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Abstract

Wars and opposition to them are all the time sold to the public through a propaganda that exploits the norms and values of the society. This paper studies the propaganda used by the Pakistani newspaper Jang and the American newspaper New York Times during the war on Afghanistan. Since the US and Pakistan are two nations with different cultures, it is interesting to show how local values are used in the media in order to popularize a certain stance on the war on Afghanistan. The author has used discourse analysis to analyze 10 articles of each newspaper during the week before the war and the first week of the war. This research concludes that neither Jang nor the New York Times gave objective reporting of the war on Afghanistan. The American paper justified the war through implicitly (and explicitly) the negative stereotypes about Muslims such as terrorist and extremism. In doing so, it was easy to condemn Islamic movement Taliban, and so wages war on Afghanistan since it rules the country. On the other hand, the Pakistani paper in general opposed the war through demonizing the American troops and showing them that they are killing innocent people of Afghanistan.
Introduction
Within days, after the 11 September attack, the president Bush called for what will be remembered generation after generation the “war on terror”. This war was waged in the name of god against the enemy which was demonized within a religious context (Andersen, 2006, p. 202). According to Bush’s rhetoric, it is a war between ‘civilization’ and ‘barbarism’, between ‘peace’ and ‘terrorism’, between ‘democracy’ and ‘dictatorship’, and so on and so forth (ibid, pp. xvi & xvii). However, whether in Afghanistan or Iraq, the main battlefields of the war on terrorism, the army of the ‘civilized’ and the ‘peaceful’ nation, we mean the US, killed and injured hundreds of thousands of innocent people. Moreover, those who came on the back of the American tank to rule Afghanistan and Iraq are involved in violations of human rights, and above all, they are far from being democratic and peaceful. But if this is the case, how did the US president manage to lobby the world, or at least the American people, behind him in such a controversial war?

In fact, propaganda was important in the war on terror because the opposition to the war was great; moreover, the motives for the invading another country was hardly convincing (Mral, 2004, p. 14). Wars are not only about using arms to fight ruthlessly; the battle includes also fighting tirelessly to win the public mind. In wars, thousands of people, if not millions, get killed, injured, tortured or displaced. Moreover, the war is financially costive and it means risking the lives of the nation’s beloved soldiers. Therefore, waging a war requires persuasive campaigns in which the public needs to be convinced that all diplomatic channels have been exhausted and that the war is being waged as a last resort (Andersen, 2006, p. xxi). In fact, wars at our times cannot be fought without the public support, and therefore, efforts need to be made to make the public supportive of the warfare (Nohrstedt, 2009, p. 84). As noted by Lasswell (cited in Andersen, 2006, pp. 5 & 6), “every war must appear to be a war of defense against a menacing, murderous aggressor”. In making the case for the war, politicians utilize established facts and assumptions, and build on the values and beliefs of the targeted audience, and that is what we actually call propaganda (Richardson, 2007, p. 181; Andersen, 2006, p. 8). Propaganda is” the active influencing of opinion: a simplified form of rhetoric that is used to steer out ideas and feelings towards a specific goal” (Mral, 2004, p. 12). In fact, it is very difficult to imagine a war without manipulation and lies, and this is actually applied to the war on terror (ibid, pp. 10&11).

With a special focus on the war on terror, this paper aims at explaining how propaganda is designed to control people’s thoughts. Analyzing media through discourse analysis shall be
explained at the second part of this essay as discourse tells us how myths and previous assumptions shape the discourse of certain issue; and this is actually central to understanding propaganda.

1.1 Purpose
This paper is a comparative study about the coverage of the war on Afghanistan between the US newspaper *New York Times* and the leading Pakistani newspaper *JANG*. In particular, this research applies discourse analysis, and specifically textual analysis, to analyze 20 news items (10 per each), selected from the week before the war and the first week of the war. Our main objective with this study is to explore propaganda used during the war on terror in both newspapers.

Although the previous studies on propaganda, one can say, are mature, it is interesting to apply propaganda theories on the media coverage of the war on terror. This work intends to emphasize the point that values and norms are the driving force of propaganda—without them there is no propaganda. Specifically this paper wants to emphasize what previous researches had come up with: fighting the evil and humanitarian intervention is politicians are telling us when they wage a war on other country. This paper also distinctive in that it fills the gap, seemingly ignored by many researchers, about how Pakistani media reported the war on terror, or to say it otherwise, how the propaganda looks like there—at their media.

1.2 Research Questions
1-How the war on Afghanistan was reported in *New York Times*?

2-How the war on Afghanistan was reported in the *Daily Jang*?

3-How different are the coverage of the two newspapers?

1.3 Background
In this part we will present some information about the media landscape in both Pakistan and the US in addition to explaining briefly the war on terror.

1.3.1 Media of Pakistan

1.3.1.1 Overview
Although media in Pakistan is sometimes subjected to pressure from military rule, it can be said that it is one of the freest media in south Asia as journalists enjoy to a large extent freedom of expression which is guaranteed by the constitution. (International Media Support, 2009, p.14). It was under the regime of General Musharraf, and exactly in 2002, the media
developed and liberated remarkably (ibid, p. 16). After decades of being regulated, or more rightly controlled, by the state, new laws that broke the state’s monopoly on media outlets were approved (ibid). However, freedom of speech in Pakistan is challenged indirectly by the political (often by the ruling and military power) groups. For instance, governments sometimes don’t allow ‘unfriendly’ media to attend government activities. More disturbingly, Pakistan has been called by many international media monitors as the most dangerous place on earth for journalists (Ricchiardi, 2012, p. 4).

Indeed media is paying a high price for reporting events in a country trapped by military people and different ethnic groups not to mention political groups such as al-Qaida and Taliban. Nevertheless, media has increasingly become a powerful force in civil society, and one cannot forget in this context that it played an important role in the downfall of the regime of General Musharraf in 2007 (International Media Support, 2009, p. 16). The media in Pakistan reflects the mixture of the different ethnic and social groups that form the Pakistani society (ibid, p. 6). As Urdu is the official language of the country, it is no strange that Urdu media are dominating the media in Pakistan, especially in the rural areas (ibid). Media in other languages such as Punjabi, Pashto and Sindhi exist in areas where these languages are used as mother tongue by people (ibid, p. 14). Because Pakistan witnessed long period of colonization under the British rule, it should not surprising that English media is widespread in the country. This type of media is elite-centric, and that is actually common in newly independent colonies where the elite still adheres to the values of the countries which were they colonized by before (ibid, p. 6).

1.3.1.2 Media landscape in Pakistan
The print media in Pakistan is the oldest in the country, dating back to before independent (ibid, p. 20). The number of the newspapers was counted 945 in 2003, with daily distribution of 6.2 million in the same year (ibid). Print media is published in 11 languages, but papers in Urdu language are dominating the market (ibid). There are three major players on print media market; First, Jang Group (will be explained in the next section); Second, The Dawn group which is seen as liberal and secular paper, producing an array of publications such as The Star, Herald, and the Dawn; and third, The Nawa-i-Waqt Group which publishes conservative newspapers in Urdu language such as Nawa-i-Waqt and The Nation (ibid).

The TV market in Pakistan was dominated for decades by Pakistan Television Corporation (PTV) (ibid, p. 21). It has today six channels; one of them is PTV Global, which broadcasts around the world (ibid). The TV produces programs in several languages; targeting the
different ethnic groups in Pakistan (ibid). The TV market was nourished in Pakistan in 2002, exactly after liberalizing the media in the country. As a result, the number of TV channels increased from 3 in 2000 to 89 in 2012 (Media of Pakistan, ¶ 3).

Radio is popular in both the rural and urban areas. The transmission costs and problems in electricity deprive many people in the rural area from watching TV; reasons make radio very popular there (International Media Support, 2009, p. 22). In urban areas, radio is increasingly getting popular due to the fact that many people lack time to watch TV (ibid). As the case with TV, radio was dominated by the state-run radio before 2002, and after this year, private radio channels started to enter the market quickly (ibid). The most important player is The Pakistan Broadcasting Corporation (PBC), which is run by the state with 31 stations that cover 80% of the country; with 95.5 million listeners (ibid).

The Daily Jang is the largest and oldest daily Urdu newspaper in Pakistan. It was first published in 1939 by Mir Khalil-ur-Rehman (Daily Jang Urdu Newspaper Pakistan History, ¶ 1). The newspaper is published from several cities in Pakistan, and also from London where a considerable number of native Pakistani living (ibid). Jang has the largest circulation in Pakistan, publishing over 800,000 copies per day (Daily Jang, ¶ 3). The newspaper targets women, men, kids, teenagers and old people through its variety of editions that cover many aspects of life (Daily Jang Newspaper, ¶ 2&6). Its different editions include weekly magazines, and supplements beside the daily newspaper, e.g. Jang Midweek magazine, Jang Sunday magazine, the Mag (a monthly edition); and educational, entertainment and children supplements on different weekdays (ibid). The newspaper is present online, and it is also published in English.

1.3.2 Media of the USA

1.3.2.1 Overview
America is a country where it was realized earlier that easy access to information is crucial to fostering of democracy. Already in 1783, the first daily newspaper was launched Philadelphia and Pennsylvania. Impressively, the country had around 2000 newspapers, including 200 dailies by 1850 (US Government: The media, ¶ 2). The freedom of press was protected in the First amendment of the U.S. constitution in 1971. It was stated that “Congress shall make no law… abridging the freedom of speech or of the press…” (The Media in the United States: Freedom of the Press, ¶ 1). However, the Supreme Court of the United States has excluded some categories from the freedom of expression: the Miller test for obscenity, child pornography laws, speech that incites imminent lawless action (Freedom of speech in the
United States, ¶ 1). It has to also be mentioned here that political pressure, as the case with many countries around the world, from government affects the freedom of press in the United States. The era of war on terror is one of those times the freedom of expression was challenged because of pressure from Bush administration (Media in the United States, ¶ 15 & 16). One of the most characteristics of the U.S. media is the fact that it is controlled by large for-profit corporations, which makes many of the U.S. media outlets as global players dominating the global market (Media of the United States, ¶ 1).

Because of the policy of profit-seeking coupled with the fact that global corporations have links with powerful political groups, it should not be surprising that the U.S. media has been widely accused of manipulation, plagiarism and propaganda (ibid).

1.3.2.2 Media landscape in the US
There are two types of print media in the U.S… newspapers and magazines. Print media, which is mostly privately owned, in general is popular in the U.S. due to the advertising revenues and the new information technology (Newspapers, ¶ 4). The computer technology helped publishers to segment the audience and produce customized magazines such as Automobile’s magazines, Children magazines, Health magazines, etc. (Magazines, ¶ 2 & 3). The most important magazine titles are NRTA/AARP Bulletin which has 21.1 million subscribers and Modern Maturity which has 21 million subscribers. There is no doubt also that New Information Technology fostered the market of the newspapers over the years, but Internet and the competition from television caused a decline of the number of daily pages of the newspapers (Newspapers, ¶ 5). US Today, New York Times, Wall Street Journal and Washington Post are the most important national newspapers in the country (ibid)

The era of the commercially licensed radio stations begun in 1920 (Radio, ¶1). Radio stations in the U.S. are generally commercial and profit-oriented. Some stations are only talk radio, which are political media featuring discussions and interviews; and some are music radio, broadcasting one type of music (Media of the United States, ¶ 4). American radio stations are generally territorial that broadcast in two bands: FM & AM (localized); however, Satellite Radio which broadcasts to wider geographical area is gaining popularity (ibid, ¶5). While the country had three radio stations in 1928, it had more than 14000 stations by 2003 (Radio, ¶ 2&6). The biggest American broadcasters are NBC (has also global audience), NPR, Clear Channel, Cumulus, Viacom’s Infinity (ibid, ¶ 7).
It has become the most popular medium in the United States since the Second World War (Television, ¶ 1). It is no strange thus that 99% of the American households have at least one TV (Media of the United States, ¶ 8).

As is the case with the radio, most of the U.S. TV channels are commercials; and only quarter of the channels is public (Television, ¶ 4&5).

TV broadcasters rely basically on advertisements and viewers’ contributions to finance their broadcasting (Media of the United States, ¶8). The major American broadcasters are ABC, CBS News, CNN, Fox News, NBC, and PBS (Television, ¶6). As is the case with newspapers, some of these channels like CNN and Fox News have international audience.

The *New York Times* is one of the largest and oldest newspapers in America which has become an important global actor in the world of media. The paper was first published in 1851, and since then won 108 prizes, more than any news organization in the world (The *New York Times* a, ¶1). One important factor had led to its early success is that it is focus on the cultured and intellectual segments instead of appealing to the mass audience (The *New York Times* b, ¶2). The paper started to become international when it was bought in 1896 by Adolph Simon Oschs (ibid). The new owner added Sunday magazine section, eliminated fiction from the paper, and reduced the cost of the paper (ibid, ¶3). The paper enhanced its prestige through its coverage of every aspect of the sinking of Titanic in April 1912 (ibid).

The newspaper is owned by the *New York Times* Company which published other 18 newspapers such as the International Herald Tribune and The Boston Globe (The *New York Times* a, ¶2). The website of *New York Times* receives more than 30 million visitors per month, which makes it the most popular website in the United States (The *New York Times* a, ¶1).

### 1.3.3 The war in Afghanistan

The war in Afghanistan was waged allegedly in response to the 11 September attack. Already hours after one of the worst attacks in the history of the United States accused Bush administration Osama bin-Laden and his network al-Qaida of being behind the tragedy. The American officials warned Taliban government, which ruled Afghanistan at the time, it should hand over al-Qaida leader; otherwise, it will suffer severe consequences the movement was seen not only as radical Islamic group, but also as a movement supporting terrorism and harboring Osama, the worst terrorist in the world according to the government of the United States. As Taliban refused the U.S. demands on the ground that Bush administration did not
provide any proof against bin-Laden, it became clear that the war on Afghanistan was inevitable. Under the heading “Operation Enduring Freedom” Begun the bombing of Afghanistan on the 7th of October 2001. On this date, Bush government launched a massive attack on Afghanistan, using B-52 bombers, B-1 stealth bomber, F-14 Tomcats, F-18 Hornets and submarines to bomb the country which already has poor infrastructure. This war which is still going on was the first chapter of what Bush administration called “the war on terror”; a war aimed at rooting out terrorists. But for many, the “war on terror” is a war of terror as the US and NATO troops did not only illegally occupied Afghanistan, but also committed war crimes against civilians. Moreover, Hamid Karzai, who came at the back of the American army to rule the country, is corrupt, and he is everything but democratic. At the end of the day, whether the U.S. war on Afghanistan is justified or not, Afghanistan is not a safe place after witnessing 12 years of war on terror; Afghans has become a war-torn society.
2 Literature review

Our theoretical researches have covered two subjects namely propaganda, and the media coverage of the war on Afghanistan.

The researches on the subject of propaganda seem to be mature, and especially that category related to the American propaganda. In this paper, we have reviewed many sources, but because we are pressed for space, we mention here two important works that we dwelled upon for understanding propaganda (read the theoretical framework for more sources). The first book is written by the researchers Jowett, G. S. & O’Donnell (1999), and entitled “Propaganda and Persuasion”. The importance of this work lies in the fact it begins with discussing in details the different proposed definitions of propaganda, and then proposes a comprehensive definition that makes it easy for young researchers to understand. This work begins with an important argument which is that the propagandists all the time exploit society’s values and norms for advancing their messages (1999, pp. 34& 35). What is impressive about this work is that it gives us a clue about how propaganda was practiced and directed from its early days by Greeks, to its use by the crusaders, and to the Twentieth century’s wars: WW1, WW2, the cold war, Korean war, etc. Only after reading this book, we will realize, indeed with bleeding a little from inside, that the killing of millions of innocents of people during these wars were given different names: liberation, humanitarian interventions, and everything but aggressions.

The second work we have mainly used in this work is a book written by the author Robin Andersen (2006), and entitled “A Century of Media, A Century of War”. Similar to the previous book, this work stresses the point that it is the highlighting of the nation’s values and beliefs what make the propaganda more convincing and successful. The authors have given examples from different wars (e.g. Korean war, the US interventions in Latin America, the First Persian Gulf war, etc.) to explain how these wars were portrayed as “good fights” and as struggle between “the good” and “the evil”. This volume is important to this particular work because it specifies almost half of it to the US-led wars in the Middle East, specifically the First Persian Gulf War and the War on Terror. In these two examples, the authors have illustrated that these two wars were poisoned heavily with black propaganda and merely lies, and people were told that there are two camps fighting there: the good and civilized, which
represents “us”, develop and protect innocents from the evil, which represents “them” who savagery persecute civilians and terrorize the world (2006, pp. 121, 122, 202-5, 220, 315).

The third book we have reviewed and used extensively was written by the Swedish media researcher Brigitte Mral (2006), and entitled “The Rhetorical State of Alert before Iraq War”. What is unique about this work is that it studies specifically the propaganda of the US and its allies during the war on terror. This work tells us how the US administration engineered its propaganda through borrowing notes from the western self-perception textbook, so to speak, in order to tell the public that the US has gone to the war, not only to retaliate and fight the terrorists, but to develop and civilize and cultivate democracy and love.

The second step of our theoretical researches was about the media coverage of the war on Afghanistan. Several works in this respect have been reviewed, and the conclusion was that the US media have adopted a pro-war stance, and applied the “us” and “them” approach. Two important volumes (2004; 2005) that were co-edited by the two Scandinavian scholars Stig Nohrsted and Runne Ottosen were used mainly here. These works contain articles written by different researchers who analyzed the media coverage of the war on terror on several countries, with a special attention to the US media. Unfortunately, as pointed out in these two books, the wars on Afghanistan and Iraq seemed difficult to be waged without the binary division the media created, and the misrepresentation and negative stereotyping of the Islamic world.
3 Theoretical Framework
In this chapter we will explain the theoretical concepts used in this research. This part is divided into two main subparts: propaganda and discourse analysis.

3.1 What is Propaganda?
According to Jowett & O’Donnell, propaganda is the deliberate, systematic attempt to shape perceptions, manipulate cognitions, and direct behavior to achieve a response that furthers the desired intent of the propagandist (1999, p. 6). Obviously, the goal of propaganda is to influence the public opinion and control people’s thoughts (Mral, 2004, pp. 12&13). Propaganda is characterized by the use of rhetoric as certain words, especially that type which appeal to the emotion of people, are used to steer the public according to the politicians’ interests (ibid, pp. 9, 10, 14).

Nonetheless, having said that propagandists are preoccupied with manipulating us, it does not necessarily mean that propaganda is about telling lies. Actually, there are three type of propaganda: white, gray, or black (ibid, p. 12). In white propaganda, the source is correctly identified and the information is accurate (ibid). However, it is called propaganda because it portrays the sender as the good side with best ideas and political ideologies (ibid). Black propaganda is on the other hand based on false source, and it spreads lies and fabrications (ibid, p. 13). A blatant example of black propaganda is Bush and Blair’s claim about the nonexistent weapons of mass destruction (WMD) in Iraq. Gray propaganda differs from black propaganda in that the source may or may not be correctly identified, and the accuracy of information is uncertain (ibid, p. 15).

3.1.1 Exploiting Society’s Values and Existing Beliefs
What must be emphasized here is that, regardless the type of propaganda, it remains worthy of study because it contains loaded language aims at influencing people. Regardless of its type, propaganda fuels the public’s imagination, fear and hatred (Andersen, 2006, p. 4). It does so through designing the message that resonates with the values and the existing public attitudes and beliefs (Doob cited in Andersen, 2006, p. 8). Let us take the current struggle of the Syrian people against the dictator Bashar al-Assad as an example to illustrate this point. Interestingly, both the West and the Islamic groups are united about the necessity of the regime change in Syria (at least publically). However, the west and the Islamic groups are propagandizing through employing different concepts that are taken from the values of their societies. While
the rhetoric of the Western leaders concerning Syria is mostly about democracy, the Islamic
groups rely on the belief that the Syrian regime is secular backed by the anti-religion
communist powers and Iran’s Shiites who want to destroy the Sunni Islam. Important to say,
Islamic groups share with the west the enmity to communism which is viewed as secular evil
and ruthless ideology. If anything, the above example emphasizes the argument advanced by
Jowett & O’Donnell (1999, p. 372) that propaganda is culture-specific as the elements of
culture such as ideologies, societal myths, government, economy, and social practices
influence propaganda. Moreover, propaganda is historically contextualized as history provides
a heritage for the propagandist to advance his or her interest (ibid, p. 370). Again, the example
about Syria helps us to advance this point. Ironically, al-Assad, who has been critical of the
West’s concept of terrorism, has been repeatedly claiming that he is in a war with the
terrorists, and meaning those who are struggling for a democratic Syria are terrorists.
Obviously, al-Assad, in his propagandistic talk about terrorism, does not address the Islamic
and Arab people who do not see any connection between terrorism and self-determination.
Clearly evident, in such type of propaganda, al-Assad, through relying in history, is asking the
West to side with him as he says that Syria, as the case with the West, has one enemy, which
is the Islamic terrorism. In a short, propagandist exploits an audience’s beliefs or values or
groups in such a way as to fan the fires of prejudice or self-interest (ibid, pp. 34& 35).

3.1.2 The Roots of the Discourse of Propaganda in War on Terror
Propagandists use belief to create belief. In other words, propaganda exploits the audience’s
beliefs or values or groups in such a way as to fan the fires of prejudgets or self-interest
(Jowett & O’Donnell, 1999, p. 34, 35 & 290). In the war on Afghanistan, the US and the
invading armies have used all what can be used from the catalogue of the existing
assumptions in order to demonize Taliban regime, which was at the time ruling the
Afghanistan. Taliban militants were regarded as extremist terrorists, abuser of women, and
as standard bearer of freedom and democracy, the US has been claiming moreover that it has
a civilizational mission in Afghanistan and seeks to develop the country (Mral, 2004, p. 29;
McEwan, 2009, p. 148). In other words, the bombardment of Afghanistan is being called
fighting the evil terrorists, and the occupation of Afghanistan is being termed peace and
development. We will explain in the following how such brandings came into being. Two
topics will be explained here: orientalism and development theory.
3.2 Orientalist Discourse

The war on Afghanistan is a war in which some western countries have a military affair in a Muslim country. Accordingly, it is no strange that rivals use in their propaganda the already established assumptions and stereotypes about their opponents in designing their propaganda. As we are concerned in this study with the pro US-NATO propaganda, orientalism theory will give us hand in understanding how the enemy image is created in the Afghanistan war. Orientalism examines how the formal study of the orient (the Middle East) in the West, in addition to key literary and cultural texts consolidated certain ways of seeing the orient (McEwan, 2009, p.62). Edward Said, one of the founders of postcolonial studies, criticizes the false assumptions, negative stereotypes and prejudices which underline the Western attitudes towards the orient (ibid). The orientalism discourse regards the orient, particularly the Muslim world, as irrational, terroristic, extremist, uncivilized and against woman (Said, 1978, p. 108; Eide, 2002, pp.11, 14&15; McEwan, 2009, pp. 90, 150). What makes orientalism important to the subject of this research is that orientalism discourse justifies Europe and the USA’s colonial ambitions in the Middle East (McEwan, 2009, p. 62).

3.3 Development Discourse

One of the most important arguments in the war on terror is that the western troops were sent to Afghanistan in order to help people there, build democracy and promote human rights. In fact, the idea of believing that one has the right to help others and to develop them and civilize them cannot be separated from colonialism. Western colonial projects were based partly on imagination of the world; they perceived themselves as superior who has the mission of civilizing other nations who were depicted as backward, irrational, feminized and incapable of governing themselves (ibid, p. 124). Affected by the legacy of colonization, the development discipline had emerged after the World War through introducing to the world the modernization theory. Unable to free itself from the colonial legacy, the modernization school had maintained the problem of underdevelopment in the Third World to the local traditions and had called for universalizing the Western values (Nederveen, 2010, pp. 34, 112&113). Modernization theories of development argue for imposing legal and political systems and the economics of the North (the West) on other nations (McEwan, 2009, p. 132). The use of the excuse of development in intervening in others’ affairs is based on the self-perception as superior, and thus, ‘we’ have the right to aid/develop/civilize/empower ‘them’, who are generalized under one category: primitive, savage, minor, and so on (ibid, pp. 122, 124, & 147).
What makes the development discourse important to this study is the fact that it tends to normalize the ‘new’ imperialism and re-colonize the Middle East through the claims of spreading democracy and bringing liberalization to the region (ibid, p. 148). As criticized by the postcolonial theorists, the lessons of development are unconsciously ethnocentric (ibid, p. 120). The development discourse justifies colonialism and intervening in others’ affairs through establishing imaginary assumptions about ‘us’ (the West), which means normal, good, democratic, developed, civilized, etc. and ‘them’ (non-West), which means abnormal, evil, barbaric, undeveloped, savage, etc. (ibid, pp. 88, 123 & 126).

3.4 The Discourse of the War on Terror: (The War on Afghanistan)

3.4.1 Terrorism Theme (Demonizing the Enemy)
Demonizing the enemy is a practice seems to be used in most wars; enemies need to be dehumanized and irrationalized in order to justify wars against them. In his book entitled “A century of media, a century of war”, the writer Robin Andersen (2006) gives several examples about how the enemy was demonized in number of conflicts where the governments of the USA were involved. The regime of North Korea was branded as “communist slavery” during the Korea war; El Salvador, where the US was involved in a proxy war in the eighties, was described indirectly as evil; Iraqis were described in the 1990 Gulf War as evils killing babies and so on (ibid, pp. 37, 98, 170 & 171). In the war propaganda, the demonized enemy is no longer described as human, and therefore, can be killed without empathy (Jowett & O’Donnell, 1999, p. 295; Andersen, 2006, p. 6). Based on that, the killing of the North Koreans are justifiable because they are communists; it does not matter if they are human beings or not (Andersen, 2006, p. 42). Similarly, the bombardment of the Japanese and German cities during the World War I was justifiable because U.S and its allies were waging “good fight” against the “ruthless demonized enemies” (ibid, pp. 42&43).

In the era of the war on terrorism, “terrorism” had become the new label for the demonized enemy. Following the 11 September attack, the president of the USA, George W. Bush, declared what will be then called from that point in history onward, the war on terrorism. However, there is no global agreement about the definition of terrorism (Goodwin, 2006, p. 2027). If it is about the unlawful targeting of civilians to achieve political goals, the military acts practiced by the US and Israel should be then put in the textbook of terrorism; and if it is about only targeting civilians and non-combatants, many of military acts practiced by Taliban against the invading troops in Afghanistan should not be placed then under the heading of terrorism (For more examples see Chomsky, 2002). The point is that terrorism has been
misused to the extent that the state oppression has been legitimized, and the struggle for self-
determination has been criminalized (Karim, 2002, p. 104). One might even argue that
politicians and media outlets, on their focus on the Islamic world, have made the world thinks
that terrorism is solely an Islamic phenomenon. The Eurocentric civilization is pilled against
the barbaric world, which throws up the challenges of “Islamic terrorism”, “macro-terrorism”,
and “nuclear terrorism” (ibid, p. 29). Now the designers of the war on terrorism might say
otherwise, but for many in the Middle East, it is a war, in every respect, on the Muslim world.
Despite this argument ignores the complexity of the international politics, it gains weight
because the terrorists which politicians mostly concern within the era on the war on terrorism
are those who adhere to Islamic beliefs. In fact, Bush’s rhetoric about terrorism were
calculated one as one may argue Mr. president has borrowed concepts from the already
existent beliefs in order to demonize his enemies and eventually propagandize for the war on
terrorism. As put by Karim (2002, p. 29), in the era of the war on terrorism, the historical
stereotypes have been invoked in order to demonize the challengers of the US policies, so the
north is viewed as the domain of rationality, order and democracy, and the south (particularly
the Muslim societies) that or irrationality, instability and tyranny. In fact, what is important to
stress upon here is that demonizing the enemy in the war on terror through the usage of words
such as “terrorists” and “extremists” is related to the orientalist discourse that attributes
terrorism to the Islamic orient. This is not an exaggeration as in the international politics;
terrorism is often used to describe military actions practiced by Islamic groups. Of course,
several non-Middle Eastern military groups were also called terrorists; however, demonizing
the enemy with the terrorism branding is mostly used against enemies belonging to the
Middle East (see Jowett & O’Donnell, 1999; Andersen, 2006). Movements fighting in Darfur
or in south Sudan for self-determination are not terrorists, but Hamas and Taliban, which also
fight for the self-determination of their people, are called terrorists because they are Islamic.
Arguably, it is easy to invoke the charge of terrorism as long as the person or the organization
in charge is Islamic. In fact, the war on terrorism has made almost every Muslim as a terrorist
or supporting terrorism. For instance, whether in the US, in the UK, in France, in Sweden, or
in any place in the West, the word “terrorism” pops up very often when Muslims arrested for
political reasons.

In fact, the best recipe to demonize and irrationalize an individual or a group is to invoke the
charge of terrorism. Terrorism denotes the utmost crime, and therefore, people usually do not
express any sorrow when the terrorists are killed. Combating terrorism was an important
theme in the war on Afghanistan as terrorists were perceived as threat to freedom and
democracy (McEwan, 2009, p. 147). The context in which the 11 September struck was missing; The US imperial policy and the US support for the Israeli suppression of Palestinians were forgotten, and terrorists and the challengers of the US policy were irrationalized and depicted as merely evil extremists. George Bush has compared the terrorists with Nazism and Fascism, and said once, in one of his most remembered phrases, that those who are opposing us are just doing so because they hate our freedom and our democratic values. When branding an enemy as terrorist, people forget that this enemy might struggle for a just case, which makes the issue not “the injustice this enemy encounter”, but “this enemy must be fought mercilessly since it is an irrational terrorist”. That is why using excessive force is justified against the demonized enemy, and any damage to the civilian population is regrettable, but unavoidable (Mral, 2004, p. 21). In this sense, as the case when it was to kill the North Koreans during the Korean War, it is OK to kill Taliban, as it OK to kill Hamas and so on: they are evil anyway. Unfortunately, many international human rights organizations have been victims of this demonization, as we they criticize the US for targeting civilians so not counting many of non-combatant persons who belong to Taliban.). In a word, when the enemy is an Islamic, the charge of terrorism is ready and it can be easily accepted since it does come in line with the stereotypes and assumptions about Muslim world.). In a word, when the enemy is an Islamic, the charge of terrorism is ready and it can be easily accepted since it does come in line with the stereotypes and assumptions about Muslim world.

3.4.2 Development Theme
We have explained that in propaganda the enemy should be demonized in order to justify actions against him. However, in today’s propaganda, the nation the enemy belongs to is not described as cruel or anything as such; they are described as victims of the tyranny of the enemy (ibid, p. 20). This is actually important as it gives rise to another justification for the war: to liberate people from their evil leaders. We have explained earlier that the West, which unconsciously sees itself as superior, gives itself the right to intervene in the affairs of others in the name of development. The war on terror, and in specific the US-NATO war on Afghanistan, was portrayed as a war, not only directed at fighting terrorism, but also, equally important, as a war aimed at helping people, promoting human rights and protecting women (ibid, pp. 35-2, 53 & 54). President George W. Bush has used the “us and them” discourse in the war on terror as he attempted to sell this war as a conflict between “civilization” and “barbarism” (McEwan, 2009, pp. xvi & xvii). As put by Richardson, the war on terrorism was in part rhetorically built on the racist concept that “the West” is responsible for civilized the world (2007, p. 191). In what follows, we will explain how the war on terror, specifically the
occupation of Afghanistan, is being justified. In other words, we will explain how the new imperialism is being justified through giving it cosmetic labels such as freedom and democracy, helpfulness, protecting women.

3.4.3 Freedom and Democracy Themes
Almost in all the US wars after the Second World War, whether in Korea, Vietnam, Grenada, proxy wars in Latin America, the Iraqi Wars 1990 & 2003, or in the current war on Afghanistan, the US was presenting itself as promoter of freedom, modernity and human rights fighting ruthless enemy, who regardless if he is a communist (or leftists) or Islamist, he represents barbarity and evilness (Andersen, 2006, pp. 37, 47, 48, 73, 121, 122). As stressed ironically by Richardson (2007, p. 191), propaganda during the 2003 war on Iraq tried to convince journalists that the US troops was trying to ‘free Iraqis’. Similarly, the then US president frequently used the word “freedom” to refer to his warfare in Afghanistan (Marl, 2004, p. 31&32). In his speech on the 20th of September 2000, President Bush proclaimed that the USA has a historic mission to liberate the world (ibid, p. 29). Freedom and liberty are Central American values, so it is not surprising the US officials refer to them in their war on terrorism propaganda (ibid, p. 31). The US president announced on October, 7, 2001, that “Enduring Freedom” will be the name of the US military operation in Afghanistan, the first chapter of the war in terrorism (ibid, p. 34). Without a bit of irony, this propaganda carries the message that the US is going to liberate the Afghani people from Taliban through occupying their country and bombing it back to the Stone Age. This arrogance is not really new as the US had sent troops in 1989 to Panama in order to ‘liberate’ the country from the Dictator Manuel Noriega, who before anything, was from Panama, which means the world ‘liberate’ is inadequate, especially it is said by a foreign force.

The theme of freedom in the war on Afghanistan was emphasized by ‘Photos of Freedom’ in the White House website, where American soldiers appeared as liberators and benefactors (ibid, p. 33). What must be emphasized here is that intervening in the affairs of non-European people in the name of Western freedom derives its legitimacy from the assumption about American idealism and generally transcendent Enlightenment values (development values) (Andersen, 2006, p. 48). What is important to note when concluding this subject is that the situation in Afghanistan is not promising after the toppling down of Taliban regime; Hamid Karzai, the president of Afghanistan, who came to the country on the back of the American tank, is corrupt to the bone, and his regime resembles everything but democracy.
3.4.4 Helpfulness Theme
One of the excuses which were/are used in the war on Afghanistan is helping people there to build up their country (Mral, 2004, p. 53). Very often we hear in the news about the coalition forces building schools and training police and security forces. In one of his war speeches, Bush observed that “the oppressed people of Afghanistan will know the generosity of America and our allies. as we strike military targets, we will also drop food, medicine, and supplies to the starving and suffering men and women and children of Afghanistan” (ibid, p. 54). In order to promote the idea that the US is helping Afghans, the White House provided in its website photos and information about humanitarian operation in Afghanistan for Afghan women and children (ibid, p. 54). What must be noted here is that claiming the humanitarian mission or the helpfulness is aimed at legitimizing the war and balancing the act of aggression on another country (ibid, p. 53). Important to note before closing this subject, the invading armies of Afghanistan have committed war crimes against the people who they claimed to help: tens of thousands of civilians have been killed or injured, and needless to say, the infrastructure of Afghanistan has been destroyed because of the war.

3.4.5 Women Rights Theme
Because the Islamic orient is negatively stereotyped as being cruel towards women, it was unsurprising that the excuse of helping women was used partly, as noted by Mral (2004, pp. 36&37) to justify the war on Afghanistan. Let us listen to what Laura Bush said in a campaign against Taliban regime. She claimed that Taliban regime did not allow children to fly kites and they “threatened to pull out women’s fingernails for wearing nail polish” (Mral, 2004, p. 36). Now the question is not whether these stories are true or myths, but whether can anyone believes that the United of States of America had sent troops to Afghanistan because Taliban did not allow children to fly kites. And is it really true that Taliban mistreats their children and their women?

The global media have reported stories about the Taliban regime oppressing their women, not allowing girls to go to school, prohibiting them from work and so on and so forth. We hear even stories about people forcing their daughters to marry elderly men, and episodes about men raping their women. Interestingly, we hear a lot of stories about women being oppressed by men; but not even a single story about Taliban being nice with women and children. Now it is very difficult to judge whether all their stories are true or not, but we have the right to be skeptical about such version of reality for the following reasons: First, claiming that all Taliban men are abuser of women rights contradict the fact that Afghanistan is characterized as a society with a strong family bonds. If men are cruel towards their women and daughter,
the family concept cannot sustain because the relation between the two pillars of the family will be authoritarian and not collaborative. Second, the US has a long history of demonizing its enemies through spreading lies. Have we forgotten the biggest lie in the modern history about Iraqi soldiers throwing Kuwaiti babies from the window? Have we forgotten the big lie about the weapon of mass destruction?

Arguably, the stories about women oppression in Afghanistan would not have been spread if the Islamic orient is not stereotyped as being savage against women. In fact, Taliban are not the only people who are accused of mistreating women. Ask people in the West about Muslim men and many will tell you that they are mistreating their women. In any case, it is important to remind the reader while we are talking about helping women in Afghanistan with this truth. The US army, which claims to help the Afghani women, was involved in raping women in Iraq, and in bombardment of women in Afghanistan.

3.5 Media and the War on Terror
The war on terror (in Afghanistan and Iraq) contained a lot of controversies. While the war on Afghanistan was obviously a response to the 11 September terrorist attack, it has to be mentioned also, the terrorist attack itself, according to its perpetrators, a response to the US imperialist policies in the Middle East. Important to tell also, the American troops committed war crimes in Afghanistan and Iraq, as they killed or injured hundreds of thousands of civilians and bombarded the two countries under the excuse of combating the evil and helping the locals. These are not unconfirmed reports; many media reports outside the US have talked about that, and WikiLeaks documents have proved that. But, where were the US media from all this?

Sadly, the US media had not applied its watchdog mission, and it rather advanced the pro-war propaganda designed by the US officials during the war on terror (Andersen, 2006, pp. 201, 206&207). The US media did not play a critical role in questioning the US involvement in wars, and it rather promoted pro-war argument (DiMaggio, 2008, p. 77). If we accept the premise argued by Höijer, Nohrstedt&Ottosen (2004, p. 11) that media is a driving force in development not to mention influencing public and politicians, it would be legitimate then to say that media organizations also, and not only Bush and Blair, should be blamed for the bloodshed in Afghanistan. Horrible words such as the followings about the Muslim world appeared in the US media: “we should invade their countries, kill their leaders and convert them to Christianity” (Kellner, 2003, p. 9). The media researcher Anthony DiMaggio has launched an attack on the US media for not discussing the possible motives behind the 11
September attack, and for merely parroting the American officials’ argument that the terrorists attacked America because of its democratic values and that the war on Afghanistan is aimed at liberating people, promoting human rights and women emancipation (2008, p. 253-12).

Obviously as noted by Richardson, journalists are often exposed to propaganda during wartimes, and they become even shaped and driven by this propaganda (2007, p. 180). Nevertheless, one cannot completely accept that media outlets were merely victims of officials’ manipulation especially new telecommunication technologies allow us to know another version of the story. Al-Jazeera for instance, although one must also recognize its anti-US bias, has offered a different perspective, which of course can be another source for cross-checking claims said by the US officials (Figenschou, 2005, pp. 75 & 77). So, apart from world’s officials who were enthusiastic about the war on terror, people working in media organizations are to blame also for making the case for the war on terror. Logically, patriotism is one of the reasons why the US media adopted pro-war argument. The scene of the planes hitting the US at home – especially how around 3000 civilians were indiscriminately killed, was definitely shocking. Perhaps many American citizens have said to themselves that our government must bring the criminals to justice by all costs. Obviously, and because objectivity is a myth, one can understand that journalists, whether consciously or not, tend to side with their countries, especially in times of wars—and American journalists are expected to do so. Many US journalists have adopted ‘patriotic’ attitude in their coverage of the war on terror (Kellner, 2003, p. 11). As Victor Navasky, a distinguished journalist and publisher, noted, the post-September 11 journalism is characterized by “rallying around the flag”, and those who questioned the national policy was seen as giving aid to the enemy (Miller, 2004, p. 27). To achieve this, the US media have not really focused on the destruction made by the US-led forces in Afghanistan. Sadly, in the international politics and media, many victims are not treated as worthy victims (Höijer, Nohrstedt&Ottosen, 2004, p. 11). The stuff of CNN were told by their chief, if it was necessary to report civilian casualties of the Afghan war, they should balance that with a reminder about the victims of the 11 September terrorist attack (ibid, p. 12). Strikingly, American media in general focused on the combat at action, and they avoided depicting civilian casualties hit by US air raids (Sharkey cited in Figenschou, 2005, p. 78).

Chomsky &Herman’s “manufactured consent” on propaganda might gives us further explanations on why the US media have taken pro-war stance. There are five filters according to this doctrine that determine the media contents (Chomsky & Herman in Lilleker, 2006, pp. 107& 108). The first filter is ownership, size and profit orientation (ibid, p. 106). Mainstream
media organizations, such as CNN, Fox News, and Associated Press are corporate seeking profit. As noted by Richardson, newspapers are businesses and many of them exist to make profits (2007, p. 77). And as a result, it is pro-capitalism, and it shouldn’t surprise us, since the US government is capitalist, that it extensively relies on US military sources in imposing the US foreign policy agenda (DiMaggio, 2008, p. 18). Financialization of media is one of the reasons for dominating the official propaganda in the US media as news stories are evaluated according to their significance to the viewers (Miller, 2004, p. 309). Of course, as noted by Richardson (2007, p. 90), considering the audience affects the choice of the story, tone and the style of its presentation. Logically, since the Bush war on terror was claimed to hunt down the terrorists, and many of the US interventions were said to enhance the US model of capitalism, we should not be surprised when the US media promote pro-war argument. The second filter in Chomsky & Herman propaganda model is advertising and funding of the newspapers, which lead into bias because the media organizations have to consider the views of its funders (Lilleker, 2006, p. 107). Sourcing of the news is the third filter (ibid). Because media organizations cannot afford sending reporters to all places, they have to rely on small groups of experts, people and news sources in order to produce their content (ibid, pp. 107&108). Of course, these small groups must be reliable- actually must appear reliable-, which means at the eyes of many people officials (who of course support the war). The fourth filter is called flak, which are the attempts to undermine the voices that are critical of the official line (ibid, p. 108). Example for that is accusing, as mentioned earlier, those who criticize the war on terror of giving aid to terrorists. The fifth filter is anti-communism, which has been changed today to “rough states” and “war on terror”, or anything promotes the US and THEM discourse (ibid). The US media has promoted the argument of clash of civilization through enhancing the US-THEM discourse: a war between civilization and Islamic terrorism (Kellner, 2003, p. 5; Nohrstedt & Ottoson, 2005, p. 13). In fact, intensifying the talk about “our values”, and “theirs” create connection to emotion, and that is what characterizes the coverage of the US media for the war on terror-emotionalization (Miller, 2004, pp. 30 & 31). Bill O’Reilly of Fox News has said chillingly that Islamic fundamentalism is the enemy of the US (Miller, 2004, p. 27). Thinkers of the “clash of civilization” doctrine, obviously the right-wing hard-liners, have dominated the TV and newspapers to promote the military intervention in the Middle East (Miller, 2004, p. 28). Openly for example in the New York Times, Michael Ignatieff has called for a new and thoroughgoing imperialism (Miller, 2004, p. 29). The media in the US has basically, whether radio, TV, or newspapers, fueled hatred, promoted dangerous and lunatic views, and called for violence against Arabs and Muslims (Kellner, 2003, p. 10). Hysterically, Jeane Kirkpatrick of Fox News observed that the US should fight Islam and
defends the West (Kellner, 2003, p. 5). In another example of the US- THEM content in the American media networks, Ivar A. Iversen provides us with an interesting comparative study about how bin-Laden and McVeigh, the person who bombed Oklahoma in 1995. While the al-Qaida leader was depicted in Time and Newsweek as evil and terrorist because of his (Islamic) culture, McVeigh was humanized, psychologized, and pathologized, and more importantly, his culture is innocence of his terroristic deed (Iversen, 2004, pp. 82, 84 & 86).

We have explained in this section how media practices promote the official propaganda. Definitely, it is important to understand these practices, in addition to the official practices, when analyzing media texts. Let us shed the light now on how media products can be analyzed though using the method discourse analysis.

3.6 Discourse Analysis
To be as persuasive as possible, propaganda should rely on social myths and assumptions in delivering its message. In other words, politicians use what have been said earlier, repeat previous claims, take into consideration previous social practices, and assume certain knowledge about the audience’s beliefs when trying to convince us about a certain issue. We call this how the discourse is produced. Discourse can be defined as “an institutionalized way of talking that regulates and reinforces action and thereby exerts power” (Link cited in Jäger & Maier, 2009, p. 35). Discourse according to the cultural theorist Stuart Hall is “about the production of knowledge through language (1997a, p. 44). Analyzing the discourse would give us then insights into how the propaganda is socially engineered as it will help us to understand how the talks and claims have been institutionalized. Discourse analysis is the analysis of “what and how language communicates when it is used purposefully in particular instances and contexts” (Cameron cited in Richardson, 2007, p. 24). It is important to note that discourse analysis is not only linguistic analysis, and it requires analyzing the language through discourse and link it to wider-personal, institutional, socio-cultural and material contexts (Richardson, 2007, p. 24). This argument is actually based on the point that all social practices entail meaning, and meaning shape and influence what we do (Hall, 1997a, p. 44).

The link between the language and social practices makes discourses not merely ‘expressions of social practices’, but also illustrates how the power is exercised (Jäger & Maier, 2009, p. 35). This premise stems actually from the fact that it is power in a society that regulates the ways of talking, thinking and acting (Jäger & Maier, 2009, p. 35). In light of this, one could expect that the ruling elite, since it is mostly well-off, and has access to education and to media, has the power to influence the discourse in a particular in a certain way. Discourse
cannot be thus separated from relations of power in a society especially since it operates in conditions of unequal relation (Hall, 1997b, p. 261). In this sense, those who have the power to say something influence more the knowledge about this thing. This is why discourse does not reflect reality, and it rather constitutes reality in specific contexts according to particular relations of power (Lidchi, 1997, p. 185).

In fact, our knowledge of reality cannot be taken for granted as our knowledge and representations of the world are products of the ways we describe the world or products of discourse (Jørgensen, 2002, p. 5). In light of this, it is important to underline the fact that power does not only assume the authority of ‘the truth’ but has the power to make it true (Hall, 1997, p. 49). Power in this context governs what can be talked about, and rules out alternative ways of talking (Jørgensen, 2002, p. 14). In most cases, influential power is centralized in the hands of the ruling class, the state, which means the direction of knowledge, is from top to bottom (Hall, 1997a, p. 49). As far as the orientalism discourse is concerned, Said argues that the images about the Orient constructed by Europe do not reflect the reality, but Europe has the power to construct, manage and produced (Hall, 1997b, p. 259). Yet power exists at lower levels (e.g. individuals, challenging groups, civil society organizations), which means power can be also productive, and produces challenging discourse (Hall, 1997a, p. 50). The discourse of the war on terror, for instance, although the US has the power to construct our knowledge about it, many people worldwide have started to rethink terrorism and question the motives of the USA in Iraq and Afghanistan. Arguably, this shift can be explained through the works of many anti-war movements and intellectuals, and one cannot also ignore the role of Al-Jazeera channel in providing another perspective to the world.

3.7 Critical Discourse Analysis
Discourse does not reflect reality and it all the time produces partial, situated knowledge through naturalizing and universalizing a particular view of the world; moreover, since it is embedded in power relations, discourse determines what is possible to say, the criteria of ‘truth’, who is allowed to speak with authority and where such speech can be spoken (McEwan, 2009, p. 122). Obviously, this leads to suppressing the voice of the week, naturalizing the ideology of the powerful which has the power to not only universalizing its values, but also misrepresenting the weak. Ideology in this context is the ways of thinking in which historically transient exploitative forms of social organization are represented as eternal, natural, inevitable, or rational (Jones cited in Richardson, 2007, p. 34). To complicate this issue further, the ideological state apparatuses are not the expression of the domination of the ruling ideology (the ideology of the ruling class), but are the sites and the means of
realization of that domination (ibid, p. 34). When the ruling class succeeds in implanting its values without the application of force, it becomes hegemonic, and acquires power and political legitimacy, and as a result becomes influential in shaping the discourse about a certain topic (ibid, p. 35). The ruling class becomes hegemonic though conscious and considering the demands of the working class, but without affecting the economic privilege of the ruling class (ibid). The work of journalists is a good example to illustrate this point as they rely on certain sources such as the official ones because it is presumed to be authoritative, which means legitimizing the official voices, and consequently normalizing their ideologies (ibid, p. 36).

From this perspective emerged a doctrine called Critical Discourse Analysis, which, is critical to the language use, and connects language with the social in order to reveal misrepresentations (Hesmondhalgh, 2006, p. 122). CDA regards discourse as a circular process in which social practices affect the way the text is produced, and in turn, texts help influence society via shaping the viewpoints of those who read them (Richardson, 2007, p. 37). CDA is culturally and historically contextualized, and it is concerned with social problems (e.g. racism), power relations, and revealing the ideological use of language (ibid, pp. 26&27). Applying CDA is important in helping us into understanding propaganda since the latter illustrates how actors benefit from their power to advance their propaganda.

There are different approaches to CDA. In this study, we want to introduce Norman Fairclough’s approach which analyses the relationships between concrete language use and the wider social and cultural structures. Fairclough’s approach is important in that it seeks to respond to the reproducing of social inequality; it aims at affecting the social practices and social relationships, particularly on relationships of disempowerment and prejudice and discrimination (ibid, p. 26). In this approach, the analysis is conducted according to three dimensions: text, discursive practices, and social practices (ibid, p. 37). As this study applies only textual analysis, the other two dimensions will not be explained in the followings

3.7.1 Textual Analysis
It analyses how the propositions are structured and combined, it examines what is present and is not present in the text, the choice of the word and so on (ibid, p. 38). However, text analysis is a linguistic analysis in relation to their direct or indirect involvement in reproducing or resisting the systems of ideology and social power (ibid, p. 39). In what follows we explain four concepts of textual analysis which are going to be applied in this study.
3.7.1.1 Lexical Analysis
Journalists have to always choose only one word from different possible synonyms that carry the same meaning. Words, as stressed by Richardson (2007, p. 47), have in addition to the denoted meanings, connoted meanings. For instance, “crazed” and “terrorist” are two words could be used to describe a person who committed a horrible crime, but they still connotes differently as the latter is a word loaded with a lot of negative political and cultural views. As noted by Richardson, words convey the social values and judgments, and that’s why it is important to understand the reason behind their selection (ibid). As noted by van Dijk (2009, p. 70), the choice of word expresses the ideological perspective of the author.

-Naming and reference: Giving names to actors in the news story is one the most important issues should concern us when conducting lexical analysis. When journalists give names to actors, they actually give them a social category (ibid, p. 49), and, although it could be a précis description, it nevertheless could carry a different implicit meaning. For instance, saying that an “immigrant man was behind the ruthless crime” does not only mean someone who is not native committed a crime, but, indeed, immigrants are the source of evil in this country. Reference strategy as proposed by van Dijk, is characterized by positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation (cited in Richardson, 2007, p. 51). In this sense, “ours” are described positively, like Anders Brevik, who was initially psychologized and humanized; and “theirs” are negatively described, such as al-Qaida terrorists, who were not even assumed, even jokingly, that they could also have psychological problems.

3.7.1.2 Sentence Construction: Syntax and Transitivity
Transitivity forms the most important part of presentation because it is concerned with the roles the participants play in the processes described in the news story; it tells us about how actions are presented and “who” (or what) does what to whom (or what) (ibid, p. 54). And since there are all the time different ways to describe things, it should not surprise us that there is a social and ideological significance between these choices in journalism (ibid, pp. 54 &56). An important aspect of transitivity is the difference between using the active and passive voice to describe a transitive action, which indeed connotes different implicit meanings. When we choose to transform an action from a transitive action process (active) to a relational process (through using passive voice) we remove a sense of specificity and clauses from the clauses (ibid, p. 55). And when we delete the actor from the passive clause, his deletion will indeed be highly important (ibid). For instance, there is a connotative difference between saying “five people were killed by the security forces” and “the security forces killed five people”. Obviously, the first statement attempts of downplay the act of the
security forces through removing the specificity. The difference is even greater when we say that “five people were killed”. What is important to note here is that at some cases when the agency is removed it does not refer to a case of reference evasion. This actually happens when the agency is mentioned in the first sentence(s), so it can be omitted in the second (Richardson, 2007, p. 58).

### 3.7.1.3 Presupposition

Analyzing how a certain text is written is important, but we should also look at what is not written, that is, the hidden or presupposed meanings in the text. According to Richardson, presupposition is “taken-for-granted, implicit claim embedded within the explicit meaning of a text or utterance” (2007, p. 63). In what follows we will discuss three linguistic structures for discovering the presupposed meanings. Firstly, the usage of certain verbs such as state verbs (e.g. stop, begin, continue) or implicative verbs (e.g. manage, forget) invoke presupposed meanings (Reah cited in Richardson, 2007, p. 63). For instance, when saying that “the West should forget about the Islamic terrorism”, we presuppose implicitly that there is already an Islamic terrorism. Secondly, the usage of “wh-questions” such as ‘why’, ‘when’, etc., implies presuppositions (ibid). An example of this is asking “who abused the welfare system of Britain”? Apart from the explicit request to name someone, we have here the implicit question that “is someone responsible for abusing the welfare system of Britain”? Third, presuppositions, or what Richardson calls nominal presupposition can be “triggered by nouns and adjectives to qualify (or modify) noun phrases” (ibid, p. 64). An example for that is saying that “the new policy of Obama in the Muslim world should yield difference” to presuppose indirectly that there has already a policy implemented.

### 3.7.1.4 Semantic Macrostructure

It is the study of the global meanings and topics addressed consciously and subjectively by the speaker or writer in the talk or the text (van Dijk, 2009, p. 68). They are normally expressed in titles, abstracts, summaries and announcements (ibid). What makes text semantics important is that they puts the rules for interpreting words, sentences, paragraphs, or the whole discourse (van Dijk 1991, 112). In fact, they are important to analyze because they represent the information and the meanings most readers will memorize, and hence, they influence the other structures of the discourse (van Dijk, 2009, p. 68). For instance, a journalist begins his or her piece by telling us about the crimes committed by the coalition troops in Afghanistan, this will add weight to the proceeding statements that criticizes the war on Afghanistan, and as a result, affects our mental understanding and perception of the text.
3.7.1.5 Description
It refers to the discursive level of sequences of propositions where events could be described at various levels of generally or specifically, containing few or many propositions at each level (van Dijk, 1995 p. 35). In this context, our good actions and their bad actions will be discussed in details with more propositions. On the other hand, our bad action and their good action will be discussed in general and abstract.
4 Methods

This chapter explains the applied method of this paper as well as how the data were collected and analyzed. In this research we have used method of Critical Discourse Analysis, with the focus on Fairclough’s approach of textual analysis, to explore the propaganda of the war on Afghanistan in the US newspaper *New York Times* and the Pakistani Urdu newspaper *Daily Jang*.

4.1 Selection of the Theories

The Swedish media researcher Brigitte Mral has made a very important point: because the resistance to the war on terror was great, propaganda was important in enhancing the pro-war argument (2004, p. 14). It is no wonder in light of this we have mainly used propaganda theories in this research. That is legitimate, because, whether in medieval times or in today’s world, leaders who want to go for war, they must convince their people about the importance of the war. We have paid a special attention to the use of religion in propaganda because the war on terror was loaded with religious words, and it was seen even by others as war between the Jihadists and crusaders. Orientalism and development theories were selected to understand how the US war propaganda was engineered. The justification for referring to orientalism theory was because Muslim countries were attacked in the war on terror. As we know, the orientalist discourse stereotypes Muslim countries as being source of terrorism, extremism and being anti-women, and these issues were actually the main themes of the war on Afghanistan. The development theory was selected because the development discourse is used often by politicians of the western countries, especially the US, when they are involved in a war far away from home.

4.2 Discourse Analysis

Since propaganda engineers a message that resonates with the social values and norms (Doob cited in Andersen, 2006, p. 8), discourse analysis should be an important method in researching propaganda. According to Deacon et al, discourse analysis attempts to “show systematic links between texts, discourse practices, and socio-cultural practices” (2007, p. 152). We have chosen discourse analysis as a method for this research because we study deeply how propaganda is being engineered and then produced in a form of media texts. More importantly, discourse analysis allows us to reveal values and norms behind some beliefs—and that is actually the heart of propaganda research. As noted by Deacon et al, It enables us not only to see language as social practices, but also as a form of representation in which
different social categories, relations are constructed from and in the interest of particular conception of social reality (ibid, p. 151).

4.3 Critical Discourse Analysis
We have mentioned above that discourse reflects the social reality; which means it does not necessarily reflect the real reality. Deacon et al, demonstrates that media texts are not neutral and it tends to reinforce relations of control (2007, 154). Logically, this results in suppressing some voices and reinforces a certain point of view. CDA as a method is critical towards the language use and it reveals misrepresentation (Hesmondhalgh, 2006, p. 122). For this reason, CDA is a suitable choice for this research since war propaganda involves misrepresentation. Actually, the propaganda of the war on Afghanistan included systematic use of the negative stereotypes about Muslims (see the theoretical framework). CDA would help us to shed the lights into these misrepresentations.

Specifically, this paper applies mainly the textual dimension of Norman Fairclough’s approach in CDA (added to it van Dijk’s semantic analysis). This approach suits our research because it aims at, as highlighted by Richardson (2007, p. 26), revealing prejudice and discrimination through media text. Although Fairclough’s perspective addresses text, discursive, and social dimensions, we will restrict our research into textual analysis. To research the discursive and social practices, we will need to conduct interviews with news people and look into other aspects, which are difficult to carry out in this time-restricted study.

4.4 Sampling
Since this research is exploratory, that is, to explore the propaganda associated with the war on Afghanistan, we have chosen a small sample to analyze. In fact, small samples give us the chance to focus and analyze deeply, and enriches us with valuable information about the study. As noted by Deacon et al, qualitative researches are illustrative and tend to use small samples (2007, pp. 45-46). The “big is beautiful” is challenged in qualitative research since it is less concerned with giving widely generalized conclusion than with explaining complex phenomena (ibid).

The first step in the sampling procedure is to define the population. According to Deacon et al (2007, 47), adequate and appropriate sampling is important to the research validity. For this reason we will attempt to select news items from mainstream media. Specifically, we have decided to analyze 20 articles; 10 selected from the American newspaper New York Times, and 10 selected from the Urdu Pakistani newspaper Daily Jang (see the Appendices). Our
justification for the selection of these two papers is that they both are leading media outlets in
the US and Pakistan. As we are concerned with how the war propaganda is being engineered
in the media, it is very important to look at news articles not also during the war, but also
from the period before the war. We know that in the pre-war period politicians do spend a lot
of efforts in making the case for the war; actually people should be prepared for why the first
 bullet is going to be fired. Furthermore, the first period of the war is important to scrutinize
also because the public mind is arguably more focused on the war at its start; and that is
unlike when the war is prolonged and becomes routine news. For this reason, we have chosen
to look at the news articles from one week before the war and from the first week of the war,
which means, our sampling period is 1-14 October 2001. As we are concerned with
propaganda, we will look at different types of news items, whether reporting, analytical or
editorial, because all of these genres are important in seeing the war to the public. However,
we will apply non-random sampling, as we will try to choose longest news items as we think
they are more serious media production and could contain important information. The news
articles of the Daily Jang newspaper are collected from the national Archive in Islamabad
Pakistan and those of the New York Times were collected through the Orebro University
library in a microfilm forms.

4.5 Analysis
The news articles will be analyzed individually at the first stage, and then will be looked at
together to draw a general picture. Part of the analysis and discussion is also comparing the
coverage of New York Times and the Daily Jang with each other. The analysis will not
separate the analysis of the headlines and the news articles; however, the first will used to
highlight the global meaning of the news articles in general.

We shall apply four concepts of textual analysis in our analysis: Semantic macrostructure,
lexical analysis (in specific Naming and Reference), sentence construction, and
presupposition. Our analysis specifically search for the global meanings of the texts, how
certain actors/events are named/referred, how actors/events are described, and digging deep
into what is hidden or what is the presupposed meanings. Of course, we will borrow
theoretical concepts such as development theme, the evil theme, etc., in order to explain for
example why a certain naming is applied or how an implicit message is conveyed.

4.6 Generalizability, Validity and Reliability
Generalizability is a risky issue especially in the case of qualitative researches where samples
are generally not representative. Yet we do not conduct researches to simply explain only
what happens in a certain incident and then close the shop and go home. Carey (cited in Deacon et al, 2007, 46) argues that qualitative interpretive studies are also interested in drawing wider inference by connecting the research with a culture or a total way of life. To put it simply, drawing a conclusion from an individual case could be achieved if we use reasoned argument, and attempt to link it with its social circumstances. In this research, despite our object is not to give a broad conclusion whatever, we still want to link the result of this research, through using the theories, with the wider social issues related to the propaganda and the war on Afghanistan. To do this, we will use what Kvale terms as “analytical generalization”, which involves using the theory to judge the extent the finding of a qualitative study could be used as a guide to what may occur in another situation (1996, p. 233).

The best way to ensure the validity of any research is to constantly checking and questioning the employed method (ibid, 242). We intend to find out, by discussing with our supervisor, by looking at previous researches, and also by conducting a pilot experiment whether the theories are adequate to answering the research questions. Another important step also is to choose an adequate sample which can validate the research conclusion. It has been noted by Deacon et al (1997, 47) that defining the population would reduce the criticism regarding the validity of the research. We have clearly defined the sample population, and the time frame, and, important not to forget, explain the rationale behind the whole sampling process.

Assessing reliability is connected with having consistent observations when the research is carried out repeatedly (Neuendorf, 2002, p. 238). It seems common sense to argue that the first step to ensure reliability is to equip ourselves as researchers with theoretical and methodological knowledge. This is actually important as it helps us to read the data in a reliable way as it reduces subjectivity or ideological reading, and help us to apply the scientific approach. Discussing the analysis with the supervisor is crucial in ensuring the reliability since our data will be examined again with more experienced, and indeed more detached eye. We also intend to ask colleagues to analyze part of the data to ensure that we will arrive at consistent observation, and thus ensure reliability.

4.7 Limitations and challenges

However any research is objective and carefully written, every research has its limitations. This paper is time-restricted, which means the impossibility of carrying out extensive theoretical and empirical researches, which could make the wider picture incomplete. To
begin with, we should say that this paper is limited to the analyzed media outlets and cannot be generalized to the mainstream American and Pakistani newspapers.

CDA as a method itself has limitations. As it is concerned with the revelation of misrepresentations, we should highlight the point that CDA could be also subjective. Of course there is universal agreement on what is “misrepresented” and what is not. It is mostly done from the perspective of the researcher. The process of interpretation itself (how to interpret the data) is complex and imposes limitations on any study. This is due to the fact that absolute knowledge does not exist in social science since different interpretations could appear for the same phenomenon (Kvale, 1996:239).
5 Analysis

In this chapter we will analyze the sample of the news articles. We plan to do a separate analysis for each article, and then in the next chapter we will discuss generally the message the news articles aim to deliver. This part consists of two subparts; first, an analysis of New York Times articles; and seconds, an analysis of Jang newspapers.

5.1 Articles of New York Times

5.1.1 In Pakistan, a Shaky Ally

It’s very important to begin the discourse analysis with studying the semantic macrostructure or the global meaning because it affects the way the reader understands the text, and guides him or her to a certain interpretation. Global meaning is normally expressed in the headline which is in the case of this article “In Pakistan, a Shaky Ally”. So, the title makes our mind prepared for some negative information about Pakistan. The global meaning can also be found in the first statements since we assume authors talk in brief at the beginning about what they intend to explain in their news stories. The author makes short statements about bankruptcy, angry mullahs, corruption, army, and about more people having guns. Now we know this country is an unreliable allies and it cannot be trusted, and as a result, whatever information about Pakistan comes, we will most probably interpret it negatively. Obviously, this is no different than the western discourse about the Third World, especially the Islamic orient, which is portrayed as underdeveloped, primitive and savage, and that aims to justify the intervention in its internal affair. Of course we don’t deny that the situation in Pakistan was unstable at the time, but we argue nevertheless that highlighting this issue at the time when there was talk about war in Pakistan is aimed at justifying the US military efforts. What gives weight to this view is that the author has not mentioned that the US was partly to blame for the instability in Pakistan because of its backing of the military regime there.

As we mentioned earlier, the global meanings in the text determine the way we look at the information that follows. In general, the author elaborates on what he calls radical Islamist in the country, and about their relationship with the army, which is also talked about. Although we don’t see in many cases the writer explicitly blame the Islamists and the army for the instability, but since the global meaning refers to how Pakistan is underdeveloped country, the reader’s mind will be ready to put the blame on the Islamists and the army who are talked about in most of the article. The author demonized the Islamists (and even Islam as a religion
implicitly) through applying orientalist discourse about them: terrorists and extremists. Applying lexical analysis, we discover how the author referred to the Islamists as “radical” or “terrorists”, which is in line with what van Dijk (cited in Richardson, 2007, p. 51) noted, the reference strategy is characterized by negative other-presentation. Examples are many in the text, and here are some: “halts the "Talibanization" of Pakistan, a drift toward the fundamentalist Islam of neighboring Afghanistan”; “Radical Muslim political parties, historically weak at the polls”; “Islamic terrorists, in league with rogue elements of the military, seize control of the government and wield the vengeful sword of jihad with a nuclear tip”. The last example is interesting as it contains also other interesting naming such as “Jihad” and reference such as “holy war” which are frequently used throughout the text such as these examples: “Twin jihads — one in Afghanistan, one in Kashmir — save many from the idle hours of joblessness”; “But the radical Islamists drawn to holy war, however grateful for their supply of guns and grenades, very often despise the national leaders who provide them”. Needless to say, “Jihad” and “Holly war” connote negative meanings because first, they are religious terms and the military religious struggle is looked at negatively, and second, “Jihad” is mostly associated with terrorism and Islamic extremism in the western mind. The writer could explain, instead of using such biased reference, many fighters are going to Kashmir to struggle against what they see as “Indian occupation”; or plan to fight with Taliban side by side against what they view as “US plan to attack Afghanistan”. To reveal the bias, that the writer of the piece we are analyzing has a choice, he choose to term what also the world view as “Jihadists”, we mean the opposition against the Soviet, as “Afghan resistance”. Obviously, the writer has not distanced himself from the news, and judged the news and classified who is legitimate (by terming them resistance) and who is not (by terming them jihadists, radicals, terrorists). The author has expressed implicitly his ideological perspective through the selection of words which we have explained above. For him, Islamists and Islam which dive Pakistan into instability- this is a presupposed meaning embedded in the text. For instance, the author stated that “Islamic guerillas – many would call them terrorists- openly operate inside Pakistani’s border”. Despite the statement “many would call them terrorist” which is an attempt to be impartial, the adverb “openly” implies ideological presupposition that the Islamic guerillas are, if not terrorists, illegal groups. The text contains even many presupposed meanings (of course negative) about the religion of Islam. For instance, the author writes that “Islam is a growing force here”, then follows that information about religious schools, and then talk about Jihad and Mullahs shouting “death to America”. Even those whose eyes are inexperienced about media analysis would read the indirect meaning that Islam is actually responsible for violence in and the instability of Pakistan.
5.1.2 Ancient Secret System Moves Money Globally

As it is clear from the title, the main global meaning of the text is that there is a suspicious financial system which is used to transfer money globally. The lexical choice of the words “ancient” and “secret” implies the ideological perspective of the writer, and connotes that this system is illegal and used for subspecies activities. The first statement of the article explains clearly the subjectivity of the author, which is normally manifested in the semantic macrostructure of the text. The author begins his news story, which occurred in Pakistan, by saying that this system doesn’t need any names and that “no trial for law enforcement to follow”. This conscious selection of the semantic macrostructure makes us prepared for thinking negatively about this system; especially it is applied in a Third World country. As it is clear from the beginning of the text, the article applies the development discourse which describes non-Western societies as abnormal and undeveloped: Everything the orient does is irrational, illegal, and extremist; there is no chance the orient is right. This is actually obvious from the lexical choices applied and the sequences of propositions in the text. As for the lexical choices, there are words used by the author that reflects his ideological perspective. For instance, it is interesting that he chooses to repeatedly throughout the text use the Arabic word “hawala” for the ancient system, and explains mistakenly that it stands for “trust” in Arabic. True, this “ancient system” is called hawala in Pakistan, but what is true also, the conventional transfer system is also called hawala. Of course, if a reporter reports how the money transfer system works in a certain country, he or she does not need to write the words without translating them unless there is something special about them. Money transfer is called hawala in Pakistan, and we have the right to argue here that the usage of this word as it is in Arabic without translating it intends to attributes negative connotation with this transfer system, and that is similar to the usage of words such as “Allah” and “Jihad” instead of translating them to “god” and “struggle”, respectively. The lexical choice behind the words “bunker” and “bulbs” to describe the place where hawala is being processed is another example in which the author implicitly criminalizes this transferring system. As for the consequences of the propositions, the author details the negative actions that are allegedly connected with this ancient system are given many details in the text. One of them is that women are not involved in this system. He also details that Mr. Bin Laden uses this system in his terrorist activities with quotes from officials are provided to give weight to this claim. The author mentions also hawala is used for payments by smuggling rings and militant groups in different disputed areas. The reference to the women is interesting as it reveals how most of the time the incidents in the Islamic Orient are generalized by western reporters to highlight the fact that women are oppressed in the Muslim world.
There are several examples in which there is a presupposed meaning embedded in the sentences. For example, the author states that new security will be unlikely to disclose all the details of bin Laden’s transactions through hawala. The presupposed meaning here is that bin Laden used this system, and hence, this system is very dangerous. In another location, the author quotes Prof. Nikos Passas, an expert on transnational crime at Temple University, who claims that “This system is made for transferring enough money to get a pilot's license or make a deposit on an apartment without raising an eyebrow”. Clearly enough, this reference presupposes that hawala is a criminal system. Although the writer mentions that ordinary people use this system, but the above-mentioned makes it clear that hawala is an illegal system used to carry out criminal and terrorist activities.

5.1.3 Terrorism and Immigration
The title of the article indicates that the main global meaning of the text is that terrorism and immigration are linked. Although the language is seemingly neutral in the headline, meaning that the author did not say that terrorism is linked with immigration, leaving it without clarification gives the impression that author is saying implicitly that terrorism is linked with immigration. In any case, the first paragraph, which the other semantic macrostructures could be derived from, proves this suggestion. The author mentions that terrorism should not let the US block its doors in front of immigrants, and that the US government should “crack down on lax enforcement of the immigration laws, with a sense of urgency”. Accordingly, the main global meaning would be that terrorism is linked with immigration; however, this should not let us welcome new immigrants. Obviously, the verb “crack down” and the adjective “lax” connote that there is a problem with the immigration laws that we have to deal with; and the adjective. They also imply an embedded presupposition which is that terrorism is linked with immigration. The discursive level of sequences of propositions (description) implies that the discussion in the congress about reduction in the number of visitors to the US is an irrational policy. The author details in several sentences that the US authority should instead identify those who are illegally staying in the country. The way the information in the text is described confirms what we have mentioned before that terrorism is linked with immigration. Obviously, this kind of reporting infuses racism and hatred towards immigrants who are seen as a source of evil. The author never discussed that terrorism is, above all, a political problem and immigrants have nothing to do with that.

In fact, the author thoughts about terrorism are implicitly explained in the text through the discursive sequences of propositions and through the lexical choice as well. The author does not distance herself from the Orientalist view that terrorism is Middle Eastern or an Islamic
phenomenon. As noted by Andersen, the charge of terrorism is mostly used against enemies belonging to the Middle East (2006). Apart from talking about the perpetrators of 11 September attack, the author gives specific examples in which Middle Easterners managed to stay illegally in the US and carry out terroristic activities. Narrowing down terrorism to these cases and ignoring other cases in which terrorism was also practiced by non-Muslim citizens (such as the case Oklahoma city bombing not to mention the phenomenon of shootings which rock the US cities frequently) reveals an ideological view that terrorism is a Middle Eastern phenomenon. The lexical choices in these propositions give weight to this view as is the case with referring to the person who was involved in the 1993 World Trade Center bombing as “Palestinian”: The author could mentions this example without referring the nationality of one of the attackers, but as we mentioned, this reference reflects the ideological perspective of the writer. Another example is the reference to Sheik Omar Abdul Rahman who was convicted in a terrorist plot. Of course this Arabic/Muslim name gives more fuel to the idea that “All terrorists are Muslims”.

5.1.4 Drugs; ‘Super’ Heroin Was Planned By Bin Laden, Reports Say
The main semantic macrostructure of the text, as the headline indicates, is that there is a massive attack is prepared by bin Laden in which the weapon will be drug. Although the author states clearly in the headline that the Heroin threat is claimed by reports, but to use what reports say in the headline reveals a tendency to make such claims credible and valid, which is a conscious bias. However, the usage of the scare quotes around the word “super” in the headline implies that the author has doubts about this big threat allegedly planned by bin Laden. The global meaning of the text, as also derived from the first sentence, is about the claims made by the intelligence reports regarding a planned attack by al-Qaida leader in which heroin will be exported to the US and the Western countries. Such claims imply a war between civilizations in which bin Laden aims to destroy western societies through drugs. Although the author mentions several times that the official reports have not found clear link between bin Laden and drug business, he gives detailed official quotes in which bin Laden’s heroin plot and his possible connection with the drug trafficking are discussed. For instance, the author explains that the official says that the heroin plot was planned as retaliation for the US striking of Afghanistan in 1998. He also tells us about the Taliban’s involvement with drug business and that bin Laden probably, as the reports indicate, cooperated with Taliban on this in order to finance al-Qaida’s activities. Clearly enough, this description suggests that the author implicitly gives weight to the idea that bin Laden has a plan to export heroin to the US and other western countries.
The lexical choices of words apply the rhetoric of the war on terror as the case with words such as “western societies” which were planned to be attacked by bin Laden by heroin; and the words “terrorists” and “extremists” who are referred by the author in relation to Taliban’s drug business. These lexical choices reveal the ideology expressed often by the conservative hardliners that terrorism is an attack on the western values. In fact, the allegation of the link of bin Laden and Taliban movement with drug business intends to demonize the enemy and portraying him as evil and immoral who spares no effort in doing whatever he can to harm others. According to Jowett & O’Donnell, enemies are demonized and dehumanized in times of wars so they can be killed without empathy (1999, p. 295). It is no strange that the enemy of the United States is demonized in this article, through talking about its link with drug business and heroin plot against the West, as it was written few days before the US war on Afghanistan broke out. The involvement of Taliban and bin Laden in the drug business is mentioned throughout the text usually in transitive forms to assure the sense of specificity and highlight the negative actions. Here are some examples for this:

- “Taliban derives millions of dollars opium production”. It is very clear for the reader here Taliban makes a lot of money from the opium business.

- “Taliban used money derived from opium and heroin production to finance ... to finance training of terrorists ... etc.”: Taliban’s act here is very clear and is highlighted.

5.1.5 Afghanistan: Murky Picture Emerges of Life under Bombardment

The semantic macrostructure which is derived from the headline is that the situation in Afghanistan after the US strikes is unpleasant and unclear. The word “murky” implies that there is an unpleasant and unclear situation in the country, and accordingly, the implication the headline leaves on the reader is that, there is damage was caused, but we are nevertheless not certain about what has happened. That is how the information follows in the text are going to be understood, or the author wants us to understand. In fact, the lexical choice of “murky” is quite interesting. While it denotes non clarity about the situation, it is also a soft description of the US strikes in Pakistan. While some might use words such as “horrible” or “terrifying”, or whatever, the author of this article seeks to downplay the effect of the US military actions in Afghanistan. There are examples of lexical choices from the text which downplays the US bombardment. An example is the choice of “zeroed in” in “American warplanes zeroed in on Afghanistan”, which implicitly indicates that the US strikes are not causing so much damage, and that they only aim at specific targets, presumably Taliban. The author also mentions that some of the information about casualties are “colored by emotion and fogged by
exaggeration”. In this example the author says explicitly that some of the information about casualties is not true, but he seems to even, through the lexical choice of “emotion”, doubts the horror of the war. When there are “emotions”, this means people are just traumatized and that not everything they say should be taken seriously. In fact, in war propaganda, “our” war, and in this case, the US war, should be viewed as a good fight against a ruthless enemy (Andersen, 2006, 42&43). The Author, as we explained above, attempts to send the message that the US fights good fight as it does not make the life of Afghani miserable. The discursive sequence of propositions reveals clearly this ideological view of the author as there is a detail showing that life in Afghanistan is still normal. Although the author mentions Taliban and UN’s information about the casualties, there is a tendency in the followed propositions to downplay such facts. Apart from telling the reader that such information could be exaggerated, he gives specific examples in which people and some officials in Afghanistan say that life is going normal in Afghanistan.

Another technique used by the author is the usage of transitive forms is transforming actions from transitive forms to relational process in order to remove the sense of the specificity. The usage of the passive form in the headline “under bombardment” without referring specifically to the US aims arguably to make the act of bombardment less important, and thus less harmful. In what follows we mention some examples in which the passive voice is used, or the subject is not states, in order to make the act looks as if it is not important:

-“Two of Mullah Omar's relatives were killed on the first night of bombing”
-“The Taliban said 76 civilians had been killed and more than 100 injured”
-“The United Nations put the number of dead at 10 in Kandahar and 20 in Kabul”
-“A guard at Mullah Omar's house was killed”.

On the other hand, we should refer to one example in which the act of killing is phrased in an active voice “... the bomb that killed four United Nations workers in Kabul on Tuesday ...” This example might tell us that the passive voice could not be used ideologically by the author, and that he might want to make his writing style diverse.

Of course, the enemy in war is demonized and described as evil in order to justify attacking him. The lexical choices of certain words indicate something like this. For instance, the usage of “fortified” to describe the compound of Taliban’s spiritual leader implies arguably that Taliban leaders care only about themselves as they build fortified places for them. Also in
more than place, the author said that Taliban leaders seek shelters in “irrigation tunnels” in order to portray them as cowards who are not even willing to fight man to man. When analyzing the discursive level of sequences of propositions, we find that the author details how Taliban prevents refugees to flee and that they beat UN stuff who are supposedly aiding Afghani people. In one statement, for example, the author says “Refugees who have arrived in Quetta in recent days after being smuggled across the border”. The lexical choice of “smuggled” implies a presupposed meaning which is Taliban are pretending people to flee the war.

5.1.6 The Deep Intellectual Roots of Islamic Terror
Acceding to the headline, the general semantic macrostructure of the text is that terrorism is not an individual issue in the Muslim world, and it is has a deep roots in the society. The lexical choices “deep” and “roots” reveal this argument. The word “intellectual” connotes that terrorism is part of the Islamic religion, and not just a result of individual misunderstanding or fanaticism. The expression “Islamic Terror” implies that terrorism is an Islamic phenomenon. The author could use less aggressive wording such as for instance “terrorism in Islam”, which if used would imply that terrorism is not merely a problem of Islam, but it can be found in other beliefs and ideologies. In any case, the global meaning that is derived from the headline implies implicitly that “Islam is a religion of terrorism”. This no overstatement as this semantic macrostructure chose to narrow the discussion to Islam, ignoring that terrorism is also practiced by people of other beliefs and that, above all, terrorism is a political problem.

In the description of the events the author seeks to highlight how terrorism is rooted in some ideological branches of Islam. True, the author mentions explicitly that many Muslims are horrified at the usage of their religion from al-Qaida to justify terrorism, but the general description of the text suggests that such a statement is made to make the article less offensive and to avoid the charge of generalization. Regardless of this statement, the ideological perspective of the author is apparent through giving extensive and detailed quotes from scholars and examples about how terrorism is a part of Salafism and Wahhabism ideologies and part of Muslim Brotherhood doctrine. Giving the fact that nations (and hence religion) are no longer demonized in war propaganda, and that Muslim Brotherhood is deeply rooted in the Arab world, and also Wahhabism has many followers, the conclusion would be that the author uses these religious and political ideologies to send the implicit message that terrorism is an Islamic phenomenon.
Demonizing the enemy, which is here the radical Muslims and we might also say Islam as a religion, is apparent in the lexical choices made throughout the text. The author over-used orientalist terms which are frequently said about Muslims such as Jihad, radicalism, extremism. Here are some examples:

- Jihad in “Mr. Bin Laden’s advocacy for Jihad”

- “… Radical Islamists …”

- “… Muslim extremists …”

- “… Islamic Jihad …”

- “Salafis are extreme radicals”.

- Terrorists in “Osama bin Laden and his fellow terrorists”

- “radicalized”.

- “… radical tradition …”

These terms which are used in relation to some Islamic groups resembles the Orientalism discourse, which has Said (1978, p. 108), considers the Muslim world as irrational, terroristic, extremist, and uncivilized. What is important to note here much of the lexical choices of the author come in line Bush administration discourse that regards the Islamic terrorism are an attack on the western values, which is fact, another way of demonizing the enemy the lexical choices, as you will below in examples, view terrorism and radical Islam as enemies of the west:

- “… holly war against the West …”.

- “… the cause of Jihad against the West …”. The presupposed meaning here and in the previous sentence is that 11 September attack, and terrorism in general, is an attack on the Western values.

- “… Modern Western culture equivalent to Jahiliyya …” (The writer explains that Jahiliyya is the Arabic term for barbarism existed before Islam). Important to note here, Jahiliyya does not mean barbarism, and it stands for ignorance since Arabs were worshipping statues before Islam. The selection of “barbarism” connotes that the many Muslims think that the Western lifestyle is barbaric.
“… democracy and nationalism as Western ideas …”. The selection of “democracy” implies implicitly that the Islamic terrorist attacked the USA because it is democratic.

As the author chose to use orientalist terms and not refers to political causes of terrorism, he intends to infuse hatred towards Muslims and their religion.

5.1.7 A VIEW FROM THE ROOFTOPS; Strains of Hope in City under Bombing

The global meaning that derives from the headline is that although there the country is at war and is rocked by bombardment, but there is nevertheless a hope, a positive side to the war. This explicit opinion in the headline leaves an implication on the way the reader understands the rest of the text. This description of the text which of course reflects the ideological perspective of the author implies only one message. While the author does not say it explicitly, the description of events in the text (the discursive level of sequences of propositions) says implicitly that the American bombing of Afghanistan aims at liberating people from the tyranny of Taliban. The author specifies his article to give an account of an Afghani man who was in Kabul at the first days of bombardment. This man, as appeared in the text, says literally that people were happy when the US bombed their city, and says that now people hope that they will be liberated. Of course, the man did not forget to talk about Taliban’s barbarity and their mistreatment of women. One has to be of suspicious of such account, not because it is non-sense to believe that people were happy to see their city is being bombed –even if people do not support their regime, they still fear the war- but because such account is given at the time the US warplanes are striking Afghanistan. Can anyone with little intelligence believe in times of war civilians, as what the Afghani did in Kabul according to the eyewitness, “ran into the streets and up to their roofs and to the balconies of their apartments, and they watched the flashes and listened to the explosions, and, silently, they cheered”? It is logic to argue that such account is given to neutralize the negative effects of the war on Afghanistan.

There are evidences from the text that the author credits the man’s account. First, the sequences propositions I mentioned above. Second, the lexical choice of “neediest” implies that this person is honest and cannot lie since he cares for the neediest. Third, the author says that “Like those who cheered the bombing in silence”, the man is deathly afraid of Taliban. Such a statement contains a presupposed meaning that it is true Afghani people cheered over the bombing of Afghanistan. It is also important to tell, for the sake of objectivity, that the author did mention that there are Afghani casualties because of the American bombings, but
they are mentioned generally and not given much details, and more importantly, he casts some doubts on the talk about some of these stories. For instance, the author says “Some of them, hundreds if Taliban accounts are to be believed, have been killed, and others have lost their homes”. The term “Taliban accounts are to be believed” is aimed to weaken the claims about Afghani casualties. We might argue even that the reference to “Taliban” here is ideological. The movement is accused of being extremist and of harboring terrorists, which means implicitly what it says is not true. We also see how the Afghani casualties are written in a passive form in order to remove the sense of specificity, and make the event less important.

In general, the discursive sequences propositions aims at two things; first, demonizing Taliban, and second, portraying the US army as savior and liberator. The author mentions that the eyewitness is “deathly” afraid of Taliban; which is a lexical choice implies that the movement is barbaric and in the habit of persecuting people. He also says Afghani people are “frightened” of telling reporters what they have seen. There is embedded presupposed meaning here that Taliban are doing bad, but people are afraid to say it. The author mentions explicitly that Taliban imposes restricting social practices on women. This is the most widespread orientalist idea about the Muslim world in general, and Taliban in specific, it is against women. But women after the US bombings are happy, the author quotes the eyewitness, and he uses words such there is now “optimism” among women, and they are filled with “joy” as they will be able to complete their “education”. The lexical choices behind “optimism, joy, education” imply that the US is savior and liberator, and that is actually one of the US war on terror discourse: women emancipation. In another example, the author says that this eyewitness does not depend on the Americans for his family’s “welfare”, which carries an embedded meaning that US are helping many Afghani people.

5.1.8 U.S. Raid Kills Unknown Number in an Afghan Village
As it is clear from the headline of the article, the global meaning is that US army killed Afghani people in a village. As we have said earlier, the semantic macro semantics of any text refers to the explicit bias of the author, and it aims at influence the way the reader should interpret the content of the article. In the case of this article, it is obvious that the reader is going to hear about something bas the US did in Afghanistan, and that is, killing number of people. But the author actually formulates the headline in a way that makes the incident looks like less negative, and that can be revealed from the lexical choice of the words. The use of the word “raid” is for instance interesting. While it is true that the author is telling us that it is the Americans who did the killing, but the word “raid” removes the specificity, and it gives
the impression that the killing happened by mistake. To make the point clearer, we have to compare “US raid” with other alternatives. If the author chooses instead “U.S. warplanes”, that will signify that U.S. army intestinally hit an Afghan village, and even if it is not understood this way, it will still carry more negative connotation than “U.S. raid” because of the specificity. Another alternative could be for instance “U.S. kills unknown number”, which if phrased as such, will make the news more specific, and there will be no chance, it seems to me, that the reader will think that the bloodshed happened by mistake. On the other hand, one might argue that the use of “raid” is not ideological and that the language of the news itself is biased and not objective. I agree. True, journalists write that “Taliban killed ...” or “al-Qaida massacred ....”, or “Taliban fighters ....”, but it seems to be that a tradition in the news, and not necessarily something related to ideology, that the news is pro-state. To makes it clear, we say even in the case with ‘enemy state’, “troops or army” or “generals” and not “rebels” or “fighters”, and obviously the latter contain negative connotation. Another point we should consider also in the headline is the use of the active form “U.S. raid kills”, which makes it more specific (and that makes the incident looks more negative) that the Americans are the ones who are responsible for the killing. The lexical choice of “kills”, which is a strong loaded world, seems to be also not in line with the argument that the author attempts to make the incident looks less negative. Nevertheless, we still see an attempt to downplay the U.S. action, and that is very clear from the lexical choice in the case of “unknown number”. Obviously, the author tries to use not specific words to refer to the Afghani casualties despite locals were talking about dozens of victims. Moreover, the author chose to write “number” instead of “civilians” for example, or “Afghani” and that is actually a blatant ideological bias. The author knows that the killed are civilians, since it is mentioned in the text, but choose to downplay the U.S. action in the headline because this will have an implication in general on how the article as whole should be perceived.

The discursive level of sequences of propositions suggests that the text attempts to remove the negative effects of the US action. While it is true the author wrote that villagers talk about tens of casualties, and that Pakistani media speak of atrocities in Afghanistan, the author seems to say implicitly that this is all exaggeration and propaganda. For instance, he repeats more than one time that it is difficult to confirm whether such reports are accurate or not, and he quotes citizens saying that Taliban inflate the death toll. Of course it is true that rivals all the time try to project their own claims of the conflict, but the sequences propositions cast doubts on Taliban’s claims and has not done the same with the Americans who were quoted that they regret the“ unintended loss of life”. Moreover, the text begins with saying that the
city which was bombed by the U.S. forces had before training camps for Islamic guerrillas. Although the author does not say explicitly that the area was hit because of this reason, the description of the training camp implicitly intended at justifying the U.S. action or at least promoting the argument that civilians were killed by mistake.

It seems to be difficult to think of the lexical choices behind “Islamic” in “Islamic guerrillas”; “Jihad” in “This is the result of your Jihad”; and “radical Islamic” in “radical Islamic Taliban government” without referring to the orientalist attitudes. These terms give rise to irrationalizing Taliban movement, and so doubt its version of reality, since “Islam” is attributed with irrationality and radicalism in the western mind. Other examples that show how the author of the article produced a biased piece are those where presupposed meaning is embedded in the text. The usage of implicative verb “eliminate” in “Although Pakistan is nominally allied with the United States in its quest to eliminate the terrorist cells in Afghanistan” is an obvious example of that. The author here is implicitly telling us that there are already terrorist cells (since the U.S. plans to eliminate them) in Afghanistan, which means the US bombings of the country is a just war. Another example is the usage of “only” in “The journalist... had a close-up look at only three corpses in a hospital”. The presupposed meaning here which comes as a result of the adjective “only” is that there are doubts about claims that many killed by the U.S. raid, and that is what the entire article is about: downplaying the U.S. action.

5.1.9 CASUALTIES, U.S. Raids Kill 4 U.N. Aides Outsides Kabul
The author chose to phrase the act of killing in a transitive form as the active verb “kills” indicates, which means there the specificity is not removed, and that it is clear the U.S is responsible for the act of killing. One can argue also here also that the verb “kills” is a strong verb in a sense that it does not downplay the unfortunate reality of the incident. However, I have argued through my analysis that the semantic choice behind “raids” connotes that the act of killing is done by mistake, and that is actually what the author tries to implicitly tell in this piece. This idea is actually reinforced by the lexical choice behind the word “casualties” in the headline, and here the ideological bias is apparent. Of course, the word “casualties” refer to how many people are killed and injured, but it remains a soft word, and in the context of this article, it indicates that the act of killing is a collateral damage. To clarify this point, this word is rarely used in the news to refer of the killed and injured in terrorists attacks. The semantic macrostructure of this article in light of this is that the U.S. army mistakenly killed U.N. workers in Afghanistan. The discursive level of sequences of propositions proves this point as the author specified a lot of quotes said by different actors that “well, mistakes happen, and
that is the bitter reality of wars”. For instance, the author quoted the U.S. defense minister Donald Rumsfeld saying that his administration does not have information about the incident, but it regrets the loss of life. The author also quoted others saying that due to the weak infrastructure of Afghanistan, the U.S. may have difficulties in finding the ‘appropriate’ targets, and it does not really need much to discover that the ideology stinks here. Of course, the author quoted people angry at the killing, but these quotes do not question the motives of the U.S. in general, but they regret the loss of life.

Assuming that the U.S. did not deliberately killed civilians is in line with the development and orientalist discourse which rationalize the West always. Taliban attacks are all the time portrayed as irrational (terrorize and destabilize and attacking civilians). U.S. attacks are all the time rational; yes the U.S. could be criticized for using disproportionate force or for not taking extra measures to avoid the civilians’ casualties, but its attacks have all the time reasons: hunting terrorists. And when civilians are killed it is all the time: mistake.

The article clearly carries pro-U.S. bias, but this bias is expressed indirectly. For instance, the article has some statements that have presupposed meanings hidden in the semantic of words. The two adjectives “first confirmed” in the proposition “The destruction appeared to represent the first confirmed case of ... killing civilians” is an example of that. The author is telling us that the other cases of U.S. killing civilians in Afghanistan could be just propaganda. The another example is the usage of the implicative verb “root out” in “The United States military has claimed success in furthering its campaign to root out terrorists through the bombing”. In this case, the existence of terrorists in Afghanistan is taken for granted by the author.

5.1.10 A pro-Taliban Rally Draws Angry Thousands in Pakistan then Melts Away

As the headline indicates, the semantic macrostructure of this article is about angry pro-Taliban people are protesting in Pakistan. Although it is mentioned why they rally, but of course it is easy to know it is because of the “war on terror” since it was at height at that days. Because the global meaning determines the way the reader should perceive the text, the reader in this case is going to perceive the protests negatively, and let me explain why. It is very important to understand the lexical choice behind the adjective “angry” in order to understand this point. Anger connotes irrationality; so these demonstrators are not driven by reason, but with passion. In fact, the headline tells more than that. The usage of “pro-Taliban” connotes that these people are extremists since Taliban is perceived as terrorist and extremist movement. In this sense, the global meaning would be that the protesters are driven by hatred,
and not just by anger. The author could just say “thousands are protesting in Afghanistan” instead of calling the protesters “angry pro-Taliban”. Do we call the anti-demonstrations in the U.S. pro-Bush rally?

The discursive level of sequences of propositions reveals also the ideological belief of the author that those protesters are merely irrational and extremists. This is not strange as the orientalist discourse tries all the time to irrationalize Muslim societies and connect them with extremism. The author elaborated a lot on how angry the demonstrators, and explained that they hate the United States and that they like Osama bin Laden, the head of al-Qaida. Almost all propositions in the articles in this direction, which reveals the ideological perspective of the author: these demonstrators are irrational an extremist. In the following I provide the reader with some examples of these propositions:

-The author started the article with talking about boy holding a toy gun and shouting against the U.S.

-They Author mentioned that demonstrators were shouting “death to America”, and “U.S.A is a dog”. Of course demonstrators said something else, but this selection indicates an intention from demonizing the protestors. The author wrote that one man spoke in the demonstration while having a gun, indicating how violent the demonstrators are.

-“He just fired his imaginary bullets in the air over and over, his finger tightening on a harmless trigger, and rode a wave of anger and hatred up to the door of a mosque where a holy man shouted into a tinny loudspeaker about the destruction of his enemies”. It is interesting here to analyze the lexical choice behind “holy” in this example. Of course, this connotes that this hatred and extremism is connected with religion. Again, this is another example of the oriental discourse that links extremism with Muslim societies.

Of course, there is no problem in reporting these things if they happen, but the problem is that the author focused on the behaviors that look like extremist in order to draw implicitly the conclusion that these people are merely extremists and terrorists. It is true that the author explained the context, meaning why the demonstrators are angry, but it was obvious he gave weight to the point that the protestors are extremists. The lexical choices done in the text reflect this point, for instance, words such as “Islamic radicals” and “terrorism” are found throughout the text, which have negative denotations and connotations, but in this context actually, the author, I argue, wants to convince the reader indirectly that the demonstrators are extremists and radicals.
5.2 **Articles of Daily Jang**

5.2.1 **Severe threats to Muslim Umma**

The global meaning of the article is that there is a serious threat to the Muslim world. The introductory propositions suggest that the Muslim world faces threats because of the war on terror which is used, the author says, as pretext to perform “imperialistic” agenda. The word “Umma” is an Arabic word stands for people, and it is used in the Islamic texts to refer to the Muslim nations. Obviously, the use of this word is ideological and it aims at telling the audience that the war on terror is actually a war on Islam. The lexical choice behind “imperialistic” aims at demonizes the U.S. which is portrayed here as state interested in colonizing the Muslim world, and not with fighting terrorists. Of course, since the semantic macrostructure of the text determines the way how a text should be interpreted, the reader in this text will expect information about the threats to the Muslim world. The discursive level of sequences of propositions in the text is in line with this argument as the author gives details on what he sees the conspiracy planned against the Muslim world. The author detailed information on why the US and its allies want to target the Muslim world, that is, the area is rich in oil, and that it has the major sea routes. The author also mentions that Pakistan is a nuclear nation, and that is one of the reasons, according to him, why the U.S want to attack the Muslim world. The author also mentions also in details that the loans are given to Pakistan as a reward for its participation in the war on terror are going to destroy the economy of the country. All these details aim of course at send an ideological message: The U.S aims at destroying the Muslim world, and in particular Pakistan. The lexical choice behind the vocabulary of the text are ideological, applying the clash of civilization or the “us” (Muslims) and “them” (The West) discourse. There are many examples of this: “Muslim nations”, “Muslim world”, “and Umma”, “Islamic countries, enemies”. Other lexical choices were aimed at demonizing the U.S. and questioning its motives in the Muslim word, and I give some examples below:

- “Crush” in “America will crush every power that challenges”: a negative term implies that the Americans plan to destroy their enemies. The statement is also formulated in the active form which indicates specificity, which gives assurance about what the Americans are planning to do.

- “Imperialistic”: we have explained the use of it.

- “Terrible economical damages”, referring to the U.S did to Indonesia and Malaysia in 1977, the author said. We are here an explicit demonization of the U.S. and its policies.
The author described the events of 11 September as “terrorist”, but he does not share with the orientalist attitudes that the Muslim world is connected with terrorism. In fact, there is a hidden and presupposed meaning in the text that 11 September attacks were not perpetrated by al-Qaida, and from the following statement this meaning can be derived “though evidence are available that non-Muslims living in the US are involved in the attacks on world trade center and pentagon”.

5.2.2 Solution to the terrorism problem
The global meaning of the text cannot be really fully understood from the text, and we need to check what is written in the first paragraphs so we understand what the general message the author aims to send. Of course it can be understood from the headline that the global meaning in general is that the author is going to propose a solution for terrorism. One might argue that when someone says that he or she has the solution for terrorism at the time when there is war on terrorism, he or she means something different. If we accept this premise, the global meaning would be that the solution to terrorism is not waging war. This point is reinforced after reading the first propositions from the text as the author questions the use of force against terrorism, and additionally poses the question why terrorism happens at the first place.

It is important to refer that the author agrees that terrorism is about killing innocent people, and so 11 September attack is viewed as a terrorist attack in this text. However, the author does not associate terrorism with Islam or Islamic groups. It is even striking that the author, contrary to many western writers, did not mention words such as “Islam” or “Islamist radicals” when talking about terrorism. This obviously reflects his ideological perspective which of course does not contain orientalist thoughts.

In general, the article has one message which is that terrorism is not a result of extremism, but it is a result of the U.S. aggressive policies in the Third World. In other words, the author does not irrationalize the terrorists and argues that terrorism is a reaction against oppression. The discourse of sequences propositions proves this ideological point of view, and I am going to explain why. The author elaborated on the U.S. wars on the Third World countries and on its killing of people there, on the U.S. support for dictatorships and on the U.S. and international organizations ‘unfair’ economic policies.

In fact, the ideological perspective of the author is explicitly shown in the text, and that is not strange in an editorial article. However, it is still interesting to scrutinize some of the lexical choices and the phrasing in the text.
There is a tendency to demonize the U.S. in this article, and that is clear from the discursive level of sequences of propositions. The lexical choices in some cases prove this as the author describes U.S. actions in some counties as “aggression” and “brutal”, and we know these words have negative connotations. The word “claimer” in “claimers of human rights”, referring to the U.S. connotes that the U.S. does not really respect human rights. The author also used the word “revenge” to describe the U.S. war on terror, which is a tendency to irrationalize the U.S. action since revenge is guided by emotions and not by reason.

Despite the article I am analyzing here is an opinioned article, there are still presupposed meanings embedded in text, and here I give few examples:

-What is the guilt of America, its people and the people of other countries who have become victims of terrorism? That means the author admits that the U.S. faces the threat of terrorism.

-Why there friends are decreasing and enemies are increasing? The presupposed meaning here is that U.S. has a lot of enemies because of its policies. This is of course an ideology not everyone believes in it.

-“America has to take lessons from its historical mistakes and play the role of impartial mediator in the solution of Palestine, Kashmir and Chechen crises”. The implicative verb “take lessons” here implies that the U.S. is already not impartial in the mentioned conflicts and that it faces terrorism because of its policies in Palestine and Kashmir.

This article actually gives us an idea about the gap between the West and the Muslim world on an important subject such as terrorism. Discourse analysis gives us an idea about social values and norms in a given societies. Therefore, it is right to argue that some of the thoughts in this argument reflect the way people in Pakistan think. Terrorism is seen in Pakistan, as explained through this article, as a reaction against oppression and injustice. Obviously, this is not the way terrorism is seen in America where terrorism is connected with radicals Muslims who have no aim except harming innocent civilians- at least this is what can be understood from the New York Times articles I analyzed.

5.2.3 Afghanistan is at war
To begin with the semantic macrostructure analysis, we have the following global meanings in the text:

-Afghanistan is at war, as the title indicates. There is a war that threatens the stability of the region.
The US plans to take vengeance on Osama bin Laden.

Clearly enough, the semantic macrostructure of the text view the US warfare efforts in a negative way through words such as “vengeance” and to some degree that “at war” which gives the feeling that Afghanistan is destroyed because of giving up diplomacy and heading towards vengeance. Now this will of course has an implication on the way the reader will understand the following contents of the text, that is, the US is behaving irresponsibly. The writer explains explicitly how the war on Afghanistan is going to cause a problem to the region, and especially Pakistan which is going to pay high price for that. The writer has also implicitly expressed his ideological perspective through his choice of certain words. Lexical analysis of the text should prove the text, as we will see how the author, through the choice of certain words, has either casted doubt over the US official views or irrationalized the US actions. Examples are the usage of terms such as “civil war” and “clash of civilization”.

Unlike many of journalists in the US, who maybe would assure that the military strikes will lead to crushing the terrorism, the author of this piece is convinced, as we see from the selection of the words, the war is wrong: it will destroy Afghanistan (causes civil war), and will lead to more hatred (clash of civilizations).

The author also used the word “accused” when referring to Osama bin Laden “(Afghanistan has sheltered the accused)”, which is connotation that the person, who was wanted dead or alive by the US, could not be behind the 11 September terrorist attack. This view is expressed also by the author in the following statement “Accusing Osama and al-Qaida for 9/11 without any investigation and proof is unjust”. Richardson (2007, p. 47) notes that words convey social values and judgment, and we know that there is a negative views about the US in the Muslim world in general, and that explains why the author selects certain terms. Another example is the reference to the 11 September attack without calling it “terrorism”. Despite the vast majority of people in the Middle East opposes targeting civilians, but many sees the attacks perpetrated by Islamists on the US as revenge for the US aggressive policy in the Muslim world. Moreover, many people in Pakistan do not view the fight against occupation and oppression as terrorism. The author of the text we are analyzing in this section is obviously one of them and arguably shares this view, and there are examples from the text on that. The author used the term “arm struggle” to refer to the fight the Jihadists are doing in Kashmir. Of course, the selection of the word “struggle” is ideological and it reflects the view of many Pakistanis who view the fight in Kashmir as righteous struggle. In another example, the author writes that” It has to know that the time has come to stop unjust, exploitation, oppression, and aggravation against the innocent people”. The selection of words such as
“exploitation” and “oppression” is ideological and it is not only a negative presentation of the US, but it is even equivalent to saying that, indeed implicitly, it is the US which stated the terrorism, and the best way to counter bin-Laden terrorism is to stop the US state terrorism.

In general, the text has a general presupposition that is embedded in the text which is the US has a hidden agenda from its war on Afghanistan, and this presupposition can be read through many examples in the text as the following one: “The US was prepared for the situation [the war]... and now it got the proper reason, which they call terrorism”. The adjective “proper” connotes and presupposes that there is a hidden agenda.

5.2.4 500 civilians martyred in fresh attack on Afghanistan, Mullah Omar and Osama’s hideouts bombed with bunker busters

This article contains in addition to the headline, two sub headlines. We pay special attention to them because they determine the global structure of the text, which as noted by van Dijk (2009, p. 68), influences the other structure of the discourse of the text. Although the author uses passive voice, which removes the specificity, and thus makes the news less negative; the lexical choices in the headline demonstrates an anti-American bias. For instance, writing the exact number (500) of casualties of the American attack on Afghanistan aims at drawing the attention to these victims, and in turn condemns the U.S. action. The usage of the word “civilians” instead of “people” gives weight to this point. Another important lexical choice is “martyred”, which is obviously ideological as the author indirectly (some would even say directly) identifies herself or himself with the Afghani casualties. Martyrdom is associated in all cultures with sacrifice and good fight. In Islamic traditions the word is associated with persons who are killed while defending their countries and religion. The adjective “fresh” triggers presupposed meaning, which is Afghanistan, is under continuous attack. We should notice here that the author is implicitly telling us that the U.S. is waging a war on Afghanistan and its people. The lexical choice behind “Afghanistan” demonstrates this point; and here we see how the coverage of the war in Afghanistan in Jang differs from that of New York Times. The latter prefers to say that the war is against Taliban and al-Qaida members, while the first, as the case with this article, makes the argument that the war is on Afghanistan and its people. In light of this, the semantic macrostructure of this article is that U.S. is waging a war on Afghanistan and killing innocent people there. This view is enhanced in the following sub headlines:

-“Omar and Osama Bin Laden remain safe due to changing hideouts, Aura Bagh village perished, 1st daytime attack on Kabul city, arms depot and base targeted with missiles”.
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Notice the lexical choices behind “perished” and “attack”. Obviously, “perished” is a strong word, and in this context, the author says implicitly that the U.S. attacks are barbaric since they caused a destruction of the village Aura Bagh. The word “Attack” is interesting since it is used by the author constantly through the text. Unlike “raids”, the word “attack” is loaded with negative meaning in this context as it connotes aggressiveness and truthfulness; especially this attack is directed against Kabul city, as the author states.

-“Two mosques also desecrated, plaza and two buses also targeted, fire erupts in Qandahar’s army depot, vast destruction as bomb drops in Hirat Bazaar, 10,000 Taliban deployed at Uzbek border”. Obviously, the lexical choices of “mosques”, “desecrated”, “buses”, “Bazaar” intend to implicitly criminalize the U.S. military actions in Afghanistan.

The description of propositions reveals also the ideological perspective of the writer as she or he details the casualties of the U.S. ‘attacks’ and the damage caused by them. In what follows we give some examples on this:

-“Bin Laden’s hideouts were targeted with 5,000 pounds heavy bunker buster”

-Giving the number of casualties: “Five hundred people were martyred and more than 1,000 injured in fresh attacks”; “Aura Bagh village was completely razed to the ground killing 200 people”; “… that killed 49 citizens. A plaza was also hit which reportedly left 98 people dead”.

Analyzing some of the lexical choices by the author gives a similar result that the author implicitly identifies with Afghanistan ad sees the war on the country as illegal aggression. The word “deadliest”, which was used to describe the U.S. ‘attacks’, connotes ruthlessness and implies huge destruction. The word ‘debris’ in “rescue the injured and dead from the debris” implies the horror of the war as houses leveled to the ground. It is also interesting that the author describes al-Qaida members in Afghanistan as “militants” instead of “terrorists”, and that reveals how terrorism is a contested concept, especially when it comes to different cultures. Taliban movement is also not perceived negatively by the author, and this can be explained through the following statement: “Taliban have deployed 10,000 troops”. The lexical choices behind “deployed” and “troops” are arguably ideological because they connote legitimacy of Taliban, who like other governments, “deploy troops”, and not “send militants or fighters or extremists”.
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President Bush announces ground attack on Afghanistan

It is important to analyze the main headline and the sub headlines in order to understand the global meaning of the text. According to the headline, the first semantic macrostructure is that the war in Afghanistan is going to enter a new phase, which is the ground attack. The sub headlines tell more about this war: killing, destruction, suffering, horrors, etc.:

- “Bombing continued for 4th consecutive day, many houses destroyed in Kabul and Qandahar, houses of Mullah Omar and neighbors suffer, numerous killed”. The horror of the war is reflected in the lexical choices in “many”, “suffer”, and “numerous”.

- “Culprits will be brought to justice, will stop attacks if Taliban handover Osama Bin Laden: Bush, Apache helicopters will also be used, 1000 commandos on standby to deploy in Afghanistan: US officials”. The selection of this particular arguably aimed at implicitly showing that the U.S. is determined to continue the war in Afghanistan.

- “Fire erupted in depots of oil and explosives in Jalalabad, mountains bombed in Hirat, Mazar-e-Sharif and Qunduz, electricity shut down in Kabul, Radio Shariat off aired, relief activities going on”. The vocabulary of this sub headline (fire, explosives, mountains bombed, shut down, off aired) implies the aggressiveness of the war in Afghanistan and its negative effects on people.

The global meaning of the text in light of the above-mentioned is that the ground attack on Afghanistan is imminent; the war continues to destroy the lives of people; and more destruction will occur due to the planned ground attack. The description of the propositions support this view as the author quoted Bush threatening Afghanistan with war at length (example of long quote is this: “Culprits would be brought to justice no matter it takes days, months, years or decades”). Moreover, the author gives details about how the American missiles and bombs kill civilians cause damages to the country. The lexical choices in this article are worth highlighting because they reveal the ideological perspective of the author, which is arguably critical of the war in Afghanistan. In what follows we give examples on the some lexical choices:

- “bombing” implies violence and damaging and hurting people. Interestingly, the author refers to the sites which were bombed by names of towns, cities and the name of the country Afghanistan (e.g. Jalalabad suburbs, Shorawak). Arguably, the author through using this reference aims at implicitly sending the message that the U.S. is indiscriminately attacking Afghani cities, causing a lot of damage.
- The author refers to the casualties as “civilians”, “women”, and “children”. Of course this reference intends to condemn Bush administration and demonize it. What is interesting here is that the author does not mention casualties belonging to Taliban, which means that the war is not against Taliban and al-Qaida, but it is against, as implicitly said, innocent people.

- “Taliban fired back at attacking fighter planes but to no avail”. The combination of “fired back” and “attacking” here implicitly mean the U.S. is the aggressor and Taliban is the defender of Afghanistan.

- “Allied Forces warplanes kept on bombing Afghanistan”. The verb “kept on” carries a presupposed meaning that the allied forces have been tirelessly bombing Afghanistan.

5.2.6 US attack on Afghanistan: Kabul, Jalalabad and Qandahar rained with missiles

This main global meaning in this article, as it is clear from the headline, is that U.S. is militarily attacking and destroying Afghanistan. The reference used in the headline is interesting. Instead of using military terms such as “air raids” or “missiles”, the author chose to use name of countries “U.S. attacking Afghanistan” in order to, it seems so, show that the war is against the Afghani nation. The lexical choice “attack” is loaded with negative meaning. The usage of the active form “U.S. attack on Afghanistan” is arguably aimed at highlighting the fact that it is the U.S. which should be blamed for all the destruction made in Afghanistan. Again, the author refers to cities (e.g. Kabul, Jalalabad) in order to implicitly tell us that this war is targeting the people of Afghanistan. The sub headlines emphasize this point:

- “Bombing started quarter to 10PM, Mazar-e-Sharif, Qunduz and Hirat also bombed, air bases, defense installations, radio station, Mullah Omar’s residence, Al-Qaida hideouts targeted, numerous jets and copters destroyed, Taliban confirm reports”. Obviously, detailing the bombed targets aims to show how Afghanistan and its people are victimized.

- “Taliban’s anti-aircraft guns retaliated the attack for 40 minutes, B-52 warplanes also used. Fifty cruise missiles fired in first round: US Secretary Defense, US will neither hesitate nor fail: Bush”. The lexical choice behind “retaliated” is ideological, and it aims at implicitly saying that the U.S. is the aggressor and Taliban is resisting a foreign attack.

The description of the propositions is ideological also, and tends in this context to highlight the argument that Afghanistan is being subjected to foreign aggression. This is obvious as the author gives details about the U.S. air raids on the country and what damage they have caused. The author details how cities of Afghanistan are attacked, what are the targets, and
what types of weapons were used. The point that Afghanistan is under ruthless attack is balanced by another discourse (description). The author also gives details about perspective of Bush administration on the war on Afghanistan:

-Bush says that the war is not directed against Afghanistan, but against terrorism.

-Blair said that this war broke out because Taliban refused to hand over the leader of al-Qaida organization.

-“France, Australia and Germany also participated in attack on Afghanistan against the Taliban”. The American perspective is clear here as the attack, as the U.S. officials say, is against Taliban

-The coalition forces try to avoid the loss of innocent lives.

-“He (US Secretary Defense Donald Rumsfeld) said they had started dropping relief goods in Afghanistan”.

It is unclear if this description is ideological or not, but we suggest that the author attempts to adhere to journalistic professional values through explaining the American perspective at length. Regardless of this discourse, the ideological perspective (U.S. is attacking Afghanistan and its people) of the author is clear as I explained it earlier, and a closer look at the lexical choices should reinforce this view.

-The word “attack” was mentioned repeatedly through the article to refer to the U.S. raids on Afghanistan. We explained before the negative connotation this word carries in this context.

-The author refers repeatedly through the text as cities which connotes that the war is against Afghanistan as a nation and not Taliban.

-“scrap” in …. “A number of their warplanes and helicopters have also been reduced to scrap”. The connotation here is the heavy and deadly fire the Americans are using against a defenseless country such as Afghanistan.

-The word “terrorism” was used several times when quoting the American and British officials. The word is full of negative connotations; however, the author seems to use it to balance his or her piece.
5.2.7 In favor of Afghanistan, our stance in interest of both Afghans and Pakistani people, sufficient proof against Osama: President Musharraf

The semantic macrostructure of the article is that the Pakistani involvement in the war on Afghanistan is to protect the Pakistani and Afghani interests. This is apparent in the lexical choices of “favor” and “interest”. Another semantic macrostructure derived from the headline is that the Pakistani involvement in the war is justified, and so the war, because there is a “proof” against the leader of al-Qaeda. “Proof” connotes strong justification. The reference to President Musharraf gives this argument more weight since he is the president of Pakistan. Obviously, the main message found in the semantics of the headline is that the war on Afghanistan is justified. The sub headlines justify this view:

- “Pakistan and Britain agree on broad-based Afghan government, elimination of terrorism, Pakistan’s economic stability”. “Elimination” is embedded with presupposition that terrorism already exists since it is need to be eliminated. The lexical choice behind “stability” implies implicitly that the war on Afghanistan is beneficial for Pakistan. This sub headline reinforces the main global meaning in the text that the war on Afghanistan is justified.

- “Purpose of attack on Afghanistan is not to harm Afghan people but to eliminate terrorism, want broad-based government in Afghanistan in which Pashtuns are also represented”. This sub headline is another example of pro-war argument: it is a war against terrorism, and not against Afghan people. Terrorism is a word loaded with negative connotations, and its use is mostly ideological, and this can be suggested in this article since it is a pro-war piece as the global meaning indicates.

- “Pakistan policy of cooperation with international fraternity laudable, IMF and EU to provide full financial support to Pakistan, defense assistance would also be given: British PM Tony Blair’s Press Conference”. One of the most important semantic macrostructures of the text is that, as this sub headline indicates, the war on Afghanistan is beneficial to Pakistan. Of course this is not said explicitly, but it is hidden in the semantic of words as the author talks about what Pakistan will get in return from its participation in the war. The lexical choice behind “cooperation” is interesting because it indicates Pakistani sovereignty since it cooperates instead of taking “orders” from the U.S. government.

It is very important to refer that the description comes in line with the ideological perspective expressed in the global meaning. The author details the help Pakistan will get from the international community, which means implicitly the reward Pakistan will get because of its
cooperation. The author gives figures of how many millions the country will get and how the international organizations such as IMF and EU. The lexical choices in the text seem to reinforce also the pro-war argument. “Laudable” (referring to Pakistani role in Afghanistan) implies that Pakistan is an important player in the international affair under Musharraf’s regime. The verb “extended” in “full support will be extended to Pakistan” implies embedded meaning which is that Pakistan is already supported by the international community. Analyzing the words “prosperous” and “development” in “He said they wanted to see Afghanistan strong, prosperous and developing” is interesting. Although the author here is quoting the then British Prime minister Blair, we should explain the connotations associated with these terms since it was the author’s choice to include such a quote in this article. These words trigger embedded meaning that Afghanistan is underdeveloped under the rule of Taliban, and it will be developed and civilized after the intervention of the US-led forces. This actually resembles the development discourse which views the Third World societies as underdeveloped, and perceives the West as developed, living in the mission of civilizing the southern societies. Clearly enough, development is another argument in the text that makes the case for the war on Afghanistan.

5.2.8 Osama in Afghanistan, Taliban should hand him over: US; US attack feared in 48 hours
The semantic macrostructure of the text is that the war in Afghanistan is imminent and investable. The reader should expect to find information about American threats to Afghanistan, and about the preparation for the war. Another global meaning in the text is that the Taliban is to blame for the war because it harbors Osama, the leader of al-Qaida. That is semantic macrostructure is derived from the reference to Osama, which highlight the American perspective in the war on Afghanistan. There are two sub semantic macrostructures that can be derived from the two sub headlines:

-“Attack will aim at Osama and Taliban’s air force of 20 warplanes as well as arms cache, first phase to start from Arabian Sea: British papers, ‘Breaking News’ may come anytime”. The reference to “Osama” and “Taliban” indicates that the war is not against Afghanistan, but it is against extremist groups such as al-Qaida and Taliban. However, the usage of the adjective “first” hides a presupposition that this war is going to be harsh and long; it will consist of different faces, and it is unknown what it will end.

-“Come anyway around, US will find us ready, Taliban with us, no one can reach to him, Ulema Council’s verdict sent to Osama, no US or British soldier landed in Afghanistan
neither have we captured anyone: Taliban‖. The second sub semantic macrostructure is also about threats, but this time from Taliban movement which warns the Americans of invading Afghanistan.

This article is divided into two parts that are written by different authors; however both come under the same headline and sub headlines. In the first part of the article the author explains the American perspective. The discursive level of sequences of propositions comes, as it is expected, in line with the semantic macrostructure. The author quoted journalists and newspapers such as ‘Observer’ and ‘Sunday Mail’ at lengthy to support the argument that the war on Afghanistan will break out very soon. As we know, the discourse of sequences propositions is normally not innocent, and it is rather ideological, and the author here arguably warns that Afghanistan is going to face tough consequences soon. Another ideological argument advanced in the text is that the war is going to be waged because Taliban is protecting the leader of al-Qaida. This is clear as the author specified a considerable space in his piece for American authorities (US defense secretary and the White House) to explain this perspective. Although the second part of the article written by different author, it is important to analyze it along with the first part as one piece that reflects policy of the newspaper. The discourse of sequences propositions in the second part aims to argue that the American war on Afghanistan is an aggression. That is clear as the author specifies this part to explain Taliban’s perspective through the movement’s ambassador to Pakistan Mullah Abdus Salam Zaeef. In this part, the ambassador explained that U.S. has no proof regarding Osama’s involvement in 11 September terrorist attack. He also calls the American war as international terrorism, and explains at lengthy that Taliban is ready to defend their country.

In general, we can say this article is somewhat balanced, but the discourse of sequences propositions tend to highlight Taliban’s perspective more. In the first part, the author allows the American officials to explain their perspective, but she or he also quoted western newspapers which not necessarily reflected the American argument. However, the second part of the author was aimed fully to explain what a Taliban official says.

5.2.9 Release of eight relief workers for ending war threat, US rejects Taliban offer

Analyzing the headline is important to understand global meaning of the text as whole. The verb “ending” is loaded with presupposed meaning which is that there is an already threat from the U.S. to attack Afghanistan. The lexical choices behind “rejects” and “offer” are ideological and aimed at showing that Taliban movement is making concisions to avoid the
war, while the U.S. does not do the same. “Reject” implies in this context extremism, and “offer” connotes generosity and reconciliation. So, the semantic macrostructure, as the headline tells, is that Taliban is heading for peace, and the U.S. is heading for war. This is very important because the war on Afghanistan has nothing to do with the relief workers, but it is about, as explained by the American officials, al-Qaida’s involvement in 11 September attack. Arguably, reducing the war to the relief workers aims at showing that the U.S. is ignoring peace initiatives. There are other two semantic macrostructures that can be derived from the following sub headlines:

“President Bush has already made clear now it was time of operation, not talks: White House, Taliban hastily losing against time, should handover Osama or face the music, US President’s Radio Speech”. This sub headlines contain two semantic macrostructures; first, the war is imminent; second, it is Taliban who should be blamed because they do not want to hand over al-Qaida leader.

“Life of Afghan people had similar importance like the Western workers, who were fleeing homes for other countries due to fears of war and attacks: Afghan Foreign Office”. The main semantic macrostructure here is that the lives of Afghani people are also worthy as those of westerners. Another semantic macrostructure is detected here, which is, the American war is going to be disastrous for people. This is derived after studying the lexical choices behind “fleeing” and “fears”.

This news story is divided into parts that are written by different authors. In the first article, the American perspective is clear, and that is what can be understood from the discourse of sequences propositions. The author specified the first part of the article to explain the US argument on the war on Afghanistan through giving the microphone to President Bush. The U.S. president explained, as the text reveals, that terrorism attacked innocent people, and that Taliban is harboring terrorism and they are cruel to their people, and that the U.S. is not fighting against Islam. Of course the description of propositions is important to study because it is ideological. Instead of saying her or his opinion directly, the author chooses to put it through the sequences of propositions. However, it is unclear if what Bush says reflects the ideology of the author because any news organization in any country, so how about a country involved in the war indirectly like Pakistan, would report what the president of the most powerful country says. In what follows we try to analyze discourse of some propositions in order to understand how the war is justified in the U.S.:
- “US had given clear option to every nation either to stand with the civilized world or support the terrorist”. President Bush is using vocabularies (terrorist, civilized) from the development and orientalism discourse (unclear if this reflects the author’s view). The west has perceived itself for long time as civilized which intends to develop the savage orient. Needless to say, terrorism has been connected in the western mind with Islam, and it is no strange that Bush is using it when there is a war in an Islamic country.

- President Bush mentioned that Taliban are “cruel to women and punish their detractors”. Again, the orientalist discourse is present in Bush speech. Referring to women is interesting because can anyone believe that a country will send its troops thousands miles away in order to protect women? The orientalist discourse view Muslim societies as against women and the west as savior who wants to emancipate women.

- “I will also stress Congress to release funds for long term projects so that the US with other friends of Afghanistan could better help in progress and rehabilitation of this ill-fated nation”. Here the development discourse is obvious. The west perceives itself as savior with divine mission, aims at civilizing and developing other nations.

The second part of the news story is dedicated to explain Taliban’s perspective through Taliban officials who explain that the war in going to be disastrous, and that the war is an aggression against peaceful nation. What is interesting here is that the author refers to the Taliban official as “minister”; a reference that is clearly ideological. In fact, in this case, the author gives Taliban legitimacy by calling their officials ministers of Afghanistan. An American newspaper would probably call Afghani officials instead Taliban’s officials. In general, this piece is balanced as the opposing perspectives are given; however, the American perspective is more highlighted because more space is given to explain what President Bush says.

5.2.10 The next phase in Afghanistan ... the role of UN should increase

As it is clear from the headline, the semantic macrostructure of the text is that U.N. should be given more assignments after the war ends in Afghanistan. So, the message to the reader’s mine is that after the war, there is a need for cooperative works in which broad coalition should be involved. Implicitly, and others may find this exaggeration, the talk about a broad coalition means a distrust in the U.S. policies. In fact, this reflects a general assumption about the U.S in Pakistan and in the Muslim world in general that it is a state with an imperial
agenda. This point is actually supported by the description of propositions which suspects the U.S. intention, and here are some examples:

- After mentioning that the Security Council should play an important role, the author stated that “America has kept the color card with it and will show it on the proper time”. In this sentence there is a presupposition that the U.S. does not have good intentions in Afghanistan. This point is expressed through figurative speech, and also through the usage of the state verb “kept” which invokes presupposition.

- “Sadly the representative of 190 countries has become the stick in the hands of superpowers”. There is a presupposition here that the U.S. will not restrict the role of the U.N. in Afghanistan.

- “The US did not consider the UN in its military action that it took on 7th of October”. The lexical choice behind “its” assumes that the U.S. acted in Afghanistan alone against the will of the international community.

- “This reality is undeniable that the power full countries bent the UN and use it for their valid and invalid proposes”. The lexical choices behind “valid” and “invalid” definitely reflects the ideological perspective of the author, who believes that power states have also dirty business as well. Actually, because this article is about the U.S., and because this article is about the U.S. war in Afghanistan, and because the discourse of sequences propositions cast doubts on the U.S. actions, we can argue that. The author wants to send the implicit message that the argument of the war on Afghanistan could be valid. This is actually not only his view, but many people in his communities believe so, and here lies our interest: to understand the values of norms of people through analyzing the language.

What is interesting about this article is that although it is an editorial, but the author chose in most cases to not express his ideological views, which we explained, above explicitly. But anyone with little experience with media analysis would be quick to conclude that this article is critical to the U.S., and soft of Taliban. Indeed the lexical choices reveal this point. For instance, it is interesting that the author refers to Taliban as “Afghan government”. Indeed as noted by van Dijk (2009, p. 70), the choice of word expresses the ideological perspective of the author. Unlike many western reporters who refer to Taliban as extremists and terrorists, the author seems to believe that Taliban is a legitimate government of Afghanistan. Accordingly, this give more weight to I have argued earlier that the author believes the argument of the war on Afghanistan is “invalid”.
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6 Discussion and conclusion
This part will be divided into three subparts. At first we will discuss the articles of *New York Times*. In the second part we will discuss the articles of the Pakistani Jang newspapers. At last, we will write the conclusion in which we try to give remarks about how the coverage of the newspapers differs.

6.1 Discussion of New York Times Articles
There are four major themes can be derived from the analyzed news articles which will be discussed in the followings:

6.1.1 Terrorism and Extremism Theme
Demonizing the enemy is a common practiced used by rivals in times of wars in order to not only justify the war itself, but also as stressed by Jowett & O’Donnell, 199, p- 295), to convince the audience the enemy should be killed without empathy. Analyzing *New York Times* revealed that Taliban were demonized and irrationalized. The traditional orientalist stereotypes were used to demonize and irrationalize Taliban. That is no longer surprising as the West is the habit of using the charge of terrorism and extremism whenever a Muslim country is attacked. Our finding revealed that Taliban and al-Qaida were branded in the news articles we have analyzed as “Islamic terrorists”, “radical Islamists”, “Muslim extremists”, “fundamentalist Islam” etc. The orientalist discourse aims at irrationalizing Muslim societies through linking them with extremism and terrorism. In fact, there is a tendency to link Islam as religion, and not only Taliban to terrorism and extremism, and this is done through several ways. In one article about terrorism the author used reference to a “Palestinian” man; and another Muslim person by the name of “Sheik Omar Abdel Rahman” to refer to examples of terrorist activities in the U.S., which is an implicit argument that terrorism is linked with Islam. Some authors used Islamic terms such as “Wahhabism”, “Salafism” and “Jihad” when talking about terrorism and extremism, which is an indirect way of attributing terrorism with the religion of Islam. It happens often when talking about the instability that some authors refer to religious Muslim groups, which is again an indirect way of seeing Islam as a source of irrationality. Another example of demonizing Islam is the reference to Hawala system in one article, which is an Arabic word for the word “money transfer”. The tendency to refer to systems or persons is their Arabic names such as “Hawala”, “Jihad”, “Jahiliyyah”, “Allah”, etc. aims arguably at irrationalizing not only Taliban, but also Islam as religion since these people link the Arabic language with Islam. Again, demonizing the enemy aims at justifying
the warfare efforts and crushing the enemy. As highlighted by Mral (2004, p. 21), demonizing the enemy justifying the excessive force against it, and makes the collateral damage to population regrettable, yet unavoidable.

6.1.2 Women Rights Theme
The orientalist discourse spreads the stereotype that Islam is against women; and that is why wars in Muslim countries are justified partly by claiming to help women (Mral, 2004, pp. 36 & 37). However, our analysis has not found much of the orientalist attitude that sees Muslim societies as against women. The explanation for this could be that the September attack was still fresh when the war was waged, which makes the argument about terrorism is a priority. Despite this, two articles gave reference to how women are marginalized in Pakistan and Afghanistan. An interesting example is the fact mentioned by an author that women are not involved in the Hawala business in Pakistan. Whether this is true or not, the reference to women here is malicious, and it cannot be separated from the western stereotypes that Muslims persecutes women. Another interesting example is that one author quoted an ‘eyewitness’ saying that women are optimistic about the war and they are filled with joy over the American bombing of their country so that they can complete their education!

6.1.3 The War Is Against Taliban, And not Against Afghan people
The discourse of the sequences propositions throughout the articles give weight to the idea that the war in Afghanistan is not against the Afghan nation; but it is against the Taliban and terrorists. We can see that the authors elaborating on what the American officials say in order to not explain, but also to highlight the American perspective. Moreover, there seems to be less focus on the civilian casualties. The lexical choices throughout the news articles tend to highlight this argument; for instance, it is interesting to note that authors of the analyzed articles tend to refer to the Afghan government by “Taliban” instead of “government” which intends to illegitimate the rule of Taliban in Afghanistan. Since authors tend to adopt indirectly the American’s perspective that the war is against Taliban and not against people; it is logic to expect that authors tend to remove or reduce the negative news that are associated with the U.S. war on Afghanistan. U.S. attacks are referred often as “raids”, which gives the impression that the attacks are directed at specific military targets. Authors often refer to the dead by saying “Taliban” or “al-Qaida” instead of referring to them as “Afghans” which is an indirect attempt to justify targeting them. We can see there is a tendency to use soft words to describe the U.S. military actions and their consequences, e.g. “unknown” instead of giving the exact number of casualties; “zeroed” when referring to American jet fighters, implying
that the raids did not make much destruction. We also notice that civilian casualties are almost absent from the reports; and “murky” to describe the damage made by the air raids.

### 6.1.4 Helpfulness Theme

The discursive sequences propositions throughout the news articles tend to describe the American war in Afghanistan as a mission aims at helping people and developing the country. This is clear as it happens on several occasions that Afghans civilians are quoted saying that they are not afraid of the Americans and that they regard Taliban as cruel and enemies. If anything, this means the American soldiers are described implicitly as liberators and saviors. Example of this is that one Afghani citizen is referred in one article as “deathly” afraid of Taliban, and “cheered the (American) bombing in silence”. The Swedish researcher Mral argued that helping people to build up their country is an important aspect of the discourse of the war on Afghanistan (2004, p. 53). It has been argued that the war on terror is built partially on racist concept that the West perceives itself as superior and developed who wants to develop the other, which is referred to as uncivilized and undeveloped (Richardson, 2007, p. 191). It is no strange that Taliban, the rulers of Afghanistan are described as terrorist, extremist, and cruel; and that it is the west represented by the U.S. is the one who is going to develop the country.

### 6.2 Discussion of Jang News Articles

#### 6.2.1 War with hidden agenda; war against the Muslim world

In general, the articles we analyzed tend to view the war on Afghanistan as a war against the Muslim world or a war with an imperialistic agenda. Examples of lexical choices that are found in news articles and give weight to this point are: “Muslim world”, “clash of civilization”, “Umma” (Arabic word stands for nation, and it is used in the Islamic texts to refer to Muslim nations), “threats” (in this context to Muslim world). The discourse of sequences propositions also focuses on issues such as the lack of impartiality in conflicts where Muslim nations are involved such as Kashmir and Palestine. Some authors gave reference to the power abuse by the power states, indicating that U.S. intervenes in Afghanistan based on its interests.

#### 6.2.2 War against Afghan People, and not against Taliban

The war on Afghanistan is described implicitly (and explicitly) in the analyzed newspapers as war against Afghan people. We can see this clearly through lexical choices such as “brutal”, “aggression”, “desecrated” (mosques), “attack”, “scrap” (referring the damage caused by the bombardment). Analyzing the discourse of sequences propositions helped to highlight this
point as specific numbers of casualties were given (e.g. 1000 injured; 500 civilians), and details about the American air raids were given. Afghani victims were referred to as “martyred”, “civilians”, “children” and “women”. Another reference used to argue that the war is directed against the Afghani nation is that names of cities were given to refer to sites that were bombed instead of telling the specific targets, which indicates that the war is waged against Afghanistan as a whole, and not against a group.

6.2.3 Terrorism
In general, authors of the analyzed news articles discussed terrorism from different perspective. It is interesting to note that al-Qaida and Taliban were not in general referred as terrorists in the news articles. The word terrorism was used often when quoting American official, and was not generally used directly by the author. The proof that authors look at terrorism in a different way is the point that some authors referred to Taliban as “government of Afghanistan” or as Afghani official/minister/spokesperson, which means the movement is not seen as extremist or terrorist movement by the authors of the news articles. Some even suspects that 11 September attack is perpetrated by al-Qaida, and others do not regard what they call “struggle” in Kashmir as terrorism. Another argument proves that Pakistani journalists understand terrorism differently is that one author explains that the reason for terrorism is the U.S. “oppression”, “exploitation” and “aggression” on weaker nations. Of course, this view does not mean that terrorism is entirely seen from different perspective. Some news articles balanced its reporting and offered another perspective, which we are going to discuss in the following section.

6.2.4 Alternative perspective
The discourse of sequences propositions sometimes reflects the American perspective. Some authors offered considerable space for the American and British officials to explain their perspectives in the war. Much of what have been written in this regards is that the war on Afghanistan aimed at eliminating terrorism, indicating that al-Qaida and Taliban are terrorists and extremists; helping Afghans (through development projects); and emancipating women. However, it is important to note here this view is still not highlighted compared to the anti-American view.

6.3 Concluding Remarks
Obviously, there is a big difference between the way New York Times and Jang newspaper covered the week before and after the outbreak of war on Afghanistan. For the New York Times, Taliban are seen as terrorists and extremists. There are signs also that the paper adopt
the orientalist discourse which links extremism and terrorism with Muslim nations. The case is far different for the Pakistani newspaper, which seems to see Taliban as legitimate government instead of terrorists; and it adopts the view that terrorist is a result of U.S. oppression and exploitation of weaker nations. The American newspaper promotes, although not given much focus, the argument that Taliban movement is an abusive of women rights, and that the foreign invaders are liberators of women and people. This is clear as the U.S. military actions and victims of them are described in soft terms that aim at removing the negative effects of the war. Jang newspapers adopts, on the other hand, an anti-American bias as the war is portrayed as an aggression against the Afghan nation which results in massacring hundreds of civilians and in the destruction of many places.

6.3.1 Propaganda and Social Values
Obviously, the two papers employed propaganda, and that appeared to happen through exploiting the values and norms of societies where the two newspapers are based. That is a common practice as whether war lords or war opponent, they need to make constant reference to the already accepted beliefs in their societies. For New York Times, which had a pro-war coverage as it is explained throughout the paper, negative stereotypes about Muslims were called into the coverage. It is arguably because Taliban is an Islamic movement; the negative stereotypes about Muslims are needed to engineer the propaganda of the war on terror. That is why the connection between Islam (and Taliban) from one side and terrorism and extremism from another side were hidden in the semantic of vocabularies used in New York Times. There was also reference to how Taliban allegedly mistreat women in Afghanistan. Now whether such reference was true or not, the talking about it by the paper serves the propaganda of the war on terror since Islam is linked with women oppression in the west, and people will have no difficulties in believing that Taliban is persecuting women since it is an Islamic movement. It is clear that this demonization of Taliban is aimed at justifying the war on Afghanistan, the country the movement ruled at the time.

Similarly, Jang newspaper popularized the negative assumptions and thoughts about the United States in Pakistan in its anti-war media effort or propaganda. One of the quite-well established idea in Pakistan (and perhaps in most of the Muslim world) is that 11 September attack is an inside job. Some authors used this idea to cast doubt on the U.S. agenda in Afghanistan. Others made reference through the semantic words also to what is called in Pakistan the U.S. imperial policies and its support of oppression regimes. All these references are taken from the societal values, and they are not innocent, and they definitely aimed at
making the argument that the war on Afghanistan is not aimed at fighting terror, but to secure the U.S interests in the region.

This paper shows that fighting for and against wars cannot be without the usage of the social values; and that is actually what propaganda is dependent on.
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The New York Times' Samples:

Appendix 1

Article Published on 2nd Oct. 2001

In Pakistan, a Shaky Ally
By BARRY BEARAK
Published: October 2, 2001

ISLAMABAD, Pakistan, Oct. 1 — For years, Pakistan has seemed a place about to blow. Bankruptcy is at the door; angry mullahs are at the gate. The corruption of the powerful is epic, the poverty of the masses crushing. The army has taken charge, again putting democracy on the shelf. More people own guns than refrigerators. This country, then, may seem a strange choice as America's indispensable ally in the hunt for Osama bin Laden. Islamic guerrillas — many would call them terrorists — openly operate inside Pakistan's borders, with government support. But for the Bush administration, Pakistan it is — a rediscovered crony from America's cold war days, forced back into friendship at gunpoint to fight terrorism. In his Sept. 19 speech to the nation, Gen. Pervez Musharraf, Pakistan's military ruler for the last two years, explained that he was facing an American ultimatum — join us or fight us — and that he felt that the country's very survival was at risk. In many ways, it is. The country is polarized. On one side stand sympathizers with the West who have felt increasingly marginalized in recent years and believe that the current turmoil may be a rare stroke of fortune that halts the "Talibanization" of Pakistan, a drift toward the fundamentalist Islam of neighboring Afghanistan. On the other stand the holy warriors, the hope of the country's myriad dispossessed.

Pakistan, with a population between 140 million and 150 million, is the world's seventh most populous country. Like many nations in the third world, it seems to be simultaneously moving ahead and falling behind at frantic speeds. It is this dichotomy that explains some of the violence of the country's conflicts.

Today, someone claiming to be from one of the best-known of Pakistan's radical Islamic guerrilla groups, Jaish-e Muhammad, took responsibility for a suicide bombing at the state legislature in Srinagar, in Indian-administered Kashmir. The attack killed at least 26 people. One of this region's many open secrets is that the Pakistani government itself has armed Islamic militants, sending them off to fight the Indian authorities in Kashmir in an attempt to wrest the contested Himalayan territory, which is primarily Muslim, from Hindu control.

A Pakistani Foreign Ministry spokesman, in a statement today, condemned the Srinagar attack. "Pakistan condemns terrorism in all its forms and manifestations," he said. But whatever the government's past relationship to Jaish-e-Muhammad, it seems clear that the United States, in its new determination to combat terrorism, has sided with a military government that has not been averse to backing insurgency in Kashmir. Radical Muslim political parties, historically weak at the polls, are traditionally potent in the streets, where the number of poor and the number of refugees grow. Kalashnikovs are everywhere, as are men who know how to use them. Twin jihads — one in Afghanistan, one in Kashmir — save many from the idle hours of joblessness and fill them with lethal, self-righteous purpose.

But the radical Islamists drawn to holy war, however grateful for their supply of guns and grenades, very often despise the national leaders who provide them. The more those Pakistani
leaders look like American cronies working to oust the Taliban government in Afghanistan, the more the hate may grow. By drafting this fragile and fractious nation into a central role in the "war on terrorism," America runs the danger of setting off a cataclysm in a place where civil violence is a likely bet and nuclear weapons exist. Pakistan has long been the speculated locale for one of the world's worst nightmare scenarios, in which Islamic terrorists, in league with rogue elements of the military, seize control of the government and wield the vengeful sword of jihad with a nuclear tip. Islam is a growing force here. Hundreds of religious schools, known as madrassahs, have eagerly sent their students to fight at the Taliban's side. Pakistani border guards wish them well as they head to the front lines. Last Friday, in a drama repeated in hundreds of towns and cities across the country, mullahs at the Red Mosque in Islamabad followed the gentle chanting of afternoon prayers with frenzied threats of violence: Death to America! Let Americans come here to be buried! A plea went out for 50,000 volunteers to defend Afghanistan against "the infidels." The entreaty was made with the desperate ardor of merchants at a going-out-of-business sale. Many of Pakistan's fundamentalist clerics endorse the Taliban's formula for a pure Islamic state. Without the Taliban, these mullahs would be without their rallying point. An 18-year-old spectator, Tai Muhammad, said he had pledged his life to the anti-American jihad, enlisting at the mosque's sign-up table. "People like me will be the Americans' reception committee," he said, grinning in satisfaction. Lambasted along with President Bush was General Musharraf, called a traitor to his country, his religion and 1,400 years of Islamic history. Afghanistan, Mr. bin Laden's sanctuary, is not merely Pakistan's neighbor. Pakistani intelligence agents have been the Taliban's godfathers, turning a throng of self-righteous religious students into a militia of self-assured soldiers.

Until recently, the Taliban have been useful to Pakistan, providing an ally on its western flank as rival India lurks to the east, and a breeding ground for Islamic militancy that could be redirected toward Kashmir. So to many at the Red Mosque, Pakistan's cooperation with America seems like a sellout. American money, of course, is not an insignificant inducement, especially to a nation $37 billion in debt with virtually no prospects of climbing out of the hole. So far, a windfall has yet to appear, though America — suddenly forgiving of the testing of nuclear weapons and the eschewing of democracy — has removed many economic sanctions against Pakistan. Together with the Japanese, the United States has rescheduled nearly $1 billion in debt and authorized $90 million in aid. Indeed, renewed solvency is the hope of many Pakistanis who believe that a decisive battle has at last been joined. "It's a wonderful thing," said a retired general, speaking on condition of anonymity. "We were in a state of drift. The silent majority was being dragged in a terrible direction by a very vocal minority. This is God-sent. We're saved. "That optimistic view is shared by much of a Westernized elite that would see the Taliban's overthrow as the logical halt to the onrushing fundamentalism in their own midst. Many have long assumed that an upheaval was inevitable, with moderate Islam battling the religion's extremist, intolerant version. That confrontation is better fought now than later, they say. "If there is a silver lining in this, it's that the radicals, the jihadists, will be de-fanged now instead of 10 years later when they'd be stronger," said Pervez Hoodbhoy, a physicist and peace activist. But radicalism has deep social roots here. In the cities, the turn of a street corner can seem to be time travel between centuries. Wide boulevards clogged with expensive cars become narrow lanes where shrouded women carry jugs of water on their heads. About 75 percent of all Pakistanis reside in rural areas. Most are sharecroppers, eking out a subsistence. In some areas, feudal families still hold sway, making private laws and operating private jails. While the wealthy send their children to college in America or Britain, many of the poor are deprived of even an elementary education. The literacy rate is below 40 percent. A fifth of Pakistan's government schools are "ghosts," with buildings but no students or teachers, General Musharraf himself admitted. This void increasingly has been filled by
thousands of madrassahs. Considered a godsend by the destitute, they feed and house their pupils while teaching them the wisdom of the Koran and the moral requirement to fight in holy wars. Islam is the great refuge of Pakistan's masses. In mosques, in the fields, on the roadsides, men drop to their knees and perform their daily prayers. However empty their pockets, they are equal in these genuflections before God. But it is not a simple picture. Fundamentalist Muslims, like secular ones, are minorities. Between them are a multitude of gradations in the practices of faith — one reason why recent polls suggest layers of ambivalence about the current crisis, Before General Musharraf's address to the nation on Friday, the pollster asked people whom they would support in a war between America and Afghanistan. Seven percent said America and 67 percent Afghanistan, with about 26 percent neutral. Four days after the Speech, those who said they would side with the United States remained the same, though 20 percent shifted from Afghanistan to neutrality. Some of this sentiment reflects a general doubt that America has enough proof against Mr. bin Laden to warrant a punishing attack on Afghanistan. At the same time, many Pakistanis are merely wary of America, regarded as a companion of shallow sincerity, "Unfortunately, America seems to be Pakistan's friend only when it suits America's needs," said Zahid Mahmood, a bank manager. "When the need is over, America deserts you." In the 1980's, America had great needs in the region. In late 1979, the Soviet Union sent its troops into Afghanistan, getting itself closer to a warm-water port. Using Pakistan as a pipeline, the United States and other nations then financed the Afghan resistance. The Soviets soon found themselves bogged down in a crippling war against guerrillas adept at mountain combat. The cold war's end swiftly followed the Soviets' humiliating retreat in 1989. America's attention span, as well as its affection, did not last much longer. That was a shock to Pakistan. Money had seemed a token of friendship, and in 1990 the United States aid package to Pakistan was $564 million; only Israel and Egypt received more. But then the largesse was suddenly withdrawn, the penalty for Pakistan's continuing program to develop nuclear weapons in pace with its archenemy India. "Looking out for No. 1, that's the American way, isn't it?" snickered Ajab Gul, a barber in Peshawar. "That is what Americans are proud of. We're different." But the loyalties of Pakistanis are no simple matter, either. In 1947, after a flurry of cartography, Pakistan and India were mapped out of the British Empire. Pakistan was devised with religious cohesion as a Muslim state. But it, rather than India, has been the one struggling for a national identity. The country is split among several ethnicities and languages. Mr. Gul, the barber, is Pashtun and admits to feeling a greater affinity for the Pashtuns of Afghanistan than the Sindis of Karachi or the Punjabis of Lahore in his native land. Democracy has never taken a firm foothold. The military has remained the dominant institution, and while it has failed in its three wars with India, it has had repeated success in overthrowing its own democratically elected governments. During the 1990's, however, it was civilian governments that generally maintained control. The indefatigably corrupt governments of Prime Ministers Benazir Bhutto and Nawaz Sharif — as well the stopped-up American spigot — helped plunge the economy into the red while at the same time discrediting democracy in the eyes of the people. Both Ms. Bhutto and Mr. Sharif now live in exile. Their political parties, the Pakistan Peoples Party and the Pakistan Muslim League, are in disarray. For now, public assembly is forbidden. By order of the Supreme Court, a return to civilian government is supposed to occur by next October. General Musharraf, who recently assumed the title of president, has promised to abide by the timetable. But his future, like his country's, is now linked to matters that could not have been foreseen a month ago: the number of American soldiers who will touch Pakistani soil, the amount of blood spilled in reflexive outrage, the havoc caused by the coming onrush of refugees and the furtive ability of a Saudi-born multimillionaire named Osama bin Laden.
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Ancient Secret System Moves Money Globally
By DOUGLAS FRANTZ
Published: October 3, 2001
QUETTA, Pakistan, Oct. 2 — With nothing more than a telephone and a fax machine, Tarir Khan transfers money almost anywhere in the world — no questions asked, no names used and no trail for law enforcement to follow. Mr. Khan is a small cog in a far-reaching network of informal banking known as hawala, the Arabic word for trust. Although it is illegal in most countries, including here in Pakistan, authorities estimate that billions of dollars flow unseen by regulators through the hawala system worldwide. A senior government official in Pakistan said law enforcement authorities were certain that Osama bin Laden's network used hawala to transfer money to agents outside Afghanistan, along with conventional means. But the nature of hawala will make tracking those particular exchanges almost impossible. In the Kandahari bazaar here, many hawala dealers are concentrated in a five-story concrete building that resembles a bunker, its interior dark and its offices lighted by dim bulbs. Outside, donkey-drawn carts vie for space with Toyota Land Cruisers, and three-wheel motorized rickshaws dodge bangled buses and pedestrians. The absence of women, save a couple of beggars, is striking. In Pakistan and Afghanistan, money business is men's business. Anyone can walk into a hawala shop in Quetta or a thousand other cities in southern Asia, put down a stack of cash and ask that the sum be transferred to a recipient in another country. Mr. Khan and his associate, found sitting cross-legged on the floor of their sparse office and sipping tea, keep transactions in a brown notebook on Mr. Khan's desk. When he receives a telephone call or a fax to confirm that money has been picked up elsewhere in the world, the relevant page is torn out of the notebook. Even the new scrutiny prompted by the terror attacks on Sept. 11 is highly unlikely to disclose all the details of how Mr. bin Laden's money moves through the ancient system. Mr. Khan, for one, refuses to divulge the cities where he has associates, saying he fears the authorities. "This system is made for transferring enough money to get a pilot's license or make a deposit on an apartment without raising an eyebrow," Prof. Nikos Passas, an expert on transnational crime at Temple University and a consultant to government agencies, said in a telephone interview. Finance Minister Shaukut Aziz, a former executive vice president of Citibank in New York, said $2 billion to $5 billion moved through the hawala system annually in Pakistan, more than the amount of foreign transfers through the country's banking system. Pakistan is trying to draft laws to regulate the industry. But for now it thrives illegally in places like the Kandahari bazaar. A United States Treasury Department study identified hawala as the principal means of money laundering from drug trafficking and other crimes in Pakistan. The report said Pakistan, India and Dubai on the Persian Gulf form the "hawala triangle" to move money secretly worldwide. In hawala, sums large and small are sent halfway around the world on a handshake and a code word. Records of transactions are kept just until the deal is completed. Then they are destroyed. No cash moves across a border or through an electronic transfer system, the places where authorities are most likely to spot or record the transaction. The sender does not have to provide his name or identify the recipient. Instead, he is given a code word, which is all the recipient needs to pick up the same amount of cash from an associate of the original trader. The transaction can occur in the time it takes to make a couple of phone calls or send a fax. The system was in place long before Western banking. The ancient Chinese used a similar method called "flying money," or fei qian. Arab traders used it as a means of avoiding robbery along the Silk Road. Millions of Pakistanis, Indians, Filipinos and other people from southern Asia working in foreign countries use the system to send money home to relatives.
"They don't feel comfortable walking into a bank," Mr. Aziz said in an interview. "It's very dangerous to talk about this, because it is illegal," Mr. Khan, who arrived in Quetta from Afghanistan many years ago, said this afternoon as a colleague shook his head and told him to keep quiet. "I can't tell you much. "Trust, he said, is the essential quality of a hawala trader. Most of his customers are from the same part of Afghanistan. So there is an innate sense of trust. He said transfers were usually sent among family members and involved a few hundred dollars. Sometimes transactions are for as little as $50. He provides a five-digit code word, a letter and four numbers, that the recipient takes to one of Mr. Khan's associates as far away as the United States, Germany or Russia. The same associates accept money for transfer to relatives in Quetta. "They tell the code word, and we hand over the money," he said. "Then we tear up the records on both ends." Most hawala merchants charge a small commission, usually $5 for transfers up to $500 and $10 for up to $1,000. Their main profit comes from currency fluctuations and extra fees for moving money for big clients. The system is used for far larger sums, often by drug traffickers, corrupt politicians and black market traders, according to local experts and law enforcement. "The drug dealers, the politicians who get kickbacks and others with black money use this system," said Kamran Mumtaz, editor of The Daily Mashriq, a newspaper in Quetta. Authorities have found evidence that hawala has been used for payments by smuggling rings and militant groups in the disputed territory of Kashmir and the Tamil Tigers in Sri Lanka, Professor Passas said. "This is the most convenient, common and cheapest system of moving money," he said. "It is also one of the most difficult to track."
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Terrorism and Immigration
Published: October 5, 2001

Sept. 11 must not become a tombstone to the nation's proud tradition of openness to foreign visitors. The terrorist attack exposed frightening weaknesses in immigration practices, as it did with airport security and intelligence-gathering. The best way to preserve the American people's commitment to keeping their doors open to the world is to crack down on lax enforcement of the immigration laws, with a sense of urgency. Congress and officials charged with homeland security will have to explore ways of enhancing the screening of visa applicants, border vigilance and the monitoring of foreigners already in the United States. But to go further and suggest that the attack calls for a drastic reduction in the number of immigrants and foreign visitors would be irrational and counterproductive. The ease with which the hijackers took advantage of this country's lax enforcement of immigration laws is indeed alarming. At least two of the terrorists were among the estimated four million foreigners who have stayed in the country after their visas expired. A third obtained a student visa to attend a Berlitz language course in California, but never even showed up at the institute. This all sounds distressingly familiar. In the aftermath of the World Trade Center bombing in 1993, Americans were shocked to learn that one Palestinian implicated in the attack had stayed in the country on a student visa long after he dropped out of school. Sheik Omar Abdel Rahman, convicted in a subsequent terrorist plot, was able to enter the United States in 1990 despite being on a government list of undesirables. In 1996 Congress passed legislation attempting to tighten the policing of immigration laws. But in practice many key provisions have been undercut by a lack of collaboration between government agencies. The law called for the development of an automated system to record the departure of all visa holders. As it is now, most people never "check out" of the country. It seems only sensible that the government should be able to identify foreign visitors who entered legally but then remain here illegally. The project has been stalled. The 1996 legislation also called for a separate computerized system for monitoring the half-million foreign students in the country. That, too, has been delayed, largely because academic institutions oppose the requirement that they help the I.N.S. monitor their students and collect fees to pay for the program. This sensible project must now be rushed into place. But Congress should avoid heeding hysterical cries for a moratorium or cutback on student visas. On the front lines, American consular officials overseas, who issued 7.1 million temporary visas last year and denied 2.4 million others, need to be in a better position to make discerning judgments about those seeking to enter the country. The 1996 law did provide them access to an intelligence database of people deemed suspect, but they still cannot look up crucial F.B.I. data. The fact that most of the terrorists in the Sept. 11 attack, if not all, entered the country legally should not blind Congress to the need to block illegal entries by increasing security along its porous borders with Mexico and Canada. Keeping people from overstaying their visas will do little for homeland security so long as hundreds of thousands enter the country illegally every year.
A NATION CHALLENGED: DRUGS; 'Super’ Heroin Was Planned By bin Laden, Reports Say
By BARRY MEIER
Published: October 4, 2001
The terror network headed by Osama bin Laden has tried to develop a high-strength form of heroin that it planned to export to the United States and Western Europe, according to intelligence reports received by United States officials. An informer and a foreign law enforcement agency alerted American officials about two years ago that the network was seeking to recruit chemists to work on the effort, a federal official said. The official said the goal of the project, which apparently did not succeed, was to create a high-potency heroin that would produce greater addiction and havoc than drugs available in Western cities. The plan was supposedly developed in retaliation for the United States missile attack in August 1998 against terrorist training camps in Afghanistan, the official said. In an telephone interview yesterday, Drug Enforcement Administrator Asa Hutchinson confirmed that the D.E.A. had received "limited information" about the reported heroin effort. The announcements were made as United States officials, gearing up for possible military action in Afghanistan, are seeking to portray the governing Taliban officials and Mr. bin Laden as critical cogs in the world drug trade. Although there is little dispute that the Taliban derived millions of dollars from opium production, the intelligence reports, if accurate, would provide a rare link between Mr. bin Laden's organization and drugs. American officials have been hard pressed to make that connection. At a hearing yesterday in Washington by the House Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources, Mr. Hutchinson and William Bach, a narcotics expert in the State Department, testified that narcotics provided important revenue for the Taliban. But they said in their statements that federal officials did not have direct evidence of Mr. bin Laden's involvement. Asked why he did not release the intelligence reports on Mr. bin Laden at the hearing, Mr. Hutchinson said that was because the information was classified and could not be released at a public hearing. "It would be available to the committee if they request it," he said. At the hearing, Mr. Hutchinson and Mr. Bach said it was their belief that the close ties between the Taliban and Mr. bin Laden's network made some interaction on illegal drugs inevitable. That view is also backed by a United Nations panel that found that the Taliban used money derived from opium and heroin production to finance, among other activities, "the training of terrorists and support the operation of extremists in neighboring countries and beyond." Faced with international pressure, the Taliban announced last year that it was banning the production of opium poppies. But most drug experts say they believe that large supplies of raw opium or heroin are stockpiled around Afghanistan and that some of those supplies are slipping across the porous borders as war appears more and more imminent. Others in the region, including the opposition Northern Alliance, also control opium growing regions. One federal official likened Mr. bin Laden's role in the Afghan heroin trade to that of a facilitator rather than a direct participant. The official said Mr. bin Laden's network appeared to provided protection for processing plants that convert opium into heroin, as well as for smugglers who carry drugs into neighboring countries. Those drugs mostly make their way to Europe, with 10 percent of the heroin derived from Afghan production reaching the United States. Mr. bin Laden's role, however, may have shifted dramatically for a time after the American missile attack in 1998 on training camps that his forces used. The United States launched that strike in retaliation for the bombings of two American Embassies in East Africa. It was at that point that American officials received information from the informer and the foreign law enforcement agency that
Mr. bin Laden or his network were preparing to become directly involved in the heroin trade by developing a super potent form of the heroin. One Federal official said Washington had not been able to confirm the reports independently, but added that the foreign law enforcement agency that had provided the information had proved reliable in the past.
A NATION CHALLENGED: AFGHANISTAN; Murky Picture Emerges of Life Under Bombardment
By DOUGLAS FRANTZ
Published: October 11, 2001

QUETTA, Pakistan, Oct. 10—As American warplanes zeroed in on Afghanistan on Sunday night, the supreme leader of the ruling Taliban left his bleak, fortified compound in Kandahar and sought shelter in a nearby irrigation tunnel. A few minutes later, his house was leveled, one of the first targets in the air war against Afghanistan. The report of Mullah Muhammad Omar's narrow escape filtered out of Afghanistan today, courtesy of an anti-Taliban businessman still inside the country who called on a satellite telephone. Like much of the information from Afghanistan, the story could not be confirmed. Pakistani intelligence officials said tonight that there was no evidence that any senior member of the Taliban or Al Qaeda, Osama bin Laden's terrorist network, had been killed in the initial attacks. The BBC, citing unidentified Pentagon sources, reported that two of Mullah Omar's relatives were killed on the first night of bombing. The officials said the failure to kill a major figure was one reason the Taliban military had not disintegrated under the barrage of bombs as some military analysts had expected. There were, however, unconfirmed reports that 1,800 Taliban fighters had joined the opposition Northern Alliance in the last 24 hours. The number of casualties from the airstrikes could not be determined. The Taliban said 76 civilians had been killed and more than 100 injured since the strikes began, and there were televised images of destroyed houses. But it was impossible to verify how or when the houses were destroyed. The United Nations put the number of dead at 10 in Kandahar and 20 in Kabul, and some pro-Taliban officials gave lower numbers of casualties than the Afghan government. Even the official government tally is far less than the numbers of civilian deaths reported by the Iraqis in the first days of the airstrikes on Baghdad in 1991. As American airstrikes pounded away for the fourth consecutive night, a picture of life in the war zone emerged from interviews with people still in the country, people who have left in recent days and official statements. Some of the information is conflicting, and no doubt some of it is colored by emotion and fogged by exaggeration. Nonetheless, the accounts provide a look at the latest wave of destruction unleashed on a country already half wrecked by 22 years of war. Surprisingly, many people said life remained nearly normal. Shops have stayed open in Kandahar, the spiritual capital of the ruling Taliban in the southern part of the country, and traffic across the border in Pakistan at Chaman was a routine mix of traders and visitors with visas. "People were very nervous the first night of bombing, but they are back out on the streets now," said Ahmed Karzai, an Afghan businessman who lives in Quetta and maintains regular contact with associates and relatives in Kandahar. "The primary military targets, like the airport and the main Taliban garrison, are outside the residential areas, so people are feeling pretty safe. "A pro-Taliban cleric from Pakistan who was in Kandahar for the first two days of bombings said life seemed normal. "I was surprised that everyone was still around and the shops were open," Mullah Kifayat Ullah, a leader of the militant Jamiat Ulema Islam religious party, said in an interview. The cleric said he had gone to deliver a message of solidarity to Mullah Omar from his party's leadership in Pakistan two days before the attacks started. He said he was reading inside the governor's residence when the first bombs fell Sunday night. "I could hear the planes up high and the antiaircraft fire from the Taliban," he said. "When I went out the streets were filled with people. "A guard at Mullah Omar's house was killed, but Mullah Ullah said the Taliban leader was not home at the time. He also said a residential compound formerly used by Mr. bin Laden was destroyed, but that the Saudi dissident was not there.
Afghanistan’s ambassador to Pakistan, Abdul Salam Zaeef, said today that Mullah Omar, the one-eyed former village prayer leader, and Mr. bin Laden, the suspected mastermind of the Sept. 11 attacks on America, were safe despite the bomb and missile attacks. Mullah Omar issued a defiant statement in an interview today with BBC radio, calling on Muslims to rise up against "this arrogant power. "Kandahar and much of Afghanistan are laced with underground irrigation canals like the one into which Mullah Omar was reported to have fled. Countless caves are scattered throughout the mountainous terrain. Together they offer safe haven from all but direct hits by missiles and bombs. With some notable exceptions like the bomb that killed four United Nations workers in Kabul on Tuesday, the American strikes appear to have spared civilian areas. As a result, aid workers and intelligence officials said, the internal panic that was expected to send millions of Afghans running for the borders has not materialized. Refugees who have arrived in Quetta in recent days after being smuggled across the border said in interviews that the Taliban had cleared away thousands of people seeking to flee from the border across from Chaman and other places. They also said the Taliban had tried to force people to remain in the country. Taliban authorities said the eight Western aid workers, including two American women, being held in Kabul on charges of preaching Christianity were safe and that they would continue to be held for trial. A French reporter, Michel Peyrard, and two Pakistani guides were charged with spying. Mr. Peyrard, 44, was arrested in Afghanistan on Tuesday while disguised in Muslim women’s clothing. The United Nations felt conditions were safe enough to resume food shipments to Afghanistan today. A United Nations convoy of trucks carrying 100 tons of wheat arrived in the western Afghan city of Heart this afternoon from Meshed, Iran. Officials with the United Nations’ World Food Program said another 600 tons would follow. A more unusual convoy arrived in Badakhshan, a remote region in northeastern Afghanistan where mountains reach 15,000 feet. The final leg of the trek from Pakistan was made by 4,000 donkeys carrying wheat and other supplies from the United Nations. Nearly 10,000 tons of food are stored in Afghanistan and there were no reports of looting. "As far as we know it’s all safe," said Stephanie Bunker, a spokeswoman for the United Nations. Ms. Bunker said the Taliban were beating local staff members from the United Nations and other nongovernmental agencies. "We have received reports that the United Nations Mine Action Program and the N.G.O.’s working with them are increasingly being targeted," she said. "Demining staff in Kabul, Jalalabad and Kandahar were beaten by the Taliban. "Ms. Bunker said she could not confirm the claim by Mullah Zaeef, the Taliban envoy, that people were burning the food being dropped in Afghanistan by American aircraft.
The Deep Intellectual Roots of Islamic Terror
By ROBERT WORTH
Published: October 13, 2001

Long before Osama bin Laden appeared on television screens with an AK-47 by his side, he released earlier videotapes in which he appears in the guise of a holy man, sitting peacefully in front of a wall of books. That scholarly backdrop is an important symbol for Mr. bin Laden's terrorist movement as he tries to legitimize his extremist views of Islam. "Many Americans seem to think that bin Laden is just a violent cult leader," said Michael Doran, a professor of Near Eastern Studies at Princeton University. "But the truth is that he is tapping into a minority Islamic tradition with a wide following and a deep history." Although many Muslims are horrified at the notion that their faith is being used to justify terrorism, Mr. bin Laden's advocacy of jihad, or holy war, against the West is a natural extension of what some radical Islamists have been saying and doing since the 1930's. These radicals were jailed, tortured and often executed in their home countries, particularly in Egypt during the 1950's and 60's, for their attacks on Western influences and their efforts to replace their own regime with an Islamic state. The Muslim extremists, members of Islamic Jihad, who assassinated the Egyptian president Anwar Sadat in 1981, for instance, left behind a 54-page document titled "The Neglected Duty" that provided an elaborate theological justification for what they had done. Addressed to other Muslims rather than to the West, the document drew on earlier thinkers in arguing that rebelling against one's rulers -- which is forbidden by most Islamic authorities -- is in fact a duty if those rulers have abandoned true Islam. Mr. bin Laden, whose Al Qaeda movement merged with Islamic Jihad several years ago, has taken the same tack, drawing on medieval authorities to argue that killing innocents or even Muslims is permitted if it serves the cause of jihad against the West. The roots of Mr. bin Laden's worldview date back to a school in medieval Islam that spread throughout the Arab world in the 20th century, known as the Salafiyya, said Bernard Haykel, a professor of Islamic law at New York University. Its name comes from the Arabic words al-salaf al-salih, "the venerable forefathers," which refers to the generation of the Prophet Muhammad and his companions. The salafis believed Islam had been corrupted by idolatry, and they sought to bring it back to the purity of its earliest days. "Salafis are extreme in observance, but they're not necessarily militant," Mr. Haykel said. The official Wahhabi ideology of the Saudi state, for instance, as well as the religious doctrine of the Muslim Brothers falls under the banner of Salafiyya. Early salafi reformers believed they could reconcile Islam with modern Western political ideas. Some argued that Western-style democracy was perfectly compatible with Islam, and even had been prefigured by the Islamic concept of shura, a consultation between ruler and ruled. That optimism began to fade after World War I, when the Western powers carved up the remains of the Ottoman empire into nation-states. A crucial step came in the 1930's, when some radicals began to argue that Islam was in real danger of being extinguished through Western influence, said Emmanuel Sivan, a professor at Hebrew University in Jerusalem, who has written extensively on modern Islam. It was then that Rashid Rida and Maulana Maudoodi developed the notion that modern Western culture was equivalent to jahiliyya (the word is the Arabic term for the barbarism that existed before Islam). But if one man deserves the title of intellectual grandfather to Osama bin Laden and his fellow terrorists, it is probably the Egyptian writer and activist Sayyid Qutb (pronounced SIGH-yid KUH-tahb), who was executed by the Egyptian authorities in the mid-1960's for inciting resistance to the regime. As Fathi Yakan, one of Qutb's disciples, wrote in the 1960's: "The groundwork for the French Revolution was laid by Rousseau, Voltaire and Montesquieu; the Communist Revolution
realized plans set by Marx, Engels and Lenin. . . . The same holds true for us as well." In his most popular book, "Signposts on the Road" (1964), Mr. Qutb wrote: "This is the most dangerous jahiliyya which has ever menaced our faith. For everything around is jahiliyya: perceptions and beliefs, manners and morals, culture, art and literature, laws and regulations, including a good part of what we consider Islamic culture." Mr. Qutb, who began his career as a modernist literary critic, was radicalized by a roughly yearlong stay in the United States, between 1948 and 1950. In a book about his travels he cites the Kinsey Report, along with Darwin, Marx and Freud, as forces that have contributed to the moral degradation of the country. "No one is more distant than the Americans from spirituality and piety," he wrote. He also narrated, with evident disgust, his observations of the sexual promiscuity of American culture. Describing a church dance in Greeley, Colo., he writes: "Every young man took the hand of a young woman. And these were the young men and women who had just been singing their hymns! Red and blue lights, with only a few white lamps, illuminated the dance floor. The room became a confusion of feet and legs: arms twisted around hips; lips met lips; chests pressed together. "Ultimately, Mr. Qutb rejected democracy and nationalism as Western ideas incompatible with Islam. Even pan-Arabism, which was tremendously popular in the Arab world, was simply an obstacle to the foundation of an Islamic state. Perhaps even more important, Mr. Qutb was the first Sunni Muslim to find a way around the ancient prohibition against overthrowing a Muslim ruler. "Qutb said the rulers of the Muslim world today are no longer Muslims," Mr. Haykel said. "He basically declared them infidels. "He did so, Mr. Haykel added, in a particularly persuasive way, by reinterpreting the works of a medieval intellectual named Ibn Taymiyya. A towering figure in the history of Muslim thought, Ibn Taymiyya lived in Damascus in the 13th and 14th centuries, when Syria was in danger of domination by the Mongols. Mr. Qutb equated Ibn Taymiyya's intellectual and political struggle against the Mongols with his own struggle against Gamal Abdel Nasser and the other Arab rulers of his day. It was a risky move, because Islamic tradition states that if one Muslim falsely calls another an infidel, he could burn in hell, Mr. Haykel said. It may also have sealed his death warrant, because Egypt's rulers did not take such threats lightly. But decades after his death, Mr. Qutb's equation continues to inspire radicals like Sheik Omar Abdel Rahman, who was convicted of conspiring to blow up the United Nations and other New York City landmarks, and Osama bin Laden. Mr. bin Laden quotes Ibn Taymiyya in the same way, arguing that the Saudi government -- which earned his wrath by expelling him and serving as host to American troops during the Persian Gulf war -- is illegitimate. "By opening the Arab peninsula to the crusaders, the regime disobeyed and acted against what has been enjoined by the messenger of God," Mr. bin Laden wrote in his 1996 "Declaration of War against America." In so doing, the Saudi leaders ceased to be Muslims, he concluded. That message resonates even with Muslims who do not share Mr. bin Laden's extreme views, largely because many Arabs see not just the Saudi regime but the entire political order in the Arab world today as tyrannical and corrupt, said John Voll, a professor at the Center for Muslim-Christian Understanding at Georgetown University. "Part of the appeal of bin Laden is that he can look people in the eye and say: 'I know you live in a police state, I know you're living in poverty, and the reason for it is clear: Satan is doing this to you. So come join my holy war,' " he said. Mr. bin Laden himself, however, has very little religious education. "He's a playboy from a very rich family, so he needed other people to relay the message to him," Mr. Sivan said. The two people who influenced him most directly were Abdallah Azzam, a Palestinian who was killed by a car bomb in 1989, and Safar al-Hawali, a Saudi who has periodically been jailed by the authorities. Both men were steeped in the writings of Sayyid Qutb, Mr. Sivan said. Mr. bin Laden does seem to have deviated from the radical tradition in one sense, by focusing his attacks on the United States rather than Arab regimes. In his 1996 declaration, he went so far as to say that Muslims should put aside their own differences so as to focus on the struggle against the Western enemy -- a serious
departure from the doctrine of Qutb and even Sadat’s killers, who argued that the internal struggle was the one that mattered. But that may be merely a shift in tactics, not in overall strategy. "Bin Laden is using the U.S. as an instrument in his struggle with other Muslims," Mr. Doran said. "He wants the U.S. to strike back disproportionately, because he believes that will outrage Muslims and inspire them to overthrow their governments and build an Islamic state. "Photos: A Muslim extremist holds up a Koran before a poster of Osama bin Laden at a rally by thousands of Indonesians two and a half weeks after the attack on the United States. (Darren Whitewide/Reuters)(pg. A13); Books and learning, as this 13th century manuscript shows, were important to Muslim life in the Middle Ages. (Bibliotheque Nationale, Paris); Rashid Rida (circa 1930) equated Western culture with the barbarism that existed before Islam. (pg. A15)
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A NATION CHALLENGED: A VIEW FROM THE ROOFTOPS; Strains of Hope in City Under Bombing

By JOHN F. BURNS
Published: October 14, 2001

ISLAMABAD, Pakistan, Oct. 13 — It was about 9:15 p.m. last Sunday in Kabul when the first loud explosions and blinding flashes started coming from east of the city, around the airport. After a decade of shellfire and bombing, the first explosions were about as startling to the people living in Kabul's endless vistas of rubble as the barking of the packs of hungry dogs that roam the city at night. And then the realization dawned, a man who was there said, that people would remember as long they lived: this was not the cruel brutality of an unending civil war, but bombs and missiles from America. The attacks came from aircraft carriers and submarines nearly 1,000 miles away in the Arabian Sea and from a bomber base 8,500 miles away in the United States. President Bush's vow to hunt down the perpetrators of the Sept. 11 attacks, and their Taliban allies, had at last been set in motion. When people realized "it was the Americans who were attacking," recalled the man, who was in Afghanistan for the first four nights of the bombing, "they ran into the streets and up to their roofs and to the balconies of their apartments, and they watched the flashes and listened to the explosions, and, silently, they cheered." "It was a moment of tremendous hope," he continued. "People saw those bombs, and they said, 'We can bear these things because finally we may get a government of the people, for the people and by the people.'" The man who brought this account to Islamabad at the end of the week cannot be identified by name because he came down here to the Pakistani capital for only 24 hours with documents vital to an organization that cares for some of Afghanistan's neediest people. Like those who cheered the bombing in silence, he is deathly afraid of the Taliban, who still hold the power of life and death over ordinary Afghans. The man, a 25-year-old civil engineer, has never been in the United States. Since the group he works for is not American, he does not depend on Americans for his or his family's welfare. Nor, like many Afghans, has he much love for what the United States did years earlier when it poured money and weapons into the hands of the guerrilla factions that in time used those weapons to start a civil war. Those resources went into the hands, too, of Osama bin Laden, a Saudi Islamic militant who at the time hated the United States about as much as the Soviet Union. The Afghan's story, too, is the experience of only one man among millions who may be affected by the American bombing. Some of them, hundreds if Taliban accounts are to be believed, have been killed, and others have lost their homes. Hundreds of thousands are on the road, in the mountains and deserts, seeking refuge from the bombing. His account is remarkable nonetheless, and not only because relatively few accounts by witnesses of the first days of the bombing have filtered out of Afghanistan. Western reporters were expelled by the Taliban weeks before the bombing began, and only a handful, all Muslims, have been invited back to Taliban-controlled regions of the country since the bombing began. Most Afghan refugees have been turned back at the Pakistani border. Few Afghans have telephones, and those that do seem frightened of telling reporters what they have seen. On Monday morning, when the skies over Kabul were quiet after the first night's attack, the man who gave his account of the bombing moved around the city, visiting food bazaars, the currency market and friends' homes. What he found almost everywhere, he said, was the same sense of optimism shown by the people who watched the first American attacks with him from a balcony about two miles from Kabul airport – among the first targets. Across the city, people found different ways to celebrate. "Some young people in Kabul started to play music for the first time in years," he said, in defiance of the Taliban edict banning music. But the
greatest sense of hope stirred seemed to be among women, who have borne the brunt of the Taliban's social policies. The Kabul man's fiancée, a 19-year-old forced from school at 14 by a ban on education for girls, reacted with joy, he recalled. "She said, 'Now I can complete my education, now I can become a doctor, now I can do anything I like.' " He said it was the same with every woman he met. "Among women, there was optimism, 100 percent. "Some of the euphoria drained away quickly. In the Serai Shahazada, the currency market beside the Kabul market that is a barometer of public confidence, dealers had been hoping that war would somehow be averted.

After the attacks in the United States on Sept. 11, the value of the Afghan currency had risen by 25 percent, apparently in the expectation that the Taliban would disintegrate as a ruling force under the threat of American attack and opening the way for a government that would foster better business conditions. The currency's gains reversed as the week wore on, especially after President Bush warned that American military operations could continue as long as a year or two. A new popular wariness, too, crept in after people learned that a bomb or a missile had struck the Kabul offices of a mine clearing operation run by the United Nations, killing four Afghan caretakers. Also, the man said, people worried that President Bush might tire of the effort in Afghanistan, and leave Afghans to face a Taliban government reinforced by a sense of triumph. He quoted Afghan men as saying that if the Americans did not oust the Taliban, "it won't be enough to grow our beards to four inches -- we will have to grow them down to our waists." The young man said that other anxieties about the American bombing related to the opposition force, the Northern Alliance. In Kabul, he said, concern about an advance into the city by the alliance forces is acute. People have unhappy memories of the guerrilla leaders, who headed a government from 1992 to 1996 and re-formed, after the Taliban seizure of Kabul, into what is now the alliance. "They are afraid," he said, "that the commanders will come, and there will be raping and looting and murdering all over again."

As for the Taliban, the Afghan said their actions under the bombing had been as menacing as ever. On Wednesday, he watched American aircraft bombing the eastern city of Jalalabad in daylight and saw a Taliban pickup truck with an antiaircraft gun fire back, then drive deep into a residential neighborhood. He said that when he went through Jalalabad, 85 miles east of Kabul, people told him they had seen Mr. bin Laden and the Taliban's supreme leader, Mullah Muhammad Omar, on Sept. 13 getting out of a convoy of four-wheel-drive vehicles at Khogiani, a village about 20 miles west of Jalalabad. If true, this would be the first actual sighting of Mr. bin Laden since Sept 11. The young man said that Afghans hoped that United States forces would succeed, as President Bush has promised, in getting Mr. bin Laden and wiping out his network of foreign-born Muslims who have been a prominent part of the Taliban's apparatus of repression. But this part of the American plan, he said, struck most Afghans as illusory. "People say America will never get him, he's far too clever," the man said. "Afghanistan has thousands of mountains, and he has bases everywhere." Photos: An Afghan on a brief visit to Pakistan looking out from his hotel balcony in Islamabad last week before heading home to Kabul. Below, residents in a Kabul area searching through rubble for belongings after bombing near the airport on Thursday night. Even with the danger, some saw chances for better times. (Lynsey Addario/Saba, for The New York Times); (Associated Press)
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U.S. Raid Kills Unknown Number in an Afghan Village
By BARRY BEARAK
Published: October 13, 2001

PESHAWAR, Pakistan, Oct. 12 — Karam is a village in the hills of eastern Afghanistan, barely an hour from the border with Pakistan. Villagers say a training camp for Islamic guerrillas was once situated nearby, though it has been closed for several years. Whether that camp was the intended target of the American bombers that swooped overhead on Wednesday, or whether there was somebody or something in the village that American military planners wanted to hit, may never be known. What does seem clear is that Karam was bombed. One eyewitness account comes from a respected Pakistani journalist, working temporarily for The New York Times and exploiting connections at the border. He was able to get to Karam late on Thursday, returning today. Villagers told him that 53 people had died, though only 22 bodies had yet been pulled from the wreckage. They said the radical Islamic Taliban government seemed inclined to inflate the toll.

The journalist, who could not be identified because his travel in Afghanistan was not authorized, had a close-up look at only three corpses in a hospital. They were all mutilated, he said. The face of one victim, a man named Shaqib, was torn away. A relative was patiently cleaning the body, preparing it for burial. This relation, on seeing a Taliban official, began to shout. "I'm angry at the Americans and I'm angry at you," he said. "This is the result of your jihad. "Karam appeared thoroughly destroyed. Dead livestock lay about. Villagers, many in tears, were pulling away debris, looking for the missing. Throughout the area, Taliban soldiers sped by in pickups, reinforcing positions on the hilltops with antiaircraft guns. The fog of war is always dense, with each side projecting its own claims and its own views of the conflict. In Afghanistan it is denser than usual because of the inaccessibility to Western journalists of the areas being bombed. This morning Pakistani newspapers reported that the hamlet had been obliterated and that more than 100 people were believed to be dead. Late today the Afghan Islamic Press, a news service, quoted a Taliban official who said the body count had reached 160 and was likely to exceed 200. The Taliban are almost certainly inflating casualties and, with Taliban-controlled territory closed to foreigners and the movement of even Afghan journalists limited, it is difficult to know how much about Karam there is to regret. In Washington, Defense Secretary Donald H. Rumsfeld, asked about the Taliban assertions, repeated assurances that United States strikes were not aimed at innocents. "There is no question but that when one is engaged militarily that there are going to be unintended loss of life," Mr. Rumsfeld said on a day when the bombardment had slowed. "And there's no question but that I and anyone involved regrets the unintended loss of life. "People in Karam said they had felt in no particular danger of an American attack. "We were eating our late meal when the planes came, dropping their bombs," said Shah Mehmood, a farmer. "I was knocked out completely, and I still have shrapnel in my neck. My 8-year-old son, Najib, he was knocked out, too, but I think he will be O.K. now. "Maulvi Abdullah Hajazi, an elder from a nearby village, had come to assist. "These people don't support the Taliban," he said. "They always say the Taliban are doing this or that and they don't like it. But now they will all fight the Americans. We pray to Allah that we have American soldiers to kill. These bombs from the sky we cannot fight. "Today's papers, whether in Urdu, Pashto or Punjabi, were filled with horrors: a civilian death toll placed at anywhere from 200 to 500; 10 members of a family killed in Kabul; a mosque leveled in the Surkh Rud district of Nangarhar Province; 11 unexploded missiles lying in the area around Jalalabad. All of the dead were referred to as "martyred. "None of those reports could be independently confirmed.
today, including a story that said the 10-year-old son of Mullah Muhammad Omar, the Taliban's supreme leader, had been killed in the air raids on Kandahar. That item, based on a single unnamed source, was published on the front page of several newspapers, including Pakistan’s largest, The Daily Jang. The Jang, an Urdu paper, also ran a front-page cartoon portraying Uncle Sam as a munitions dealer boasting that his latest products were being field-tested in Afghanistan. The reports reveal the gulf in perceptions between Pakistan and the United States about the war. Although Pakistan is nominally allied with the United States in its quest to eliminate the terrorist cells in Afghanistan responsible for the Sept. 11 attacks, sympathy for the plight of Afghans is strong here. Items published here often seem eerie twists on items appearing in the United States. Ausaf, the second largest daily, ran what purported to be an announcement from Al Qaeda offering $50,000 for the capture of an American soldier and $3,000 for the uniform of a dead one. At a protest rally here today, 1,000 people marched from one of Peshawar's famous mosques to one of its famous bazaars, chanting anti-American slogans all the way, "Death to Bush!" they yelled. In the United States, the "war against terrorism" is described as a duel between good and evil. But most of the protesters are working from a much different set of premises. To them Al Qaeda's leader, Osama bin Laden — from a remote perch in Afghanistan — is an unlikely suspect in the terrorism of Sept. 11. Rafatullah, a well-groomed wholesaler of medical supplies, said, "I think the Americans are anti-Islam, and their assault on Osama without proof is a tragedy." By then another protester, this one with an unkempt beard and a raging tone in his voice, declared that the Muslims of the world had decided to wage jihad against the Americans. Yet another man intervened. "We will have our vengeance," he said, unfolding a newspaper he had placed in his pocket. He pointed to the news about the village of Karam.
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A NATION CHALLENGED: CASUALTIES; U.S. Raids Kill 4 U.N. Aides Outside Kabul
By BARRY BEARAK
Published: October 10, 2001

PESHAWAR, Pakistan, Oct. 9—Four security guards working the night shift were killed near Kabul when the local headquarters of a United Nations-supported organization in Afghanistan was struck during an air attack by the United States. The organization, Afghan Technical Consultants, is a pioneer in the perilous work of clearing land mines and unspent rockets and shells. On Monday night it suffered its own blast, which flattened its offices, warehouse and mechanics shop. Secretary of Defense Donald H. Rumsfeld said in Washington today that he had no information about the men "who may have been killed" or whether their deaths were caused by "ordnance fired from the air or ordnance that we've seen fired from the ground on television." He added, "We regret a loss of life. "But witnesses and four injured survivors said an American bomb or missile hit the organization's compound. The group's officials said they thought that the intended target was a radio tower in an adjacent building. The antenna belonged to a station that had been defunct for the last decade, they said. "The totally innocent have been killed for no reason," the local supervisor, a man who uses the single name Usman, said, speaking by telephone from Kabul. "We know we have four dead, but the bodies are so torn apart we don't know who is who. "The destruction appeared to represent the first confirmed case of an American bomb going astray and killing civilians since the bombardment began on Sunday. The Pentagon has suggested that it is scrambling to find appropriate targets in a country that has already suffered more than two decades of war. "Afghanistan does not have the infrastructure of a Baghdad or Belgrade, so the air strikes seem aimed at scaring the Taliban more than at hitting specific targets," said a senior Pakistani intelligence officer, who spoke on the condition of anonymity. Such officers have in the past shown loyalty to the Taliban. The officer added, "Our information is that except for knocking out the rudimentary Afghan air force and a few ammunition dumps, the Taliban's ground fighting capacity has so far not been affected. "The United States military has claimed success in furthering its campaign to root out terrorists through the bombing. But another officer in Pakistani intelligence – after reviewing day-to-day reports about a neighboring country he knows intimately – said that the Americans "only got some mud buildings and air installations that didn't mean much to the Taliban anyway. "Stephanie Bunker, a United Nations spokeswoman, told reporters in Islamabad, Pakistan's capital, "People need to distinguish between combatants and those innocent civilians who do not bear arms." Here in Peshawar, where the nearby Khyber Pass leads to the Afghan border, staff members at the organization's main headquarters were stunned by the news that arrived in a morning phone call. "We are not political," said Syed Ahmed Farid Elmi, the group's acting director. "We were the first U.N.-sponsored mine-clearing operation in the world." Opposite him was a wall of plaques and commendations neatly arranged on a background of blue felt. "We have lost 30 people in the minefields in the past 11 years, but these four people, this is entirely different," he said. "They were in an office. In my mind, there can be no reason. "The dead are Nasir Ahmad, 28; Nazibullah, 33; Abdul Saboor, 25; and Safriullah, 33. Their personnel files contain small photos and slight facts that begin to portray the contours of individual lives rather than a mere listing of names. Safriullah had four young sons, two of whom are pictured on an insurance form. Mr. Ahmad was a newlywed. Each job entitled the men to $15 in monthly medical expenses and three meals a day. They earned $60 a month. "Of course, we knew the American attack was coming," said Abdul Samad, who is Abdul
Saboor's younger brother, who was found today in a refugee camp in Pabbi, outside Peshawar. Several days ago his brother had been visiting him. "We begged him not to go back, but he said: 'I have a job. I am paid a salary. I cannot be absent.' "Taliban leaders seemed to savor the news of the deaths as indicating what they portrayed as an American profligacy with human life. "Thirty-five civilians have been confirmed to have died or injured," said Abdul Hai Mutmaen, a spokesman in Kandahar for the Taliban supreme leader, Mullah Muhammad Omar. "In the early morning, as I was sleeping, the U.S. shot again at our airport," the spokesman said in a telephone interview. "The U.S. is trying to find where we have hidden the tanks and aircraft, but they only managed to destroy some small houses built for the Pilots."In Islamabad, Abdul Salam Zaeef, the Taliban's envoy to Pakistan, called the attacks a "freestyle game," where "Washington is aiming firstly to hunt the sitting Islamic government in Afghanistan and then every committed Muslim in the name of terrorism. "That hunt, he said, has so far failed. Two attacks on Mullah Omar's home in Kandahar -- first on Monday night and then early today -- left major damage, but Mullah Omar -- the Amir-ul-Momineen, the Taliban's so-called commander of the faithful -- apparently ducked out in time. "He is alive, thank God," Mr. Zaeef said. "There were strikes around the house, but he had vacated it."

For three nights residents of the capital have listened to the sudden thunder of bombs and missiles as Taliban gunners responded with the crackle of antiaircraft fire. "All night, no one can sleep," an Afghan journalist said. "Otherwise, things are quite normal. The attacks have not been as bad as was the worrying about the attacks."More devastating than the air strikes may be the interruption in deliveries of food. "Nothing is going in from the outside," said Michael Huggins, a spokesman for the World Food Program. "We'll start again as soon as it's deemed that there is no risk to our personnel and the truck convoys themselves."The United States is dropping packages of food. But criticism of the air drops -- and there are many -- include the possibility that the gently falling food will drift into the many minefields in Afghanistan's booby-trapped landscape. There are an estimated five million to seven million mines in the rocky soil. Afghan Technical Consultants, started in 1989, was one of the first groups to reclaim the ground. The work is wearisome. The organization has unearthed 2,500 antitank mines, 135,000 antipersonnel mines and 630,000 unexploded ordnances, Mr. Elmi, the acting director, said. Photos: Other employees of Afghan Technical Consultants who were killed in the Kabul airstrike on Monday were Nazibullah, top, Nassir Ahmad, center, and Safriullah.; Abdul Saboor was 25. His picture was part of his personnel file in the headquarters of Afghan Technical Consultants in Peshawar, Pakistan.; In the Pakistani village of Pabbi, Abdul Samad received news of his brother Abdul Saboor's death in Kabul. (Photographs by Ruth Fremson/The New Y ork Times)(pg. B3)
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A NATION CHALLENGED: PROTESTERS; A Pro-Taliban Rally Draws Angry Thousands in Pakistan, Then Melts Away

By RICK BRAGG
Published: October 6, 2001

RAWALPINDI, Pakistan, Oct. 5—A small boy of 4 or 5, his face as blank as a doll’s, rode the shoulders of an angry crowd through the Raja Bazaar, his head wrapped in a black turban, one small hand holding a plastic toy pistol in the air. He did not smile or laugh, as children typically do in rallies against the United States in this part of the world, as the crowd of nearly 15,000 chanted "O-sa-ma, O-sa-ma," and "Tal-i-ban, Tal-i-ban." His eyes highlighted with black makeup to make him more beautiful, more perfect, the boy did not join in the now everyday chants of "Death to America" or "U.S.A. is a dog." He just fired his imaginary bullets in the air over and over, his finger tightening on a harmless trigger, and rode a wave of anger and hatred up to the door of a mosque where a holy man shouted into a tinny loudspeaker about the destruction of his enemies. Only then did the crowd let the boy down from their shoulders. The child, as if trying to please, made a second gun from the fingers of his empty hand, and fired it at the sky as well. The thousands came to hear the words of Mullah Fazlur Rehman, who heads Jamiat Ulema Islam, a hard-line Islamic political party that supports Afghanistan's Taliban rulers. A former member of Parliament, the mullah did precisely what the demonstrators, and a heavily armed and armored cadre of Pakistani police officers, expected him to do: he threatened. "The United States is the No. 1 terrorist state in the world," said the mullah, who has been known to wave a pistol -- a real one -- as he speaks. "We are not scared of the United States, and we will teach them a lesson if they attack Afghanistan." This demonstration was notable because it was not in a border city or a city strongly controlled by Islamic radicals, but just minutes away from Islamabad, the capital, a region considered less friendly to those who want to tie Osama bin Laden, the Saudi-born terrorism suspect, so tightly to the Islamic faith that an attack on him would be seen as an attack on Islam itself. Rawalpindi is also where the Pakistani Army is headquartered, and protesters, by marching here, were thrusting their noses at the government -- and especially at Pakistan's ruler, Gen. Pervez Musharraf. Hours before General Musharraf met with Prime Minister Tony Blair of Britain in Islamabad to reaffirm their commitment to the war on terrorism, supporters of the Taliban and Mr. bin Laden packed four streets. Hundreds watched from windows and rooftops. Some held posters with Mr. bin Laden's image on them. Others wore decals and stickers of his face on their clothes. The mullah, whom many in Pakistan call "Mullah Diesel" because he was suspected of involvement in a diesel-fuel smuggling ring in the mid-1990's, told the crowd that the United States was not after Mr. bin Laden or the Taliban but Islam itself. Muslims in Pakistan, he said, should ignore Mr. Musharraf's decision to recognize evidence against Mr. bin Laden as conclusive. "Pakistan has become an agent of the United States," the mullah said. "Pakistan's government has deceived its people. "The mullah charged that Israel's Mossad intelligence agency was behind the Sept. 11 attacks in the United States. He blamed the Jews for most other terrorist attacks in American history, and said that President Bush was in on the conspiracy. His listeners appeared to agree with every word. This crowd also appeared different from previous ones. It was not trucked in, for effect, as some past crowds had been, but seemed to filter in from all over the city. Some came straight from work as janitors, cooks, vendors, furniture makers and more, a cross section of working men who said they believed that Mr. bin Laden was a champion of Islam, if not more. "Osama talks to Allah," said Midrarul Haq, a janitor. Mr. Haq said he hated the United
States. "Why are they so upset?" he asked of the Americans. "Five thousand, six thousand killed. How many did you kill in Iraq? Do you think only Americans are people? We are people, too. But we are poor, so you do not treat us as people. "But what some people in the capital had feared might ratchet into a major confrontation between anti-American demonstrators and the Pakistani police passed without any significant violence. One man in the crowd, Abdullah Saeed, picked out Americans and warned them. "You have two days," he said, but would not elaborate. "We will live with Osama," he said. "We will die with Osama. "Such demonstrations begin with noon prayers, and usually finish in a few hours. Here, the demonstrators lingered until 5 p.m. Only then did the streets return to normal. Vendors sold dates and pastries, instead of pictures of Mr. bin Laden. Steel riot doors that had been slammed down to guard shops when the demonstrators gathered clanked open, for some late Friday business. Men and boys squatted on the asphalt, poking through piles of cheap watches, cassette tapes, jewelry. It was as though the demonstration had never been. The only things clutched in the fingers of little boys were cobs of roasted corn, sesame cookies or a father's hand. Photos: "We are not scared of the United States," said Mullah Fazlur Rehman, head of Jamiat Ulema Islam, a hard-line Islamic party, at the rally.; A boy with a toy pistol was held aloft by an anti-American crowd at a rally in Rawalpindi, Pakistan, yesterday. (Photographs by Robert Nickelsberg for The New York Times) Map of Pakistan highlighting Rawalpindi: Rawalpindi is minutes from the Pakistani capital, Islamabad.
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