

## Media Construction of Pakistan's Image: Discourse Analysis of Editorials of the Elite UK Newspapers

Ghulam Shabir\*, Zafar Iqbal\*\*

\*Islamia University, \*\* International Islamic University

**Abstract:** This paper aims at exploring image portrayal of Pakistan in elite UK newspapers. Editorials<sup>1</sup> of two widely read newspapers – *The Guardian* and *The Daily Telegraph* - published between March 2007 and March 2008, have been selected for analysis. The period selected for analysis was the time when Pakistan was entangled with multiple internal and external crises including suspension of the Chief Justice of Pakistan, Red Mosque issue, suicide bombings, doffing of uniform and re-election of General Musharraf as President, arrest and deposition of Nawaz Sharif, resignations of MPs, Benazir Bhutto's assassination, arrest of journalists under proclamation of emergency, restrictions on media, stock market crash and economy slump due to the proclamation of emergency. This research study explores as how UK mass media, especially the print media, represents Pakistan and characteristics of the issues they consider salient. The research also explores differences in image portrayal of Pakistan in these two newspapers of contrasting outlook. Further, efforts were made to point out the issues that these newspapers considered significant and prominent. It also investigates nature of the discourse on Pakistan's role in 'war on terror' and other issues of national and international concern. The paper highlights stylistic features in both groups of newspaper editorials. While doing the discourse analysis, corpus-modus operandi was used to study the 'stances' in the editorials. [China Media Research. 2010; 6(3):48-56]

**Key words:** Discourse Analysis; Corpus Modus; Media Construction of Reality; Pakistan; Media Effects

### Introduction and Background

'War on terror' destroyed already war-ridden Afghanistan and ushered in a seemingly long war in Pakistan, which rocked its very roots. Pakistan was liberated from British colonial mindset some 62 years ago using religion as a point of departure from Hindu-Muslim unity, and is now fighting another war to thwart the religious extremism. The creation of Pakistan as an independent nation on the basis of a distinct religion and now an altogether different stance – the 'war on religious extremism', have tarnished its image world over and shaken its foundations badly.

Pakistan has about 2,500km long border with Afghanistan - extremely porous, mountainous and next to impossible for Pakistan to shield effectively. Geographic contiguity did not leave any excuse for Pakistan to avoid becoming part of the US-led NATO forces coalition in 'war on terror'. Indeed, for miscreants in Afghanistan, Pakistan could have and has been a safe heaven once the war started there. This situation resulted in a 'direct threat' to Pakistan (Ali, 2008, p.19). Recent and distant past is witness to such ingressions of surrogates and offenders in Pakistan's territory. This time it could have and has devastating effects on the country's politics and law and order.

For the US-led Allied Forces to hunt Osama Bin Laden in Afghanistan, a prime suspect behind 9/11 catastrophe, huge logistic support was needed, which was only viable through Pakistan being the shortest possible route (Mir, 2008, p.28). Thus, there were multiple reasons for Pakistan to become part of the package of 'war on terror' initiated by the US and supported by the

NATO countries. The second war in the region, the 'war on terror', finds deep roots in the Soviet war that started in late 70s to late 80s. Pakistan was then a sufferer and the only frontline state, and now too a victim of what's going in Afghanistan. Nevertheless, residues of the last war won against the then USSR have proven to be reasons for growing extremism in Pakistan. Taliban, whether of Pakistan's brand or Afghan origin, are fallouts of the war fought in 80s in this region.

The issue is sensitive, as the whole world feels concerned; hence, media coverage of the 'war on terror' has been quite extensive. There has been hardly any event in this region, which attracted world's attention in this fashion. The media lights covered Taliban, Afghan insurgents, growing extremism in Pakistan, besides tracked efforts of the allied forces to capture Osama Bin Laden. This coverage depicted a negative picture of Muslims, Islam and particularly Pakistan, where the events of extremism, political turmoil were also taking place. Recent investigations into the Western media portrayal of Muslims reveal that the media have been hostile and negative towards Muslims (Poole & Richardson, 2006, pp.89-102). The material provided by media to the world shaped their discourses and negative representations of a minority with extreme views provided a distorted image of the people of Pakistan, who are tolerant, modern and open in their views. This process continues due to 'significant effects' of media on the people to construct images and realities about what is happening around them (McQuail, 1994, p.331).

This paper attempts to investigate as to how media in the UK construct the image of Pakistan in the

background of 'war on terror' and its ongoing political instability. As the media affect public policy formation, they change people's perceptions towards foreign communities and eventually effect relations between nations and generate the political discourses, which more often follow the media discourses making it a cyclic process; hence, it is considered significant to analyze the media contents about Pakistan.

Pakistan, at present, is engaged in war against the extremism in the areas bordering Afghanistan. It is also passing through a transition from military dictatorship to democracy, besides encountering an unprecedented judicial activism, severe economic crunch and other issues of national and international concern, which formed the base for conducting the present study to determine as to how selected print media of a civilized society set discourses about these issues in their editorials.

Against this backdrop, the paper aims at investigating as to how two elite newspapers of the United Kingdom - *The Guardian* and *Daily Telegraph* - represented Pakistan in their views and what discourses were made in the period between March 2007 and March 2008. This research aims at finding answers to the following questions:

- a. Has there been any difference in portrayal of Pakistan in editorials of these two newspapers due to their contrasting outlook (Leftist vs Rightist)?
- b. Which issues were given more significance/prominence/emphasis in the editorials?
- c. What discourses on various issues concerning Pakistan have been done in the editorials?
- d. What has been the nature of discourse on Pakistan's role in 'war on terror' by these newspapers?

### Literature Review

For the world at large, Pakistan is the next epicenter of extremism wherein Al-Qaeda top leadership is hiding. This happened to be so due to the intensive anti-terrorist operations in Afghanistan by the ISAF and American forces, leaving hardly any space for miscreants to stay. President Obama repeatedly expressed concerns on this issue in his statements issued to media saying that the war would be 'extended into Pakistan'<sup>2</sup>. Not only this, it is generally perceived that Pakistan has failed 'to neutralize anti-western militants and religious extremism' (Kronstadt K. Alan: 2008, Kronstadt K. Alan, (2008). 'Pakistan-US Relation', Foreign affairs, Defense, and trade division updated. February 22, 2008. find exact reference).

Pakistan is a Muslim country sharing over 2500 km long border with Afghanistan that has long been hosting fleeing extremist elements. Generally, western media representation of Muslims and Islam has clearly been negative as Poole (2002), Said (1997), Ahmed (1993), Field (2007), Mescher (2008), Saeed (2007) and many

others indicate. Owing to its geographic contiguity, Pakistan's portrayal in the media could somehow be graver than overall Muslim world. Pakistan is a politically moderate country, dominated by the feudal elite, and its majority supports a secular, more democratic Pakistan<sup>3</sup>. Nonetheless, it is not only Pakistan that is hit by negative portrayal syndrome by the Western media, Malaysia and Indonesia besides some other countries also have faced largely unfavorable tone in the western press (IJC, 2007, pp.127-132). This negative portrayal becomes even worst when media place statements of elite political players saying that Pakistan needs to take more aggressive actions to hunt down the Taliban and Al-Qaeda operatives on its soil (Rahman, 2007).

Strange enough has been the case with General ® Musharraf who was considered a 'courageous' and 'visionary leader' by the US administration even though he was a military dictator having control of weapons of mass destruction (Fergusson, 2007). British Prime Minister Tony Blair, following US policy statements, also said the same for Musharraf during his October 05, 2002 visit to Pakistan. Not only this, rather he signaled that 'the British government would welcome the overthrow of the Taliban regime' (Wintour, 2001, p.A8). His (Musharraf's) anti-extremist tone changed the western point of view towards dictatorship, ultimately endorsing his illegitimate rule for more than nine years in a 'politically moderate' country. Military rule combined with growing religious extremism in Pakistan did not leave any scope for its positive media representation in the West.

Despite being aware of the people and government of Pakistan's stance towards extremism and terrorism, celebrated writers of the west kept on vomiting biased opinions about the country and declaring it as the hub of 'Islamist extremist'<sup>4</sup> (Fair, 2005). Such mediated messages, coupled with events of war and terrorism, have clearly created a different perspective about Pakistan among the US citizens, who encountered 9/11 cataclysm, and the rest of the western world (Vender, 2004). Forced by the negative representation of Pakistan in media, even political players in the US perceiving the public opinion constructed by the media, have been claiming in public processions to disarm Pakistan from weapons of mass destruction and roll back its nuclear programme<sup>5</sup>.

Interestingly, *New York Times* allocated special space to cover events pertaining to Pakistan under the slug "A Nation Challenged". This continued for about four months when Pakistan was constantly viewed as a 'failed economy' with an anathema of dictatorship, 'insecure nuclear arsenal', and 'a reluctant supporter of US goals at best and as potential long term problem at worst' (Leon, 2002). Armstrong (2002, Karen, Armstrong. (2002) Islamic terrorism in [www.](http://www.)

[thermodernreligion.com](http://thermodernreligion.com)) comprehensively discussed the negative image construction of Muslims and Pakistan in her work. Even before the 9/11 disaster, as Khalid (2001, pp.109-124) viewed, the image portrayal of Pakistan and Muslims was negative in the six elite newspapers (the New York Times, Washington Post, The Wall Street Journal and the Los Angeles Times), which contained a total of 1829 news stories during three years periods from 1995-1997. Mirza (1995, p.31), Sheikh (1994), Zaidi (1991, pp.25-26), Al-Zahrani (1988) and others supported Khalid (2001)'s analysis that print media in the west framed a false image of Islam in their contents.

Said (1997, pp.12-15) opines that western media link fundamentalism and militarism with Islam and present it 'as a threat to the west and western civilization', which has resulted in 'racist caricatures of Islam' in the west. More than before, what Yamani (1997, pp.87-98) said in *Islam and West: The Need for Mutual Understanding* seems more relevant today:

'the misrepresentation of Islam, which was limited in the past to the printed word, has now mushroomed to all forms of mass communication ....The entertainment industry, news telecast, radio shows, the movie industry children's TV programs, and even commercials on billboards all have become vehicles for propagating the misrepresentation of Islam in the West.....Literary fictions and nonfiction remain among the most insidious vehicles for permanently damaging the image and concept of Islam in the minds of non Muslims audience'.

This misrepresentation of Muslims in Western media in general and Pakistan in particular is not meaningless. Rather, it constructs meanings in the minds of people. As Fowler (1991, p.5) states that 'news is a representation of the world in language' while a 'language is a semiotic code' which 'imposes a structure of values, social and economic in origin, on whatever is represented; and so inevitably news, like every discourse, constructively patterns that of which it speaks'. The representation in this 'sense of construction' is not a 'value-free reflection of facts' (Ibid).

As agreed by many scholars of communication, news representation construct 'schemas' – shared meanings of events, in minds of people. These schemas are commonly known as frames and stereotypes, which are understood and perceived coherently by the people (Ibid, p.43). Not only contemporary literature, Lippmann (1922, p.3) also considered 'schemata' as an important area of study, which he referred to as 'the picture inside our heads'. Entman (1991, p.7), whose work is considered seminal, takes it as 'information

processing schemata' wherein individuals make decisions on the basis of their internal schemata about every significant issue. However, Scheufele (1999, p.103) has been so précised as to say that news provides 'a construct for the public to understand events' and form a basis for reality. Hence, whatever people have in their minds as 'schemata' to process or construct a reality greatly depends on what they have been presented by the media of communication.

### Hypotheses

The following hypotheses have been constructed to know and understand the representation of Pakistan by *The Guardian* and *Daily Telegraph* in their news and editorials:

H1: *The Guardian* criticizes Pakistan's role as a frontline allied state in the 'war on terror', while *Daily Telegraph* supports/appreciates Pakistan's role as a frontline allied state in the 'war on terror'.

H2: *The Guardian* supports democracy in Pakistan and criticizes the dictatorship; while *Daily Telegraph* supports democracy in Pakistan, but does not overtly condemn/criticize the dictatorship.

H3: *The Guardian* is likely to comment more on the events of extremism (suicide bombing etc.) than the *Daily Telegraph*.

H4: *The Guardian* supports judicial activism in Pakistan more than *Daily Telegraph*.

H5: *The Guardian* is likely to comment more on economic issues of Pakistan than the *Daily Telegraph*.

H6: *The Guardian* is likely to comment more on corruption issues of Pakistan than the *Daily Telegraph*.

H7: *The Guardian* is more open in criticism of the event of Benazir Bhutto's assassination than *Daily Telegraph*.

### *The Guardian and Daily Telegraph*

Known as *The Manchester Guardian* in the beginning, *John Edward Taylor* founded *The Guardian* in 1821, and it started publication on May 5<sup>th</sup> of the same year. It was published weekly until 1836 and appeared as a daily in 1855. It earned the status of a national and international newspaper under the editorship of CP Scott, who held the post for 57 years from 1872. CP Scott outlined some principals in a much-quoted article written to celebrate the centenary of the paper: 'Comment is free, but facts are sacred... The voice of opponents no less than that of friends has a right to be heard' (reference...).

*The Guardian* is owned by Scott Trust, which was created in 1936 with an objective 'to safeguard journalistic freedom and liberal values'<sup>6</sup>. The Trust believes in free journalism and considers 'the voice of opponents no less than that of friends'<sup>7</sup>.

*The Guardian* passed through extreme critical situations throughout its life and heavily depended upon

*Manchester Evening News* – its sister concern, for financial support. However, it remained consolidated to maintain its political and social position and managed to expand the business and circulation. It suffered financial crunches but did not compromise on its ways of doing business and did not reduce its price even when its contemporaries dropped too low making it hard for *The Guardian* to survive. It did not just survive, rather survived with pride by maintaining its pro-left outlook. Even in the increasingly polarized political climate of the late 70s and early 80s, *The Guardian's* position as the voice of the left was unchallenged<sup>8</sup>.

*The Guardian* is positioned to the left of the political spectrum (Poole, 2006, p.89) as revealed by MORI poll taken in 2005<sup>9</sup> where 48% of *the Guardian* readers were Labour Party voters. It had a certified average daily circulation of 358,844 copies in January 2009 – a drop of 5.17% on January 2008<sup>10</sup>. *The Guardian* has a Sunday sibling - *The Observer* -, which has free access through web containing all news and opinions of *The Guardian* with a huge archive of old editions.

On the other hand, *The Daily Telegraph*, previously known as *The Telegraph*, is a broadsheet newspaper which was founded by Colonel Arthur B. Sleigh in June 1855 (Marr, 2006, p.238). It is one of the few newspapers in Britain that are still published on broadsheet while others have shifted to tabloid or Berliner format. It has a highest circulation of 842,912 copies in January 2009. The newspaper carries a slogan 'the largest, best, and cheapest newspaper in the world' (Burnham, 1955, p.5). It absorbed *The Morning Post* in 1937 due to its poor economy. The paper remained under the title as *The Daily Telegraph and Morning Post* for sometime after the merger.

*The Sunday Telegraph* is its sister concern which was founded in 1961 with a glossy magazine look covering money, home, living, fashion, travel and business events. At present, *The Daily Telegraph* is substantially owned by Barclay Brothers while until 2004, it was owned by a Canadian businessman Conrad Black. Contents of both the newspapers are made available for free on its website with a unique option of 'video on demand'.

The newspaper is known to be politically conservative. It supports the political objectives of the Conservative Party, also known by the term Tories. Due to its outlook it is also referred to as the *Torygraph*<sup>11</sup>.

### Method

The qualitative method of research goes beyond dealing with the arithmetic of discourses in media. One of such methodologies is the discourse analysis which is 'unobtrusive' in nature and explores the meaning, structure and function of media messages (Smith, 1999, p.260). The discourse analysis method helps to

understand the 'description, inference, interpretation and criticism or evaluation' in the messages, which quantitative methodologies hardly offer (Ibid). However, Rose (2001, p.36) puts it in a simpler way to define discourse analysis as 'groups of statements which structure the way a thing is thought, and the way we act on the basis of that thinking'. On the other hand, Henry and Tator (2002) consider critical discourse analysis as 'a tool for deconstructing the ideologies of the mass media and other elite groups and for identifying and defining social, economic, and historical power relations between dominant and subordinate groups'.

Keeping in view the nature of the topic, discourse analysis method was applied to accomplish identification of different moves in editorials or leading articles of the two elite UK newspapers: *The Guardian* and *The Daily Telegraph*. Main domains along with their sub-dimensions of the discourses were Politics: election, democracy, political parties (PPP, PML(N), PML (Q), MQM), army's role in politics; Eextremism: suicide bombing, Lal Masjid issue, religious activism, Talibanization, FATA/Swat affairs/ operations; 'War on Terror': Pak-US relations in fight against terror, military aids (monitory, technological), Pak-Afghan relations, Musharraf role's in 'war on terror'; Economy: Pakistan's economics, oil price fluctuation, economics slump; Judicial Activism: judicial crisis, lawyers' strike, court boycott; Ccorruption: kickbacks, stock exchange bargain, elite class corruption and 'miscellaneous' which include discourses on all other issues.

Lexis Nexis search engine was used to identify the 'leading articles' on Pakistan from the newspapers: *The Guardian* and *The Daily Telegraph*. The period for the search was between March 2007 and March 2008. A total of 29 pieces of leading articles were found from *The Guardian*; and 31 items from *The Daily Telegraph*. All pieces found were comments on what has been happening in Pakistan during that period and not the news items. Majority of writings were labeled as 'features' in the search and the issues being undertaken for analysis in this research were high on 'subject' (the domains) and 'geography' (Pakistan) priority of the newspapers. As the items found between the selected period were not big in number, hence all pieces were analyzed and no sampling method was applied.

For data collection and analysis, the corpus-based method has been utilized to measure 'stances' in the leading articles, which includes: Epistemic stance: comments on the certainty (or doubt), reliability, or limitations of a proposition, including comments on the source of information; Attitudinal stance: conveying the writer's attitude, feelings, or value judgments; Style stance: the manner in which the information is presented (e.g. condemning, appreciative, supporting etc.).

### Analysis and Interpretation

An attempt has been made to count the instances in the leading articles on the domains of our hypotheses, which have been enunciated earlier in methodology section. We have found that *The Guardian* in almost all domains has more often been discussing the issue(s) in epistemic style. Though *The Daily Telegraph* also opted to discuss the episteme of the issue, however, it has been heavy on attitudinal domain. Moreover, there is a slight difference in quantum of pieces of writing on the domains by both the newspapers (29 in *The Guardian* and 31 in *The Daily Telegraph*).

### Hypothesis Testing

H1: *The Guardian* criticizes Pakistan's role as a frontline allied state in the 'war on terror', while *Daily Telegraph* supports/appreciates Pakistan's role.

*The Guardian* has been quite open to criticize Pakistan's role as a frontline state in 'war on terror'. It has more often discussed the issue in epistemic and condemning styles. What fallouts of the 'war' could bring for Pakistan as being ally to the NATO and US forces have more often been discussed in its contents. *The Guardian* thinks that the west invades its 'enemies in the name of democracy, but allow its allies to subvert it'<sup>12</sup>. It condemned the Pakistan's role in the following words<sup>13</sup>:

When our client states collapse, as they inevitably do, we puzzle at how we "lost" Russia or Iraq. We fret about how anti-Western the world has become (sic) the truth is simpler. We do not need tsars or mullahs to fan the flames. We do it quite effectively ourselves.

Not only Pakistan, the British government's initiatives on Afghanistan were also subject of criticism in the contents published by *The Guardian*. One of such instance is:

Two of the foreign interventions in which the west is engaged, Iraq and Afghanistan, are proceeding with such difficulty; it is either brave or foolhardy of David Miliband to say that our experience in neither country should cloud the moral imperative to intervene.....It is also the mistake we are making in continuing to support President Pervez Musharraf, who has locked up independent judges in the run-up to a flawed general election in Pakistan.'<sup>14</sup>

*The Guardian* more often stated in plain words that Gen ® Musharraf was a hated person in Pakistan because of his dictatorial attitude<sup>15</sup> as he faced many assassination attempts from the militants. After the bloody Red Mosque event, the vengeful militants wanted to kill him. He lost public support as a

consequence to his support for the 'war on terror'. Most of the comments on 'war on terror' domain were in epistemic style, of course in a condemning tone. When Musharraf claimed in front of international media that he is the only person who is sincere with Pakistan and without him nobody will save the country from terrorism and anarchy, *The Guardian* commented that 'Pakistan is in the centre of the fight against Islamic militancy'<sup>16</sup> and law and order situation in tribal areas where Al-Qaeda and Taliban network is not to be ended. It further contended that Pakistan has 'failed to curb extremism'<sup>17</sup>. Consequently Musharraf appeared to be a failed dictator who has lost his trust of Pakistan's people; even senior retired generals have advised him to resign if he wanted democracy in Pakistan without any loss.

*The Daily Telegraph* did not lag behind in criticizing Pakistan's 'weakness' to deal with militancy and extremism as a result of 'war on terror' in Afghanistan<sup>18</sup>. Though it did not criticise Pakistan's role as a frontline state in 'war on terror' overwhelmingly, but it more often discussed the possibility of a better option while joining hands with 'democrats'. In its approach towards ongoing Pakistan's policy, the newspaper more often commented on dictatorship in an anecdotal fashion<sup>19</sup> and said, 'Gen Musharraf is an isolated figure'<sup>20</sup>.

*The Daily Telegraph* approach towards Pakistan's role as a frontline state in 'war on terror' becomes clear from the following statement<sup>21</sup>:

'the relationship between Gen Musharraf and the West is bankrupt...Valued as an ally after 9/11, he is now part of the problem. Under his dictatorship, Pakistan has become an increasingly ungovernable country in which moderate, secular forces have been sidelined to the advantage of the Islamists...Pakistan is a spent force...'

Considering Musharraf as 'part of the problem', *The Telegraph* repeatedly remarked that 'Pakistan is one of the most dangerous places on earth'<sup>22</sup>. Nonetheless, the newspaper more often favoured a political leadership to lead Pakistan in such a delicate period of time of its history when it is engaged at many fronts: 'the tribal areas, and Afghanistan'<sup>23</sup>.

Analysis of the contents of both newspapers indicates that our hypothesis may not be supported which predicts that *The Guardian* criticizes Pakistan's role as a frontline state in 'war on terror' while *The Daily Telegraph* supports and appreciates it. Interestingly, *The Daily Telegraph* has been found to be discussing the issue epistemologically with a greater degree of contents to change existing attitudes of its readers towards the necessity of a dictatorial rule in Pakistan to find support for fight against terrorism in Afghanistan. On the other hand, *The Guardian*

commented in an epistemological fashion on the issue but with less arguments aimed at changing attitudes of its readers. Nevertheless, both the newspapers have been found using condemning tone in their leading articles.

H2: *The Guardian* supports democracy in Pakistan and criticizes dictatorship; while *Daily Telegraph* supports democracy in Pakistan, but does not overtly condemn/criticize the dictatorship.

*The Guardian* has been open in criticizing the military dictatorship in Pakistan which implies its support for democracy in the country. It cautioned in different leading articles that Pakistan would face many problems<sup>24</sup> under the command of Musharraf and would be 'in the eye of the storm' if he continues<sup>25</sup>. Not only this, it continually affirmed that the President must abide by the Constitution of Pakistan<sup>26</sup>.

Supporting democracy in Pakistan, *The Guardian* showed concern on the dismaying basic human rights situation due to the military dominated establishment<sup>27</sup>. The newspaper did not consider judicial crisis as mere suppression of the law and the constitution, but also took it as a human rights issue where judges of the apex court were put under house arrest<sup>28</sup>.

In a bid to support democracy and condemn military rule in the country, the newspaper terms<sup>29</sup> Musharraf & Miss Bhutto deal self benefiting but not in the interest of the country or nation because the Army Chief wanted a next term and Benazir intended for becoming prime minister for a third term, which the Constitution does not allow<sup>30</sup>. It also showed concerns over the army rule in the country as the Pakistani institutions like Supreme Court are in danger.

*The Guardian* further wrote that President Musharraf now must quit and the West, including America, should never support him. To support democracy, it contended that all parties' conference (APC) should be convened for holding fair elections while the judiciary must be restored immediately. It furthered with saying that Chief of the Army Staff must realize that democracy is the demand of the people.

Contrary to *The Guardian's* stance on democracy and dictatorship in Pakistan, *The Daily Telegraph* has opted for epistemic style to support democracy though it has not been found openly criticizing the military rule in Pakistan. But, it does not mean it did not, it did but in enumerating the fallouts of dictatorship or talked much about the ways for the military dictator to bring the country out of the deepening quagmire of politics<sup>31</sup>.

For instance, *The Daily Telegraph* editor says that Musharraf has three options for self-defense; i.e. to restore the democracy, to develop good coordination with parliament and never attempt to overstep the constitution<sup>32</sup>. Even the headlines of leading articles indicate a kind of mild criticism of the military dictatorship when it says 'Musharraf does not deserve our support'<sup>33</sup>. Unlike *The Guardian*, it more often opined in

rhetoric fashion to condemn Pakistan's state of affairs by labeling it with 'Asia is Ashamed by Pakistan'<sup>34</sup>.

*The Guardian's* editorials openly criticized Pervez Musharraf's government and supported the restoration of democracy. While, *The Daily Telegraph* more often gave suggestions to Musharraf government by criticizing it in a light and on some occasions in a rhetoric way. Its suggestions included indication of a high time for Musharraf to restoring the democracy in Pakistan otherwise indicated loss for it. *The Guardian* has been epistemic with modality stance while *The Daily Telegraph* has attitudinal style. The analysis supports our hypothesis which predicts that *The Guardian* supports democracy in Pakistan and criticizes the dictatorship; while *The Daily Telegraph* supports democracy in Pakistan, but does not overtly condemn/criticize the dictatorship.

H3: *The Guardian* is likely to comment more on the events of extremism (suicide bombing etc.) than the *Daily Telegraph*.

Interestingly, *The Guardian* did not discuss the issue(s) of extremism, especially the suicide-bombing, which virtually shocked the whole nation. However, it discussed the issue of religious extremism in the 'Lal Masjid' perspective in detail. More often, it opted for epistemic than attitudinal style to discuss the issues of extremism, of course in a condemning tone. The newspaper opined that the events of extremism would increase Western support for President Musharraf<sup>35</sup>.

On the other hand, *The Daily Telegraph* took lead in discussing the events of suicide bombing and extremism in a greater detail. Discussing suicidal attack on former Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto in Karachi under the heading line 'Pakistan on the edge', it appreciated the political leader and condemned the extremists<sup>36</sup>. The newspaper also devoted enough space for the leader and probable future of Pakistan People's Party after the death of Benazir Bhutto and discussed the issue in an epistemic fashion with a greater degree of comments in its leading articles<sup>37</sup>.

The hypothesis stands rejected, as *The Guardian* has hardly been found discussing the issue(s) of extremism in its leading articles, while *The Daily Telegraph* discussed it in somehow greater detail in epistemic and commenting tone.

H4: *The Guardian* supports judicial activism in Pakistan more than *Daily Telegraph*.

*The Guardian* not only devoted relatively greater space to shed light on the judicial crisis which gripped the country for a longer time, but also appreciated the stance taken by the Chief Justice of Pakistan<sup>38</sup>. In a leading article entitled 'General unrest', the newspaper openly condemned the president's action which was nothing but an augmentation to the already worsened political scenario<sup>39</sup>. The articles in this domain were mostly in epistemic and condemning style.

*The Daily Telegraph* did not discuss the issue in a greater detail; however, it has been open to criticize the policies of support to the brutalities of the President of Pakistan by the UK and the US governments despite having a 'strong claim to be the most dangerous country in the world'<sup>40</sup>. The comments were in epistemic stance.

The analysis indicates that *The Guardian* has devoted relatively more space to the issue as compared to *The Daily Telegraph*, which supports our hypothesis, if taken in quantitative manner. Amazingly, *The Daily Telegraph* stance was anti US and UK policies of support to the quasi-martial law by the President Musharraf. Even being less in quantum, *The Daily Telegraph* did not lag behind *The Guardian* to discuss the issue. However, quantitatively as our hypothesis predicts, *The Guardian* took lead over *The Daily Telegraph* to comment on the issue in question.

H5: *The Guardian* is likely to comment more on economic issues of Pakistan than the *Daily Telegraph*.

Pakistan suffered severe economic bankruptcy in the last couple of years which left it at the mercy of international lending organizations and remained on flash point to default on foreign loans. Developed countries in the west and the United States assisted Pakistan with soft loans and financial aid to reduce its financial deficits. This state of affairs forced the country to frame its economic policies and other domestic affairs in accordance with the dictates of the international monetary organizations and superpowers, resultantly reducing the sovereignty of the country. Nonetheless, no single leading article has been found in both the elite UK newspapers during the period of our analysis on this subject. Although certain references of Pakistan's economy have been found in both the newspapers but the comments were not centered on Pakistan's economy; rather they were about aid by the US and the UK for Pakistan<sup>41</sup>, poor economic conditions as a reason for terrorism<sup>42</sup> and references of economy of Pakistan in peripheries<sup>43</sup>. Thus, our hypothesis, which predicted that *The Guardian* is likely to comment more on economic issues of Pakistan as compared to *The Daily Telegraph*, is not supported.

H6: *The Guardian* is likely to comment more on corruption issues of Pakistan than the *Daily Telegraph*.

Both the newspapers seem to be discussing the issues of corruption and kickbacks in extremely low tone; however, some references of Mr. Zardari's corruption (Mr. 10%) are found in the leading articles<sup>44</sup>, albeit, with almost same frequency. *The Guardian* commented on General Musharraf's strong will to remain in power, for which he used the 'tactics' to lower the anti-military establishment tone among the 'democrats'<sup>45</sup>. The comments were found to be epistemic and in attitudinal styles.

Concluding the hypothesis, our analysis does not support the hypothesis which predicts that *The*

*Guardian* is more likely to comment on corruption issues in Pakistan than *The Daily Telegraph*.

H7: *The Guardian* is more open in criticism to the event of Benazir Bhutto's assassination than *Daily Telegraph*.

Former Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto was the leader of Pakistan People's Party - fairly a national political party of Pakistan. Her assassination was a tragic moment in the Pakistan's history which ended the Bhutto legacy. Not only this, her assassination jolted the nation and virtually paralyzed the whole country. Despite being a popular political leader and twice former woman premier of a developing country, her death could not take sufficient attention and space of the UK leading newspapers: *The Guardian* and *Daily Telegraph*. *The Guardian* in its leading article entitled 'Benazir Bhutto: Death in Rawalpindi'<sup>46</sup> could hardly shed much light on the sacrifices she rendered for the restoration of democracy in a country held by the military might. Following her death, the newspaper still seemed more inclined to discuss Musharraf as 'the linchpin of Washington and London' and the one who should be hated by the west. *The Guardian's* unfettered support for democracy turned it to comment more on the dangers posed to it than the pillars of democracy that support it.

*The Daily Telegraph* did not sound somehow different in its tone. Commenting on her style of governance ('her own mistress'), her husband ('Mr. Ten Per Cent'), and on her family legacy, the newspaper declared 'her torturous and compromising negotiations with Gen Musharraf' as her 'desire for political office'<sup>47</sup>, and for the restoration of democracy in the country. Her assassination again could not muster enough space and attention of the newspaper for her contributions towards democracy.

Our analysis of the discourses made in both the newspapers does not reveal any significant difference on the issue of Benazir Bhutto's assassination. Both the newspapers condemned her death at the hands of extremists, while discourses were more on consequences of her death than loss of a popular leader. Thus, our hypothesis which indicates that *The Guardian* is more open in criticism to the event of Bhutto's assassination than *Daily Telegraph* is not supported.

### Discussion and Conclusion

The gist of the research can be explained in the following manner:

Discussing democracy in Pakistan, *The Guardian's* editorials openly criticized Pervez Musharraf's government while *The Daily Telegraph* was more often found suggesting Gen Musharraf with light criticism. The suggestions included indications about the high time for Musharraf to restore democracy in Pakistan otherwise face losses. *The*

*Guardian* has epistemic with modality while *Daily Telegraph* has attitudinal style.

On the issue of extremism and suicide bombing, *The Guardian* offered hardly any comment during the period of analysis, while *The Telegraph* has epistemic style and it offered light comments without covering it in a critical manner.

*The Guardian* discussed the Lal Masjid (red mosque) issue in its editorials in detail and considered it as the mismanagement of military dictatorship and held Gen Musharraf fully responsible, while *The Daily Telegraph* criticized the General but in a light way.

On religious activism, both *The Guardian* and *The Daily Telegraph* were found concerned but the quantum of the leading articles was very low.

In FATA affairs sub-domain, *The Guardian* openly and constantly criticized Musharraf's policies in FATA affairs/operation in detail while *Daily Telegraph* also slammed the General over his failed strategic policies, however, in a light fashion.

Pakistan suffered immensely due to the recent economic slump but *The Guardian* and *The Daily Telegraph* did not highlight this problem.

Despite the fact that the lawyers across the country staged boycott of court proceedings as protest against the suspension of Chief Justice of Pakistan by the President Pervez Musharraf, and agitation by lawyers gripped the entire country, paralyzing the court system, masses suffered, the lawyers faced economic crisis, the issue could not get place in the editorials of *The Guardian* and *The Daily Telegraph*.

Both the internationally recognized newspapers did not discuss the corruption or kickbacks issue in Pakistan in their editorials during the specified period of discourse analysis i.e. March 2007 to March 2008. However, elite class' corrupt practices were discussed which included corruption by the political leaders, corruption in cricket etc. Both the newspapers seem to have discussed the issue with hardly any observable difference.

#### Correspondance to:

Ghulam Shabir, Ph.D.

Department of Media Studies

Islamia University, Bahawalpur, Pakistan

E-mail: [drshabair@yahoo.com](mailto:drshabair@yahoo.com)

Zafar Iqbal, Ph.D

Centre for Media and Communication Studies

International Islamic University, Islamabad, Pakistan

E-mail: [drzafar.iqbal@iiu.edu.pk](mailto:drzafar.iqbal@iiu.edu.pk)

#### References

- Ahmed, Akbar S. (1993). *Living Islam: from Samarkind to Stornoway*. London: BBC Books.
- Ali, Tariq (2008). *Purze Hooye Paiman Kitne—Pak America Taluqat ki Kahani* (Translation: How many promises broken – a story of Pak-US

relations) (Urdu). Lahore: Good Books.

Al-Zahrani, A. A. (1988). 'United States Television and press coverage of Islam and Muslims'. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Okalahoma, United States.

Entman, R.M. (1991). Framing US coverage of international news: Contrasts; in narratives of KAL and Iran air incidents. *Journal of Communication*, 41(4).

Fair, Christian C. (2005). Demographics and security: the contrasting cases of Pakistan and Bangladesh. *Journal of South Asian and Middle Eastern Studies*. Vol. 28, No. 4, pp.53-76.

Fergusson, J. (2007). Extracts from the Independent. *Daily The Nation*, Islamabad, Pakistan, Dec.17, 2007.

Field, Clive D. (2007). 'Islamophobia in Contemporary Britain: The Evidence of the Opinion Polls, 1988-2006'. *Islam and Christian-Muslims Relations*. London: Routledge, Vol.18, No.4, 447-477, October.

Fowler, R. (1991). *Language in the News*. London: Routledge.

IJC (2007). The media in and After9/11. Review essay by Douglas Kellner. University of California, Los Angeles, pp.127-132.

Khalid, Muhammad. (2001). 'United States mass media and image of Muslim world'. *Pakistan Perspective*, Pakistan Study Centre, University of Karachi.

Leon, T. Hadar. (2002). Bush insists on US Resolve: US pledges boost in aid to Pakistan, *San Francisco Chronicle*. Nov.11. Policy Analysis No.436. May 8, 2002.

Lippmann, W. (1922). *Public Opinion*. New York: Macmillan.

Marr, Andrew (2006). *My Trade*. London: Pan.

McQuail, D. (1994). *Mass Communication Theory: An Introduction*. California: Sage.

Mescher, Heidi (2008). 'Policing and Islamophobia in Germany: The Role of Workplace Experience'. *International Journal of Conflict and Violence*. Vol.2(1), pp.138-156.

Mir, Amir (2008). *The Flattering Flag of Jihad*. Lahore: Mashal Books.

Mirza, W. Sabri (1995). 'Factor analysis of the impact of mass media on viewers' perceptions of Muslim nations'. Unpublished M.A. Thesis, University of Illinois, Chicago.

Poole, E. & Richardson, J.E. (2006). *Muslims and the News Media*. London: I.B. Tauris.

Poole, E. (2002). *Reporting Islam: Media Representations of British Muslims*. London: I.B. Tauris Publishers.

Poole, E. (2006). The effects of September 11 and the war in Iraq on British newspaper coverage. In Poole E and Richardson, J. E (eds.) *Muslims and the news media*. London: I. B Taurus publishing.

- Rahman, B. (2007). 'Al-Qaeda in GHQ, Rawalpindi', South Asia Analysis Group in International Terrorism Monitor (New Delhi), paper no. 2522. December 28, 2007.
- Rose, G. (2001). *Visual methodologies*. London: Sage Publications.
- Saeed, Amir (2007). Media, Racism and Islamophobia: The Representation of Islam and Muslims in the Media. *Sociology Compass*. 1/2(2007).
- Said, Edward (1997). *Covering Islam: How the Media and the Experts Determine How We See the Rest of the World*. London: Vintage.
- Said, Edward. (1997). *Covering Islam: how the media experts determine: How we see the rest of the world*. New York: Qintage Books.
- Scheufele, D. (1999). Framing as a theory of media effects. *Journal of Communication*, v49, pp.102-122.
- Sheikh, Mughees-uddin (1994). 'Elite press editorial framing of United States foreign policy: The case of Pakistan, The New York Times, the Washington Post and the Los Angeles Times (1980-92)'. Unpublished Ph.D dissertation. The University of IOWA, United States (Abstract published in Journalism Abstract, Vol. 32).
- Smith, M. John (1999). *Contemporary Communication Research Methods*. California: Wordsworth Publishing Company.
- Vender, V.P. & Shoma, M. (2004). *Media, war and Terrorism: responses from the Middle East and Asia*. London: Routledge-Curzon Taylor Francis Group.
- Wintour, P. (2001). Blair brief MPs on war aims. *The Guardian*, September 27, 2007.
- Yamani, A. Muhammad (1997). 'Islam and the West: The need for mutual understanding'. *The American Journal of Islamic Social Sciences*. Vol. 14, No. 1, Spring.
- Zaidi, Nayyar (1991). 'Medium is the Mischief'. *The Message International*: January, 25-26.
- <sup>1</sup> Editorials in the UK are generally referred to as the leading articles.
- <sup>2</sup> 'Al-Qaeda got a brand new bag' stated by the then Democratic Presidential candidate Senator Barack Obama in a press conference at Kabul on July 23, 2008.
- <sup>3</sup> <http://islamabad.usemassy.gov/pakistan/cs-completing-ds-11.htm>, retrieved on March 26, 2008
- <sup>4</sup> Huekabee, Michael D. has undermined Pakistan's efforts to thwart extremism from its soil has been in his article in *The Nation*, Pakistan, May 8, 2007.
- <sup>5</sup> *Dawn*, Pakistan, an article by M. Shahid Amin on October 09, 2004, entitled 'United States and Pakistan'.
- <sup>6</sup> Comments can be retrieved from Guardian Media Group site under Scott Trust from <http://www.gmgplc.co.uk/ScottTrust/tabid/127/default.aspx>. We retrieved it on July 26, 2008.
- <sup>7</sup> It can also be reviewed on <http://www.gmgplc.co.uk/ScottTrust/TheScottTrustValues/tabid/127/default.aspx>. We retrieved it on July 26, 2008.
- <sup>8</sup> <http://www.guardian.co.uk/gnm-archive/2002/jun/06/1>, retrieved on August 20, 2008.
- <sup>9</sup> Retrieved from [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The\\_Guardian](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Guardian) on August 16, 2009.
- <sup>10</sup> Retrieved from Audit Bureau of Circulations Ltd – <http://www.abc.org.uk> on July 12, 2009.
- <sup>11</sup> [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Daily\\_Telegraph](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Daily_Telegraph). We retrieved it on August 16, 2009.
- <sup>12</sup> *The Guardian*, January 01, 2008.
- <sup>13</sup> *The Guardian*, January 01, 2008.
- <sup>14</sup> *The Guardian*, February 13, 2008.
- <sup>15</sup> *The Guardian*, December 28, 2007.
- <sup>16</sup> *The Guardian*, January 29, 2008.
- <sup>17</sup> *The Guardian*, November 02, 2007.
- <sup>18</sup> *The Daily Telegraph*, July 06, 2007.
- <sup>19</sup> *The Daily Telegraph*, November 05, 2007.
- <sup>20</sup> *The Daily Telegraph*, October 20, 2007.
- <sup>21</sup> *The Daily Telegraph*, November 09, 2007.
- <sup>22</sup> *The Daily Telegraph*, December 31, 2007.
- <sup>23</sup> *The Daily Telegraph*, January 02, 08.
- <sup>24</sup> *The Guardian*, July 07, 2007; July 11, 2007; January 29, 2008.
- <sup>25</sup> *The Guardian*, January 29, 2008.
- <sup>26</sup> *The Guardian*, March 17, 2007; August 10, 2007; November 10, 2007.
- <sup>27</sup> *The Guardian*, November 05, 2007.
- <sup>28</sup> *The Guardian*, November 10, 2007.
- <sup>29</sup> *The Guardian*, May 05, 2007; September 19, 2007; November 10, 2007.
- <sup>30</sup> *The Guardian*, May 15, 2007; September 19, 2007; November 10, 2007.
- <sup>31</sup> *The Daily Telegraph*, November 05, 2007; December 28, 2007; December 29, 2007; January 02, 2008; January 05, 2008.
- <sup>32</sup> *The Daily Telegraph*, November 05, 2007.
- <sup>33</sup> *The Daily Telegraph*, November 05, 2007.
- <sup>34</sup> *The Daily Telegraph*, January 05, 2008.
- <sup>35</sup> *The Guardian*, July 11, 2007.
- <sup>36</sup> *The Daily Telegraph*, October 20, 2007.
- <sup>37</sup> *The Daily Telegraph*, December 31, 2007.
- <sup>38</sup> *The Guardian*, March 17, 2007.
- <sup>39</sup> *The Guardian*, March 15, 2007.
- <sup>40</sup> *The Daily Telegraph*, November 09, 2007.
- <sup>41</sup> *The Daily Telegraph*, March 10, 2008.
- <sup>42</sup> *The Guardian*, February 26, 2008.
- <sup>43</sup> *The Guardian*, April 30, 2008.
- <sup>44</sup> *The Guardian*, January 01, 2008; *The Daily Telegraph*, July 06, 2007.
- <sup>45</sup> *The Guardian*, January 01, 2008.
- <sup>46</sup> *The Guardian*, December 28, 2007.
- <sup>47</sup> *The Daily Telegraph*, December 28, 2007.