



E-ISSN: 2664-603X

P-ISSN: 2664-6021

IJPSG 2020; 2(1): 111-118

Received: 20-02-2020

Accepted: 22-03-2020

Sohom Roy

Student of Cluster Innovation Center, University of Delhi, Sudhir Bose Marg, Hindu College, University Enclave, Delhi, India

Shabdita Tiwari

Student of Hindu College, University of Delhi, Sudhir Bose Marg, Hindu College, University Enclave, Delhi, India

Dhruv Kaushik

Student of Hindu College, University of Delhi, Sudhir Bose Marg, Hindu College, University Enclave, Delhi, India

Sumit Singh

Student of Hindu College, University of Delhi, Sudhir Bose Marg, Hindu College, University Enclave, Delhi, India

Corresponding Author:

Sohom Roy

Student of Cluster Innovation Center, University of Delhi, Sudhir Bose Marg, Hindu College, University Enclave, Delhi, India

Understanding Pakistan in Prime Minister Modi's speeches

Sohom Roy, Shabdita Tiwari, Dhruv Kaushik and Sumit Singh

Abstract

In the road down from democracy to authoritarian rule, the role of perceived 'enemies' are often very important. While the existence of these 'enemies' might be questionable, they are shown by the beneficiaries of authoritarian rule as the harbingers of evil, and the reasons for whom/which democratic rights must go down the drain. In the context of India, which is still a democracy as I write, there are several candidates who can take up the role of this 'enemy' in less fortunate times. A very important one among them is the neighboring country Pakistan. It receives an enormous amount of space in political discourses including Prime Minister Narendra Modi's speeches, and it is important to scrutinize the importance it receives. The paper takes into account these speeches delivered by the prime minister which mention Pakistan, and uses the method of discourse analysis to inspect parts where Pakistan has been mentioned. Using the same, it tries to understand why the neighboring country has been mentioned, the purpose it serves and how the speaker wants his audience to view Pakistan. It asks if Pakistan is being used as a red-herring to distract attention from more important issues. It assesses the techniques used by the speaker to create the enemy named Pakistan in his audience's minds.

Keywords: Discourse Analysis, Political Speeches, Enemy Image, Propaganda, India

Introduction

On 26 February 2019, India carried out a pre-emptive air strike in Pakistan's Khyber Pakhtunkhwa province¹. The Indian Air Force dropped bombs in the vicinity of Balakot town, and claimed that it had destroyed an important terrorist training camp killing many who were later going to be used against India. Despite controversies regarding the claims, this incident became one of the major reasons behind the re-election of Bharatiya Janata Party and its Prime Ministerial candidate Sri Narendra Modi in the subsequent Lok Sabha polls². This shows how important Pakistan in general, and acts of enmity against Pakistan in particular (in whatever ways possible), is for the Indian populace.

This hatred for Pakistan³ among Indians involves hatred for the Pakistani state, which is not entirely unreasonable. Stories of partition still haunt many Indian households (and surely many Pakistani ones too) which was partly a result of decisions made by people who formed the Pakistani state. There have been four recognized wars between the Indian and Pakistani state along with innumerable other border skirmishes in which the Pakistani state played a part. India has faced multiple attacks by terrorists who were enabled, if not supported, by the Pakistani state and it very often finds the Pakistani state's interests in terms of international diplomatic affairs at crossroads with its own. But it's not just the state that is subject to Indian hatred. Faizaan Qayyum (The Dawn, February 28, 2020) ^[1] portrayed the hatred towards India in Pakistan as twofold- one for the Indian state, another for the major Indian religious community. With the recent communal riots in Delhi proving the pervasiveness of Islamophobia in India, there is no reason to believe that the case isn't the same in case of India. A large number of Indians might view Pakistan in a negative light just because of its Islamic credentials.

However, this hatred for the Pakistani state and Pakistani state religion couldn't have lived so long and ripe a life without the contributions of mass media. Mass media constantly reminds people the reasons behind that hatred and reports on that hatred. When people act under the influence of the same, new reasons to hate Pakistan are created in turn. Mass media gets its 'Pak hating' content from various sources, but it gets a boost when it comes from the holders of powerful positions who have mass following.

One such position holder and popular leader is Sri Narendra Modi, the Prime Minister of India. When he says something, a large number of people believe his words, and almost everyone pays attention. When he too paints Pakistan in negative light, and that painting is amplified and distributed by mass media, people increasingly feel the existence of valid reasons- to hate Pakistan, and to act on the same. In the process, the enemy named Pakistan is created.

Methodology

The method of Discourse Analysis has been used to draw the inferences in this paper. Discourse Analysis is a qualitative research method that examines social action through the prism of language use (Hout and Smedt, p-1), and involves the scrutiny of language used in communication. Language reflects realities in which it is used and also shapes those realities. These realities reflected by language are not always apparent and they might not be reflected as a result of the active intention of the user. As a result, language becomes a rich source of information-information which is intentionally conveyed and information regarding the world of the user which seeps into the language and is visible only to the keen eye. Discourse Analysis puts language under that keen eye, tries to understand all that is reflected and retrieves information regarding the world where the language is used. It asks why particular words, phrases, sentences have been used, why they have been used in their particular orders and tries to understand their special meanings embedded in the context in which they have been used.

For the purpose of this paper, texts of six speeches delivered by Prime Minister Narendra Modi which mentioned Pakistan were analyzed using discourse analysis. Computerized filters (available in the website) were used to find speeches which mentioned Pakistan from the online archive of Narendra Modi's speeches, available at <https://www.narendramodi.in/category/text-speeches>, from which six speeches were chosen randomly. In these speeches special attention was provided into paragraphs which mentioned Pakistan or were somehow related to Pakistan. The following table shows the speeches chosen and details regarding when and where they were delivered.

Each discourse rests on certain assumptions, judgments, and contentions that provide the basic terms for analysis (Glynos, et.al. p-8). In these discourses in the form of speeches we tried to understand why Mr. Narendra Modi used the words or phrases that he did, what underlying assumptions and judgements lay hidden behind his words, what are the images that his speeches created in the minds of listeners and how he used language to create the grand enemy named Pakistan. We then categorized our findings into themes, each of which is a function his words regarding Pakistan performed.

Theoretical Framework

The art of enemy construction for political benefits isn't a field that has seen heavy theoretical development or research. Important foundations were however laid by Nazi theorist Carl Schmitt. In his work 'The Concept of the Political', he claims that the creation of a friend-enemy distinction between members and 'others' is essential for the survival of a political community. This line between the friend and the enemy actively constitutes the political identity or existence of the community and determines who

belongs to the community (Vinx, para 14-18). The distinction between friend and enemy, according to Schmitt refers to the "utmost degree of intensity ... of an association or dissociation." (Schmitt 26, 38) The utmost degree of association here involves the willingness to fight and die for and together with other members of one's group, and the ultimate degree of dissociation involves the willingness to kill others for the simple reason that they are members of a hostile group. Schmitt hands a sovereign dictator the power and justification to homogenize the community by appealing to a clear friend-enemy distinction, as well as through the suppression, elimination, or expulsion of internal enemies who do not endorse that distinction (Schmitt 46-8).

While we don't claim that the enemy creation out of Pakistan is based on or inspired by Schmitt's theories, it is clear that the enemy image of Pakistan helps the Prime Minister consolidate his support base (a political community). While creating the enemy, he also implies that death to defeat this enemy is justified (see section Perpetual State of War), and that this enemy has allies within the country against whom actions must be taken (see section The Congress Conspiracy).

As to how the enemy is created, Spillman and Spillman (1997) provided an essential theoretical base in their work titled "Some sociobiological and psychological aspects of Images of the Enemy". They describe enemy image construction as a syndrome of deeply rooted perceptual evaluations that take on the following characteristics:

- Negative Anticipation: All acts of the enemy, in the past, present, and future become attributed to destructive intentions toward one's own group. Whatever the enemy undertakes is meant to harm us.
- Putting Blame on the Enemy: The enemy is thought to be the source of any stress on a group. They are guilty of causing the existing strain and current negative conditions.
- Identification with Evil: The values of the enemy represent the negation of one's own value system and the enemy is intent on destroying the dominant value system as well. The enemy embodies the opposite of that which we are and strive for; the enemy wishes to destroy our highest values and must therefore be destroyed.
- Zero-Sum Thinking: What is good for the enemy is bad for us and vice versa.
- Stereotyping and De-Individualization: Anyone who belongs to the enemy group is ipso facto our enemy.
- Refusal to Show Empathy: Consideration for anyone in the enemy group is repressed due to perceived threat and feelings of opposition. There is nothing in common and no way to alter that perception (Spillman and Spillman, pp. 50-51).

The paper will show how Narendra Modi nudges his audience to think about Pakistan in the above- mentioned lines, leading to creation of an enemy image.

Forming Relationships

An important aspect of discourse analysis is to identify the relationship between the addresser and the addressee. In this section of the paper we will identify this relationship as is established by our addressor, Prime Minister Narendra Modi and the addressee which is more often than not the general populace in rallies. The said relationship will bring to light

different power dynamics that highlight the intent of the speech in addition to the specific tools that were used to achieve the desired outcome.

अब आपका ये चौकीदार भारत के हक का एक-एक बूंद, भारत के किसान तक पहुंचाने के लिए संकल्प लेकर के बैठा है और काम कर के रहेगा। अब एक बूंद पानी जो हिंदुस्तान के हक का है वो पाकिस्तान नहीं जाएगा दोस्तों। (8 May 2019; Kurukshetra Haryana)

(Now this watchman is sitting with a pledge to take every drop of India's water, to the farmers of India and I'll do this. Friends, now a drop of water which belongs to India will not go to Pakistan.)

In both the excerpts mentioned above, Mr. Modi uses the term 'chowkidar' to describe himself. A chowkidar or watchman refers to a person entrusted with the security of a place. By identifying himself as India's chowkidar, he is reiterating the mandate that he has received from the people of the nation. In addition to this, he highlights his monumental efforts towards the peace and security of India, for which he implies he alone is responsible. We can derive this from the common imagery that is evoked from the use of the word 'chowkidar', a lone figure in the night guarding the doors of a huge enclave.

महाराष्ट्र के मुख्यमंत्री श्रीमान देवेन्द्र फडणवीस जी, शिवसेना प्रमुख मेरे छोटे भाई श्रीमान उद्धव ठाकरे जी, मंच पर उपस्थित अन्य महानुभाव और मेरे प्यारे भाइयों और बहनो। (8 April 2019; Latur Maharashtra)

(Chief Minister of Maharashtra, Mr. Devendra Fadnavis ji, Shiv Sena Chief my younger brother Mr. Uddhav Thackeray, other dignitaries present on stage and my dear brothers and sisters.)

In the above mentioned speeches we notice an alternative strand to Mr. Modi's self-identification. This is the constant usage of the term 'bhaiyon-beheno' when referring to the populace. This hints at the portrayal of Mr. Modi as the elder brother of the household, alternatively a patriarch. The role of a patriarch in the Indian context is someone who is responsible for the proper functioning and protection of the household, who single-handedly takes decisions for the well-being of the members. This identification stands in stark contrast to portrayal as chowkidar who works according to the wishes of the master.

The suffix attached, i.e. 'pyare' or loved hints again at the approachability of Mr. Modi for all his younger siblings which is the common populace. In extension, we can also look at this with the view that Mr. Modi is responsible for the well-being of the individuals and the individuals look up to him for guidance.

साथियो, हम भारत के ज्ञान-विज्ञान और अध्यात्म की समृद्ध परंपरा को साथ लेते हुए नए भारत के निर्माण के रास्ते पर आगे बढ़ रहे हैं। (8 May 2019; Kurukshetra, Haryana)

(Friends, we are moving forward on the path of building a new India, taking along India's rich tradition of knowledge, science and spirituality.)

Another similar identifier that is used is the word 'saathiyon' or friends. In the above excerpts it is evident that a friendly relationship is established between the addresser

and the addressee. It furthers the notion of the Prime Minister being an affable personality who is easily accessible. Contrary to other identifiers, here we notice, instead of placing the populace as being inferior or superior to himself, the term 'saathiyon' accords both the involved parties the same pedestal.

Further, this identification conveys the idea that the populace is an equal stakeholder in the policy making of the nation. Despite the fact that people's participation in decision making is only through electing representatives, the speeches convey an alternative method of participation.

पूरी दुनिया ने माना की स्पेस में भारत ने बहुत बड़ी उपलब्धि हासिल की है। लेकिन मोदी विरोध के चक्कर में ये लोग फिर भारत का विरोध करने पर उतारू हैं।

(9 April 2019; Chitradurga Karnataka)

(The whole world believed that India has achieved a great achievement in space. But in order to oppose Modi, these people are again ready to oppose India.)

भाइयों और बहनो, आज कल ये लोग मेरे पीछे पड़े हैं, मुझे ये कहते हुए गालियां दे रहे हैं की भारत ने पाकिस्तान का कोई लड़ाकू विमान नहीं गिराया, दुनिया में एक झूठ कहीं से भारत के खिलाफ निकलता है तो ये लोग लपक कर के उसको उठा कर के दो दिन अपना मीडिया में जगह बनाने के लिए कोशिश करते हैं।

(8 April 2019; Latur Maharashtra)

(Brothers and sisters, these people are attacking me these days, they are abusing me by saying that India has not destroyed any Pakistani fighter aircraft, someone lies against India from anywhere in the world, then these people highlight it and try to make a place for it in our media for two days.)

Here we notice a different kind of identification that Mr. Modi makes use of, this is his identification of himself with the Indian state. In the first excerpt an assumption comes to light which is that 'Modi virodh' (opposing Modi) equates directly to 'desh virodh' (opposing India). This kind of assumption coming from the Prime Minister of the nations, furthers the ignorant notion that opposition and criticism of a leader is opposition of the state that one belongs to. This also brings into the ambit of our discussion that tag of an 'anti-national' which is increasingly being used for anyone who offers criticism to Mr. Modi's government (Tremblay and Bonner 2019) [7]. The statement becomes evident from the second excerpt, where Mr. Modi follows 'mujhe gaali de rahe hain' (they are abusing me) with 'bharat ke khilaf jhut nikalta hai to lapak kar utha lete hain' (they make a media day out of any lie spread against india). The progression which is created is from self to whole further proves our point.

Glorifying India

The creation of solidarity and loyalty in a particular 'in-group' is facilitated by the creation of a supposed 'out-group'. This solidarity is strengthened by highlighting the differences between the two groups. These differences are then viewed in a negative light in opposition to the positive aspects of the in-group. A similar technique commonly appears in Mr. Modi's speeches. This is done to highlight the stark contrast between the two nations of India and Pakistan. The positive aspects of India are meant to evoke a

sense of pride and joy among the populace of the country, furthering the notion of Pakistan being a degraded state.

उसके कारण आज दुनिया में हिंदुस्तान का डंका बज रहा है। साथियो, आज भारत का हर व्यक्ति आत्मविश्वास से भरा है। क्योंकि देश एक महाशक्ति बनने के रास्ते पर निकल पड़ा है।

(Due to which, India's trumpet is blaring in the world today. Friends, today every person of India is full of confidence. Because the country is on its way to becoming a superpower.)

योग और आयुर्वेद को लेकर देश और दुनिया में जो जागरूकता बढ़ी है, वो इसी का परिणाम है। कुरुक्षेत्र को तो अब आयुष यूनिवर्सिटी के रूप में एक नई पहचान भी मिल रही है और यहां मनोहर लाला जी की सरकार ने अंतरराष्ट्रीय गीता जयंती की महोत्सव की भी आन-बान और शान के साथ शुरुआत की है लेकिन साथियो, जब भारत की संस्कृति की बात आती है तो न जाने क्यों कांग्रेस के मुंह पर वोट बैंक का ताला लग जाता है। ध्यान रखिएगा, इनकी मानसिकता क्या है? रामायण और महाभारत को दिन-रात गाली देने वालों के समर्थक आज भी ये महामिलवटियों के बीच में हैं।

(The awareness that has increased in the country and the world about Yoga and Ayurveda is a result of this. Kurukshetra is also getting a new identity as Ayush University and Manohar Lal ji's government has also started the International Geeta Jayanti Festival, but friends, when talking about India's culture I don't know why the mouth of Congress is locked by vote bank. Keep in mind, what is their mindset? The supporters of those who abused the Ramayana and the Mahabharata day and night are still in the midst of the 'Mahamilawati'-great mixture of political parties).

(9 May 2019; Kurukshetra Haryana)

After analysis of the above excerpts, a distinct pattern becomes visible to us. The glorification of the Indian nations and its achievements is described in terms of international recognition for India. The fact that other nations recognize the greatness of India is an indicator of the heights that we have achieved. These enormous achievements of the nation are meant to instill pride and self confidence among the people. When we probe deeper into this characterisation, we can find hints of our colonial past. The fact that Mr. Modi continues to use external factors to highlight our achievement instead of talking about them in absolute terms. It is also indicative of Indian conditioning, to give greater importance to external factors instead of internal ones.

Another facet that becomes evident here is the characterization of the culture as Hindu culture. The first excerpt mentions the epics of Ramayana and Mahabharata, both of which are a part of the Hindu traditions. Additionally, Yoga and Ayurveda too have roots in Hindu philosophy (Larson 1987)^[8]. Although we do not become instantly aware of the lack of diversity in culture, a further probe reveals Mr. Modi's speeches are replete with indirect signalling about the greatness of Hindu culture and traditions. A person who has been exposed to such signalling for a long period of time is bound to pedestalize Hindu traditions as compared to others. Furthermore, given that our perpetual enemy Pakistan is identified as an Islamic

Republic, this signalling becomes even more effective in relegating Pakistan to a lower rung.

सीमा पर हमारे जो जवान होते हैं, वो देश की सीमा की ही नहीं, देश के लोगों की ही नहीं, देश के स्वाभिमान की भी रक्षा करते हैं। किसी भी आजाद देश की पहली पहचान होती है- स्वाभिमान। (28 January 2020; Delhi)

(Our soldiers who are on the border, not only protect the border of the country, they not only protect the people of the country but also the self-respect of the country. The first identity of any independent country is self-respect.)

The glorification of the nation further extends to the glorification of the armed forces that are protecting our borders against aggressors. This fits perfectly with the narrative of the perpetual state of war that we are engaging in with Pakistan. As is made abundantly clear in the above excerpt, the armed forces are protecting the self-respect of the nation. Thus, the army and in continuation the nation, is further pushed to the foreground and glorified.

भाइयों-बहनो, इस चुनाव में आपको सिर्फ सांसद नहीं चुनना है, सिर्फ प्रधानमंत्री नहीं चुनना है। बल्कि एक मजबूत भारत के लिए मजबूत सरकार चुननी है। (9 April 2019; Chitradurga Karnataka)

(Brothers and sisters, in this election you do not only have to choose an MP, not just a Prime Minister. Rather, you have to choose a strong government for a strong India.)

Finally, the glorification of the nations is also an outcome of the glorification of the existing government. The ruling party i.e. Bharatiya Janata Party is said to be a strong government. This can be done in two ways- to underline the efforts of the existing government and to undermine the efforts of the previous government. Mr. Modi uses both these tools tactfully in his speeches. He underlines the achievements of his government by portraying Pakistan as an aggressor on the battlefield, and how his government has defeated this aggressor time and again.

A Perpetual State of War

A consistent theme in most speeches by Narendra Modi, is a reference to Pakistan in a manner which suggests that India is in a perpetual state of war with Pakistan. It is not necessarily a physical war on the borders but more like a phony war or a cold war which entails both countries to show off their strength, mostly in terms of military or diplomatic terms. An assumption that Modi makes when tailoring parts of his speeches on this theme is that an average listener subconsciously has some malice towards Pakistan because of the long history of conflict with the said country. Modi consciously taps into this understanding of a listener in order to build it further. In a way, it can be said that Modi often seems to be trying to reinstate this very theme in his speeches with the help of a consistent display of loathe for Pakistan which the public in turn translates into a public opinion against Pakistan. Modi constantly feeds his audience with the idea that India and Pakistan are still at war and are the bitterest of enemies and it is only in the interest of India to take active action in order to win this war. Such messaging quite naturally leads to what Spillman and Spillman called Zero-Sum Thinking among his audience. They are led to believe that every harm caused to Pakistan is

a victory for India.

Having established this premise it would now be imperative to understand the various manners in which he uses this theme to his advantage. A number of examples are on display when the Balakot strikes took place.

पांच वर्ष पहले का एक दौर वो था जब पाकिस्तान के आतंकी हम पर हमला करते थे और फिर पाकिस्तान से ही धमकियां भी मिलती थी। हमारे जांबाज एक्शन के लिए इजाजत मांगते थे लेकिन तब की सरकार डर कर के बैठ जाती थी। इस चौकीदार ने उस स्थिति को बदल दिया है। (9th April, 2019. Chitradurg, Karnataka)

(Five years ago, Pakistani terrorists attacked us and then there were threats from Pakistan itself. Our brave soldiers requested permission for action, but the government then sat in fear. This watchman has changed that situation.)

In a public meeting at Chidurga, Karnataka just before the Lok Sabha elections of 2019, Narendra Modi addressed the public about Balakot strikes and the aforementioned quote is an accurate reflection of the idea of the perpetual state of war. Modi effectively uses it to evoke the emotions of the public in that context and also to criticize his political opponents. Modi starts off by talking about the inaction on part of the UPA government while they were in power. According to him they did not take active action against terrorist activities prompted by Pakistan. He also says that the army under the UPA rule always wanted to take up such operations but the Congress would not grant permission for it. The importance of this tactic in his speeches is seen from the fact that such messages became more frequent in his speech as the Lok Sabha elections drew closer. He used the sentiment of the public against Pakistan to glorify his previous tenure and also criticizes the UPA government. In a very explicit manner Modi declares his government as the only brave enough force to stand up to the villains, i.e. Pakistan, which had never been done before.

फिर एक बार मोदी सरकार, और मैं आपको वादा करता हूँ जो पानी आज पाकिस्तान में जा रहा है, वो पानी हिंदुस्तान के खेतों में जाएगा। हम पानी के बिना तरसे और वहाँ पानी चला जाए। ऐसी सरकारें चली है भाइयो। ऐसी सरकारों को अब हिंदुस्तान में 100 साल तक कोई घुसने देने वाला नहीं है | (8th May, 2019. Kurukshetra, Haryana)

(Once again Modi government, and I promise you that the water that is going into Pakistan today, that water will go to the fields of India. We went without water and there there was water. Such governments have run, brothers. Nobody will allow such governments to enter India for 100 years)

In another speech in Sikar, Rajasthan he mentions the water crisis in reference to the Indus Water Treaty and very blatantly portrays the farmers in Pakistan as the villains and in contrast tries to evoke sympathy for poor farmers in Rajasthan. By drawing on this issue, Narendra Modi successfully conveys that just like the water from 'our' rivers has been flowing into Pakistan since time immemorial, India has been in conflict with Pakistan since time immemorial. The repeated and inflated reminders of conflicts, the showering of reasons to still be in conflict, and the constant portrayal of India's superiority and ability for victory, creates the illusion of a constant state of war.

भारत के बंटवारे के समय कागज पर एक लकीर खींच दी गई थी। देश का विभाजन कर दिया गया था। कागज पर खींची गई इसी लकीर ने गुरुद्वारा करतारपुर साहिब को हमसे दूर कर दिया था, उसे पाकिस्तान का हिस्सा बना दिया था।

(January 28, 2020. New Delhi)

(At the time of Partition, a streak was drawn on paper. The country was divided. This streak, drawn on paper, drove Gurudwara Kartarpur Sahib away from us, making it a part of Pakistan)

Another common pattern noticed in Modi's speeches in the context of Pakistan, is the constant callbacks to the partition in 1947. These statements again suggest the perpetuity of Indo-Pak enmity, which Modi's statements portray as having roots right in the foundation of the countries. It can be deduced that such references are often used to portray Pakistan in a bad light and build up the public opinion against Pakistan. In the aforementioned speech, several such indicators are found and the quote is only one of the several such references.

The Congress Conspiracy

In an extension to the perpetual state of war with Pakistan, Narendra Modi uses the sentiment against Pakistan to use as a weapon against Congress, for their policies in the past. He builds up a web of accusations pinning the blame of all security problems on Congress and implying time and again that they were actively furthering the interests of the Pakistani establishment. It is critical for us to understand that Modi uses this tactic frequently and in almost every manner tries to connect Pakistan and Congress to use the public opinion against Pakistan against their "accomplice". He makes his political opposition look like the internal enemies Carl Schmidt discussed, whose extermination is beneficial for the nation.

“भाइयो और बहनो, आपने देखा कि जब हमने पाकिस्तान के आतंकीयों पर प्रहार किया। आपको अच्छा लगा कि नहीं लगा, आप खुश है क्या? मैंने सही किया? जब हमने आतंकीयों पर प्रहार किया तो दर्द पाकिस्तान को हुआ लेकिन आंसू हमारे यहाँ कांग्रेस और जेडीएस उनके साथियों के निकले।”

(9th April, 2019. Chitradurg, Karnataka)

(Brothers and sisters, you saw that when we attacked the terrorists of Pakistan. Do you like it or not, are you happy? Was I correct in my actions? When we attacked the terrorists, the pain was inflicted on Pakistan, but the tears came out of the Congress and JDS colleagues of ours)

“मैं जरा यहाँ के मुख्यमंत्री को पूछना चाहता हूँ कि आपका वोट बैंक भारत में है कि पाकिस्तान में।”

(9th April, 2019. Chitradurg, Karnataka)

(I just want to ask the Chief Minister here that is your vote bank in India or Pakistan)

He reinstates his theory about the Congress working as an 'Agent' for Pakistan in this speech in Karnataka. He uses such means to tackle several domestic issues as well. As highlighted above he employs this relationship between the Congress and Pakistan to reach out to the subconscious loathe for Pakistan that his audience might have. He

portrays most of his domestic issues similarly by connecting them to Pakistan. Another example of the same is found in his speech in Rajasthan where he talks about the plight of the farmers of India by contrasting the supposed prosperity of Pakistani farmers. This again is not complete without implying that the Congress was behind the whole crippling of the farmers' lives.

“भाइयो-बहनो, मोदी वचन का पक्का है, और मैं आज राजस्थान को कहता हूँ कि ये ऐसी सरकारें थी इन्होंने भारत के हक का पानी भारत को देने के बजाय पाकिस्तान को दे रहे हैं। आप मुझे पांच साल और मौका देने वाले हैं मुझे मालूम है।”
(8th May, 2019. Kurukshetra, Haryana)

(Brothers and sisters, Modi is sure of his promises, and I say to Rajasthan today that these are such governments that they are giving India's share of water to Pakistan instead of giving it to India. I know you are going to give me another five years)

In various other speeches he often invokes the much sensitive issue of Kashmir and portrays Congress and its allies as the puppets of Pakistan who were never brave enough to stand up to the villains of the tale, i.e. Pakistan. This strategy often seems to work for domestic issues as well.

आखिर किसके हितों के लिए काम कर रहे हैं ये लोग?
क्यों इन लोगों को पाकिस्तान में अल्पसंख्यकों पर हो रहे अत्याचार दिखाई नहीं देते?
(January 28, 2020. New Delhi)

(After all, who are these people working for? Why do these people not see atrocities on minorities in Pakistan?)

Demeaning Pakistan

Narendra Modi usually goes an extra mile to demean Pakistan. It helps in the formation of the image of an enemy who has all the negative characteristics and therefore is easily dislikable. He attaches these negative characteristics to the word 'Pakistan', as if it's a single, homogeneous entity. In his act of enemy making, we clearly find Spillman and Spillman's characteristics of Negative Anticipation, Identification with the Evil and Stereotyping. By using the single term 'Pakistan' to denote Pakistani Army, government, media, population and individuals, he erases the distinction between them in the minds of his audience. Their enmity as a result, is often directed against all of them. There are various ways in which he creates the negative image of Pakistan. To understand them, let us look at the following examples-

"क्यों इन लोगों को पाकिस्तान में अल्पसंख्यकों पर हो रहे अत्याचार दिखाई नहीं देते? सिर्फ आस्था की वजह से पाकिस्तान में इन बेटियों पर जो जुल्म होते हैं, उनके साथ बलात्कार होते हैं, उनका अपहरण होता है, इन सबको क्यों झुठलाने पर तुले हुए हैं ये लोग?"

(Why do these people not see atrocities on minorities in Pakistan? It is only due to faith that these daughters are victimized in Pakistan, they are raped, they are kidnapped, why are these people trying to deny it?)

In this excerpt, we see Narendra Modi creating the image of

a Pakistan which is communal, discriminatory and oppressive against minorities. What must be remembered is that the minority communities of Pakistan are the majority communities of India and consequently, Narendra Modi's voters. In the first excerpt, we see Narendra Modi calling upon others to feel the supposed pain of minority communities of Pakistan, and therefore, hate the perpetrator of that pain- Pakistan. It is interesting to note that he assumes that the people he is directing the question to (his political opponents) do not have empathetic feelings for the minorities of Pakistan, with whom many of them too share their religion. He tells his audience about atrocities occurring against women belonging to the minority communities of Pakistan. He says that they are raped and kidnapped there, and that his opponents are fixated on falsifying these facts. What we must remember is that women, to their own detriment, had become vessels of communal honor during partition related violence, and they became the same in several communal riots throughout independent India's history. Mr. Modi here is tapping into similar sentiments, with the aim to agitate his audience whose communal honor is being stained by the atrocities against women of their religion in Pakistan.

एयर स्ट्राइक के बाद जब भारत ने आतंकियों को घर में घुसकर मारा तब हमारे एक वीर सपूत को पाकिस्तान ने कब्जे में ले लिया था। 48 घंटे के भीतर-भीतर पाकिस्तान को उसे छोड़ना पड़ा था। वाघा बॉर्डर तक छोड़ने आना पड़ा था और तब आपने उनकी मुंडी देखी होगी टीवी पर। आपको, आपको गर्व हुआ की नहीं हुआ? आपका सीना चौड़ा हुआ की नहीं हुआ, आपका माथा ऊंचा हुआ की नहीं हुआ? (8 May 2019; Kurukshetra, Haryana)

(After the air strike, when India entered and killed the terrorists in their homes, one of our brave soldiers was captured by Pakistan. Pakistan had to leave him within 48 hours. They had come to leave him at the Wagah border and then you must have seen their heads on TV. Aren't you proud? Isn't your head held high?)

In this excerpt Mr. Modi is showcasing the incident where Pakistan returned a captured Indian soldier with 48 hours as a great diplomatic victory for India and a testament to its military superiority. He says that Pakistan 'had to' free the soldier, the underlying assumption shared by Mr. Modi has his supporters being that they had no intention to do so and instead wanted to harm him. It must be pointed out that an alternative reading of the Pakistani actions was possible. The returning of the Indian soldier could have been seen as a measure of goodwill and an attempt to forge better relations. However, Mr. Modi interpreted and framed Pakistani actions in a way that would help him create an enemy out of it.

"इस चौकीदार ने उस स्थिति को बदल दिया है। अब अगर डर है तो डर सीमा के उस पार है। वहां सत्ता में बैठे लोगों को तरह-तरह के डरावने सपने आते हैं। आज धमकी देने वाले दुबक गए हैं, और बालाकोट के प्रहार से आतंकी खौफ में हैं। भाइयो और बहनो, आपने देखा कि जब हमने पाकिस्तान के आतंकियों पर प्रहार किया। आपको अच्छा लगा कि नहीं लगा, आप खुश है क्या? मैंने सही किया?" (9 April 2019; Chitradurga Karnataka)

(This watchman has changed that situation. Now if there is fear, it is present on the other side of the border. People

sitting in power are having nightmares there. Today, the bully has gone down, and the terrorists are frightened after the strike in Balakot. Brothers and sisters, you saw when we struck the terrorists of Pakistan. Did you like it or not, are you happy? Was I right in my actions?)

"हर हिंदुस्तानी का जवाब होता है अरे प्रधानमंत्री के पद तो आते-जाते रहते हैं, मेरा कश्मीर रहना चाहिए और इसलिए भाइयो-बहनो, अब कैलेंडर वो तय नहीं करेंगे, दुश्मन देश से तारीखें तय नहीं होंगी, अब तारीखें हिंदुस्तान तय करेगा।" (October 19, 2019. Ellenabad, Haryana)

(The answer of every Hindustani is that Prime Ministers keep coming and going, my Kashmir should remain, and so brothers and sisters, now they will not decide the calendar, dates will not be fixed from the enemy nation, now India will decide the dates.)

In these excerpts Narendra Modi tells his audience about the change in situation that has come about. He says that now, Pakistan is comparatively much weaker than India in terms of military prowess, the fear is on the other side, the Pakistanis are having nightmares and they have been suppressed by India's strength. What that does is give a message to his audience that a war against Pakistan would be easily winnable, there would only be minor losses, and hence the war becomes more desirable. This is accentuated by usage of terms like 'प्रहार' (strike/hit) and as seen in a previous excerpt 'घर में घुसकर मार' (we beat by going inside their homes) to describe military actions where several lives were lost. These terms create an image of military actions which is far less violent and harmful (for all sides) than they actually are, by equating them with 'hitting', 'beating' or 'striking' with which the audience is practically familiar. The usage of these words to describe acts which would undoubtedly take away Pakistani lives shows refusal on Narendra Modi's part to hold any empathy for people of the 'enemy nation', reminding us of the characteristics of the enemy construction process as provided by Spillman and Spillman. Another interesting aspect to note is the Prime Minister asking his audience leadingly if they felt good about the fact that Pakistan is now humiliated, scared and suppressed, as if every damage done to Pakistan by India is a cause of celebration.

In the second excerpt he categorically calls Pakistan 'dushman desh' (enemy country) leaving little doubt in the minds of his audience who they must hate and fight against. He goes on to say that unlike the past, India is going to be aggressive against this enemy from now on.

Conclusion

Several tactics are used by Mr. Modi in his speeches, an important one that requires attention is his ad populems.

आपने देखा कि जब हमने पाकिस्तान के आतंकियों पर प्रहार किया। आपको अच्छा लगा कि नहीं लगा, आप खुश है क्या? मैंने सही किया?

(9 April 2019; Chitradurga Karnataka)

(You saw that when we attacked the terrorists of Pakistan. Did you like it or not, are you happy? Was my action correct?)

Mr. Modi tries to justify his actions by asking his audience if what he did was right. The basis for this can be found in

the common phrase 'the majority is always right'. However, that is not always the case. The presence of a large support base does not quantify the morality of any action. A larger support base is not equivalent to the greater correctness of any action. However, when such a tactic is evoked in speeches, it results in the production of more or less favourable answers that strengthen both the addresser's and the addressee's beliefs.

Mr. Modi's speeches are replete with such questions. They in turn create an environment of agreement among the audience, the existence of any doubts is then reconsidered to fall in line with the majority. In addition, Mr. Modi's belief and stance is strengthened further.

A corollary is created by Mr. Modi, which is again a classic case of pitching one group against another. To evoke togetherness among the members of the in group, a sense of competition is highlighted. In order to create an environment of competition, certain information is left out of verbatim. This being the Indus Water Treaty, Mr. Modi refrains from any mention of the same. Thus, he succeeds in creating a sort of urgency among the audience and urges that we take back each and every drop that belongs to us.

From the above analysis we can infer that although Mr. Modi very tactfully uses all of the techniques in his toolkit to suit his requirements. These include creating a strong united front against aggressors to undermine the aggressor to boost the morale of his cadre. These tactics are used to poke holes in the rhetoric of his political competitors as well as evoking a sense of pride among the masses. However, it is not without its set of drawbacks. The creation of such rhetoric in the public realm often results in the sidelining of other political issues which concern the nation. These include the economy, state of infrastructure, growth, unemployment and healthcare. We must realise that the promotion of a set of ideas more often than not, comes at the cost of another. Additionally, considering the highly digitized world that we are living in, the quantum of information is reaching gargantuan heights. This in turn puts a moral obligation on the speakers to be more responsible with the information that they choose to float in the public realm.

Although the above analysis limits itself to a discourse analysis of Mr. Modi's speeches, that is not to say that speeches made by other leaders cannot be scrutinised using the same methodology. A further probe into the subject might bring to light other interesting revelations contributing to the ocean of literature in this field.

On behalf of all authors, the corresponding author states that there is no conflict of interest.

References

1. Qayyum Faizaan. Constructing the Enemy, published in *The Dawn*, on March 2019. Accessed at <https://www.dawn.com/news/1469957>, 2020.
2. Gee, James. *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis*. Routledge, 1999.
3. Vinx Lars, Carl Schmitt, *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2019 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), Accessed at <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2019/entries/schmitt/>, 2020.
4. Schmitt, Carl. *The Concept of the Political*. Expanded Edition (1932), trans. by G. Schwab, Chicago:

- University of Chicago Press, 2007.
5. Van Tom, De Smedt Eva. Discourse analysis and role performance. In book: C. Mellado, L. Hellmueller & W. Donsbach (Eds.). *Journalistic Role Performance. Concepts, Models, and Measures*. London: Routledge, 2016.
 6. Glynos Jason, Howarth David, Norval Aletta, Speed Ewen. *Discourse Analysis: varieties and methods*. ESRC National Centre for Research Methods.
 7. Tremblay, Reeta and Michelle D. Bonner, In India, Modi's nationalism quashes dissent with help from the media, published in *The Conversation*, 2009. 2019. Ed. Misha Ketchell. Accessed on 17 May, 2020 at <https://theconversation.com/in-india-modis-nationalism-quashes-dissent-with-help-from-the-media-125700>
 8. Larson, Gerald, *Ayurveda and Hindu Philosophical Systems in Philosophy East and West*. 1987; 37:3. Published by University of Hawaii Press.

Notes

1. Balakot is located in Mansehra District in Pakistan's Khyber-Pakhtunkhwa province. Balakot is situated some 190 km away from Islamabad, 81 km away from Uri in Jammu and Kashmir, and 50 km from the Line of Control.
2. Several analysts claimed, among others like the Ujjwala Yojana and Hindutva, the Balakot Strike was a major drawer of votes. One such analysis is available at - <https://www.indiatoday.in/elections/lok-sabha-2019/story/election-results-2019-5-reasons-that-got-narendra-modi-another-term-1532978-2019-05-23> (website accessed on 3rd March, 2019)
3. Here the term hatred has been used because it seemed to be the most fitting. This is not meant to discount the possibility that most Indians might just have a general dislike for Pakistan and some might hardly care. The term has been used to highlight the fact that Pakistan is increasingly being portrayed as a deserving candidate of hatred and negative sentiments for Pakistan is clearly on the rise.
4. Texts of individual speeches were saved under headings in the online archive. The same heading has been used to denote the speeches.