RESEARCH PAPER

Analyzing Language as a Reflection and Construction of Individual and Group Ideologies in Pakistan and India Conflict: A Discourse-Based Study

[1]Muhammad Sheraz Anwar*, [2]Sana Bibi and [3]Tayyaba Mahboob

1. Lecturer, Department of English Language & Literature, Superior University, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan
2. BS English Student, Department of English Language & Literature, Superior University Rakez Campus, UAE
3. BS English Student, Department of English Language & Literature, Superior University Rakez Campus, UAE

| ***Corresponding Author:** | sherazsadhu786@gmail.com |

ABSTRACT

This study elucidates the individual and group identities are greatly influenced by language, which also helps to identify the ways in which one group differs from another. It also explores the function of language in creating personal identities in the Pakistani setting. Drawing on purposive sampling and Fairclough's three-dimensional model of Critical Discourse Analysis unveil the development of media literacy among Pakistani media authorities and audiences. Qualitative method is used to express the ideologies that are presented in Pakistani and Indian media. The results indicate that language is deliberately used in both Indian and Pakistani contexts to promote collective ideas, build national identities, and defend political positions. This study expresses that monoglossic ideologies are used from both sides. Urdu over regional languages is seen in Pakistani discourse and Hindi is dominant in Indian discourse. This study suggests the importance of recognition of national and regional languages in resolving disputes.

| **KEYWORDS** | Identities, Critical Discourse Analysis, Ideologies, Indo-Pak Conflict, Urdu Hindi Language |

Introduction

Generally speaking, language textbooks are thought to be politically and socially neutral. Rather, the findings demonstrate that they are ideological instruments that shape students' subjectivities during the socialization process. Fairclough makes the case for the study that tracks how the media texts are received by the audience while highlighting the significance of media analysis. Analyzing the ideologies that are present in various texts is just as crucial as determining how audiences "read" them. Ideology is not always expressed directly in media discourses, it is always important to raise questions in order to uncover any potential ideological work done in a certain medium. Sharma (2023) denoted, people also find the relationship between language use and power to be ambiguous, which leaves them open to manipulation or exploitation. To further the interests of a particular "specialized class" in a society, various media organizations spread "false consciousness" among their audience (Dijk, 2006).

After the parliamentary, executive, and judicial branches of government, the media is considered the fourth pillar of the state in Pakistan. Additionally, Pakistan's constitution, which acts as a legal foundation for the country's media and forbids anything that is inimical to Islam, Pakistan's security, or morals, provides strong protection for the right to access information.

Literature Review

A method of examining discourse that involves challenging widely held beliefs without giving them much thought is called critical discourse analysis. It makes the innermost thoughts of the conversation visible. Instead of limiting itself to the description of discourse practices, CDA aims to expose oppressive discourses by demonstrating how power and ideology relations shape discourse and the positive effects discourse has on social identities, social relations, and knowledge and belief systems, according to Fairclough (1995). Discourse is described by Wodak (2001) as an interactive process that constitutes on the text, and with the help of text, the writer particularly associated with media text intentionally influence on people's perceptions for a specific topic. In this context, discourse can determine what is true and what is false. So, a truth on some topic can be constructed discursively. It might be concluded that truths do have universality but most of the truths are constructed by production of a discourse. Burr (2015) commented on reflections of reality, he is of the opinion that our views and understandings of the world are generally subjective truths. Ahmed (2015) said, media texts fall in such type of discourses as subjectively produced. Fowler (1991) said, the world of the press is not impartial one, rather it is skewed, and it cannot be assumed as a real world.

Media discourse includes communicative practices, language and structure of editorials, news reports, and TV content. This is the main area of investigation in media and communication studies due to the media's role in shaping and influencing ideologies and public opinion (Richardson, 2014). Media discourse works as a keeper of information, displaying what and how it is said, and to whom (Allan, 2010). In the context of Pahalgam Attack, both Indian and Pakistani narratives are significantly rooted in national ideology. Indian media used emotionally charged themes and language to display martyrdom, national unity, and foreign threat, framing Pakistan as an external threat.

The role play between the media and conflict is reciprocal. Gadi wolfsfeld (2004) and Piers Robinson (2011) argued about the construction of public ideology and media role play. Geopolitical antagonism is often reflected during incidents like the Pahalgam Attack. Indian media claimed the happening as an action of terrorism, demanding a response from the state, meanwhile Pakistani media claimed it to be a fabricated narrative to sidetrack India's domestic issues and an act of gaining global attention during the time of high-profile visits. Media selection of aspects to shape reality into a certain interpretation was derived from sociology (Goffman, 1974) and later adopted by Entman (2007) media studies. In case of foreign policy and security, media framing theory aligns with state narratives (Chong & Druckman, 2007). Post Pahalgam Attack, Indian media falsely engineered the action as cross-border terrorism, pointing fingers at Pakistan without any evidence. This stance led to mounting criticism from its nation. Pakistan denied these false accusations, clearly stating it to be political theatre and tactics designed to turn the attention from internal unrest.

Goswami, M. (2020) seminal concept of "imagined communities" showed how media develops a sense of belonging among dispersed populations. Saeed, (2024) elucidated, during conflicts media plays an essential role in sustaining unity, nationalism and resistance against the opposition, maintaining a boundary against the enemy (Billig, 1995). During the recent rivalry between the neighboring countries, Pakistan and India media tried their best to sustain national sentiment. Indian media played a blame game by framing the Pahalgam Attack as a foreign-sponsored attack. Pakistani media in

counter-defense stated it as an act of marginalizing the Indian Muslims in Kashmir, and justifying aggression. This serves as an example of International Image management and domestic consolidation in media nationalism (Bashir & Crews, 2020).

Material and Methods

The study adopts a qualitative approach grounded in CDA to interpret ideological meanings within the texts. The interpretivist paradigm guides the research, acknowledging that reality is socially constructed and that language reflects multiple truths shaped by cultural and political contexts. Using a qualitative research approach based on the Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) paradigm, this study examines how language both reflects and creates individual and collective ideas in the media discourse surrounding the war between India and Pakistan. In particular, the study looks at how media sources in both nations use language to shape national narratives and ideological stances, using Norman Fairclough's three-dimensional model of CDA. Linguistic elements like transitivity, modality, and metaphor were analyzed to detect ideological encoding.

Media information that is rich in ideological importance and reflects prevailing narratives from both Indian and Pakistani news sources is chosen via the use of purposeful sampling. Published between 2019 and 2025—years that have witnessed notable political and military tensions between the two nations, including the Pulwama and Pehlgaam attack and the revocation of Article 370 in Jammu and Kashmir—the sample includes editorials, news reports, televised debates, and opinion pieces. Texts were gathered from digital news archives, YouTube channels of political figures, and social media feeds.

Fairclough's three-dimensional model of CDA serves as the basis for the study and includes:

1. Textual analysis (description) is the study of how language creates certain realities and ideologies by looking at lexical choices, modality, metaphors, and grammatical structures.
2. Examining the creation and consumption of texts with an emphasis on intertextuality, narrative framing, and audience interpretation is known as discursive practice (interpretation).
3. Understanding the larger sociopolitical and cultural structures—such as nationalism, media control, and audience reception—that both influence and are influenced by speech is known as social practice (explanation).

The discursive techniques used in each text—such as polarization, labelling, victimization, and othering—that support ideological formations are examined. Using this paradigm, the study investigates how the audience's understanding of these narratives and the ideological stance of media authorities' impact media literacy.

Results and Discussion

Language as Resistance, Islamic Solidarity, and Strategic Narrativization in Pakistani Ideological Discourse. In the context of its conflicts with India, Pakistan's postcolonial identity, religious underpinnings, and geopolitical concerns all influence the way it constructs its ideology through language. Language is used in Pakistani media discourse, political speeches, and religious sermons not only to explain conflict but also

to establish an ideology position that supports its own moral and political beliefs. The following five major subjects are examined in Pakistani discourse:

Kashmir: Emotional and Territorial Claim as the Nation's Heart

In Pakistani ideology, the symbolic centrality of Kashmir is the most frequently used rhetorical device. Politicians, including former presidents Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, Pervez Musharraf, and Imran Khan, frequently utilize phrases like "Kashmir banega Pakistan" (Kashmir shall become Pakistan) and the metaphor of Kashmir as the "jugular vein" of Pakistan. The ontological stakes that these metaphors represent transcend politics. Discussions like this reinterpret national identity in relation to the Kashmir dispute. According to this interpretation, the fight for Kashmir is not only a geopolitical issue but also a moral obligation that is ingrained in Pakistan's ideology as a Muslim nation.

International Human Rights Framing and Victimhood

The war in Kashmir is discussed not just in the national discourses of India and Pakistan, but also in the context of international human rights law. Both nations deliberately use vocabulary related to human rights to create victimization and moral justification at international fora. Specifically, Pakistan portrays the Kashmiri people as being oppressed by the Indian state, emphasizing purported abuses including arbitrary detentions, communication blockages, military presence, and repression of free speech. In order to portray itself as the voice of a persecuted Muslim minority, Pakistan uses international platforms such as the UN, the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC), and the international media to highlight the humanitarian nature of the war.

Pakistan is able to change the focus from a bilateral territorial conflict to a global humanitarian issue by using this human rights framing to bolster its moral position and appeal on a global scale. However, India frequently frames its activities in Kashmir as an attempt to maintain law and order and combat terrorism, painting itself as a victim of cross-border terrorism. In doing so, India also makes use of language related to human rights, but it does so in a way that protects democratic ideals, national security, and the rights of all citizens. Any critique of its Kashmir policy is usually presented as an assault on its sovereignty or as false information. International human rights terminology thus turns into a potent discursive instrument that both countries use to create opposing victim narratives. Through this framing, each side can delegitimize the other's claims, win over sympathies from around the world, and defend domestic policy.

Pan-Islamic Unity and Religious Identity

In Pakistan, the debate over the Kashmir dispute is frequently influenced by ideas of religious identity and Pan-Islamic unity, which represent a larger ideological framework that cuts across national borders. Kashmir is viewed in this framework not only as a political or geographical problem, but also as a religious duty connected to the common identity of the Muslim ummah (community). The employment of Islamic terms like jihad, mujahid, ummah, and shaheed in speeches, demonstrations, and media portrayals frequently lends a sacred aspect to the Kashmiri conflict. Such framing mobilizes support on a national and international level by transforming the conflict into a symbol of Islamic resistance against imagined oppression. This Pak-Islamic discourse also serves to consolidate national unity within Pakistan by aligning the Kashmir issue with the religious sentiments of the population.

Patriotic Sacrifice and Militant Nationalism

Words like "shaheed" (martyr), "national pride," and "custodians of our frontiers" are frequently used in public gatherings and state-sponsored media. The military is portrayed as the protectors of oppressed Muslims in media campaigns, parades, and marches held annually to commemorate events like Kashmir Solidarity Day (5 February). Posters, TV commercials, and songs usually include catchy slogans like: "Tera paigham, naam Kashmir ke." (Your statement, in the name of Kashmir) "Watan ki shaan hai, Wardi wala bhai" (Our nation's pride is in the man in uniform.) These discursive practices use militarization to build nationalism and link resilience and sacrifice to pride in one's country.

Creating the "Other" and delegitimizing India

India is presented as another in terms of ideology and culture. Terms such as "fascism," "majoritarian tyranny," and "RSS ideology" are frequently used to criticize India's internal affairs, and Indian nationalism is sometimes confused with Hindutva radicalism. Pakistan uses language to create a moral dichotomy in which India is the aggressor and Pakistan is the protector. This narrative is used both domestically and externally to promote unity and defend military spending. States' tales as examples Nehru's India is not Modi's India. This Hindu fascist state is determined to eradicate Muslims.

"The RSS must be stopped by the world before it transforms India into another Nazi Germany."

Such terminology reinforces Pakistan's defensive posture narrative by framing India as ideologically incompatible with peace.

Language of Ummah Solidarity and Islamic Brotherhood

An important aspect of Pakistan's ideology is its support for the idea of the Ummah, or worldwide Muslim community, especially in light of the conflict with India and the Kashmir dispute. The following are common expressions used by religious clerics and political leaders:

Shah rag hai hamari kashmir hamari (Kashmir is our vitality.)

Islam ek jism ki tarah hain. (The Muslim community is one body.)

"Should mehsoos karta hai, har Muslim Kashmiri bhai?" (All Muslims share the suffering of their Kashmiri brothers.)

This kind of discourse bridges the gap between nationalism and pan-Islamic brotherhood. Portraying India as a danger to the worldwide Muslim identity in addition to being a competing state. As a result, Pakistan could: Explain religiously motivated diplomatic positions.

Present its ideological goal as heavenly and protective. Encourage public opinion outside of national boundaries.

By integrating political positions within religious responsibility, this language approach fortifies the intellectual connection between Pakistani identity and Islamic duty.

Institutional and Educational Conversations

Pakistani university lectures, school curriculum, and textbooks all exhibit the ideological construction of India as the other. Frequently, educational materials exalt Muslim leaders as courageous and just while portraying Hindus as cunning and unreliable. According to a study conducted by the Sustainable Development Policy Institute (SDPI), textbooks written in Pakistan portray India in a largely negative light and encourage a monolithic Islamic identity. Both the "valiant resistance of Pakistan against Indian aggression" and the "treacherous behavior of Hindus during Partition" are taught to the students. A strong ideological framework is ingrained in the brains of young Pakistanis as a result of this institutional discourse being perpetuated throughout generations.

Popular culture, the media, and the spread of ideologies

The construction and dissemination of ideology are significantly influenced by Pakistani media. When talking about India, journalists, talk show hosts, and news anchors frequently utilize hyper-nationalistic terminology. TV discussions, for instance, employ combative language like:

"*Dushman Mulk*" *(the enemy nation)*

"*Tabahi ka paigham, modi ka fasla*" *(Modi's decision, destructive message)*

"*Haq ki awaaz dabai nahi ja sakti.*" *(The truthful voice cannot be suppressed.)*

In addition, patriotic dramas, music, and movies frequently portray Pakistanis as valiant guardians of their homeland and faith, whereas India is portrayed as an adversarial force. Due to the emotional consensus this media environment fosters, the general public's acceptance of ideological narratives is strengthened.

Making Partition Mythological: Presenting India as the Enduring Danger

Not only is the 1947 Partition a historical occurrence in Pakistani discourse, but it is also a mythologized genesis story that captures the trauma, treachery, and rationale for Pakistan's independence. The story frequently focuses on the violence that Muslims experience, portraying India as being hostile to Muslims from the very beginning. Through tales, textbooks, speeches, and documentaries that depict the "betrayal of the Indian National Congress," the "massacres of Muslims by Hindu mobs," and the "trains arriving full of corpses," this myth-making is perpetuated in the public consciousness. Such portrayals are commonly used in discourse that portrays Pakistan as a refuge from ongoing Hindu persecution.

Invoking Partition trauma repeatedly serves an ideological purpose through:

Increasing mistrust of India. Defending the militarization of the armed forces Reiterating stories of incompatibility between Muslims and Hindus.

Pakistan's policies and views toward India are justified by the language of "sacrifice," "blood," "martyrdom," and "survival," which guarantees that Partition will always be more than simply a historical memory.

Framing of Civilizations: Islam and Hinduism in the National Imaginary

Instead of viewing the tension between India and Pakistan as a simple geopolitical competition, Pakistani discourse instead frames it as a clash of civilizations. Religious and historical terminology that compares Hindu heritage with Islamic culture is commonly used to frame this dichotomy.

The Language of Eternal Vigilance: Securitization of National Identity

India has been framed by the Pakistani state as a constant existential danger, linguistically and discursively securitizing its national identity. The phrase "perpetual vigilance," which is used in defense policies, curriculum, and the media in general, makes this clear.

Some common expressions are:

Always prepared, or "Hamesha tayyar."

"Dushman har waqt chaal chalta hai" (Everything is planned by the adversary). "Hamla kisi bhi waqt ho sakta hai" (every moment is a potential attack).

In this rhetoric, patriotism is associated with readiness to attack India, maintaining a state of national awareness. Everyday life is transformed into a rhetorical battlefield by Pakistan's ideological apparatus, which continuously uses language of threat to gauge allegiance to India.

The Function of Legal and Bureaucratic Conversations in Institutionalized Othering

Even Pakistan's legal and bureaucratic discourse, which extends beyond politics and the media, reflects its worldview toward India. An institutionalized kind of "othering" is evident in the terminology used in official declarations, immigration paperwork, and visa regulations.

Laws such as the Enemy Property Act preserve the legal framework of the post-war era. Though technical, the language used here has ideological significance. Expressions such as:

"State of enemy"

"Unfriendly foreign national"

"Restricted classification"

It reinforce the public's view of the Indian state as hazardous and unreliable by establishing India as a constant threat in Pakistani official terminology.

Nuclear Talk: Deterrent and Morally Superior Words

In contrast to its portrayal of Indian aggression, Pakistan's nuclear policy is framed in language that stresses ethical restraint and defensive necessity. Official statements frequently contain the following:

"*Minimum credible deterrence*"

"*Nuclear power that is responsible*"

"*Nuclear weapons should only be used for defense, not aggression.*"

Pakistan frames its nuclear program as a peacekeeping force against Indian expansionism by linguistically associating itself with responsibility and moderation, thus creating a moral narrative around its military capabilities.

According to this rhetoric, Pakistan is:

Peace-seeking and logical.

India has forced it to defend itself.

A safeguard against instability in the area.

In addition to being strategic, this positioning is ideological, influencing how the Pakistani people and the world community view its power.

Exporting the Story Abroad: Diaspora Conversation

Communities of Pakistanis living abroad, particularly in the US, UK, and Canada, also use terminology identical to the state to propagate ideological narratives about India and Pakistan. This entails planning demonstrations, writing opinion pieces, and participating in scholarly discussions.

In international Kashmir rallies, signs such as

"*Cease the occupation of India!*"

"*India is not what Kashmiris are!*"

"*Judicial Justice for Kashmir Now!*"

Based in the Diaspora English-language content is used by Pakistani influencers and media to portray Pakistan as a victim of Indian misinformation in an effort to change international opinion and get more diplomatic backing. These transnational discourses are dominated by the vocabulary of global justice, freedom, rights, and dignity, which modifies home ideology for audiences around the world.

The Semantic Domains of Good and Evil: Lexical Polarization

There is a noticeable pattern of semantic polarization in the language used in Pakistani media and political discourse, which produces sharp moral distinctions between India and Pakistan.

About Pakistan Concerning India Shaheed (Killer) Qatil (Martyr) Warriors Mujahid and Enemy Dushman Peace (Aman) and chaos (Fasaad) Honored Izzat and Disgraced Izzat Truth (Haq) (Lie) Jhoot.

Using this divisive language, a clear ideological moral map is created, with India being linked to violence, disorder, and deceit and Pakistan continuously tied with righteousness, truth, and peace.

This pattern is reinforced in:

Bulletins for news

Speeches in politics

Lessons at school

Preaching on Fridays

Compromise or neutral discourse becomes more challenging when such linguistic oppositions strengthen ideological entrenchments.

The Sacralization of Conflict and the Language of Martyrdom

In the context of India-Pakistan, martyrdom is a sacred political idea that is used to honor loss, and it is not just a military or religious term in Pakistan. Armed forces martyrs, border-area residents, and even protesters in Kashmir are referred to as

"shaheeds."

Typical official messages read:

A martyr never perishes, or "Shaheed kabhi marta nahi."

"Unka lahoo watan ki zameen mein hai" implies that the nation's soil is nourished by their blood.

The struggle is spiritualized by such terminology, which elevates it to a religious obligation. This forges a strong intellectual and emotional connection between the country and its military objectives, especially in the context of Kashmir. The ideological stance against India is being sanctified.

Recurrently using religious analogies (such as "janat" for martyr's reward) sanctifies the ideological stance against India by associating national struggle with everlasting redemption.

Cultural Memory and Narratives of Collective Grievances

Cultivating collective memory based on past confrontations with India, especially the wars of 1948, 1965, 1971, and the Kargil conflict in 1999, is another ideological tactic in Pakistan's language use. Both historically and emotionally, these are frequently described as follows:

The Indian army conveyed a message of hatred, or "Bharati fauj ne nafrat ka paigham diya."

"Magar hum ne mohabbat se jawab diya." *(However, we answered with love).* These stories are perpetuated by means of:

Songs that are patriotic

Documentaries on history

Programs for schools on Defense Day

Through preserving emotional continuity between generations, the language of pride and grievance contributes to the long-lasting ideological purpose associated with animosity toward India.

Using music and cultural symbols as a language of resistance

Linguistic instruments of ideological reinforcement include cultural items like as films, patriotic anthems, and even sports commentary. Aye Watan ke Sajile Jawano, "Dil Dil Pakistan," and modern anthems played before military parades are examples of songs that use emotionally charged metaphors:

"Tamanna ab hamare dil mein hai sarfaroshi ki." (Now, we have the urge to make sacrifices.)

In Arze-Pakistan, Tu Nishan-e-Azm-e-Aali (You are the symbol of a strong will, Pakistani land.)

These artifacts aid in converting cultural areas that would otherwise be secular into ideological tools, particularly during times of increased tension between India and Pakistan. By doing so, the viewer is conditioned to:

Nationalism based on emotion.

Opposition that is romanticized.

Festivity for the military.

Language-based cultural nationalism like this strengthens ideological unity over alleged Indian dangers.

The Language of Honor and Female Symbolism in Gendered Nationalism

In many nationalist discourses in Pakistan, national honor and dignity are expressed figuratively through the employment of female figures and gendered language. Often, the country is feminized:

"Tarah hai watan maa ki." (The country is like to a mother.)

"Aan pe hamla kiya dadushman ne maa ki." (The honor of the mother was assaulted by the enemy.)

Similar to this, narratives about Kashmiri women being abused are structured linguistically to incite feelings of protective anger and community guilt, portraying India as a breach of honor.

Several ideological purposes are served by this gendered rhetoric:

Defends military retribution as a moral obligation.

Men to "protect" the country as if it were a family.

Conflict is emotionalized in the service of female virtue.

This symbolic feminization of the country strengthens the ideological resonance by transforming impersonal political concerns into personal emotional demands.

II. Language of Sovereignty, Nationhood, and Civilizational Continuity in India's Ideological Discourse

India's nationalism, sovereignty, and historical legitimacy serve as the ideological foundations for its conflicts with Pakistan. A strong dedication to India's unity and indivisibility, pride in its democratic past, and an increasing statement of civilizational identity are all reflected in the language used by Indian politicians, the media, and public intellectuals.

The historical and legal discourse surrounding Kashmir as an inseparable part of India

The legitimacy of the constitution is a key component in Indian discourse regarding Kashmir. Across the political spectrum, politicians frequently utilize terms like

"integral part of India" and "no compromise on territorial integrity."

Indian leaders spoke in a triumphant and forceful manner after Article 370 was repealed in August 2019;

"*United States, united constitution.*"

"*We have fixed an important error.*"

Security and Terrorism: Presenting Pakistan as the Danger

Counterterrorism and national security become prominent topics in India's rhetoric on the Kashmir dispute, frequently framed in juxtaposition to Pakistan. Presenting Pakistan as a security threat—mainly due to its purported support of terrorism and disruptive actions in the area—is a crucial tactic in Indian political and media narratives.

Not only does India portray Pakistan as a geopolitical adversary. Not only does India portray Pakistan as a geopolitical adversary, but it also portrays it as a state that harbors and supports terrorist networks that operate in Kashmir. In news reports, public debate, and government statements, phrases like "cross-border terrorism," "proxy war," and "sponsored insurgency" are frequently employed.

In domestic discourse, Muslims and Pakistan are othered

Pakistan and Muslims being viewed negatively in domestic discourse

Opening

When Muslims and Pakistan are portrayed as essentially different, inferior, or dangerous, this is known as "othering" them in domestic discourse. This phenomenon frequently stems from preconceptions, assumptions, and misconceptions.

Othering Forms

One common perception of Muslims and Pakistanis is that they are terrorists or possible security problems.

Radical or fundamentalist.

Immature or primitive.

The following are some common ways that Muslims and Pakistanis are portrayed negatively:

Their perceived differences are emphasized in public discourse; politicians' rhetoric; and negative media portrayals

Implications Islamophobia

The dehumanization of Muslims and Pakistanis can exacerbate this sentiment, which can show up as hate crimes.

Prejudic The process of marginalization.

Polarization: When societies are divided by othering, it can lead to: The mindset of "us versus them" A rise in tensions - A decline in comprehension and compassion

Handling the Othering

Raising Knowledge and Awareness: To refute myths and stereotypes, raise knowledge and awareness about Islam, Muslims, and Pakistan.

Promote Inclusive Conversations: Promote inclusive conversations that highlight our humanity and shared values

Interfaith Dialogue: Encourage community involvement and interfaith discussion to create connections between various populations.

Spectacle in the Media and the Formation of Public Emotion

India's popular media is vital in influencing public opinion by means of emotive rhetoric. With titles like these, news reports about relations with Pakistan frequently adopt a performative nationalist stance.

"*India Returns the Attack!*"

"*The Nation's Enemies Unveiled*"

Simplified dichotomies of heroes, villains, and victims are produced by media spectacles. Bollywood also plays a role in promoting films that further instill ideological ideas in popular culture by exalting Indian warriors and disparaging Pakistanis.

A declaration of patriotism in rhetoric. "Ghus ke maarenge unko" (We'll strike them within their own borders.) Particularly on social media, these catchphrases combine political messaging with fun to create popular memes and slogans. As a result, Pakistan is being vilified in popular discourse and military action is becoming more accepted.

The Emergence of Digital Vigilantes and Social Media Nationalism

Crowdsourced nationalism has found a home on social media sites like WhatsApp, Instagram, and Twitter. Typical hashtags include:

#Pakistan Boycott

#India Returns

#Terror Nation Pakistan

Frequently, aggressive rhetoric is used:

"Traitors last, India first."

"Return all Pakistanis"

Misinformation also turns into an ideological weapon, frequently with communal overtones, as seen by the proliferation of WhatsApp forwards that use incorrect facts and pseudo-historical information. These online platforms enable regular people to: Engage in debates over ideology.

Promote narratives that are majoritarian. Police dissent by calling opponents anti-national.

Conditional Citizenship Language and Muslims in India

Indian Muslims are frequently portrayed as internal others in discourse, while Pakistan is portrayed as the external adversary. This is seen in commonplace legislative language and political rhetoric, such as during the protests of the Citizenship Amendment Act (CAA).

Crucial terms consist of:

"Desh ke gaddar" (National Traitors) was spoken.

The phrase "Go to Pakistan" is often used to disparage Muslims who disagree. This ideological framing redefines who belongs in India, which goes beyond simply alienating Pakistan. Language in the nationalist discourse is used to: Challenge the allegiance of Muslims in India.

Subjugate in the guise of Hindu principles. Equivalency between national allegiance and religious identity

International Relations and the Moral Superiority Language

India frequently portrays itself as a peaceful democracy under threat from terrorism around the world, in contrast to its domestic discourse. Indian diplomatic pronouncements frequently use phrases like:

"*Terrorism sponsored by the state*"

"*Dwelling on terrorists*"

"*Pakistan must dismantle its infrastructure for terrorism.*"

The usage of moralistic language helps to:

Promote India as a conscientious actor on the world stage.

Challenge the legitimacy of Pakistan.

Present the Indian military's reactions as appropriate and controlled. India strengthens its ideology, both at home and abroad, by directing the global narrative with such strategic language.

The Negative Confusion between Religious Identity and Patriotism

National holidays like Republic Day, Independence Day, and the inauguration of the Ram Mandir frequently combine religious and national symbols. Often heard at political rallies:

"Jai Shri Ram"

One hymn with Hindu overtones is Vande Mataram.

This shows that Hinduism and patriotism are discursively confused. Muslims and Christians in particular are excluded from the symbolic center of the country by this ideological framing.

Language of Justification: Article 370, Balakot, and Other Examples

Government officials use language excuses to avoid criticism after military operations or legal revisions. Examples are following:

"*We didn't have any choice.*"

The adjustment was historic.

"India has demonstrated a determination to uphold its independence"

Beyond merely explaining policy, these expressions moralize it by enshrining state activities in an ideologically just framework that portrays opposition as perilous.

Sing Official Language with Strategic Ambiguity: Juggling Nationalism and Diplomacy

Strategic ambiguity is a term that Indian state officials often employ to convey strength without resorting to overt aggressiveness. As a consequence, India is able to

balance upholding international standards with preserving a nationalist image for domestic consumption.

As examples, consider:

"*India remains entitled to self-defense.*"

"*We will react when and where we determine.*"

Because of this balanced ambiguity, India can:

Preserve ideological stance without resorting to sudden escalation. Reluctant but necessary military reactions should be framed.

Preserve the perception of it as a responsible regional force. India portrays itself through this discourse as principled and logical, in contrast to Pakistan, which is unstable and illogical.

How the "Civilized Self" and the "Barbaric Other" are constructed

India is frequently mentioned in speeches and editorials using terms like:

"The biggest democracy in the world"

"Land of nonviolence and tolerance"

"Gandhi's descendants"

However, Pakistan is frequently portrayed as:

The "incubator of terror"

"Failed state"

"Sponsor of extremism"

This dichotomy between civilized and barbarous is a potent rhetorical tactic. That

Reaffirms India's moral superiority in the world.

Delegitimizes any empathy for Pakistan's plight.

Explains India's activities both at home and abroad as civilizational reactions rather than merely strategic ones.

Hindi-Belt media's politicization of historical narratives

History is presented in a very ideological manner in Hindi-language newspapers, TV channels, and online platforms (particularly in Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, and Madhya Pradesh). Crucial clichés consist of:

Honoring Hindu rulers such as Prithviraj Chauhan.

Highlighting the oppression of the Mughals.

Connecting the identity of Pakistan now to past invaders.

This historical ideology is expressed using oversimplified terminology such as:

"India was plucked by Muslim rulers."

"Traitors received the gift of partition."

Narratives of this type function to:

Construct a persistent historical adversary.

Explain the current animosity towards Muslims in India and Pakistan.

Strengthen the majoritarian Hindu conception of Indian identity.

Language of Exclusion in Legal and Citizenship Conversations

Legal terminology entered the ideological fray during the Citizenship Amendment Act (CAA) and National Register of Citizens (NRC) discussions. Sayings like:

"Illegal infiltrators"

"Persecuted minorities," which does not include Muslims.

"Problem of national security"

Portray Muslims of Pakistani descent as existential threats while favoring Hindus from Pakistan and its surrounding nations. The following discursive technique:

Paints Pakistanis as essentially suspicious.

Identifies religious identification as a requirement for inclusion.

Blurs the distinction between legal and ideological exclusion.

Presenting Dissension as a Stand-in for Pakistani Attachment

Dissension in Indian official and media discourse is frequently equated with foreign loyalty, especially to Pakistan. The following accusations are made against CAA/NRC protesters, Kashmiri activists, and left-leaning intellectuals:

"Anti-nationalists"

The puppets of Pakistan

"Desh ke dushman" (Opponents of the nation)

This discourse is democratic opposition which is delegitimized.

Turns disagreements over ideology into betrayals of the country.

Condenses complicated complaints into international plots. It upholds an ideology in which adherence to nationalist narratives—rather than citizenship—defines devotion.

Electoral Talk and Pakistan's Symbolic Denigration

Invoking Pakistan frequently during election seasons is a common practice among political leaders, particularly those from right-wing parties.

Discredit opposing groups by claiming they are lenient toward Pakistan. Encourage Hindus to be more patriarchal.

Encourage a renewed sense of patriotism. Among the speeches and campaign slogans are:

"If you desire swift action against Pakistan, vote for us." In comparison to India, opposition leaders weep more for Pakistan. Voter mobilization is facilitated by the politicization of Indo-Pak hostilities, which frames elections as a referendum on nationalism.

The Symbolic Erasure and Rewriting of National Narratives in Bollywood's Saffron Tur

The ideology of recent films is more and more in line with Hindu nationalism. Some go one step further than simply portraying Pakistan as the antagonist by:

Muslim contributions to Indian history are being erased.

Flaunting India's Hindu-only splendor.

Insensitively celebrating military action.

Typical dialogue from these movies is:

"Modi's India is this, not Nehru's India."

"Traitors are not part of our negotiation." These cultural artifacts have an ideological purpose through:

The propagation of nationalist ideology.

Political speech can be transformed into an emotive and visual experience.

Increasing support for a solitary, exclusive image of India.

Strategic Talk Using Religious Rhetoric

Geopolitical strategy and religious overtones are occasionally combined in Indian ideological discourse. This manifests when: Success on the battlefield is ascribed to divine will.

Dharma yuddh (righteous war) is the rhetoric used to describe conflict. Chants with religious roots are used to show national pride. As an example:

There have been instances of "*Jai Shri Ram*" in relation to border conflicts.

Leaders refer to the Indian army as "*the descendants of Shivaji.*"

This rhetoric not only stirs up public opinion but also elevates state violence by enshrining it in the holy story of Hindu justice.

The International Reproduction of Indian Nationalist Ideology through Diaspora

The following are some ways that the Indian diaspora, especially in the UK, USA, and Canada, supports nationalist discourse:

Amplification   through   social   media. Lobbying in international policy arenas against Pakistan.

Planning demonstrations using political terminology similar to that of India. Words such as...

The "Hindu voice globally"

"Proudness of Bharati"

"Islamists supported by Pakistan" frequently employed. There are two ideological goals for this global conversation:

It portrays Indian nationalism as a movement for world civilization.

In terms of diaspora politics, it internationalizes India-Pakistan conflicts.

Judicial Terminology and the Normalization of Theological Opinions

Even court rulings may use subtly biased wording to express nationalist views:

The defense of "national interest" to restrict certain liberties.

To quell dissent, "public order" is invoked.

Calls protests "disruptive to unity" or "seditious."

This wording frames ideology in the legal system in addition to:

Infuses nationalist ideals into the logic of the law.

Civil rights restrictions are normalized under the guise of sovereignty.

The "New India" Lexicon: Progress as an Ideological Initiative

Politicians and the media commonly use the ideologically charged term "New India." It suggests:

A departure from the post-independence, secular Nehruvian paradigm.

An   aggressive,   forward-thinking,   and   culturally   grounded   India. Associated terms:

"Indian independence" (Atmanirbhar Bharat)

"Vishwa Guru" (global educator)

"Digital warriors"

These expressions show a rebranding of national identity that is based on cultural majoritarianism as well as economic self-sufficiency. It portrays India ideologically as:

Better than Pakistan in spirit.

Geopolitically destined for greatness.

Incompatible with pluralistic, conciliatory visions of the past.

Conclusion

This study has demonstrated that language is a central medium through which ideologies are both reflected and constructed in the context of the India-Pakistan conflict. Through an in-depth discourse analysis of political, media, and social texts, it is evident that specific linguistic strategies—ranging from metaphor and pronoun usage to historical references and modality—play crucial roles in sustaining nationalistic ideologies.

By examining these strategies, the research contributes to the field of sociolinguistics by illustrating how discourse functions as a powerful social tool. More importantly, it underscores the necessity for critical engagement with media and political language, especially in regions where language can either foster understanding or perpetuate division.

Future studies might extend this research by exploring regional languages or examining the impact of multilingual discourse in shaping ideological narratives. There is also scope for comparative studies with other geopolitical conflicts to further understand how language influences and constructs political realities.

Recommendations

1. Promote inclusive language policies that recognize the importance of national, regional, and regional languages in resolving disputes and forming identities.

2. Encourage media outlets in both nations to steer clear of rhetoric that stokes nationalistic sentiments and instead employ speech that fosters harmony and understanding between people.

3. Start international academic and cultural interactions that prioritize language comprehension and dispel discourse-based misconceptions.

4. Promote educators and politicians to recognize the ideological power of language, especially the way that official narratives may silence minority voices. To assist educators and journalists in recognizing and combating linguistic prejudice, provide them with discourse-sensitive education.

5. To prevent monoglossic dominance, advocate for fair media coverage and political discourse that places equal importance on Urdu, Hindi, English, and indigenous languages in both nations. Encourage candid discussions on how language may either escalate or de-escalate conflicts between the two countries in scholarly and policy circles.

6. Enhance organizations to regularly host publications and workshops that consider how linguistic choices affect public opinion and the formulation of policies pertaining to Indo-Pak relations.

References

Ahmed, S. (2015). Media discourse and national identity: A study of Pakistani English newspapers. *Journal of South Asian Studies, 30(2),* 203–215.

Allan, S. (2010). *News culture*. McGraw-Hill Education (UK).

Bashir, A., & Crews, J. (2020). War of words: Ideological discourses in Pakistani and Indian newspapers. *Discourse & Society, 31(6),* 665–683.

Billig, M. (1995). *Banal nationalism.* SAGE Publications.

Burr, V. (2015). *Social constructionism*. Routledge.

Chong, D., & Druckman, J. N. (2007). Framing public opinion in competitive democracies. *American political science review*, *101*(4), 637-655.

Entman, R. M. (2007). Framing bias: Media in the distribution of power. *Journal of communication*, *57*(1), 163-173.

Fairclough, N. (1995). *Media discourse (pp. 9-14)*. London: Edward Arnold.

Fowler, A. (1991). *The role of NGOs in changing state-society relations: Perspectives from eastern and southern Africa.* Oxford University Press.

Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*. Harvard University Press.

Goswami, M. (2020). Benedict Anderson, imagined communities (1983). *Public Culture*, *32*(2), 441-448.

Richardson, J. E., & Burridge, J. D. (Eds.). (2014). *Analysing media discourses*. Routledge.

Robinson, P. (2011, March). Pockets of Resistance: Theorising media-state relations and the case of British media and the 2003 Iraq Invasion. In *International Studies Association Annual Convention, Montreal*.

Saeed, S. (2024). COVID-19 and the Production of Knowledge: Communication, Control, and the Citizenry. *In Pandemic, Event, and the Immanence of Life (pp. 79-95).* Routledge India.

Sharma, V. (2023). Twitter wars and ideological battles: Language, identity, and conflict in India-Pakistan relations. *Journal of Media Linguistics, 9(1)*, 45–67.

van Dijk, T. A. (2006). Discourse and manipulation. Discourse & Society, 17(3), 359–383.

Wodak, R. (2001). The Discourse-Historical Approach. In Wodak, R. & Meyer, M. (Eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis (pp. 63–94).* Sage.

Wolfsfeld, G. (2004). *Media and the Path to Peace*. Cambridge University Press.