

**DOI:** 10.5281/zenodo.17927585**Submission Date:** 19 March 2021**Publication Date:** 10 July 2021

## **Critical Discourse Analysis of Z. A. Bhutto and Nawaz Sharif Speeches:**

### **Comparative Use of Diplomatic Language**

Shehzadi Talib<sup>1</sup>, Badriah Khaleel<sup>2</sup>

#### **Abstract**

This research aims to examine the comparative use of diplomatic language by Pakistani Prime Ministers, Zulfikar Ali Bhutto and Nawaz Sharif in their speeches at UN Security Council on 15th December 1971 and General Assembly on 21st September 2016 respectively, for clarifying and explaining their political, economic, and military perceptions or agendas to the International community. The documentary as well as audio-visual analysis is mainly performed by employing the Halliday's Systemic Functional Linguistics to elucidate how the use of smart linguistic choices assisted both prime ministers to incorporate their domestic ideology and power politics in their speeches. The findings suggest that their respective contexts played a pivotal role in their speeches such as Zulfikar Ali Bhutto broke all the norms of diplomatic language in his speech due to excessive use of personal references, aggressive tone and blunt language because his country was at war at that time. Whereas Nawaz Sharif remained confined within the domain of diplomatic discourse by avoiding the use of personal references along with aggressive tone because his context was not alarming as compared to Bhutto's. In addition, the extensive use of stylistic devices and rhetoric is identified in Z. A. Bhutto's speech as compared to Nawaz Sharif' speech which uses more unpretentious and straightforward language due to the shift in diplomatic language at International Forums. In other words, the political and diplomatic implications of both these speeches in their corresponding epochs have also been critically analysed in order to examine their influences back at home in Pakistan, as well as at the International forums like UN and other International Communities.

**Keywords:** *Halliday's Functional Linguistics, Implications, Political Communication.*

---

<sup>1</sup> Research Associate, Information Technology University, Lahore

<sup>2</sup> Head of Applied Linguistics Department, Kinnaird College for Women, Lahore  
Email: [badriah.khaleel@kinnaird.edu.pk](mailto:badriah.khaleel@kinnaird.edu.pk)

## Introduction

Ideology is the set of ideas of a group of people as a nation which they portray to the world to define themselves. Being subjective in nature, it varies from nation to nation and even from individual to an individual. The set of beliefs, norms, values and morals of a certain group are manifested and understood by the ideology of the respective group. The tool for putting forward an ideology is language which is used either in spoken form or written form. Mainly politicians explain the ideology of their nation or party in their political speeches at national as well as international forums such as UN, ASEAN and WTO etc. In Political Discourse, not only language but visuals also play vital roles in conveying the political ideologies or agendas. According to Fairclough (1998), the visuals are accompanied to talk in order to determine and interpret meaning. For instance, the smirk normally changes the innocent sounding question into an offensive taunt. Sometimes, visuals substitute talks for conveying the exact meaning as for yes and no answers, head shaking, head nodding are workable along with shoulder shrugging for evading an answer.

## Statement of the Problem

The diplomatic use of language by the Prime Ministers of Pakistan differs depending upon their respective discourse i.e. context of their time.

## Significance of the Study

This study is significant in the field of linguistics, political science, international relations, foreign affairs, diplomacy, and psychology. It is helpful for the learners who want to study political discourse with reference to critical discourse analysis. Moreover, it also deals with diplomatic discourse which is a very updated area of modern politics and tries to elaborate on how deliberative use of rhetoric, certain style, tone and gestures by politicians assist them in putting forward their agenda effectively at national as well as at international forums.

## Rationale of the Study

In point of fact, many researchers have critically analyzed and evaluated speeches of different politicians across the world but nobody has carried out a comparative exploration of the speeches of Pakistani Prime Ministers or Diplomats particularly of these two prime ministers i.e. Z. A. Bhutto and Nawaz Sharif in perspective of critical discourse analysis (CDA) and diplomatic discourse in Pakistan. Therefore, this research tries to work on this.

## Research Objectives

The present research aims are:

- To compare the diplomatic use of language by Z. A. Bhutto and Nawaz Sharif in their political speeches at international forums.

- To identify the role of their respective contexts which motivated both leaders to use such language.
- To evaluate how different tone, gestures, and use of figurative language help leaders to disseminate their ideology to a mass audience.

## Research Questions

This research has established a focus on the following questions:

**RQ 1:** How diplomatic use of language in speeches of both Prime Ministers is different from one another?

**RQ 2:** How Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) assists in interpreting the ideas and motives behind these political speeches?

**RQ 3:** What is the role of their context in deliverance of those speeches at International forums?

## Literature Review

This section provides a basic understanding of discourse, critical discourse analysis, political discourse, diplomatic discourse, rhetoric and Halliday's Systemic Functional Linguistic (SFL) Model. Further it explains how all these linguistic elements are significantly linked to the field of politics. It explains the SFL model in detail by making it the theoretical framework of this research. Moreover, it also states the research which has already been done on these aspects.

## Discourse

Discourse analysis, the major domain of linguistics, is a very extensive field in which language is used in a particular context. Being the basic unit of language it may be a speech or a written text that is not restricted to a single utterance or a sentence rather it is above the level of sentence. Van Dijk (1995), explains that discourse in context of discourse studies means a particular form of language use or social interaction which can be identified as a communicative event in some social state of affairs. For instance, they can be conversations, letters, discussions, interviews, meetings, political discourses, news, laws, songs, propaganda, diaries, contracts, poetry and many more (Dijk T. A., 1995). According to Tistcher (2000, p.42) "discourse is a broad term with different definitions, which integrate a whole palette of meanings".

## Discourse Analysis

The Discourse analysis is the examination of a language i.e. either written or spoken. It can also be any piece of the material which embodies certain messages aimed to be delivered to others. Particularly, the language's nature is dependent on

the demands of the speaker as well as the functions it has to serve (Rahimi, 2015).

### **Critical Discourse Analysis**

Through Critical Discourse Analysis, the notable components of a content can be recognized to translate the belief systems passed on inside the portrayals and syntactic designing of discourse. CDA is an integrative way to deal with language that aims to highlight the way of social power and strength by demonstrating the complex connections between content, verbal communication, social comprehension, culture, society and power (Dijk T. A., 1995). Critical discourse analysis is not paradigm oriented rather it is issue or problem oriented. In CDA, only those kinds of methodological and theoretical approaches are considered appropriate which are excellent at studying relevant social issues or problems. Such as those of racism, colonialism, sexism and other forms of social inequality. Moreover, it takes all dimensions and levels of the discourses under study such as those of style, grammar (syntax, phonology and semantics), schematic organization, rhetoric, pragmatic strategies, speech acts along with the interaction among one another. (Dijk T. A., 1995). It is not perceived as a mere toolkit for interpreting as well analysing texts and talks which can also be evaluated against many other toolkits rather it allows every possible way to study issues. It enables researchers to trace down the relationship between the process and relations and patterns which one can discriminate in talk and text, and the wider social relations (political, economic and legal), patterns and processes and structures.

### **Political Discourse Analysis**

Political discourse is the domain of discourse which is acknowledged by the presence of actors, authors or the politicians within it. Moreover, it mainly deals with the talk and the text of either professional politicians or the political institutions like the presidents, the prime ministers as well as other participants of the government, the parliament or the political parties of any state at the local, the national or the international level. In political discourse, the written text and the talk is perceived as the political action which determines the course of people being the part of that political process (Dijk T. A., n.d.)

### **Diplomatic discourse**

In diplomatic discourse, diplomats, executives and decision makers in foreign policy frequently use historical analogies to strengthen their arguments as well as making their opinions broadly acceptable. According to Gazer Pehar, historical analogies are those metaphorical expressions which make use of the past image to predict some present or future affair particularly of the political concern. Metaphor depicts an overlap between the source analogue i.e. sun and its target analogue i.e. Juliet, similarly historical analogies exhibit an overlap between the image of the past i.e. source and the image of the present or the future i.e. target. Moreover, historical analogies embody the national narrative, national identity, and the course for future action as well. In diplomatic discourse, public diplomacy aims to influence foreign

people with the art of persuasion. According to Melissen (2005), Hans Tuck perfectly defines public diplomacy as the process used by a government to communicate with the foreign public in order to proliferate the understanding of its nation's ideals and ideas, its culture and institution, as well as its national policies and national goals. The practical examples of public diplomacy can be seen as being exercised by the UN at supranational level along with Barroso European Commission where it enjoys the top priority (Melissen, 2005).

## Rhetoric

Professor Hugh Rank of Governors State University, elaborates that intensification and downplay is the technique employed by political leaders for persuasion and political communication. Intensifying generally involves few techniques i.e. the repetition, the association along with the composition, whereas tone down consists of the omission, the diversion and the confusion (D'Acquisto, n.d.). Metaphors hold pivotal roles in diplomatic discourse where they imply several meanings to the audiences. In linguistic mechanism of diplomatic communication, they are of varied kinds ranging from metaphors of cooperation (for building trust and understanding, for creating new partnership, for enhancing global economic structure), metaphors of scale and size (champion of democracy, force of power), metaphor for diplomacy (conveying the modern scenario of the world), metaphors of severance (to look for its own way) to metaphors for particular political as well as diplomatic phenomenon (gunboat diplomacy, left/right wing of the policy, shuttle diplomacy, the brink of war, a howl/cry of the protest). Generally, metaphors for display are transparent, however, with many subtle nuances (Kashchyshyn, n.d.)

## SFL model

M. A. K. Halliday has invented a strategy or an approach to the field of linguistics i.e Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) which studies language as foundational for the construction of human experiences. It was developed by Halliday along with his cohorts during the years of 1960s formerly in the United Kingdom, then in Australia. It is now a worldwide applicable approach particularly in the field of education. Since it mainly focuses on the usage of the language, therefore, great significance is given to the function of language. For instance for what the language is being used, instead of what the language structure is all including as well as the method by means of which it is being constructed (Almurashi, 2016). In Halliday's SFL, the language being a social spectacle, is considered purposeful which means that it deals with instrument of text construction, the function as well as the meaning of language. The exploration is started by doing the language analysis in the social setting wherein a specific lexicogrammatical decision is being fabricated underneath the impact of the communal as well as cultural framework (Haratyan, 2011). According to Almurashi (2016), a text is scrutinized in four different methods in SFL i.e. the Context, the Semantics, the Lexico-grammar, and the Phonology. Among them, context is of particular nature and is always given prime importance because of its centrality and the power of

making meanings. In fact, when the language happens in any context, it is always either related or linked to the number of other contexts such as the Context of the Culture (genres) and the Context of the Situation (Register).

Moreover, in the light of SFL, the language performs three basic metafunctions i.e. the ideational, the interpersonal, as well as the textual which are echoed in a gigantic system linkage of meaning aptitudes together with sub-linkages of the Transitivity, the Thing, and the Quality accompanying particular set of semantic structures for an utterance fabrication. In reality the context of the situation plays a pivotal role for rendering ideas of metafunctions in Halliday's model. The ideational function deals with the description of the experiential along with the logical as well as rational content of a text by explaining the familiarity and understanding of the external world. Contrarily, the textual function is all language-oriented which aims to deal with the cohesive as well as coherent text production with the help of organizing as well as constituting the linguistic data in the clause. Lastly, the interpersonal function studies the societal as well as power dealings existing amid the language speakers. It also tries to relate the situational role of the participants to the discourse produced (Haratyan, 2011). Metafunctions are equivalent to the grammatical classes of the context of the situation as below:

- Ideational Transitivity (Field)
- Interpersonal Mood (Tenor)
- Textual Theme (Mode)

The ideational metafunction deals with the methods and ways of the representation of the external realities. In other words, it can be a message that is being received by people at first encounter (Banks, 2002). Moreover, it also provides the grammatical resources at clause level and tries to explain and expand the meaning via the system of transitivity. Earlier, in traditional grammar, the transitivity concepts dealt with the nature of verb i.e. the transitive or the intransitive, however, in recent time, Halliday considers transitivity as a major concept of experimental function where a verb is associated with representation, process, transmission of ideas, experience etc. (Haratyan, 2011). The Transitivity classification encompasses six processes which are explained as under (Rahimi, 2015):

- 1) Material process deals with the Physical act present in the real world where the doer is an actor and the process is action.
- 2) Mental processes deal with the Processes of reasoning, the affection as well as the perception where the participants are labelled as sensors and it further includes process and phenomenon.
- 3) Relational processes deal with the description of abstract relations along with expressing possession, the equivalence and the attributes. Moreover, the use of emotive terms that are either subjective or objective, negative or positive at the degrees of adverbs, adjectives, or nouns express the attitudinal approach of any individual towards the entity or his audience.
- 4) Verbal processes are related to the processes of communication where symbolic exchange of meaning takes place.

- 5) Behavioral processes are the Hybrid processes of a material and a mental process which encompasses physiological and psychological behaviors such as smiling, staring, breathing, coughing etc.
- 6) Existentialism deals with the process of prevailing through an empty space in the position of subject.

The interpersonal meta-function deals with the relationships prevailing amongst the utterer and his receiver(s), and among the utterer and his message (Banks, 2002). Moreover, it is considered to deal with Mood at the clausal level if seen grammatically. Mood is generally believed to be concerning the topic of the information or the service. Being corresponding to the interpersonal, it encompasses three grammatical categories i.e. tone, modality and speech function. Particularly, the interpersonal metafunction concentrates on the social roles as well as relation by considering formality degree, clausal mood, pronouns etc. The Mood element comprises subject and finite verb (lexical or auxiliary verb) along with the residue of a clause. The position of the finite verb decides what type of mood it is. For instance, when a finite verb comes after the subject, the mood of the clause is declarative and when it comes before the subject of the clause, the mood is interrogative (Haratyan, 2011).

According to Haratyan (2011, p 263), the third aspect of Halliday's SFL model deals with textual metafunctions. This metafiction's core concept lies within thematic structures that encompasses Theme as well as Rheme or old along with new information. In reality, thematic construction is all about clause analysis in terms of the Theme i.e. the starting point of speaker and the Rheme i.e. where the clause goes from there (Banks, 2002). Moreover, the theme of the clause encompasses the message in the text demonstrating the uniqueness of text relation (Halliday, 1981). In a sentence, the information always streams like a wave from the thematic top towards the thematic bottom accompanied with the rising of the falling intonations. In other words, the Theme slides towards the Rheme and given information slides towards the new information in order to unveil the location of information prominence (Haratyan, 2011). According to Halliday and Hassan (1976, p7), the cohesion is a nonstructural text forming relations that relate to the cohesion of meaning within the texts. Moreover, Halliday also put forward the idea of cohesive devices i.e. referencing, ellipsis, substitution, lexical cohesion and conjunction. Summing up the whole discussion, it becomes evident that discourse, discourse analysis, critical discourse analysis, political discourse and diplomatic discourse all aid each other in carrying out the research on the political speeches. They deeply analyze the aspects of the language used by the politicians and their connotations. The SFL model helps to evaluate how the speeches were composed that result in mind control of the public and helped in gaining political support.

## Methodology

### Type of Research

The type of research is qualitative and descriptive in nature. The transcription as well as video of the selected speech of Prime Minister Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto and

Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif are thoroughly analyzed.

## Sample

Research sample is two political speeches.

- 1) One speech is of Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto at the United Nation Security Council delivered on 15<sup>th</sup> Dec, 1971.
- 2) The other speech is of Nawaz Sharif at the United Nations General Assembly delivered on 21<sup>st</sup> Sep, 2016.

## Research Tool

This is a documentary as well as audio visual analysis of both speeches with the help of Halliday's Systemic Functional Linguistics.

## Discussion Analysis

### Background of Z. A. Bhutto's Speech

Since Bhutto was an outspoken rhetoric, eloquent and brilliant orator in delivering speeches, that is why he was sent to United Nations Sessions for ceasefire. His country was at war because the east wing with the assistance of India in the form of MuktiBahini was fighting with its own army for independence. There was chaos, bloodshed, anarchy, and restlessness prevailing in his country when he was there in New York to seek peace through the so called peace building body i.e. United Nations.

### Background of Nawaz Sharif Speech

Prime Minister Mian Muhammad Nawaz Sharif addressed the 71st session of the United Nations General Assembly at the UN headquarters on 21st September, 2016, in New York. He delivered his speech in a timely reply to the ambassadorial outburst projected at Pakistan by the old rival i.e. India for the atrocious attack in Uri, in which around 17 Indian soldiers were killed. In order to reveal the brutalities of India carried out in Jammu and Kashmir along with sacrifices made by Pakistan in tackling foreign sponsored terrorism, he briefed the 71st United Nations General Assembly. His speech clearly countered the comment of Indian Home Minister Rajnath Singh which came right after the Uri attack, in which he blatantly pronounced Pakistan a state which is sponsoring terrorism around the world. Moreover, his speech was an eye opening fact containing a document which made the world realize that it should appraise the sacrifices and struggles of Pakistan instead of blaming it all the time.

**Table 1:** *Statistical Analysis of the Speeches*

Sr. No	Statistical Item	Statistics	
		Z. A. Bhutto's Speech	Nawaz Sharif's Speech
	Words (tokens)	4594	1897
	Sentences	313	100
	Paragraphs	25	18
	Characters	21,177	12,415

In the light of the above table, it becomes evident that Bhutto's Speech consists of 4594 words that constitutes 313 sentences and 25 paragraphs. On the other hand, Nawaz Sharif's speech includes 1897 words with 100 sentences and 18 paragraphs. As being realized from the both sample speeches, Nawaz Sharif used simplest words than Bhutto. The reason behind using colloquial language by Nawaz Sharif is that he tried his best to shorten the distance between him and the audience. Moreover, he also made use of less stylistic devices to make his speech easily comprehensible and understandable to his target audience. Whereas, Bhutto's speech is rich in literary devices and is not easily comprehensible by a layman. The reason behind this use of language by Bhutto is that at his time there were limited members of UN who easily understood the highly rich literary language. Whereas, at Nawaz Sharif's time, UN had nearly 200 members with distinct cultural backgrounds. Therefore, to make himself understandable by everyone he used simple words and sentences which can be understandable.

### Textual Analysis

The textual analysis means that language possesses a mechanism to create any stretch of either written or spoken discourse into a more coherent as well as unified text. It also differentiates a living text from a random list of the sentences. In order to make speech more coherent, speakers use certain stylistic features that enable them to invoke emotions and attention of their audience for conveying their message.

### Stylistic Features and Their Rhetorical Effects

Z. A. Bhutto during his whole speech employed the emotional nuance via the help of stylistic features i.e. the rhetorical question and the irony. He also achieved the actual purpose of his speech with the help of the metaphors as well as the metonymy. In addition, to convey his message in stressed words he took help from two other stylistic devices i.e. the anaphora and the epistrophe. In short, his speech is a great piece of art which is enriched with all possible stylistic devices that can make any piece of text more descriptive as well as more expressive.

## Rhetorical Questions

### Bhutto's Speech

The rhetorical question is employed by political speakers to engage the audience and allow them to feel that their pains as well as values are also shared by the speaker. This was the signature style of Bhutto in all his campaigning speeches which he conducted throughout Pakistan before the general elections of 1970 in order to gain support from the audience. He was fully aware of the situation like where to say what. In other words, he was good at handling situations and giving diplomatic responses. Similarly, while in UN, he had a chance to defame his age-old rival India and create doubts in the mind of the international community about it, he intentionally used rhetorical questions. This is visible from his speech excerpts in which he directly attacked Indian Foreign Minister as well as India.

*How is he [the Indian Foreign Minister] distinguished when his hands are full of blood, when his heart is full of venom? (Bhutto 78)*

*What hope will India give to the people of East Pakistan? What picture of hope is it going to give when its own people in Western Bengal sleep in the streets, where there is terrible poverty, where there is terrible injustice and exploitation, when the parliamentary rule in West Bengal has been superseded by presidential rule? (Bhutto 223-224)*

The rhetorical questions are the best technique to engage the audience and invoke their responses as well. Therefore, Bhutto made use of this device by using contrasting elements. For instance, he used hope and injustice, the presidential rule and the parliamentary rule for arguing his wider disagreement of justice as well as injustice.

### Sharif's Speech

There is an absence of rhetorical questions in Nawaz Sharif's speech which implies that he is not involved as well as engaging the audience rather he is just telling something to the President only. The participation of the audience is missing as compared to Bhutto's speech who directly asked questions by tagging names of the persons.

### Apposition

Apposition is the stylistic device in which two synchronizing elements are placed parallel, where the second one elucidates the first one or adds additional information to the first.

### Bhutto's Speech

Z. A. Bhutto made use of this stylistic device in his speech in order to confront

the Indian as well as the Russian representatives for being the agent of spreading bloodshed in countries like East Pakistan. Since both these countries were highly involved in invoking the anarchy and restlessness in the East Wing of Pakistan, therefore, Bhutto represented them as a figure of ridicule in his speech.

*If he can be Foreign Minister of India, I could have been Prime Minister of united India. But I would rather be a janitor in a free country. (Bhutto 41)*

*I know you are the representative of a great country; you behave like one. The way you throw out your chest, the way you thump the table. You don't talk like Comrade Malik; you talk like Tsar Malik. (Bhutto 208-210)*

*I don't see what objection he has to it if he sees some similarity between his [Russian] empire and the Roman Empire. (Bhutto 99)*

In the above examples, Z. A. Bhutto used very sarcastic, and rude references which flouted the rules of diplomatic discourse. The extensive use of irony implies that Bhutto' intentionally used them because he was aware of the International press which was more interested in hyperbolic phrases rather than simple sentences. Moreover, he also used analogy in his speech in drawing comparison through rhetorical word play such as the foreign minister, the prime minister, Czar Malik as well as Comrade Malik.

### Metaphors

According to the Dictionary of Britannica, the similarities or the comparisons prevalent between the two similar objects or ideas and that articulates a significant judgment among them is called metaphor. It is a property of language which tries to equate things not because they are equal but because they are similar in features and properties. Henceforth, in order to make his speech more emphasized and expressive, Bhutto used several metaphors. Few of the used metaphors are as under:

*My heart is bleeding. (Bhutto 212)*

*You will be turning the medium-sized and the small countries into the harlots of the world. (Bhutto 45)*

*We are your guinea pigs. (Bhutto 255)*

*Finally, I am not a rat. (Bhutto 290)*

In the above statements, he has used two living organisms i.e. guinea pigs and rat as survival metaphors to refer to small countries and himself. The reason behind using these metaphors is that both these living creatures are used in the labs for experimentation. Therefore, he is telling the international community that these world powers have considered us the people of small countries as their experimental labs where they can test their theories and tug of war for becoming super powers. While calling himself not a rat, he is giving a clear gesture to them that your experiments are not applicable to me. Moreover, in the other example, he has

compared smaller countries to the harlots to seek the attention of these countries that they are of no value in the cruel bipolar world of US and Russia. These survival metaphors are also throwing light on the so-called self-created hierarchy of the countries in the world, where smaller countries are considered trash by these world powers.

### **Nawaz Sharif's Speech**

He did not use very many metaphors throughout his speech. His whole speech is very simple and straightforward. He has conveyed his every message in very simple words that are comprehensible to all 199 members of the UN. Only once use of the metaphor is being identified in his whole speech. While talking about the illegal invasion of Kashmir by India, he is calling India an alien. The motive behind the use of the word alien is that India by no means belongs to Kashmir and its presence in Kashmir is just like occupation of planet Earth by some alien creatures.

#### **Example**

*Their struggle is a legitimate one for liberation from alien occupation.*  
(Sharif 65)

### **Metonymy**

Bhutto has made use of metonymy in his speech for brevity. Metonymy is one of the stylistic device which replaces some characteristic words with some indicative words to convey the actual meaning of the word. It is considered as one of the most useful devices for rhetorical wordplay.

Z. A. Bhutto used the word “**Carthage**” to sum up the past, the present as well as the future of the India Pakistan relationships. He deliberately used this word so that the world will know how their relations have been in past and in present and how they will be in future as well. Carthage is a very strong word that has so many connotations such as some continuous wars that involve the whole destruction of an enemy. Here, Bhutto has used the word that both countries are after the destruction of each other because of being the rivals for decades.

### **Epithet**

A political speech is supposed to be rich in figurative language to draw the attention of the people. The use of epithet which is the use of adjectives to enhance the words makes the text more appealing.

### **Z. A. Bhutto's Speech**

Z. A. Bhutto's speech is more undiplomatic in a manner that it is more of spoken discourse because he delivered it at that moment. He used adjectives scarcely too.

**Example:**

*The Pakistani nation is a brave nation. (Bhutto 106)*

*And I thank the third world for having supported a just cause, a right cause. (Bhutto 249)*

### **Nawaz Sharif's Speech**

Nawaz Sharif made very less use of this stylistic device, however, the used adjectives are highlighted in the examples below.

**Example:**

*Despite this adverse international economic environment, my government has, in three short years, moved the country towards robust growth. (Sharif 20) But we cannot ignore our neighbor's unprecedent arms buildup and will take whatever measures are necessary to maintain credible deterrence. (Sharif 80)*

### **Epistrophe**

Epistrophe and Anaphora are two stylistic devices that deal with repetition. Epistrophe deals with the reappearance of the same word or the phrases at end of every succeeding clause or the sentence.

### **Z. A. Bhutto's Speech**

Z. A. Bhutto has made a repetition of two phrases in his speech where he aims to tell some truth for instance, "under foreign occupation" and "do not have vision". Both these repetitions are of great concern because they are telling the bitter truth to the world.

*China was under foreign occupation for years. Other countries have been under foreign occupation. France was under foreign occupation. Western Europe was under foreign occupation. (Bhutto 52-55) (Emphasis added)*

*But you know they do not have vision. The partition of India in 1947 took place because they did not have vision. Now also they are lacking vision. They talk about their ancient civilization and the mystique of India and all that. But they do not have vision at all. (Bhutto 80-84) (Emphasis added)*

Since epistrophes focuses on repetition, it is directly linked to memory of the human beings. Here Bhutto used certain words repeatedly so that his audience national as well as international audience would not forget these words.

## Anaphora

Anaphora deals with the reiteration of the same word or the phrases at the start of every successive clause or the sentence. It is similar to the epistrophe because both have the same intentions of conveying a strong message with the help of repetition. One does it at the start of the sentence and the other does it at end of the sentence.

### Bhutto's Speech

Z. A. Bhutto has made use of anaphora as well in his speech for adding emphasis in his speech:

*Let us build a monument to the veto, a big monument to the veto. Let us build a monument to the impotence and incapacity of the Security Council and the General Assembly. (Bhutto 250-252)*

*You have to be either on the side of justice or on the side of injustice; you are either on the side of the aggressor or of the victim. There is no third road. It is a black and white situation in these matters; there is no grey involved. You are either for right or you are for wrong; you are either for justice or for injustice... (Bhutto 268-269)*

In other words, the anaphora creates a ringing tone to the paragraphs and in the above examples Bhutto used them excessively to remind the Council of its duties.

### Sharif's Speech

Just like Bhutto, Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif has also made use of anaphora in his speech in order to put emphasis on his notion of Kashmiri people. Since, his main focus of speech was to convey and unveil the brutalities of India being conducted in Kashmir in front of the whole world that is why the repetition is being identified in this context. Moreover, as Quaid said, Kashmir is the jugular vein of Pakistan, we Pakistanis consider Kashmir the part of Pakistan. We tell the Kashmiri people that we are standing beside you through thick and thin by every mean. Therefore, to tell the world that Pakistan was, is and will be speaking on the behalf of Kashmiri people on all international forums, the Prime Minister has repeatedly used the word "on behalf of" in his speech. The following below excerpt from his speech tells where exactly he has used those words.

*On behalf of the Kashmiri people; on behalf of the mothers, wives, sisters, and fathers of the innocent Kashmiri children, women and men who have been killed, blinded and injured; on behalf of the Pakistani nation, I demand an independent inquiry into the extra-judicial killings, and a UN fact finding mission to investigate brutalities perpetrated by the Indian occupying forces, so that those guilty of these atrocities are punished.*  
*(Sharif 68)*

## Paradox

The use of paradox is observed in both speeches where speakers made use of self-contradictory statements or ideas. It is frequent in spoken discourse because when we speak we make self-contradictory statements.

### Bhutto's Speech

Bhutto has used the word "legalization" but not with its positive connotation rather with its ironic and negative connotations. For instance, in the example below he repeatedly used this word with the words like aggression, occupation and illegal. Asking the UN to make something legal that was previously illegal is the use of a stylistic device i.e. paradox. In addition, he is actually mocking the role of the UN for peace building. The UN has never done justice with smaller states. That is why he tried to remind the so called peacebuilding UN to legalize whatever you want to.

*Impose any decision, have a treaty worse than the Treaty of Versailles, legalize aggression, legalize occupation, and legalize everything that has been illegal up to 15 December 1971. (Bhutto 297)*

### Nawaz Sharif Speech

In the beginning of his speech while describing the contemporary situation of the world after the cold war, he made use of paradox, henceforth grasping the attention of the audience.

**Example:**

*Today, three decades after the end of the Cold War, our multipolar world is more free and vibrant, yet still chaotic and turbulent; more interdependent, but more unequal; more prosperous, yet still afflicted with poverty. We see spectacular progress, but also unprecedented human suffering. (Sharif 4)*

In above example, following words are used paradoxically:

- 1) Free and chaotic
- 2) Interdependent and unequal
- 3) Prosperous and poverty
- 4) Progress and suffering

## Allusion

Allusion is another stylistic device in which a brief as well as an indirect reference is made to a person, a thing, a place, or an idea which is of historical, literary, cultural or political importance. In addition, it is not focused on explaining or discussing that referred person or place. It only aims to pass a comment and allow

the reader to grasp the importance of that referred person, or event. In the selected sample speeches, the speakers have used allusion in order to put forward their agendas explicitly. They used historical references to make their arguments stronger and clear.

### **Z. A. Bhutto's Speech**

His whole speech is filled with historical references which he used for almost every argument. For instance, when talking about building terms with India, he used references of many world's successful alliances.

Example:

*As I said, if the French and the Germans can come to terms, why cannot India and Pakistan come to terms? If the Turks and the Greeks can still talk sensibly as civilized people over Cyprus, why cannot India and Pakistan do likewise? If the Soviet Union and the United States can open a new page in their history, why cannot we usher in a new era in our relation? (Bhutto 91-93)*

*This has been the worst form of aggression, of naked aggression. Even Poland was not invaded by Germany in this fashion. (Bhutto 145-146) In the old days, great warriors swept over the world- Changiz Khan, Subutai Khan, Alexander, Caesar, coming down to the great Napoleon. (Bhutto 188)*

### **Nawaz Sharif's Speech**

Similar to Bhutto's strategy of using allusion, Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif has also used this stylistic device in his speech. While explaining the upsurge in Kashmir after the murder of a young soldier Burhan Wani, he made a brief reference to the Kashmiri Intifada in his speech. This is evident in this excerpt which has been taken from his speech.

Example:

*Burhan Wani, the young leader murdered by Indian forces, has emerged as the symbol of the latest Kashmiri Intifada, a popular and peaceful freedom movement, led by Kashmiris. (Sharif 57)*

### **Comparative Analysis of Use of Diplomatic Language by Both Leaders**

Diplomacy is a delicate art. Diplomats are supposed to choose their words with utmost care and they avoid offensive, direct and even plain language. For this reason, they are often called mealy-mouthed. An American travel writer, humourist and a one-time magazine editor Caskie Stinnett once famously said, "A diplomat is a person who can tell you to go to hell in such a way that you actually look forward to the trip."

## Z. A. Bhutto's Use of Diplomatic Language

Being the senior most diplomat of Pakistan, he must have spoken Diplomatic Language at the UN for urging people to vote for his country. However, during his speech he blatantly and deliberately broke almost all the conventions of diplomatic oratory. He was decidedly aggressive, angry, rude, belligerent, blunt and highly personal that is why he showed his absolute disregard and disappointment with the proceedings UN sessions. Here is an excerpt from the speech of Bhutto which shows the undiplomatic use of language by him:

*The Permanent Representative of the Soviet Union talked about realities. Mr. Permanent Representative of the Soviet Union, look at this reality. I know that you are the representative of a great country. You behave like one. The way you throw out your chest, the way you thump the table. You do not talk like Comrade Malik; you talk like Tsar Malik. (Bhutto 205-210)*

## Aggressive Tone

Bhutto's language, tone as well as body language broke all the features of a diplomat because he was observed aggressive throughout his speech. The textual as well as video analysis of his speech gives clear signs of his aggressions. For instance, he made use of extravagant hand gestures while talking about the "legalization of aggression" (2:27). Moreover, his YouTube video footage shows clearly how he was sitting back in his chair and was continuously tapping his pen. His frown is also clearly visible because of the raising of his eyebrows in the footage. He didn't look at his papers while addressing the Security Council. In the end, emotions overcame him that led to the cracking of his voice. Therefore, with waving hands he said, "...we will go back and fight."

Moreover, in the end, Bhutto tore up his speech papers in front of everyone which is clearly visible in video (2:58) and walked out of the security council hall along with the Pakistani delegation. All these symbolic gestures showed his absolute disrespect and disappointment with proceedings of the session. Even on his paper, his impoliteness is observable. He bluntly called the representative of Russia "a Tsar" and sarcastically associated the foreign minister of India with "a janitor":

*Mr. President, you referred to the "distinguished" Foreign Minister of India. If he can be Foreign Minister of India, I could have been Prime Minister of united India. But I would rather be a janitor in a free country.*  
*(Bhutto 41)*

## Use of Personal References

In diplomatic discourse, the diplomats are expected to represent their country, not themselves. Their main objective is to gain support for their countries whilst keeping themselves in the background. However, Bhutto flouted this discourse also by talking about himself more than his country. His whole speech is loaded with excessive personal references. He used the word "I" almost 88 times in

his speech. In other words, the man was more visible than the country.

*My people must know. I have not come here to accept abject surrender. If the Security Council wants me to be a party to the legalization of abject surrender, then I say that under no circumstances shall I be. Yesterday my 11-year- old son telephoned me from Karachi and said to me, "Do not come back with a document of surrender. We do not want to see you back in Pakistan if you come like that." I will not take back a document of surrender from the Security Council. I will not be a party to the legalization of aggression. (Bhutto 23-29) (Emphasis added)*

### **Nawaz Sharif's Use of Diplomatic Language**

#### **Mild Tone**

Nawaz Sharif's tone remained mild and moderate throughout his whole speech. He remained very composed and delivered his speech in a manner a diplomat is expected to deliver. His face is utterly expressionless, calm and straight-faced even while discussing serious issues. In video footage that is available on YouTube, it is clearly observable that simply comes to the podium and talks to the representatives of nations in a very organized manner. He has an already written speech that is why he is seen doing paper reading throughout his complete speech. During his 20 minutes' speech, he stammered a little bit while pronouncing a few words. He also avoided use of body language such as using hands or raising eyebrows etc.

#### **Stressed Words**

In spoken discourse, words are stressed when they carry a certain meaning and importance in a particular context. It is human nature that we stress those words to which we expect our audience to pay more attention. Similarly, in his speech, Nawaz Sharif is seen stressing upon certain words which he wants his audience to hear with attention. For instance, he stressed upon the word "peace" through his speech in order to reinforce the theme of his speech i.e. peace and humanity. Moreover, he stressed upon "Pakistan's Zarb e Azb Operation" (4; 22) while telling the whole world what kind of measures Pakistan has taken in countering menace of terrorism which actually needs their appreciation. Pakistan's Zarb-e-Azb Operation is the largest, most robust and most successful anti-terrorism campaign anywhere in the world, deploying 200,000 of our security forces. (Sharif 28) The other words he stressed upon are "firm, killed, Kashmiris, killing, islamophobia and international community".

#### **Use of Personal Reference**

He used a very diplomatic language keeping in mind the conventions of diplomatic discourse. He avoided every kind of personal reference in his speech

rather he preferred to represent his country. He made use of "I" only for 4 times that is meaningless as compared to references he used for his nation i.e. us. For instance, he used collective nouns "we and ours" almost 46 times which is 11 times more than "I".

*We have consistently urged the conclusion of bilateral arms control and disarmament measures between Pakistan and India to prevent conflict and avoid wasteful military expenditures. We are open to discussing all measures of restraint and responsibility with India, in any forum or format and without any conditions. We are ready for talks to agree on a bilateral nuclear test ban treaty. (Sharif 81-83)*

*He also did not directly mention those countries which are sponsoring terrorism in Pakistan. However, he gave a message to them that Pakistan is well aware of them and it will never let them do this anymore. He had a very firm tone and clear expression while using the words "supported, sponsored and financed" (3:33)*

*My country has been the principal victim of terrorism including that supported, sponsored and financed from abroad. We will not allow externally sponsored terrorism and threats of destabilization to cause turbulence in Pakistan. (Sharif 24-25)*

## Conclusion

The aim of this research; to discover how the political speeches made by different politicians or diplomats at international forums contain as well as violate the norms of diplomatic language, is met by putting forward a critical discourse analysis (CDA) of the political speech of Z. A. Bhutto, delivered on 15<sup>th</sup> Dec, 1971 at UN, a former prime minister and an active politician in the history of Pakistan along with the speech of former Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif's Speech delivered on 21<sup>st</sup> of Sep, 2016 at UN General Assembly, who is current politician of Pakistan. To serve this end, the text of these political speeches as well as their audio-visual aids are explored through Halliday's Systemic Functional Linguistics. In addition, use of rhetoric by both these politicians in their speeches is also analyzed for more critical evaluation of the speech. For this reason, the Critical analysis of any text as well as discourse is significant for elucidating the correlation between the language, the identity and the ideology. In a nutshell, considering the comparative analysis of both speeches it has been revealed that Z. A. Bhutto broke all the conventions of diplomatic discourse due to factors such as the context of his time (war) and intransigence of the world's leaders, particularly the UN towards his country. On the other hand, Nawaz Sharif fulfilled all the conventions of diplomatic discourse by using very simple and plain language in a mild tone. It was because of the context of his speech that it was not an alarming one like Bhutto's. In other words, the difference in their comparative use of diplomatic language was only because of their

different discourses i.e. their contexts. Summing up the whole research, it becomes evident that context plays a pivotal role in the relations of any country. The diplomats' choice of words depends upon the nature of context and situations. This research reveals that a diplomat's choice of words depends upon the nature of the audience. The language rich in figurative language tries to address the native speakers with big veto powers of the UN like the US and UK. Whereas the use of more plain and simple language is intended to address the large audience i.e. native and non-native (all 193 members of UN) while presenting their agendas to the international community. Henceforth, the main agenda behind simple use of language is to make themselves easily comprehensible and understandable by every country around the world even by those countries which have strikingly distinct cultures.

### **Research Limitations**

CDA has its own limitations on micro and macro levels. It requires great emphasis on context. This research is confined to dealing in comparative analysis with respect to discourse. Moreover, there is very limited research available on this topic in Pakistani Context which was a bit problematic.

## References

Almurashi, W. A. (2016). An Introduction to Halliday's Systemic Functional Linguistics. *Journal for the Study of English Linguistics*, 4(1). Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.5296/jsel.v4i1.9423>

Banks, D. (2002). Systemic Functional Linguistics as a model for text analysis. [openeditions.org](https://journals.openedition.org/asp/1584), 23-34. Retrieved from <https://journals.openedition.org/asp/1584>

D'Acquisto, G. (n.d.). A Linguistic Analysis of Diplomatic Discourse. Cambridge University. Retrieved Jan 22, 2018, from <http://www.cambridgescholars.com/download/sample/63720>

Dijk, T. A. (1995). Aims of Critical Discourse Analysis. *Japanense Discourse*, 1, 17.

Dijk, T. A. (n.d.). What is Political Discourse Analysis? Retrieved april 14, 2018, from [discourses.org](http://discourses.org/OldArticles/What%20is%20Political%20Discourse%20Analysis.pdf): <http://discourses.org/OldArticles/What%20is%20Political%20Discourse%20Analysis.pdf>

Fairclough, N. (1998). Language and Power (Vol. 10th).

Halliday, J. M. (1981). Readings in systemic linguistics. Trafalgar Square Publishing.

Haratyan, F. (2011). Halliday's SFL and Social Meaning. 2nd International Conference on Humanities, Historical and Social Sciences, 17, p. 260. Singapore. Retrieved April 14, 2018, from <http://www.ipedr.com/vol17/49-CHHSS%202011-H10074.pdf>

Kashchyshyn, N. (n.d.). Metaphors in the English Diplomatic Discourse: Their Role and Functions. Retrieved Jan 29, 2018, from <http://www.lit.auth.gr/amgl37/Poster/Kashchyshyn.pdf>