

The Paradox of Environmental Discourse: An Ecolinguistic Analysis of the National Environmental Policies of Pakistan

Iman AIB¹

Algiers 3 University – Algeria

aib.iman@univ-alger3.dz

 [0000-0002-7890-8444](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7890-8444)

Wasima SHEHZAD

AIR University – Pakistan

wasima@mail.au.edu.pk

 [0000-0002-9777-8593](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9777-8593)

Received 06/12/2025

Accepted 31/05/2026

Published 01/07/2026

Abstract

This paper draws on ecolinguistic theory and systemic functional linguistics as a lens to analyse the conceptual frames embedded in the environmental policies of Pakistan. Given the trajectory of environmental degradation of Pakistan, being ranked at the seventh most affected countries, there is a need for linguistic analysis of how environmental policy discourse perpetuates misleading orientation towards ecological behaviour. This linguistic communication constructs a particular reality of environment which seems oppressive and anthropocentric that under-represents all other life and earth itself. So much so that the discourse produced to advocate environmental concerns paradoxically makes use of the oppressive linguistic structures that tend to distance it from its actual political cause. Evidently, the environmental policies of Pakistan emphasize scientific values and consumerist practices, which contribute to non-ecological behaviour and unsustainable environment. The analysis has revealed that the environmental policies employ anthropocentric *stories* to serve the primary benefits of mankind more than environment— a concern which questions the validity of environmental management with reference to environmental policy texts. We suggest that the National Environmental Policies of Pakistan, being part of green consciousness discourse, require more positive ecological stories. This can help enhance public awareness of environmental issues and encourage more sustainable behaviour.

Keywords: ecolinguistics; eco critical discourse analysis; environmental policies; systemic functional linguistics; sustainability.

¹ Corresponding author: Iman AIB/aib.iman@univ-alger3.dz

Journal of Languages & Translation © 2026. Published by University of Chlef, Algeria.

This is an open access article under the CC BY license <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Introduction

This research addresses an important concern about the relationship of language, ecology and governance policy and their role in instigating ecological philosophies about environmental sustainability. Although the interconnection of language and environment is usually met with bafflement (Stibbe, 2015), however, one way to think of them as relying on one another is through the belief that human language influences how we think about environment, thus, how reproduction of anthropocentric realities may exist within the established discourse of environment (Halliday, 2001; Goatly, 1996). Owing to this interest, equally important and integral to the development of positive ecological impact is the discourse of environmental policies of developing countries like Pakistan as they strive to design and produce environmental actions and practices which impact ecological wellbeing and sustainability. Particularly, this area, being part of green consciousness discourse (Soria, et al., 2019), requires a need for eco critical discourse inspection primarily due to the witnessed deteriorating health of the ecosystem of Pakistan being ranked at the seventh number in the list of countries affected by climate change (Azizullah, 2011; Hussain, 2019). Probably, this deterioration is also affected by the discursive hostile representation of the ecosystem that seemingly produces ambivalent and imbalanced conceptual frames about the reality of environment.

Owing to the struggle of developing countries' influence by the rapid growth of urbanization and the commodification of life and earth itself, it has perpetually caused perennial ecological change in the present world that, in no sense, could be regarded as positive (Gare, 2002; Glenn, 2004; Goatly, 2000; Larson, 2011). Despite this drastic change, urbanization still continues to spread all over the globe causing harmful actions to the ecosystem (Cook, 2001; Halliday, 2001; Trampe, 2001). Nevertheless, it remains an integral part of consumerist discourse that heavily influences all other revolving discourses, one of which is environmentalism (Collins, 2008; Stamou and Paraskevopoulos, 2008). This research, therefore, puts under investigation the environmental policy of Pakistan which while it is considered a major support for perpetuating ecologically sustainable ideologies, however, generates ambivalent conceptual frames that are problematic from an ecological perspective due to the influence of other discourses, affecting it and being affected by it (Glofelty, 2014). Importantly, this area must be critiqued where human language takes on the role of an *agent* for establishing ecosophies (Stibbe, 2015) and environmental actions that are only limited to human-thought capacity and human-centred practices. More significantly, this discourse requires attention due to the practical implications that are heavily influenced by policy guidelines stated that they control ecological actions and practices. In saying so, the purpose of this study is to unveil the covert linguistic intricacies that instigate problematic and misleading conceptual frames that normalize actions and practices which are ecologically imbalanced and oppressive towards the non-human living environment. Hence, they must be challenged from an ecological perspective (Lakoff, 2010; Stibbe, 2015).

While several theoretical bodies have investigated issue of environmental concerns through ecolinguistic analysis (Beckett, 2013; Bullis, 1992; Gare, 2002; Mulhausler, 2001; Larson, 2011; Priest, 2016; Stibbe, 2012) the study of environmental policies has seemingly remained unexplored in developing countries such as Pakistan. As environmental management has become one of the central themes of research to receive critical discourse inspection (Glenn, 2004; Halliday, 2001; Larson, 2011; Midgley, 2003; Stibbe, 2013), of equal importance is to find out how environmentally endangered countries like Pakistan are affected by an imbalanced environmental policy which overtly shapes complex practices and actions aiming at environmental sustainability, yet, renders the ecosystem mute through cognitive structuring of frames that influence human-centred consciousness, so much so that they become 'the stories we –policy makers- live by'. Embedded in green-consciousness discourse, this research is particularly significant because it examines governance environmental policy that still embeds so many anthropocentric ideologies and continues to provide a range of ambivalent ecosophies about environment that go unnoticed and unchallenged, thus, often making this discourse subjected to eco critical discourse inquiry.

Following an eco critical discourse analysis using systemic functional linguistics, this research finds out that the discourse of governance environmental policy is problematic because although it focuses on establishing policy guidelines for positive impact on environment, it engenders ambivalent ideologies through a language that projects nature as a commodity and struggle. Pertaining to the discourse of environmentalism, such frames are rendered paradoxical and oppressive towards nature. This research, hence, suggests that the governance environmental policy of Pakistan direly needs to shift towards a more positive ecological behaviour that stimulates both global -policy experts- and local -common masses- consciousness as a means of establishing ecologically sustainable environment.

Owing to the pertinent role of environmental policies and the large amount of theoretical inspection received to address issues of environmental sustainability (Dryzek, 2005; Gleaser, 2014), equally detrimental and integral to the constitution of policymaking for ecological practices is the choice of language provided to address environmental actions. This interconnection between language and the political influence it produces on ecological issues calls for ecolinguistic critical discourse study to reveal how language, being anthropocentrically centred, establishes ecosophies that are more human-centred and science-driven that may consequentially normalize and promote unsustainable environmental practices. According to Poole and Spangler (2019), real world activities that apparently seem unproblematic such as digital games or visual texts, in reality heavily influence ecological behaviour and actions. Similarly, Stamou and Paraskevopoulos (2008) also find that consumerist ideologies penetrate ecotourism protection action discourse. In addition, McElhinny (2006) examines how landscapes emerge into history through discursive practices Likewise, Pounds (2020) reveals that policy-makers often rely on instrumental values based on a utilitarian appreciation of nature through evaluative patterns which is also problematic as it views nature as a commodity. Mainly, ecolinguistics provides a critical lens to investigate how environmental issues are being addressed through discursive practices. This critical inquiry of linguistic evidence is pertinent to the establishment of environmental discourse as it builds on the perception of identity construction that shapes, normalizes and reinforces ecological practices (Colding, 2011; Soria et al., 2019). Evidently, Pakistan is considered to have a weak institution for environmental management (Naureen, 2009), which even after the establishment of the National Environmental Quality Standard (NEQS) in August 1993, still continues to deteriorate leading to excessive pollution, land degradation, water depletion and loss of biodiversity (Hanson, 2002). With the increasing susceptibility of environment towards degradation and the influence of non-ecological attitudes, many see these outcomes as being heavily contingent upon the ecological philosophy that normalizes non-ecological actions (Tosun and Lang, 2017). Unfortunately, ecological policy guidelines seemingly remain an occupied niche of policy-makers and ‘experts’ centralizing the knowledge of ecological practices and rarely can be communicated to the general masses. More importantly, mindful of these practices, the choice of language seems responsible towards ecological behaviour which essentially relies on a global than local language. Alternatively, an insightful understanding of ecological issues could be developed by locally grounding ecological awareness to inculcate non-western epistemological considerations for the development of a better understanding on the complex human-nature relation (Chen, 2016).

Pertinent to eco critical discourse inspection is the idea of ‘erasure’ (Stibbe, 2013). Environmental policy-makers, often being influenced by technical language that is science-driven, seem to overlook the idea of human distancing from ecological problems, consequentially, erasing the possibility of human accountability for environmental degradation. The problem of undermining human interference and decreasing the involvement of human consciousness pertains to the use of grammar in such discourse, which represents ecological actions and practices in material ways, thereby, justifying environmental resources as commodities suitable for human needs and benefits (Halliday, 2001). This “grammatical syndrome” (Halliday, 2001, p. 3) needs to be explored to reveal the covert practices of anthropocentric power that shapes ecological actions as *business-as-usual* (Macy and Johnstone, 2012), thereby, viewing

economic growth and technological advancements as the only means of progress in society, so much so that even when this practice deviates human consciousness from the very norm of establishing environmental policies, still continue to spread inevitably as ‘the stories we live by’ (Stibbe, 2015). This transference is primarily a result of the power of economics and scientific growth that penetrates into other discourses leaving an imprint of cold, dry-as-dust objectives and policy guidelines marked by consistent use of passivity to deny the projection of human responsibility towards non-ecological actions (Kahn, 2001). Similarly, Killingsnorth and Palmer (1992) criticize the tone of this discourse which is identified by a neutral, detached language characterized by anthropomorphizing the effect of scientific language, and the mode of addressing nature is found to be highly emotional and irrational (Schiewer, 2002). Myerson & Rydin (1996) criticize the ironic representation of environmental discourse for using a teleological language for non-teleological concepts, thus, often portraying destruction and degradation as self-generated processes. Harre et al. (1999) similarly denounce the choice of language that addresses climate change for being highly apocalyptic such as the metaphor of global warming.

To address these matters, this research moves its scope beyond a linguistic analysis of environmental discourse. It on the other hand reflects on the general cognitive patterns which influence policy-makers in shaping views and guidelines about the ecosystem. It, hence, reveals the mental models that this discourse establishes, reinforces and internalizes to perpetuate ecological practices and actions.

1. Eco Critical Discourse Analysis

This research draws its theoretical underpinnings from eco critical discourse analysis. Stibbe (2013) draws his main definition of discourse from the work of Fairclough (2003) who interprets discourse not as a mere representation of the world, but as the ‘imaginaries’ which are tied to construct possible worlds that are radically different from the actual. Every discourse shares a certain set of members who have a specific way of characterizing knowledge through the use of a set of linguistic features which includes vocabulary, grammatical choices, and patterns of presupposition, which together constitute a *story* about life. These stories have been defined as *ideologies* in the light of Stibbe’s (2015) theory. In saying so, the larger focus of this paper is to reveal ideologies that shape the mental perception about environmental management while focusing on the grammatical structures that help in shaping conceptual frames. A frame is defined as a “story about an area of life that is brought to mind by particular trigger words” (Stibbe, 2015, p. 47). Framing is “the use of a story from one area of life (a frame) to structure how another area of life is conceptualized” (Stibbe, 2015, p. 47), while reframing is “the act of framing a concept in a way that is different from its typical framing in a culture” (Stibbe, 2015, p. 47)

The term *story* within these definitions has been defined by various theorists. Story/ stories are “packages of knowledge beliefs and patterns of practice” (Fillmore & Baker, p.314), “situation types” (Chilton, 2004, p.51), “memories, emotion and values” (Blackmore and Holmes, 2013, p. 314). The structure of a story consists of participants, their relationships and the most likely consequences that stem out of the interaction.

From an ecolinguistic perspective, we need to analyse the common conceptual frames embedded in the Environmental Policies of Pakistan, to find the problems within them from an ecological perspective. In order to identify the cognitive patterns of frames, a Systemic Functional Linguistic approach is taken to analyse how experiential meanings trigger the identified frame. Experiential meanings are realized through: (i) **Material Processes** which describe processes as doing, usually of concrete and tangible actions. (ii) **Mental Processes** which define what we feel or talk about. (iii) **Behavioural Processes** which encode processes of behaviour (iv) **Existential and relational processes** that encode meanings about state of being are categorized in two types: (a) existential processes in which things are stated to exist (b) and relational processes in which things are stated to exist in relation to other things.

1.1. Environmental Policies of Pakistan

Under the declaration of Stockholm in 1972, the Ministry of Environment of Pakistan was established in 1975. The constitution of the Islamic Republic in 1973 served the federal and provincial legislatures with a power to make laws on environment. Owing to this constitution, the federal legislation had built Pakistan's Environmental Protection Ordinance (PEPO) in 1983 which included Pakistan's Environmental Protection Council (PEPC) that was headed by the President of Pakistan as the supreme policymaker, Pakistan Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) at the federal level and four environmental protection agencies at the provincial level to implement the aims of PEPO. In 1992, Pakistan additionally took part in the Earth Summit which accelerated the process of environmental law-making in the country. In the same year, Pakistan prepared the National Conservation Strategy (NCS) as a broader framework to address environmental concerns and practices. In 1993, Pakistan Environmental Protection Act (Pak-EPA) replaced PEPO to improvise environmental conservation and protection. The National Environmental Policy (2005), on the basis of the NCS (1992), was established to provide guidelines to the federal government, provincial governments, federally administered territories, and the local government for addressing environmental concerns. The provincial governments then took the National Environmental Policy as a guideline to develop provincial environmental policies. The selected texts for the analysis, therefore, are as below:

- National Environmental Policy (2005)
- National Forest Policy (2015)
- National Climate Change Policy (2012)
- National Sanitation Policy (2006)

2. Results and Discussion

Frames are of particular importance to ecolinguistics because they constantly enable environmental organizations, ministries and policy-makers who are working towards a social change to structure views about environmental concerns (Stibbe, 2015). One of their major agendas is to explore and advise about ecological communication of biodiversity, climate change, conservation and development which can be seen in the way frames are constructed. These frames invoke environmental ideologies which have been summed up in Table 1.

2.2 Framing

Water Hygiene

The National Environmental Policy of Pakistan (2005) states:

Develop (Pr: Material) legal and policy framework for promotion of safe drinking water by promoting low-cost water treatment technologies (Goal) at the community and household level, promote (Pr: material) appropriate technologies (Goal) for rain water (01 NEP, p. 5)

Make (Pr: material) installation (Range) of water treatment plants as an integral component of all drinking water supply schemes (01 NEP, p. 5)

Establish (Pr: material) a water quality monitoring (Goal) and surveillance system (01 NEP, p.5)

In this excerpt, Pakistan Ministry of Environment explicitly frames technology and scientific inquiry as primary sources to access clean water. By using terms like 'safe drinking', 'low-cost', 'appropriate technologies', 'quality monitoring', 'installation' realized as Goals, invoke a *science-dependent frame* where quality equipment and monitoring are tied to the initiative of water hygiene. This idea consequentially establishes the frame resonating as 'Build Technologies, Save Clean Water'. This frame reinforces a science-dependent life that heavily relies on the centrality and dominion of science. In doing so, technology, mainly, becomes the primary source of an ecologically sustainable environment which is paradoxical. It is paradoxical because while its focus is on producing ecological-friendly practices, these

lexical choices perpetuate non-ecological actions that stand against the very idea of positive environmental behaviour. Alternatively, the idea of ‘clean water’ could have been structured otherwise through different set of vocabulary. For instance, the Deviant Art (n.d) presents a portrait of clean water in which it states the phrase: ‘*Thirsty? Save water, save Earth, save Life*’. This phrase instead prompts human responsibility in that it stresses on an ecologically sustainable philosophy that is water conservation instead of relying on scientific assumptions and innovations. Ostensibly, the reliance on scientific register seems problematic and misleading as it tends to distance human conscience from the moral responsibility towards nature. Additionally, the use of trigger words such as ‘quality monitoring’ and ‘surveillance system’ further predicts water as a vulnerable entity because terms such as ‘monitoring’ and ‘surveillance’ are used to suspect an endangered or unsafe activity. This heavy reliance on the inevitability of science places huge emphasis on evolution and scientific inquiry which strengthen the idea that the belief in progress requires us to have faith in the omniscience of Science –additionally realized through Material Process to avoid abstraction and reflect on the actual practicality of this area. Apparently, then, the governance environmental policy is misleading as it tends to promote an ecological behaviour that relies on scientific experiments as the key to environmental sustainability.

Pollution

The National Environmental Policy of Pakistan (2005) states:

Pollution (Range) caused (Pr: material) by liquid and solid waste (Actor) in the country would be prevented and reduced. For this purpose, the government may introduce (Pr: material) discharge licensing systems (Goal), establish cleaner production centers, cleaner production techniques (Goal)

Adopt (Pr: material) measures for mitigating pollution (Range)

devise and implement (Pr: material) master plan (Goal) for treatment of industrial wastewater (01 NEP, p. 6)

This excerpt triggers a frame of rejection of human responsibility held accountable for pollution and instead renders ‘liquid and solid waste’ which is realized as Actors to blame. Ostensibly, it gives rise to the conceptual frame of ‘pollution not as a moral responsibility’ which erases the possibility of human accountability for this non-ecological practice. Having framed that, ironically, it then normalizes the human practice of heavily relying on science to take actions against pollution. Terms like ‘discharge licensing system’, ‘cleaner production centres’, ‘adopting measures’, ‘implement master plans’ realized as Goals, bound to human capacity to operate with, are thus introduced. This conceptual frame replaces a more docile frame of an ‘environmental issue’ that can be tackled through eco-friendly actions such as cleanliness and recycling on individual level, but is rather transferred into a ginormous plan assuming to supersede human capacity. Moreover, encoding terms such as ‘cleaner production centres, adopting measures, implement master plans’ as Goals in Material Processes distance an individual’s empathy to work towards the betterment of environment, and instead empowers a more science-dependent ideology to penetrate in discourse. This idea further denies the possibility of a ‘Progressive Moral System’ (Lakoff, 2010) which is characterized by showing empathy, responsibility and an ethic of excellence towards nature. Lakoff (2010) defines the inability to accept the main cause of pollution, and the lack of ideas we need to have regarding pollution as “hypercognition” (Lakoff, 2010, p. 76). Resultantly, it seems that policy-makers seem to lack frames that capture the reality of ecological degradation or ecological sustainability. Nature is not perceived as to how the Romantics visualized it in the form of a goddess or a mother to which we all belong (Wordsworth, *The Prelude*, 1850). Instead, it is how Science takes it as the other; the separable; the independent; the removable. This separation has certainly become so deeply ingrained that it cannot be wiped out from our brains (Lakoff, 2010).

Biodiversity

The National Environmental Policy of Pakistan (2005) states:

The government (behavior) would promote (pr: behavioural) the conservation and sustainable use of Pakistan's biodiversity (Behaviour)... and the equitable use (pr: material) of sharing of benefits (Goal) arising thereof for the well-being of the nation (Beneficiary) (01 NEP, p. 7)

It is noteworthy how biodiversity is not represented as an inclusive phenomenon to the perception of the ecosystem, rather is apparently framed as a commercial venture marked by 'arising benefits' which is realized as Goal in a Material Process particularly set for the 'well-being of the nation' who is marked as the Beneficiary. As a result, it triggers the conceptual frame of identifying 'biodiversity as a commercial venture'. In doing so, it reinforces a consumerist ideology through material acquisition where 'arising benefits' realized as Goal normalize the urban practice of reproduction of material resources that is in constant quest for the fulfilment of material gains. Consequentially, the policy document is rendered paradoxical to framing a positive ecological representation of biodiversity, because while it explicitly emphasizes on 'conservation and sustainable use' as eco-friendly actions, it implicitly triggers non-ecological practices that normalize the quest for material gains. Hence, two main discursive practices can be drawn from this discourse: primarily sell products and make the nonhuman victimization disappear. A pertinent connection can be drawn to Upadhyay and Hasnain's (2017) research on linguistic diversity who claim that the interconnection between linguistic diversity and biodiversity is in direct proportion, thus, any damages to the ecosystem may result in consequence of the system as a whole (Crystal, 2000). This pessimistic vision of the present humanity in which animals and humans are alienated and distant has also been criticized by Burt (2007). However, the frame process and linguistic choices in this excerpt only juxtapose biodiversity with commodification and development, providing a hostile, detached perspective on biodiversity. These myths have contributed to the construction of a world characterized by 'development and growth' for human beings and constantly talks about competition, thus, suppressing other means of living organisms, or in other words, exploiting rest of the ecosystem for its benefit. The destructive nature of this discourse can be seen in how the 'story of human centrality' is naturalized in policy documents to an extent that they no more appear as stories.

The measures which the government is supposed to take are enlisted as below:

the involvement of local communities in sustainable use of biodiversity through provision of incentives (nominal head: Range) (01 NEP, p.)

develop policy and regulatory frameworks for conservation, cultivation, marketing (Range) of medicinal and economic plants (01 NEP, p. 13)

Notable are the underlined lexis that trigger an economist-consumerist approach towards biodiversity. Stated that economics orient all aspects of human endeavours for achieving personal gains towards consumption and commodification (Chawla, 2001), realizing terms such as 'provision of incentives' as Range in a Material Process and talking about the 'marketing' of plants further entrench the extrinsic value of getting richer. This idea of shaping nature as a commercial transaction is also held against by Blackmore and Holmes (2013) because it eventually reinforces a self-centred, consumerist frame which implies the cultivation of biodiversity for serving human benefits in the first place.

Table 1: Framing Analysis of Environmental Policies of Pakistan

Domain	Systemic Functional Analysis	Invoked Frame	Ideological Effect
Water Hygiene	<i>Material processes:</i> develop, promote, make installation, establish. <i>Goals:</i> safe drinking water, low-cost technologies, quality monitoring, surveillance system.	“Build Technologies, Save Clean Water”	science and technology as the central solution to water hygiene
Pollution	<i>Actors:</i> liquid and solid waste. <i>Material processes:</i> introduce licensing systems, establish cleaner production centers, adopt measures, implement master plans.	“Pollution Not as a Human Responsibility”	Human responsibility is erased by assigning agency to “waste”
Biodiversity	<i>Behavioural/Material processes:</i> promote conservation, equitable sharing of benefits. <i>Goals:</i> arising benefits, marketing, provision of incentives. <i>Beneficiary:</i> the nation.	“Biodiversity as a Commercial Venture”	Reduces biodiversity to material gain and commercial profit

2.2 Reframing

While framing is defined as the process of structuring one area of life, reframing entails restructuring how one area of life is conceptualized by using a completely different area to define it. Reframing provides a new means of structuring an area of life in a way that is different from how it has been perceived earlier. However, all that is needed to reframe a concept is to employ words that trigger the desired frame. As Lakoff (2010) puts it “words can be chosen to activate the desired frames” (Lakoff, 2010, p. 73). Whereas Lakoff (2010) defines framing as an unconscious process, one significant point that has to be highlighted is the fact that reframing cannot be considered as unconscious, since it encourages the writer or the reader to activate one form of frame i.e., the source domain in order to contextualize the other frame i.e., the target domain (Stibbe, 2015). Hence, by bringing into consciousness how the target domain has been perceived earlier, it aims to restructure the cognitive imposition of that particular frame by bringing in a completely contrastive frame to help in restructuring the target domain.

Following are the interpretations of how environmental topics of sanitation and forestry are reframed:

Sanitation

The National Sanitation Policy (2006) states that:

Sanitation (Nominalization: Carrier) is (Pr: intensive) one of the basic necessities (Value) which contribute to human dignity (Beneficiary) and quality of life and is an essential pre-requisite (Value) for success in the fight against poverty, hunger, child death, gender inequality, and women empowerment (02 NSP, p. 6)

Notions such as ‘poverty, hunger, child death, women empowerment, inequality’, may not be directly triggered by environmental degradation. However, reframing the discourse of human rights resonates the idea of ‘initiating sanitation, achieving equality’, which connects human needs realized as Beneficiary with sanitation which is realized as Carrier. Ostensibly, what may have seemed as destined for ecological sustainability is actually subverted by anthropocentric practices, that is, even if the process of sanitation is carried properly, it directly may not bring a change in the perception of human rights practices, but

having reframed these stories in relation to sanitation may give rise to a new form of frame where both the source and target domains not only become interconnected, but inseparable. This further validates how ecological destruction is part of an oppressive relation between humans and other humans, influencing others at the most basic level of the ability to continue living (Stibbe, 2011).

Furthermore, the National Sanitation Policy (2006) states:

Recognizing deficiency in the provision of sanitation services in Pakistan, Ministry of Environment (Agent) initiated (pr: material) the preparation of the national sanitation policy (Range) to meet (pr: material) the commitment of the Millennium Development Goals (Range) on environmental sustainability (02 NSP, p. 6)

The central dependence of non-ecological human-centred practices of ‘Millennium Development Goals’ on ecological actions, particularly tied to human development and recognition and all other frames that normalize the fulfilment of human development is an ambivalent and seemingly paradoxical story. It rather stands against the very primary ecosophy pertaining to the establishment of environmental policies as part of environmental discourse. Consequentially, we start to relate all that is achieved through Millennium Development Goals with proper sanitation that perhaps resonates as ‘initiate sanitation, achieve millennium development goals’.

Seemingly, what is even more problematic is the idea of ‘development’. Stibbe (2015) is highly critical of framing ‘development’ which is one of the most powerful areas in ecolinguistics due to its influential impact on ecology and the culture around us. Development is usually perceived in terms of economic growth and is widely regarded as having an ecologically destructive impact on the world around us. However, reframing the concept of development in relation to sanitation can be considered as a “frame modification” (Stibbe, 2015, p. 58). Modifying ‘development’ into ‘millennium development goals’ ostensibly gives rise to a historical and remarkable achievement instigated by the term ‘millennium’ that further reinforces human more than ecological development. Moreover, situating ‘sanitation’ as the means to ‘meet the commitment of Millennium Development Goals’ is a subtle rhetorical move that renews the positionality of human needs and centrality as primary, whereas sanitation is perceived as a tool to achieve this very purpose. This radical development of metaphors such as ‘economic growth, modernization, political stability and order, entrepreneurism culture and personality, modes of production, production relations, millennium development goals’ tend to overlook the question of environmental disorder, ecological degradation through means of capitalist consumerist expansion. The paradox of sustainable development, therefore, seems to be constrained by economic growth which itself is the proponent of environmental harm (Reid, 1995; Reed, 1996).

Forestry

The National Forestry Policy (2015) states:

The conventional treatment (nominalization: range) of forestry (Beneficiary) as a stand-alone wood producing (Attribute) sub-sector has been transformed into a cross-cutting subject impacting (pr: mental) a number of economic sectors (Phenomenon) including water, energy, agriculture, non-timber forest products, health, housing, tourism, and communication (03 NFP, p. 7)

The transformation of forestry from a ‘stand-alone’ and ‘wood producing’ machinery realized as Attributes into a marketing business that trades ‘housing, tourism, and communication’ is another *reframe* which first establishes the role of forests as Beneficiary, and then indexes all other frames of ‘livelihood’ particularly tied to human growth with forestry. Evidently, then, it resonates the frame ‘cultivate forestry, gain livelihood’ which is misleading because while it may overtly propel an ecological practice of positively

evaluating nature, actually reinforces a non-ecological behaviour that promotes a positive ecological identity for the sole purpose of marketing and economic growth. Mentioning forestry as the means to ‘wood production’ triggers the frame of legitimizing its role for human development and reframing forestry as a means of gaining livelihood in terms of ‘housing’, ‘tourism’ and ‘communication’ that are all other means of human achievements which are projected as being dependent on nature.

In general, there seems to be a tendency for frames in the National Environmental Policies of Pakistan to instigate non-ecological behaviour as a means to serve human purposes and make the world a better place which is only modified towards making efforts for achieving human development. Despite their main agenda of environmental sustainability and promoting eco-friendly actions and guidelines, policy-makers tend to project human development and human growth as an inevitable phenomenon which not only cannot be separated from nature, but also solely dependent on nature. This framing consequently legitimizes the role of nature to be the means of providing human beings with the essence of life. In other words, governance environmental policy discourse can be so ironic and paradoxical that while it attempts to work for the betterment of the ecosystem, it still cannot put human priorities at the backdrop. Instead, they are framed as the fundamental premises upon which nature and all other means of living organisms rest. Due to this problematic non-ecological behaviour, there is a need to challenge these frames that empower, reproduce and normalize anthropocentric ideologies that stand against the purpose of establishing governance environmental policy as part of green consciousness discourse.

Table 2: Reframing Analysis of Environmental Policies of Pakistan

Domain	Systemic Functional Analysis	Invoked Frame	Ideological Effect
Sanitation	<i>Intensive relational processes:</i> sanitation is a basic necessity. <i>Values:</i> human dignity, quality of life, poverty reduction, child mortality, gender equality.	“Initiate Sanitation, Achieve Equality”	An anthropocentric reframe where sanitation is a tool for achieving human development.
Sanitation (Development Goals)	<i>Material processes:</i> meet Millennium Development Goals through sanitation.	“Initiate Sanitation, Achieve Millennium Development Goals”	Positioning ecological action (sanitation) as subordinate to human-centred development agendas.
Forestry	<i>Nominalization:</i> conventional treatment of forestry. <i>Attributes:</i> wood-producing sub-sector. <i>New Phenomena:</i> housing, tourism, communication, agriculture, energy.	“Cultivate Forestry, Gain Livelihood”	Reframes forests as economic assets rather than ecological entities.

Conclusion

Pertinent to environmental management and green consciousness discourse is to explicitly reveal the values which shape the ecosophy of environmental policy of Pakistan and challenge this discourse that is influenced by consumerist ideologies and mirror non-human sacrifice through the reproduction of conceptual frames that reinforce anthropocentric domination and power. While seemingly establishing ecological guidelines for positive environmental actions, the use of nature as a commodity and the framing of nature as a site of struggle perpetuate ecological exploitation. Pertaining to the ecosophy that establishes

the discourse of environmental policies, this orientation is rendered paradoxical, misleading and ambivalent.

Environmental policy, being part of green consciousness discourse, is an important area of environmental management where guidelines and actions totally depend on the ecological philosophy of this discourse. According to Dryzek (2005) and Tosun and Lang (2017), the need to introduce multi-actor, multi-scale and multi-level governance structures has become the requirement of environmental discourse. Nevertheless, despite the responsibility of environmental policy-makers to carefully recognize environmental representation in texts, the linguistic structuring of this discourse is misleading because while it is designed as a mode of political communication that is set to describe, plan and implement positive ecological actions, yet, snatches this agency from nature to only fulfil human-centred practices. That is, while this discourse should have purely focused on the development of a more ecologically sustainable environment, it rather furnishes human needs by relaying emphasis on human growth and reinforcing anthropocentric power and dominion through scientific innovations.

As revealed in the analysis, the text along with the embedded conceptual frames reflects science-dependent values that normalize the belief in the omniscience of science (Midgley, 2003) which inevitably contributes to ecological degradation. Although overtly, it may seem to promote positive ecological actions by relaying emphasis on environmental sustainability, it covertly reproduces, reinforces, and normalizes non-ecological behaviour.

Owing to the role of critical discourse studies in challenging oppression and inequality - be it behavioural or practical- such discourses which render the ecosystem mute and hence impose anthropocentric orientations and behaviour, must be critiqued and resisted.

While the focus of ecolinguistics has moved beyond discourses aiming at studying environmental management and rather emphasize on the need to identify practices contributing to ecological crisis that go unnoticed, however, countries like Pakistan where environmental degradation continues to grow rapidly, such discourses must be critiqued and challenged. Hence, we hope our research will benefit environmental policy-makers in particular and environmental discourse in general to understand the actions and identities that promote non-ecological outcomes.

Moreover, this research provides an analytical inquiry for environmental policymakers of Pakistan to realize the pertinent choice of linguistic structures that construct ambivalent and anthropocentric frames which are misaligned with the main agenda of producing positive ecological discourse. In doing so, national environmental policy makers can work on those texts and make them more ecologically embedded and less anthropocentrically centred.

References

- Azizullah, A., Khattak, M. N., Richter, P., Hader, D.P. (2011). Water pollution in Pakistan and its impact on public health. *Environment International*, 37(2), 479-497.
- Alexander, R. (2009). *Framing discourse on the environment: A critical discourse approach*. New York: Routledge.
- Baker, P. (1984). Agglutinated French articles in creole French: their evolutionary significance. *Te Reo* 27, 89—129.
- Baudrillard, J. (1994). *Simulacra and simulation*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Beckett, A. (2013). What is the 'global race'? *The Guardian*. Retrieved 8 August, 2017 from: <https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2013/sep/22/what-is-global-race-conservatives-ed-miliband>
- Berardi, F. (2012). *The uprising: On poetry and finance*. Los Angeles, CA: Semiotext(s).
- Blackmore, E & Holmes, T. (2013). *Common cause of nature: Values and frames in conservation*. Machynlleth, Wales: Public Interest Research Centre.
- Bowers, C. (2014). *The false promises of the digital revolution: How computers transform education, work, and international development in ways that undermine an ecologically sustainable future*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Bullis C. (1992). Retalking Environmental discourses from feminist perspectives: The radical potential of ecofeminism. In J. G. Cantrill and C. L. Oravec (Eds.). *The symbolic earth: Discourse and Our creation of the environment* (pp. 123-48). Lexington: University of Kentucky Press
- Burt, J. (2005). John Berger's *why look at animals?* A close reading. *Worldviews: Global Religions, Culture, and Ecology*, 9(2), 203–18.
- Chawla, Saroj. (2001). Linguistics and philosophical roots of our environmental crisis. In A. Fill & P. Mühlhäusler (Eds.). *The ecolinguistics reader* (pp. 115-122). London: Continuum
- Chomsky, N. (2006). *Language and mind*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Colding, J. (2011). The role of ecosystem services in contemporary urban planning. In Niemelä, J., Breuste, J.H., Elmqvist, T., Guntenspergen, G., James, P., McIntyre, N.E. (Eds.), *Urban ecology: patterns, processes and applications* (228–237), Oxford University Press, UK.
- Cook, G. (2001). *The discourse of advertising*. (2nd ed). London: Routledge.
- Couto, H.H. (2014). Ecological approaches in linguistics: A historical overview. *Language Sciences*, 41 Part A, 122-128. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2013.08.001>
- Crystal. (2000). *Language death*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Devian Art. (n.d.). Retrieved 03 Feb, 2018. from: <https://karimfakhoury.deviantart.com/art/Save-Water-137137402>
- Dryzek, J. (2005). *The politics of the earth: Environmental discourses*. (2nd ed). Oxford University Press, UK.
- Dunayer, J. (2001). *Animal equality: Language and liberation*. Derwood, MD: Ryce.

- Durrleman, S. (2014). The syntax of Mauritian creole: Anand Syea, Bloomsbury studies in theoretical linguistics. *Lingua*, 145, 226-242.
- Eggins, S. (2004). *Introduction to systemic functional linguistics* (2nd ed). London: A & C Black.
- Eisenstein, C. (2011). *Sacred economics: Money, gift, and society in the age of transition*. Berkeley, CA: Evolver Editions.
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. London: Routledge.
- Fillmore, C. and Baker, C. (2010). A frames approach to semantic analysis. In B. Heine and H. Narrog (Eds.). *The oxford handbook of linguistic analysis* (pp: 313-40). Oxford: Oxford University press.
- Gare, A. (1996). *Nihilism Inc.: Environmental destruction and the metaphysics of sustainability*. Como, NSW: Eco-Logical Press.
- Glenn, C.B. (2004). Constructing consumables and consent: A critical analysis of factory industry discourse. *Journal of Communication Inquiry* 28(1), 63-81.
- Glaeser, E.L. (2014). A world of cities: The causes and consequences of urbanization in poorer countries. *Journal of European Economic Association*, 12(5), 1154–1199.
- Glotfelty, C. (2014). What is ecocriticism? Association for the study of literature and environment. Retrieved 23 Mar 2018 from: <http://www.asle.org/site/resources/ecocritical-library/intro/defining/glotfelty/>
- Goatly, A. (1996). Green grammar and grammatical metaphor, or language and the myth of power, or metaphors we die by. In A. Fill and P. Mühlhäusler (Eds.). *The ecolinguistics reader: Language, ecology, and environment* (pp. 203-225). London: Continuum.
- Goatly, A. (2000). *Critical reading and writing: An introductory coursebook*. London: Routledge.
- Grant, A. (1995). Article agglutination in Creole French: a wider perspective. In P. Baker. (Ed.). *From contact to creole and beyond* (146—176), University of Westminster Press, London.
- Halliday, M. (2001). New ways of meaning: The challenge to applied linguistics. In A. Fill and P. Mühlhäusler (Eds.). *The ecolinguistics reader: Language, ecology, and environment* (pp. 175-202), London: Continuum.
- Hanson, A. J. & Ministry of Environment. (2002). Pakistan's national conservation strategy, renewing commitment to action: Report of the mid-term review. Islamabad: Ministry of environment, local government and rural development. Retrieved from: https://www.iucn.org/downloads/pakistan_ncs_mid_review.pdf
- Hussain M. (2020, Aug 16). Pakistan's battle against climate change. *Inter press service*. Retrieved from: <http://www.ipsnews.net/2019/04/pakistans-battle-climate-change/>
- Haque, M. S. (2000). Environmental discourse and sustainable development: Linkages and limitations. *Ethics and the Environment*, 5(1), 3-23.
- Kahn, M. (2001). The passive voice of science: Language abuse in the wildlife profession. In A. Fill & P. Mühlhäusler (Eds.). *The ecolinguistics reader: Language, ecology, and environment* (pp. 241-44), London: Continuum.
- Killingsworth, J. M. & Palmer, S. P. (1992). *Ecospeak: rhetoric and environmental politics in America*. Carbondale: Illinois Southern University Press.
- Kingsnorth, P. and Hine, D. (2009). The dark mountain project manifesto. Retrieved 31 May, 2017 from: <http://dark-mountain.net/about/manifesto/>

- Lanthier I, & Olivier, L. (1999). The construction of environmental 'awareness'. In E. Darier, (Ed). *Discourses of the environment* (pp. 63-78). Maiden, PA: Blackwell.
- Larson, B. (2011). *Metaphors for environmental sustainability: Redefining our relationship with nature*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (1999). *Philosophy in the flesh: The embodied mind and its challenge to western thought*. New York: Basic Books.
- Lakoff, G. (2006). Conceptual metaphor. *Cognitive Linguistics Research*, 185-238. doi:10.1515/9783110199901.185
- Lakoff, G. (2010). Why it matters how we frame the environment. *Environmental Communication: Journal of Nature and Culture*, 4(1), 70-81.
- Martin, J. (2014). *Politics and rhetoric: A critical introduction*. London: Routledge.
- Meisner, M. (1997). Resourceist language: The symbolic enslavement of nature. In D. Sachsman, K. Salomone, S. Seneca (Eds.). *Proceedings of the conference on communication and our environment* (pp. 236-43). Chattanooga: University of Tennessee at Chattanooga.
- Midgley, M. (2003). *The myths we live by*. New York: Rutledge.
- Milstein, T., Littlejohn, S., & Foss, K. (2009). Environmental communication theories. In S. Littlejohn & K. Foss (Eds.). *Encyclopaedia of communication theory* (pp. 344-9), Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Mühlhäusler, P. (2001). Talking about environmental issues. In A. Fill and P. Mühlhäusler (Eds). *The ecolinguistics reader* (pp. 31-41), London: Continuum,
- Mühlhäusler, P. (2003). *Language of environment, environment of language: A course in ecolinguistics*. London: Battlebridge books.
- Nerlich, B., & Jaspal, R. (2012). Metaphors we die by? Geoengineering, metaphors, and the argument from catastrophe. *Metaphors and Symbol*, 27 (2), 131-47.
- Naureen, M. (2009). Development of environmental institutions and laws in Pakistan. *Pakistan Journal of History and Culture*, XXX(1), 93-112.
- Okri, B. (1996). *Birds of heaven*. London: Phoenix.
- Poole, R., & Spangler, S. (2019). 'Eco this and recycle that': An ecolinguistic analysis of a popular digital simulation game. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 17(3), 344-357. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17405904.2019.1617177>
- Pounds, G. (2020). The values of trees and woodland: a discourse based cross-disciplinary perspective on integrating 'revealed' evaluations of nature into environmental agendas. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17405904.2020.1752757>
- Priest, S. (2016). *Communicating climate change: The path forward*. United Kingdom. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Reed, D. (1996). *Structural adjustment, the environment, and sustainable development*. London: Earthscan.
- Reid, D. (1995). *Sustainable development: An introductory guide*. London: Earthscan.
- Sachon, D. (1993). Generative metaphor: A perspective on problem setting in social policy. In A. Ortony (Ed.). *Metaphor and thought* (pp. 167-3). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Smith-Harris, T. (2004). There's not enough and there's no sense: Language usage and human perceptions of other animals. *Revision*, 27(2), 12-15.

- Soria, K. Y., Palacios, M. R., & Morales Gomez, C. A. (2020). Governance and policy limitations for sustainable urban land planning. The case of Mexico. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 259, 109575. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2019.10957>
- Stamou, A. G., & Paraskevopoulos, S. (2008). Representing protection action in an ecotourism setting: A critical discourse analysis of visitors' books at a Greek reserve. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 5(1), 35-54. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17405900701768620>
- Steffensen, S. and Fill, A. (2014). Ecolinguistics: The state of the art and future horizons. *Language Sciences*, 41(6), 25. [www.ecoling.net/ articles](http://www.ecoling.net/articles).
- Stibbe, A. (2001). Language, Power and the Social Construction of Animals. *Society and Animals* 9 (2), 145–162. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/156853001753639251>
- Stibbe, Arran (2012). Ecolinguistics and Globalization. In N. Coupland. *The handbook of language and globalization* (pp. 413-18). London: Blackwell.
- Stibbe, A. (2013). An ecolinguistic approach to critical discourse studies. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 11(1), 117-128. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17405904.2013.845789>
- Stibbe, A. (2015). *Ecolinguistics: language, ecology and the stories we live by*. London: Routledge.
- Tosun, J., Lang, A., 2017. Policy integration: Mapping the different concepts. *Policy Studies*, 38(6), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01442872.2017.1339239>
- Trampe, W. (2001). Language and ecological crisis: Extracts from a dictionary of industrial agriculture. In A. Fill and P. Muhlhausler (Eds.). *The ecolinguistic reader: Language, ecology, and environment* (pp. 232-40). London: Continuum.
- Upadhyay, R. K. & Hasnain, S. I. (2017). Linguistic diversity and biodiversity. *Lingua*, 195, 110-123. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2017.06.002>
- Verhagen, F. (2008). Worldviews and metaphors in the human-nature relationship: An ecolinguistic exploration through the ages. *Language and Ecology*, 2(8), 1-14.
- Van Humboldt. (1999). *On language, on the diversity of human language construction and its influence on the mental development of the human species*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.