
Nasir Mehmood*

Hazrat Umar**

Muhammad Uzair***

Myth and Reality: A Critical Discourse Analysis of Olaf Caroe's "The Judgment"

ABSTRACT

*This article aims at investigating how social control and power relationship are represented through language. It explores how unequal relations between the dominant and dominated are ideologically disguised and naturalized to the advantage of a particular group. It identifies how dominant political positions influence the public opinion. The text which constitutes the data for the current study is a chapter titled "The Judgment" taken from *The Pathans*- a book written by Olaf Caroe. After critical discourse analysis of the text, specifically taking the merits of the judgment, the authors of this study make the case of Khushhal Khan and Aurangzeb, as a point of departure. It has been found that the author of *The Pathans* shows his weak appraisal of the events and makes self-contradictory statements thereby weakening his arguments.*

* Lecturer, Department of English, NUML, Islamabad, Pakistan.

** Assistant Professor, Department of English, NUML, Islamabad, Pakistan.

*** Associate Professor & Director Academics, NUML, Islamabad, Pakistan.

Finally, after looking into the evidences, the study concludes that the actual cause of Khushhal Khan's imprisonment was a political conspiracy rather than his rebellion against King Aurangzeb's authority, which the author of The Pathans took for granted.

Keywords: *Khushhal Khan, political conspiracy, rebellion, King Aurangzeb, CDA, ideology*

Introduction

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) is a type of discourse analytical research which aims at examining the ways how social power abuse, dominance, and inequality are enacted, recreated as well as resisted by text and talk in the social and political context, notes Van Dijk (1998). He argues further that what critical discourse analysts do is to take explicit position comprehending, exposing, and consequently resisting social inequality (Van Dijk, 1998). Generally speaking, text is not an isolated entity but it carries the ideological mindset of the author. According to Fairclough (2012), there is a reciprocal relationship between ideology and language. Language is the primary medium of social control and power. Similarly, ideology is presented through language and the ideological nature of language should, therefore, be one of the major themes of modern social sciences. Moreover, the social, political and historical factors become significant in CDA as it allows the researcher to look into both text and the context.

The present article highlights how these factors are represented through text. Moreover, it focuses on how the

unequal power relations between the dominant and dominated are disguised and naturalized to the advantage of a particular group. It takes into account the political tussle between the King Aurangzeb and Khushal Khan Khattak, the chieftain of the Pathan in the first half of the 17th century. In fact, Aurangzeb ascended to the throne as the sixth Mughal King, by assassinating his brothers and throwing the incumbent king Shah Jahan into prison. Khushhal Khan Khattak, on the other hand, became the chieftain of Khattaks after his father Shahbaz Khan got wounded fatally in a battle with Yusufzais after which he died shortly. Khushhal Khan continued to serve the Mughal Kingdom and performed his duties, including the protection of the royal road from Attock to Peshawar. However, soon afterwards, grievances developed between him and King Aurangzeb, which ultimately resulted in the arrest of the former. After getting release from the imprisonment, Khushhal Khan became rebellious. The fire (Khushhal's anger) 'turned from a mere spark into a flaming fire, and set it to Aurangzeb's house (Kamil, 1968, p. 53). It is in this context, that the present research tries to explore the issue focusing on the following research questions:

1. How are persons, objects, phenomena/events and actions named and referred to linguistically?
2. What characteristics, qualities and features are attributed to social actors, objects phenomena and events?
3. What arguments are employed in the discourse in question and from what perspective are these arguments expressed?

Literature Review

According to Fairclough (1995) critical discourse analysis, in a nutshell, focuses on systematic exploration of relationship of causality and determination between texts, events and discursive practices in a broader socio-cultural context. Moreover, it investigates how such practices and events happen to occur, and are ideologically shaped by the power and struggle over power (as cited in Lock, 2004). In this context, the present work focuses on how the political events led to the serious differences between King Aurangzeb and Khushhal Khan Khattak. Moreover, it aims at finding out how these events were represented in the text and political discourse. According to Van Dijk (2001) the objective of critical discourse analysis (CDA) is to find out how the conflict and unequal relationship exist between different social groups in the social hierarchy, in the political context, and how the exercise of resistance is enacted/reproduced through text and talk. It implies that the major focus of CDA remains on studying the relationship between language, power and ideology.

Ideology in Marxist's framework can be defined as a system of ideas and practices that disguises or distorts the social, economic and political relationship between the dominant and the dominated classes. In this connection, Althusser (1971) notes that ideology is a way in which people make sense of their lives and the ideological and political institutions as well as the discourses they propagate, hail the individual in social interactions, by giving him an identity. Although, power and ideology are sometimes interchangeably used in discourse, but some critical analysts such as Foucault (1969), think the other way. Foucault refuses

to link "ideology" with any rigid, settled notion of truth. Truth is produced and reproduced by the adherents of ideology. In fact, Foucault came eventually to drop the use of ideology for his preferred term "discourse. He acknowledges that there is a strong link between ideology and power in the sense, but claims that power is diffused by the effect of ideology, and therefore, it requires an archeology of its own. He thinks that power is not concentrated but diffused throughout the whole society and that relations between parents and children, between lovers, between employers and employees – all are power relations. This allows us to see the power relations at work in each human interaction and thus to see how resistance always shows up. Power is seen as a more volatile, unstable element, which can be always contested (Foucault, 1969). The present work is also directed in the same lines as it focuses on how a king uses his power to imprison a man, to whom he had given a heavy administrative and political authority. It is an attempt to identify the immediate causes of rebellion on the part of Khushhal Khan Khattak.

Fairclough (1995) is of the view that the dominance of one group over the other(s) within an order of discourse gives rise to the naturalization of its (ideological) meanings and practices. He claims that resistance comes from the subjects whose positioning within other institutions and orders of discourse provides them with the resources to resist. Ideology, he says, is backgrounded in the text. However, he adds further that it is also seen, being 'located' in both structures (discourse conventions) and events. On the other side, the conventions drawn upon in actual discursive events, which are structured together within 'orders of discourse', associated with institutions, are

ideologically invested in particular ways (Fairclough, 1995, p.25).

Wodak (2015) seems to support Fairclough's point of view as she also describes the terms 'ideology, power and critique' in her discourse historical approach to CDA. She argues that these three concepts are constitutive for every approach in CDA, though they are frequently employed with different meanings. While explaining Discourse Historical Approach (DHA) she opines that the 'term' has a complex history, but she is of the view that the proponents of CDA use discourse analysis to challenge what they regard as undesirable social and political practices. She states that 'ideology', 'power' and 'critique' are always used to be the key points in the discussion of CDA. In this context Wodak and Meyer (2009) mention four basic characteristics of ideology. Firstly, ideology is more significant than cognitions. Secondly, it has the potential of guiding individuals' evaluations. Thirdly, it provides necessary guidance through action. Lastly, it must be logically coherent. The next point of discussion is the conception of power and ideology. Power relates to the unequal relationship among social actors who assume different social positions or belong to different social groups. According to Weber (1980) power is associated with the possibility of having one's own will within a social relationship against the will or interests of others. He uses the term 'actional power' by which he means the power in the form of physical force and violence. In other words, it is the control of people through threats or promises, an attachment to authority and technical control through objects, such as means of production, means of transportation, weapons and so on. Wodak (2015) also argues that power is the concept which is no less important

in CDA. She claims that researchers in CDA are interested in the way discourse enacts as well as reproduce social domination. The task of the researcher is then to uncover what moral standard permits them to distinguish between the use and abuse of power. She emphasizes that the term 'critical' can be explained as keeping distance from the data, analyzing the data in the social context, clarifying the political positioning of discourse participants, and concentrating on self-reflection while carrying out research (Wodak, 2015).

Theoretical Framework

Wodak (2015, p.64) argues that some politicians and groups of elites are best seen both as shapers of specific public opinions and interests as they react to the atmospheric anticipation of changes in public opinion and to the articulation of changing interests of specific social groups and affected parties. Those who hold dominant political positions influence the public opinion. She states that in diverse modern societies and in the rapidly changing world, the relationship among media, politics and people is often very intricate. In such situation, questions like: who influences whom, and how these influences are directed, cannot be suitably answered by a simple model. Wodak (2015) argues that the solution to make such relationship more lucid, lies in the discourse analytical research i.e. CDA. The present research uses discourse historical approach (DHA) to CDA as a theoretical framework, as outlined in Wodak and Meyer (2001) and Wodak (2015), in order to analyze a text, which embodies political, social and historical elements. The text, titled, 'the judgment' has been taken from the book, 'The

Pathans', written by Olaf Caroe in 1957. The model rightly fits the present work because it follows a complex concept of social critique, focusing both on cognition and the dimension of action.

The three dimensional model adopted for this study has the following characteristics:

1. Text or discourse immanent critique which focuses on identifying inconsistencies, paradoxes and dilemmas in the text/discourse internal structures.
2. The socio-diagnostic critique, which is associated with uncovering apparent or latent, persuasive or manipulative character of discursive practices. Moreover, it allows the analyst to look beyond textual or discourse internal horizon, and by using his/her background/contextual knowledge, in order to explore the discursive event in a wider frame of social and political relations, processes and circumstances.
3. Prognostic critique, which is concerned with transformation and improvement of communication within public institutions, by giving proposals and guidelines for reducing language barriers in various institutions.

The present work explores the subject text from the above three angles including text, context and, finally, giving some proposals at the end.

Methodology

In the present study, the theoretical framework/model, used for analysis of the data, is based on linguistic as well as interpretive framework keeping in view the paradigm of CDA. In this connection, identifying the specific contents of

the subject discourse, the present work carries out textual analysis. The focus remains on investigating the covert or manifest discursive strategies, linguistic means and specific, context-dependent linguistic realizations, exhibited in the text. However, the socio-cultural and historical context in which the text was produced has also been taken into account.

Analysis

Olaf Caroe embarks upon judging the merits of the case of Khushhal Khan Khatak against Aurangzeb in which he seems to be defending the former and denouncing the later. He deals with the subject in a way which shows his weak appraisal of the historical facts and uncertainty about the correctness of the statements he makes. Caroe gives several reasons for the arrest of Khushhal Khan Khatak. According to the author, it "had more to do than any other factor with the rebellion of Khushhal Khan Khatak" (Caroe 1957, p. 232). He adds further that it is fair to note two things in order to deal with the case: the first is that Khushhal Khan Khatak had good reason for disliking a ruler who had deprived him of the ferry and high way tolls which were being enjoyed by his forefathers since the time of Akbar's rule. Moreover, he defends the King Aurangzeb and criticizes Khushhal Khan as he argues:

The deprivation was part of a general remission of all taxes collected on every highway throughout the empire, and it can be represented as a wise act of statesmanship, resistance to which on the part of Khushhal Khan Khatak and others was self-interested and small-minded. (Caroe 1957, p. 232)

The second reason which the author presents is as under:

The alienation of Khushhal Khan and his Khataks was bound up with the local tribal aversion of Khataks for Yusufzais. And in all this no doubt the local officials, including the governor of the time, were able to find much that was intriguing and profitable to them. (Caroe 1957, p. 241)

The author seems to dictate as he writes:

Khushhal Khan Khatak should have poured the vials of his wrath on the wise emperor whose only fault was that he decreed measures for the public good which impinged on private vested interests, but on the Yusufzais and the local officials whom they misled. (as cited in Kamil 1968, p. 77)

After highlighting the two aspects of the case, which the author calls fair, he puts forth some more arguments against what he calls constitute "a strong school of historians engaged on the rehabilitation of Aurangzeb" along with an apology for Khushhal Khan Khatak and denunciation of Aurangzeb in the strongest possible terms. The author writes:

But for Khushhal Khan Khatak too there is this to be said. He did not resist the withdrawal of the right to collect tolls; he did not go into rebellion over it. Yet despite twenty years' personal service to the monarchy and the loyalty of father, grandsire and great-grandsire to empire cause, in 1644 he was placed under arrest at Peshawar, sent to Delhi in chains, confined to Gwalior for two years and not released until 1668. (as cited in Kamil 1968, p. 77)

The author further refers to the people who say that Aurangzeb was justified in the way he treated Khushhal Khan Khatak. By using a harsh language against Khushhal Khan, he writes:

What of that, say Aurangzeb's partisans? Given the vitriolic attacks of the poet on his king, and knowing as we now do that Khushhal Khan Khatak's release was a naming factor leading to a dangerous rebellion on the empire's most difficult frontier in the course of which the imperial armies were defeated in six pitched battles, Khushhal Khan Khatak was lucky to escape with four years' restraint. Aurangzeb would have been justified in cutting of his head, and the fact that he did not do so, shows his magnanimity. (as cited in Kamil 1968, p. 77)

In contrast to the king, Khushhal Khan Khatak's action has been called treacherous. The author holds:

In proof of Khushhal Khan Khatak's treachery is pointed out that he was with Amin before the battle in the Khaibar, but his poems show that he not only glorified in Amin's defeat, the defeat of his commander and patron, but straightaway went into open rebellion against his king and he spent the rest of his life in that fashion. (as cited in Kamil 1968, p. 77)

In fact, the author, not only criticizes Khushhal, but also his race. He holds that Khushhal Khan Khatak's treacherous actions of being unyielding as well as disloyal to the

authority are due to the defects of his race. The author argues:

Khushhal Khan Khatak had certainly the defects of a race never constant on himself, as he saw it. Such men can be held only in the bonds of loyalty which is personal to him to whom it is offered and it is hard to think of any such emotional bond between the cold-blooded Emperor and his headstrong vassal in the north. Even now the tribal spirit is so strong in them that Pathans will chafe under authority: three hundred years ago the slightest affront would rouse the instinct of the tribesmen to get free, to strike off every bond and be a law to himself, obeying only the *nang*, the honor, of the Patan. Khushhal Khan Khatak would have seen no wrong, after the Khaibar fight to go into outlawry. (as cited in Kamil 1968, p. 78)

Finally, the author comes to the point of making judgment between the two: the king Aurangzeb and the warrior poet, Khushhal Khan Khatak. The author states:

All said, we have to judge between the two men. Which voice is more authentic, that of the emperor who killed his father and imprisoned his father and imprisoned his brothers to reach the throne, and with all his genius and persistence, led the empire to corruption and decay; or that of the warrior poet whose words still kindle fire in the hearts of his compatriots? (Caroe, 1957, p. 241)

Before we, as researchers, offer our own views on the comparative merits of the cross-case, and about the

judgment given therein by the author, I think it pertinent as well as helpful to quote a passage from the "The setting in history", a chapter in Howell and Caroe (1963). The joint authors argue for the reasons which give rise to the conditions, leading to the arrest and imprisonment of Khushhal Khan Khatak, and ultimately contributing to a localized disturbance, assuming the form of a dangerous and widespread rebellion.

The collaborators say:

But the climate was to change completely. In 1661 Mahabat Khan, the founder of the mosque that bears his name in Peshawar city handed over the charge of the frontier Province to Sayyid Amir, with one Abdurrahim as deputy in Peshawar. These two men determined to back the Yusufzais and obtained an imperial mandate for the abolition of the Indus ferry tolls. Khushhal Khan Khatak was hard hit, and it would have been unlike a Pathan not to resent this blow to his pride and to his pocket. An endeavor can be made to justify the measure on general grounds, but it may also have been prompted by a genuine belief that Khushhal Khan and his Khataks had for too long enjoyed a monopoly of imperial favour and that the Yusufzais were better worth cultivating. (Howell, & Caroe, 1963, p.4)

Now, critically analyzing the discourse of the above arguments, it appears that they contradict each other. Firstly, the author describes that the deprivation in question, not being peculiar to the Attock highway on account of the

imperial decree abolishing road tolls, but also applicable to all parts of the empire from the very beginning, and until shortly before the arrest of Khushhal Khan Khatak the "Frontier Province" and other areas being excluded from the operation of the decree and on its being extended to those areas as result of shift of policy. In fact, this statement is not supported by any historical evidence. Moreover, official records and other contemporary Indian sources are silent even about the arrest and imprisonment of Khushhal Khan Khatak. This, in turn, weakens the strength of the argument that Khushhal Khan resented the blow to his pocket, keeping in view the same had been dealt to many others like him, including those who derived greater incomes from the road-tool etc than he did.

Secondly, if it was thought that the change in the state policy was intended to please and favour the enemies and opponents of Khushhal Khan Khatak and his tribe, then it seems to be the act of small mindedness. Moreover, the change could not have been brought about without the knowledge and approval of the emperor. In this case if Khushhal Khan Khatak had the right to pour the vials of his wrath on the viceroy and his deputy at Peshawar, the same right could also not be withheld from him even in the case of emperor.

Thirdly, analyzing the remark about the Pashtuns being over-sensitive regarding their prestige and financial interest, it can be said that concern for both is equally applicable to people in general because human nature is uniform everywhere. For Pashtuns, however, it may be asserted that their honour, pride, and prestige according to their code of honour (*nang*) are associated, besides other things, with feelings which, as far as possible, have no concern for

money. The generosity of Pashtuns speaks for itself as the door of every house is always open for outsiders and guests. It is probably because of this that a newcomer never needs introduction in a Pashtun *hujra* (a village guest house or privately owned one). So, the Pashtuns, though not certainly less fond of wealth than anyone else, want, but to win honour and prestige by spending it, because it is not only the sword or rifle with which his Pashto (ethos and code of honour) is bound but also his dining table. In this connection, it is interesting to note here that Caroe himself acknowledges this aspect of Pashtuns' character in the introduction to his book. The author writes:

For the stranger who has eyes to see and ears to hear, always as he drove through the Margalla pass just north of Rawalpindi and went on to cross the great bridge at Attock, there was a lifting of the heart and a knowledge that however hard the task and beset with danger, here was a people who looked him in the face and made him feel he had come home. (as cited in Kamil 1968, p. 80)

As said earlier, Pashtuns are famous for their hospitality to the strangers which shows their generous attitude. As for Khushhal Khan Khatak being a Pashtuns' representative it was no exception. Olaf Caroe himself, not only calls him the "Pashtun par excellence", or "a Pathan of Pathans" but he also appreciates his benevolent interest in the needy and the poor, and his generosity, which he had inherited from his father. He once distributed alms among the poor, and showing his coin stained hands to his son, Abdul Qadir Khan, said, "Beware of the stain of this thing. You may wash it off

from your hands but not from your heart" (as cited in Kamil 1968, p. 80).

According to Kamil (1968, p. 81), the official records and contemporary Indian sources are silent even about the reasons and circumstances that led to the arrest/imprisonment of Khushhal Khatak. However, we may be able to gather the circumstantial by looking at the poetry of Khushhal Khan Khatak, written during and after his captivity. Following are some of the extracts of his poetry, along with English translation rendered by Dost Muhammad Khan Kamil.

I

*Pa nahaq da Aurangzeb pa band bandi yam
Khudai Khabar da pa tuhmat aw pa buhtan
Za pa zaan kha gunah na venam pa khudai go
Wala nor khabara ka shan shan
Da guna ma sara shta na da malooma
Magar Khpal da zaan venum tawan*

Unjustly Have I been made a captive in Aurangzeb's prison
God is cognizant of the false charge and fabrication,
No crime of mine I know, by Go I swear,
Though others may, however,
tell a thousand tales.
It is unknown wherefore and how
I am guilty,
But the creditable in me is my discredit
(as cited in Kamil 1968, p. 81).

II

Sa yawaza pa ma na da ka zhwanda vee

*Aurangzeb badshah pa dar kanda paial
Da pa las da Bukht Nasar zulm wakhist
Za da da lasa band laka danial*

I am not the solitary victim of
Aurangzeb's oppression,
Many others will be ruined if he
lives a while.

He has revived the tyranny of
Nebuchadnezzar,
And I, like Daniel, am a captive
In his prison
(as cited in Kamil 1968, p. 81).

III

*Parwarda ka da Muhgalo pranamak yam
Da Aurang da lasa han la ghrawa dak yam
Pa na haq yae pa zandan krham yo so kala
Khuda khabar dae ka pa khpal gunah za shak yam*

Albeit on the Moghal's salt have
I been fed,
Aurangzeb's tyranny has made me
A complaint personified.
For many years unjustly he kept
Me in confinement,
God is aware of my being unaware
of my guilt (as cited in Kamil 1968, p. 82).

IV

Pa dawran da Auranzeb badshah pa band shwam

*B taqsera ba gunaha dardmand shwam
Dr salor kala pa band da Aurangzeb wum
Khudai cha khlas krham intiqam tan a shakaib wum*

I was made a prisoner in the
Emperor Aurangzeb's reign,
I was tortured without guilt or
Fault of mine.

For three or four years I was
Aurangzeb's captive.

On becoming free I became
Impatient for revenge
(as cited in Kamil 1968, p. 81).

Discussion and Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to critically analyse Olaf Caroe's estimate of the unpleasant relations between King Aurangzeb and Khushhal Khan Khatak, which finally led to the imprisonment of the later. Ruth Wodak's discourse historical model was used in order to see how persons, events and actions are linguistically represented in the subject text. In addition, what characteristics, qualities and features are attributed to social actors and events? Lastly, what supporting arguments are employed in the said discourse and how far does the author defend his case by making judgment?

The analysis of the selected discourse shows that Olaf Caroe referred to King Aurangzeb and Khushhal Khan Khattak in two different ways. The language he used shows a sharp contrast in terms of the way he addresses the two politically opposed persons. For example, he calls the abolishment of road tolls "as a wise act of statesmanship, resistance to which on the part of Khushhal Khan Khatak, was self-interested and small-minded" (Caroe 1957, p. 232). At another place the author seems to dictate Khushhal Khan Khattak by saying that he (Khushhal Khan) "should have poured the vials of his wrath" "on the Yusufzais and the local officials whom they misled" (pp. 239, 243). Referring to the imprisonment of Khushhal Khan Khatak by Aurangzeb the author says that "Aurangzeb would have been justified in cutting of his head, and the fact that he did not do so, shows his magnanimity" (as cited in Kamil 1968, p. 77). At another place, the author holds that Khushhal Khan Khatak was hit hard, not to resent `this blow to his pride and to his pocket. In this way, he not only criticizes Khushhal Khan Khattak, but

also his race. The same argument is used at another place when he points out that "Khushhal Khan Khatak had certainly never constant on himself" (as cited in Kamil 1968, p. 78).

Now at first, as already pointed out that ideologies play an important role in determining the choices the authors make during the act of writing. The author's feelings, thoughts and especially his ideology, in addition to the social and cultural context in which the text is produced, becomes significant when it comes to critically analysing a text. In the present case, it appears that Olaf Caroe's estimate of the case between King Aurangzeb and Khushhal Khan was not based on the historical facts as a result of which he misjudges between the two parties. Secondly, a discourse is needed to be analyzed as a text unit where words and lexis are important not only with respect to their individual meanings, but also their contribution to the meaning of the discourse as a whole. But this meaning can be understood by considering the socio cultural and historical contexts. Accepting that a language is a social and cultural phenomenon, the foreign author has to deal with different linguistic and cultural system. It means that not only text, but also the context is significant which goes beyond structural features of language and reveals the hidden aspects of discourse. Social and cultural factors consciously/unconsciously influence the author, resulting in the ideological discrepancies between the way persons and events are represented and the way they actually are. Here again it seems that Olaf Caro misrepresents some of the important socio-political events, which were the actual cause of the tussle between King Aurangzeb and Khushhal Khan.

It is natural that the author always holds some position (bias or belief or a set of values) as he writes about

something which is politically, socio culturally and historically important. He is a subject constituted socially and historically. He sets the text by setting it against the backdrop of common words and phrases, and the familiar conventions and texts with his general knowledge, which is ideological. In this connection it is argued that Caroe was a politically influential figure. He was one of those British politicians who exercised their politically dominant positions in order to support one group or the other. He later on became the governor of NWFP (now KPK) before independence but before that he had closely watched the political situation. However, as a writer on the political scenario, he ignored to see those relevant details which should have been considered as a necessary part of describing as well as understanding the relationship between Khushhal Khan Khattak and King Aurangzeb before giving any decision in favour of one person or another. Another problem in understanding and interpreting the situation depends upon the deeper understanding of the cultural intricacies involved, especially when the author is not indigenous. In such case, he/she fails to understand the people and make a true judgment because of cultural gaps. This also seems true in the present case as Caroe not only criticized Khushhal Khan Khatak using a harsh language, but also ignored his loyalties towards the Mughal Kings before grievances arose between the two parties.

Another factor which becomes visible after analyzing the textual data is that Caroe statements are self-contradictory. Firstly, on the one hand he appreciates the matchless generosity of Khushhal Khan Khattak and on the other hand, he criticizes him for his resentment saying that it was blow to his pocket. Secondly, he appreciates Khushhal

Khan Khattak Khattak being a Pathan of Pathans, but attributes Khushhal Khan Khatak's demerits to his Pashtun's race. Thirdly, he appreciates the Pashtuns for their hospitality and says that their door will remain open for every stranger, even if it is their enemy, but at the same time, he is critical about them being over-sensitive regarding their prestige and pecuniary interest.

To conclude, Olaf Caroe has exercised power in making judgment in the case of Khushhal Khan Khattak's case against Aurangzeb. Caroe seems to be influenced by the powerful political and social position of the later as a result of which he ignored the ground realities. He seems to fail in defending his own arguments as he gives contradictory statements about the same event. In the light of the evidences, which are mostly taken from Khushhal Khan Khattak's own poetry (with English translation), Olaf Caroe's one sided judgment holds no ground. It is only the power structure and the unequal relations between the dominant and the dominated which dictate the direction of the subject discourse. Khushhal Khan Khattak's forefathers served the Mughal kings since Akbar's time and he continued to do so with almost the same spirit before acrimonious relations developed between him and King Aurangzeb. He attributes his imprisonment to the political conspiracy of which he was unaware. Therefore, he became impatient for revenge. Khushhal Khan Khattak's revolt was not for his personal benefits but he took the sword to vindicate the *nang* (honour) of the Pashtuns as he himself articulates in the following words:

*Da Afghan pa nang ma watharhala thora
Nangialae da zamanae Khushhal Khattak yam*

Now I have taken up the sword to
Vindicate the afghan honour,
I am the honourable one of the time,
Khushhal, the Khattak.
(as cited in Kamil 1968, p. 82)

References

- Althusser, L. (1971) *Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses*. In L. Althusser (Ed.), *Lenin and Philosophy and other Essays*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Caroe, O. (1957) *The Pathans: 550 B.C.-A.D. 1957*. London: Macmillan.
- Fairclough, N. (1989) *Language and Power*. Available at <https://www.researchgate.net/file,Accesses on Date.....>
- Fairclough, N. (1995) *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. London: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (2012) *Critical Discourse Analysis*. Available at https://www.academia.edu/3791325/Critical_discourse_analysis_2012_, Accessed on
- Foucault, M. (1969) *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. Trans. A. M. Sheridan Smith. London: Routledge, 2002. ISBN 0-415-28753-7?
- Howell, E. and O. Caroe. (1963) *The Poems of Khushhal Khan Khatak*. Peshawar: Oxford University Press.
- Kamil, K. M. D. (1968) *On a Foreign Approach to Khushhal*. Peshawar: Maktabah-i-Shaheen.
- Locke, T. (2004) *Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Continuum.
- Mesthrie, R and A. Deumert. (2009) *Introducing Sociolinguistics*. Edinburg University Press.

- Peukert, D. (1987) *Inside Nazi Germany: Conformity, Opposition, and Racism in Everyday Life*. Available at <https://www.google.com>, Accessed on March 24, 2016.
- Resigel and R. Wodak. (2008) *The Discourse Historical Approach DHA*. Available at <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/2>, Accessed on 22 Apr 2016.
- Teun, A. Van Dijk . (1998) *Critical Discourse Analysis*.(B. Details)
- Teun, A. V. D. (2001) *Critical Discourse Analysis*. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen and Heidi, (Eds), *The Hand Book of Discourse Analysis*. Available at <https://scholar.google.nl/scholar>, Accessed on 21, Apr 2016.
- Weber, M. (1980) *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft*. 5th Edition, Edited by J. Wincklemann (Ed), Tübingen: Mohr.
- Wodak, R. (2015) *Methods of Critical Discourse Studies*. Sage Publisher. Available at <https://www.researchgate.net/publication>, Accessed on 18 Apr 2016.
- Wodak, R. (2009) *Critical Discourse Analysis: History, Agenda, Theory, and Methodology*. In R Wodak and M Meyer (Eds), *Methods for Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage (2nd revised edition), 1-33.
- Janks, H. (n.d.) *Critical Discourse Analysis as a Research Tool*. Johannesburg: University of the Witwatersrand. Available at <https://www.uv.es/gimenez/Recursos/criticaldiscourse.pdf>, Accessed on 19 Apr 2016. (put this at suitable place)

