

## Critical Discourse Analysis of Asif Ali Zaradi's Speech at the UN General Assembly 2012.

### Dr. SHAZIA AYYAZ

Assistant Professor/ In-charge Department of English, University of Okara, Okara.  
Email: [shaziaayyaz@uo.edu.pk](mailto:shaziaayyaz@uo.edu.pk)  
Tel: +923348555996

### Dr. SAADIA FATIMA

Assistant Professor, Department of English, Foundation University (FUI) Islamabad, Islamabad.  
Email: [saadia.fatima@fui.edu.pk](mailto:saadia.fatima@fui.edu.pk)  
Tel: +923325205986

### SHAMIM ARA SHAMS

Assistant Professor, Department of Linguistics and Literature,  
Karakoram International University, Gilgit, Gilgit Baltistan.  
Email: [shamim.shams@kiu.edu.pk](mailto:shamim.shams@kiu.edu.pk)  
Tel: +923125170817

---

### Abstract

*The present study analyzes the speech of the former Pakistani president Mr. Asif Ali Zardari that was delivered at the UN general Assembly meeting in September 2012. The main objective of the study is to find out power relations and hegemony in the global political context through interdiscursive analysis of the speech. The researcher has used Fairclough's (1992) concept of intertextuality and hegemony as theoretical base of the study. The study finds that Zardari struggles to construct, sustain and fracture power relations through interdiscursive references. He intensifies and de-intensifies certain ideologies through mixing of discourses, genres and styles. His discourse unveils his subordinate position in the international political order. The study exposes his struggle to establish a positive image of himself in the context of internal as well as international politics. This struggle is aimed at winning a power position in the internal as well as international politics.*

**Keywords:** *Critical Discourse Analysis, Interdiscursivity, Hegemony, Political Discourse, Ideologies.*

---

### Introduction

Asif Ali Zardari is a Pakistani politician, former co-chairman of Pakistan People's Party; a major political party of the country. He was elected as 11<sup>th</sup> president of Pakistan from 2008-2013. His time of presidency is highly criticized for his internal and international political strategies. In his time of presidency, due to controversial political strategies in the area, Nato's attack on Salala and, Raymond Davis incident people of Pakistan were not in favour of the US but Zardari remained a strong ally of the United States in the war against Afghanistan (Nayani 2013). His government is also blamed for the rise of corruption and terrorism in the country (Masood, 2011).

He represented Pakistan as head of the country at different occasions. In September 2012 he represented Pakistan in the 67<sup>th</sup> UN General Assembly meeting. It was the time when the Muslim world was protesting the blasphemous film *The Innocence of Muslims* which was made by a Hollywood director and contained blasphemous content against Islam. Pakistan suffered the most from the protests. The country was also

facing instability due to disqualification of the elected prime minister, terrorist attacks, corruption and political unrest. In this context Zardari was representing not only Pakistan but the Muslim world as well. His status as a representative of the Muslim country and his affiliation with the US complicates his position in the binary of power relations. As Pakistan an ally of the US The present study is aimed at studying his discourse to find out the interdiscursive elements used by him to construct, sustain and fracture the power relations in the context of international politics. It is an attempt to study the power relation as exposed in the interdiscursive references present in the discourse of President Zardari.

## **Research Questions**

1. How power relations are reflected through discourse in the world of politics?
2. Which discursive strategies are used by the President Zardari to construct/sustain the power relations?
3. How does interdiscursive references help in establishing power relations and hegemony?

## **Discourse and Power Relations/Hegemony**

The focus of discourse is the language in the society at different levels and the way it is used by the social actors in a context where their social life and other elements of society are closely connected (Fairclough, 2003). Therefore, when discourse is studied in association with the power it means the social power that is “a property of the relationship between groups, classes, or other social formations, or between persons as social members” (Van Dijk, 1989, p.19). This relationship is based on control of one group or individual on the behaviour of the other group or individual. The relationship between groups and classes can be collective and is influenced by collective social behaviours of the group members, however, it can also be individual and influenced by the behaviour of the individuals. Contrary to that, individuals can influence one another within a group. Van Dijk (1989) sees these relations in the interaction of the social actors where one individual or group has control over the actions or wishes, desires and beliefs of the other. The control is visible only in the interaction of social actors and through the interaction power relations work.

Foucault (1982) argues that power relations are the relations among the free individuals. The subordinates are free to their will whether to follow the dominant group or not. They are not at all the slaves of the powerful but they are influenced by them. He believes that power relations cannot be present in slavery because slaves are bound to follow their masters in any case. Here the question of coercion and consent arises. The relationship between master and slave is based on coercion or power by force. Master forces the slave to follow him in all conditions. While power with consent is related to the persuasion of the oppressed by the oppressor to make him follow or accept certain things.

Van Dijk (2001) describes it in the following words

“Critical Discourse Analysis is a type of 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” (p. 352).

Critical discourse analysis is a tool take works on discourse to expose the power relations in different institutions. The present study focusses on the institution of political at global context.

## **Intertextuality and Hegemony**

The term ‘intertextuality’ was introduced by Kristeva (1960) but the concept of intertextuality is actually developed by Bakhtin (1981) in his theory of dialogism. Bakhtin (1981) emphasized that texts are dialogic in nature because for the production of every new text the voices already present in other text are transformed and used in the new text (Bakhtin, 1981, 1986). Kristeva (1980) used the term intertextuality while discussing different ways in which text and talk are used to produce new texts. According to

Fairclough (1992) intertextuality is “the property texts have of being full of snatches of other texts, which may be explicitly demarcated or merged in and which the text may assimilate, contradict, ironically echo and so forth” (p. 84). Bakhtin (1981), Kristeva (1980) and Allen (2000) find texts as a meeting point of different other texts and composite of utterances each of which is a form of dialogue (Sheyholislami, 2001). Intertextuality is a source of exerting power and hegemony which is proved by different studies conducted in different genres of political discourse. Gadavanji (2002) has studied intertextuality in the political discourse in the context of No-confidence debate in the parliament of Thailand. He shows how intertexts help the parliamentarians to talk against the policies of government without breaching the parliament code of behaviour. Hodge (2011) examines the intertextual elements in the discourse of the US political leaders on post 2001 terrorism, Mikinori (2009) has studied print media, Oliveria (2004) has analyzed newspaper discourse and Bazerman (2011), Lemke (2004) and Khaghaninejad (2014) have examined the role of intertextuality in academic discourse. Intertextuality in political discourse operates at two levels that are the text may exhibit intertextuality from its own cohesive characteristics e.g. morpho-syntactic elements like ellipsis, pronouns and conjunctions which indicate how a specific discourse is constructed and how it refers to other texts and the public knowledge from which that text has been drawn (Wafula, 2002). Momani et al. (2010) have examined the intertextuality derived by the ideologies of producers and receivers of the text in political discourse with reference to the Middle East. They exposed the ideological power struggle in the political discourse of Osama bin Laden and George Bush.

Fairclough (1992a, p. 189) claims that intertextual properties of a text are realized “in its linguistic features” since it is assumed that texts “may be linguistically heterogeneous.” Intertextuality has an active dialectical relationship with the society. Not only does the history of discourse manifest itself in intertextuality, intertextuality also serves as a strategy to create the most effective discourse in that particular context (Gadavanji, 2002). The discussion shows that intertextuality facilitates the discourse by providing a chance to the individuals to say something which is not easy for them to say by adapting the intertexts according to the situation. Secondly, intertextual elements make a piece of discourse more effective by converting it into the discourse of power and hegemony.

## **Methodology**

The study follows Fairclough’s (1992) model of intertextuality and hegemony. He defines intertextuality in terms of manifest intertextuality and interdiscursivity. This article is delimited to the concept of interdiscursivity that is mixing of different discourses, genres and styles in a single text. According to Fairclough (1992) social/political actors bring in other discourses, mix genres and shift styles to construct sustain and fracture the power relations. Fairclough merges theory of hegemony and intertextuality to expose the hidden ideologies present in the discourse of the individuals from different levels of the society where power relations are present. He believes “Hegemony is a focus of constant struggle around points of greatest instability between classes and blocs, to construct or sustain or fracture alliances and relations of domination/subordination, which takes economic; political and ideological forms” (p. 92).

The study follows theory of hegemony as theoretical framework and interdiscursivity as method of the analysis and is aimed at analyzing the interdiscursive elements present in the speech of president Zardari to expose his position in the binary of power relations.

## **Analysis**

### **Paragraph 1**

Zardari starts with mixing religious and political discourses which is exposed in his choice of words “faith”, “Muslims”, “Prophet” for religion particularly Islam and “peace”, “security”, “International community”, “freedom of expression”, for global politics. Actually, both are integrated here and merged by him. The attribution like “incitement of hate, condone and violence is associated by him with the religious discourse.

All of them are negative but only one is attributed to the other group. He is protesting against the uploading of the blasphemous of the video on YouTube that hurt every Muslim but, in this attempt, only “incitement of hate” (rather an indirect expression) is from the other group while more forceful words like “violence, condone and condemnation are attributed to his own group. The most initial part of Zardari’s speech is “*Bismilla hirrahmaan irrahim – Assalam-o-Alaikum — Peace be upon you*”. This is an Islamic style of starting something. This addition identifies president Zardari as a representative of the Muslim community. He further shifts from the discourse of global politics and cooperation by adding metaphors “bridge, and “Widening rift” and leaves both the political and the religious discourse.

He himself separates this initial paragraph from his speech by saying “before I take up my speech”. It means he has not entered yet in the genre of political speech rather it is a pre-speech declaration that is mixed with the genre of political speech. This paragraph contains important information because here he complains against the issue of blasphemy to the international community and protests against the uploading of the video. This part is very important for his ideological and identical position in the world politics but he separates it from the main speech and declares it a separate and detached thing. This attempt of exclusion mitigates the effect of the protest he has just made. His style is direct in the beginning which shifted to indirect and “I” is replaced by “we” while addressing the international community. In the final sentence “we” is taken up by “Pakistan” which is going towards neutral tone. The interdiscursivity in the paragraph is exposing the power relations between Pakistan and the international community where Pakistan is at dominated position.

#### **Paragraph 2**

In this paragraph he entirely shifts the discourse from where he left in paragraph 1. This looks like the actual beginning of his speech. He congratulates the UN staff and appreciates their contributions. The rhetorical style is intimate and very pleasant, the tenor is still formal but more pleasant that proves the mixing of style too. Zardari disconnects the previous part of his speech in a rather abrupt way to enter a new genre, discourse, and style. The sudden shift from a very important topic to a common or totally different topic suggests his avoidance from the discussion in the previous paragraph that was going against the dominant group. This shift also exposes his ideologies about the feelings of his group and the other group.

#### **Paragraph 3**

It seems that this is the actual start of his speech and before that it was a preamble. Zardari has problems with cohesion as he jumps from one topic to the other. Therefore, he is often indulged in the mixing of discourses, genres, and styles. The cheerful tenor of the first sentence changes into grave tenor of the second sentence and forceful in the next part of the paragraph. The rhetorical mode also changes in second sentence to expository and argumentative. He brings in different discourses together from discourse of economics and environment to the discourse of law and military. The intertexts of the mixed discourses are joined together to establish an ideological stance that could help him to take a strong position in the power structure. He intensifies his discourse with the help of modal verb “must” but the discourse he is involved in focused on the problems of the world (including his country) and he, at his present position and identity, seems to be commenting on them for the sake of commenting. His intensified discourse and mixing of styles are not effective. Therefore, he fails to influence the ideologies of the audience and winning their opinion to establish himself as a strong political actor or one from the dominating class.

#### **Paragraph 4**

This paragraph also has a sudden and unexpected start. Zardari mixes private and public discourse here and he shifts from pluralization of personal pronouns “we” and “us” of the previous paragraph now changed into singular form “I”, “my” and “me”. While mixing the private discourse with public/ global discourse he endeavors to be considered one with the global power. He is in a struggle with constructing new power

relations by restructuring his present identity. His discourse is ideological and through that he tries to influence the ideologies and assumptions of the political world keeps about him. He is involved in the production of discourse as a political actor in the global political order and not a member of certain political party or nation. This is also explicit through the use of single personal pronouns by Zardari that he endeavored to detach himself from his group and he is taking himself and his family (children) as a group that has similar goals, aspirations, and problems to be solved. This paragraph also reveals hybridization of genres by the president by bringing in private discourse. He mixes genre of family discussion and personal account in the genre of political speech. The style mode is oscillating between personal and intimate. These strategies are used as the best possible way to achieve his goals in global political power.

### **Paragraph 5 and 6**

He takes a shift from personal to global discourse. In these paragraphs, he concentrates on the discourse of war and peace as a part of the global political discourse. The phrase “wear blue helmets” belongs to a specific activity type (see Fairclough, 1992a, p.112) in the genre of military discourse. He starts with descriptive style but by the end of paragraph 6 he again gets personal by using words “brothers and sisters”. His style, discourse, and genre choices unveil his ideologies. He talks about international responsibilities, call for duty and contributions of Pakistani troops in peacekeeping campaigns by the United Nations. These things are mentioned to construct and maintain the power position. He mixes genres and styles to associate himself with the dominant group. However, the highly intimate rhetoric mode of style establishes the strong position of the international community. He fails to shift his identity by shifting from one to the other discourse, genre, and style. Words like “proud”, “proudly” and “service”, “consistency” have ideological importance and are used in the context of serving the dominant group (the west). The height of intimacy with the other group is shown to construct a positive identity rather powerful one by preferring “brothers and sisters” over the people of the world.

### **Paragraph 7**

Within the broad umbrella of the political order of discourse, parliamentary discourse is a point of focus here. It has many genres but only voting and selection are evident here. Pakistan’s “commitment to world peace” is driven by the mixing of the genre and brings in the history from the war on terror. Pakistan itself is suffering badly due to war on terror and it is more in the interest of America than Pakistan. Zardari’s commitment to the world peace is actually a commitment of fulfilling America’s interests at the stake of lives of Pakistani citizen and its instability. The tenor and mode are rather stable in this paragraph. His rhetoric style is descriptive but gets explanatory near the end of the paragraph. He can be identified as an ally of the powerful group but not at an equal level friend.

### **Paragraph 8**

Global political order and the context of the speech (UN general assembly) allows him to bring in environmental discourse but the intertexts brought in from environmental discourse belong to intentional context. This exposes his attempt to achieve his goals in the structure of power. There are two verbs in action, “suffered” and “support”. Pakistan suffered and the international community supported. In the previous paragraph he criticized international community (UN) for not being democratic and accountable. Here he suddenly shifted to environmental discourse to show the positive image of the international community. This makes his shift or mixing of discourse important because it focuses on the positive qualities of the international community. He intensifies the calamities first by using “last several years”, “repeatedly” and then appreciate the international community for support. The intensification of Pakistan’s suffering is adding to the positive image of the international community. He is polite and obliged in his manner of appreciation and it is evident that he is glorifying the support of the international community.

### Paragraph 9

The paragraph is evident that Zardari mixes different styles to achieve his goals in global political discourse. He initiates it with rather a plain mode but in a second sentence, a sudden emotional move is added to it. The impassioned rise in the style is maintained for some time. The fervent nature of tenor here exposes his incapability and hopelessness on the situation faced by his country due to the imposition of war on terror by the west. The absence of agency (asking question body) is exposing the ideological nature of his discourse. Rhetorically he is in argumentative mode but with whom he is arguing is not clear because he hides the agency to avoid direct reference as the agency is the dominant group. He adds intertexts from the order of discourse including discourse of crime, military discourse and “internal political discourse” (Schäffner, 1997, p.2). Another strategy he uses is individualization of Shahbaz Bhatti and Salman Taseer which makes things uncomfortable in the context he is speaking. Interdiscursivity in here is exposing his ideological stance as he discusses the problems created by his attachment to the international community without mentioning it rather hiding it through passive agent deletion (see the first sentence of paragraph 10).

After missing the agency his argumentation, mixing of discourses and tenor are no more effective as these are not directed to a specific agent who is responsible for this harm. Furthermore, his direct blame is towards “mindset of extremism” that is an abstract idea that is vague and isolated from any of the groups in the binary of political power relations. Individualization of Zardari in this paragraph is exposing the negative image of his country because the individuals mentioned were assassinated because they were charged with committing blasphemous acts. Zardari is mixing the discourse of terrorism and religious extremism and attempting to establish them as one. This action establishes the America/the West as a complete hegemonic power and Zardari from the dominated group. Zardari here exposes his consent to accept the power of the international community which identifies him as a subordinate in the political hegemony.

### Paragraph 10

Zardari gets into private discourse again and shows his own wounds to the world and mixes it with discourse of war which is exposed in his use of war metaphors “*martyred through the bullets and bombs*” while intertexts like “personal, wife” reveal the presence of very intimate forms of private discourse and can also be associated with the family discourse. He keeps an informal intimate tenor mode of style, which is descriptive from the rhetorical aspect. He also mixes the mode from written-to-speak to a personal conversational tone. He individualized his wife as a prominent politician of Pakistan. Her assassination is not clearly result of the terrorism or extremism because the case is still in the court. He glorifies her death to an extreme and blames the terrorist in a categorical manner to show the international community what he suffered for them in the war against terrorism. He attempts to win the positive opinion of the dominant group by utilizing private and war discourse and by being intimate and describing his suffering due to being an ally of them. The factual value of the intertexts is not true and discourse exposes the manipulation of the facts and events from his personal life to impress the dominant powers.

### Paragraph 11

The intertexts present in the paragraph indicate the presence of multiple discourses here. This brings in the socio-historical discourse of Pakistan. He glorifies his past and depicts his present as miserable. He talks about his glorious past to influence the assumption of the other groups about him. He wants his beautiful and peaceful past to conceal the ugly and restless present which is destroyed by the terrorism to win the positive opinion of the world. He starts with pluralization that is his discourse identifies him as member of his group (Pakistan) then he shifts to personal pronoun “I” and speaks as Zardari himself. To whom actually he is addressing is unknown because he conceals the identity of the agency who is asking these questions. In other words, he turns to an explanatory rhetorical mode without declaring a specific individual or group as his audience. People give explanations because they are weak and Zardari is also powerless in

both the positions, as a member of his group and as an individual political actor. Here again, he attempts individualization of some of the victims of the war on terrorism in Pakistan. The intertexts from the marketplace to university are brought in to miss in the political discourse and in final lines he shifts from public to the private discourse. The genres present in his discourse range from a personal account to storytelling. The rhetorical mode gets narrative at times. The interdiscursive references here expose the ideology of Zardari and his aspirations and assumptions about the dominant group as well as his struggle to maintain power relations with them.

### **Paragraph 12**

Zardari brings in another issue posed on Pakistan by the international community/America that is the presence of Afghan refugees in Pakistan. The presence of domestic intertexts with reference to Afghan refugees shows his intimate relationship with them e.g. “doors have been open”, “fend”. However, he creates a distance by replacing “brothers and sisters” with “guests”. He expresses a more intimate relationship with Afghans in the context of their immigration to Pakistan and he shows distance while talking about their survival in Pakistan. This is important because of the history behind Afghan refugees in Pakistan. They were accepted in the 1980s to live in Pakistan because the international community was interested in it and also supporting them economically. Zardari manipulates the Afghan refugees and complains the international community that it left Pakistan alone to take care of them. Here “left” suggests the expectations of Pakistan from the international community for aid and support not only for Afghans in Pakistan but for Pakistan too. Zardari exposes the intentions of Pakistan behind accepting the Afghan refugees that is damaging the image of Pakistan in other words negative self-image is created by him. The passivizing “we were left” and missing of the agency raises the questions as to who left them? Who are supposed to be with them? The answer is the international community which is concealed by Zardari but intertextuality reveals it. It is an attempt of avoidance of constructing or supporting the negative image of the dominant group.

### **Paragraph 13**

Zardari takes a shift from international politics to internal politics of Pakistan. He gets sarcastic towards the international community for supporting the dictatorship in Pakistan. Metaphors “red carpet” and “the moon”, “dark” are exposing his ideology. The metaphorical intertexts peep in the past of Pakistani politics and suggest that the international community was responsible for the assassination of the democracy (here he means the government of Zulfikar Ali Bhutto) by welcoming and supporting the dictator rule (of General Zia ul Haq) for their personal benefits and interests and without thinking about the negative consequences of it for Pakistan. He is actually manipulating the reality to attain a power position. The democracy he is referring to is the rule of his party only. The individualization of Zulfikar Ali Bhutto is also exposing his intentions to find a power place in the political structure of his group. The judicial execution, jailing (PPP leaders) and funding (dictatorship) are the allegations he posed on the international community to support dictatorship in Pakistan but still he is unable to achieve a power position in the international politics because these allegations are exposing him as powerless as he is confirming the influence and the power of the international community in the parliamentary matters of Pakistan.

The International community is the actual power in Pakistan while its government and other systems are just puppets in the hand of the international community. He never criticized the indulgence of the international community in high-level politics of Pakistan rather is regretting their support to the other group in the Pakistani politics and harming their political party, government, and leaders. The use of first person singular pronoun adds his powerless position because this stops him to take a distance from his discourse. His discourse proves him helpless in front of the power of the international community. In the last sentence, he openly admits that his country is in miserable condition and apart from that the attributions in the paragraph like “dark”, suffocating and throttling” also suggest the helpless condition of Pakistan which establishes the position of Pakistan and Zardari as powerless.

#### **Paragraph 14**

This paragraph is mainly focused on the discourse of terrorism. Intertexts in the connotation of terrorism like “suffering”, “epic struggle”, “drone strikes” and “civilian casualties” expose the position and condition of Pakistan with reference to the war on terrorism and all express the sufferings of Pakistan in this war. Drone strikes and civilian casualties are taking place and America is responsible for it. Instead of criticizing the responsible agency Zardari is criticizing the actions. While highlighting the actions instead of the action-doer (the subject) is an attempt to de-emphasize the negative role of the international community. Zardari expresses the pressure and criticism he is facing from different groups of his country in the war on terrorism “the complexity of our battle for hearts and minds through this epic struggle” and especially the drone strikes and deaths of civilians. That is the battle Zardari is fighting to make America fight its battle against terrorists. The fact unveils the helplessness of Zardari, his devotion, commitment suffering in the way of supporting the American cause. All is expressed in discourse and it reveals his inferior position in the world political order. He reacts on unacceptance of his struggle for war on terrorism without declaring the addressee and use of “humility”, “dead”, “pain”, “demonize” refer to the sufferings of his group that is oppressed and dominated by the super power. He takes a shift to imperative and highly emotional style to talk about the miseries of his group. The imperative structure usually shows power but the content of the sentences and the context of the discourse prove it powerless. He mixes expository and narrative rhetoric mode. The content of narration exposes the weaknesses and miserable condition of his group. He shifts to the conversational mode in highly emotional and rather depressive way while discussing the sacrifices of Pakistanis for international safety. He hides the addressee of his words but highlights the negative attributions towards his people.

#### **Paragraph 15**

The assertive rhetorical mode of Zardari towards the positive intentions of the international community for his country and the whole world is an attempt to get associated with them. It is further exposed in the next sentence when he directly addresses the international community as a “partner”. He aspires that international community gives special importance to Pakistan and keeps it above all the other countries (least of all in Pakistan) because he sees the international community at a very high place. Zardari keeps it concealed as to who is the partner of the international community and pluralizes the subject position “we” because of the gap and distance that is present between him and the international community. He further exposes the relationship of domination and subordination between his group and the international community by generalizing all the nations, partners including Pakistan and international community. Generalized discourse shows his struggle to ally with the international community and win a powerful position in the global political order. The previous paragraph’s conversational mode changes again because the topic is changed and the intentions and ideologies of Zardari makes him mix the style and take a shift to the intimate positive style that is rhetorically assertive because he wants to show that he does not have any doubt about the sincerity and good will of the international community for him and his group.

#### **Paragraph 16**

Zardari in the quest of associating himself with international community shifts again to the internal political discourse of Pakistan with a personal mode. The personal mode is chosen to show his interest in an alliance with the international community in a more categorical manner. His descriptive, as well as explanatory rhetorical mode, reveals his attempts to heighten his image as a leader of Pakistan in the eyes of the international community. In the internal political discourse, he brings in the snatches from many other discourses to construct a positive self-image. He records his contributions in the politics of Pakistan with reference to “parliament”, “democracy”, “Constitution”, “social reform”, “National Commission for Women”, “National Commission on Human Rights”, “Independent Election Commission”, “free media” and “Benazir Income Support Program”. He covers a wide range of institutions and departments while individualizing some of them to construct a positive political image for himself. The internal and national level of the programs/ reforms fail to help him in achieving his political goals and furthermore these

revelations are destroying the socio-political image of his group for being so vulnerable and weak through establishing negative assumption about Pakistan.

In Pakistan civilian governments / democracy is not stable, parliament has not been established on democratic rule, election commission in Pakistan was neither free nor truly independent before his party rule. The elections were not fair and transparent and media was not free. While trying to establish his positive political ideology and identity Zardari exposes negative points and weaknesses of his group which is a sign of powerlessness. These assumptions are creating a negative image of Pakistan in different institutions and departments which are negative for his political image also because he himself is the product of an unfair system where his party grew as well as developed and he was elected as president of the country. This also justifies his subordinate position in the world politics which is fatal for his struggle for the construction of the power relations.

#### **Paragraph 17**

Zardari brings in the discourse of international relations and regional cooperation as another attempt to detail his contributions as a political leader of Pakistan. The rhetorical mode is explanatory and descriptive and aims at giving details to the international community and record the contribution of himself as a useful person for the development of international cooperation and international politics. The regional cooperation discourse brings in the intertexts from China, Afghanistan, and India. Pakistan enjoys the friendly and strong relations with China that are deemphasized by Zardari by giving less space in his speech. While his description about the relations with Afghanistan is a detailed one. The detailed account of the relationship with Afghanistan reflects the struggle of Zardari to convince the international community that Pak-Afghan relations are strong. He highlights Afghanistan more because he has more to talk about it with reference to the contributions he has made in regional cooperation. Afghanistan is not stable and it receives support from Pakistan (e.g. Afghan refugees) and Pakistan receives aid from the international community for keeping the Afghan refugees in their country. Here also, he tries to establish his positive image as well as his support to the international policies to strengthen his affiliation with the international community.

Similarly, his discussion on the relations with India has not taken as much space as the discussion on Afghanistan. However, the account of meetings with the Indian prime minister is another instance of building a positive image in the world politics. His emphasis is on a number of the meetings rather than the content or the details about the meeting with Indian leadership that indicates he is manipulating the intertextual reference about India. This manipulation is aimed at showing his interest and exposing his attempt to work for a better relationship with the neighboring countries especially India. The pluralized subjective hinder Zardari to attribute the mentioned regional cooperation to himself; rather it is attributed to Pakistan. Expository mode of president Zardari exposes that he is in hegemonic relation with the international community where he has surrendered his will and given his consent to be dominated by the international community.

#### **Paragraph 18**

As in the present context Zardari is going to support the Kashmir issue at a global forum but before that he is compelled to prepare some ground for it. An account of “principled position” in the connotation of “territorial disputes” is a foreground by Zardari for the next statement. The metaphor “bedrock” an intertext from the geological discourse is selected to add some force to his argument. Furthermore, the co-text of bedrock, the foreign policy suggests that the force he added is directed to the foreign policy to establish it as strong and “principled”. The foreground of the Kashmir issue exposes dominance of the international community which is further exposed in his actual discussion on Kashmir issue. The plural subject pronoun reveals that he is indulged in a discourse of his group that makes his discourse less intensive. Secondly, he wants international community (UN) to resolve this issue even after a long wait and no efforts from the international community to solve it are seen. Zardari while exposing the negative points of the dominant group changes agency from the UN to the UN system that is an example of powerless discourse. He further

deemphasizes the negative point of the dominant group by suggesting other solutions of the problems in which he not the international community is responsible for taking measures. He mixes global political discourse with the discourse of regional cooperation which makes him able to shift the issue of Kashmir from international to the regional level. He shifts the rhetorical mode from assertive to the descriptive and then explanatory that exposes his shifts from one to the other point and then justifying it. The assertive mode is used to discuss the Kashmir issue and its background and description and explanation are used not only to mitigate the effect of the negative role of the dominant group but also to bring himself in the matter and suggest a solution for the problem.

#### **Paragraph 19**

Zardari continues with regional cooperation discourse and brings in some other discourses to emphasize the negative behavior of the other countries towards Pakistan. The intertexts “failure”, “win-win situation” are snatched from the discourse of the playground and the negative ones like “failure” and “blame” are attributed to the other country (India) to emphasize the problems of Pakistan and its tolerance on this situation. The emphasis on a specific agreement with Afghanistan and hosting of the quadrilateral summit individually reveals the power struggle of the president. He keeps expository rhetorical mode in this paragraph to establish his positive identity and regional and international cooperation-based strategies, then shifts from specific to a general context in his discourse and aspires to have an equal level relationship with regional countries. His eventual goal is to construct the similar level of relationship with the international community too. The tenor is formal but light and friendly in nature that expresses Zardari’s intention to elevate his image in his region and finally in the world political order.

#### **Paragraph 20**

A shift is taken by Zardari from the discourse of internal and international politics to the discourse of economy. The intertexts from the discourse of economy unveil his subordinate position as he is from the receiving group and depends on the European Union for a boost in the economy of his country. The contrast of trade and aid is also ideological and it lowers his position at the forum of the international economy. Additionally, the “concession in trade” and “revive the economy” again show the reliance of Pakistan on the west. Their help and concession in the economy sector of Pakistan expose their strong position, influence on it and Pakistan’s weak and low position in the binary of power relations because its economy is also dominated by the economy of the west. However, Zardari associates the strong economy of Pakistan as a positive move for the fight against “terrorism” (the war of the international community fought by his country) as an attempt to convince the EU that trade relations with Pakistan will benefit them as well. Zardari is trying to show that he is more interested in taking care of the interests of the West than of himself and his group. The intimate, polite and thankful tenor towards the EU/ the West also exposes the same ideology of Pakistan and Zardari. The intimate style is attempted to show the association with the dominant group while thankful and polite style shows the domination of the powerful group. The same ideological signs are exposed in the explanatory rhetoric mode of Zardari in this paragraph.

#### **Paragraph 21**

The regional cooperation discourse is brought in to throw light upon the role, contribution and aspirations of the speaker to make his region peaceful. The mixing of the discourse of drug production and trafficking itself is pointing towards the weak points of the region. Highlighting the weak point and suggesting solution for betterment show the struggle of Zardari for power and position in the region. The expository rhetorical mode helps him further to describe the weakness of the neighbor in detail to set a platform to get a power position in the region which can lead him to the power position in the international politics. Another attempt to achieve his power goals is the emphasis on the weakness of the international forces who are unable to stop heroin production; rather it is growing more in their presence and reached to increase of “3000%”. The numeral details expose his struggle to convince others and achieve his power goals. He goes a step further in leading his goals by attaching the heroin industry with the growth of terrorism. After

drawing a horrible picture, he talks about his contributions to control the production and trafficking of the heroine and coordinating with other regional countries for this cause. Zardari starts with the formal and distant mode by using plural pronouns, “we” “them”, “our” and mixes it with more intimate rather informal, direct and one to one conversational mode through the end of the paragraph. The shift again exposes his aspirations that are his struggle to finish the distance, get closer and finally become an integral part of the international community.

### **Paragraph 22**

Zardari comes back to internal political discourse and goes from public to private discourse. He brings in direct discourse representation from his wife that has the snatches from different discourses. All these discourse are brought together by him to construct and maintain the power relations with the international community but many times these relations are fractured. The discourse representation from Benazir Bhutto is not as effective for Zardari to construct the power relations or restructure them because he gets biased and individualizes Benazir Bhutto as his wife and his leader rather than just a great politician and former leader of Pakistan. The excerpt from her speech is very strong and influential but the context in which it is fixed by Zardari makes it lose its force. He is assertive and rather descriptive too in his rhetorical mode but the assertions are used to detail his personal aspirations for his group. This makes him stand out from the international political forum. Secondly this shows his attempt to draw a positive image of himself in the eyes of the dominant group and thirdly it exposes his subordinate relationship with the international community as his country is under the influence and control of the international community because of which he has to inform about the political and other activities going on in Pakistan. He keeps the formal tenor but sometimes it seems to be in clash with the discourse he chooses that is more intimate and personal. This clash reveals the clash between his struggle for power and his present position in the structure of political power. He ends his speech in a formal and detailed style. This exposes his ideology that makes him take the other nations present as superior to him in the structure of power

### **Findings and Conclusion**

The above analysis exposes the subordinate position of the president Zardari in the context of international politics. He separates his comment on the issue of blasphemy from the main content of his speech though he added it right in the start of the speech but declared that part a preface to his speech and not the actual speech by saying “before I start”. The discussion on the issue of blasphemy was significant for Zardari as a member of the Muslim world. Furthermore, his people protested the most against the video and number of casualties in Pakistan, as a result of the protests were great in number. The account of the issue of blasphemy was not forceful neither he rejected the contextual opposite idea of freedom of expression that was contesting the issue of blasphemy.

Secondly, the divide he created within internal political discourse of Pakistan where he associated himself with one sub-group and the other sub-group his opponents present within Pakistani political discourse. The further division of his own group revealed his attempt to win the positive opinion of the dominant group at any cost. He found a divide within his group to detach himself from the negative actions of it.

Thirdly he desperately struggles to show his consent to the dominant group in all their actions where most of the actions were against his group and finally, he promoted the positive picture of the dominant group by appreciating their actions overall. He also highlighted the favors he received from the dominant group and from time to time expressed his intentions to associate himself with the dominant group even declares himself a partner of the international community.

He attempts to construct negative image of the other sub-groups from his side and exposed their destructive, deceitful and fraudulent nature to the dominant group (see paragraph 14) and prove himself very efficient, active (see paragraph, 5,6,7) and always ready to act upon the orders from the dominant

group. The oppressed discourse of Zardari conveyed to the dominant group that their enemies were enemies of Zardari for the reason Zardari is friend of the dominant group. His speech from the start to the end was a continuous struggle to win a position in the power structure with the dominant and from discourse representations to the interdiscursive references this struggle is evident. Zardari's struggle as exposed after the analysis of his speech, has three aspects that is structuring/constructing, sustaining and fracturing the power relations between him and the dominant powers.

The struggle of constructing the power relations with the international community was itself the evidence of his subordinate position in the world political order. The context of the discourse and his identity already established the powerless condition of his group. He attempted to construct his position with the help of positive self-image as well as supporting and enhancing the positive image of the dominant group. In the power structure his position was not strong so he could not enter the power structure of the world political order to win a power position therefore he attempted to get a start from his own group. His discourse contested the ideologies of the political leaders of his country leaving his own party and debased their politics in front of the whole world and distances himself from them to become prominent and different from the subordinate group. He through these strategies was able to take a position in the binary of internal political discourse and not the international political discourse. This seemed to be a step of his journey towards the powerful position in the international politics. However, he failed to add force to his discourse because for dominant group it was not important to consider on such details. Secondly, Zardari himself disclosed that the sub-group was welcomed, supported and financially helped by the dominant group. In that case Zardari could not construct a powerful position for himself and contrary to that he was exposed as the opponent of the ally of the dominant group hence of the dominant group too. This is how the discursive practice of Zardari lost his position as a supporter of the dominant group. The construction of the sub-group within the group he belongs to could not help him to win a power position so it consequently fractured the relations of power between him and the dominant as he was out of the binary of power relations even as a subordinate political actor because the subordinate was the whole group from which he detached himself.

The discourse of Zardari also evidenced the sustention of the power relations between the two groups. He talked about the miseries of humanity, the aspirations he had for the improvement of the livings all the people of the world and his offer to work together with the international community. The miseries directed the discourse consumers towards his own country, the improvement of the life as discussed with reference of the whole world directed towards his own country. So, his offer to work together with the international community was actually in Pakistan too where it is needed. Zardari struggles to construct and sustain the power relations as explicit in the mixing of public and private domain in his speech.

The interdiscursivity in the speech of Zardari as a subordinate, exposed his contribution in strengthening the positive image of the dominant group and contributing to the struggle of the dominant to construct and sustain the hegemonic relations that is the dominance over the subordinate with their consent. The intertextual references also disclosed the attempts of the subordinate group to enter the power structure as an important or powerful group but failed in this attempt and power relations between the dominant and subordinate are fractured. It was also exposed that the dominance of the hegemon again constructs the power relations with the subordinate group.

## References

- Allen, G. (2000). *Intertextuality*. London: Routledge
- Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bakhtin, M. (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bazerman, C. (2011). Intertextuality: how texts rely on other texts. In C. Bazerman, and P.A. Prior (Eds.) *What writing does and how it does it: An Introduction to analyzing texts and textual practices*. (pp. 83-96). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Fairclough, N. (1992) *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Polity

- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. London: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analyzing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. London: Routledge.
- Foucault, M. (1982). The subject and power. *Critical inquiry*, 8(4), 777-795. Retrieved on January 24, 2013 from: [http://www.unisa.edu.au/Global/EASS/HRI/foucault\\_the\\_subject\\_and\\_power.pdf](http://www.unisa.edu.au/Global/EASS/HRI/foucault_the_subject_and_power.pdf)
- Gadavanji, S. (2002). Intertextuality as discourse strategy: The Case of No-Confidence debates in Thailand. *Leeds Working Papers in Linguistics and Phonetics*, 9, 35-55.
- Hodge, A. (2011). *The war on terror narrative: Discourse and intertextuality in the construction and contestation of sociopolitical reality*. Oxford University Press.
- Khaghaninejad, M. S. (2014). Introducing intertextuality-aware instruction as a novel approach of teaching reading passages in EFL context. *Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics*, 18(1), 65-83.
- Kristeva, J. (1980) *Desire in language: A semiotic approach to literature and art*. L. S. Roudiez (Ed.), T. Gora et al (Trans.) (1980). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Kristeva, J. (1986). *The Kristeva reader*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Lemke, J. L. (2004). Intertextuality and educational research. In N. Shuart-Faris & D. Bloome (Eds.), *Uses of intertextuality in classroom and educational research* (pp.3–17). Greenwich: Information Age Publishing.
- Masood, S. (11 February 2011). "[Pakistan: Austerity cabinet begins](#)". *The New York Times*. Retrieved 15 June 2017.
- Mikinori, N. (2009). *A consideration of the concept of hegemony in terms of critical discourse analysis focusing on intertextuality and assumptions*. Retrieved on March 25, 2013 from: [http://www.gifucwc.ac.jp/tosyo/kiyo/59/zenbun59/Consideration\\_Nakanishi.pdf](http://www.gifucwc.ac.jp/tosyo/kiyo/59/zenbun59/Consideration_Nakanishi.pdf)
- Momani, K. et al. (2010). Intertextual borrowings in ideologically competing discourses: The case of the Middle East. *The Journal of Intercultural Communication*. Retrieved on June 30, 2013 from: <http://www.immi.se/intercultural/nr22/badarneh.htm>
- Nayani, Aziz (9 May 2013). "[Democracy's Surprisingly Low Approval Rating in Pakistan](#)". *The Atlantic*. Retrieved 11 August 2015.
- Oliveira, S. (2004). The unthinkable unprecedented: Intertextuality in newspaper genres. *Linguagem em (Dis)curso - LemD, Tubarão*, 5(1), 9-28
- Schäffner, C. (Ed). (1997). *Analyzing Political Speeches*. Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Sheyholislami, J. (2001). *Critical discourse analysis*. Unpublished manuscript, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario. Retrieved on Jan 20, 2016, from: <http://http-server.carleton.ca/~jsheyhol/articles/what%20is%20CDA.pdf>
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1989) Structures of Discourse and Structures of Power. In J.A. Anderson (Ed.) *Communication Yearbook 12* (pp. 18-59). Newbury Park: SAGE.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2001). Critical discourse analysis. In D. Tannen, et al. (Eds.). *Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. (pp. 352-371). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Wafula, R (2002). Language and Politics in East African Swahili Prose: Intertextuality in Kezilahabi's *Dunia Uwanja wa Fujo* "The World, a Playground of Chaos". In Samuel G. O. & Beverley H.(Eds.) *Surviving Through Obliqueness: Language and Politics in Emerging Democracies*. (pp.19-29). New York: Nova Science.