

Language and Ideology in *I am Malala* (2013): A Critical Discourse Analysis



|   |  |
|---|--|
| Dr. Muhammad Javaid Jamil<br>(Corresponding Author) | Lecturer, Govt. Associate College, Makhdoom Rasheed, Multan, Punjab Pakistan. <a href="mailto:javidjamil459@gmail.com">javidjamil459@gmail.com</a> |
| Dr. Saiqa Imtiaz Asif                               | Department of English, Bahauddin Zakariya University, Multan, Punjab, Pakistan. <a href="mailto:saiqaasif@yahoo.com">saiqaasif@yahoo.com</a>       |

**Abstract:** *Language and ideology as an instrument in the hands of the powerful has an overarching hold on the people. As a nexus, it is not only a potent weapon of intervention but also a vector of (re)presentation. In its potential power, it does not 'reflect' the social reality only; it 'refracts' it too. Fascinated by such interplay of language and ideology, the aim of the present study is to investigate how and which aspects of language play more significant roles in ideologically manipulating the potential readers of I am Malala (2013), and ultimately how these aspects of language could be systematically analyzed. Essentially, through the lens of Fairclough's 'three dimensional model' of CDA (1989, 1992, & 2003), a textual analysis is conducted on the purposively collected extracts of the biography. And, the study has been found that in the biography, the language has been appropriated at both the levels of morphology (i.e., vocabulary) and syntax (i.e., sentence structure) to promote the Western version of the 'fictionalized Islam' and to encourage a specific political propaganda against Pakistan.*

**Keywords:** Language, Ideology, Critical discourse analysis, Political propaganda, Literature and discourse, Language and power.

### Introduction

"Malala day is not my day. Today is the day of every woman, every boy and every girl, who have raised their voice for their rights of education.", these were the words pronounced by Malala Yousafzai—the youngest-ever person to win the Noble Peace Prize—in a stirring speech at the UN on 12 July 2013 on her 16<sup>th</sup> birthday, now dubbed 'Malala Day'. She is known for her activism for the right of education for girls. On 9 October 2012, Malala was shot in the head and neck in an assassination attempt by Taliban gunmen while she was returning home on a school bus. And, the very next year she brought out a non-fiction biography with the title 'I Am MALALA' and the subtitle 'The Girl Who Stood Up for Education

and was Shot by the Taliban'.

Since the production of this biography, Malala Yousafzai has become the icon of the struggle for free and universal education and her mantras and her story obsessively repeated by the media all around the globe. In January 2013, the German international broadcaster Deutsche Welle called her 'the most famous teenager in the world'. On April 29 of 2013, the *Time* magazine in the U.S featured her on the magazine's front cover as one of 'The 100 Influential People in the World'. On July 16 of 2013, Davis Guggenheim, the Oscar-winning director of the documentary *An Inconvenient Truth*, proclaimed his intention to make a film about the personality of Malala. In September of 2013, the Library of Birmingham in the UK

invited her to officially open the library. Simply put, since the book's publication Malala has achieved a level of stardom rarely observed in the field of political or educational activism—her numerous interviews, travels and recognition have forged her into a curious hybrid of an ordinary schoolgirl, a sought-after celebrity and an admired hero. The way in which the West reacted did make me inquisitive of the reasons and the motives behind the fact that why Malala's case was taken up and not so many others. This curiousness, being more precise, that 'Why does the West promote her narrative in such a fanatically passionate way?' is one of the reasons behind the selection and the conduction this study on the non-fiction biography of *I am Malala: The Girl who stood up and was shot by the Taliban* (2013).

However, apart from this universal acclaim, Malala Yousafzai has been accused by many, if not all Pakistanis, of being a puppet of the West, whose iconic status is a marvellous fabrication by the American, intended to bring a bad name to Pakistan and overshadow the work of Swat's other education activists. Debatably, Malala has been described as an undercover CIA agent; some have the opinion that she was never really shot at all, and produced carefully annotated images of her 'fake wounds'; others have suggested that Malala's personality cult was deliberately staged by her father. She has also been called the 'darling of the West' (Zubek, 2016), 'the overexposed poster-child of the West' (Aimen, 2013) and even her role as 'the White-Saviour Complex' (Baig, 2013). Thus, unofficially, Malala is a persona non grata in Pakistan. Whatever the opinions prevail, the fact remains that in late 2013, shortly one month after its initial publication, the book was banned in Pakistan's 40,000 private schools, an event that hints back at the country's ban on Salman Rushdie's much-disputed book *The Satanic Verses* (1988). Fascinated by the abomination, such controversial reception of the book is another motive behind this research, attempting to find the answer to the

question, which pinches almost every active reader of the book, that 'What type of ideology does the book propagate?'

In addition to the curious acclaim of Malala and the controversial reception of her biography, the motivation behind this project initially stem from personal fascination with the power of language and its potential in influencing people at the ideological level. The broad objectives of this study thus became an attempt to investigate how and which aspects of language play more significant roles in ideologically manipulating the readers, and ultimately, how these aspects of language could be systematically analyzed. Moreover, it was noticed that the highly controversial biography of Malala has not only received little consideration at the practical level, but that it had also been handled rather unsatisfactorily through mere opinions, conspiracy theories and speculations. With the notable exception of Sadaf (2017), few formal studies have been conducted to sort out the controversial position of the present biography. Furthermore, it was also detected that the book is controversial not only in the terms of its content, but also in the matter of its real authorship. It is in this context, the present study attempts to find the satisfactory answer to these controversies via the linguistic analysis of the text in a systematic way. Being more precise, the present study is aimed at finding the answers to the questions: What type(s) of ideology/ideologies does the book propagate? How is sentence structure used/manipulated in conveying such ideology/ideologies? How is vocabulary employed and handled to reinforce or undermine such ideology/ideologies?

## 1. LITERATURE REVIEW

Language and ideology as an instrument in the hands of the powerful has an overarching hold on the people. As a nexus, it is not only a potent weapon of intervention but also a vector of (re)presentation. This language-ideology nexus is, in fact, so strong that the very nature of linguistic theorizing is ideological (Joseph &

Taylor, 1990). In its potential power, it does not 'reflect' the social reality *only*; it 'refracts' it too. Lecerle (2006) has maintained that "ideology is wholly linguistic and language is wholly ideological" (p. 170). Barthes (2002) has even coined the term 'ideosphere' to fuse the language-ideology nexus, since it implies that language and ideology are two terminological scissors, cutting starkly each other. Ideosphere is "the linguistic system of an ideology" (Barthes, 2002, p. 122)—a term forged out of 'ideology' by asserting that "ideology, no matter which, is and is only language." (Barthes, 2002, p. 122).

Similarly, Fairclough (1989) has unveiled that "ideology is pervasively present in language" (p. 3). But, just right to the point, Žižek (1994, p. 13) has warned that "*power inscribes itself into the body directly, bypassing ideology*" (italics original). Pointing out the *locus* of ideology, Fairclough (1995) has made it that "Ideology invests language in various ways at various levels, and that we don't have to choose between different possible 'locations' of ideology, all of which seem partly justified and none of which seems entirely satisfactory" (p. 71). However, Eagleton (1991) has remarked that "Ideology is a matter of 'discourse' rather than of 'language'" (p. 223). Therefore, in recent studies, the 'language-ideology nexus' has increasingly and approvingly been replaced by the 'discourse-ideology nexus' (Fairclough 1992, 2003; van Dijk, 1995, 1998, 2006). Summing up, Voloshinov, probably, strikes the last hammer by indicating that "Wherever a sign is present, ideology is present" (1973, p. 10)—an operational position for the present study.

In this context, there is a great body of literature which strives to exhibit how language

and ideology cover almost every area and subject of human inquiry (see, e.g., Fowler et al., 1979; Fowler, 1991; Hodge & Kress, 1993; Wright, 1998). However, George Orwell was one of the earliest writers who in literary discourses attempted to show the nexus between language and ideology. In his novel *Animal Farm* (1946), Orwell deals with the nexus resourcefully. Language is given a tacit twist at the level of syntax (i.e., sentence level) with the ideological use of 'implicature'. For example: "All animals are equal, but some are more than equal" (Orwell, 1973 [1946], p. 114). This ideological expression of equality has now become a classic in political and literary discourse. At another point, "Napoleon announced that there would be work on Sunday afternoons as well. This work was strictly voluntary, but any animal who absented himself from it would have his rations reduced by half" (p. 53). The sentence is remarkable for its directive simplicity, commonsense, and straightforwardness, but hides the exploitive agenda of subjugation and hegemonic authority.

In his second work of fiction, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (1949), we come across "Thought Police" and the "Ministry of Truth", whose task is to destroy the literature and the history books, using the subtle strategy of the ideological translation<sup>1</sup>. The most effective ideological weapon in the hands of the Party is *Newspeak*,—the official language of Oceania, a linguistic weapon that is Whorfian in its very essence. In fact, it labeled the 'freedom of thought' as 'thoughtcrime'<sup>2</sup>. In *Newspeak*, the language has been corrupted chiefly at the level

---

<sup>1</sup> As described in the novel: "Various writers, such as Shakespeare, Milton, Swift, Byron, Dickens, and some others were therefore in process of translation: when the task had been completed, their original writings, with all else that survived of the literature of the past, would be destroyed." (Orwell, 1949, p. 392).

<sup>2</sup> As summed up in the novel. "Don't you see that the whole aim of Newspeak is to narrow the range of thought? In the end we shall make 'thoughtcrime' literally impossible, because there will be no words in which to express it". (Orwell, 1949, p. 67).

of morphology by the deletion,<sup>3</sup> conversion<sup>4</sup> and compression of the words<sup>5</sup>.

However, the *Lingua Tertii Imperii* (LTI)<sup>6</sup> is the real-life specimen of the Orwell's fictional 'Newspeak'. It popped out with the work of Victor Klemperer (1946) and Eugen Seidel (1961). 'The Language of the Third Reich' (LTI) was used by Hitler and other National Socialist leaders for the propagation of the Nazi ideology. In contrast to *Newspeak*, LTI is 'Stylistically innovative' rather than 'lexically inventive' (Press, 2005). Klemperer has noted that "The Third Reich did not invent the words 'fanatical' and 'fanaticism', it just changed their value and used them more in one day than other epochs used them in years... [Thus, it increased] the frequency of their occurrence." (2000[1946], p. 14). Nazism was infiltrated into the consciousness of the people through single words, idioms, increased use of the dissociating prefixes e.g., *ent*-{de}<sup>7</sup> and the superlative,<sup>8</sup> ironic use of the inverted commas, emphatic use of the semicolon and sentence structures which were imposed on them in a million repetitions and taken on board mechanically and unconsciously (Klemperer, 1946; Seidel, 1961). As an omission, however, LTI does not use the emotive exclamation marks as if "it turns everything into a command or proclamation as a matter of course and therefore has no need of a special punctuation mark to highlight the fact" (Klemperer, 2000[1946], p. 67).

Revisiting the foundational works of Hitler's *Mein Kampf* (1925) and Rosenberg's *Myth of the Twentieth Century* (1930), Press (2005) has confirmed the Klemperer and Seidel's claim for

linguistic manipulation in the rise of the National Socialist Party and further provides a detailed explanation of how Hitler and Rosenberg employed rhetorical language to promote fascist ideology without an underlying basis of logical argumentation. Similarly, Rozina and Karapetjana (2009) has explored the ideological use of the linguistic devices—allusion, metonymy and metaphor—in political rhetoric and concluded that a powerful combination of the linguistic and rhetorical devices can be used to inform, influence, command, legislate and persuade the masses. Last but not least, Haig (2009) has investigated the ideological aspects of 'cohesive conjunctions' in a radio news bulletin about youth crime, applying the framework of critical discourse analysis of Fairclough (2001). He arrived at the conclusion that "ideology influences the composition and structure of the text as a whole" (Haig, 2009, p. 69).

Hence, whether it is *language of ideology* or *ideology of language*, the result is the same: production and reproduction of the (human) subject under the yoke of the powerful who define and decide the truths and falsehoods, good and bad, and legitimate and illegitimate. It is in this spectrum that the present study intends to investigate the insidious and the subtle linkage of language and ideology in the biography of *I am Malala* (2013)

## 2. Methodology

Since both of the central notions of the study—i.e., 'Language' and 'Ideology'—are highly flexible in their conceptual nature and definitional operativeness (see, Lecercle, 2006; Gerring, 1997) and the present investigation is

---

<sup>3</sup> Words such as HONOUR, JUSTICE, MORALITY and RELIGION were abolished (Orwell, 1949, p. 384).

<sup>4</sup>E.g., DARK into UNLIGHT, LIGHT into UNLIGHT, BAD into UNGOOD (Orwell, 1949, p. 380).

<sup>5</sup> All the words grouping around the concepts of 'liberty' and 'equality' were compressed into the single word of CRIMETHINK (Orwell, 1949, p. 384).

<sup>6</sup> Abbreviation of *Lingua Tertii Imperii* translated as 'The Language of Third Reich' by Martin Brady.

<sup>7</sup> For example, "*entbittert*" [de-bittered], "*entrümpelt*" [de-cluttered], "*entnazifizierung*" [denazification]. See Klemperer (2000, p. 1).

<sup>8</sup> For example, "*Grossoffensive*" [great-offensive], "*Grosskampftage*" [great days of struggle], "*Weltfeinde*" [World-enemies]. See Klemperer (1946, p. 282-83).

about the ‘*what*’ and ‘*how*’ of the ideology and the language respectively, the study is inclined to the more open and emerging design of the ‘qualitative research’ (see, Creswell, 2009, p. 130). Within the qualitative research design, owing to the mutual reciprocity of both of these notions (i.e., ‘language’ and ‘ideology’), the study, in fact, called for the interpretive/constructivist paradigm—a paradigm which acknowledges that reality is subjective and socially constructed with multiple mental constructions and perspectives (Creswell, 2009, pp.8-9; Mertens 1998, pp. 11-14) with the basic assumption that “data, interpretations, and outcomes are rooted in contexts...” (Mertens, 1998, p. 13). Thus, pulled by the more open and emerging qualitative research design with its leanings towards the social interpretivism/constructivism of the paradigm, the researcher left with no single theoretical framework other than the all-

inclusive CDA—a framework that insists on the recognition that “language is a part of society; linguistic phenomena *are* social phenomena of a special sort, and social phenomena *are* (in part) linguistic phenomena” (Fairclough, 1989, p. 23). In its real effect, CDA treats ideologies as “representations of the aspects of the world which contribute to establishing and maintaining relations of power, domination and exploitation” (Fairclough, 2003, p. 218)—an operative position for the present research.

For an analytical framework, Fairclough’s (1989, 1992, & 2003) three dimensional model provided a critical lens that directed the linguistic analysis in locating the ideological power relations. In specific, drawing on Fairclough’s (1989, 1992, & 2003) three dimensional model, the present study has used the table 3.1 as a potential checklist for the analytical activity (as given below).

**Table 3.1: Fairclough’s Three Dimensional Model as an Analytical Tool**

|   |   |                        |   |
|---|---|------------------------|---|
| <b>Fairclough’s three dimensional model</b> | <b>Text (Description)</b>                   | <b>Vocabulary</b>      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Word meaning.</li> <li>• Re-wording (Alternative wording).</li> <li>• Lexicalization.</li> <li>• Signification.</li> <li>• Metaphor.</li> <li>• Overwording</li> </ul>   |
|   |   | <b>Grammar</b>         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transitivity (ideational function of language).</li> <li>• Theme (textual function of language).</li> <li>• Modality (interpersonal function of language).</li> </ul>  |
|   |   | <b>Cohesion</b>        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Through vocabulary.</li> <li>• Through repetition of words.</li> <li>• Using near-synonyms.</li> <li>• Through pronoun, definite article, demonstratives, ellipsis of repeated words, etc.</li> <li>• Using conjunctive words, e.g., ‘but’, ‘and’, ‘therefore’ and ‘however’.</li> </ul> |
|   |   | <b>Text-structure</b>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Architecture of text.</li> <li>• Higher-level design features of text type.</li> </ul>   |
|   | <b>Discursive Practice (Interpretation)</b> | <b>Text production</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interdiscursivity (discourse types in terms of genre, style and register etc)</li> <li>• Manifest intertextuality.</li> <li>• Sequential intertextuality</li> <li>• Embedded intertextuality</li> <li>• Mixed intertextuality</li> <li>• Conditions of discourse practice.</li> </ul>    |
|   |   | <b>Distribution</b>    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intertextual chains</li> </ul>   |

|  |   |  |   |
|--|---|--|---|
|  |   | <b>Consumption</b>                                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Coherence.</li> <li>• Force of text.</li> </ul>  |
|  | <b>Social Practice</b><br>(Explanation) | <b>Social matrix of Discourse</b>                    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ideology</li> <li>• Hegemony</li> <li>• Ideological structures</li> <li>• Hegemonic structures.</li> <li>• Power relations</li> <li>• Hegemonic relations</li> </ul> |
|  |   | <b>Orders of Discourse</b>                           |   |
|  |   | <b>Ideological and political effect of discourse</b> |   |

Adapted from: *Discourse and Social Change* (1992) by Fairclough.

And, so far as data and sampling are concerned, Wodak and Meyer (2009) have identified that “there is no CDA way of gathering data, either” (p. 27), however, “many CDA approaches work with existing data, i.e., texts not specifically produced for the respective research projects” (Wodak & Meyer, 2009, p. 32). The same is true for the present research. For the investigation, the data for the analysis are collected from an existing text, i.e., *I am Malala: The Girl Who Stood Up for Education and was Shot by the Taliban* (2013) by Malala Yousafzai with Christina Lamb, via non-random theoretical sampling<sup>9</sup>. Thus, adopting the ‘purposive’ sampling strategy (O’Leary, 2004), broadly, two extracts are selected from *I am Malala* (2013) for purpose of in-depth textual analysis. Hence, the main unit of analysis is an *extract* and it can be anything above the morphological level. And, the mode of analysis is textual analysis with the hermeneutic approach.

### 3. Data Analysis

#### 4.1 Analysis of the Extract 1

The first extract consists of one long paragraph (see appendix-I). The paragraph starts with the personal pronoun “I”, reinforcing the authority of an omniscient narrator. Thematically, the paragraph does not deal with any single theme strictly. It seems that different events and

issues relating to Pakistan are juxtaposed forcefully in a single paragraph: the paragraph starts with being “proud” at the creation of “the world’s first Muslim homeland” and moves, abruptly, towards the culture-specific notions of “purdah or wearing burqas”, “jihad” and “many strands of Islam in Pakistan”. After this, the narration flashes back to the event of partition of the subcontinent, depicting the scenario of events that occurred almost fifty years ago of *author’s* own birth. And then, the paragraph ends with the discussion of the minorities, namely—Christians and Ahmadis, and, notably, with the comment that “Sadly those minority communities are often attacked”.

Let us investigate the ideological tone set from the very first sentence: “I am proud that our country was created as the world’s first Muslim homeland, *but* we still don’t agree on what this means” (italics added, Yousafzai, 2013, p.75). In this sentence, the entire point of view simply revolves around the pivot of “but”—a cohesive conjunction. Such organization of a sentence, in fact, imparts an ideological patterning to the overall informative structure of that sentence. Guy Cook (1989, pp. 64-65) has divided the information structure of a sentence into two parts: the ‘Given’ information—an already known or generally agreed upon chunk of

<sup>9</sup> For some researchers, ‘non-random’ implies samples that are gathered through strategies seen as second best or last resort. However, “there is a growing belief that there is no longer a need to ‘apologize’ for these types of samples. . . [and] that non-random samples can credibly represent

populations, given that selection is done with the goal of representativeness in mind” (O’Leary, 2004, p. 109). Moreover, O’Leary preferred the label of ‘purposive’ to the ‘theoretical’, which highlights the importance of conscious decision-making in non-random sample selection (O’Leary, 2004, p. 109).

information and the 'New' information—an ideologically less agreed upon piece of information. The same pattern of an information structure, as pointed out by Cook (1989) can be marked here i.e., first the 'Given' information (I am proud that our country was created as the world's first Muslim homeland) is presented and then the ideological 'New' information (*but* we still don't agree on what this means) is stated in an informally nonchalant manner. In fact, the contracted use of 'don't', which is the marker of an informal style, is meant to convey that the newly inserted piece of information is just a matter of routine, like a to-be-ignored phraseology of common occurrence.

Moreover, the contrastive function of the conjunction "but" is not based on the 'balanced weightage'. In other words, the points of views of both of the independent clauses are not of equal weight. In the contrastive use of "but", it is frequent that the point of view given after the "but" is emphasized more stressfully than the one given before the "but". Therefore, the inherent assumption of the sentence becomes that 'I am proud, *but* there is a reason *not to be proud*'—a loaded chunk of 'New' information. So, the circle of ideology revolves around the centre of contrastive "but". Furthermore, the but-content (i.e., "*but* we still don't agree on what this [creation of Pakistan as the world's first Muslim homeland] means.") leaves the reader thirsty of information and, simultaneously, prepares the reader mentally that the following sentences will tell the actual meaning the creation of Pakistan "as the world's first Muslim homeland". This is the ideological use of the sentence structure and the manipulative use of contrastive conjunction "but". Noticeably, the same conjunctive 'but-pattern' is employed frequently not only in the rest of paragraph, but in the whole book too.

Lets us take the very next sentence: "The Quran teaches us *sabar*—patience—*but* often it feels that we have forgotten the word and think Islam means women sitting at home in purdah

or wearing burqas while men do jihad" ( second italics added, Yousafzai, 2013, p.75).

Again, the sentence structure is manipulated to impart the desired ideologies via the contrastive use of "but". The same structure of 'Given...New' information (Cook, 1989) can be noted. The first clause (i.e., "the Holy Quran teaches us *sabar*—patience..." ) consists of an absolutely correct piece of information that is true to every Muslim all over the world—hence, a piece of Given information. However, after the conjunction of *but*, the "it feels" that "we have forgotten the word" *sabar* and, further, the meaning of Islam is described with the negative connotations of 'purdah' and 'jihad' (i.e., New information). Furthermore, it is startling to note that the whole of the we-statement (i.e., we have forgotten the word and think Islam means women sitting at home in purdah or wearing burqas while men do jihad) is based on the feeling and the thinking of the implicit "it" rather than of any explicit *author*. Most probably, the *author* also shares the same feelings, but the point is that it is has been kept implicit in the sentence. To be noted, this is a clear example of the investing ideology through the technique of 'Metadiscourse'. According Fairclough (1992, p. 122), "Metadiscourse is a peculiar form of manifest intertextuality where the text producer distinguishes different levels within her own text, and distances herself from some level of the text, treating the distanced level as if it were another, external, text". In effect, the author has attempted to lexically abrogate and appropriate the Islamic notions of "purdah", "burqa" and "jihad", while distancing herself from the commitment of the truth to that statement *metadiscursivley*. In truth, it is an insidious way of deconstructing the Islamic conceptions of "purdah", "burqa" and "jihad", while disseminating the western version of an intolerant Islam echoing that the Quran teaches us *sabar*—patience—but we have become the symbols of *impatience* because our women are sitting at home in purdah or wearing burqas while men are doing jihad. How offensive to the

Muslims!

In addition to the sentence structure, one can also locate ideology in the loaded use of lexicalization. For example: the phrase “The Quran” is used instead of ‘The Holy Quran’. The omission of the adjective ‘Holy’ is not innocent or impartial. It is surprising to note that, within the whole book, the lexis of ‘Quran’ without the adjective of ‘Holy, is used thirty times as a book<sup>10</sup>, one time as an adjective (i.e., Quranic)<sup>11</sup> and one time within a phrase (*khatam-ul-Quran*)<sup>12</sup>. However, the phrase “The Holy Quran” is used eight times<sup>13</sup> too, but for a different purpose. Let us probe the ideology behind this discrepancy by examining just one instance. Commenting on the 9/11 event, in chapter 6 of the book, the author has stated that “These clerics said 9/11 was revenge on the Americans for what they had been doing to other people round the world, *but* they ignored the fact that the people in the World Trade Centre were innocent and had nothing to do with American policy and that the *Holy* Quran clearly says it is wrong to kill. (Yousafzai, 2013, p. 70, emphasis added).

What an ideological manipulation of the religious ideas! Here the adjective “Holy” is used only at the point where there is a need to back an argument for the defense of 9/11 event. Ideologically, this is the technique of ‘Authorization’ in which the legitimization of discourse is achieved “by reference to the authority of tradition, custom, law, and of persons in whom some kind of institutional authority is vested.” (Fairclough, 2003, p. 98). In the above instance, via referring the *Holy* Quran, the *author* is trying to exploit the situation. The West has frequently manipulated the Islamic ideas only to back up their own

---

<sup>10</sup> See page numbers: 23, 26, 42, 75, 77, 78, 84, 86, 88, 92, 96, 111, 117, 129, 130, 144, 149, 183, 187, 199, 210, 220, 231 & 263.

<sup>11</sup> “She also said I must leave my school bag because there was so little room. I was horrified. I went and whispered Quranic verses over the books to try and protect them” (Yousafzai, 2013, pp. 148-149).

benefits. This is one of the important points raised by Edward Said in his book *Covering Islam* (1981). In fact, this whole ideological exploitation can best be described in the words of Shakespeare that “The devil can cite Scripture for his purpose” (Shakespeare, 1979: *The Merchant of Venice*, Act 1, Scene 3).

However, it is also important to note that the lexis of “purdah” “burqas” and “jihad” are not italicized in the text, although they are treated as the culture-specific items (see Newmark, 2010; Davies, 2003) and are explained in the glossary for readers. In text, no hint is offered to the reader who does not know these culture-specific items. In other words, it is a major possibility that some non-Muslim readers may not even get at these Islamic concepts. And, to the surprise, even in the glossary these items are linguistically appropriated.

Let us take the term “purdah”. In glossary of the book, it is described exactly as: “(of women) segregation or seclusion, wearing the veil” (Yousafzai, 2013, p. 267). This is a reduced and restrictive explanation of the concept communicated via a bunch of disconnected words, rather than a complete sentence. It does not specify who is segregated? Why? Where? and When? These are just nouns i.e., segregation, seclusion. One can compare that this definition is the ‘nominalized’ version of what is defined as “purdah” in the *Oxford Advanced Learners Dictionary*: “the system in some Muslim societies by which women live in a separate part of a house or cover their faces so that men do not see them” (Turnbull et al., 2010, p. 1232). According to Fairclough (1992, p. 179), nominalization is the conversion of processes into nominals, which has the effect of backgrounding the process itself and usually

<sup>12</sup> “By the time the Taliban came I had finished my recitation of the complete Quran, what we call *khatam-ul-Quran*, much to the delight of *Baba*, my grandfather the cleric.” (Yousafzai, 2013, p. 111).

<sup>13</sup> See page numbers: 70, 76, 93, 95, 173, 215, 228 & 267.



not specifying its participants, so that who is doing what to whom is left implicit. Sword (2012) is even hard upon the nominalizations and has called them “zombie nouns” because they cannibalize active verbs, suck the lifeblood from adjectives and substitute abstract entities for human beings.

Moreover, the rhetorical device of *inversion* is used within the glossary-version of “purdah”. If we move the bracketed phrase (i.e., of women) from its initial position and put it just before comma, the arrangement will convey the Western stereotypical conception of purdah—i.e., segregation or seclusion (of women), wearing the veil. In addition, the lexicalizations of “segregation or seclusion” connote the implied meanings of discrimination. So, the whole message conveyed may turn out to be: ‘if you observe purdah, you will be segregated or secluded’. The same is the Western version of *burqa*, as summed up somewhere else in *I am Malala* (2013): “Wearing a burqa is like walking inside big fabric shuttlecock with only a grille to see through and on hot days it’s like an oven” (Yousafzai, 2013, p. 55). One cannot help noticing that burqa is described with the imagery of being in a prison, echoing the definition of glossary i.e., “(of women) segregation or seclusion, wearing the veil” (Yousafzai, 2013, p. 267).

Almost the same is the case with the lexis of “jihad”. It is defined in glossary of *I am Malala* (2013) just as a “holy war or internal struggle” (Yousafzai, 2013, p. 266). It is not specified that whose holy war is this? Who is fighting? Against whom? Now, this is again the ‘nominalized’ and the reduced version of what is defined in *Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary* as jihad: “1. (in Islam) a spiritual struggle within yourself to stop yourself breaking religious or moral laws. 2. a holy war fought by Muslims to defend Islam” (Turnbull et al., 2010: 834). Just the nominal phrase “holy war” is selected from it, while the clause “fought by Muslims to defend Islam” is omitted completely. Notably, the element of spirituality has also been exorcised from the

definition with the result that the phrase “internal struggle” may allude to the internal psychological state of dilemma or the mental illness of ‘schizophrenia’ implicitly. This is how the West has always attempted to bend language to bear the burden of its desired ideologies.

Moreover, the *metadiscursivity* of ‘we-statement’ (i.e., “we have forgotten the word and think Islam means women sitting at home in purdah or wearing burqas while men do jihad”), at some level, bears the imprint of sarcastic irony too. Fairclough (1992, p. 123) has described the intertextual nature of irony by exposing the fact that “an ironic utterance ‘echoes’ someone else’s utterance...expressing some sort of negative attitude—be it anger, sarcasm, or whatever”. In fact, in the above sentence, one can find the intertextuality of the Western sarcasm of the Islamic notion of jihad after the event of 9/11 and the tongue-in-cheek irony of the Western feminism, that revolves around the mockery of the Islamic practices of purdah, hijab or burqa as the signs of illiteracy and orthodoxy.

Analyzing the third sentence (i.e., “We have many strands of Islam in Pakistan”), this again is a metadiscursive ‘we-statement’—possessive in its structure and existential in its meaning. Now, this sentence implies that Islam is not a single complete religion and these strands exist only in Pakistan, *not* in any other country. After reading this sentence, the question that pinches in the mind of the reader is that ‘which are those strands and how many?’ and curiously expects the details of this first-person assertion. But, no detail is given of those strands and the topic shifts, abruptly, to the partition of the sub-continent that happened long time ago. This is a gap—an ‘interstitial space’ (Bhabha, 1994)—that needs to be enunciated or to be filled by ideology. According to Spivak (1988), in the interstitial gaps that interrupt narratives, oppositional and subaltern histories can be found. Therefore, these silences become the negotiating spaces for the operational locus of

ideology (Pérez, 1999, p. 5).

Moving forward, one can find the same pattern of contrastive use of the conjunction *but* as: “Our founder Jinnah wanted the rights of Muslims in India to be recognized, *but* the majority of people in India were Hindus” (Yousafzai, 2013, p. 75). As far as the lexical choice is concerned, it is to note that only last name “Jinnah”—meaning ‘weak’ in Gujarati—is used. Neither the honorary title—i.e., the Quaid-e-Azam—nor his complete original name—Muhammad Ali Jinnah is preferred to use. Moreover, the implicit assumption being promoted may come to be: Since the majority of people in India were Hindus, therefore Jinnah’s claim was not justified. Furthermore, in the next sentence it is elaborated that: “It was *as if* there was a feud between two brothers and they agreed to live in different houses” (emphasis added, Yousafzai, 2013, p. 75). In this sentence ‘the two-nation theory’, propounded by Quaid-e-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah, is treated as if it never existed. The Muslims and the Hindus are described to be “brothers” echoing that they may have shared the same religious guidance or the fatherly figure.

How can the Hindus and Muslims be brothers? This forceful coexistence is reflected in the elaborative conjunction of *as if* too. In its structure, this conjunction is the mixture of half simile (conveyed by ‘as’) and half conditional (i.e., ‘if’). In its operation, it may echo the semanticity of ‘it was as if, *but it was not so*’. Thus, this conditional-simile-like conjunction may carry the idea of merging the two extreme opposites. For such discourses, Fairclough (2003) has pointed out the “logic of equivalence” by which the discourse “subverts the existing differences and divisions” (p.100) and sweeps efficiently the “visions and the divisions” (Fairclough, 2003, p. 138; see also Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). Consequently, the implicit ideology that seems to be popping out of this sentence may hint that: if the two brothers agreed to live in different houses, it is also possible that they may live in the similar

house together again, since it was just a quarrel. How tacitly the sentence structure and the vocabulary are handled to undermine ‘the two-nation theory’ that was already a universally-agreed and forceful-fact behind the partition of the sub-continent in 1947.

Further in the paragraph, the bloody events, happened during and after the partition of the sub-continent, are summarized in passive structures with the ideological play on preposition i.e., “Millions of Muslims crossed *from* India, and Hindus travelled in the other direction. Almost two million of them were killed trying to cross the new border. Many were slaughtered on trains which arrived at Lahore and Delhi full of bloodied corpses” (emphasis added, Yousafzai, 2013, p. 75). In this discourse, the preposition *from* is important and ideological. Its function in the sentence is that of ‘locomotory’ i.e., it marks the initial point of locomotion. Locomotion is usually described with the preposition-pair of ‘*from...to*’, in which ‘*from*’ marks the initial point and ‘*to*’ marks the final point or the goal. In the above sentence, initial point ‘India’ is presented and final point or goal ‘Pakistan’ is omitted, as if migration towards Pakistan did not happen at all, conveying the message that ‘millions of the Muslims crossed *from* India *to nothing*’. And the next clause, after the additive conjunction of “and” (i.e., Hindus travelled in the other direction), is also dubious. How can “the other direction” be calculated, if the goal of the locomotory direction is not specified at all? And, because of this the anaphoric reference of “them” is made ambivalent deliberately. It has not been made clear that whether this “them” points to the Muslims or to the Hindus. It is simply stated that “almost two million of them were killed” (Yousafzai, 2013, p. 75). Moreover, by employing the agentless passive structure, it remains unknown that who killed them? The same strategy of agentless passivization is used in the next sentence: “Many were slaughtered on trains....” (Yousafzai, 2013, p. 75). Fairclough

(1992, p. 182) has maintained that an agentless passive is used to obfuscate agency, and hence causality and responsibility. However, it is a generally accepted reality that the Hindus killed millions of the Muslims on trains during the migration from India to Pakistan. But, the *author* has omitted this fact through the manipulative use of the structure of the sentence.

In the last portion of the paragraph, the *author* has summed up the present situation of the country by describing the demographics of the religious communities that “We also have around two million Christians and more than two million Ahmadis, who say they are Muslims *though* our government says they are not. Sadly those minority communities are often attacked” (Yousafzai, 2013, p. 75). Here again the negative side of the picture is made more prominent. Once more, this is the case of *Metadiscourse*, where the *author* has detached herself from the narrative to invest it ideologically. As Fairclough (1992) has pointed out that “Metadiscourse implies that the speaker is situated above or outside her own discourse, and is in a position to control and manipulate it (p. 122). Here, the important point to note is the conjunctive choice of *though*, rather than of *but*. As a conjunction, *though* does not function contrastively like *but*. In its operation, it conveys the approximate meanings of ‘and yet’ or ‘despite the fact’. Such usage of *though* might have represented ‘the Ahmadis’ more approvingly: who say they are Muslims [and yet or despite the fact] our government says they are not.

Another point to be made, on part of the *author*, is the lexical choice of the word ‘government’ rather than of ‘constitution’, since it is the ‘Second Amendment to the Constitution of Pakistan’, which has categorically declared that Ahmadis are not Muslims. This Amendment was passed

unanimously on September 7, 1974.<sup>14</sup> So, the ideology, behind choice of the word “government”, instead of “Constitution”, is to present the positive face of the Ahmadis and to hide the fact that they were declared as non-Muslims constitutionally long time ago—even the *author* of the book was not born at that time. Moreover, at the thematic position of the last sentence, the adverb “Sadly” is meant to convey the soft feeling for Ahmadis depicting them the victims of government. In fact, such modality adverb exposes the emotional commitment of the *author* to the Christians and the Ahmadis and thus, the social identity of the *author*. As Fairclough (2003, p. 166) has opined that “modality choices in texts can be seen as part of the process of texturing of self-identity”.

#### 4.2 Analysis of the Extract 2

The extract, taken from the “Epilogue: One child, one teacher, one book, one pen...” of the book, consists of two paragraphs (see appendix-II). Both of these are in the omniscient first person narration and the narrator has described the events in a reminiscent mood. Overall, these paragraphs deal with Malala’s visit to Saudi Arabia with the purpose of performing *Umrah*. In the first paragraph, the *author* has talked about her “flashbacks”. Thematically, it deals with “the worst” flashback of the incident of buying “a special burqa”. The incident is described in an epic tone much like a self-created filmic scenario. As Simpson (2005, p. 11) has pointed out that “filmic texts and narrative texts share many features of temporal point of view, with their flashbacks, gaps in the progression of time, and the interweaving of other stories and incidents which break up the linear development of the main body of the narrative”. The same can be noted in the present narration. The spatial setting of the incident is in Abu Dhabi, on the way to perform *Umrah* in Saudi Arabia, while the temporal marker of the incident is only

---

<sup>14</sup> Accessed from:  
<http://www.pakistani.org/pakistan/constitution/amendments/2amendment.html> Accessed on: 16-03-2024.

“June”. No year is mentioned. However, it becomes clear, indirectly, at the end of the paragraph that it happened after Malala’s year of shooting i.e., 2012.

The incident starts with the disagreement that Malala’s mother “wanted a special burqa to pray in Mecca” while Malala herself “didn’t want one”. The personal pronoun “I” of the sentence that “I said I would just wear my shawl as it is not specified that a woman must wear a burqa” (Yousafzai, 2013, p. 260) marks it a subjectively modalized sentence. And, according to Fairclough (2003, p. 166), “[subjective] Modality is important in the texturing of identities, both personal and social, in the sense that what you commit yourself to is a significant part of what you are—so modality choices in texts can be seen as part of the process of texturing self-identity”. Therefore, the first person “I” of the sentence illustrates Malala’s viewpoint about wearing a “special burqa”. And, the use of the modal verb “must” with negation in the previous clause (i.e., as it is *not* specified that a woman *must* wear a burqa) implicitly presupposes that ‘wearing burqa is an optional affair not a mandatory obligation’, even to pray in Mecca. Moreover, the sentence is structure to be argumentatively weak. The author has just pointed out that “it is not specified”. But the question arises ‘where it is not specified?’ In other words the propositional claim is not endorsed by any institutional or religious authority. The narrator just simply made the claim and moved forward to the next focal point leaving the gap to be filled by ideology. Now, this is the “strategic avoidance of explicitness” (Fairclough, 2003, p. 60)—passing off something contentious as if it was uncontentious.

Apart from this, the burqa-scene is described in militarily terrorized terms as: “I thought they were waiting for me with *guns* and would *shoot*” (Yousafzai, 2013, p. 260). In this sentence verb *thought* is important and marks the locus of an ideological import. According to

Simpson (2005, p. 22), “the verb *thought*, in addition to its reporting function, can be used ‘nonfactively’”. It seems that the sentence has manipulatively been shortened. In reality, the whole situation is like: ‘I thought they were waiting for me with guns and would shoot, *but they were not.*’ In other words, there were no men with guns as a matter of fact. The entire terror-incident imagery is based on just a “*thought*” i.e., an imaginative hyperbolic self-thought. Moreover, the last italicized sentence of the paragraph is preceded with the phrase “I told myself”, much like an ‘internal monologue’. Even the last part of this italicized sentence (i.e., *if you are afraid you can’t move forward*) stimulates an implicature that: if you wear burqa “*you can’t move forward*”. One must also bear in the mind that this incident is described as “the worst” flashback for the narrator—the superlatively bad one—which establishes the evaluative stance of the whole Abu Dhabi incident. In texts, such statements should be seen as conscious choices made on part of author to invest ideology in them. Fairclough (2003) has revealed that “evaluative statements are statements about the desirability and undesirability, what is good and what is bad” (p. 172), where values are often much more deeply embedded in the texts insidiously.

As a matter of fact, the negatively evaluated adjective “the worst” turns the whole incident ideologically ‘evaluative’—where the ‘undesirability’ of burqa is suggestive, implied and assumed. Such evaluations expose the ideological intent behind the heroic description of such an unoccurred incident. According to Fairclough (2003), “Texts inevitably make assumptions. What is ‘said’ in a text is ‘said’ against a background of what is ‘unsaid’, but taken as given” (p. 40) In fact, the brief burqa-buying incident should be seen against the background of the so-called Western feminism that promotes the modern image of woman by deriding on Islamic practices of *pardah*, *hijaab* and *burqa*. One cannot help but noticing this

descriptive incident as a narrative technique of *Mythopoesis*, in which text is littered with short incidents and narratives to get its ideas legitimized and universalized (Fairclough, 2003, p. 100). In fact, such invested universalizations should be framed within the hegemonic struggle as “achieving hegemony entails achieving a measure of success in projecting certain particulars as universals” (Fairclough, 2003, p. 41).

Moving ahead, the second paragraph is related to the first one and seems to be more ideologically invested than the previous one. Let us take the first sentence of this paragraph: “We believe that when we have our first sight of the Kaaba, the black-shrouded cube in Mecca that is our most sacred place, any wish in your heart is granted by God” (Yousafzai, 2013, p. 261). Generally, a Muslim belief is encoded in this sentence. Coherently, the sentence consists of one main clause—i.e., “we believe that when we have our first sight of the Kaaba-----any wish in your heart is granted by God”—and an embedded clause i.e., “the black-shrouded cube in Mecca that is our most sacred place” (Yousafzai, 2013, p. 261).

According to Cook (1989, p. 64), a typical information structure of the sentence proceeds roughly as: “Given...New...Given”. It should be noted “how one piece of what is probably new information is slipped into the middle of the given information” (Cook, 1989, p. 65). The same is true in the structure of the above sentence. The sentence structure is manipulated to adjust the ideological information in the form of an embedded clause. This embedded clause, in fact, is the elaboration of the word “Kaaba”, as it provides the information about the colour (black), material (shrouded), shape (cube), location (in Mecca) and importance of “the Kaaba” (that is our most sacred place). However, this is an incongruent elaboration of the Kaaba. These lexical choices make it clear that “the most sacred place” of the Muslims is described in an irreverent way.

The metaphor of “shroud” is a significant case in point here. Fairclough (1992, p. 194) has pointed out that “metaphors are not just superficial stylistic adornments of discourse...[When] we signify things through one metaphor rather than another, we are constructing our reality in one way rather than another.” The adjective “shrouded” is also the example of the metaphorical lexicalization which has been coined from the noun ‘shroud’ by adding the suffix ‘-ed’. This, in fact, imparts the death imagery to the description of the Kaaba, implying that the Muslims’ God (Allah) is dead. Since the Muslims from all over the world orient themselves toward the Holy Kaaba while praying; therefore, the phrase “black-shrouded” can imply that the Muslims pray to the dead God. How irreverent is this! Moreover, the Kaaba is presented in an unemotional mathematical term of a cube, rather than as a sanctuary. So, the logical implicature of the embedded clause becomes thus as: ‘Our most sacred place is the black-shrouded cube in Mecca’. This metaphor of “shroud” used for the Kaaba, in fact, bears the imprint of Orientalism, that is endemic in Western ontology and epistemology, in which the Orient is constructed by “making statements about it, authorizing views of it, describing it, by teaching it, settling it, ruling over it” (Said, 1978, p. 3). Such invested attempts of linguistically appropriating the admired practices of *purdah*, *hijab* or *burqa* and the most sacred place of *qibla-o-kaaba* of the Muslims should, essentially, be marked “as a Western style for dominating, restructuring, and having authority over the Orient” (Said, 1978, p. 3).

Furthermore, in contrast to the previous paragraph, this one starts with the plural personal pronoun “we”, rather than the singular “I”. This shift is ideological in the sense that ‘we-statements’ import “the ‘power of prediction”, the power of making statements on behalf of others, or indeed on behalf of ‘all of us’ (Fairclough, 2003, p. 171). Hence, the we-statement promotes the idea that *all of us*

*believe in* that ‘the Kaaba is a black-shrouded cube’. In fact, this is a strategic ‘rewording’ (Fairclough, 1992) of the meaning potential of the lexis of ‘Kaaba’. ‘Rewording’ leads to the ‘recontextualization’, which further leads to the reformulation and, hence, transformation (Bernstein 1990, Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999). Therefore, one must consider such practice of rewording as a conscious attempt on part of the West for the linguistic appropriation, transformation, and colonization of the Orient. Rewording of ‘the black-shrouded cube’ is a colossal phrasal step towards the threat of eroding and dismantling the profound cultural, religious and the associational reverence that is inherent and self-ascriptive in the wording of *Qibla-o-Kaaba*.

Another point to note is that both the words “burqa” and “the Kaaba” are not glossed in the text. In other words they are not given the status of the ‘*culture-specific items*’ (Davies, 2003, p.68) that are to be defined as “separate units, like items in glossary” (Newmark, 2010, p. 173), like *Umrah* which is italicized and defined in the glossary list. Baker (1992, p. 21) has explained that “the source-language word may express a concept which is totally unknown in the target culture... [The] concept in question may be abstract or concrete; it may relate to a religious belief, a social custom, or even a type of food...[Such] concepts are often referred to as ‘culture-specific’”. In contrast, they are treated to be self-evident and self-sustained concepts that need not separate illustration.

In text, this irreverent tone is also traceable by noting the lexical choice of “the Prophet”, rather than that of the honorific ‘the Holy Prophet’. Moreover, a phrase “peace be upon him”—a conventionally complimentary phrase which Muslims often write or say after writing or saying the name of the Holy Prophet of

Islam— is also missing here. And, the name of the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) i.e., Mohammad (S.A.W.W) is omitted at all, confusing the readers to be curious to think ‘which of the Prophets?’ It is more shocking to note that the name “Mohammad (S.A.W.W)” as the Holy Prophet is not used in the whole book except for once with the spelling variation of “Mohammed” and that too is from the mouth of a Christian woman called Asia Bibi as: “One version was that they [Muslim women] tried to persuade Asia Bibi to convert to Islam. She replied that Christ had died on the cross for the sins of Christians and asked what the Prophet Mohammed had done for Muslims.” (Yousafzai, 2013, p. 173). One can notice that even in this case the name has been used ironically, as it was inevitable to use “the Prophet Mohammed” because without it the irony would lose its edge.

Lexically, the phrase “the desert of Mecca” is also handled in an ideological way. Firstly, the use of the definite article gives an existential meaning to ‘desert’, implying that Mecca is a desert as the definite article ‘the’ is grammatically used before the names of deserts (Wren & Martin, 2001, p. 34). Secondly, the possessive use of the preposition “of” in the phrase “the desert of Mecca” echoes the famous names of the deserts like “the desert of Sahara”, “the desert of Gobi” etc. And, if we omit the preposition “of” and reverse the phrase, it will become the complete name of desert like the Sahara desert, the Gobi desert and the Mecca desert.<sup>15</sup> By inserting the lexis of ‘desert’, the whole sentence is marked or ‘triggered’ (Fairclough, 2003) to procure the host of ideological meanings implicitly. For example: the holy places of the Muslims are in the *desert* of Mecca; the Holy Prophet, Muhammad (peace be upon him) lived in the

---

<sup>15</sup> Scientifically, the term ‘Desert’ is applied to regions of the earth where daytime temperature can reach 55° C (131° F) in the shade (Encarta, 2009). However, the average high temperature of Mecca is 41° (106° F).

For details visit:  
<http://www.weather2travel.com/climate-guides/saudi-arabia/mecca.php> Accessed on: 18-03-2024.

*desert* of Mecca and the Holy Prophet, Muhammad (peace be upon him) preached in the *desert* of Mecca etc.

Furthermore, the use of contrastive cohesive conjunction “but” is again used as an ideological pivot here. In a sense, everything seems to be okay before “but”. However, after “but” the negative side of Mecca has been painted by pointing out that the “holy places” are “littered with empty bottles and biscuit wrappers”. Which city in the world does not have empty bottles and biscuit wrappers!—a point worth-raising. And, Mecca becomes “the desert of Mecca”. Finally, the last sentence of the paragraph is an indirect reporting of a Hadith, rather than the direct quoted reporting, which would make prominent the name of the Holy Prophet Muhammad (S.A.W.W). In a nutshell, the sentence structure and vocabulary are handled in a way to bear burden of Western ideological import.

#### 4. Findings and Discussion

In the previous section, the data is analyzed with the aim of investigating the mutual relationship of the nexus of language and ideology. Essentially, through the lens of Fairclough’s Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), it has been found that in the biography, the language has been appropriated at both the levels of morphology (i.e., vocabulary) and syntax (i.e., sentence structure) to promote the Western version of the ‘fictionalized Islam’ and to encourage a specific political propaganda against Pakistan.

More precisely, keeping in mind the main research question of the study (i.e. *what type(s) of ideology/ideologies does the book propagate?*); it has been found that, at least at textual level, the biography seems to propagate anti-Islamic and anti-Pakistan ideologies. Behind the persona of Malala and the so-called rhetoric of social injustice, a severe criticism has been launched on Pakistan, its culture, society, politics, religion and its constitution. More simply, under the pretence of ‘education for

girls’, actually, the Western motives and ideologies are projected from the polyphonic point of view, in which Western ideas, culture and civilization are attempted to naturalize. For more examples: In the biography (Yousafzai, 2013), it is notable that Malala is fond of American TV programme ‘*Ugly Betty*’ (p.137); she reads the books like “*Anna Karenina* and the novels of Jane Austen” (p. 55), ‘*Bend it Like Beckham*’—a story of a Sikh girl (p. 242), and ‘*The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*’, the story of Dorothy (p. 249); she loves the book “*The Alchemist*” by Paulo Coelho and reads “it over and over again” (p. 138); in Islamabad, she watches an English play called ‘*Tom, Dick and Harry*’ (p. 161) and proclaims that “until I had watched the English play I had no idea there were so many talented people in Pakistan” (p. 163); in school, she chose to write “a sketch based on *Romeo and Juliet* about corruption” (p. 113); in order to quote in her speech, she preferred Lincoln to Allama Iqbal (p. 64); and she loves “Justin Bieber songs and Twilight movies” (p. 4).

In contrast, to her “one of the worst times was the fasting month of Ramadan...[as] during Ramadan no food or drink can pass a Muslim’s lips in daylight hours” (p. 120). She says that during the exams “school started at nine instead of eight, which as good as I don’t like getting up [early in the morning] and can sleep through the crows of the cocks and the prayer calls of the muezzin” (p. 3). She calls her own mother *Bhabi*—an affectionate Urdu term used for ‘a brother’s wife’—which is totally unusual in any Eastern Islamic society, while in the West there is a special term of ‘Oedipus Complex’ for the incestuous relationship of mother and her own son. It is an attempt to naturalize the notion that in Pakistan it is usual to call her own mother a ‘*Bhabi*’. And, the Islamic concept of ‘Jihad’ is ridiculed by describing that “it was as if under Zia jihad had become the sixth pillar of our religion on top of five we grow up to learn” (p. 26). It bears repetition to mention that the Islamic practices of ‘purdah’ and ‘wearing of

burqa' is depicted in a kind of highly invective language: "Wearing a burqa is like walking inside big fabric shuttle-cock with only a grille to see through and on hot days it's like an oven" (p. 55). Moreover, Malala and her father's way of defending the author Salman Rushdie in her intertextual reference of *The Satanic Verses* (1988), makes it clear that, ideologically, they may have a nexus with Salman Rushdie and are more inclined to criticize Islam under the pretence of the so-called and the biased Western notion of freedom of speech.

Such anti-Islamic or anti-Pakistan ideologies are communicated through the appropriation of language used in the biography. Keeping the other two subsidiary questions (i.e. *How is sentence structure used/manipulated in conveying such ideology/ideologies? & How is vocabulary employed and handled to reinforce or undermine such ideology/ideologies?*) in mind, a textual analysis has been conducted on the selected extracts. It has been found that sentence structure is twisted manipulatively to construct the specific information structure, in which the 'Given' information is juxtaposed with the 'New' ideologically-loaded information roughly. Grammatically, the contrastive conjunction 'but' is used frequently to handle the ideological structuring of the sentences. The clauses before the conjunction 'but' were usually found to be value free, however the clauses after the conjunction 'but' were loaded with the ideologies of Western point of views. And as far as the handling of vocabulary is concerned, the processes of wording, rewording, inversion, lexicalization, passivization and nominalizations are used ideologically. For more examples: The lexical choice of "the killing of the Prophets' grandson Hussein Ibn Ali" (p. 76), rather than that of 'the martyrdom' of the Holy Prophet's (peace be upon him) grandson Hazrat Hussein Ibn Ali (R.A). Here, the nominalization of the active verb "killing", in effect, obscured the agency behind the action. This *killing* [of Hazrat Hussein Ibn Ali (R.A)] is "commemorated" with

a "festival" called Muharram. How irreverent is this! The Muslims 'mourn' rather than "commemorate". And, Muharram is not a festival at all! All this should be seen as the West's construction of its own version of Islam by intervening and desecrating its history and practices and as a sign of power exerted by the West over the Orient than a 'true' discourse about the Orient.

Lastly, one cannot help surprising to note that all these processes of wording, rewording, lexicalization, passivization and nominalization are journalistic in their very use (Fairclough, 1992) and rhetorical in their very effects (Andrus, 2021). Such estimation, actually, leads to the fact that the 'with-author' of the biography (i.e., Christina Lamb) is a professional journalist, currently working as the chief foreign correspondent for the *Sunday Times*. To be explicit, such 'with-authorship' of Malala's memoir makes it a controversial book from its very cover page, as its authorship appears to be deliberately twisted into an ambivalent complex of two *authors*, that is to say, Malala Yousafzai *with* Christina Lamb. In fact, in the publication process of *I am Malala* (2013), the preposition "with" does not make clear exact the role of Christina Lamb: whether she is a compiler, a composer, the organizer of the content, a co-author, an editor, a co-producer, an hired author, an actual author or just the translator and the facilitator of Malala!

Who is the *actual* author of the book? If its authorship has not been asserted explicitly, then all these linguistic appropriations can be considered as the part of the wider *discourse practice* on part of the West's power struggle to alter the course of the Islamic history and to change the semantic domain of such Islamic concepts like jihad, purdah, burqa, martyrdom etc. As has been pointed out by Fairclough (2003) that the *discourse practice* of the linguistic appropriation can be seen as a "power in its most general sense of the 'the transformative capacity of human action', the capacity to 'intervene in a series of events so as



to alter their course” (p. 41).

## 5. Conclusion

“Who is Malala? the gunman demanded. I am Malala and this is my story”, these are the words inscribed on the back cover of the book. But, there is always the other side of the story, *always*. No doubt, the story of Malala Yousafzai is unfortunate and terribly tragic, but her narrative seems to be ‘appropriated’ and ‘manipulated’ to get the legitimization of the Western cultural war which has already been naturalized all around the globe. Her story, in fact, has been used to justify the West’s rhetoric for the “war on terror” in the Muslim World and beyond. The terror actions of the West, the drone attacks in Iraq, the carpet-bombings in Syria and all the war-like occupations of America in Pakistan and Afghanistan, are all seem to be justified now with the rhetoric that ‘look at Malala! we told you they are threat to you, to us, to the world, that is why we intervene to save natives’.

If truth be bold, like McCormick’s *Sold* (2006)<sup>16</sup> in which, Lakshmi, a fourteen years old South Asian girl, is saved by an American savior; *I am Malala* (2013) is also the story of a native girl being saved by the white man. Malala represents the girl whose emancipation and identity cannot emerge from within her own society and culture. Her identity is articulated in the terms of Western literacy. Hence, Malala’s self-defining articulation of a hegemonic discourse is rooted in a discursive struggle between the West and the rest, where ‘the other side of the world’ is once again proved to be incapable of agency. So, the latent ideology behind the whole story of Malala becomes that Pakistani Islamic society offers little potential for positive change. Instead, the West is the centre of a transformative discourse on education and the articulation of individual identity, echoing the famous epigraphs of Said’s *Orientalism* (1978) that “they cannot represent

themselves; they must be represented” and that “the East is a career” for the West to pursue.

Therefore, in the light of the findings and the above discussion, it can be concluded that the biography of *I am Malala* (2013) is no less a literary canon contributing to the establishment of neo-imperialism or neo-colonialism than Conrad’s *Heart of Darkness* (1900). Indeed, *I am Malala* (2013) is a strategic asset in the European academic culture, with a recent wave of policy-oriented literature painting and imposing picture of Islam and Pakistan as an opposing force of the West. This meant-for-purpose biography seems to be the part of a larger genre of strategic literature of the sort that celebrates the triumph of liberalism and the “end of history” (e.g., Fukuyama, 1992), or which portends a “clash of civilizations” (e.g., Huntington, 1993), or which posits a global battle between consumerism and tribalism (e.g., Barber, 1995), and which includes various other permutations of the linearity myth (e.g., Beck, 2000). In fact, this biography is one of those literary neo-colonial discourses, which often resist Islam as the ‘Other’ by contributing to the series of monolithic, deterministic, black-and-white typologies and are used as a defensive tool for the white savior complex with the Eastern skin and the Western mask over it.

Lastly, it bears repetition that the purpose of the present study is not to undermine the humanitarian validity of the book that seeks to broaden the reader’s awareness of the relationship between terrorism, extremism, and culturally fostered gender inequalities or inequities. It is just an attempt to paint the other side of the picture. Certainly, in such effort, its analyses, its findings and its interpretations are not immune to criticism. However, it has been argued that in spite of the indisputable commitment to the human rights

---

<sup>16</sup> Patricia McCormick, like Christina Lamb, is also the “with-author” of the ‘Young Readers Edition’ of

*“I am Malala: How One Girl Stood Up for Education and Changed the World”* (2014).

and the pedagogical need to foster empathy and further social justice, a critical stance needs to be alert to the morphing of hegemonic processes in the “third worlding” of social action. Definitely, in pursuing such critical stances ‘pure’ cognition is inappropriate and inaccessible and, admittedly, it is pertinent to reiterate that “CDA is biased—and proud of it” (van Dijk, 2001, p. 96).

## REFERENCES

- Aimen, U. (2013, July 16). In Pakistan, Malala is seen as an overexposed poster child of the West. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from: <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blog/s/she-the-people/wp/2013/07/16/in-pakistan-malala-is-wrongly-derided-as-an-overexposed-poster-child-of-the-west/>. Accessed on: 11-03-2024.
- Andrus, J. (2021). Rhetorical discourse analysis. Accessed from: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal1017.pub2> Accessed on: 15-03-2024.
- Baig, A. (2013, July 15). Malala Yousafzai and the white saviour Complex. *The Huffington Post*. Retrieved from: [http://www.huffingtonpost.co.uk/assed-baig/malala-yousafzai-white-saviour\\_b\\_3592165.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.co.uk/assed-baig/malala-yousafzai-white-saviour_b_3592165.html) Accessed on: 08-03-2024.
- Barber, B. (1995). *Jihad versus McWorld: How globalism and tribalism are reshaping the world*. New York: Times Books.
- Barthes, R. (2002). *Le Neutre*. Paris: Seuil/IMEC.
- Beck, U. (2000). *What Is globalization?* London: Polity Press.
- Bernstein, B. (1990). *The structure of pedagogic discourse*. London: Routledge.
- Bhabha, H., K. (1994). *The location of culture*. London: Routledge.
- Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L. (1992). *An invitation to reflexive sociology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Chouliaraki, L., & Fairclough, N. (1999). *Discourse in late modernity: Rethinking critical discourse analysis*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Conrad, J. (1900). *Heart of darkness*. [ebook, Planet PDF].
- Cook, G. (1989). *Discourse*. Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.
- Creswell, J.W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). London: Sage.
- Davies, E. E. (2003). A goblin or a dirty nose? The treatment of culture-specific references in translations of Harry Potter Book. *The Translator*, 9(1), 65-100. doi: 10.1080/13556509.2003.1079914.
- Eagleton, T. (1991). *Ideology: An introduction*. London: Verso.
- Encarta, Microsoft [computer software, version:16.0.0.1117]. (2009). Microsoft corporation.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. London: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Oxford: Polity Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. London: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analyzing discourse and text: Textual analysis for social research*. London: Routledge.
- Fowler, R. (1991). *Language in the news: Discourse and ideology in the press*. London: Routledge.
- Fowler, R., Hodge, R., Kress, G., & Trew, T. (1979). *Language and control*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

- Fukuyama, F. (1992). *The end of history and the last man*. New York: The Free Press.
- Gerring, J. (1997). Ideology: A definitional analysis. *Political Research Quarterly*, 50(4), 957-994. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1177/106591299705000412>. Accessed on: 15-03-2024.
- Haig, E. (2009). *Applying systemic functional linguistics and critical discourse analysis to the investigation of ideology in a radio news bulletin*. [PhD thesis, pp, 45-73]. Lancaster: Lancaster University. Extract retrieved from: <https://www.lang.nagoya-u.ac.jp/media/public/mediasociety/vol4/pdf/haig.pdf>. Accessed on: 20-09-2023.
- Hodge, R., & Kress, G. (1993). *Language as ideology*. London: Routledge.
- Huntington, S. P. (1993). The clash of civilizations? *Foreign Affairs*, 72 (3), pp. 22-49.
- Joseph, J. E., & Taylor, T. J. (1990). Introduction: Ideology, science and language. In J. E. Joseph, & T. J. Taylor (Eds.), *Ideologies of language* (pp1-8). London: Taylor & Francis.
- Klemperer, V. (1946). *lingua tertii imperii: Notizbuch eines philologen*. Leipzig: Reclam Verlag.
- Klemperer, V. (2000[1946]). *The language of the Third Reich* (trans. M. Brady). New York, NY: Continuum.
- Lecerle, J. J. (2006). *A Marxist philosophy of language* (G. Elliott, Trans.). Leiden: Brill.
- McCormick, P. (2006). *Sold*. New York: Hyperion.
- Mertens, D. M. (1998). *Research methods in education and psychology: Integrating diversity with quantitative & qualitative approaches*. London: Sage.
- Newmark, P. (2010). Translation and culture. In B. Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk (Ed.), *Meaning in translation* (pp. 171-182). Frankfurt: Peter Long Publishers.
- O' Leary, Z. (2004). *The essential guide to doing research*. London: Sage.
- Orwell, G. (1949). *Nineteen Eighty-Four* [e-book]. Retrieved from: <http://www.planetebook.com/about.htm>. Accessed on: 24-09-2014.
- Orwell, G. (1973 [1946]). *Animal farm*. London: Penguin.
- Pérez, E. (1999). *The decolonial imaginary: Writing Chicanas into history*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Press, S. M. (2005). The language of ideology: Lingual manipulation of readers in German literature of the Third Reich. *Vanderbilt Undergraduate Research Journal*, 1(1), 1-10. Retrieved From: <https://doi.org/10.15695/vurj.v1i0.2712>. Accessed on: 28-02-2024.
- Rozina, G., & Karapetjana, I. (2009). The use of language in political rhetoric: Linguistic manipulation. *SDÜ Fen Edebiyat Fakültes Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 19, 111-122. Retrieved from: [http://sablun.sdu.edu.tr/dergi/sosbilder/dosyalar/19\\_9.pdf](http://sablun.sdu.edu.tr/dergi/sosbilder/dosyalar/19_9.pdf). Accessed on: 28-08-2023
- Sadaf, S. (2017). I am Malala: Human rights and the politics of production, marketing and reception of the post-9/11 memoir. *Interventions*, 19(6), 855–871. Doi: 10.1080/1369801X.2017.1347053.
- Said, E. W. (1978). *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Said, E. W. (1981). *Covering Islam: How the media and the experts determine how we see the rest of the world*. New York: Pantheon.
- Seidel, E. (1961). *Sprachwandel im Dritten Reich: Eine Kritische Untersuchung*

- Faschistischer Einflüsse*. Halle (Saale): VEB Verlag Sprache und Literatur.
- Shakespeare, W. (1979). *The merchant of Venice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Originally published in the First Folio in 1600.
- Simpson, P. (2005). *Language, ideology and point of view* [ebook]. London & New York: Routledge.
- Spivak, G. C. (1988). Subaltern studies: Deconstructing historiography. In R. Guha & G. C. Spivak (Eds.), *Selected subaltern studies* (pp. 3-32). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Sword, H. (2012, July 23). Zombie nouns [Blog post]. Retrieved from: [http://opinionator.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/07/23/zombie-nouns/?\\_r=0](http://opinionator.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/07/23/zombie-nouns/?_r=0)  
Accessed on: 14-02-2024.
- Turnbull, J., et al. (Eds.). (2010). *Oxford advanced learner's dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- van Dijk, T.A. (1995). Discourse analysis as ideology analysis. In C. Schaffner & A. L. Wenden (Eds.), *Language and peace* (pp.17–33). Dartmouth: Aldershot.
- van Dijk, T.A. (1998). *Ideology: A multidisciplinary approach*. London: Sage.
- van Dijk, T.A. (2001). Multidisciplinary CDA: A plea for diversity. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.). *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (1<sup>st</sup> ed, pp. 95–120). London: Sage.
- van Dijk, T.A. (2006). Ideology and discourse analysis. *Journal of Political Ideologies*, 11(2), 115-140. doi: 10.1080/13569310600687908.
- Voloshinov, V. N. (1973). *Marxism and the philosophy of language* (L. Matejka & I. R. Titunik, Trans.). London: Seminar Press.
- Wodak, R. & Meyer, M. (2009). Critical discourse analysis: History, theory, agenda, and methodology. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of CDA* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed, pp. 1-33). London: Sage.
- Wren, P. C., & Martin, H. (2001). *High school English grammar & composition*. Karachi: Paramount Publishers.
- Wright, S. (1998). *Language and conflict*. Cleveland: Multilingual Matters.
- Yousafzai, M. (2013). *I am Malala: The girl who stood up for education and was shot by the Taliban*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson.
- Žižek, S. (1994). The spectre of ideology. In S. Žižek (Ed.), *Mapping ideology* (pp. 1-33). London: Verso.
- Zubek, E. (2016, December 18). She is Malala: Darling of the West, public enemy in Pakistan? [culture trip (Blog Post)] Retrieved from: <http://theculturetrip.com/asia/pakistan/articles/she-is-malala-darling-of-the-west-public-enemy-in-pakistan/>.  
Accessed on: 15-03-2024.

Appendix-I  
(Yousafzai, 2013, p.75)

I am proud that our country was created as the world's first Muslim homeland, but we still don't agree on what this means. The Quran teaches us *sabar* – patience – but often it feels that we have forgotten the word and think Islam means women sitting at home in purdah or wearing burqas while men do jihad. We have many strands of Islam in Pakistan. Our founder Jinnah wanted the rights of Muslims in India to be recognised, but the majority of people in India were Hindu. It was as if there was a feud between two brothers and they agreed to live in different houses. So British India was divided in August 1947, and an independent Muslim state was born. It could hardly have been a bloodier beginning. Millions of Muslims crossed from India, and Hindus travelled in the other direction. Almost two million of them were killed trying to cross the new border. Many were slaughtered on trains which arrived at Lahore and Delhi full of bloodied corpses. My own grandfather narrowly escaped death in the riots when his train was attacked by Hindus on his way home from Delhi, where he had been studying. Now we are a country of 180 million and more than 96 per cent are Muslim. We also have around two million Christians and more than two million Ahmadis, who say they are Muslims though our government says they are not. Sadly those minority communities are often attacked.

**Appendix-II**  
**(Yousafzai, 2013, pp. 260-61)**

Though I don't remember exactly what happened that day, sometimes I have flashbacks. They come unexpectedly. The worst one was in June, when we were in Abu Dhabi on the way to perform *Umrah* in Saudi Arabia. I went to a shopping mall with my mother as she wanted to buy a special burqa to pray in Mecca. I didn't want one. I said I would just wear my shawl as it is not specified that a woman must wear a burqa. As we were walking through the mall, suddenly I could see so many men around me. I thought they were waiting for me with guns and would shoot. I was terrified though I said nothing. I told myself, *Malala, you have already faced death. This is your second life. Don't be afraid – if you are afraid you can't move forward.*

We believe that when we have our first sight of the Kaaba, the black-shrouded cube in Mecca that is our most sacred place, any wish in your heart is granted by God. When we prayed at the Kaaba, we prayed for peace in Pakistan and for girls' education, and I was surprised to find myself in tears. But when we went to the other holy places in the desert of Mecca where the Prophet lived and preached, I was shocked that they were littered with empty bottles and biscuit wrappers. It seemed that people had neglected to preserve history. I thought they had forgotten the Hadith that cleanliness is half of faith.