



Strategies of Legitimization through Axiological Proximization in War Poetry

Faisal Khan¹, Sham Haidar², Farzana Masroor³

¹ Lecturer/ Ph.D. Scholar, Department of English, NUML / Air University, Islamabad, Pakistan.

Email: faisalkaaemail@gmail.com

² Associate Professor, Air University, Islamabad, Pakistan. Email: sham.haider@mail.au.edu.pk

³ Associate Professor, Air University, Islamabad, Pakistan. Email: farzana.masroor@mail.au.edu.pk

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

Article History:

Received: July 10, 2023

Revised: September 08, 2023

Accepted: September 09, 2023

Available Online: September 10, 2023

Keywords:

Political Discourse

Militant Discourse

Critical Language

Proximization

Legitimization

Threat Construction

Axiology

War Poetry

Funding:

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Despite an increased interest in war studies and militant discourse in recent years, proximization and legitimization perspectives remain scarce. This paper investigates such perspectives in war poetry by proposing a framework of axiological proximization. In this paper, we have focused upon axiological proximization that is a forced construal of a mounting ideological conflict between the political speaker and his/her enemy. This paper focuses on rhetoric of war poetry from Afghanistan and Kashmir concerning legitimization strategies. The study is qualitative in nature and lays emphasis upon the ways war poetry as a critical language embarks upon proximization and legitimization strategies especially via axiological proximization. The movement from ideological clash to the physical conflict is an essential part of axiological conflict. Axiological proximization marks the "self" with positive home-values and the "other" with alien values. This leads to antagonism between the 'home values' of the political speaker and 'alien values' of the enemy. The mechanism of axiological proximization is a salient feature of rhetoric of war poetry from Afghanistan and Kashmir where the two antagonistic ideologies are contrasted: freedom of the East versus negative values of the West.

© 2023 The Authors, Published by iRASD. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial License

Corresponding Author's Email: faisalkaaemail@gmail.com

1. Introduction

This paper deals with legitimization strategies through proximization in poetry of war from Afghanistan and Indian occupied Kashmir. The political speaker uses multiple scenarios for legitimization of political agenda. One such tool is axiological proximization. Axiological proximization is grounded in construal of adversarial negative values (Cap, 2013). We contend that political speaker/poet, in war poetry from Afghanistan and Kashmir, uses axiological proximization in order to serve political goal. Legitimization is considered a fundamental principal goal of the political speaker who seeks for support and justification of political actions which he/she intends to perform (Cap, 2016). Legitimization is the end goal of axiological proximization through which the political speaker/poet convinces his/her audience to obey him/her because legitimization is grounded in the process where the political speakers license or accredit a form of social behavior (Reyes, 2011). Thus, legitimization through axiological proximization needs to be critically investigated for it is via axiological proximization that the political speaker purposes at establishing justification of their social behavior and political agenda. Such legitimization of political goals takes place at the level of linguistic choices in discourse where legitimization is realized. The notion of legitimization via axiological proximization occurs discursively. Therefore, it is important to account for such an aspect of language because language is deemed as a medium of power that can encode legitimate unjust social relations and sediment inequalities of power (Richardson, 2017).

The concept of proximization is comprised of three dimensions: spatial, temporal and axiological. Spatial proximization account for the construal of distant entities invading upon

the Discourse Space (DS involves contesting IDC and ODC) concerning home entities located in deictic center which includes the speaker (the self, I, us etc.) (Cap, 2013). Temporal proximization deals with construction of enemy encroaching upon the territory of the political speaker in terms of time (Cap, 2016). Axiological proximization is grounded in highlighting the ideological clash and antagonism between the political speaker and the enemy. However, the function of spatial, temporal and axiological proximization is to create element of threat and fear and thus seek for legitimization of political agenda or physical acts against the enemy. Spatial, temporal and axiological (henceforth STA) perspectives of model locate enemy entities in two ways: the political speaker as inside-the-deictic-center (henceforth IDC) and the enemy as outside-the-deictic-center (henceforth ODC). Henceforth, proximization subscribes to construal vision of a foreign entity invading upon a home territory of the political speaker and his/her that requires a prompt preventive action against the enemy (Cap, 2013). The same mechanism of proximization and legitimization resides at the heart of war poetry of Afghanistan and Kashmir.

1.1. Background of Proximization and Legitimization

The word "proximise" denotes the idea of bringing something near. However, the term proximization was used by Cap for the first time as a linguistics concept. According to Cap, proximization refers to "an organized, strategic deployment of cognitive-pragmatic construals of/ in (originally, political) discourse" (Cap, 2013). Proximization has been used in variant disciplines as a methodological tool; but it goes well in political discourses particularly legitimization and de-legitimization discourse. The aim of proximization lies in bridging the connection between language and power/politics because the political struggle is essentially a linguistic struggle since language and power are innately and strongly connected (Craith, 2007).

The spatial-temporal-axiological (hence STA) model of proximization and legitimization proposed by Cap (2013) suggests representation of the alien/other entities invading upon the territory of the political speaker. This invasion can be physical as suggested by spatial proximization, or in terms of time as taken by temporal proximization or in the form of antagonistic ideologies as explicated by axiological proximization. The aim of all three proximization frameworks is to seek for legitimization of political agenda because legitimization is the fundamental aim of the political speaker for seeking support and justification of political agenda or physical action.

Moreover, legitimization has a fundamental counterpart that is de-legitimization (Chilton, 2004). Legitimization and de-legitimization go parallel in the sense that the political speakers legitimize their political action but they de-legitimize the actions of the enemy. Henceforth, de-legitimization is engaged in legitimization of the "self" but de-legitimization of the "other/alien" (Cap, 2013). Through the strategy of legitimization, the political speaker holds for getting support from the audience in terms of justification for his/her political action. However, language can play an instrumental role in the process of legitimization because it is through language where legitimization gets enacted. The same argument is substantiated by Berger and Luckmann (1967) who argue that the concatenation between language and legitimization takes place as soon as a linguistic system of objectification of human experience is transmitted. This implies the fact that elements of legitimization are built in vocabulary of a language. Therefore, the connection between language and legitimization strategies is integral.

In this regard, Van Leeuwen (2008) has carried a study regarding strategies of legitimization in political discourse. He contends that political texts are replete with process of legitimization. He has outlined certain ways responsible for legitimization. His findings establish the fact that through authorization, moral evaluation, rationalization and mythopoesis, the political speaker establishes legitimization strategies. The notion of legitimization has also been addressed by Chilton (2004) who traced back legitimization strategies in European Union (EU) discourse concerning identity. Their study critically analyzed European Union (EU) discourse and identity construction and concludes that discourse of European Union (EU) achieves legitimization through: 1, the idea of culture, history and identity; 2, legitimization through procedure of democracy; 3, legitimization via standardization and humanistic discourse.

Moreover, Cap (2013) has further advanced the idea of legitimization. According to Cap, political discourse exhibits legitimization strategies particularly interventionist discourse. He analyses interventionist discourse of Bush's Administration and finds out that Bush used legitimization strategies in his political speeches against Iraq and Afghanistan to legitimize political agenda of waging war. Bush used such interventionist discourse for justifying interventionist agenda of war in Iraq and Afghanistan. However, his focus stays upon political speeches but the discursive strategies used in war poetry have not been adequately studied. Although several studies are conducted on legitimization strategies in political discourse; however, war poetry often embedded with political discourse, has been largely overlooked by scholars of critical discourse analysts in terms of axiological aspect of proximization.

War poetry is examined from multiple perspectives but not from perspective of legitimization and axiological proximization. Silkin (1998) outlines categories of war poetry in his book, *Out of Battle*. He has divided war poetry into four categories. The first category of war poetry is grounded in showing chauvinistic nationalism. The second category deals with resistance. Category third engages with compassion and the last category is about change for social system. Nevertheless, his work did not focus to marking war poetry concerning legitimization strategies because war poetry is political in nature and political discourses do often get engaged in legitimization strategies. War poetry has gained ample of attention in literary circles but still has often not been adequately studied for its internal intensity because of being too much familiar (Kendall, 2007; Scheff, Daniel, & Sterphone, 2018). The war poetry is concerned not only with pleasure but also bring human suffering and political agenda and thus provide a suitable data for critical analysis (Beaton, 2023; Gardner, 2018; Halawachy & Alobaidy, 2020). According to Ervine (1915), war impacts imaginative literature and leaves irreparable marks on the writers as well. Moreover, war poetry and its political nature needs to be studied because "the study of war writing is a source of enhanced literary insight" (McLoughlin, 2009). That is why; it is significant to investigate war poetry particularly from perspectives of legitimization via axiological proximization because war poetry is political in nature and legitimization and de-legitimization are important aspects of political discourse (Chilton, 2004).

We have seen in the light of aforementioned literature review concerning legitimization and proximization that strategies of proximization and legitimization are available in political discourses but not in war poetry particularly legitimization via axiological proximization. Therefore, this paper takes into consideration war poetry from Afghanistan and Kashmir concerning axiological proximization.

1.2. Cap's (2013) Model of Proximization

The theoretical framework we have selected for this study is Cap's (2013) model of proximization because "proximization is worth building a theory around" Cap (2013), since proximization as a theory and methodological tool suits well in state political discourses (Cap, 2016). War poetry of Afghanistan and Kashmir also is grounded in political discourse that has often been ignored because of its artistic nature. Therefore, in this study, we investigate war poetry from proximization strategies especially legitimization through axiological proximization.

Proximization is comprised of three frameworks: spatial, temporal and axiological. As we have earlier mentioned that spatial proximization deals with presenting the outside-deictic-center (henceforth ODC) entities physically invading upon the territory of the inside-deictic-center (henceforward IDC). Likewise, temporal proximization is grounded in highlighting the ODC as encroaching upon the land and people of the IDC in terms of time. Finally, axiological proximization explicates ideological clash between the IDC and ODC that eventually leads to the physical conflict. Axiological proximization has three significant sub-categories which are following:

- (1) Noun phrases (NPs) construed as IDC positive values or value sets (ideologies)
- (2) Noun phrases (NPs) construed as ODC negative values or value sets (ideologies)
- (3) Discourse forms no longer than one sentence or two consecutive sentences involving linear arrangement of lexico-grammatical phrases construing materialization in the IDC space of the ODC negative ideologies.

These three categories give a proper analytical power to axiological proximization. The first category explicates ideologies and values of the IDC as positive. We can see that the second category resides in highlighting the ODC ideologies and values negative and consequential to the IDC. The third category is grounded in focusing upon the way abstract ideologies between the IDC-ODC lead to physical conflict between the IDC and ODC.

The study has taken this third framework of proximization (axiological proximization) to analyze war poetry of Afghanistan and Kashmir concerning legitimization strategies via axiological proximization. The reason for selecting this framework lies in the fact that war poetry of Afghanistan and Kashmir builds ideological clash in terms of Muslim and non-Muslim ideologies/values which has become a long-term conflict in the shape of antagonism between Afghanistan versus U.S (United States) and its allies NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) and between Kashmir and India. This study helps the readers to understand the on-going conflict between Afghanistan versus U.S/NATO and between Kashmir versus India and its root cause.

Moreover, in this article we have reviewed and tested Cap (2013) model of proximization particularly axiological proximization as an analytical tool in war poetry because proximization model has been used in political discourse but not in war poetry. We have delved deeper into the methodological question: how legitimization strategies can be studied through the framework of axiological proximization in war poetry? By doing so, the model of (axiological) proximization does not merely explicate the critical discussion concerning legitimization strategies but also develops an interesting research avenue concerning war poetry and its political nature.

2. Research Methodology

This Qualitative Content Analysis (QCA) study, elucidating legitimization through axiological proximization in poetic discourse of Afghanistan and Kashmir, is based upon conceptualization of constructivist-interpretive paradigm. Choosing a research paradigm is pivotal because research paradigm points to different reasons for conducting research (Willis, 2007). Constructivist-interpretive paradigm believes the notion that "qualitative interpretations are constructed" Denzin and Lincoln (2011) and thus the researcher becomes an interpreter of the text and constructs reality.

We have delimited the study to political war poetry from Afghanistan and Kashmir. From Afghanistan we have selected *Poetry of the Taliban* (2012) which is published by Oxford University Press. This book of poetry contains around 200 poems. The second poetic war text is designated from Kashmir entitled: *Of Gardens and Graves: Kashmir, Poetry, Politics* (2017). This anthology of poetry is published by Duke University Press and contains around 45 poems.

3. Analysis and Findings

In this section, we propose axiological proximization framework to reflect legitimization strategies in war poetry of Afghanistan and Kashmir at the level of key words, phrases and sentence. In each poetic text of war, we have used axiological proximization framework which is represented in the form of a table. The most significant words, phrases and sentences regarding axiological proximization are registered in the form of a table. From each war poetic text, we have selected poems. In this regard, we have designated 50 poems from war poetry of Kashmir and Afghanistan concerning the theme of axiological perspective. We then have interpreted the data qualitatively and drawn the conclusion. Furthermore, we have used brackets and inverted commas in each category of axiological proximization to separate each poetic textual instance from the rest. We have used the same strategy in both axiological frameworks concerning war poetry from Afghanistan and Kashmir.

3.1. War Poetry of Afghanistan

The table 1 includes some of the textual instances from war poetry of Afghanistan regarding legitimization via axiological proximization. Here, the explanatory power of axiological proximization gets substantiated because we can see key items and phrases in the above table reflecting axiological aspects. The first category marks the positive and home values of the IDC (Afghan people) as positive and prosperous.

Table 1: Core Items of the Axiological Proximization Framework in War Poetry of Afghanistan

Category	Core Items
1. (Noun phrases (NPs) construed as IDC positive values or value sets (ideologies))	{“sweet land”, “peace”, “homeland of beauty”, “freedom”, “liberty”, “Justice”, “prosperity”, “my <i>Shari’a</i> ” (Islamic political system), “peace”, “sweet land”, “ <i>Qur’an</i> ” (religious scripture of Muslims), “freedom”, “homeland of beauty”, “paradise”, “dear country of saints”, “liberty”, “Justice”, “Afghans”, “own homeland” dear country of saints”, “ <i>Qur’an</i> ” (religious scripture of Muslims), “Abrahamic”, “Kabul’s soil”, “Pashtuns”, “Afghan <i>Mujahed</i> ” (a religious warrior), “soldiers of Islam”, “revolutionary religion”, “our heroes”, “Muslims”}
2. (Noun phrases (NPs) construed as ODC negative values or value sets (ideologies))	{“Western rules”, “extreme cruelty”, “crusader terrorists”, “strange democracy”, “strangers”, “murderer of the nation”, “Crusaders”, “Western style”, “Jews and Christians”, “infidels”, “idolatry”, “Pharaohs”, “Western colonization”, “), “cruel colonizer”, “Christians”, “dollars”, “foreigners”, “Cold War”, “Bush and Gordon Brown”}
3. (Discourse forms no longer than one sentence or two consecutive sentences involving linear arrangement of lexico-grammatical phrases construing materialization in the IDC space of the ODC negative ideologies)	{“your homeland is being controlled by the pigs/ they have brought a sick dog with them/ to rule over your honor/ you have got rid of those lions/ Who beat the wolves of the Caucasus”, “you should remove the eyes of this dog/ there would then be such a young ruler/ Whom the lions would fear/ you will hear the Azan again/ Worship will only be for the one God/ these jackals will be/ either killed or will flee”, “the one who grows thorny sleep on my eyes/the arrows of sighs leave my heart like stings/ My afghan beauty is destroyed by the bad appearance of these/ green eyes/ My body’s blood leaves me in a thorny stream”, “Which poor man’s house is this that has been ruined by bombs?/ Why has this cottage become the food of fire?/ Which child’s body is this that is smirched with red blood?/ the smoke of whose wishes will rise again today?”, “about what’s going on with my poor nation in my homeland, about the words of bombardment against our innocent women. May this emotionless pen be broken and lost, the one that still talks about love and the beloved”}

Here we can vividly see that Afghanistan and its people are represented with positive ideological values. All these textual instances from war poetry of Afghanistan highlight the IDC and his/her values positive. Afghanistan is labeled as “sweet land, paradise, home of beauty, own homeland, dear country of saints’. All these instances describe Afghanistan with positive and prosperous ideologies and values. Moreover, the land of the IDC is shown with highly positive values which are: “peace, freedom, liberty, justice, prosperity”. These linguistic items in the form of words and phrases show Afghanistan and its people prosperous and having a peaceful life. All these words describe the positive ‘home values’ of the IDC. Finally, the argument of depicting the IDC and his/her land is strengthened by positively marking the Afghani people as “Afghan *Mujahed*” (a religious warrior), “soldiers of Islam”, “heroes” and “Muslims”. These words denote abstract positive ideologies and home values of the IDC. These positive values of the IDC are shown with antagonism against the ODC.

The second category of aforementioned table explains the negative representation of the ODC. This representation is ideological. We can see that the ODC who in this case are the U.S and NATO forces are marked negatively. Their ideologies and values are labeled consequential for the IDC (in this case, Afghani people) because they are invading upon the values of the IDC. The good values of the IDC are contrasted with the bad values of the ODC in category first and second of axiological framework table above. The ODC (U.S/NATO) is marked negative with invading ideologies upon the home values of the IDC. The negative

impact of ODC and his/her alien ideologies are shown in the form of: "Western rules, extreme cruelty, strange democracy, Western style, Western colonization". Moreover, the U.S/NATO forces are shown as "crusader terrorists, strangers, murderer of the nation, cruel colonizer, foreigners". These words and phrases show negative ideological alien values of the ODC. The argument is substantiated by representing religious ideology of the ODC negatively and invading in the form of "Crusaders, Jews and Christians, infidels". The words "Pharaohs, dollars, Cold war" mark the negative ideological impact of the ODC over the IDC. We can see that the first and second categories of axiological framework in the above table show the abstract ideological clash between the IDC and ODC.

This leads us to the third category of axiological proximization which is grounded in materialization of the ideological clash as leading to physical clash. This is done in the form of sentences where the abstract ideological clash between the IDC and ODC leads to the physical fight. We can see that IDC-ODC ideological clash that may lead to physical fight. The same argument can be seen in: "you should remove the eyes of this dog/ there would then be such a young ruler/ Whom the lions would fear/ you will hear the Azan again/ Worship will only be for the one God/ these jackals will be/ either killed or will flee". Again, the ODC political and suppressive values are shown consequential to the IDC values of freedom and religious ideology. One can see a strong appeal for persuasion of the IDC to "remove the dog" (ODC) so people of Afghanistan can "hear the Azan (religious call for prayers) and "worship" freely again. The same negative characterization of the ODC ideologies against the IDC can be seen in the rest of the axiological categories registered in category number three of the aforementioned table. All the textual instances recorded in the third category axiological framework exhibit materialization of the abstract ideology that leads to the physical fight between the IDC and ODC. This shows that abstract alien ideologies of the ODC invade upon the positive home ideology of the IDC.

All the three categories of axiological proximization successfully reflect the true essence of ideological antagonism between the IDC and ODC, in this case U.S/NATO forces and Afghanistan. Category one reflect upon the positive and 'home values' of the IDC which are contrasted in the second category of axiological proximization with the negative 'alien values' of the ODC. The third category shows the materialization of the abstract ideological antagonism into a physical fight. The function of axiological proximization is twofold: on one hand it invokes emotion of fear and threat and on the other hand, it paves way for legitimization of political agenda and justification of physical action. In this case, the political speaker of the IDC creates fear and threat in his/her audience in order to appeal for justification of political agenda and physical force against the ODC.

To conclude, the above mentioned three categories of axiological proximization successfully reflect mechanism of axiological proximization. The mechanism of axiological proximization lies in the fact of construing dogmas and ideologies which are foreign and alien to the IDC center. Though, as we mentioned earlier that like spatial and temporal proximization, axiological proximization too serves a vital function that resides in the fact of proximization and legitimization of political agenda of the IDC against the ODC.

3.2. War Poetry from Kashmir

This table registers all poetic textual instances from Kashmir poetry concerning axiological proximization. The first category marks the positive 'home values' of the IDC (Kashmiri people) which are contrasted with the negative 'alien values' of the ODC (Indian state and military forces). These two categories are grounded in highlighting the abstract ideological clash between the IDC and ODC. However, this abstract ideological clash gets materialized in the third category of axiological proximization and thus eventually leading to the physical fight.

In the first category of the above table, the positive home values of the IDC for instance: "peace of mind", "homes", "my paradise", "freedom", "and freedom of speech". The land of the IDC (Kashmir) is portrayed as "paradise" and "home". This shows the depiction of the land of Kashmir beautiful and with a sense of belonging. The argument gets substantiated by showing Kashmir replete with positive ideologies and home values of "peace of mind, "freedom", and "freedom of speech". These words are replete with showing Kashmir and its

people living with good human values of freedom and peace. However, this serenity and positive values of the IDC (Kashmiri people) are shown being invaded and encroached by the ODC (Indian military forces).

Table 2: Core Items of the Axiological Proximization Framework in War Poetry of Kashmir

Category	Core Items
1. (Noun phrases (NPs) construed as IDC positive values or value sets (ideologies))	{“freedom of speech”} “peace of mind”, “freedom”, “my paradise”, “homes”}
2. (Noun phrases (NPs) construed as ODC negative values or value sets (ideologies))	{“a king-serpent”} “waves of flames”, “murderous oppression”, “murderous regime”, “democratic politics”, endless occupation”, “political shadow”, “the killing”}
3. (Discourse forms no longer than one sentence or two consecutive sentences involving linear arrangement of lexico-grammatical phrases construing materialization in the IDC space of the ODC negative ideologies)	{“threads of deceit woven around a word of Plebiscite/ by treacherous puppet politicians who have no soul inside/my paradise is burning these killings are not random , it is an organized genocide./sponsored media who hide this homicide/no more injustice, we won’t go down when we bleed, alive in / the struggle even the graves will speak”, “with Troops left loose with Ammo/who murder and rape then hide behind a political shadow/like a Casino human life is thrown like a dice/I will summarize atrocities till the resurrection of Christ”, }

The textual instances in second category show invasion of the antagonistic values of the ODC against the IDC. Here one can see the replacement of the positive home values of the IDC getting invaded by the negative alien values of the ODC. The political values of the ODC are rendered as “murderous regime”, “murderous oppression” and “political shadow”. These are negative political values of the ODC consequential to the positive values of the IDC which are “freedom, peace and freedom of speech”. The function of doing so is to create element of fear and threat among the IDC and thus seek for legitimization of political agenda. This leads us to the third category of axiological proximization that materializes the abstract ideologies that result in physical fight between the IDC and ODC. Here the political ideology of the Indian state and its military is denounced because of its lethal consequences for the people of Kashmir. Ideology of “murder and rape” is associated with Indian military forces who commit such atrocities of war “behind political shadow”. The ODC ideology is that of “killing, genocide and homicide”. These words exhibit strong negative barbarian ideology of the Indian military forces. However, we can see the appeal for taking action against the ODC in the form of physical clash. In the light of axiological analysis of poetic text of war concerning Kashmir, we have found out that war poetry of Kashmir too is grounded in legitimization strategies via axiological proximization. But we should remember that when the IDC seeks for legitimization of his political agenda, he/she at the same time de-legitimizes alien ideologies of the ODC because legitimization has an essential counterpart and that is de-legitimization (Chilton 2004).

4. Discussion

In war poetry of Afghanistan and Kashmir we encountered the same phenomenon of legitimization of political speaker’s ideologies and political action and de-legitimization of ODC’s consequential ideologies. Therefore, the notion of de-legitimization is grounded in legitimization of the “self” and de-legitimization of the “other” (Cap, 2013). However, we saw that legitimization is enacted through language because language and legitimization go parallel Berger and Luckmann (1967) and that legitimization and de-legitimization are deemed vital ingredients of political discourse (Chilton, 2004). War poetry of Afghanistan and Kashmir too are political in nature where legitimization strategies are used through axiological proximization. The political speaker uses a main source of enacting ideological antagonism with the ODC because language is a tool for communicating power and social inequalities (Richardson, 2017). It is here where the CDS can help the model of proximization because proximization as analytical tool can dig linguistic items but the notion of power/power abuse and social inequalities are denoted by Critical Discourse Studies.

Moreover, instances of axiological proximization in Afghanistan are in abundance as can be seen in the aforementioned table. However, axiological instances in Kashmiri poetry are not in abundance as compared to war poetry of Afghanistan. As for as Afghanistan is concerned, it was free, at least from foreign occupation, and had a *Taliban* state before the U.S and NATO forces invaded Afghanistan that is why not only instances of ideological antagonism are in abundance in war poetry of Afghanistan but also ideological intensity (Akbarzadeh & Ibrahimi, 2020; Crews & Tarzi, 2008; Johnson, DuPee, & Shaaker, 2017). And the reason for lacking straight ideological antagonism in Kashmiri poetry is because Kashmir has not experienced freedom and has been under Indian occupation since the freedom of India and Pakistan from the British (Duschinski & Ghosh, 2017; Zia, 2019). Therefore, we can see that in Afghanistan poetry there are so many times mention of free and prosperous country, although during Taliban era people of Afghanistan were not free (Roberts, 2009), and in poetry of Kashmir such instances are lesser. The NATO and Western power are also presented as barbaric and anti-democratic principles and interestingly the US led forces attacked Afghanistan with the rhetoric to free its people from barbaric Taliban reign (Abbas, 2014; Johnson et al., 2017). This can be interpreted that how war poetry in political and having an agenda to mobilize people against the enemy and present the facts distortedly (see also Van Wiene, 1997). Secondly, Indian armed forces have kept Kashmiri people under strong oppressive circumstances and for majority of time curfew prevails in Kashmir that is why ideological resistance and antagonism is indirect in war poetry of Kashmir (Zia, 2019).

Finally, the ideological clash between U.S and Afghanistan, India and Kashmir fundamentally highlights ideological clash between Muslim and non-Muslim ideologies at a general level. The IDC in both Afghanistan and Kashmir are Muslims and the ODC are non-Muslims. This shows, at a bigger level, a clash of religious ideologies between the Muslims and non-Muslims. Hence this study can be helpful for understanding the actual nature of conflict between U.S and Afghanistan, and India and Kashmir.

The main function of axiological proximization is to create fear among the public. One of the common ways to build in the minds of the audience against the enemy (U.S/NATO/Indian army) is to take into account the usage of fear an instrumental tool by highlighting the "now" moment which is threatening for the ODC and thus demands for a preemptive action against the immediate threat of the enemy (Cap, 2016). In this case, axiological proximization created the fear against the enemy (NATO/Indian forces) ideologically. The ideologies of the ODC are deemed to be dangerous and consequential for the IDC. This results in fear among the audience and then requires an immediate action to eliminate the fear. The function of using the element of fear is that it maintains legitimacy rhetoric regarding shaping a strong emotional appeal to the audience and compelling them take a political action against the enemy's threat.

To sum up, the three categories mentioned above successfully reflect the mechanism of axiological proximization that is: the construction of foreign ideological dogmas and values akin to the axiological context of the self and dominant ideology of the entire deictic center. We should bear in mind that axiological framework of proximization also serves a pivotal function like spatial and temporal proximization: legitimization of political agenda of the IDC against the ODC and their negative impact. Henceforth, it can be concluded that poetry does not serve the aesthetic purpose only but political in nature and use rhetorical devices and even distorted facts to justify the political struggle and instigate the audience to raise against the enemy who is presented as worst.

5. Conclusion

War poetry of Afghanistan and Kashmir endorse axiological proximization for the sake of legitimization purpose. Axiological proximization takes place at the level of ideology where the "home" values of the IDC contrast with the "alien/foreign" values of the enemy. In this regard, the clash is ideological. However, such an ideological clash between the IDC and ODC transforms into a physical clash eventually. We found out that war poetry exhibits ideological clash between the "home" values and "foreign values". This serves a political function of constructing binary oppositions. By doing so, the political speakers carry good representation of the 'self' and negative representation of the 'other'. Such ideological clash between the IDC-ODC leads to the actual physical clash. War poetry of Afghanistan and Kashmir construes

legitimization strategies by highlighting the ideological clash against the concerned enemy. We found that Afghanistan constructs ideological clash between the U.S/NATO forces; and Kashmiri poetry against the Indian army. Eventually, the ideological clash between the IDC and ODC adopts a physical form. Thus, war poetry from Afghanistan, Kashmir and Palestine successfully uses axiological proximization for legitimization purpose.

We have also concluded that poetry from these war affected zones successfully incorporates Cap (2013) model of spatial, temporal and axiological proximization. This is carried out strategically in order to form and maintain rhetoric of legitimacy against the enemy. However, Cap's model lacks pivotal aspects which are integral components of war poetry as political discourse. Therefore, we have coupled Cap's model of proximization with Silkin's model of war poetry in order to make it a comprehensive model. This combination can be used in future for better understanding of war poetry in other contexts.

The purpose of this study was to expose the political pattern of ideological clash that governs the poetic war texts. As a result, this helps to understand the way legitimization strategies are enacted deliberately via linguistic items in literary texts of war. Consequently, the argument improves reader's understanding concerning concatenation between political and poetic which is often ignored. Model of axiological proximization can be an apt analytical tool for analyzing the political nature of war poetry as we have seen in this study. Moreover, Cap's model of axiological proximization is only confined to political prose and thus ignores political poetry of war. This study implies that axiological proximization should be explored further in war literature to test its analytical capabilities and theoretical and methodological shortcomings. This study being qualitative having limited data cannot be generalized but can be replicated in other contexts.

Moreover, the study can thus help in understanding the resistive forces against oppression that how the discourses and especially poetic discourse contributes to the resistance. Here the IDC is presented with all the positive values and at times these are not as per the ground realities, however, these are used to create love for the mother land and the ODC is presented with all the negative connotations in order to garner hatred against them. Moreover, such poetry can be used by militant poets in order to convince people for taking political action by enacting their militant agenda. Interestingly, this study has poetic appeal even for the ordinary person who apparently is not necessarily interested in politics or resistance via poetry. However, war poetry brings in the political discourse in poetic discourse and contributes to the resistance which is largely overlooked by scholars as poetry is mostly read and heard for aesthetic purposes by common people. Hence this study can contribute to a better understanding of resistive forces and resistance against the foreign occupation especially in terms of legitimization strategies.

References

- Abbas, H. (2014). *The Taliban revival: violence and extremism on the Pakistan-Afghanistan frontier*: Yale University Press.
- Akbarzadeh, S., & Ibrahim, N. (2020). The Taliban: a new proxy for Iran in Afghanistan? *Third World Quarterly*, 41(5), 764-782. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1080/01436597.2019.1702460>
- Beaton, R. (2023). Aphrodite at war: the wartime poetry of Embirikos, Kaknavatos, Papatsonis and Seferis. In *Ancient Greek Myth in Modern Greek Poetry* (pp. 131-138): Routledge.
- Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1967). *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge*: Anchor.
- Cap, P. (2013). *Legitimation in Political Discourse: A Cross-Disciplinary Perspective on the Modern US War Rhetoric Second Edition*: Cambridge scholars publishing.
- Cap, P. (2016). *The language of fear: Communicating threat in public discourse*: Springer.
- Chilton, P. A. (2004). *Analysing political discourse: Theory and practice*: Psychology Press.
- Craith, M. N. (2007). *Language, power and identity politics*: Springer.
- Crews, R. D., & Tarzi, A. (2008). *The Taliban and the crisis of Afghanistan*: Harvard University Press.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2011). *The Sage handbook of qualitative research*: sage.
- Duschinski, H., & Ghosh, S. N. (2017). Constituting the occupation: Preventive detention and permanent emergency in Kashmir. *The Journal of Legal Pluralism and Unofficial Law*, 49(3), 314-337. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1080/07329113.2017.1347850>

- Ervine, S. J. G. (1915). The War and Literature. *The North American Review*, 202(716), 92-99.
- Gardner, K. (2018). The Church Elegy: Recuperating Anglican Memory in Post-war English Poetry. *Renascence*, 70(4), 221-303.
- Halawachy, H., & Alobaidy, N. (2020). "Let us call it a truthful hyperbole!" A Semantic Perspective on Hyperbole in War Poetry on Iraq (2003). *International Journal of Language and Literary Studies*, 2(4), 151-166. doi:<https://doi.org/10.36892/ijlls.v2i4.439>
- Johnson, T. H., DuPee, M., & Shaaker, W. (2017). *Taliban narratives: The use and power of stories in the Afghanistan conflict*: Oxford University Press.
- Kendall, T. (2007). *The Oxford handbook of British and Irish war poetry*: Oxford University Press.
- McLoughlin, K. (2009). *The Cambridge Companion to War Writing*: Cambridge University Press.
- Reyes, A. (2011). Strategies of legitimization in political discourse: From words to actions. *Discourse & society*, 22(6), 781-807. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926511419927>
- Richardson, J. E. (2017). *Analysing newspapers: An approach from critical discourse analysis*: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Scheff, T., Daniel, G. R., & Sterphone, J. (2018). Shame and a Theory of war and violence. *Aggression and violent behavior*, 39, 109-115. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2018.02.006>
- Silkin, J. (1998). *Out of battle: The poetry of the Great War*: Springer.
- Van Leeuwen, T. (2008). *Discourse and practice: New tools for critical discourse analysis*: Oxford university press.
- Willis, J. (2007). *Foundations of qualitative research: Interpretive and critical approaches*: sage.
- Zia, A. (2019). Blinding Kashmiris: The right to maim and the Indian military occupation in Kashmir. *Interventions*, 21(6), 773-786. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1080/1369801X.2019.1607527>