

Construction of Pakistan Army in the Western Media: Discourse Analysis of Leading Articles of *Time* and *The Economist*

Zafar Iqbal and Zareen Zubair*

Abstract

Media do not present, but represent and construct images by framing people and events in a way that may or may not be based on realities. This is merely done following the agenda set by the bodies influencing the media and its policies. After 9/11, Pakistan has given the US full support to counter terrorism. Various operations were carried out by the Pakistan Army in order to fight off terrorism, which resulted in heavy loss of military lives. Yet it was a common notion that the US media did not support Pakistan or its Army in its contents. The aim of this study was to see as how Pakistan's Army was constructed in the Western media - *Time* (US) and *The Economist* (UK). The articles were retrieved using Lexis Nexis from April 2010 to April 2012. The discourse analyses were carried using corpus modus to understand the underlying meanings. Analyses from both newsmagazines were then compared.

Key Words: Discourse Analysis, Corpus Modus, *Time*, *The Economist*, Pakistan Army, War on Terror.

Introduction

Pakistan's strategic significance keeps it under constant scrutiny of international power players, especially the US. Not only because of its geographic contiguity with Afghanistan, but Al-Qaeda and growing Talibanization also augment its status in the region (Khan M. , 2010). According to Khan (2010), \$10.8 billion was provided to Pakistan as developmental aid by the US and only one tenth of it actually invested in the developmental sector.

Ever since Barak H. Obama came into power in the US, military relations between the two have become stronger. The US and Pakistan decided to operate separately to counter terrorism in the region by sharing intelligence reports. It is of the view that India is a threat to the region and because of growing relations between India and Kabul, it can be a bit problematic for

*Authors are Professor of media studies at the Department of Mass Communication, School of Social Sciences and Humanities, National University of Sciences and Technology (NUST) and student of postgraduate studies in Communication and Media from International Islamic University, Islamabad – Pakistan.

Pakistan. To have a strong ally at hand, Pakistan has been supporting the US in 'war on terror' and provided them routes for NATO goods transportation and points for the US to guard its interest in the region. So much so, Pakistan has provided US with air space for drone attacks notwithstanding huge condemnation nationwide by the civil society.

Despite a decade long collaboration, militants are on the rise in Pakistan. In 2008, it was clear from the military operations that the US and the NATO both were interested in targeting the terrorist groups – mainly Al-Qaeda and the Haqqani network. They had kept Pakistan to chase their own militant groups. This put Pakistan Army into a situation that was less than the actual problem they were supposed to tackle. Some strategic analysts also believe that Pakistan prefer to keep such Taliban at hand to counter India in the time of need. Negative projection concerning Pakistan becomes conspicuous when media issue statement of influential officials regarding Al-Qaeda movement in Pakistan (Rahman, 2007).

General Musharraf was perceived to be the key moderator of enlightened moderation campaign in Pakistan and a futurist thinker even though he was backed by the US administration as a typical authoritarian ruler having control over weapons of mass destruction(Fergusson, 2007). British PM Tony Blair also supported the US stance and further added that the British government would back the WoT(war on terror) by all means (Wintour, 2007).

He managed to change the Western understanding of dictatorship due to his anti-extremist stance which resulted in his prolonged regime. Eventually, dictatorship along with gradual increase in religious extremist problems did little to Pakistan's soft image in the media.

Even though the US claims to be the torch bearer of democracy and favored it in every means possible; however, contrarily Pakistan has been closest to the US during its dictatorial regimes. The US aid to Pakistan has been contrastingly higher in military regimes than in the democracies. Ali (2011) argued that the US did not bother about Pakistan's democracy when it had its own motives behind Pakistan's dictatorship. In actual numbers, Pakistan has received \$382.9 million per military year as compared to \$178.9 million per year of a democratic government (Ibid).

A negative posturing of Pakistan was created in the Western world due to such biased opinions. Surprisingly, a well-known US paper gave special space to Pakistan and for four months labeled Pakistan as 'a failed economy' and also portrayed it to be a short term ally and a long term problem(Leon, 2002). Armstrong (2002) also in her works discussed negative portrayal of

Construction of Pakistan Army in the Western Media

Muslims in the West, including Pakistan. Khalid (2001) also studied six US newspapers which gave negative image construction of Pakistan even before 9/11 attack.

This study focuses on this representation of a certain subject, i.e. Pakistan Army, to the international audience. Since US has certain policies towards Pakistan and the UK has ever so backed the US, it makes it significant to understand where Pakistan Army stands in their media. Pakistan Army seemingly followed their objectives in the so called 'war on terror', thus it becomes even more important to find out how they have positioned it in their media.

Literature Review

'The media are American'(Tunstall, 1977). US media coverage holds great importance worldwide as it has an influence on its foreign policy and on the international platforms(Cohen, 1963). It is obvious that the US media have an essential role in creating and raising awareness that in turn conform to the opinion of the public and also the decision making at state level (Shoemaker, 1996). On the same lines, Khalid (2001) also stated that the US media do not portray the just images in its coverage of news, especially when it comes to Muslim countries.

The US and other Western countries do not put forward a healthier image of the third world countries – with limited coverage mainly dealing with violence and crime. This dramatic coverage of third world countries has an impact on their international reputation and has considerable effects on their development(Wilfred, 1993).

Big corporations are investing millions and trillions of dollars in media organizations. A much contemporary approach to above notion was given by Chomsky (2008) in his Authors@Google talk(Chomsky N. , Authors@GoogleTalk, 2012), who also explained media on the same lines. Media works on 'doctrinal system' where the message of the elite is broadcasted. These elite, like the Pentagon in the US, controls what kind of message is to be broadcasted in print and in electronic media.

The Propaganda Model developed by Herman and Chomsky in 1996 still stands valid today. It suggests that the dominant media is bound to serve the 'elite institutions', 'uncompromisingly' (Herman & Chomsky, 1997). This mainstream media deals with the interest of the elite institutions, or corporations in order to gain colossal profits. The 'concerned elite' deals with

the kind of information that flows to the 'unaware' masses through 'effective propaganda'. And for their sake, it works.

Propaganda Model suggests that media as a whole is a profit-seeking business where the flow of information is controlled by the elite. The elite refers to the state, non-media organizations, agencies etc. These elite have the potential to put pressure on media by threatening to cut advertisement. Since media works on money, it is bound to follow the norm set forth by the market forces. Researchers advocated on the notion that the objective of the media is to construct information with the support of the government that leads the audience to favor elite's decision (Shabbir & Iqbal, 2010).

Khan (2008) analyzed the US media to study portrayal of Pakistan before and after 9/11 attacks, wherein he concluded that Pakistan received critical projection before 9/11 and despite that Pakistan allied with the US against its 'War on Terror', it still gained negative image even after the attacks. Many others also confirmed that the US media portrays those countries more in which it has vested interests. Portrayal of Pakistan was negative before and after 9/11 incident even though Pakistan was an ally to its 'war on terror'.

Such portrayal of Pakistan in the media contents leaves negative images of the subject country. Dainton (2004) confirms this notion saying that using strong arguments in a context helps in persuading the readers or making a long lasting impression on their mind. The cognitive response is favourable to the subject being stressed upon. It then works parallel to the reader's mind.

In another qualitative study, Iqbal and Shabbir(2010) analyzed the elite UK papers using corpus modus discourse analysis method to evaluate representation of Taliban. In this study, the same method will be used to study representation of Pakistan Army in *Time* and *The Economist*.

Theoretical Perspective

Luhmann (2000) takes basic framing to a newer level. He argues in his study that there are ways of selecting information worthy of news and these are concurrently unavoidable. He furthers with that this stands true for classification of types of depiction of factual information, broadly speaking, and it also stands true for casual attributions, i.e., the viewpoint by which each subject described depends on some ideological or normative biasness and as a result it is hard to avoid it. The difference of opinion comes in a form of conflict with those operate repetitively with various casual attributions and therefore the attribution and the subject are tagged with each other and after a period of time cannot be separated.

Construction of Pakistan Army in the Western Media

He argues that conformity that assents towards a single perception tends to anchor the issue to one side. But in his opinion, this can be balanced by balancing the attribution on moral judgements. He strongly believes that mass media determines the way the world perceives an information and itself allocate moral perceptions to its context.

Luhmann (2000) used a term second-order observation which he took from Maturana and Varela. He stated that the reality of the mass media is the reality of second-order observation. To understand this phenomenon, he said that the society relies on the media for their own observation of society and this system of the media then is capable of manipulating information from the observers (sources such as journalists, reporters).

With the gradual progress in understanding the agenda-setting theory and framing theories, Scheufele (2007) talked about construction of subjects by media on two levels, macro-level and micro-level. Macro-level, like in this research study, deals with projecting certain subject framed in a way that has the ability to give more or less importance to it. It generally does not mean the reporting is false, but the matters discussed as main issue may not even be of as much importance on ground.

In this study we shall see how image of Pakistan Army is constructed and which different discourses have been made. Since *Time* is a US based newsmagazine, we shall see how it portrays Pakistan Army, specially being its ally on the WoT. Are the US policies visible in its articles? The United Kingdom, on the other hand, has from time to time, paired itself with the US and we shall see how, if it does, see Pakistan Army differently.

Methodology

Discourse analysis is a qualitative method to analyze news articles or conversations to understand the underlying messages and social structures (Fulcher, 2012). The analyst in this case tries to identify themes, stances, roles, attitudes and attribution within the text itself.

Keeping in view the nature of the topic, corpus modus operandi technique was applied to analyze articles in the two newsmagazines: *Time* (US) and *The Economist* (UK).

Zafar Iqbal and Zareen Zubair

Time is the leading newsmagazine in the US with a circulation of 3,298, 390 copies. On the other hand, *The Economist* leads in the UK with 1.5 million copies sold every week¹.

The population of this research study was articles from *Time* and *The Economist* from April 2010 to April 2012. In this time period, there were 11 articles from *Time* and 14 from *The Economist*. Since the sample size was low, no sampling method was used.

The main domains along with their sub-domains were as follows:

- Political: Democratic parties (PML-N, PML-Q, PPP, MQM,), elections, Army as a political institution;
- Extremism: suicide bombings, Talibanization, Army Operations in tribal areas (FATA, Swat), religious activism;
- War on Terror: Pakistan and United States relations, 9/11, Osama bin Laden, drone attacks, military aids, Musharraf's role in WoT;
- Economy: Economy of Pakistan, inflation, economic failure
- Judicial: judicial activism, Supreme Court actions
- Corruption: upper class corruption, political figures' corruption
- India as a threat: Relations with India, Nuclear issues, Kargil, bilateral talks.

All articles were retrieved using Lexis Nexis search engine from the issues of *Time* and *The Economist* during the time period of the study.

For analysis of these articles corpus modus operandi method was applied. This method helped to measure 'stances' in the articles: epistemological stance (comments, reliability of information, or doubt, source of information), attitudinal stance (negative, neutral or positive), style stance (sarcastic, condemning, exploratory, explanatory, authoritative, questioning, sympathetic, appreciative, descriptive, defensive), attributions (adjectives used to describe political figures, various facets of Pakistan, the Army). Metaphors were also highlighted regarding positive or negative stance on the Pakistan Army. Headline and first paragraph was used as a coding unit. Each paragraph was taken as contextual unit.

¹ Audit Bureau of Circulations (FAS, FAX report for consumer magazines)

Construction of Pakistan Army in the Western Media

Styles coding

- Sarcastic
- Condemning
- Exploratory
- Explanatory
- Questioning
- Sympathetic
- Appreciative
- Descriptive
- Defensive
- Attitudinal Stance:

Negative (-1)::All paragraphs those were unfavorable for Pakistan Army were termed negative.

Neutral (0)::All paragraphs those were neither positive nor negative termed as neutral.

Positive (+1)::All paragraphs those were in favour of Pakistan's Army termed as positive

Each paragraph of every article was coded along style stance, epistemological stance, attitudinal stance, theme it possess, attributions and metaphors.

Results, Analysis and Discourses

For this study, the articles were divided into time frame according to the main context of the events. The different time frames were:

- September, October 2010 (floods in different parts of the country)
- May 2011 (Death of Osama bin Laden)
- June, July 2011 (Post bin Laden's death, drone attacks)
- October, November 2011 (Haqqani Network issues, memogate)
- December 2011(Pakistani soldiers killed by NATO)
- January, February 2012 (Judicial crisis for the Army)

October 2010

Time and *The Economist* both ran stories post floods. *Time* stressed more on the strong position Army enjoys in the country. It condemned and explored the

situation keeping focus of Army's strong hold. Pakistan's Army is 'already in control' (Baker, 2010) leaving the civilian government helpless in issuing orders. But despite their strong holds, *Time* suggest that it still is a 'failed' institution and keeps on providing 'safe haven' to the terrorist groups including Al-Qaeda.

America has been sending Pakistan with 2 billion US Dollars per year to fight terrorism and extra 1.5 billion US Dollars for civilian usage. In the two-year time period this is the only phase where *Time* has accused Pakistan's richest citizens of not paying taxes. Due to this, inflation is on the rise and as a result parents who are unable to fulfill their basic needs pull out their children from schools. *Time* has tried to shed some light on the economy of the country when so much money is coming in, in shape of aid, even then the conditions of basic facet of a nation like economy has been dismal and there is 'widespread insecurity' (Ibid) throughout the country.

With all the criticism intact, *Time* does appreciate the rescue and relief efforts of the Army in times of summer floods. In one of the articles, *Time* also mentions Musharraf's take on the situation of the country where he proposed that army is the solution to all problems in Pakistan. *Time* does criticize and condemn army but at the same time gives it more importance over civilian government.

The attitudinal stance had been negative. 'Army has consistently failed', 'it (Army) provides safe haven to Al-Qaeda, and Pakistan's government 'unable to check rampant inflation, corruption and widespread insecurity' are the few examples.

The Economist, on the other hand terms floods and Taliban as two major problems for Pakistan. It had almost the same level of episteme as *Time* in this period. *The Economist* condemned the Pakistan's Army and government for 'failing'(Hobbling along Pakistan's Shaky Government, 2010)in the post flood situation. *The Economist* adds usual sarcasm and bluntly states that the President of Pakistan, Asif Ali Zardari had made such a 'mess' of the country that no one except the Taliban would want to rule it. Or it proposes Pakistan to create a new government based on 'technocrats'.

Interestingly both newsmagazines vehemently quoted Mushahid Hussain, a well-known politician from Pervez Musharraf's democratic party, PML-Q. *Time* quoted his statement referring to his comment on Pakistan-US relations that the actual relation is 'between the GHQ and the Pentagon'(Baker A. , 2010). *The Economist* quoted his criticism against the government that it has failed to deliver during the floods.

Construction of Pakistan Army in the Western Media

Death of Osama bin Laden

While coding articles, it was noticed that Osama bin Laden is America's favourite personality. Even though *Time* had shed negative light on him, reasonably so, but in all of its issues discussing extremism and terrorism came down to this one man, '*the man who said yes to the 9/11 attacks*' (Beyer, 2011). *Time* had inclined towards more attitudinal stance (negative) and with much less epistemic than *The Economist*. Interestingly, *Time* has its articles on bin Laden's death written in a very detailed, and descriptive manner. It progressed as would a thrilling Hollywood movie. The pieces in *Time* described intricate details as how the US Special Forces left Afghanistan and flew towards Abbottabad. These Special Forces were termed as '*birds*'. This might have led the readers to believe that the Special Forces are out on a heroic mission, brave and with dignity. On the other hand it goes on stating, "*In the dark houses below slept doctors, lawyers, retired military officers and perhaps the world's most wanted fugitive*" (Drehle, 2011). From this, we can deduce that *Time* tried to point out that world's biggest terrorist (termed by America) was residing in the neighbor hood of Pakistan's most educated, professional and powerful class and they were rather ignorant of that fact.

Time proceeds on detailing on the trained pilots who had practiced before in '*pecially built replica*' of bin Laden's house. It also states about the advanced helicopters those were used in this operation. To describe bin Laden's hideout it stated, '*walls higher and thicker than any ordinary resident would require*'. Moving on, *Time* picks on an authoritative tone when President Obama steps in the entire scenario. Second by second coverage of this episode as it unfolded. *Time* did not lose grip on the details as how the Special Forces landed and through which wall they entered, and how they attacked Osama bin Laden.

To put it on President Zardari, *Time* stated that he himself blamed the Al-Qaeda for his wife, Benazir Bhutto's assassination. And then *Time* bluntly stated (Quotes of the Day, 2011):

Politics of Pakistan are Byzantine and double dealing in ways no spy novelist could conjure. ...This government manages to fight Taliban with one arm and support them with the other

Time has been found to be questioning Pakistan's position regarding bin Laden's whereabouts. Was he '*protected, pursued or ignored...all of them*', it stated. The US State Department Specialist adds, '*Pakistan is full of suspicious characters and fortified homesteads*'. The power of US command and failure of Pakistan's Army was summed up in this one sentence: '*US*

Zafar Iqbal and Zareen Zubair

Force had to be in and out of Pakistan before the Pakistani military could respond.

The Economist on the other hand did not go into any details, probably as not being the UK's epic, and straight away condemned the failure of Pakistani Army. Even the title of the article (*Humiliation of the Military Men: Pakistan after bin Laden*) was plain condemnation of Pakistan's Army (Pakistan after bin Laden: Humiliation of the Military Men, 2011). The article on the whole was written in an epistemological fashion, criticizing Pakistan and informing the readers that the Pakistani radars were off that day (questioning) and that the US informed General Kiyani and not President Zardari. This also indicates that what *The Economist* considers important in the country.

The Economist goes on questioning the Pakistan's Army if they 'scoop quarter of all public spending', 'accept large dollops of aid', allot 'prime land for retire generals' and 'working on expansion of nuclear assets', how can they not track Osama bin Laden? *The Economist* plainly states that a week after bin Laden's operation, President Obama had said that there is bin Laden's support network in Pakistan and demanded names of ISI agents who backed Al-Qaeda.

The Economist progresses that General Kiyani and General Pasha 'congratulated Marc Grossman, American's regional envoy, few hours after the raid. But in public, Kiyani growled that America must reduce its "footprint"'. *The Economist* hints at Pakistan's double dealing persona.

The Economist ends its article with this sarcastic sentence:

America has concluded that Pakistanis are rascals but atleast they are 'still our rascals'.

Post Osama bin Laden's death, Drone Attacks and Pakistan Army Summer 2011

'Pakistan is the most dangerous country in the world,(Pakistan after bin Laden: Humiliation of the Military Men, 2011)' *The Economist* stated and 'Pakistan (is) on verge of collapse'

Time criticizes Pakistan's situation but also explores Pakistan and the US relationship and indirectly stated reasons why this relationship should not continue. The epistemic level was not high; however, the tone to construct negative attitude was considerably high. At many places, *Time* had compared

Construction of Pakistan Army in the Western Media

Pakistan with India terming the former to be an aid-receiving country even being of the same age as that of India, which is turning to be an aid-giving country. *Time* argued defensively on the United States' role on drone attacks and OBL. The main themes touched by *Time* were War on Terror (18 times), Political (6 times) and India as a threat (4 times).

The Economist has been more informative regarding Pakistan's situation despite being negative in its stance. It condemns Pakistan's policies and institutions in a sarcastic manner; however, it has been found to be substantiating its arguments with reason/logic. The main themes touched by *The Economist* were War on Terror (18 times), Political (2 times), India as a threat (3 times), Extremism (3 times) and Others (Technology in this time frame, once).

With billions of dollars 'wasted'(Baker, 2011), *Time* questions the relationship between Pakistan and the US. It puts every reason forward for this relationship to end. 'How safe is Pakistan?'(Ibid) asked *Time* in one of its cover stories. It posed Pakistan as a problematic country by stating that it was not Osama bin Laden's presence in a 'military prim city' but his mere presence in such a close locality to armed forces indicates that he could pose danger to Pakistan's nuclear arsenals.

Time suggests Pakistan's Army has been insecure after fighting three wars with India that had led Pakistan towards 'massive military spending', leaving education and health care in dole drum, and the basic infrastructure for economy in jeopardy. This negligence resulted in severe electricity crisis, agriculture problems and transport issues besides many other issues in the peripheries. To top it off, *Time* states that the corruption has further worsened the situation. This has weakened their relationship with the US but *Time* blames the US itself to have supported Pakistan's Army throughout their dominant regimes.

Time accuses Pakistan to have portraying India as an enemy in their textbooks which builds intolerance among the masses at their infancy. It termed the assassinations of Salman Taseer (then Governor of Punjab who was killed for his views on blasphemy) and Minister for Minority Affairs who was a Christian as the result of such teachings at early level education.

To prove Pakistan's guilt, *Time* noted connection of all the recent terrorist attacks and titled its article as 'element in common: Pakistan' (Ibid). The magazine doubts that Pakistan captured most of Al-Qaeda members, and if so then the *Time* wonders the high 'concentration of terrorists in the country'.

Time's analyst Aryn Baker explored reasons why Musharraf 'failed to explain value of US relationship to his people'. She condemned the Pakistani nation for blaming the US for their problems and despite finding bin Laden's hideout in Pakistan. The Pakistanis are more worried about how US came in, killed and flew back without anyone knowing. 'It is not hard to detect dysfunction(ed) civil government which is *'incompetent, corrupted, has now power and backbone'* (Ibid).

Time puts forward a question for the readers to decide with giving its own justifications. 'We need to look each other in the eye and decide, are we real allies?' The US Senate had already spent \$20 billion dollars for WoT and yet there is anti-Americanism feeling in Pakistan and *Time* suggests this needs 'sorting out' (Ibid). '*...some of the most wanted terrorists were bring sheltered by elements of the Pakistan's establishment,*' it states.

Thirdly, *Time* also questions the Pakistan's civilian leadership and blames Army for making it weak. It mentions an incident about a parliamentarian who received threats and continuous explicit messages on his cellphone regarding his whereabouts around the world, after his anti-military stance. Despite this, the army was unaware of Osama bin Laden's location. *Time* also mentions the Raymond Davis case and termed it as 'legitimate case of self-defense' where two Pakistanis were shot dead by this undocumented CIA official.

Time puts things into hypothetical propositions. If army fights the Haqqani lot residing in the northwestern part of the country, it is possible that Pakistan to get weaker on the eastern side, along the Indian border. In case of drone attacks, *Time* weighs Prime Minister Gillani's words where at one side he wants to negotiate with the US for drone strategy and on the other side passed an anti-drone bill in the parliament.

Time suggests that it needs to 'stop giving aid to Pakistan'(Zakaria, A flight plan for the American Economy, 2011) and should focus on their own economy and create more job opportunities in the US.

Following *Time's* tone, *The Economist* also accuses Pakistan for having connections with the terrorist groups. Similarly, it felt Pakistanis were more interested to know how Americans 'swooped'(A rivalry that threatens the world: Pakistan and India, 2011) in and carried out the Osama bin Laden's operation. Despite their heroic efforts, *The Economist* states that 49% Pakistanis believe the operation to be faked and 68% are not bothered about the sovereignty of the country (the magazine did not refer the source of this data). This is posed as a serious question on the declining nationalism in Pakistan. It compares Pakistan and India as aid-receiving and aid-giving

Construction of Pakistan Army in the Western Media

country, respectively. *The Economist* condemns Pakistan for having anti-American stance while it lets NATO goods travel three quarters of the country.

It puts India's point of view forward that 'Pakistan's own paranoia is the root of their instability' (Ibid). The 7th largest army in the world uses 1/6th of the nation's budget, it stated. Moreover, it stated that Pakistan has no issue to be the first one to use its nuclear arms and is expanding its arsenals with the help of China. In contrast, Indian Prime Minister is said to have friendly outlook for initiating bilateral communication for peaceful relations.

Again, *The Economist* had termed the Army as a 'failed' institution. 'Pakistan's military is feeling wounded' after bin Laden's successful operation. It criticizes Army's position for not handling bin Laden's situation and also refers to journalist's killing in Karachi.

The Economist states that Pakistan is pretty helpless in its position and the US will do as it pleases. It provides facts of drone attacks in Pakistan that summed up to 168 in the past two years. But to give readers an insight on US technology, *The Economist* explains how unmanned drone works and the hi-power technicalities it possesses but it is still 'horribly like a video game' (Ibid). *The Economist* also condemns the US for not keeping any record of casualties where those who died also included ordinary civilians. 'Only 1.3% of total deaths were of recognized militant chiefs,' it stated. As a result, UK's organization Reprieve filed a case and got a CIA lawyer, who was involved in where the drone had to hit, arrested.

Fall – 2011

Where *The Economist* felt the need to shed light on the Haqqani Network and the memogate scandal, *Time* did not run any story on Pakistan during this time. On *The Economist's* part, it reported on the following themes: Extremism (5 times), War on Terror (3 times), India as a threat (once). The overall stance was negative.

The only article that mentioned Pakistan was in regard to the retirement of Admiral Mike Mullen, as Chairman of Joint Chiefs of Staff. This stresses that Pakistan is having 'strained relation'(Thompson, 2010) with the US. 'Mullen did not hesitate to call out Pakistan's double dealing,' stated *Time* as they praised Mullen efforts in his duty to war on terrorism.

On the other hand, *The Economist* ran two separate articles on Haqqani Network and memogate scandal. Not high on at epistemic level, it had

repeated itself writing a little more on Pakistan and terrorist groups' connections. Nonetheless, it also mentioned that if Pakistan does not ponder on the reality of terrorist organizations being active in the country, it may have to 'face the consequences'(Snake Country, The Haqqani Network, 2011) after the US pull out their leading troops in 2014. 'Pakistan will have to live with the jihadists it promotes,'it bluntly stated.

Regarding memogate, *The Economist* stressed on Army's hold in the country, 'real power lies with the soldiers'(As you were; Pakistan's "Memogate", 2011). It stated that despite the humiliation bin Laden's operation brought to the Army, the memogate scandal shows how strong it still is. Army will do anything, *The Economist* predicts, to give self-respect to its country by returning the US favours.

24 Pakistani Soldiers killed by NATO

Time's renowned analyst Fareed Zakaria started off with survey report facts(Pew Survey). "*Only 12% Pakistanis favour the US*" (Zakaria, *Time*, 2011). Despite millions of aid flowing to Pakistan, there is still some problem with the relationship between Pakistan and the US. He fears that the US policy towards Pakistan is '*not working*' and there are '*chances of it to go thinner*'. Attitudinal stance has been found to be negative throughout as he explained and explored situation of Army and military fund. Predicting the US-Pakistan relations, Zakaria opines that it would '*worsen as the policy is not working*'. He states in the first sentence, 'It is difficult to find country that is more anti-American than Pakistan.'

In the whole article that came right after NATO killed 24 Pakistani soldiers there was only one line dedicated to the lost souls: '*That number*(referring to the previous poll) *has probably dipped even lower in the wake of the NATO air attack on a Pakistani army post that killed 24 Pakistani soldiers*'. No sympathy whatsoever. Chances of Pakistan-US relations to get weaker was feared. But Zakaria was of the view that the incident took place primarily because Pakistan supported the Afghan militia and that was how the confusion took place.

'Pakistan is not Somalia...There have been no Gaddafiesque colonels' coups in Pakistan'

Time proceeds on condemning the Army's support to the terrorist groups and that too 'the most deadly terrorist group in South Asia'. 'Over a quarter of Army's budget is funded by the US', it states. It is obvious that if America is paying billions of military aid and yet the military they are funding is supporting

Construction of Pakistan Army in the Western Media

those groups who the Americans are set to kill, it does make an interesting triangle, if it's true, that is. But *Time* does stress on the point that Pakistan Army is supporting the terrorist groups and that '*they pay off the mafia.*'

According to *Time*, the US government has been cooperating with Pakistan's military government because '*it delivers more cooperation on ground.*' But adds that '*we will get a dysfunctional nation if this continues.*'

To sum it up, Zakaria compared the US relationship to its previous relationships with Arab countries. Countries those ally with the US develop an anti-American stance and that builds over time and finally '*erupts*' like it did in the Arab Spring phenomenon.

On the other hand, *The Economist* in its very first paragraph is sympathetic and terms the killing of 24 Pakistani soldiers as an '*accident*' (Till death us do part; Pakistan and America, 2011) shares the same notion that the Taliban is backed by the Army. Their stance was neutral in the beginning of the article then they did incline towards negative tone and condemned the support to terrorist groups.

Pakistan's defensive point was also taken into consideration that there was a clear '*outrage*'. Pakistan was given a superior position as it tried to stand up for the national security. Pakistani officials gave statements to boycott the Bonn Conference. But on the other hand, *The Economist* again mentioned the ties of Pakistan Army with the Haqqani Network. It described Pakistan as a failed ally to terrorism as it '*gives sanctuary to terrorists and its army is involved with them.*' It moreover describes Osama bin Laden's hideout as '*army-spy safe house.*'

The Economist wants to project Pakistan's youth as conservative who wants to '*snap*' ties with the US. It says that '*Anti-Americanism in Pakistan is rising to intense levels.*' But, it enforces that the US and Pakistan need each other due to the situation they are in. The US needs terrorism and nuclear arsenal locked and Pakistan Army needs aid. Pakistan is viewed as an '*isolated and paranoid*' by its neighbours, *The Economist* stresses.

Even though *The Economist* did provide sympathy to the killed soldiers, the relationship between Army and Taliban and other terrorist groups is condemned and apparently that's what caused the confusion of the killing in the first place.

2012

The Economist ran two stories in 2012 time frame (January to April) whereas *Time* did not include any story regarding Pakistan other than its 2011's prediction. It predicted 'further destabilization of Pakistan'(Stein, 2012). *The Economist's* main theme was Judicial (8 times).

The Economist was appreciative of the fact that the Supreme Court was taking action against army's conduct and was inclined to sort out the problems. The judicial actions to report petitions against the army were a 'development applauded'(The men in black v the men in green, 2012). It has been lamentable as *The Economist* states that a huge chunk of budget goes to the defense which results in 'shameful 58% literacy rate'(Ibid).

Q. How's there been any difference in portrayal of Pakistan Army in articles of these two newsmagazines?

The difference between *Time* and *The Economist* was that *Time* focused more on the 'War on Terror' phenomenon and stuck to US policy on it in its context. Whereas in *The Economist*, along with WoT, it discoursed on couple of other issues like memogate, Supreme Court decisions, economy, education and floods etc.

Moreover, *The Economist* attempted to be more just in its criticism as it touched different aspects of Pakistan Army and substantiated its discourses with evidence / instances. Though the headlines and tone were firm at quite few places, but it did condemn Army's hold in the country and wanted the civilian government to have the authority(My ally, my enemy, 2011). Whereas *Time* have found ways to justify the importance of Army's strong hold despite stating it to be weak and also being a mouthpiece for democracy otherwise (Zakaria, Friends without benefits, 2011).

Tone wise, *Time* was more condemning and authoritative whereas *The Economist* was suggestive but also sarcastic and condemning. *Time* wanted Pakistan to let America fight the 'War on Terror' smoothly that in the end will be good for Pakistan itself otherwise Pakistan will have to face the consequences.

Time had been more attitudinal level discourses whereas *The Economist* was more epistemic with modality in its articles.

Construction of Pakistan Army in the Western Media

- **Which issues were given more significance in the articles?**

Time gave 'War on Terror' more significance whereas *The Economist* highlighted 'war on terror' along with other political issues.

	<i>Time</i> %	<i>The Economist</i> %
Political	12.6	14
Extremism	-	12.5
War on Terror	71.4	43
Economy	1.5	5.6
Judicial	-	7.9
Corruption	3.17	6.8
India as a threat	7.9	6.8
Others	3.17	3.4

(% of discourses in articles regarding Pakistan in *Time* and *The Economist* during April 2010 to April 2012)

- **What attributions were used to describe the Pakistan Army?**

Time and *The Economist* both had termed army to be a failed institution. The word failed/failure was used 18 times by *The Economist* and 30 times by *Time* for Pakistan. But specific words used by both for Pakistan or any discourses relating to Pakistan Army were as follows:

Time

Pakistan: '...byzantine and double dealing', 'full of suspicious characters and fortified homesteads', 'Pakistan's double dealing', 'dysfunctional nation', 'rogue state', 'failed state', 'failing economy', 'chronic development', 'collapsing nation', 'arsonist' etc.

Pakistan Army: 'consistently failed', 'failure of Pakistan to note the terrorist chieftain's luxury digs', 'they pay off the Mafia', 'supports most deadly terrorist group' etc.

Osama bin Laden: 'prey', 'with camo jacket costume and rifle as prop (joker)'.

The Economist:

Pakistan: 'government intolerably treacherous and irredeemably corrupt', 'sickly economy', Chief Justice 'chutzpah', 'shameful literacy rate', 'double

game', 'government needs help', 'technocrats', 'rascals', 'weak civilian government', 'traitors', 'state fails to act', 'begs' foreign aid etc.

Pakistan Army: 'scoop' public's money', 'dismayed generals', COAS Kiyani 'sullen faced', COAS Kiyani 'grumbled', 'real power lies with the army', 'isolated and paranoid', 'feeling wounded', 'failed army', 'are wallowing' etc.

- **What has been the nature of discourse on Pakistan's role in 'war on terror' by these magazines?**

On 'War on Terror', both newsmagazines had similar stance but *Time* gave its 71% coverage in articles relating to Pakistan. *Time* kept the US position far superior than Pakistan when discussing this. In its content, *Time* focused on US policy that is to eradicate terrorism from the world by any means, and it justified it with Pakistan's weak situation to handle it alone. 'War on terror' was so much stressed throughout in their coverage on Pakistan that it sounds viable to the readers that the US policy stands true to its word. There was no positive news regarding Pakistan or Pakistan Army. For example, in the article regarding Osama bin Laden's operation the Americans were termed as heroic and Pakistan was posed as a much weaker entity. To keep the readers hooked to its perspective, it reminded the 9/11 incident and included stories of families of the victims killed that day.

Also to justify America's position and policy, Pakistan Army was posed to have been supporting the terrorist groups so the Americans could not completely rely on them. Due to this, the US used unmanned drone attacks. *Time* stresses on the dangerous terrorist groups residing in Pakistan and also that Pakistan and its Army have failed to fix that problem. As a result they used the last resort of fighting the terrorist groups in tribal areas themselves with drones. The international readers would agree to US stance since *Time* consistently termed Pakistan as the most dangerous country.

The Economist kept its tone firm as well but it focused more on the failure of Army and civilian government to tackling the 'war on terror'. It has been sarcastic at some places and stern at others. Even though *The Economist* is a UK based newsmagazine and the country supported the US policy on 'war on terror' and spent millions of dollars in America-led war, but *The Economist* has been found to be more reasonable in its approach. It also blamed the Pakistan Army to be in contact with the terrorist organizations, and questioned Pakistan on its role to protecting its sovereignty and national security which, according to *The Economist*, was facing a threat by the Taliban.

Construction of Pakistan Army in the Western Media

- **How did Pakistan military interfere with the political affairs of the country?**

Both newsmagazines considered Pakistan military to have a strong hold in the country. Their stance was somewhat same on this matter. However, both magazines opined that the Pakistan Army having strong hold on the country's affairs did not mean army's success. Both newsmagazines stated the Army as a failed institution.

In fact, the word 'fail' was used for the Pakistan Army 30 times by *Time* and 18 times by *The Economist*. *The Economist* condemns army's role in Pakistan and supported democracy in its contents. Whereas *Time* was critical of the Army but at a few places presented it to be a much admired political institution and also said it is not as bad as Gaddafi's dictatorial regime.

- **Is there any role Army playing in the economy of Pakistan?**

Time did not shed any light on Army's role in Pakistan's economy. Its main focus was on Army's failure in just utilization of military aid provided by the US. *The Economist* on the other hand did mention Army with respect to economy of Pakistan, but in a negative frame. Army was accused by *The Economist* for using most of Pakistani budget and yet failing to act up to its responsibilities and stature. Also Pakistan was positioned weaker by 'begging'(A rivalry that threatens the world: Pakistan and India, 2011) for foreign aid as compared to India.

- **Is there a possibility that military might be posing a regional problem to the neighboring countries such as India, Afghanistan, Iran or China from the Western perspective?**

Pakistan's military was termed weaker by both the newsmagazines. *Time* constructed Pakistan Army's image so weak that it said if it had to fight the Haqqani group, a terrorist group on the north western side of Pakistan, the eastern side of Pakistan (along India's border) might be under threat. It also said that Pakistan is somewhat scared of growing friendly relations between Afghanistan and India and due to that, feels better to let Haqqani group do its job, that is, be involved in terror activities in Afghanistan.

The Economist said that Pakistan needs to collaborate with the US in order to fight terrorism or it would become like its neighboring Afghanistan. It also put forward a notion from an Indian point of view that Pakistan spends so much money on its defense whereas India is more involved in economic

development. Due to this, *The Economist* termed Pakistan to be a state of paranoia because of its own problems and it has nothing to do with India as a threat.

Military itself was not posed to be causing any trouble with its neighbors but was constructed as being a problem in itself.

Discussion and Conclusion

Time had portrayed Pakistan Army from the eyes of the Pentagon as the main focus of its reporting was solely 'War on Terror'. The different aspects relating to 'War on Terror' were the military aids, Army's contacts with the terrorist organizations, drone attacks and Osama bin Laden. It proves what Chomsky, et. al. (2008) stated that the mainstream media, *Time* in this case, puts the message of the elite forward, the Pentagon. 'War on Terror' was a political phenomenon on which the US policy for Pakistan was shaped after the 9/11 attacks. *Time's* portrayal of Pakistan Army was basically on the same lines where a 'War on Terror' phenomenon reinforces itself.

Keeping *Time's* portrayal of Pakistan Army in mind, it was noticed that during April 2010 and April 2012 wherever Pakistan Army was mentioned, it was repeatedly tagged in connection with terrorist organizations. *The Economist* did not lag behind in this regard, but *Time's* repetitive tagging can be termed as classical conditioning or Pavlovian conditioning. In this case, one stimulus, the Pakistan Army is conditioned with another stimulus, terrorism and the repetition of both will cause the reader to label Pakistan to be a terrorism promoting country. The pairing of both stimuli results in conditioning the two with each other in the human mind. The influence of repetitive messages is that it helps the mainstream media, of US and UK in this case, to promote their own agenda and government's policies toward a third-world country.

On parallel lines, the US highlights those issues in which it has vested interest (Kumar, 2011). This holds true for this study too. *Time* is a US based newsmagazine and has given maximum coverage to 'war on terror'; whereas *The Economist* referred to other issues regarding Pakistan Army as well. Even in the case of Osama bin Laden's operation, the tone of *Time* promoted American nationalism and kept its superiority over Pakistan. Hutcheson, et.al; (2004) also proposed that US puts its nationalism first in its media and demonize the enemy.

Also this theory leads to the propaganda model (Chomsky N. a., 1996) where mainstream media propagates a certain kind of message to the public. In this case, Pakistan was reported negatively in both *Time* and *The Economist*

Construction of Pakistan Army in the Western Media

which proves the fundamental basis of propaganda theory. Army was labeled continuously to be in constant contact with the terrorist groups. This takes away the credibility and lowers the stature of a prestigious institution of a country. Such messages influence the international audience to perceive Pakistan's Army to be irresponsible and promote US and UK's policy towards Pakistan, even if it keeps Pakistan's sovereignty at stake. Also, this message is more influential when it comes from a reliable source; both newsmagazines are renowned and widely read all over the world.

Closely linked to these theoretical perspectives is the persuasion theory. Repetition and commanding tone in message also persuade readers to act in a certain way. Negative coverage regarding Pakistan Army will also have an impact on Pakistanis living abroad.

Time also provided dramatic coverage of Pakistan, which may create obstacles in its development (Wilfred, 1993). Tagging Pakistan as a country which promotes terrorism will affect transnational business dealings and will lower foreign investments. Like Dainton (2004) suggested, strong arguments to an issue will give a positive response and that is what *Time* did. It kept its tone firm and posed Pakistan at an inferior level as well as kept labeling it as not only an ally to counter terrorism but also a part of it. Without giving importance to any other issue, it wanted to persuade the readers to associate terrorism with Pakistan and nothing else.

The construction of Pakistan Army in *Time* was done keeping the US policy in mind. *Time* made it sure that it did justice to its country's policies. Pakistan Army was constructed to be unreliable, irresponsible and a problem itself along with the terrorist group. Repetitive affiliation of Pakistan Army with terrorist groups would set the mind of the readers that Pakistan's Army is double faced.

On the other hand, *The Economist* constructed Pakistan Army on the same lines but also signified other issues. In its view, 'War on Terror' was not the only problem for the Pakistan Army. There were other issues like the memogate scandal, battling with the Haqqani Network, facing judicial crisis etc. In other words, *The Economist* mentioned other problems Army faced that resulted in its failure to tackle the issue of terrorism effectively.

To conclude, the construction of Pakistan Army was done in a negative light by both *Time* and *The Economist*. Since *Time* stressed on 'War on Terror', it proved that US policies were visible in all the articles it published. Whereas *The Economist* did not only highlighted 'War on Terror' but also gave space to other issues associated with the Pakistan Army.

End Notes

A rivalry that threatens the world: Pakistan and India. (2011, May 21). Retrieved from The Economist: <http://www.economist.com/node/18712274>

Ali, S. (2011). US Mass Media and Image of Afghanistan: Portrayal of Afghanistan by Newsweek and Time. *South Asian Studies*, 83-101.

Armstrong, K. (2002). *Islam: A Short History*. New York: Random House Publishing Group.

As you were; Pakistan's "Memogate". (2011, November 26). Retrieved from The Economist : <http://www.economist.com/node/21540318>

Baker, A. (2010, October 24). *Pakistan's Army Flexes its Muscles*. Retrieved from Time: <http://content.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,2024229,00.html>

Baker, A. (2011, May 20). *How Can We Trust Them?* Retrieved from Time: <http://content.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,2069572,00.html>

Beyer, L. (2011, May 02). *Death Comes for the Master Terrorist: Osama bin Laden (1957-2011)*. Retrieved from Time: <http://content.time.com/time/world/article/0,8599,2068858,00.html>

Chomsky, N. (1996). *Chomsky.info*. Retrieved march 22, 2012, from <http://www.chomsky.info/onchomsky/199607--.htm>

Chomsky, N. (2012, March 22). *Authors@GoogleTalk*. Retrieved from YouTube: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rnLWSC5p1XE&feature=plcp>

Chomsky, N.& Arno, A. (2008). *The Essential*. New York: The New Press.

Cohen, B. (1963). *The Press and Foreign Policy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Dainton. (2004, April 15). *Sage Publication* . Retrieved from Sage Publication: http://www.sagepub.com/upm-data/4985_Dainton_Chapter_5.pdf

Construction of Pakistan Army in the Western Media

Fergusson, J. (2007, December 17). *Extracts from the Independent*. Retrieved from The Nation.

Fulcher, E. (2012, April 18). *What is Discourse Analysis?* Retrieved from http://www.eamonfulcher.com/discourse_analysis.html

Herman, E. S., & Chomsky, N. (1997). *Manufacturing Consent: The Spectacular Achievements of Propaganda*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Hobbling along Pakistan's Shaky Government. (2010, October 09). Retrieved from The Economist: <http://www.economist.com/node/17202331>

Hutcheson, J., Domke, D., & Billeaudeau, A. &. (2004). U.S. National Identity, Political Elites, and a Patriotic Press Following 9/11. *Political Communication*, 21, 27-50.

Khalid, M. (2001). United States Mass Media and Image of Muslim World. *Pakistan Perspective*.

Khan, A. (2008). The Image of Pakistan in Prestigious American Newspaper Editorials: A Test of the Media Conformity Theory. *Strategic Studies*, XXVIII(2&3), 105-128.

Khan, M. (2010). *Pakistan-US Relations: A New Chapter, a New Theater*. http://www.issi.org.pk/publication-files/1299569410_88067869.pdf As retrieved on April 15, 2012. Islamabad: Institute of Strategic Studies.

Kumar, N. &. (2011). Coverage of India by Major US Television. *Global Media Journal – Indian Edition/ Summer Issue*, 1-15.

Leon, T. H. (2002, May 8). Bush insists on US Resolve: US pledges boost in aid to Pakistan. *San Francisco Chronicle*.

Luhmann, N. (2000). *Reality of Media*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

McCombs, M. (2004). *Setting the Agenda: The Mass Media and Public Opinion*. Polity.

Zafar Iqbal and Zareen Zubair

My ally, my enemy. (2011, June 16). Retrieved from The Economist : <http://www.economist.com/node/18836800>

Pakistan after bin Laden: Humiliation of the Military Men. (2011, May 14). Retrieved from The Economist: <http://www.economist.com/node/18682829>

Rahman, B. (2007). *Al-Qaeda in GHQ, Rawalpindi* . New Dehli: South Asia Analysis Group in International Terrorism Monitor.

Scheufele, D. A. (2007). Framing, Agenda Setting, and Priming: The Evolution of Three Media Effects Models. *Journal of Communication*.

Shabbir, G., & Iqbal, Z. (2010). Media Construction of Pakistan's Image: Discourse Analysis of Editorials of the Elite UK Newspapers. *China Media Research*, 6(3), 48-56.

Shoemaker, P. J. (1996). *Mediating the message: Theories of influences on mass media content* (2nd ed.). New York: Longman.

Siraj, S. (2006). Image of Pakistan in the US Media. *University of Southern Illinois*.

Snake Country, The Haqqani Network. (2011, October 1). Retrieved from The Economist: <http://www.economist.com/node/21531042>

Stein, J. (2012, January 09). *My psychic powers at work.* Retrieved from Time: <http://content.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,2103276,00.html>

The men in black v the men in green. (2012, February 11). Retrieved from The Economist: <http://www.economist.com/node/21547244>

Thompson, M. (2010, April 29). *Admiral Mike Mullen.* Retrieved from Time: http://content.time.com/time/specials/packages/article/0,28804,1984685_1984864_1985426,00.html

Till death us do part; Pakistan and America. (2011, November 27). Retrieved from The Economist : <http://www.economist.com/blogs/banyan/2011/11/pakistan-and-america>

Construction of Pakistan Army in the Western Media

Tunstall, J. (1977). *The Media are American: Anglo-American Media in the World*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Wilfred, N. (1993). A Content Analysis of the Coverage of the India in The New York Times before and after the New World Information Order debate. Carbondale, Illinios, United States of America: Southern Illinois University.

Wintour, P. (2007, September 27). Blair Brief MPs on War Aims. *The Guardian*.

Zakaria, F. (2011, December 12). *Friends without benefits*. Retrieved from Time: <http://content.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,2101031,00.html>

Zakaria, F. (2011, December 12). *Time*. Retrieved from Friends without benefits:
<http://content.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,2101031,00.html>

Zakaria, F. (2011, June 05). *A flight plan for the American Economy*. Retrieved from Time:
<http://content.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,2072632,00.html>