

**Pakistan in US Media: A Historical and Ideological analysis
of editorials of *The New York Times***

Dr. Samia Manzoor

*Assistant Professor,
Department of Communication Studies,
Bahauddin Zakariya University, Multan*

Dr. Muhammad Ashraf Khan

*Professor,
Department of Communication Studies,
Bahauddin Zakariya University, Multan*

Ms. Sadaf Zahra

*Lecturer,
Faculty of Media and Communication Studies,
UCP, Lahore*

Abstract

*The current research study focused on the ideological presentation of Pakistan in a chronological order to reveal the ideologies *The New York Times* was using to present Pakistan. A historical and ideological analysis of the editorials of *The New York Times* which have the word Pakistan in the start was conducted. In total one hundred and fifty eight editorials appeared about Pakistan in the aftermath of 9/11 till the end of 2016. It was revealed that Pakistan received substantial editorial coverage in *The New York Times*. But almost all the coverage was negative and unfavorable for Pakistan. The ideology that the editorialists at this newspaper adopted and presented through editorial content was absolutely damaging, bitter, and hateful. They created a picture of a country that was very feeble, having dishonest and crooked politician, weak security strategies, crumbling economy, an army and intelligence agency that is facilitating terrorists, and pathetic social and human rights situation. As a whole it would not be wrong to conclude that Pakistan was discussed in a very bad*

light by the editorials of The New York Times during all the post 9/11 years.

Keywords: Pakistan, US media, *The New York Times*, historical analysis, ideological analysis, negative portrayal

Introduction

Media has very strong impact on the opinion construction of an individual. Public opinion is linked with the media from the end of previous century¹. Even in today's society people are heavily dependent on media for information². Though in the contemporary times online media has become very influential but the traditional media still plays the role of gate keeping³. Especially the editorials are considered a part of opinion discourses⁴.

A very important topic of discussion in the editorials of Pakistani and US newspapers after September the 11th was Pak-US coalition in the war on terror. After the incident of 9/11, both nations were strongly compelled to get closer to each other⁵. Both had their vested interests linked to each other. Presentation of Pakistan in US media has remained a topic of numerous researches (see ^{6;7;8;9}). But no research has been conducted to observe the historical presentation of Pakistan in US media with an ideological perspective.

The present research focused on the editorials of *The New York Times*, a prestigious US newspaper as referred by Khan¹⁰. A historical and ideological analysis was done to identify how Pakistan was presented in the editorials of *The New York Times* after September, 11th, 2001 to December 31, 2016.

Literature review

The terrorist attacks on World Trade Center on September 11, 2001 is one of the most tragic events of the history and perhaps the most theatrical and dramatic media exhibit until now¹¹. These attacks are considered as the most detrimental and tragic case in the history of terrorism¹². After these incident media organizations, around the world lacked a frame to present the incident so that their audience can imagine the unimaginable¹³.

In the aftermath of 9/11, portrayal of Muslim countries and Islam increased dramatically in the US media rhetoric but most of this portrayal remained extremely detrimental and unfavorable as Islam was presented as a religion that creates hurdles in the attainment of Western democracy¹⁴.

This point is endorsed¹⁵ that those Muslim countries that were either considered friendly or neutral to the United States before 9/11 incident were increasingly portrayed as negative by US media after 9/11 attack. US Media started presenting Muslim Countries and Islam with direct/indirect reference to 9/11 incident¹⁶. According to Arif¹⁷ Pakistan never attained a place in the top stories of US media before 9/11 incident. But post 9/11 US media presentation had a lot to say about Pakistan¹⁸. Arif¹⁹ noted that post 9/11 US media portrayal of Pakistan was mostly associated with terrorism. Pakistan has remained a frontline ally with United States in war against terrorism and she is still facing the challenges of terrorism and extremism²⁰. As said by Ali²¹ to study the image of Pakistan in US media is a topic of utmost significance.

Arif²² conducted framing analysis of pictures to examine the major news themes appearing about Pakistan in Times and Newsweek from January 1999 to January 2002. Similarly, Reynold and Barnett²³ examined the first five hours of breaking news coverage of ABC, CNN, NBC, and CBC right after 9/11 attack to analyze the news frames. Moreover, another study²⁴ analyzed the variations in coverage of Pakistan by Western media after 9/11 terrorist attack. Kellner²⁵ admitted that coverage of media has changed due to 9/11 terrorist attack while Mishra²⁶ also claimed that depictions of Islam have changed considerably after 9/11 incident in US prestigious press. Similarly, Nacos²⁷, Saleem²⁸, Ali and Khalid²⁹, Siraj³⁰, Sultan³¹, Yousaf³², Zelizer and Allan³³ and many others have conducted image studies to identify US and Western media portrayals.

Therefore it is evident from the existing literature that a lot of work has already been done in this area. For instance, Khan³⁴ has examined within the domain of media conformity theory

that how American media has created the image of Pakistan through editorials presentation. Moreover, a lot of studies (Ahmed³⁵; Durrani & Sheikh³⁶; Hassan³⁷; Khan & Safder³⁸; Mitnik³⁹; Peek⁴⁰; Siraj⁴¹; Yenigun⁴²; Yousaf⁴³) have been conducted to analyze US media coverage of Pakistan, Pakistani media coverage of US or media presentations about the relations between these major role players of war on terror. Furthermore, few studies (Maney & Woehrle⁴⁴; Nisbet, Ostman & Shanahan⁴⁵; Powell⁴⁶; Salama⁴⁷; Samy⁴⁸) have also been conducted using ideological analysis of the media regarding Pakistan, US and the relation between the countries. After conducting a rigorous literature review it was identified that no research has been done where the ideologies used by US media for Pakistan were identified in a historical manner. So the following research question was formulated: How Pakistan was ideologically presented on a yearly basis in the editorials of *The New York Times* from post 9/11 till December 2016?

Method

The following methods of data collection were used during the course of the present research; historical analysis and ideological analysis

Historical Analysis:

Historical analysis is a method used to discover what happened in the past from the records and accounts⁴⁹. It is defined by Karacan⁵⁰ as a method of examination of the evidence stored in the documents of the past. This method can be applied to all artifacts including historical texts, newspaper reports, diaries, recordings, and maps etc. The researcher who is going to analyze the history will be analyzing the facts of the past to gain the insights into social phenomena⁵¹. It has been utilized by researchers in other disciplines, for instance, Wezel and Soldat⁵² has applied it in agro ecology, while Ma⁵³ has applied it to study economic growth in China. Moreover, Johnson⁵⁴ has used this method in linguistics and Simonton⁵⁵ has done its application in psychology. Likewise, Dhanani⁵⁶ has explored suburban development in London using Historical method and there are many other studies of different disciplines which have

applied historical analysis but its application in media studies is an under-researched area. Few studies that has adopted historical analysis as their research methodology include Dillard and Pevehouse⁵⁷; Hudson and Day⁵⁸; and Thies⁵⁹ etc. These above mentioned studies have opted historical analysis for the purpose of analyzing foreign policies. Therefore, this specific study has selected historical analysis to examine the coverage of Pakistan in American print media (*The New York Times*) for two reasons i.e. in order to fill the gap in already existing body of knowledge and it is evident from the few studies in the field that it is the best method to analyze the policy of media towards a foreign country.

Ideological Analysis

Critical discourse analysis also deals with language, power and ideology. The perceptions held by people are constructed through language. According to Van Dijk⁶⁰ ideologies are wide-ranging, vital and intangible and their work is to organize attitudes. Ideologies define matters like our identity, our position in a society, the way we are supposed to act and our thoughts are all defined by ideologies. Van Dijk⁶¹ said that “through complex and usually long-term processes of socialization and other forms of social information processing, ideologies are gradually acquired by members of a group or culture” (p. 18). Ideologies are represented through text and talk. Power plays a very substantial role in shaping and manipulating the ideology of a society. An inductive approach was adopted to study ideology about Pakistan in the current research. Van Dijk⁶² conducted research on ideology and discourse semantics and identified in *The Washington Post* and *New York Times* that discourse semantics are influenced by the fundamental ideologies in US. On the similar bearings the present research looked at the inherent ideologies in the editorial content of *The New York Times* about Pakistan and identified the main ideologies which were used by the editorialists at *The New York Times* to present Pakistan over a time period of sixteen years. As the present research utilized the data of newspapers to record what aspects were used to

discuss Pakistan over a long period so the present research can be treated as a historical ideological analysis.

Population of the study

“Pakistan” was selected as the keyword to select editorials in *The New York Times*. Only those editorials where the word “Pakistan” was used in the topic or in initial paragraph during a time period of roughly sixteen years starting from September 12th 2001 to December 31st 2016 were downloaded from Lexis-Nexis databank and were selected for analysis. One hundred and fifty eight editorials were downloaded on the basis of the operational definition.

Findings

In this section, the researcher did the historical and ideological analysis of the editorials published in *The New York Times* during September 2001 to 2016. The analysis of the discourse of editorials revealed how this newspaper constructed realities regarding Pakistan.

2001 After September 11, 2001, attacks, the stance *The New York Times*, adopted towards Pakistan was quite friendly and mildly accusing. Rather Mr. Musharraf was appreciated for his efforts in supporting war against terrorism. A relatively rational approach was observed in the editorials of *The New York Times*. Attacks on the Indian parliament took place on December 13, 2001, within this context *The New York Times* wrote that the perpetrators of these attacks are “two groups operating within Pakistan.” Which means that these groups are only operating within Pakistan, Pakistani government has nothing to do with them, it is neither owning them, nor supporting them. Over all Pakistan-India conflict in the aftermath of attacks on Indian parliament remained the center of attention during the last months of 2001. Pakistanis’ inclination towards supporting fundamentalist organizations like Lashkar-e-Taiba and Jaish-e-Muhammad was also discussed but Pakistani government was not directly and ruthlessly accused for these attacks.

2002 On January 23, 2002, Daniel Pearl, a reporter working for *The Wall Street Journal* was abducted in Karachi, Pakistan, and was killed on February 1st, 2002 by the same people who kidnapped him. Although Mr. Pearl was murdered in Pakistan but *The New York Times* never once criticized or blamed Pakistani authorities for this insane act of violence. Rather the newspaper acclaimed Pakistan for her cooperation and wrote in one of the editorials that “Pakistani authorities had already made several arrests in connection with Mr. Pearl's abduction.” The Pandora box of India Pakistan conflict opened up right from the start of 2002 and *The New York Times* covered it with full zeal. During 2002, out of total sixteen editorials which published about Pakistan, seven were devoted to India Pakistan relations. Like previously *The New York Times* adopted a balanced approach while discussing India Pakistan conflict. Initially instead of fixing the responsibility on either one of the two countries, it discussed the issue with quite neutrality. But later on *The New York Times* adopted a clear hostile approach towards Pakistan. Same was observed in case of Mr. Musharraf. He was praised remarkably for his support in war on terror and criticized equally for his referendum. In one editorial, while discussing Mr. Musharraf’s cooperation in war on terrorism, *The New York Times* wrote “The general has impressed Americans, and indeed the whole world.” While in another the referendum he held was called as a “blunder”, and “rigged.” Pakistan’s nuclear program was also discussed very gravely. It was blamed for being “stolen from the West.” General Zia ul Haq was also held responsible for turning “Pakistan into a hotbed for Islamic extremists.”

2003 Pakistan was vehemently accused during most of 2003. An editorial appeared in *The New York Times* on September 21, 2003, “Pakistan, a Troubled Ally,” in which the case was made that Pakistan is not doing what she is claiming to do. Discrediting General Musharraf’s efforts in war on terrorism it was written that, “His actions fell short of his words.” Pakistan was accused of “still provides Kashmiri terrorists with sanctuary,” Pakistan’s behavior in nuclear arms was considered “extremely irresponsible,” Pakistan’s history was declared as “scarred,” overall it was established that Pakistan’s support in

Afghanistan is “less than ideal.” While discussing Pakistan’s nuclear program, it was written “whether Pakistan is the trustworthy ally.” Pakistan was called a “rogue state.” Pakistan was directly accused of many crimes without mentioning any solid proofs. It was written on December 23, 2003, “It shared nuclear bomb technology with Iran and North Korea, sponsored terrorism in Indian-ruled Kashmir and backed the Taliban government that sheltered Osama bin Laden.” It was obvious from such presentations that *The New York Times*, which once portrayed Pakistan with much rationality, has lost its affection towards Pakistan over the course of a couple of years.

2004 2004 especially remained a difficult year for Pakistan as far as her portrayal in *The New York Times* is concerned. Although Musharraf’s “enlightened moderation” concept emerged around mid-2004, yet *The New York Times* never bothered to discuss it. India Pakistan conflict seemed like the heart favorite topic when it comes to *The New York Times*. But fortunately this time, Pakistan became successful in getting a relatively positive stance in the newspaper while discussing India and Pakistan peace talks. Majority of the editorials focused on the nuclear technology issue which hit Pakistan in 2004. Pakistan definitely faced very harsh criticism of *The New York Times*, which is clear from many of the editorials’ statements. At one point Pakistan was affirmed as, “the world’s leading suppliers of illicit nuclear technology,” was called “the biggest violator” of the non-proliferation treaty and “least reliable ally.” Pakistani nuclear experts were called as “rogue scientists” and even Pakistan’s nuclear program was alleged of being “illicitly obtained.” Even Pakistani president was not exempted from these “praises,” he was called “highly skeptical.”

2005 During 2005 Mukhtaran Mai case gained much attention in the international media and so in *The New York Times*. In one of the editorials it was mentioned that Ms. Mukhtaran was arrested by General Musharraf’s government before she could leave for America. They wrote that America is “dismayed” by this act. Talking about terrorism the paper wrote that Pakistan, “originally helped create, nurture and train the

Taliban.” General Musharraf was kept on criticizing for his political regime. A massive earthquake struck Pakistan on October 12, 2005, the paper adopted a sympathetic stance towards Pakistan. The efforts of rehabilitation taken by the Pakistani government were also appreciated.

2006 2006 was the year when the editorialists of *The New York Times* discussed numerous issues about Pakistan; off course Mr. Musharraf was included in them. Prime Minister Shaukat Aziz perhaps was the only Pakistani leader, who was unconditionally admired as “a decent, intelligent man.” On the other hand Mr. Musharraf was repeatedly called “dictator.” Pakistani government and military were criticized badly. Terms like “Pakistani based terrorists,” “dangerous international terrorists hiding out in the mountain caves of Pakistan,” “scandalously porous border,” and “Pakistani based Kashmiri terrorists” were used while discussing Pakistan. Baluchistan insurgency also remained a hot topic. An overall impression was tried to create, of Pakistan by *The New York Times* as a volatile state.

2007 2007 started with a myriad of fury from *The New York Times* for Pakistan. In an editorial, published in January it was written about Pakistan, “Quetta is an important rear base for the Taliban, and that Pakistani authorities are encouraging and perhaps sponsoring the cross-border insurgency.” The newspaper never bothered about the emotions of Muslims when it ruthlessly declared Salman Rushdie’s wickedness as his “knighthood.” Musharraf faced ruthless criticism during 2007. He was called “blundering and increasingly unpopular military dictator and a halfhearted strategic ally of the United States.” At another place, he was described as “General Musharraf’s reckless political trajectory is turning him into one of the Bush administration’s most dangerous partners.” Pakistan was called a “ready sanctuary” for Taliban. Ms. Bhutto and Mr. Sharif were continuously referred as flawed and corrupt leaders. Musharraf was mercilessly discussed as a “military dictator,” “autocratic ruler,” “stubborn,” and his actions as “authoritarian maneuvers.” Ms. Bhutto was murdered on December 27, 2007, even in an editorial on her death, she was called “flawed.” Such

was the portrayal which Pakistan received in *The New York Times* during 2007.

2008 2008 started with new accusations for Mr. Musharraf. Mentioning to the investigations regarding Ms. Bhutto, he was referred as a man “who has no credibility of his own.” Mr. Musharraf was treated as a prime suspect in Ms. Bhutto’s murder. Mr. Zardari was cited as someone who is “tainted by charges of corruption.” Pakistani intelligence agency, ISI and Pakistan army was kept on condemning about “supporting Islamic militants in Afghanistan and Kashmir.” When Pakistan People’s Party won the general election of 2008 in Pakistan, it was written in one of the editorials of *The New York Times* that, “even with a rigged system, the moderates managed to win.” This is a clear example that Pakistan could not receive a fair portrayal by *The New York Times*. Pakistan was called a “battered country,” at another place Pakistan was referred as “dangerous and dangerously neglected country” its democratic institutions were also called “battered.” Pakistani coalition government was entitled as “weak, fractious and fumbling.” Pakistani democratic government was repeatedly termed as “Pakistan's fragile democracy.” In short Pakistan was tried to present as an extremely volatile country.

2009 2009 was no exception. The negative stance about Pakistan was kept on appearing in the editorials of *The New York Times*. In an editorial which appeared during February, 2009, it was explicitly mentioned that “Pakistan's stability is imperiled.” Mr. Zardari and Mr. Sharif both were called “flawed leaders” time and again. Pakistan was doubted to be in “mortal danger.” Pakistani leaders were advised to “put aside their corrosive rivalry” and “address Pakistan's many other urgent problems.” During 2009, a video appeared of Swat valley in which a Taliban was flogging a woman mercilessly. Although unfair but this insane video was linked with Pakistani government’s allowing Taliban to implement Sharia law. American aid to Pakistan was especially and constantly discussed in detail to strengthen the impression of Pakistan as a volatile state. Drone strikes in Pakistani territory were only slightly discussed although many noncombatants were targeted

through these attacks. Pakistan was, many a times, declared as “safe haven” for Taliban.

2010 2010 started with the same blame game for Pakistan which was continued from last several years. During the very first month Pakistan was blamed for making and using Taliban. Pakistan India relations were also discussed where Pakistan was badly accused for “nurturing Taliban” against India and 2008 Mumbai bombings. Faisal Shahzad brought more bad-name to Pakistan when he was arrested while planting a bomb in London Time Square. It was written that he has learnt bomb making in Pakistan, presenting Pakistan as a state that is providing assistance to the terrorists by providing them necessary trainings. When they found no other issue, it was observed that they started criticizing Pakistani government accusing it of being “fragile.” It was observed by the researcher that many phrases and sentences were used for Pakistan repeatedly without even altering the words. And there is no doubt in it that all those phrases and sentences were giving an extremely negative impression of Pakistan. Majority of such phrases were either related to Pakistan’s support to Taliban, fragility of Pakistan’s government, corruption and flawed nature of Pakistani leaders, Pakistan’s nuclear arsenals, to give a bad-name to Pakistan army and intelligence services or Pakistan’s support to extremists for insurgency in Indian held Kashmir. An article published named “Pakistan’s Double Game.” In which Pakistan army and intelligence service ISI is condemned throughout the article for their “double game,” taking American aid to fight terrorism on the one hand and supporting Taliban on the other hand. Massive flood hit Pakistan in 2010, rather than sympathizing Pakistani government, words like “volatile” and “weak” were used to describe it.

2011 Right from the start of 2011, Pakistan was plunged into disaster when Mr. Salman Taseer, governor of Pakistan’s most populated and rich province Punjab was shot dead by his own bodyguard, for committing blasphemy. No doubt it was a very unfortunate incident. But instead of condemning this incident, *The New York Times* wrote that Pakistan has an “unraveling

economy and an unraveling central government.” Pakistan’s nuclear assets were also presented as a threat to the international community. Pakistan’s nuclear program was called as “Pakistan’s illicit nuclear program” Mr. Shahbaz Bhatti, a Pakistani minister of minorities was also assassinated by extremists, regarding this unfortunate incident, the Times wrote about Pakistan army and intelligence service as “either blind to the extremist threat or in league with the extremists.” When Osama bin Laden was found and killed by America’s Navy seal force in Abbottabad, Pakistan was named as a “faithless ally,” which is “sheltering and enabling some of the worst anti-American extremists.” In one editorial *The New York Times* vowed that “Pakistan has the potential to be a far greater nightmare than Afghanistan under the Taliban.” The editorialists even suspected that Pakistan army was involved in the murder of Saleem Shahzad, who was a Pakistani journalist. Overall this newspaper made every effort to make Pakistan the root cause of all the terrorism in the world.

2012 2012 started with accusations towards Pakistani government. Mr. Yousaf Raza Gillani’s troubles were discussed which arise due to his failure of fixing Mr. Asif Ali Zardari for his corruption cases. Pakistani President Asif Ali Zardari met with Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh in April, 2012. It was openly appreciated by *The New York Times*. But Pakistan could never win complete appreciation from US press, that is why, although this meeting was appreciated but it was also mentioned that situation could get out of control because of the 2008 Mumbai attacks, which were planned by “Pakistani-based extremists, abetted by the army.” Words like “Pakistani extremists” and “Pakistani terrorists” were abundantly used. Terrorism and India Pakistan conflict remained the main issues. Malala Yousafzai, a young girl from Swat valley, who was striving for women education, was shot by Taliban in October 2012. The editorialists condemned this incident and appreciated Malala for her courage. Drones attacks in Pakistan, although created many problems for innocent people living in tribal areas of Pakistan, were also discussed but very minutely.

2013 In January 2013, seven health workers, including many teachers, out of which six were women, were killed in Swabi district of Pakistan's Khyber-Pakhtunkhwa province, who were working with a private aid group. Osama bin Laden was identified by Americans with the help of fake polio team workers so many of the people living in this area were not accepting aid workers. India Pakistan conflict remained on discussion. General Musharraf returned to Pakistan in March, 2013, *The New York Times* wrote in this regard, "If there is anyone capable of saving Pakistan, he is not it." President Asif Ali Zardari was said to have a "flawed record on corruption and governance." Pakistan was said to have a "crippled economy." Declan Walsh, The Times's bureau chief in Pakistan was expelled by Pakistani authorities in 2013 right before the general elections. It was quite intolerable for the newspaper. Pakistan was brutally condemned for this act. Nobody bothered to write about the reasons behind his expulsion. Pakistan as a country was declared as "one of the deadliest for journalists." Pakistan's general election and their outcome which made Mr. Nawaz Sharif, the prime minister of Pakistan were discussed in a positive light. Many of Mr. Sharif's decisions were appreciated openly. Along with this Pakistanis were called a "fragile nation", Mr. Mamnoon Hussain was named as, "an obscure 73-year-old political figure." Pakistan was called a "dangerous country." In short Pakistan received a negative picture in *The New York Times* during 2013.

2014 2014 was no exception. Referring to a report of Amnesty International, the Times wrote that the "job of reporting the news in Pakistan" is "increasingly perilous." Pakistani Taliban attacked international airport in Karachi in June 2014, instead of providing moral support, the Times called it a "humiliating security breach." Polio outbreak in Pakistan and India Pakistan conflict were also on the list of issues which the paper discussed about Pakistan. In an editorial entitled "Pakistan, Its Own Worst Enemy," the editorialists wrote Pakistan has many big problems including "a failing economy; a Taliban insurgency; and persistent tension with India." In December 2014, one of the most sad and unfortunate incident in the history of the country took place when Taliban killed 145

children in an army public school. It was the kind of incident which throughout the world has very few examples in the past. *The New York Times* while talking about this incident in one of the editorials instead of condemning the incident wrote about Imran Khan that he is a “dangerously disruptive politician.”

2015 Talking about Pakistan-US relations *The New York Times* wrote in January 2015, an editorial entitled “Is Pakistan Worth America's Investment?” in which it was clearly mentioned that Pakistan army is playing a “double game,” the militant groups in Pakistan are “supported and exploited by the army,” the government of Pakistan is “fragile,” and Pakistan is “obsessed with nuclear weapons.” “Duplicity of Pakistani Army leaders” was also discussed in an editorial. Many editorials were written about Pakistan in 2015 in *The New York Times* but in many of the editorials Pakistan was only slightly mentioned. The topics through which Pakistan was discussed are drone strikes, war in Iraq and Syria, Axt scandal, terrorism, Pak-Afghanistan relations and Pak-India relations. Pakistan was said to have provided “Taliban financial support and allowed them to live and operate in the border region with Afghanistan.” At another place it was mentioned that “Pakistan's powerful army and intelligence services have for years relied on the Taliban.” Pakistan was once again called “the most dangerous country in the world for the news media in 2014.” Pakistan was called “home” for terrorist groups, who are “backed by a paranoid security establishment obsessed with India.” In short Pakistan faced all the backlash from *The New York Times* during 2015.

2016 The first editorial about Pakistan in *The New York Times* was written about Pakistan-India relations in January 2016, when Mr. Modi visited Lahore, Pakistan. This visit was ought to be discussed in a positive light as it was the first visit of an Indian prime minister to Pakistan in 12 years but Pakistan was accused of playing “double game.” At another place it was said that “Pakistan has given assistance and a haven to the Afghan Taliban as a hedge against India.” In March 2016, a suicide bomber blew himself in a park in Lahore, Pakistan, killing 69 people and injuring about 300. Once again it was said that Pakistan has “cynically used terrorist groups for their own

purposes, encouraging them to act as proxy fighters against India.” In another editorial during 2016, Pakistan was called “a duplicitous and dangerous partner for the United States and Afghanistan.” In short Pakistan received image of a volatile, duplicitous and dangerous country in *The New York Times*.

Discussion and Conclusion

It was observed that Pakistan received substantial coverage in *The New York Times* but there was found an abundance of negative presentation. Newspapers records become a part of history⁶³. That is why it was tried to observe that what history US media is recording about Pakistan and how Pakistan is being portrayed in an ideological perspective. As identified by Rashid⁶⁴ it was observed that Pakistan received abundance of coverage in the editorials of *The New York Times* during the aftermath of 9/11. One hundred and fifty eight editorials were written about Pakistan during a period of sixteen years. This coverage was scattered on all the years. It was observed that during some years Pakistan remained the most important agenda in the editorials of *The New York Times* and as much as seventeen editorials in a single year were written about Pakistan. It was also observed that an extremely deteriorating and menacing ideology was adopted by the editorialists at *The New York Times* to present Pakistan. General Pervez Musharraf was very harshly criticized for many a reasons. Pakistan and Pakistan army was repeated accused of playing a “double game” (July 27, 2010, p. A18). A complete editorial was devoted to this title. As observed by Yousaf⁶⁵ Pakistan army and intelligence agencies were linked with terrorist group operating around the globe. Pakistan’s nuclear program was alleged as being “stolen” (December 2, 2002, p. A20), Pakistan’s democratic leaders were repeatedly labeled as “corrupt” (April 17, 2002, p. A22), and Pakistan was treated as being responsible for tensed Pak-India relations.

At one point it was written about Pakistan that, “Islamabad has still not severed its ties to terrorist groups (November 6, 2001, p. A20),” Pakistanis were referred as “troubled nation (March 25, 2002, p. A20),” Pakistan was straightforwardly accused of

“Pakistan's strong support for the Taliban, links with Kashmiri terrorists” (September 21, 2003, p. A10), even in one editorial it was written about Pakistanis that “young Pakistanis who can't get jobs in factories that export to America sometimes go to training camps to learn how to kill Americans” (October 25, 2004, p. A20). Pakistan was accused of many evils but terrorism remained on the top, “Pakistan, provides rear support and sanctuary for the Taliban insurgency (January 23, 2007, p. A18).

If we look at the ideology that *The New York Times* presented about Pakistan in a chronological order, we can see that during 2001 after 9/11 incident seven editorials were published about Pakistan where Musharraf was appreciated and government was not directly accused. The situation appeared to be changing during 2002 when mild policy shift was observed. Paki-India conflict was presented in a way that Pakistan faced accusations vehemently while two pronged policy was adopted for Musharraf, appreciation for war on terror and criticism for referendum. An ex-army chief General Zia ul Haq and Pakistan's nuclear program was criticized. A total of sixteen editorials were published about Pakistan in 2002. The year 2003 was no different where Pakistan's participation in war on terror and nuclear program were bitterly criticized. Total five editorials appeared in 2003 *The New York Times* about Pakistan. During year 2004 eight editorial about Pakistan were published in *The New York Times* where Pak-India relations were appreciated regarding peace talks but nuclear program and counter terrorism measures were criticized. The coverage during the year was not different from the previous years. Mukhtaran Mai case was discussed in quite detail, Musharraf and terrorism measures were while earthquake rehabilitation measures were appreciated. Five editorials in total published during 2005. 2006 Prime Minister Shaukat Aziz was the only Pakistani PM who was appreciated but Musharraf was badly criticized. Baluchistan insurgency remained a topic of much attention. Accusations regarding counter terrorism strategies of Pakistan were made. Total six editorials were published about Pakistan in *The New York Times*. During 2007 Musharraf once again remained the

target of merciless criticism. Nawaz Sharif and Benazir Bhutto were also referred as corrupt leaders. Even on her death Ms. Bhutto was not spared. During year 2007 total thirteen editorials gained place in *The New York Times* about Pakistan. In general elections of 2008 Pakistan Peoples Party won but Pakistan never received any positive coverage on initiation of a democratic system. Pakistan was continuously presented as a weak and battered country. Most numbers of editorials in a single year were published in 2008 when Pakistan remained the supremely important topic of discussion in seventeen editorials. During 2009 Pakistan's stability was questioned. President Zardari and ex PM Nawaz were continuously discussed in a very bad light. American aid to Pakistan was repeatedly questioned. Pakistan was criticized for allowing Taliban to implement Sharia law. Total eleven editorials about Pakistan were published in the year 2009. The year 2010 also remained disastrous for Pakistan in terms of treatment of Pakistan in the editorials of *The New York Times* is concerned. Total fourteen editorials were published where Pakistan army was accused of using Taliban. It was also established the terrorists around the world are taking training in Pakistan. Pakistan was continuously presented as weak and fragile state. During 2011 fifteen editorials about Pakistan were published in which killings of Pakistani governor Salman Taseer and minority minister were thoroughly discussed. It was written that Pakistan army and intelligence services are blind to extremism. OBL killing in Abbottabad opened a new chapter of criticism. Pakistan was called a nightmare. And root cause of all the terrorism around the world. During the year 2012 Mr. Yousaf Raza Gillani PM of Pakistan and President Mr. Asif Ali Zardari were criticized for corruption cases. Zardari and Manmohan Singh were appreciated for peace talks between Pakistan and India. Malala Yousafzai who was shot by Taliban in Swat valley was also discussed. Drone attacks, a very important problem for Pakistan, were minutely discussed. Total nine editorials were published in the year 2012. During the year 2013 Pakistan was declared as unsafe for journalists. Musharraf and Zardari once again faced harsh criticism.

During the year 2014 attack on Karachi airport, polio disease and India Pakistan conflict were discussed. The Army Public School attack took place and Imran Khan was criticized for this unfortunate incident. A total of nine editorials were published during the year 2014. During 2015 drone attacks, duplicity of Pakistani army leaders was discussed in ten editorials. 2016 remained no different in the context of presentation in *The New York Times*. Six editorials were published where nightmarish accusations were made about Pakistan. Pakistan was even accused of playing a double game with India and the terrorist activities with its territory.

Overall the newspaper painted a very threatening picture of Pakistan in its editorials. According to Yousaf⁶⁶ Associated Press, an American news agency decidedly gives a negative coverage to Pakistan. In the same way it appears that *The New York Times* uses a decidedly negative coverage to Pakistan.

Jabeen⁶⁷ emphasized the importance of language in breeding the power relations in a society. By using language as a major tool *The New York Times* presented Pakistan as a very feeble country, having dishonest and crooked politician, weak security strategies, crumbling economy, an army and intelligence agency that is facilitating terrorists, and pathetic social rights situation. Although Pakistan provided support to US in war against terrorism but US media always denounced Pakistan. The negative ideology about Pakistan was presented so furtively by using negative or negatively connoted words and phrases. As affirmed by Wanta, Golan and Lee⁶⁸ that negative coverage given to a country or nation by US media greatly influence the fate of that country in the minds of the people. Moreover it was concurred by Van Dijk⁶⁹ that ideologies take a long period of time to settle in a group of people. US media ideology about Pakistan is acutely negative and no doubt Pakistan has a negative international image. US media is very much successful in cultivating this ideology in the minds of readers around the world.

References

-
- ¹ Anne-Marie Gingras and Carrier Jean-Pierre. "Public opinion: Construction and persuasion." *Canadian Journal of Communication* 21, no. 4 (1996).
 - ² Sandra J. Ball-Rokeach and Melvin L. DeFleur. "A dependency model of mass-media effects." *Communication research* 3, no. 1 (1976): 3-21.
 - ³ Marko M. Skoric and Nathaniel Poor. "Youth engagement in Singapore: The interplay of social and traditional media." *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media* 57, no. 2 (2013): 187-204.
 - ⁴ Teun A. Van Dijk. "Opinions and ideologies in editorials." In *4th International Symposium of Critical Discourse Analysis, Language, Social Life and Critical Thought, Athens*, pp. 14-16. 1995.
 - ⁵ Muhammad Rafique. "US Image in the Pakistani Print Media: A Case Study of Pre and Post Abbottabad Operation." *NDU JOURNAL, XXVII* (2013): 2073-0926.
 - ⁶ Zafar Ali, Mirza Jan, and Noshina Saleem. "Portrayal of Pakistan by US leading news magazines." *Science International* 25, no. 4 (2013).
 - ⁷ Syed Abdul Siraj and Jyotika Ramaprasad. "Image of Pakistan in Elite US Newspapers: Exploring News Framing." *Strategic Studies* 27, no. 4 (2007): 20-52.
 - ⁸ Shahzad Ali. "US mass media and images of Pakistan: Portrayal of Pakistan by Newsweek and time magazines (1991-2001)." *American Communication Journal* 10 (2) (2008).
 - ⁹ Muhammad Ashraf Khan. "The image of Pakistan in prestigious American newspaper editorials: A test of the media conformity theory." *Strategic Studies* (2008): 105-128.
 - ¹⁰ Muhammad Ashraf Khan. "The image of Pakistan in prestigious American newspaper editorials: A test of the media conformity theory." *Strategic Studies* (2008): 105-128.
 - ¹¹ Douglas Kellner. "Review Essay: The media in and after 9/11." *International journal of Communication* 1, no. 1 (2007): 20.
 - ¹² Brigitte Lebens Nacos. *Mass-mediated terrorism: The central role of the media in terrorism and counterterrorism*. Rowman & Littlefield, 2007.
 - ¹³ Barbie Zelizer and Stuart Allan, eds. *Journalism after september 11*. Taylor & Francis, 2011.
 - ¹⁴ Sameeta Mishra. "Islam and democracy: An analysis of representations in the United States prestige press from 1985–2005." PhD diss., The University of Texas at Austin, 2006.

-
- ¹⁵ Shahzad Ali and Muhammad Khalid. "US mass media and Muslim world: portrayal of Muslims by news-week and time." *European Journal of Scientific Research* 21, no. 4 (2008): 554-580.
- ¹⁶ Barbie Zelizer and Stuart Allan, eds. *Journalism after september 11*. Taylor & Francis, 2011.
- ¹⁷ Rauf Arif. "September 11, 2001, attacks on the US & their effects on journalism in Pakistan." PhD diss., University of Kansas, 2009.
- ¹⁸ Ahmed Rashid. *Descent into chaos: the US and the failure of nation building in Pakistan, Afghanistan, and Central Asia*. Penguin, 2008.
- ¹⁹ Rauf Arif. "From sympathy to antipathy: Portrayal of Pakistan in the US news magazines." *Journal of Media Studies* 26, no. 2 (2011): 92-106.
- ²⁰ Muhammad Rafique. "US Image in the Pakistani Print Media: A Case Study of Pre and Post Abbottabad Operation." *NDU JOURNAL, XXVII* (2013): 2073-0926.
- ²¹ Shahzad Ali. "US mass media and images of Pakistan: Portrayal of Pakistan by Newsweek and time magazines (1991-2001)." *American Communication Journal* 10 (2) (2008).
- ²² Arif Rauf. "From sympathy to antipathy: Portrayal of Pakistan in the US news magazines." *Journal of Media Studies* 26, no. 2 (2011): 92-106.
- ²³ Amy Reynolds and Brooke Barnett. "This just in... How national TV news handled the breaking "live" coverage of September 11." *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* 80, no. 3 (2003): 689-703.
- ²⁴ Ahmed Rashid. *Descent into chaos: the US and the failure of nation building in Pakistan, Afghanistan, and Central Asia*. Penguin, 2008.
- ²⁵ Douglas Kellner. "Review Essay: The media in and after 9/11." *International journal of Communication* 1, no. 1 (2007): 20.
- ²⁶ Smeeta Mishra. "Islam and democracy: An analysis of representations in the United States prestige press from 1985–2005." PhD diss., The University of Texas at Austin, 2006.
- ²⁷ Brigitte Lebens Nacos. *Mass-mediated terrorism: The central role of the media in terrorism and counterterrorism*. Rowman & Littlefield, 2007.
- ²⁸ Noshina Saleem. "US media framing of foreign countries image: An analytical perspective." *Canadian Journal of Media Studies* 2, no. 1 (2007): 130-162.
- ²⁹ Shahzad Ali and Muhammad Khalid. "US mass media and Muslim world: portrayal of Muslims by news-week and time." *European Journal of Scientific Research* 21, no. 4 (2008): 554-580.

-
- ³⁰ Syed Abdul Siraj and Jyotika Ramaprasad. "Image of Pakistan in Elite US Newspapers: Exploring News Framing." *Strategic Studies* 27, no. 4 (2007): 20-52.
- ³¹ M. S. Sultan. "Portrayal of Pak-US relations in Elite Press of Pakistan and United States during Raja Pervaiz Ashraf Regime (June 2012-December 2012)." *Journal of Mass Communication Journalism* 3, no. 2 (2013): 149.
- ³² Salman Yousaf. "Representation of Pakistan: A Framing Analysis of the Coverage in the US and Chinese News Media Surrounding Operation Zarb-e-Azb." *International Journal of Communication* 9 (2015): 23.
- ³³ Barbie Zelizer and Stuart Allan, eds. *Journalism after September 11*. Taylor & Francis, 2011.
- ³⁴ Khan, Muhammad Ashraf. "The image of Pakistan in prestigious American newspaper editorials: A test of the media conformity theory." *Strategic Studies* (2008): 105-128.
- ³⁵ Fauzia Ahmad. "British Muslim perceptions and opinions on news coverage of September 11." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 32, no. 6 (2006): 961-982.
- ³⁶ Sameera Durrani and Mughees Uddin Sheikh. "The Pictorial Image of Pakistan in Newsweek and Time: Pre and Post-9/11." *Journal of the Research Society of Pakistan* 47, no. 1 (2010).
- ³⁷ Kiran Hassan. "The role of private electronic media in radicalising Pakistan." *The Round Table* 103, no. 1 (2014): 65-81.
- ³⁸ Muhammad Ashraf Khan and Aasma Safder. "Image of US in Pakistani Elite Newspaper Editorials after 9/11 Incident: A Comparative Study of The Dawn and Nawa-i-Waqt with Special Regard to Media Conformity Theory." *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences (PJSS)* 30, no. 2 (2010).
- ³⁹ Zachary S. Mitnik. "Post-9/11 media coverage of terrorism." (2017).
- ⁴⁰ Lori A. Peek. "Reactions and response: Muslim students' experiences on New York City campuses post 9/11." *Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs* 23, no. 2 (2003): 271-283.
- ⁴¹ Syed Abdul Siraj. "War or peace journalism in elite US newspapers: Exploring news framing in Pakistan-India conflict." *Strategic Studies* 28, no. 1 (2008): 194-222.
- ⁴² Halil Ibrahim Yenigun. "Muslims and the Media after 9/11: A Muslim Discourse in the American Media?." *American Journal of Islamic Social Sciences* 21, no. 3 (2004): 39-69.
- ⁴³ Salman Yousaf. "Representation of Pakistan: A Framing Analysis of the Coverage in the US and Chinese News Media Surrounding Operation Zarb-e-Azb." *International Journal of Communication* 9 (2015): 23.

-
- ⁴⁴ Gregory M. Maney, Lynne M. Woehrle, and Patrick G. Coy. "Ideological consistency and contextual adaptation: Us peace movement emotional work before and after 9/11." *American Behavioral Scientist* 53, no. 1 (2009): 114-132.
- ⁴⁵ Erik C. Nisbet, Ronald Ostman, and James Shanahan. "Public opinion toward Muslim Americans: Civil liberties and the role of religiosity, ideology, and media use." *Muslims in Western politics* (2009): 161-199.
- ⁴⁶ Kimberly A. Powell. "Framing Islam: An analysis of US media coverage of terrorism since 9/11." *Communication Studies* 62, no. 1 (2011): 90-112.
- ⁴⁷ Amir HY. Salama. "Ideological collocation and the recontextualization of Wahhabi-Saudi Islam post-9/11: A synergy of corpus linguistics and critical discourse analysis." *Discourse & Society* 22, no. 3 (2011): 315-342.
- ⁴⁸ Waheed Samy. "Perspectives on 9/11: A critical discourse analysis of ideologies, opinions, and attitudes in Arab Media." PhD diss., University of Michigan, 2004.
- ⁴⁹ Catherine Marshall and Gretchen B. Rossman. *Designing qualitative research*. Sage publications, 2014.
- ⁵⁰ Elifcan Karacan. "An Analysis of Biographies in Collective Memory Research: The Method of Socio-Historical Analysis." *Qualitative Sociology Review* 15, no. 3 (2019): 94-109.
- ⁵¹ Barbara Laslett. "Beyond methodology: The place of theory in quantitative historical research." *American Sociological Review* (1980): 214-228.
- ⁵² Alexander Wezel and Virginie Soldat. "A quantitative and qualitative historical analysis of the scientific discipline of agroecology." *International journal of agricultural sustainability* 7, no. 1 (2009): 3-18.
- ⁵³ Debin Ma. *Modern Economic Growth in the Lower Yangzi in 1911-1937: a Quantitative, Historical and Institutional Analysis*. Discussion paper 2004-06-002, Foundation for Advanced Studies on International Development, Tokyo, 2004.
- ⁵⁴ Keith Johnson. *Quantitative methods in linguistics*. John Wiley & Sons, 2011.
- ⁵⁵ Dean Keith Simonton. "Qualitative and quantitative analyses of historical data." *Annual review of psychology* 54, no. 1 (2003): 617-640.
- ⁵⁶ Ashley Dhanani. "Suburban built form and street network development in London, 1880–2013: An application of quantitative historical methods." *Historical Methods: A Journal of Quantitative and Interdisciplinary History* 49, no. 4 (2016): 230-243.

- ⁵⁷ Micah Dillard and Jon CW Pevehouse. "Quantitative Methods in Foreign Policy." In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Politics*. 2017.
- ⁵⁸ Valerie M. Hudson and Benjamin S. Day. *Foreign policy analysis: classic and contemporary theory*. Rowman & Littlefield, 2019.
- ⁵⁹ Cameron G. Thies. "Role theory and foreign policy analysis in Latin America." *Foreign Policy Analysis* 13, no. 3 (2017): 662-681.
- ⁶⁰ Teun. A. Van Dijk. "Critical Discourse Analysis. In *The handbook of journalism studies*, eds. Wahl- Jorgensen, K. & Hanitzsch, T, pp, 191–204. New York: Routledge, 2009.
- ⁶¹ Teun A. Van Dijk. "Discourse analysis as ideology analysis." In *Language & peace*, eds. Christina Schäffne, Anita L. Wenden pp. 41-58. London: Routledge, 2005.
- ⁶² Teun A. Van Dijk. "Opinions and ideologies in editorials." In *4th International Symposium of Critical Discourse Analysis, Language, Social Life and Critical Thought, Athens*, pp. 14-16. 1995.
- ⁶³ John Lee Allaman. "Nineteenth century homicide in Henderson County, Illinois: A study of court records and the press media as reliable sources for writing local history." (1990): 2212-2212.
- ⁶⁴ Ahmed Rashid. *Descent into chaos: the US and the failure of nation building in Pakistan, Afghanistan, and Central Asia*. Penguin, 2008.
- ⁶⁵ Salman Yousaf. "Representation of Pakistan: A Framing Analysis of the Coverage in the US and Chinese News Media Surrounding Operation Zarb-e-Azb." *International Journal of Communication* 9 (2015): 23.
- ⁶⁶ Salman Yousaf. "Representation of Pakistan: A Framing Analysis of the Coverage in the US and Chinese News Media Surrounding Operation Zarb-e-Azb." *International Journal of Communication* 9 (2015): 23.
- ⁶⁷ Sarwat Jabeen. "Ideological Representations of Pak-India Relations in Political Cartoons of Post 9/11 Print Media of Pakistan." *Journal of Historical Studies* 2, no. 2 (2016): 90-110.
- ⁶⁸ Wayne Wanta, Guy Golan, and Cheolhan Lee. "Agenda setting and international news: Media influence on public perceptions of foreign nations." *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* 81, no. 2 (2004): 364-377.
- ⁶⁹ Teun A. Van Dijk. "Discourse analysis as ideology analysis." In *Language & peace*, eds. Christina Schäffne, Anita L. Wenden pp. 41-58. London: Routledge, 2005.