
Samia Manzoor*
Muhammad Ashraf Khan**
Sarwat Jabeen***

Critical Discourse Analysis of US Newspapers' Representations of Pakistan

ABSTRACT

The present study aims to investigate the lexical choices used by The Washington Post and The New York Times to portray Pakistan in the editorials. It is based on critical discourse analysis of the newspapers' text to reveal hidden ideologies. The data was collected from 12th September 2001 to 31st December 2016. Total population of editorials of both the newspapers was 274, which were downloaded from Lexis Nexis data base. Fourteen sentences from the population were selected through multistage sampling technique. Fairclough's (1989, 1995) models were adopted to analyze the content by using an inductive approach. The results showed that both the newspapers use derogatory and offensive terms and phrases to portray Pakistan. It was concluded that media of such nature is a gigantic contributor in developing a negative global image of Pakistan.

Keywords: Propaganda, Language, Lexical Choice, Newspaper, Ideology, CDA

Introduction

Language is a very pertinent factor in propaganda, framing and dissemination of ideologies. That is why language cannot be ignored when analyzing content to reveal propaganda, ideologies and framing hidden in it. Witkowska, J. (2008) says that propaganda became very powerful by using carefully measured language. The present study attempts to establish how *The Washington Post* and *The New York Times* have been using rhetorical devices

* Assistant Professor, Department of Communication Studies, BZU, Multan, Pakistan

** Professor, Department of Communication Studies, BZU, Multan, Pakistan

*** Assistant Professor, Department of English, BZU, Multan, Pakistan

to portray Pakistan in their editorials. Words and terms, which media use to portray some issue, have great influence on how people understand and conceptualize that issue (Brewer, 2002). It shows that special rhetorical devices and language are very important in constructing propagandistic messages (IPA, 1939). Propaganda has also been studied on the base of rhetoric. The importance of language in propaganda is reinforced by numerous propaganda techniques such as distorting truth to the point of lying and presenting false appeals (Witkowska, 2008). Likewise, it has also been contended by researchers that propaganda uses simple but connotatively laden language. It has been established that the key components of propaganda were connotatively laden words and appeals to nationalism.

Mead (1964) shared arguments about “representations” through communication and language. He further said that understanding language is important in propaganda messages. That is why Black (2001) said that most of the academic research on propaganda is done on the tone and language which is used while conducting propaganda. Language was always given importance by the communication researchers because according to Lasswell (1927) language tactics and presentation methods of messages play an important role in persuading people. Sometimes propaganda is blended with emotions and argumentations (Walton, 1992). It has been stressed that emotional language provokes distinctive and culturally partial responses in receivers. It is noted by many propaganda analysts that emotionally loaded terms and phrases are used in propaganda campaigns tremendously. And these also affect how individuals think about certain issues (IPA, 1939; Ellul, 1965; Lasswell, 1927; Lee, 1953). Eristic language is also often used in propaganda. Walton (2002) describes the characteristics of eristic dialogues as first, eristic arguments have nothing to do with the bylaws of critical discussion. Attacks are made on the opponents and self-defense is done. Secondly, no effort is made to acquire information or reveal the facts and finally, the parties will not talk openly and will always remain enemies and behave like one no matter what happens. These devices are used for deception and involve clever and sarcastic remarks and pretense. Propaganda manipulates the events and conceals the facts. Importance of use of words in propaganda is clear from many examples. During Iraq War 2003 the military spokespersons were directed not to use the term “Fedayeen” to refer to the troops loyal to Saddam Hussain because it has a positive connotation but to use negatively laden terms for them like, “terrorists”, “death squads”, or “thugs” (Kumar, 2006).

Lee (1953) found two techniques of propaganda which have been identified earlier: (a) use of catchy ways to forming a dispute, (b) case-making to explain why it should be done through the use of linguistic features,

selective truth, and simple language. Lee further added that different sources of communication serve different propaganda objectives. He concluded that there are direct and indirect channels as well as formal and informal. In this way propagandist uses that medium which is most suitable for his messages and can easily research the target audience. Lee advocated that propaganda has indirect effects. Importance of language and words is inevitable in propaganda. Walton (1992) says that a very important feature of propaganda theory is emotional appeals and the speaker's use of emotion arousing words which will in return exploit the feelings and biases of a target public. Along with use of emotions, the choice of words is also thought out. Carefully selected words are chosen to disseminate specific messages (Kumar, 2006). Gamson (1992) says that same words should be used for framing some aspect of an issue because when a term becomes generally accepted it is quite illogical to change it. Entman (2003) says they use such words to promote frames which are highly important in some culture. It means that they are "visible, reasonable and unforgettable and emotionally loaded" (p. 417). Prominence and repetition of words and images which are used for framing measure the importance of issues.

Dell'Orto et al. (2004) studied "designators" which were defined by Pan & Kosicki (1993, p. 62) as "lexical choices of words or labels" that give meaning to a category. Framing helps in social construction of reality by using language because it deals with readers cognitive abilities for constructing meanings (Pan & Kosicki, 1993; Dell'Orto et al. 2004). Dell'Orto et al. (2004) applied lexical choices differently from the other researchers. Instead of content analyzing the text to find out lexical choices of words or labels, she deliberately infused lexical choices in text to study its effect on readers' perception. Moreover, they say that as journalists make these lexical choices so the frame they build is deliberate and contribute to establish a particular point of view.

Fairclough (2001) says that CDA critically analyses the text to reveal broader perspective of the discourses of people which shows ideologies, vested interests and power relationships. Fairclough (1992) explains that there is a strong bond between words and their political and social use for the achievement of set goals. As Brown and Yule (1985) say that words are used to break certain image and at the same time they set another image. So this is very important to understand how language discloses ideologies and on the other hand set new ideologies. Fairclough (1989) is of the view that language/discourse carries certain meanings which have to be understood in certain cultural and historical contexts as meanings are context bounded. According to Flower (1996) CDA creates awareness among learners to look at the text critically in order to reach to the layer of meaning which is not [apparent].

It is mostly believed that the biases present in news cannot be avoided. Parenti (1997) says that biases found in media content do not happen unintentionally rather the lexical choices are made by journalists deliberately, and for journalists solid reasons are present behind making these biases. Press is considered very influential. Then how is it possible that US press like *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post* would not influence the public opinion about Pakistan. Moreover, the images constructed by the press are not always fair due to the prejudices and biases of journalists. The present research aims on two major objectives, to identify the lexical choices in the editorials of *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post* about Pakistan from 12th September 2001 to 31st December 2016. And a secondary objective was to infer the thoughts presented for Pakistan by *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post* which contribute in developing the image of Pakistan globally. Following research questions were formulated:

RQ1: What lexical choices have been used by *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post* to portray Pakistan in the editorials?

RQ2: What ideologies are being presented through these choices?

Methodology

The present research is qualitative in nature. Critical discourse analysis, commonly known as CDA is a type of linguistic research that deals with identification and clarifying clues of cultural and ideological back ground which are present in the communication content (Fairclough, 1989; O'Halloran, 2003; Hodge & Kress, 1993). Lexical choice of words is a branch of critical discourse analysis. The intensity of words used in relation to Pakistan was measured. An inductive approach was adopted. No priori of operational definitions was developed as the lexical choices were found out in the editorials of *The Washington Post* and *The New York Times* through critical discourse analysis which is a qualitative technique. 274 articles from both the newspapers were downloaded from Lexis Nexis database by using the word 'Pakistan' in the opening paragraph or title to delimit the number of editorials. Eight sentences from *The Washington Post* and six from *The New York Times* were selected for final analysis through multistage sampling technique. In the first stage fourteen editorials were randomly chosen from a population of 274 by using the table of random numbers. At the second stage those single sentences were listed from the selected editorials where some propaganda technique was observed at work. Out of this list of sentences fourteen sentences were selected for final analysis.

The following framework of Fairclough (1995) has been used for linguistic analysis.

Model for Linguistic Analysis

Three modules for discourse analysis are present in the Fairclough's (1989, 1995) framework.

- i. Text Analysis
- ii. Discourse Practices
- iii. Social Practices

i. Text Analysis

Text analysis is the first aspect, it comprises of micro-as well as macro-levels of text structures; Fairclough (1995) uses Halliday's systemic functional linguistics for analysis at the textual level and its three spheres are:

- a. Ideational Function
- b. Interpersonal Function
- c. Textual Function

Meta narratives that flow in the society are included in the Ideational Functions. Analysis at this stage takes in transitivity that includes the diverse practices, or kinds of verbs, involved in the communication. Interpersonal Functions are used for the analysis of social relations customary among the participants in an interaction. Examination at this stage involves an analysis of the temperament (whether a sentence is a proclamation, question, or announcement) and modality (the amount of assertiveness in the conversation). Thematic structure of the text is included in the Textual Function.

ii. Discourse Practice

Study of discourse practice, through which texts are shaped and received, comprises analysis of the practice of production, explanation, circulation, and consumption. It is related with the way people take in and replicate or alter texts. Fairclough (1989, p. 134) says that "texts and discourses are socially constitutive"..... language is used ideologically to shape people's identities, knowledge and social relations.

iii. Social Practice

Inquiry of social practices, particularly focus on the relationship between discourse and power and ideology. It is concerned about the issues of power. As a construct power is realized through inter-discursively and hegemony.

Examination at this direction comprises of probing the ways in which discourses work in different areas of society. Fairclough (1989, p.20) proposes that language is “a socially conditioned process,” in which “process” refers to the production of text and the process of interpreting the text, and this process itself is related to the practices of the society.

Analysis of Words Found in the Editorials of the Washington Post

1. *“Far worse is the behavior of Pakistani President Pervez Musharraf, who has blatantly broken his promise to the Bush administration to control the infiltration of terrorists from Pakistan to Kashmir (December 1, 2002, page B-6).”*

Pakistani President Pervez Musharraf behavior is accused of being worse. It means that they are referring to something bad but the behavior of President Musharraf is even worse than the other thing. And why his behavior is considered bad because he has “blatantly broken his promise.” Breaking promise shows that Mr. Musharraf is not a credible and reliable person. He is not a man of words. He does not fulfill the commitments he makes. Moreover, the promises he is breaking are deliberately broken. He is intentionally doing it. When a person breaks his or her promise there are reasons behind it. And he/she usually feels ashamed of this act. But Mr. Musharraf is such a person that he is intentionally doing it. Referring Mr. Musharraf as “Pakistani President” means that he is the head of the state of Pakistan. It shows that actually the President of Pakistan does not have any credibility and to whom they are breaking promises? They are breaking promise to the Bush administration, to America. Furthermore, the promise Pakistan is breaking was about stopping infiltration of terrorists from Pakistan to Kashmir. Here Pakistan is vehemently accused of being non cooperative. It shows that Pakistan’s non cooperative behavior is the reason behind all the terrorist activities in Kashmir. Terrorists are going to Kashmir from Pakistan. And Pakistan is not stopping them from doing so. It shows that Pakistan wants terrorists to go to Kashmir and spread insurgency there. Pakistani President promised this previously but now backing off and is not controlling this problem by deliberately breaking his previously made promises.

2. *“Now Mr. Bush has placed another huge stack of chips on Gen. Pervez Musharraf, the self-appointed president of Pakistan, which since 9/11 has become the world's single largest haven of Islamic terrorists (June 30, 2003, page A-14).”*

This sentence conveys that Mr. Bush has given some new responsibility to Mr. Musharraf. And Mr. Musharraf is not a democratically elected president but a self-appointed president of Pakistan. He himself appointed him as president of Pakistan. In the second sentence the paper

writes about Pakistan “the world’s single largest haven of Islamic terrorists.” “Haven” is the center of this sentence. The meaning of haven is sanctuary or shelter. It means that the paper is calling Pakistan a place where “Islamic terrorists” are finding shelter. Pakistan is a place of refuge for Muslim terrorists. And Pakistan is the “single largest haven.” It means that the kind of refuge the terrorists find in Pakistan they don’t find it anywhere else. Pakistan has no competitor in this trait. Pakistan is the only and biggest sanctuary of Muslim terrorists in the whole world. Mr. Bush must not rely on Mr. Musharraf. Because he is a dictator and Pakistan is the largest refuge of terrorists in the whole world.

3. *“Now the administration must confront the reality that Pakistan's military leadership has done more to threaten U.S. and global security with weapons of mass destruction than either al Qaeda or Saddam Hussein (February 5, 2004, A-20)”*.

In this sentence *The Washington Post* is trying to tell the US administration that they must understand this reality. It is not an illusion but the reality that Pakistan’s military leadership has done such things which even al Qaeda (being the terrorist organization) and Saddam Hussein (being the dictator) of Iraq have not done. The acts of Pakistan’s military leadership are threatening towards not only US but to global security as well. Pakistan’s weapons of mass destruction are more threatening than al Qaeda or Saddam Hussein. al Qaeda and Saddam Hussein are two greatest enemies of America. If Pakistan’s military leadership is even more threatening to US and global security than al Qaeda or Saddam Hussein, it means that Pakistani leadership is declared even worse than al Qaeda or Saddam Hussein.

4. *“Ms. Bhutto and Mr. Sharif both are two-time failures as Pakistani prime minister. Both have been credibly accused of breathtaking acts of corruption; both have been unscrupulous in pursuing their personal ambitions (August 29, 2007, page A-16)”*.

The Washington Post writes about Ms. Benazir Bhutto and Mr. Nawaz Sharif, that both of them have disappointed. Both of them have repeatedly disappointed. They have not met the expectations of people both the times they were elected. Both of them are not only “two times failures” but “have been credibly accused of breathtaking acts of corruption.” It is a fairly loaded sentence. The meaning of “credibly accused” is that the source who is blaming them both has credibility and is a reliable source. “Breathtaking acts of corruption” is a very interesting term. “Breathtaking” is a positively connoted term. But the newspaper is combining this positive term with an extremely negatively connoted term

“corruption.” The editorialists are writing sarcastically that the corruption of Mr. Sharif and Ms. Bhutto is ‘awesome and wonderful’. Both of Pakistan’s ex-prime ministers were labeled as “unscrupulous.” they did not follow their principles sincerely. Pakistani nation is established as unwise and irresponsible here. They elected corrupt people to lead their country.

5. *“Now, Pakistan's democratic politicians have what they wanted: full responsibility for governing this notoriously unstable, nuclear-armed nation of 167 million mostly poor people (August 21, 2008, page A-14)”*.

It was written after August 2008, when Pakistan was once again enjoying a democratic rule. Instead of talking about the responsibilities the democratic leaders will be fulfilling, *The Washington Post* once again has a pinching style of writing when it mentions that “now, Pakistan’s democratic politicians have what they wanted.” But what was that what they wanted? A country which has no positive quality, she has a very bad reputation for being insecure, and then it has nuclear weapons which are also a very dangerous and lethal, the population is very large and this population is also burdensome for this country. Did the democratic politicians of Pakistan want this? It seems like the newspaper is making the politicians realize that it is not worth it. The paper is making them realize all the evil traits which Pakistan has. Unstable means something which is going to collapse. “Notorious” is the antonym of famous, and it is a negatively connoted term. If Pakistan is “notoriously unstable” it means that Pakistani is extremely weak and can collapse any time. “Nuclear armed nation” means that another responsibility which falls on the democratic politicians of Pakistan is to safeguard its nuclear assets. And in the context of the term used before this (notoriously unstable), it is very dangerous. Because if an unstable nation has such a dangerous weapon, who will take the responsibility of safeguarding its weapons of mass destruction? Moreover, Pakistan has a large population of 167 million people. And the paper is explicitly mentioning that most of these people are poor. A poor person of a country becomes burden for the government of that country as the government has to provide him resources for living. If Pakistan has such a huge number of poor people definitely she would not be an easy task for her politicians.

6. *“The presence of Osama bin Laden in a military town has reinforced the notion that Pakistan is playing a "double game," supporting some extremist groups even while it helps the United States fight them (May 8, 2011, page A-16)”*.

Osama bin Laden was captured and killed in Pakistan in May, 2011. In this regards this sentence was written where Pakistan is accused of playing a "double game." It shows that the newspaper is already holding this point of view about Pakistan. "Reinforced" means strengthened. When Osama was found in his compound in Abbottabad, which is called a military town by the newspaper because it has a military academy, the idea of Pakistan's double game became strengthened. It is shows that they already had doubts about Pakistan's "double game," and presence of Osama in this sensitive place, these doubts have become stronger. "Double game" is a negatively connoted term, which could be inferred as deceitful. It means that the person is playing a game on two ends. Pakistan's actions are called a game. It is said Pakistan is playing this game, on one end with America and on the other end with some extremist groups. Moreover, the newspaper writes that Pakistan "supporting some extremists groups," making Pakistan's position very suspicious, because Pakistan has remained a close ally of America in war on terror. If Pakistan is providing help to extremist groups which are the enemies in war on terror, it means that Pakistan is providing help to enemies while on the other side Pakistan also helps America to fight them. Hence Pakistan's position is doubtful.

7. *"The Afridi case does not change the U.S. interest in Pakistan, which lies in continued, frustrating but essential efforts to bolster civilian institutions and target terrorist safe havens (May 27, 2012, page A-26):"*

Shakeel Afridi was the man who gave information to US about the presence of OBL in Pakistan. *The Washington Post* wrote about it that whatever punishment Pakistan gave to Afridi does not change anything in their interest in Pakistan. Although US relationship with Pakistan is based on sustained efforts done by US but what US is doing is quite frustrating because they are putting efforts to uplift the civilian institutions in Pakistan but all the efforts are going in vain. US is trying hard to target the places of terrorists refuge but their efforts are not successful. The newspaper is using the term "safe havens" that means places of secure refuge. This term reveals that Pakistan has become a very secure and safe place for terrorists and US is putting all her efforts to eliminate these secure places. Moreover, US is concerned about the strengthening of civilian institutions in Pakistan and that's the reason behind US interest in Pakistan. *The Washington Post* is trying to establish the view point about Pakistan that Pakistan is giving punishment to a person who has done nothing wrong, rather he should be treated as a hero. But whatever Pakistan is doing does not affect the US interest in Pakistan. They will not spare Pakistan.

8. "Exceptions cannot be made for jihadists who fight for causes favored by the Pakistani elite, such as the "liberation" of Kashmir from Indian rule, or Taliban battling the Afghan government (March 31, 2016, page A-16)".

The Washington Post writes about the terrorists to who it is referring as "jihadists". Jihad is an Arabic term and its English meaning is "a holy war fought by Muslims to defend Islam" (Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary, nd). By using the term of jihadists they are directly linking the activities of terrorists to Islam by doing so trying to create a violent image of Islam. *The Washington Post* is writing that no immunities will be given to the terrorists they will take strict actions against them who are fighting for Pakistani elites. Pakistani elite means here Pakistani government and army. The newspaper is directly accusing Pakistan of using these terrorists for their own interests like "liberation" of Kashmir from Indian rule. By writing the word liberation in inverted commas the newspaper is trying to establish that the newspaper does not trust this word in this context thus creating a sense of doubt. The newspaper is directly accusing Pakistan by applying two allegations on Pakistan that she is on one hand using terrorists in Kashmir and on the other hand the Taliban fighting against Afghan government are also doing so because they are backed up by Pakistani elites.

Analysis of Words Found in the Editorials of *The New York Times*

1. "Islamabad has still not severed its ties to terrorist groups fighting Indian rule in Kashmir, its commitment to restraining future weapons development is uncertain and General Musharraf's own promises of restoring democracy are hedged with ambiguities (November 6, 2001, page A-20)".

Pakistan is accused of having links with terrorists groups. When *The New York Times* writes that "Islamabad has still not severed its ties to terrorist groups," it clearly means that Pakistan has ties with terrorist groups and she is not cutting these ties. When Pakistan is not cutting ties with terrorist groups who are fighting Indian rule in Kashmir then Pakistan must be supporting them. Although it is not clearly mentioned by *The New York Times* but they are communicating in between the lines. The editorialists in *The New York Times* are using such words and phrases about Pakistan that, when people will read them they will perceive deeper meanings from them. The newspaper wrote that, this is not the only bad thing which Pakistan is committing but there are numerous. The newspaper claimed that there is no certainty that Pakistan will remain restrained from developing more weapons. Moreover, it is also mentioned that the promises of General Musharraf about restoring

democracy in Pakistan are also not fulfilled. *The New York Times* applied the card-stacking technique very artfully by just telling one side of the story and never sharing Pakistan's point of view.

2. "He has no choice but to change the direction of his troubled nation and its military establishment. Dissident elements of the I.S.I. have to be rooted out, and the agency has to end its support of Islamic insurgents in Kashmir and cease intimidating Pakistani civilian politicians (March 25, 2002, page A-20)."

The New York Times is talking about General Pervez Musharraf that his only choice is to change the direction of his "troubled nation and military establishment." The newspaper is once again establishing Pakistan as a volatile nation. "Troubled nation" means a nation that is disturbed and distressed. And what is the reason behind Pakistan's being a troubled nation; the newspaper is quiet in this regard. The paper writes that rebellious elements in ISI (Pakistani intelligence service) should be cut out. It is a very good suggestion, but on the other hand it also means that there is chaos in ISI. The ISI personnel do not share the same thoughts regarding issues and some of the elements are trouble creators. These statements about ISI are once again proving that Pakistan is a volatile country. This is not the only crime which *The New York Times* accused of ISI. The newspaper wrote that ISI must end its support to insurgents in Kashmir. Once again *The New York Times* called ISI, one of the most prestigious institutions in Pakistan, an insurgent supporter. The paper also accused ISI to stop threatening Pakistan's civilian politicians. The task of a country's intelligence service is to do work to ensure peace in the country and safety of the nation. But ISI is such a kind of intelligence service which is creating fear in the people by threatening them. In short *The New York Times* made every claim and accusation on ISI to defame them.

3. "Young Pakistanis who can't get jobs in factories that export to America sometimes go to training camps to learn how to kill Americans (October 25, 2004, page A-20)."

The New York Times becomes extremely unrealistic when it writes that when young Pakistanis cannot find jobs in factories that export to America they sometimes go to training camps and learn how to kill Americans. This sentence clearly indicates that most of the young Pakistanis are terrorists and Americans are threatened by them. The newspaper is trying to create hatred in the minds of Americans for Pakistani youth. This sentence is unrealistic because definitely all the young Pakistanis cannot work in factories that export to America. There

would be a limited number of workers who can be accommodated in those factories. According to *The New York Times* the remaining “young Pakistanis” go to training camps to learn to kill Americans, making most of the Pakistani youth terrorists. And they are not ordinary terrorists but terrorists who particularly learn to kill Americans. This sentence presents the Pakistani youth as killers who learn to kill Americans, making Pakistanis evil and Americans vulnerable. Such sentences must become successful in creating hatred in the minds of American for Pakistani youth.

4. “*President Bush must work a lot harder to restore democracy -- the best hope for holding off the chaos that would make Pakistan an even more hospitable host for extremists (November 23, 2007, page A-36).*”

The New York Times writes that President Bush must do every effort to restore democracy in Pakistan for this is the only hope which can make Pakistan a tranquil country. And can end the disorder in Pakistan. The next sentence is very meaningful where it is said that “the chaos would make Pakistan an even more hospitable host for extremists.” *The New York Times* is not saying that if democracy would not be restored in Pakistan then Pakistan will become a host of extremists but it is alleging Pakistan of already being a friend of extremists and if the chaos in Pakistan would not be stopped Pakistan will become “even more hospitable host for extremists.” The word “hospitable” means welcoming or friendly. And “host” means entertainer, a person who entertains guests in their house. If Pakistan is a welcoming entertainer to extremists, it shows that Pakistan must have good relations with extremists. This sentence is clearly making Pakistan a country that is friendly to the American enemies.

5. “*Al Qaeda and the Taliban have found far too comfortable a safe haven in Pakistan's tribal regions (February 20, 2008, page A-20).*”

Al Qaeda and Taliban are two militant groups which are considered a threat to peace and harmony. And because of the rebellious nature of these two groups no peaceful country wants them but *The New York Times* is writing that these groups have found a more than comfortable, secure sanctuary in the tribal areas of Pakistan, which surely means that Pakistan is a weak country and cannot protect herself from Al Qaeda and Taliban entering her territories. Moreover, it could also mean that Pakistan is willingly providing a place of refuge to Al Qaeda and Taliban, making Pakistan an accomplice. The word used here is “far too comfortable”, which means that in Pakistani tribal areas they have found a place where the terrorists have no fear and worries; rather it is a place

where they have all kind of facilities. And definitely Pakistan is not doing anything to oust them from her territory.

6. “Nearly 15 years after 9/11, the war in Afghanistan is raging and Pakistan deserves much of the blame. It remains a duplicitous and dangerous partner for the United States and Afghanistan, despite \$33 billion in American aid and repeated attempts to reset relations on a more constructive course (May 12, 2016, page A-26).”

The text is loaded with ideologies and openly declares Pakistan as a main culprit in waging war in Afghanistan. Despite Pakistan’s active and strategically most important role, here it is being blamed and categorized as the dangerous partner of US. Pakistan’s sacrifices are all together neglected and the public is being told about the aid which has been given to her over the years. This is so negative portrayal of Pakistan almost undermining its contribution to war against terror being US ally in its war against terror. Pakistan did more than any other country in fighting US war on terror even at the huge cost of bringing war home. The portrayal or projection of such ideology builds not only negative image in the masses but also vilifies the country’s image. The use of word ‘duplicitous and dangerous Partner’ is highly ideological and connotes all negativity.

Discussion and Conclusion

The lexes used for Pakistan in the editorials of *The Washington Post* and *The New York Times* were analyzed and found highly ideological. It was observed that there was an abundance of derogatory and negatively connoted words and terms for Pakistan. Terms and phrases like “Pakistani terrorist groups,” “supposed freedom fighters in Indian-ruled Kashmir, they have been supported for years by the Pakistani military's own intelligence service,” were used for Pakistan. *The Washington Post* wrote about General Pervez Musharraf, who was the president of Pakistan at that time in one editorial that he has “blatantly broken his promise.” In another place he was mentioned as “self-appointed President of Pakistan.” Pakistan was referred as “the world's single largest haven of Islamic terrorists” in more than one editorial. The analysis revealed that “name calling” propaganda technique was quite abundant for Pakistan in the content of both the newspapers’ editorials. Name calling propaganda technique as explained by Koppang (2009) is one of Miller's propaganda devices. In name-calling, the propagandist calls opponents' names such as 'communist,' 'fascist,' 'evil,' or 'terrorist.' By definition, 'evil' people do not do the right things. Moreover, the intention of phrases, seems to be to stigmatize persons, groups, or countries, thereby arousing emotions such as hate and fear (pp: 129). The findings are

endorsed by Ali, et al (2013). They mentioned that US print media propagate that “Pakistan is a safe haven for terrorists and promoting terrorist activities in the region.” Pakistan’s military leadership was criticized openly through sentences like “Pakistan's military leadership has done more to threaten U.S. and global security with weapons of mass destruction than either al Qaeda or Saddam Hussein.” The picture of Pakistan was portrayed as a weak and volatile country by continuously referring her as an “unstable country.” Pakistani politicians were called “unscrupulous.” Pakistan was accused of playing a “double game.”

The editorials published in *The New York Times* were no exception. At one point the newspaper is writing about Pakistan that, “Islamabad has still not severed its ties to terrorist groups,” Pakistanis were referred as “troubled nation,” Pakistan was straightforwardly accused of “Pakistan's strong support for the Taliban, links with Kashmiri terrorists,” at another instance it was written about Pakistanis that “young Pakistanis who can't get jobs in factories that export to America sometimes go to training camps to learn how to kill Americans.” Pakistan was accused of many evils but terrorism remained on the top. Sentences like “Pakistan, provides rear support and sanctuary for the Taliban insurgency” were found abundantly. Pakistan was framed as a volatile state. It was promoted by using the fear frame that the world should be fearful of Pakistan. So much so that at some instances Pakistan was framed as a foe.

Overall both newspapers painted a very threatening picture of Pakistan in their editorials. It only generates hate. As Yousaf (2015) mentioned that “the news coverage of Pakistan by the AP was decidedly negative. News related to terrorism was often framed in a way that presented Pakistan as responsible for the widespread terrorism in the region (p. 3056).” The editorial coverage of *The Washington Post* and *The New York Times* about Pakistan was also decidedly negative. The results of the present study are also in accordance to the Khan’s (2008) results, where he concurred that the Western press generally presents the Islamic world as anti-modernism, pro-militant, non-tolerant and a threat to Western interests. According to Fairclough (1995) discourses are always socially constituted and portray particular aspect of reality. He further says that readers’ world view is created through selective representational strategies as we see in the above text that how Pakistan’s image is being created for the world. Fairclough (1995) rightly says that linguistic choices reveal writer’s intentions. The lexical items used by editorialists working in *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post* are ideologically loaded and bring forth only some certain aspects of reality.

It was also observed that there is no difference of treatment for Pakistan in the editorials of both of these newspapers. Both newspapers shared information about Pakistan in a similar manner. No doubt a certain type of mindset has been developed about Pakistan globally. To reveal American media’s ideology about

Pakistan it was very important to analyze American media content about Pakistan because Fairclough (1995) explained that texts cannot be read by ignoring ideologies deeply embedded in them rather it's fair to say that ideologies are propagated, disseminated and cherished through texts. Wanta, Golan and Lee (2004) identified that if a nation receives negative coverage in the US media, people start thinking negatively about it; however, the positive coverage does not have any effect on perception. Lasswell (1927) said that "the problem of the propagandist is to intensify the attitudes favorable to his purpose, to reverse the attitudes hostile to it, and to attract the in- different, or, at the worst, to prevent them from assuming a hostile bent" (p: 629). So, the present research concludes that negative portrayal of Pakistan, in the two of the widely read and elite newspapers of United States, is a very major contributor in creating a negative image of Pakistan internationally.

References

- Ali, Z., Iqbal, A., Jan, M. Ahmad, A (2013), Coverage of Pak-U.S. Relations on Issue of Counter Terrorism by U.S. Leading News Magazines. *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research* 15 (10): 1464-1471. DOI: 10.5829/idosi.mejsr.2013.15.10.11582
- Black, J. (2001). The Semantics and Ethics of Propaganda. *Journal of Mass Media Ethics*, 16, 121-137. DOI: 10.1080/08900523.2001.9679608
- Brewer, P. R. (2002). Framing, value words, and citizens' explanations of their issue opinion. *Political Communication*, 19, 303-316.
- Brown, G. and Yule, G. (1985). *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Dell'Orto, G., Dong, D., Schneeweis, A., & Moore, J. (2004). The impact of framing on perception of foreign countries. *Ecquid Novi: African Journalism Studies*, 25(2), 294-312, DOI: 10.1080/02560054.2004.9653299
- Ellul, J. (1965). *Propaganda: The formation of men's attitudes*. New York: Random House.
- Entman, R. M. (2003). Cascading Activation: Contesting the White House's Frame After 9/11. *Political Communication*, 20(4), 415-432, DOI: 10.1080/10584600390244176
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and Power*. London: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Polity Press
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. London: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and Power*. London: Longman.

- Fowler, R. (1996). 'On Critical Linguistics 1': in Caldas-Coulthard, C. R. and Coulthard, M. (eds.) *Texts and Practices: Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis*, London: Routledge,
- Gamson, W. (1992). *Talking Politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hodge, R. & Kress, G. (1993). *Language and Ideology*. (2nd Ed.). London: Routledge.
- Institute of Propaganda Analysis (1939). *The Fine Art of Propaganda*. A. M. Lee & E. B. Lee (Eds.). New York: Hartcourt Brace.
- Jihad. [Def. 2]. (n.d.). *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*. In Oxford Learner's Dictionary, Retrieved on February 15, 2020, From <https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/jihad>
- Khan, A. (2008). The Image of Pakistan in Prestigious American Newspaper Editorials: A Test of the Media Conformity Theory. *Strategic Studies*, (XXVIII) 2&3.
- Koppang, H. (2009). Social influence by manipulation: A definition and case of propaganda. *Middle East Critique*, 18(2), 117-143.
- Kumar, Deepa (2006). Media, War and Propaganda: Strategies of Information Management During the 2003 Iraq War. *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies*, 3: 1, 48-69. DOI: 10.1080/14791420500505650
- Lasswell, H. D. (1927). *Propaganda Techniques in the World War*. New York: Smith.
- Lasswell, H. D. (1927). The theory of political propaganda. *The American Political Science Review*, 21(3), 627-631. https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/1945515.pdf?casa_token=ww8r_ED3SFYAAAAA:eUaNT9AgitafLoLA_1Dx9BlsqgGz9lqRDv4oIWTeZwWwk-ZFbO5RMPnVtRu33rS8SPtZamj2XtoDVmXd91P7wAVjOLOK34Mq5UOgQaa2M94jRvjN36Vz
- Lee, A. M. & Lee, E. B. (1939). *The Fine Art of Propaganda: A Study of Father Coughlin's speeches*. New York: Harcourt, Brace.
- Lee, A. M. (1953). *How to Understand Propaganda?* New York: Rinehard & Company.
- Mead, G. S. (1964). *On Social Psychology: Selected Papers*. (A. Strauss, ED.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- O'Halloran, K. (2003). *Critical Discourse Analysis and Language Cognition*. Edinburgh, Scotland: Edinburgh University Press.
- Pan, Z. & Kosicki, Z. M. (1993). Framing analysis: An approach to news discourse. *Political Communication*, 10, 55-75.
- Parenti, M. (1993). *Inventing Reality: The Politics of News Media*. St. Martin's Press.

- Walton, D. N. (1992). *The Place of Emotions in Arguments*. University Park, Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Wanta, W. Golan, G. and Lee, C. (2004). Agenda Setting and International News: Media Influence on Public Perceptions of Foreign Nations. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 81(2): 364-377. <https://doi.org/10.1177/107769900408100209>
- Witkowska, J. (2008). Creating False Enemies: John Bull and Uncle Sam as Food for Anti-Western Propaganda in Poland. *Journal of Transatlantic Studies*, 6 (2), 123-130. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14794010802184309>
- Yousaf, S. (2015). Representations of Pakistan: A Framing Analysis of Coverage in the U.S. and Chinese News Media Surrounding Operation Zarb-e-Azb. *International Journal of Communication*, 9: 3042-3064