Discourse Formation in Musharraf Era Analysed in the Lens of Post-structuralism

Muhammad Talha Saleem[*] & Mudassir Ayub[†]

Abstract

The post-structuralist framework, introduced by Micheal Foucault and Derrida, is rooted in the power, knowledge, language, and identities that emerge throughout time. According to this theory, words do not have fixed scientific meanings but vary depending on the circumstances. Employing a Critical Discourse Analysis framework, this study analysed the discourse formation in Musharraf era through the lens of post-structuralism. Here, the discourse is defined as a performative activity, emphasizing the fundamental power of language in the production of subjects and social realities. Discourse is constructed at the power-knowledge nexus. It is spread in society through linguistics and semiotics (written, spoken, and visual). The content analysis technique is employed to uncover the truth hidden in the language. Exploration of various sources, including the literary journals, archives, books, theses, reports, and archival newspapers, revealed that a discourse with the concept of moderation was introduced on Pakistan's alliance with the United States of America against terrorism. Sounds of liberalization, media development, and progress were ubiquitous in this discourse. A power-knowledge nexus and emotional language were employed to convey Islamic narratives to the local masses. Enlightened moderation discourse was simulated to tackle the progressive society and the international community.

[*] M. Phil. Scholar, National Institute of Pakistan Studies, Quaid-i-Azam University Islamabad.
[†] Research Associate at MUSLIM Institute Islamabad-London.

Keywords

Enlightened Moderation, Discourse Analysis, Perception Building, Propaganda, Power-Knowledge Nexus, Martial Law.

1. Introduction

In 1999, Pakistani society witnessed the political transition from democracy to dictatorship. Pervez Musharraf became the 'Chief Executive' of Pakistan on October 12, 1999 (Hussain, 2019). On the other hand, in September 2001, a terrorist attack took place on the World Trade Centre in the United States of America, unleashing the War on Terror in the form of the US-led global counter terrorism campaign (State, 2001). On September 12, a letter of condolence was sent from the President's office in Pakistan to the US President. Letter strongly condemned the terrorist attacks in Washington and urged the world to unite against this "modern-day evil." On September 13, Wendy Chamberlain gave a list of seven demands, which included logistical support, intelligence operations, allowing the US to conduct military operations against al-Qaeda, publicly condemning the terrorist attack, cutting all support to the Taliban in Afghanistan, and breaking all kinds of relations with the Taliban government (Yamin, 2015). Pakistan accepted all demands without any conditions. Becoming an ally of the US, it agreed to help the Allied/NATO forces in Afghanistan. In return for the US support, Pakistan received distinct socio-economic and military benefits.

In South Asia Specifically, after 9\11, the concept of foreign aid shifted from economic development to eradicating terrorism, mainly by non-state actors. In 2004, Afghanistan and Pakistan received $657 million in economic aid and $395 million in military aid (Shehzad et al., 2020). On the other hand, the country was facing growing extremism, drug trafficking, and a weak economy. To mitigate this, Pakistan expanded its science and technological capabilities, provided scholarships for students, and fostered close bilateral relations with the United States. Both countries also collaborated in the energy sector to address Pakistan's growing energy needs. Similarly, quota-free access to the US markets, particularly for cotton-based products, helped diversify and expand exports. Similarly, the Kerry-Lugar-Berman bill of 2009, for example, authorized $7.5 billion

in nonmilitary assistance over five years (Rafique, 2011). Thus, various socio-economic projects were launched with the aid received from the US.

General Pervez Musharraf overthrew Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif's government, with having the military on the same page. He addressed the nation on national TV and Radio, stating that the coup was necessary to restore democracy and resolve the issues such as corruption and economic deterioration. He suspended the Constitution and dissolved the National Assembly, and assumed the role of Chief Executive. In 2001, Musharraf officially became the President of Pakistan (Alam et al. 2020). His era was marked by efforts to modernize the economy and assert Pakistan's role in global affairs. As a strategic ally of the US, Pakistan also received support from the Western world.

When Pakistan became an ally of the US, Glenn Amendment Sanctions imposed because of the 1998 nuclear tests were removed. Along with that, the US provided $600 million in military and $177 million in economic aid. Besides that, in 2003, the US government pledged $3 billion in aid for the next five years. The net total aid provided to Pakistan by the US from 2001 to 2007 was $7.1 billion in the context of military aid, economic assistance, and logistic support. Moreover, Japan also restored its aid to Pakistan, which had been suspended following the 1998 nuclear tests. Japan not only provided Pakistan with a $300 million grant but also supported Pakistan in negotiations with the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the Paris Club. In 2005, Japan resumed its official development assistance to Pakistan, which had previously been around $500 million per year (Dawn, 2020).

There were many global and local implications of Pakistan’s alliance with the US. Musharraf’s government tackled the situation with simulating multiple discourses including the enlightened moderation, liberalization of media, development, women's empowerment, and progress, etc. In that political situation, and global pressure for imposing Martial Law, legitimacy, and public concerns about the alliance with the US, Musharraf used specific language that appealed to the emotions of the people, and they considered him as their leader. His words were understood literally. He managed many challenges successfully and reigned for almost nine years. Through the lens of post-structuralist theory, this study attempts to

understand the discourse of the Musharraf regime. The post-structuralist framework can be defined as there is nothing stagnant in the world. The words are used to construct different narratives or to formulate the identities of different people in front of a mass audience. For the construction of specific discourse, specific jargon is used, which attracts people and leads them to believe it as a truth (Hulatt, 2022). The theory also elucidates the role of the power-knowledge nexus; it does not matter what is right or wrong; what matters is who is saying it and to whom. Power lies in knowledge, which influences others to believe what is right or wrong.

The post-structuralist framework was introduced by Micheal Foucault and Derrida, and its roots lie in the language, power, knowledge, and identities that emerged throughout time. These identities do not have fixed scientific meanings, but they do vary for someone for specific reasons. It is spread through linguistics and semiotics (written, spoken, and visual) in society and the mass audience. Discourse is used to convey the message from the subjective to the objective. According to Foucault, discourse is defined as:

"Practices that systematically form the objects of which they speak. Discourses are not about objects; they constitute them and, in the practices of doing so, conceal their own intervention (Wright, 2004)."

This study undertakes to answer the following questions: How were discourses formulated in Musharraf's era? How did he present himself in public speeches? And did the public incline towards him? The post-structuralist lens is a philosophical approach that challenges fixed meanings. It emphasizes that language, the concept of truth, and the concept of reality are fluid, subjective, and shaped by interpretation. Critical theorists criticized the fixed meanings of truth, as Jacques Derrida notes:

"There is nothing outside of the text (Derrida, 1976)."

He explained that there is no fixed meaning; the language defines it. Similarly, Jean Baudrillard said, "We live in a world where there is more and more information, and less and less meaning (Baudrillard, 1994)."

He emphasized how the meaning is formulated and distorted by different stakeholders to maximize their interests. Many scholars argue that the concept of Post-structuralism is a dead end for the justices in the social sciences: ignore the objective truth and tangible material realities. Although Barry Buzan claims that language constructs reality, he rejects the radical conclusion of theory: deconstruction without a solution. Buzan, along with Ole Wæver, acknowledges that security is not an objective reality, but it is a speech act (Floyd & Schouenborg, 2026). So that the assumptions of Post-structuralism: genealogy, Power and Knowledge nexus, and subjective truth are embedded in today's world, which allows a commentator to use this lens to reach at least a near-truth.

2. Statement of Problem

During Musharraf's era, a discourse of "enlightened moderation" became famous amongst the other diverse discourses, through which the common man and the rest of the world looked at Pakistan. The creation of this discourse involved the nexus of power and knowledge. The choice of words he used in his speeches appealed to the emotions of the people. Musharraf's rule is less examined from the perspective of critical theories. Today, we live in a world dominated by post-truth narratives where truth is often seen as lost in words. Post-structuralist theory seeks this truth, employing genealogy, intertextuality, and the reconstruction of words and statements to uncover the hidden truth in language.

3. Significance of the Research

A theory offers a valuable perspective for understanding any era, time, and ideology, which helps to explain complex issues thoroughly. It is not just a means of intellectual analysis but also a means of understanding how knowledge is created, used, and how it promotes a particular power, interest, and narrative. Every knowledge has a specific historical, political, and social structure, which makes it acceptable in society.

General Pervez Musharraf ruled as the President of Pakistan and the Chief of Army Staff at the same time. Some quarters call his rule an era of progress . In this period Pakistan's alliance with the United States entered

new dimensions. The country had been suffering with an increase on the human rights concerns. Pakistan also received significant financial assistance in this period. Critical theories play a crucial role in understanding such contradictory aspects, and reject the notion that any reality or narrative emerges spontaneously or innocently. Rather, there is a specific political, social, or powerful interest behind each narrative.

The power of words and language, especially in political discourse, influences peoples' thinking and understanding. That is why a theoretical perspective like Post-structuralism helps to understand how power was justified, modernized, and made globally acceptable during the Musharraf era by critically analysing language, media, and global narratives. In today's era, when everything in the world is just a click away, the use of theory is not just an academic exercise but an intellectual necessity, which helps to uncover the reality hidden behind words.

The importance of this research is highlighted at two levels: at the societal and policy-making levels. At the societal level, it explains how discourses are shaped by the interplay of power and knowledge and how these discourses present social realities as the ultimate truth. In this way, this research helps to challenge many stereotypes prevalent in society and make individuals aware that specific intellectual and ideological elements underlie every discourse. At the policy-making level, study provides empirical evidence of how the combination of language, knowledge, and power shapes the educational curriculum and cultural environment. Based on this understanding, policymakers make more effective and informed decisions and adopt an approach that proves to be more sustainable and productive when formulating new policies.

4. Theoretical Framework

The discourse is a bridge between the language and the formation of the structure. Its roots are in the subject of anthropology. Until the 1980s, the term discourse was used only in anthropology. To some extent, discourse theory is a theoretical framework that attempts to understand language and communication in social, political, and cultural contexts rather than in terms of mere structural principles. It began with the structuralist theories of Ferdinand de Saussure, who divided language into

a structured system (langue) and its use (parole), but was later criticized by post-structuralist thinkers such as Michel Foucault, Jacques Derrida, and Pierre Bourdieu, who argued that language is used to construct power, knowledge, and identities. Foucault saw discourse as a form of power that establishes standards of knowledge and truth through social institutions. Thus, discourse theory presents language as a social process that not only produces meaning but also shapes social reality (Paz, 2013).

In today's world, through methods such as advertising, psychological warfare, and propaganda, the social sciences have become more influential on human life than nuclear physics. This is because the social sciences have a direct influence on human behaviour and social systems. Therefore, when one tries to understand or define the social sciences, instead of inventing new terms or classifications, one should look for the common features present in all these branches, so that the basis of this knowledge can be improved and comprehensive, and the truth can be reached (Anderson, 2015). Similarly, the theoretical framework is defined as, "A theory can in itself be a form of practice, that is, if we accept that theory constitutes the world we live in, by advancing a theory, one may either reproduce or change mindsets and, hence, social realities." (Dunne et al., 2013)

A theory in social work refers to explanations and predictions of human behaviour, ranging from broad theories such as psychoanalysis and social learning to specific models for specific problems (Thyer, 2014). Initially, a theory explains security studies that focus on the state, military threats, and power, which is called the realist perspective. While post-structuralist or critical theories often avoid making any clear statement at all, this may disconnect a theory from the real world of politics. In today's world politics, other variables, such as people, identities, and social issues, also influence a theory's ontology. So, the critical theorists focus least on insecurity, violence, wars, and inequality. They consider it as a constructed evil, not by default (Mustapha, 2013). A theory can be defined as: A group of related hypotheses, concepts, and constructs, based on facts and observations, that attempts to explain a particular phenomenon (Barker, 1999).

A theory is a systematically organized set of concepts, definitions, and propositions that explains or predicts phenomena by specifying relationships among variables (Kivunja, 2018).

A theory acts as a lens that is used to see things, events, identities, culture, and sovereignty. Mostly theories are divided into two groups: one is mainstream theories, such as Realism (power and State) and liberalism (institutions). Second is critical theories such as Marxism (economic and class bifurcation), feminism (women's rights), social constructivism, and Post-structuralism (power, language, and discourse). So, the mainstream theories elucidate the fixed meanings and objective realities. Besides that, critical theories elaborate that there is no fixed meaning or objective reality, but it is formulated as per the requirement (Pietrzak, 2024).

There is a need to critically analyse the assumptions and claims made by any theorist. Critical theorists consider reality or the truth to be subjective, not objective. It varies from person to person. To some extent, post-structuralist theory, by Michel Foucault, argues that there is a complex relationship between knowledge, power, and language to construct a discourse known as the discourse of power. Similarly, Jacques Derrida says that 'there is nothing outside the text,' so it draws attention towards the language that is used during the different acts. For example, when 9\11 happened, different language was used; such as 'it is an act of terrorism,' 'an act of evil,' 'a criminal act,' and 'an act of revenge,' etc. Therefore, the text explains various discourses, and to uncover the truth, it is necessary to deconstruct the text (Heywood, 2011). Post-structuralism has four key assumptions: discourse, deconstruction, genealogy, and intertextuality (Baylis et al., 2020).

The concept of discourse given by Michel Foucault supports in making sense of the social world. Politicians use language as a tool to make foreign policy. So, the words are not neutral at all. For example, at the United Nations, someone may denote a happening somewhere in the world as genocide, while others may take it just as tribal warfare. Words thus have deeper meanings. The second assumption of post-structuralism is deconstruction, which is given by French philosopher Jacques Derrida: a single word has multiple meanings, and language is made up of dichotomies. Like, in 2002, President G. W. Bush spoke about an 'axis of

evil'. He wanted to say Iraq, Iran, and North Korea are rogue states and a threat to Western states.

Third is the genealogy, given by Foucault, 'history of the present', which interprets who is giving us the discourse and making decisions? In that specific discourse, which other discourses are being forgotten and marginalized? For example, in the discourse about the climate change and global warming as a Global threat, who tells all this, who creates it, and who are affected? This discourse has been spreading through power. According to Foucault, there are two types of power: at the individual level, we are told to discipline and control our bodies. At the collective level, governments and other institutions seek to manage whole populations through education, laws, and family planning; consequently, a new discourse emerges, known as the discourse of power.

The last assumption of Post-structuralism is intertextuality, which was developed by Julia Kristeva. It is a concept to address the literature gap in the time when some text was written and the circumstances at that time. Does it still exist or not? Do we need it or not? If not, then why is it still practiced in the contemporary world? Who are the beneficiaries of any diffuse concept? For example, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) was formed to counter the Soviet Union's expansion, but who is its beneficiary after the Cold War? To some extent, politicians make their foreign policy based on their identity. To strengthen the foreign policy, they use the popular culture to convey the messages all over the world through new media technologies, such as smartphones, Facebook, and X, which have fundamentally changed who can produce the 'texts' of world politics (Hansen, 2020).

Michel Foucault, the father of Post-structuralism, strengthens the new deconstruction of language, ideas, and social principles. Thus, the theory aims to reform, revise, and reconsider the world's processes. Hence, the theory contributes to making new thinking patterns about socio-political practices. Post-structuralism provides a powerful lens for analysing the formation of discourse through the interplay of language, power, and knowledge during the Musharraf era in Pakistan. Rejecting the notion of fixed meanings and objective facts, this approach describes identities and concepts as constructed through discourse. Foucault's idea of discourse

reveals how Musharraf strategically used terms like 'enlightened moderation' to frame his policies as progressive. In contrast, Derrida's deconstruction exposes the binaries, such as 'moderation' versus 'extremism,' that were used to legitimize his rule. Through Foucault's genealogy, one can trace how historical narratives were constructed to justify global agendas, particularly the war on terror, domestic reforms, and the rise of the modern state. The power-knowledge nexus further illustrates how initiatives such as educational reforms and media expansion were not simply developmental but also mechanisms of governance, creating coherent identities and legitimizing authority. Furthermore, Kristeva's intertextuality explains how Musharraf's discourse echoed international rhetoric, embedding domestic policies in a broader global narrative (Sørensen, 2013). Taken together, these post-structuralist tools expose the subtle but strategic use of language in building power and shaping public understanding during his reign. Similarly, knowledge is not neutral in the presence of the power-knowledge nexus. It is defined as, "All power requires knowledge, and all knowledge relies on and reinforces existing power relations. Thus, there is no such thing as 'truth', existing outside of power." (Jackson & Sørensen, 2013)

5. Application of Theoretical Framework

This paper employs a Critical Discourse Analysis framework to investigate how discourse influences identities, ideologies, and power relations within sociopolitical contexts. Foucault's conception of power as both productive and relational reinforces the sociocultural dimension, allowing the study to connect discourse with historically conflicting mechanisms of control and resistance (Todoli et al., 2015). Similarly, Foucault defines that Knowledge is not made for understanding; it is made for cutting (Resende, & Douglas, 2025). Selected texts from General Pervez Musharraf's speeches and memoirs, particularly those that focus on the formation of discourse on national interest, security, international propagandization, and civil-military relations were analysed. Data selection is based on the presence of contrasting elements such as metaphor, methodology, and ideological framework. Through the process of coding, thematic mapping, and contextual interpretation, the analysis

explores how discourse is used to assert authority, legitimize governance practices, and construct national identity. Further methodological information is provided by Toon A. van Dijk's concept of critical discourse analysis as socio-political discourse analysis, which situates language within power hierarchies and ideologies that reproduce dominance and inequality. Thus, critical discourse analysis serves as a methodology and a form of critical inquiry, enabling the study to challenge the implicit assumptions and accepted truths embedded in political language (Fairclough, 2001).

6. Research Questions

1. How did Musharraf justified his acts on the local and global level?

2. What were the major strategies, narratives, jargon, terminologies, and communication devices used to formulate discourse and justify the policies and actions?

7. Central Argument

The tenure of President Musharraf is viewed through the lens of Post-structuralism to illustrate how the nexus of power and knowledge shapes discourses. Moreover, how President Musharraf conveyed Islamic discourse to the local masses and folk society, as well as enlightened moderation discourse to progressive society and the international community, and how this process contributes to reshaping Pakistan's identity and its international perception are also examined. Analysis focuses specifically on the creation of discourses, their historical development, and the role of power in shaping these discourses. In his speeches, Musharraf employed specific jargon, tailored to the time and place, that evoked emotions in the audience. Critical discourse analysis examines the word choices in these speeches to reveal truths that are perceived as acceptable and seemingly definitive by the public.

8. Research Gap

Post-structural theory argues that there is a power-knowledge nexus that is utilized by a sovereign person who has credibility and acceptability among the masses. What one says is reality or otherwise does not matter.

Only one's issues with language can hinder the formulation of discourse. This paper also looks into what research has already been done on this so far. Musharraf's era was primarily focused on terrorism, civil-military relations, Pakistan's alliance with the US, women's empowerment, economic development, soft foreign policy with India, the 4-point Kashmir solution, lawyer movements, etc. However, the theoretical aspects of the Musharraf era were least emphasized, including the role of language, discourse formation, and how it engages the audience. This research heuristically examines how political authorities utilize the power-knowledge nexus by employing specific language that appeals to their audience, thereby connecting with their intended targets. Moreover, this research also covers the period from the dawn to the decline of the Musharraf era in Pakistan, along with the recognition of his government, which was based on the rhetorical slogans like enlightenment or modernization.

9. Methodology

This is a qualitative study that draws on various primary, secondary, and tertiary sources, including books, scholarly articles, speeches, newspapers, reports, interviews, official correspondence, gazettes, and gazetteers. Internal and external criticism are used to collect and verify data and the authenticity of sources. Inductive methods are used to understand and analyse the data. Content analysis techniques are used to understand the structure, use of jargon, terminology, and word selection. Through the adoption of descriptive and narrative methodologies, the narrative is presented at the official, public, and media levels. Different patterns of the relationship between global and public discourse questions and their answers are analysed using exploratory, analytical approaches and techniques.

10. Critical Discourse Analysis of Musharraf's Speeches

When General Musharraf established a military government in October 1999 under the doctrine of necessity, he faced domestic and foreign pressure. He had to restore democracy. So, elections were announced in 2002. A day before the polls, President Musharraf addressed the nation, in which he highlighted that the main problem the nation was

facing at that time was restoration of democracy. Elections were being held to solve that issue, established in the country. If we do the genealogy and intertextuality of this address, it is clear how the discourse was made, each time making an echo with the thinking of the people. The term real democracy attracts the capitalist states, the youth, and revisionist people (Musharraf G. P., 2002).

President Musharraf stated that regarding elections, he had held meetings with representatives from all schools of thought, including the political, social, business, and women's groups. He said that he found everyone satisfied. Some changes are, however, noted in the statements in his addresses to the students. They were told that the youth and the country have been held hostage for 10 to 15 years. He affirmed that the government was taking necessary steps in that regard. While addressing the general public, workers, and domestic consumers, he would reiterate that he was there to help them. When he spoke to the religious scholars, he assured them that he was realising a government that would be formed and implemented in light of the Islamic democratic system (Musharraf, 2002).

In his speech delivered on January 12, 2002, he pointed out three main problems which country was facing, including: the Kashmir issue; the tension between Pakistan's Islamic identity and political parties; internal sectarian differences; and tagging Pakistan as a terrorist country. It is also true that the country was facing challenges in these domains. The discourse of war on terrorism was on the tongue of every common person. President Musharraf opened his speech by saying that he came to power to eliminate extremism, violence, and terrorism in the country and to move the country towards the true Islamic ideology as given by Pakistan's founder (Musharraf, 2002).

In this context, many madrassas were first kept under observation. Later on, some of them were completely banned. In 2001, more than 400 citizens fell victim to extremism. He echoed this scale of problem in his speech as:

> Islam teaches tolerance, not hatred; universal brotherhood, not enmity; peace, not violence. I have a great respect for the Ulema and expect them to come forward and present Islam in its true light. I urge

them to curb elements that are exploiting religion for vested interests and bringing a bad name to our faith (Musharraf, 2002).

He further mentioned Al-Beruni, Ibn Sina, and Ibn Khaldun in his speech, stating that these individuals also graduated from the madrasas. They not only mastered religious knowledge but also acquired knowledge of mathematics, science, medicine, astronomy, and jurisprudence. The syllabi of all the madrasas in Pakistan ought to be updated in this spirit (Musharraf, 2002).

Addressing the journalists on October 25, 2004, President Musharraf said that his main aim was to appraise Pakistan's place in the world. He further mentioned that four main allegations were being made against the government. He informed that his government neutralised those allegations with its performance. In the first allegation it was pointed out that Pakistan had been sponsoring all the terrorism in Afghanistan. Second, the Kashmir issue has been going on for many decades. He asserted that only his government had been making some progress on these matters. He emphasised that Pakistan and India should work together to solve their issues, for which talks were going on with the Indian Prime Minister (Musharraf, 2004).

Third, Dr. Abdul Qadeer Khan was being denounced as a culprit and rogue scientist, with the allegations that he was selling nuclear technology. In the fourth allegation, Pakistan was being accused as a terrorist country. Pakistanis were associated with many terrorist incidents in the world. Pakistani society was being tagged with extremism and terrorism. Musharraf claimed that his government had taken Pakistan out of all those charges. Moreover, the world had admitted that Pakistan was not involved in all of those activities (Musharraf, 2004).

As evidence of the Almighty's pleasure in him, President Musharraf would tell the people that the doors of the Kaaba were opened for him every time he visited Saudi Arabia. President Musharraf further said, "I want to give you people food for thought. Because I know that you people are writing and speaking a lot about uniforms. If somebody guarantees that with the removal of uniform, there will be total stability?"

He emphasised that the main objective of all the projects that were going on in the country was the economic prosperity (Musharraf, 2004). On January 17, 2004, the President of Pakistan opened his address to the Parliament by stating that all the promises made to the nation had been fulfilled. This includes the establishment of a true democracy (Musharraf, 2004). This clearly manifests how discourse can be created by using words in the right place and at the right time.

President Musharraf, while addressing the OIC meeting on June 1st, 2004, informed all the countries about his model of Enlightened Moderation. In the first part of his speech, he highlighted that noting the number of countries in OIC, it comprised of around half of the world. These countries were being portrayed as warriors in the world. While highlighting the reason for this situation, he pointed out that there were only a small number of people among them who would fight in the name of Islam. He identified them as extremists, terrorists, militants, and radicalized people. Those who were tarnishing the name of Islam for their own interests. If that continued, what message would they be leaving behind for their future generations? He asserted that they needed to correct their identity. Muslim countries ought to invest in science and technology for the benefit of their future generations (Musharraf, 2004).

His model of enlightened moderation was a two-pronged strategy: the Muslim world should reject militancy and extremism, focus instead on socio-economic development, while the West, especially the United States, should help resolve its political conflicts and deal fairly with Muslims. He argued that militancy is born from a combination of political injustice (external or internal), poverty, and illiteracy, which breeds hopelessness and makes people vulnerable to recruitment by extremists. Therefore, addressing these root causes was essential for sustainable peace and development (Musharraf, 2004).

He explained his model of enlightened moderation as follows:

> We have had a glorious past: Islam exploded on the world scene as the flag-bearer of a just, law-loving, tolerant, and value-oriented society. We are taught to have faith in human exaltation through knowledge and enlightenment. We were the fountainhead of learning

> in the Middle Ages. We exemplified tolerance within ourselves and for people of other faiths. Our religion places great emphasis on the resolution of problems through dialogue and has always stood for peace, justice, and co-existence (Musharraf, 2004).
>
> He further argued to strengthen his model,
>
> As the West acquired knowledge and enlightenment from Islam during the Dark Ages and used it for self-development. But unfortunately, we went on the decline and remained in our shells and refused to learn, and to acquire and assimilate from the West, till we got to the present depth of despair and despondency. We have to adopt the path of moderation, a conciliatory approach. A peaceful approach to cleanse ourselves of the charge that Islam is a religion of militancy and is averse to modernization, democracy, and secularism. (Musharraf, 2004).

Musharaf emphasized that both prongs of enlightened moderation must be implemented simultaneously, and both must succeed. If the Muslim world was to implement enlightened moderation by focusing on socio-economic development and reject extremism, then the West must also play its part sincerely in the larger interest of global peace and harmony (Musharraf, 2004).

On April 16, 2005, President Musharraf went to India at the invitation of Indian Prime Minister Dr. Manmohan Singh. He delivered a speech there. He stated that the Kashmir issue is one of the biggest problems between Pakistan and India. Although it was the least discussed in Musharraf's speech. Rather, he remained focused on bilateral relations: forgetting what happened in the past and insisting on the establishment of people-to-people relations. His speech started with: "Today we visited Ajmer Sharif and the Dargah of Hazrat Khawja Moeenudin Chishti in India, where I prayed for the progress and prosperity of both the countries, India and Pakistan." (Musharraf, 2005)

On January 26, 2006, Pervez Musharraf, in his speech at the World Economic Forum, presented Pakistan to the international community as a positive, capable, and trustworthy country. He portrayed his leadership as calm, decisive, and pragmatic: a leader who could handle major natural

disasters, especially crises like the 2005 earthquake, without panic. He explained how the damage was accurately assessed, specialized institutions were established, qualified and talented people were given responsibility, effective strategies were developed, resources were generated, and implementation was ensured with transparency. Musharraf cited his immediate public presence, the provision of cash to revive the economy of the affected areas, and people-centred planning for the reconstruction of houses as prominent examples of success. By demonstrating its ability to effectively manage crises and mentioning the $6.2 billion pledge made by the international community at the donors' conference, he further reinforced the impression that Pakistan can not only resolve crises in an orderly manner but also receive practical support from the world. He conveyed the message at the global forum that Pakistan is a leader in learning from international best practices, maintaining transparency, and seizing development opportunities, and that Pakistan is an organized, responsible, and future-ready country, while he is a leader who prioritizes direct oversight, public outreach, and practical action (Musharraf, 2006).

On April 1st, 2007, the President of Pakistan addressed the Seerat Conference. If the discourse analysis is done, it becomes clear that President Musharraf expressed his pain for the nation and talked about making himself the leader of not only Pakistan but also tried to make all 57 Islamic countries follow his agenda. He said that, unfortunately, today Islam has been hijacked by some elements that are not so enlightened about Islam (Musharraf, 2007).

He further stated that Islam provides the concepts of Ijtihad and Ijma, but Muslims' practices were contrary to them. Muslim societies have always been progressing with the acquisition of knowledge and practicing it. He said that these days, two religious groups from the same country were not ready to sit at the same table for dialogue. Pakistan and Islamic countries could only progress when they unify their words, deeds, and character, as practiced by their Holy Prophet (Peace & Salutations be upon him), whose character proved that he was an example of honesty, integrity, and truthfulness. It has been inspiring people across the world to embrace Islam (Musharraf, 2007).

He further noted that the madrasas should be "centres of knowledge and excellence in science, medicine, astronomy, and mathematics, with successful expertise." On the contrary, people were waging jihad, but it was not known who had imposed this jihad on them. He underscored that this responsibility belonged to the state, but the state was unaware of it. Rather few non-state actors and extremists targeted a few innocent people and trampled on the rights of the people by giving them the lure of paradise. He insisted on the need to end all of this. Moreover, the non-Muslim states did not read the Holy Quran, but they observed or felt whatever the Muslims were doing and practicing in daily life. He realised that the true spirit of Islam needed to be portrayed to them. If the people of Pakistan were to move forward and elevate their status, they would have to follow their government's policies. President Musharraf also mentioned that Allah Almighty had blessed him with the privilege of entering the Haram Sharif. He said that he had been in the Holy Mosque, not just once but six or seven times, and the slogan of Allah-O-Akbar would rise from the roof of the Haram Sharif every time he visited that holy place (Musharraf, 2007).

This discourse has been created in a unique way to attract people and show not only the legitimacy of his authority but also his divine duty, so that the ultimate goal can be achieved. All the things are proven to be correct in appearance. But it is important to understand who benefited from this. The answer that we get from discourse analysis. The beneficiary of all this discourse had been President Musharraf himself, who had gained acceptance not only in the country but also in Western countries. All these sources help in understanding the policies, strategies, and political and social impacts of this era, which show that President Musharraf had been creating his discourse according to the place and the people being addressed. For instance, when he would be in consultation with the religious scholars, he would discuss Islamic democratic principles. When he was with the international community, he would talk about enlightenment and moderation. When with the students, he would speak about corruption, loans, and interest. When addressing farmers, labourers, and women, he would describe himself as their servant.

Conclusion

Research on the reign of President Pervez Musharraf encompasses a review of various sources from his era. This includes Musharraf's writings, the discourse of Pakistan's national and international media on Musharraf's policies, and the study of Musharraf's official and public speeches. He thus knew whom to talk to and what to talk. Which school of thought will believe in which discourse? In his entire tenure, numerous discourses were created in the government according to the occasion. If one looks at all these discourses in today's history, it is clear that, to some extent, states also need these discourses today to solve problems like instability, intolerance, violence, extremism, terrorism, greed, and lust in society. President Musharraf had talked about all the evils of the Pakistani society and its possible solutions as well; however, he did not form inclusive institutions for the implementation of all his thoughts.

One of the reasons for this is the separation of people from their spiritual roots. This threatens the identity of Islam. Due to this, today, people of the state are facing problems like Islamophobia, violence, extremism, intolerance, ethnic, sectarian, and political differences. Discourses have been created and will continue to be created. Their practical application will be possible only when one considers that this is the need of the hour, and whatever has to be done, it should be done for the identity of Islam and Pakistan. There is no undue interest in this. Many discourses that President Musharraf created were for short-term goals. The main purpose of which was to get his legitimate authority recognized in every detail of the country and to get his military takeover approved by the West, in which President Musharraf also achieved success.

The importance of discourse never ends, but what is needed to create a discourse is the nexus of power and knowledge. Along with this, there must be a desire to play a role in knowledge and also in a good designation. In this way, statements are made through discourse and also come into action. Hence, the Micheal Foucault theory of Post-structuralism proved that to construct any discourse, there must also be a historical, political, social, religious, and emotional knowledge to understand the pattern of the application of knowledge through the power of the judiciary, executive, media, and legislative. The main proponent of Foucault is also based on

the binary construction of the identities of the state, religions, emotions, sex, and the people by constructing one over the other. Furthermore, the assumptions of discourse formation, such as genealogy, intertextuality, governmentality, and deconstruction, further help one to reach closer to the historiography of the discourse and the questions that are rising in society and the globe in the post-truth world.

References

Alam, S., Bhatti, M. N., & Asia, S. A. (2020). Civilianization of Military Rule in Pakistan: A Study of Musharraf Era (1999-2005). *Pakistan Social Sciences Review, Volume 4, Issue 2*, 150-163.

Anderson, M. (2015). *Introduction To The Social Sciences With Special Reference to Their Methods.* London and New York: Routledge Library.

Baylis, J., Smith, S., & Owens, P. (2020). *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction To International Relations, Eighth Edition.* London: University of Oxford Press.

Baudrillard, J. (1994). Simulacra and simulation (S. F. Glaser, Trans.). University of Michigan Press. (Original work published 1981)

Barker, R. L. (1999). The social work dictionary (3rd ed.). NASW Press.

Dawn. (2004, August 13). *Japan to resume $500m assistance*. DAWN. https://www.dawn.com/news/367448/japan-to-resume-500m-assistance

Derrida, J. (1976). Of Grammatology (G. C. Spivak, Trans.). Johns Hopkins University Press. (Original work published 1967)

Dunne, T., Kurki, M., & Smith, S. (Eds.). (2013). *International relations theories: Discipline and diversity* (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.

Floyd, R., & Schouenborg, L. (Eds.). (2026). *The big picture as an approach to the study of international relations: Thinking with and beyond Barry Buzan*. Cambridge University Press.

Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and Power: Second edition.* Hong Kong: Centre for English Language Education if Communication Research, City University of Hong Kong.

Heywood, A. (2011). *Global Politics.* United Kingdom: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hulatt, L. (2022, 12 06). *StudySmarter UK.* Retrieved from Post-structuralismPost-structuralism: https://www.studysmarter.co.uk/explanations/english-literature/literary-criticism-and-theory/Post-structuralismPost-structuralism/

Hansen, L. (2020). Post-structuralismPost-structuralismPost-structuralism. In S. S. John Baylis, *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations Eighth Edition* (pp. 177-191). London: University of Oxford Press.

Hussain, Z. (2019, October 13). The Last Coup. Pakistan. Retrieved from https://www.dawn.com/news/1510606

Kivunja, C. (2018). Distinguishing between theory, theoretical framework, and conceptual framework: A systematic review of lessons from the field. *International Journal of Higher Education, 7*(6), 44–53. https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v7n6p44

Musharraf, G. P. (2002). General Pervez Musharraf's Address to the Nation. *General Pervez Musharraf's Address* (pp. 1-22). Islamabad: President's House.

Musharraf, G. P. (2002). President of Pakistan General Pervez Musharraf Addresses the Nation. *President of Pakistan General Pervez Musharraf Addresses* (pp. 1-6). Islamabad: President's House.

Musharraf, G. P. (2004). Joint Session of the Shura Council. *President of Pakistan General Pervez Musharraf* (pp. 1-6). Islamabad: President's House.

Musharraf, G. P. (2004). Seminar on OIC_Challenges and Response Enlightened Moderation. *Seminar on OIC_Challenges and Response Enlightened Moderation* (pp. 1-9). Islamabad: President's House.

Musharraf, G. P. (2004). Sheikh Rashid Ahmed, Federal Minister for Information and Broadcasting, Iftar Dinner in Honor of Journalists. *Speech to Federal Minister for Information and Broadcasting, Iftar Dinner in Honor of Journalists* (pp. 1-14). Islamabad: President's House.

Musharraf, G. P. (2005). Banquet Hosted in His Honour. *Banquet Hosted in His Honour by Dr Manmohan Singh, Prime Minister of India* (pp. 1-5). New Delhi: President's House, Islamabad.

Musharraf, G. P. (2006). World Economic Forum. *General Pervez Musharraf, President Islamic Republic of Pakistan, at the World Economic Forum on the subject Leadership in the wake of Natural Disasters* (pp. 1-8). Davos, Switzerland: President's House.

Musharraf, G. P. (2007). National Seerat Conference. *National Seerat Conference Speech of General Pervez Musharraf, President of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan* (pp. 1-18). Islamabad: President's House.

Musharraf, P. (2006). *In the line of fire: A memoir.* New York City: Free Press.

Mustapha, J. (2013). Ontological theorizations in critical security studies: making the case for a (modified) post-structuralist approach. *Critical Studies on Security, Vol.1, No.1*, 64–82.

Pietrzak, P. (2024). The Sixth Great Debate in International Relations Theory Revolves Around Clarity: Ontology in Statu Nascendi as a Cutting-Edge Tool for Conflict Management. *In Dealing With Regional Conflicts of Global Importance*, 1-27.

Paz, A. I. (2013). Discourse theory. In J. McGee & R. Warms (Eds.). *Theory in social and cultural anthropology: An encyclopedia*, 191–196. Retrieved from https://www.utsc.utoronto.ca/people/aipaz/wp-content/uploads/sites/11/2014/04/Paz-Alejandro-2013-Theory-Soc-Cul-Ang-dsc-thy.pdf

Rafique, N. (2011). Rethinking Pakistan–U.S. relations. *Institute of Strategic Studies Islamabad*, 124-152.

Resende, E., , D. B., & D. B. (2025). *Defending Memory in Global Politics Mnemonical in\security and Crisis.* London and New York: Routledge Taylor and FrancisGroup.

Shehzad, U., Sarwar, S., Farooq, M. U., & Qin, F. (2020). USAID, official development assistance and counter terrorism efforts: Pre and post 9/11 analysis for South Asia. *Socio-Economic Planning Sciences*, 1-12.

Sørensen, R. J. (2013). *Introduction to International Relations Theories and Approaches Fifth Edition.* United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.

State, U. D. (2001). The global war on terrorism: The first 100 days. Washington DC, United State of America. Retrieved from https://2001-2009.state.gov/s/ct/rls/wh/6947.htm

Thyer, B. A. (2014). What is the Role of Theory in Research on Social Work Practice? *Journal of Social Work Education*, 9-25.

todoli, J., María, L. P., & Dolón, R. (2015). WHAT IS CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS? *Quaderns de Filologia. Estudis Lingüístics. Vol. XI*, 9-34. Retrieved from file:///C:/Users/pc/Downloads/adminojs,+01_Todoli_Labarta_&_Dolon_9-34.pdf

Wright, J. (2004). *Post-structural methodologies: The body, schooling and health. In Body knowledge and control.* Routledge. Retrieved from https://books.google.com.pk/books?hl=en&lr=&id=PuWBAgAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PA19&dq=post+structuralist+theory+&ots=NjBBoEKzrh&sig=JQSSNMU0WTGZg0JP3GTgWsF_Ip0&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=post%20structuralist%20theory&f=false

Yamin, D. T. (2015). Examining Pakistan's Strategic Decision to Support the US War on Terror. *Strategic Studies*, 113-135.