role in forming crippled democracy. Hence the author of the text has the ultimate power to control the representation of particular social events and elements from a specific aspect of types of social practices. He inclines to represent contents, relations and subjects to fulfil his various purposes as an antagonist.

Hence, the Power in Discourse is of the left-wing. Khan tries to influence people by enhancing readers' realization about the feudal system that cursed us and brought an unfair social system. To get the commonality of these structural effects, the author uses the mechanism of communication. He provides authentic shreds of evidence to prove that their ravaging authority to crush poor people is considered unquestionable. He refers to the damaging effects of the 2010 flood water; these cruel feudal lords diverted this flood water from their lands towards the lands of poor people. He supports it by highlighting the upheaval that is 'corruption' and 'enormous rich-poor divide' caused by elites' access above the reach of law; here 'enormous' is used to enhance the realization of the destructive effects of this unequal division by feudal and politicians and makes the ideology readily acceptable. The inequality is extended to the womenfolk also; the influential in rural areas treat the women as their property. Moreover, he argues to trickle down the power from feudal to common people by reviving the panchayat system, determines to empower people by adorning them with the innovative educational system, and also, need for the transfer of control from state to institutions.

As Fairclough (2003) describes, the mechanism of communication leads toward emancipation. Resultantly, it seems to be an effort to change the existing power structure instead of reproduction.

Hence, the Discourse is the site of the power struggle of antagonists against protagonists to get rid of the crooks ruling over the country. All in all, the author is the possessor of ultimate power in Discourse.

The power behind the Discourse

Fairclough (1989) describes power behind discourse as the hidden effect of power on discourse constituted by putting together whole social hierarchical order of the sociolinguistic context. It is explained at a more general level. The power behind Discourse quenches the thirst of the one who has access to which discourses and who can impose restrictions on the access. Usually, this is Dominant Bloc (Fairclough: 2003). In this text, the opposition or left-wing has access to the Discourse. Although the antagonists used this category, it belongs to the political cant that falls into the dominant bloc category. By the mechanism of inculcation, Khan controls contents, subjects, and social relations in the Discourse and successfully maintains the power of opposition.

Seemingly, being the leader of the opposition author of the text has access to this Discourse, but the lines (365, 370, 373, 374, 394, 395, 399) in the text give different interpretations.

It elaborates that there is a covert working of a power that shapes the final format of the discourse. Every type of social practice and discourse adopted in the text is the effect of a power working in the background. It either, in return, reproduces that power structure or strengthens the emerging new power relation that is being normalized in the text.

In the selected text, Khan stresses the significance of the 'Western Education System'. The reason for this normalization in the text is the power of the West dominated over the world because of modern and advanced technologies. This hidden power of the West mentally imperializes the East to accept her dominance and the necessity to follow her education system to be called learned and innovative. Hence, the author normalizes the discourse of the Western education system and contributes to the reproduction of the power of the West over the East. Another content chosen by the author is 'extremism', a term introduced by the West against Muslims. The author seems to advocate the western viewpoint as in 'reactionary mullahs promoted a medieval attitude', Taliban emerged out of Deobandi madrassas..." and Madrassas promote sectarianism.

Subject: positions are deliberately given to religious people. Contemptuously, a grotesque picture has been presented of the beholders of our spiritual knowledge. They are being held responsible for the terrorism causing devastation. These are madrassas that actively promote sectarianism, Taliban and fundamentalism.

The author has the power to control the orders of discourse to disguise the power of the West. By the process of inclusion and exclusion, nominalization and meronymy (as madrassas substituting molvies), he provides only favoured interpretation. So, the power being exercised here is the ability to disguise power. It is, in fact, the power of the West behind the text because the wording and viewpoint about Muslim countries presented in the text are of the West. Apparently, it is the author's belief, but between the lines, he is giving air to the notion of the West against our religion Islam.

Hence, by the mechanism of inculcation, he controls over contents, subjects, and social relations in the discourse and successfully maintains the power of the West.

Hegemony

Fairclough (2003) describes, "The ideological work of text is connected to what I earlier said about ideology and hegemony". Hegemony is ruled by consent, and "ideology is the key mechanism of rule by consent (Fairclough, 1992, pg 34), so a more powerful ideology means a more powerful and more acceptable politician. It is evident in Pakistani politics when most of the time, political leaders are asked again and again what is his stance on a particular issue. Resultantly, a more acceptable stance

makes the politician more popular. By 2011 many people shunned back to accept PTI as a strong party as it was a hue and cry it does not present any ideology and plan for the solution of Pakistan. Hence, ideology is a tool to undermine competitors. Any political ideology underlies the ambition of getting supremacy over rivals. Fairclough (*Language and Power*, pg. 45) quotes butler et al. 2000, "The hegemony struggle between political forces can be seen as partially a contention over the claims of their particular vision and representation of the world having universal status". As Adamson (1980) cited, Gramsci believes that strong states rule through hegemony while weak by domination. When political leaders from the opposition develop hegemonic strategies to undermine the consent of existing ruling elites, Adamson (1980, pg. 170) suggests that it is highly invaluable in a country where dictatorship is being practised.

This struggle for hegemony brings democracy, and democracy strengthens a state contrary to dictatorship rule. Hence, the concept of hegemony in Pakistani politics is highly required. The author of the text struggles for hegemony by using various strategies, mainly presenting a strong ideology. Supporting policies concerning universal and common sense practices make ideologies powerful (Fairclough, 2003). Khan's ideology of 'justice, equality and fair play in every domain of life appeal to every common sense, thus, rendering him ideological power to influence people's minds. He strengthens it with the policies of eradicating the feudal system, the elite's corruption and their luxuries, and stamping out injustices of the three-tier education system. The author successfully universalizes his vision while stressing the need for a 'Western education system', the need for strong and modernized institutions and state support instead of state control.

The author strengthens his struggle for hegemony by using the language of persuasion. He amplifies his control over readers' minds and hearts. He believes that Iqbal is our national hero, had lived before Pakistan was founded; still, his philosophy is immensely relevant to the current scenario of Pakistan's political ideology. He believes that Iqbal still occupies a profound and unparalleled place in the hearts and minds of the people of Pakistan. He tries to persuade people that Iqbal's revelation is an ideal vision for the bright future of Pakistan. For this purpose, he arouses people's emotions while touching their cords of association with Iqbal. He also controls the readers' minds by emphasizing the wise and powerful imagination of Iqbal and his influential writings, successfully moving and inspiring millions of people. Thus, he tries to influence people to accept the importance of his philosophy in structuring the ideological framework of Pakistan.

Khan persuades people about the importance of integrating Islam into politics using other intertextual references from history, which is evident when he advocates Islamic democracy. He distils references from history that during the golden age of Islam (mid-eighth to mid-thirteenth) from Iberia and North Africa to South West and Central Asia Muslim world made intellectual discoveries. Instead, he convinces the readers by 'threatening' that destruction to life comes when we leave back the Islamic principles and import 'alien culture to indigenous people'. The disruption (he indirectly refers to the voice of Iqbal) started to happen five hundred years ago when 'doors to Ijtihad were closed' (The Quranic principles-which for Muslims are eternal principles-needed constantly to be reinterpreted in the light of new knowledge). The author makes himself more convincing by quoting Iqbal, instead of pronouncing his voice that in Pakistan, we need Ijtihad to rebuild sharia in the light of 'modern knowledge and experiences'. He integrates his views with Iqbal in "the claim of the present generation of Muslim liberals to reinterpret the foundational legal principles in the light of their own experiences and altered conditions of modern life, is perfectly justified" (Khan, 2011). The assumed meaning is that Islamic legal principles should be deeply analyzed for the perfect life instead of Sufi's 'outward imitation (Taqlid)', that 'ignored Islam's role as organizing societies and politics'. Hence, the author seems very much in favour of 'modern reformists': 'who paved the way for the creation of Pakistan'; who keep pace with the 'modern scientific discoveries' and reform 'traditionalism' by breaking the shells of 'fossilized' 'rigid brains'; who are the 'fusion' of

'Islamic ideals' and 'scientific progress'; who oppose both 'Pakistani liberal fanatics' and 'western liberals' and 'religious fundamentalists', also.

To enable Ulama e Islam with the correct and deep understanding of Islam's role in worldly progress, he vocalizes Iqbal as "He was apprehensive of their bigotry and intolerance against science, arts and original thought and to set up a university for Ulema and religious scholars..." (Khan, 2011). He also refers back to the Mangolian Era that has given a death blow to the Golden age of Islam by the destruction of libraries. Resultantly, 'centuries of learning were lost'. Hence, it can be assumed that the author is trying to gain dominance over his rivals by showing his inclination towards establishing the libraries to make Ulema 'informed' for the production of an 'informed public' to make the best choices for their political leaders.

Moreover, to win the race of hegemony in the democratic state, Khan highlights the flaws of the present government and presents a more convincing framework as he says, "Whenever there is a talk of reform, we are told that government 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 an increase in salaries so that injustice brought through bribes could be eliminated, as people are unable to meet their needs because of lower wages. Hence, they impart their favour to people who give them more bribes; resultantly, justice is based on money instead of right. Secondly, it is necessary to equip them with the modern investigation system and modern technologies to bring forward solid evidence against criminals. Thirdly, as per population size, more courts are required to provide justice within a short period. Apart from the more courts, he suggests,

Sympathizing the crushed public, he stresses the Equality of Education. He makes himself more acceptable by giving Quranic references, "The Quran lays great emphasis on both justice and education" (354). He makes it more convincing by arousing people's sense of deprivation and extending his sympathies for them that "yet in these two areas the Islamic Republic of Pakistan has sorely failed". To catch up with the West, Pakistan must forge ahead in education. For this purpose, the author draws many examples from history by the communication mechanism to explain that the 'spirit of inquiry led to 'the blossoming of Muslim civilization'. He explains the contributions of Muslim scholars such as IbneSina, Ibne Rashid, and Al Ghazali to the world of knowledge. He adds up the names of Western learners as Roger Bacon, Thomas Aquinas, and St. European of Assisi. Moreover, he quotes indirect speech, W. Montgomery Watt, "without Arabs, European science and philosophy would not have developed".

Thus, he tends to control the readers' minds to accept that we need to beat the West in its own game by gaining their style of knowledge as Europeans received knowledge from our scholars in history and made progress in life, using it in their context. A sketch of historical facts drawn into the text shows his mechanism of communication to learn and adopt the Western education system.

Touching the cords of people's hearts, he is against the injustices in the economy of Pakistan. He states, "our elite have been inhuman and immoral in colluding with IMF...." and to pay back instead of asking the rich to 'pay tax', the poor is 'penalized'. It is assumed here that first, he favours following the teachings of the Quran for the superiority of humanity and moral values in the economy; second, to end up this injustice, tax should be collected from the right channel. He describes "people were neither consulted" before ordering or spending loans in the text. He also stresses the need for an explicit policy of loan collection and then an 'audit system' for its spending to get public trust. It implies his ideology will also decrease the chances of corruption, and secondly, people are important to be considered because it is for the people. To control the readers' minds, he provides them with the facts about the amount of the collected loan now being doubled because of the wrong managerial policies. So, he tries to win people's favour by speaking in their voices for policy formulation and implementation to do away with injustice in the economy.

In short, a politician criticizes his opposition to make himself more convincing; the author highlights the devastating activities of his contrary political system, i.e., dictatorship. The dictatorship 'suppresses', brings 'suffering' and 'pains' to people, while democracy brings prosperity, 'justice', 'equality', 'fair play'. Furthermore, by the 'Discourse of compassion,' the author extends his sympathies with the Pakistani nation drenched in the hands of their cruel fate determiners. He also highlights the mismanagement, hypocrisy and corruption of the opposite party to let them down in public. Thus, he undermines the hegemony of the concerned rulers. The discourse of left-wing and the discourse of antagonism eliminate the discourse of right-wing and the discourse of the protagonist.

Moreover, he associates himself with all the good and sincere deeds, appealing to the emotions of people such as,

"I quote this verse to the youth of Tehreek-e-Insaaf because truth, bravery and justice are among the most highly valued attributes of a human being".

"That is why I named my party Tehreek-e-Insaaf, the justice movement".

"The educational crisis is one of the reasons I founded Namal University in Mianwali".

Moreover, he persuasively moves around the social practice of education, politics, social cohesion and economics that determine his hegemony over existing political leaders. In short, he motivates people to get his party a chance to rule over the country by making a 'Promise' to bring fortunes to Pakistan. All in all, this tussle for hegemony is the beauty of democracy only.

CONCLUSION

The particular use of language is accompanied by his deliberate and intensified control over the text and context, types of social and discourse orders to be the part of the text. By advocating the Western policies, Khan implicitly promotes the Western power to control the Pakistani nation's minds and hearts. It also provides the facts of the West being the main power behind the production of the text. Furthermore, with control over the subject relations and contents of the text, Khan effectively portrays the wild and ruthless image of the opposition. This act of executing power in discourse paves his way to become the ruling party in the next campaign. Moreover, the discursive strategies divulge the ideology distinguishing him from the politicians in the corridors of power. Resultantly, he is more or less able to augment his place in people's hearts. Hence, he tries to floor his hegemony, undermining the hegemony of his competitors. In consort with hegemony, it motivates people to give his party a chance to rule over the country (Pakistan) by a 'Promise' to bring fortunes to Pakistan. All in all, this tussle for hegemony is the beauty of democracy only.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adamson, W. L. (1980). *Hegemony and revolution*. London, England: University of California Press Ltd.
- Althusser, L. (2014). *On the Reproduction of Capitalism: Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses*. London: Verso Books
- Ashok, K. (2002). *Pakistan crises*. London: Taylor and Francis.
- Bhatia, A. (2010). Critical discourse analysis of political press conferences. *Discourse and Society*, 173-203.
- Balderidge, J. V. (1975). *Sociology: A critical approach to power, conflict and change*. New York: Willey.
- Chilton, P. (2004). *Analysing political discourse*. London: Routledge.
- Dijkers, M. P., Hart, T., Tsaousides, T., Whyte, J., & Zanca, J. M. (2014). Treatment taxonomy for rehabilitation: Past, present, and prospects. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*, 95(1), S6– S16.

- Dijk, T.A. V. (2006), Critical discourse analysis. *Journal of Discourse and society*, Vol 18(2), 252-262. London: SAGE. Retrieved September 2, 2013. Web site: www.discourses.org.
- Dijk, T.A. V. (2009). Critical discourse analysis: A sociocognitive approach. In Wodak, R and Meyer (Eds), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, 62-85. London, SAGE. Retrieved September 2, 2013. Web Site: www.discourses.org.
- Dupre, B (2010). *50 political ideas*. UK: Oxford.
- Edelman, M. J. (1977) *Political language: Words that succeed and policies that fail*. New York: Academic Press.
- Fairclough, N. (2013). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. New York: Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Language and Power*, London: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis of social research*. New York: Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*, London: Polity Press.
- Foucault, Michel. (1995). *Discipline and Punish* 2nd ed. New-York: Vintage Books.
- Galbraith, J. (1983). *The anatomy of power*. London: Hamish Hamilton.
- Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*, New York, International Publishers.
- Jones, J. and Peccei, J. S. (2004). 'Language and politics', in Thomas, L. (ed), *Language, Society and Power*. New York: Routledge.
- Kvist, J. (2016). *Fighting poverty and exclusion through social investment: A European research perspective—A policy review*. Edited by the Directorate General for Research and Innovation of the European Commission, Unit Open and Inclusive Societies. Brussels: European Commission.
- Levitt, J. (2017). Exploring how the social model of disability can be re-invigorated: In response to Mike Oliver. *Disability and Society*, 32(4), 589–594.
- Luuka, M. R. & Markkanen, M. (1997). *Hedging and discourse: Approaches to the analysis of a pragmatic phenomenon*. Germany: Walter de Gruyter.
- Marvin, E. & M. N. Mager (1993). *Power in modern societies*. Oxford: Westview press.
- Milner, Helen V. & Ketznelson, Ira (2002). *Political science: State of discipline*. New York: Norton.
- Oppenheim, F. E. (1981). *Political concepts: A reconstruction*. The University of Chicago Press: Chicago.
- Pasha, Ahmed Shuja (1995). *Pakistan: A political study*. Combine Printers Lahore: Sang-e-Meel Publications Lahore.
- Røberg, A. S. B., Feiring, M., & Romsland, G. I. (2017a). Norwegian rehabilitation policies and the coordination reform's effect: A critical discourse analysis. *Scandinavian Journal of Disability Research*, 19(1), 56–68.
- Røberg, A. S. B., Hansen, H. P., Feiring, M., & Romsland, G. I. (2017b). Rehabilitation in momentum of Norwegian coordination reform: From practices of discipline to disciplinary practices. *AlterEuropean Journal of Disability Research*, 11(3), 193–207.
- Rose, N. (2006). Governing "advanced" liberal democracies. In A. Sharma & A. Gupta (Eds.), *The anthropology of the state. A reader* (pp. 144–162). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Rubin, D (1993). *Gaining word power*. New York: Macmillan.
- Simon, R. (1982). *Gramsci's political thought*, Lawrence & Wishart Ltd.
- Weiss, Anita M. & Gilani, S. Zulfiqar (2001). *Power and civil society in Pakistan*. Graphics, Karachi, Pakistan: Oxford University Press.
- Wodak, R. and Chilton, P. (2005). *A new agenda in critical discourse analysis*. The Netherlands: John Benjamin.