

Dichotomy, Partisan, Propaganda And Dehumanization: Framing Of Foe In The Economist And Time

Dr. Nasim Ishaq¹, Dr. Tanveer Hussain², Sana Haroon³

¹Assistant Professor, School of Communication Studies, University of Punjab.
nasimishaq17@gmail.com

²Assistant Professor, School of Communication Studies, University of Punjab. tanveerlabar.dcmr.scs@pu.edu.pk

³Lecturer Department of Mass Communication Government college university, faisalabad sanash49@gmail.com

Abstract

The current article studies the American, British leading newsmagazine's exposure of the battles in Afghanistan, Iraq, and military operations in Pakistan. These newsmagazine's articles, essays, and reports are studied for the mode in which an appearance of the "foe" is fabricated and outlined in prevailing media elucidation. An inquiry of the data divulges a configuration of degrading language used to foe privileged as well as Arab and Muslim inhabitants at large in the media's indiscriminating replica of similes that linguistically frame the enemy in categorical ways. Chiefly, the article discusses that the international media have contributed to umpiring structures of Islam and Muslims, marshaling conversant similes in illustrations that manufacture a foe-Other who is assaulted, dichotomized, and eventually dispensable. These dichotomized and partisan similes take the practice of animal descriptions that connects and diminishes human activities with sub-human conduct (Steuter, E., & Wills, D, 2009). The current paper debates that the frequent consumption of animal allegories by monopoly media institutes establishes enthused illustrations that have sociopolitical standing. The evidence of the significance of these demonstrations is more than pretentious, triggering the phase for racist counterattack, inmate exploitation, and even annihilation (Steuter, E., & Wills, D, 2009).

Keywords: Dichotomy, dehumanization, Newsmagazines, propaganda, Foe.

Introduction

This article focuses on American and British print news magazines (Time and The Economist respectively) and, in particular, articles, reports, and essays penned by influential journalists. These published writings in widely circulated print media not only dehumanized the administrative group but dichotomized all the followers of Islam, fortifying the wider political dialogue of indispensable, to develop partisan (Steuter, E., & Wills, D, 2009).

Selection of contradictory phrases in leading print media like labeling the foe and the rest of Muslims, "extremist", and "monster" --- deepen the gap among different religions and swiftly aggregate the tension among them. Franks (2003) examined that throughout the "War on Terror" the UK military strapped the media to narrate the evidence in the legitimization of battle. Media is considered a device, an armament, and a strength to extend the war (Ishaq, Saeed & Aqdas, 2018; Ishaq, Mukhtar & Manzoor, 2020).

The part of the Media in Crafting the Identity of Foe

Numerous studies have unfolded up that media, particularly in confrontation, conflict, and crafting of the identity of foe do not present the whole picture, categorically after 9/11, and errand Americans' strategies and overlook alternative positions, such as negotiation, context-oriented reporting, and dialogue with arguments (Rid, 2007).

Jackson, R. (2007) narrated that the expression 'Islamic terrorism' has become a pervasive piece of European administrative and theoretical counter-terrorism dialogue in the latest decades. While scrutinizing over three hundred administrative and theoretical manuscripts and employing a discourse critical approach, this article attempts to describe and dissect the central terms, assumptions, labels, narratives, and genealogical roots of the language and knowledge of 'Islamic terrorism and to reflect on its practical and normative consequences.

It accomplishes that 'Islamic terrorism' is awkward, not least as they are extremely biased, rationally contestable, destructive to community associations, and counter-productive. This act exposed government approaches concerning Muslims and Islam in Obama's administration, and how transnationally discrimination, bigotry, and incongruous words have been practiced against Muslims and Islam in the West. Exclusively the American media, western and UK media are considered responsible for disseminating racism and abhorrence seeds awkwardly, showing and framing a partisan image of Muslims and Islam in the perception of western people. (Alghamdi, E. A., 2015).

Another added that there has been mounting debate adjoining the occurrence of Islam phobia in European civilizations over the preceding few eras. Nevertheless, detailed

experiential research on the pervasiveness and forms of predisposition toward Muslims remains threatened, specifically from the Canadian perspective. The Muslims in Canada themselves have practiced discernment in current years due to their faith, culture, and values (Wilkins-Laflamme, S. (2018).

Ryan, M. (2004) concluded that opinion writers penciled subjectively on chronological orientations, administration foundations, and related statements in parallel means to tilt the disaster and the probable American response to it. No editorial recommended that martial interference would be incongruous and none stated that military intrusion would not eventually flourish, while some advised cautiousness.

The predominance of sub-human and ailment representations has been recognized worldwide in numerous practices of civic dialogue (Steuter & Wills, 2008b). Journalists have importantly mentioned the 9/11 alleged culprits in sub-human positions, terms that have also been applied in portrayals of opponents in Afghanistan, Iraq, and some areas of Pakistan as well as of Muslims in overall.

Methodology

In the current paper, American and British newsmagazine news items that utilized the frames of dichotomy, propaganda, partisan, and dehumanization in their treatment of the American operations from 2001 to 2011 were scrutinized. The newsmagazine news items were retrieved from hard copies of news magazines. Widely circulated newsmagazine items are especially noteworthy since it is claimed that a large part of the intellectuals and educated people are being enjoyed to squeeze the information. Newsmagazine's writings have eventually influenced logical fabrication, chiefly ideologically influential (Erjavec, K. 2004; Graber, 2007, Rahman, 2006, Iqbal, 2014.). Since 2001, a strong outline has become

obvious in the practice of framing the foe as sub-human in the American, Canadian and British media's reporting of the 9/11 context and related treatment of the battles in Afghanistan and Iraq (van Dijk, 1985; Pan & Kosicki, 2001; Norris, Kern & Just, 2003 as cited in Steuter, E., & Wills, D, 2009).

The discourse of Foes in Media: An Analysis of Worldwide News magazines

Hunt-related similes were recurrently embedded within the text of the news magazines while sharing information from the battlefield. Degraded the foe as animal and Coalition forces were labeled as "chasers", seek, find, search type words have been switched; "flush out", "hunt", "smoke them out", "snare". "The world's highest military, the financial and diplomatic authority would progressively and obstinately hunt down its foe while practicing everything it can to sustain an alliance of sustenance from an unusually inclusive range of states" ("For family and", 2001). Time disgraced Al-Qaida's chief by mentioning: "The aim is to flush out Al-Qaida's chief from his burrow and seizure or slaughter him"; "the hunting for Osama is escalating", "burn them", "U.S. armed and acumen officials are vigilantly optimistic that their 'prey' is inside the range", "the initiative 'to snare' Osama has been reinforced by an enriched alliance with Pakistan" (McGirk and Ware, 2004).

"Bush declared as the cord cuddle around his (Bin Laden) collar" ("Could worse be", 2001). Time shared General Richard Meyers's venous statement about the Taliban that "they are hazardous people, so treacherous that they distress through the hydraulic ropes" (Elliott, et al, 2002). Whereas, accelerating the armed operation the phenomenon of 'other' and 'our' was maximally noticeable. The Economist unsympathetically argued regarding Osama, "He, is one of the few fanatics adept of coordinating such a bold and byzantine series of assaults" ("Who did it?" 2001). Taliban were

categorized as 'muggers', and "crooks" (Thompson, 2004).

The British newsmagazine *Elite*-quoting was very frequent as the American president said "We will mark no distinction between the extremists who define this drive and those who support them" ("The new enemy", 2001). Expand its maliciousness for all Muslims and Islam as a whole these newsmagazines applied prejudiced adjectives, 'extremist movement', "architect of fanatic attacks", and "Al-Qaida became the core of the movement to the eradication of Islamic lands of European impact through panic", "most desired men", "to enforce Islam in its inelastic practice", 'erroneous priests' ("After the Taliban", 2001). "as the snare stiffens, One of the U.S. military majors articulated Time: "coalition forces won't inquire him (Al-Qaeda chief) if he desires to capitulation but kills him" (Ratnesar, 2001).

Any conquest that leads the Al-Qaida in charge of even a minor portion of the state will not be a triumph at all. The optimism must be that the Taliban are in overall, not simply, strategic withdrawal, but that cannot be considered ordinary (After the route, 2001). British media characterized Taliban managers and web members as: "miserable revolutionaries", "deceased mole", "prey", ("Who did it"?, 2001) to seize members' "Chopping off the creature's, the head may not slaughter its body" (Elliot, et al, 2003). Time categorized American soldiers as 'predators' with their air sovereignty and the Taliban a web was pigeonholed as 'captive' the predators pursued their victim from the blue and in the obscurities (Ratnesar, et al 2001). British's print media penned while mortifying: "The battle in Afghanistan had paused the snake, not slaughtered it" ("America still vulnerable", 2002). America directs more marines "toward rummaging Osama" (Cherchez l'homme, 2001). The mists of burn emblem overhead the heavens of Iraq in the pole of profound, gloomy grimy air,

numerous Tomahawk weaponry carrying with them the bits of beheaded government (Ratnesar, et al, 2003). American executives misinformed the world by saying in 2003, "my trust is we will, in fact in Iraq be received as emancipators" (Gosh, 2010). The leading magazines more recurrently stated elite viewpoint, as one of American armed personnel assumed, "I've categorically no hesitation at all that indication will be discovered". "Whereas Bush spontaneously incorporated out various opinions for confrontation", "counting suspected Iraq associations with and the decency of altering a wicked `` establishment"(No WMD, 2003). Iraqi president, his descendants, government, and participants of the Baath party were being repetitively disgraced by tagging them, "tyrant", "Callous", "over-sexed", "Iraq's quadruped", "one of Iraq's famed ministers was docketed as "Chemical Ali" and also added: "it's plausible to determine that Iraq will not leave its artilleries of bulk annihilation except Mr. Saddam (Iraqi president) kills" ("Confronting Iran", 2002).

The adjectives have been used to craft the battleground's worst situation with context to mention that "Saddam treacherous cultivated extra treacherous with his armament accumulation of gasses and toxins and fervent for an atomic armament Programme" (Tumulty, et al, 2002). "Organic, biochemical perilous arms", "only accountable for all the agonies of Iraq", and "he was distribution WMD with Al-Qaeda web". The results revealed that the dichotomy, propaganda, partisan and dehumanizing are the predominating frames that have both administrative and philosophical drive, specifically when it blowouts from specific opponents such as others or foes at privileged statuses like Saddam Hussein, his sons, Osama Bin Laden, Taliban, Al-Qaida and their loyal team.

Legitimize the attacks:

Time vindicated the whereabouts of American-commanded alliance marines by saying Iraqis amiably cheered American militants and inscribed: "the Iraqis arose assortment with armed forces, stroking them on the backbone, giving those victory marks again" (Lacey, 2003, p. 37). The same magazine in an alternative item penned: "it's the wish of Baghdadi people to get rid of Saddam Hussein's regime and they adore the presence of Coalition armed personals" (Gibbs, 2003, p.21). "U.S. military groups were being tenderly applauded in the Afghan capital" "Afghan crowds eagerly rushed to shave their beards and unnoticed the request for Salah" (Elliott, et al, 2002). The Economist often embraced the gauge of contradiction. "Iraqi is very enthusiastic to purge the oppressor". The veteran journalist crafted the story with the least evidence that the "Iraqi dictator himself is accountable for his people's financial scarcity and undernourishment and Saddam Hussein hid approximately 87 dollars" ("Putting Humpty", 2002). The Economist engraved that: "Iraqi president was a treacherous Iraqi tyrant", "who was eager to have a hoard of missiles to threaten his neighbors", "anguish and assassination of his people", "he desecrated international treaties, his avowed regional drives made the world treacherous, its compulsory to eradicate him from the authority with vigor" ("remember, remember", 2002). The reporter pointed out ferociously, that by toeing the administrative agenda "America can triumph the battle in Iraq effectively but if the Iraqi president approaches to know that he has nil to drop at that time he may use a missile of bulk annihilation" ("A phony war", 2002). The frequency of vilification can be monitored through the statement "It's not promising to neutralize Iraq in the presence of the Iraqi president" ("confronting Iraq", 2002).

Propaganda

Reports of the Inspective squad of almost fourteen hundred participants for penetrating organic and biological armaments assumed that

Iraq had missiles of mass devastation; they could catch the precise location and position of the Programme soon (Duffy, et al, 2004). Time writers depend on elite-oriented and subjective remarks about the Iraqi administration: “Iraqi dictator is a tricky”, “inflexible and theoretically crazy foe of the USA”. “USA should reward the battle beside Iraq to deactivate it from organic and substance armaments and thrash the association among Iraq and Al-Qaeda web because this web has endured intimidation for US and European republics” (Clark, 2002). The reporter also proclaimed that Iraq had 20 arsenals with a reach of 650 Km and additionally anticipated to construct an apparatus testing ability by emerging thousand Km rocket and also stressed to evaluation the range of its short-range arsenals”. “Currently world power America has to make the universe harmless” (“Tony's dossier”; 2002). “Mr. Saddam was an individual who snubbed 16 United Nations resolves in the previous decade”, without ample proofs the seasoned journalists also became propaganda machines by writing “it is vital to underprivileged him from these armaments. The dichotomy echoed through the writings: “polls propose that utmost Iraqis ponder that their portion has upgraded since the tumble of the tyrant, and will endure expanding” (“The challenge”, 2004, p.10). The American president said, “We should be equipped to halt rascal countries” and the extremist patrons earlier they are capable of bullying or practice missiles of huge demolition to the USA, her followers and comrades’ American newsmagazine engraved that Bush ended it clear “Americans cannot lease their foes assault first” (Duffy, 2002).

Dehumanization: The news items of said magazines were de-individualized and dehumanized Saddam without ample evidence framing him as a “tyrant”, “callous”, “intimidator”,

“Iraqi totalitarian was gabbed, assassinated, infected, and tortured to demise hundreds of thousands of his associated citizens” (“A case for”, 2003). Applied the vocabulary that reflected animal imagery “CIA officers confident to drive the former Iraqi authoritarian dry”, “Fierce and despot” (“Got him, but”? 2003). “The trick squeezes (“The case for”, 2002). “lethal bully”, “professed USA opponent”, “who has been assembling heaps of biochemical arms for two decades and now involved in nuclear missile provision” (“pre-emptive threat”, 2002). . Time repeatedly narrated the stance in degrading language as described the characteristics of Mr.Hussain and his descendants, for example: “it’s not cool being a parasitizing, oversexed, snubbed insert of an Iraq’s tyrant” (Robinson, 2003, p.33).

Debasing expression of Time’s overloads the manuscript while the newsmagazine inscribed regarding Iraq’s association with Al-Qaeda. It categorized Islam/Muslims with very adverse expressions, “the Islamic fanatic grading”, “leaders will obtain instant revenge”, and “proactive drawbacks”, Time inscribed that Abu Mousab al-Zarqawi was the utmost unsafe man in Iraq. Both important newsmagazines worryingly gave more consideration to the issues that offered the obvious effects of the clash as well as overstated the audacity of rivals, as one of these engraved: “Carcasses of Taliban’s Arab and cautious Pakistani jihadists were branded with marks of disregard. Afghan bills were chock full in their body entrances, noses, and physique cuts. Wounded troops were crushed to death by the Afghan public, their departed bodies mortified and left in the streets” (Gibbs, 2001).

Conclusion

International media should put a stop to their predecessors being denounced Muslims as “extremists”, “viruses”, and “monsters” and accused of trying to shatter world peace by

holding a diversified opinion. Historical precedents include the Rwanda genocide where local dailies and Radio added fuel to the fire and fortified the violence. Rwanda's local media dehumanized the ethnic minority by noxious statements, "You pests (cockroaches) must identify you as the end of dermis! We won't lease you slaughter! We will slaughter you!" Mitchell, J. (2007). The consequences exposed that indigenous leaders are the leading characters in the pathway to ethnic clash while dailies framing arouses ethnic variances through clash oriented outlining. Treatment of conflict in the media has been directly and incidentally manipulating ethnic clashes (Muhammed, A. R. (2016). The same brutal tool of dehumanization for Rohingya Muslims was applied by the Myanmar administration and the media propagated the dichotomy and hate in the least possible time, Rohingya Muslims genocide and Involuntary Immigration Disaster (Lee, R. (2019). The nature of dichotomy, biased and dehumanizing framing against the Muslims depicts the pro-Europeans' atrocious appetite for demonizing young Muslims. Whether or not they were, young and likely alleged terrorists young Muslim men were being enforced to pay the price for America's and her coalition forces' obsession with demonizing Muslims in Abu grab and Guantanamo. The Bush government's inexhaustible drive for persecuting Muslims destroyed infinite lives. The prisoners of Abu grab and Guantanamo endured inconceivable cruelties; "Sodomising a caged with a material light", "torrential phosphoric fluid on internees", "whipping; pressures of rape and electrocution", "scrap recidivist exposed", and "driving them to masturbate and emulate other sex actions in the community that is prohibited in Islam". Snaps and tapes are engaged by US combatants who were purportedly viewers. The misuses were not amalgamated in the boom because of their "terribly delicate nature" ("Crime and Punishment", 2004). "Daily Mirror printed pictures that were unproven to show

combatants from the Queen's Lancashire Troop urinating on and jolting Iraq's captives" ("The not-so", 2004).

They would do well to consider that current practice serves to fortify the gap among civilizations when the leading opinion crafting industry engaging in such recrimination. Islam followers endured challenges globally and even experienced genocide amidst precisely such venomous rhetoric and the policy of vilification. This must end now.

References

1. After the route. (2001). *The Economist*
2. After the Taliban. (2001, October). *The Economist*, 17.
3. Akhtar, A. S. (2004, March). *Real Politics & Global Resistance. The Herald*, 76-77.
4. Alghamdi, E. A. (2015). The representation of Islam in Western media: The coverage of Norway terrorist attacks. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 4(3), 198-204.
5. America still vulnerable. (2002, May). *The Economist*.
6. Boots on the ground; Afghanistan and Pakistan. (2009, February). *The Economist*
7. Cherchez l'homme; Hunting for bin Laden. (2001, November). *The Economist*
8. Crain, C. (2007, July). A soldier's shame. *Time*. 168(3), 38-39.
9. Duffy, M. (2002, September). Does might make it right? *Time*. 160(14).
10. Duffy, M., McGirk, T., & Gosh, A. (2006, June). Streets of blood. *Time*, 36-38.
11. Eid, M. (2014). Perceptions about Muslims in Western societies. In Re-

- imagining the other (pp. 99-119). Palgrave Macmillan, New York.
12. Elliott, M. (2002). How al-Qaeda got back on the attack. *Time*.
 13. Erjavec, K. (2004). The Newsweek war on terrorism. A construction of Risk. In S. Nohrstedt & R. Ottosen (Eds.), *U.S. and the others global media image on the war on terror*. Sweden.
 14. *Fatally Flawed*. (2002, December). *The Herald*. 71-72
 15. *From the control tower; the bombing of Bagram*. (2001, November). *The Economist*
 16. *Further into Taliban country; Afghanistan*. (2009, March). *The Economist*.
 17. Gibbs, N. (2001, November). *Blood and joy*. *Time*
 18. *Got him, but what now? Justice for Saddam Hussein*. (2003, December). *The Economist*
 19. Graber, D. A. (Eds.). (2000). *Media powers in politics* (4th ed.). Washington, D.C.: University of Illinois Chicago.
 20. *Imaginary friends; Iraq and Al-Qaeda*. (2003, February). *The Economist*.
 21. Iqbal, Z., & Zubair, Z. (2014). *Construction of Pakistan Army in the Western Media: Discourse Analysis of Leading Articles of Time and The Economist*. *Journal of Political Studies*, 21(2).
 22. *Iraq and Afghanistan in the line of fire*. (2008, July). *The Economist*
 23. Ishaq, N, Saeed, R, & Waheed, A. (2018) *Media Framing of Combat, Army Operations, Conflict and Crises: An Analytical Insight*. *Pakistan Social Sciences Review*, 2(1), 196-207.
 24. Ishaq, N; Mukhtar, M; & Manzoor. S. (2020). *State interest and media coverage on conflict: A case of American military operations in Pakistan*. *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences*, 40(2), 665-672.
 25. Jackson, R. (2007). *Constructing enemies: 'Islamic terrorism' in political and academic discourse*. *Government and Opposition*, 42(3), 394-426.
 26. Kukis, M. (Dec, 2006). *How to avoid Iraq Syndrome*. *Time*
 27. Lee, R. (2019). *Extreme speech| extreme speech in Myanmar: The role of state media in the Rohingya forced migration crisis*. *International Journal of Communication*, 13, 22.
 28. Mcgeary, J. (April, 2003). *Inside the secret world*. *Time*.
 29. McGirk, T. (2003, April). *Meanwhile back at the other war*. *Time*. 161(14), 14.
 30. McGirk, T., & Ware, M. (08/03/2004). *Remember Afghanistan*. *Time*
 31. *Military intelligence*, 03-09-2002-*The Economist*.
 32. Mitchell, J. (2007). *Remembering the Rwandan genocide: Reconsidering the role of local and global media*. *Global Media Journal*, 6(11).
 33. Muhammed, A. R. (2016). *News framing of ethno-political issues and conflict behaviours: Ethnic conflict pathways model* (Doctoral dissertation, Universiti Utara Malaysia).
 34. Musa, A. O., & Ferguson, N. (2013). *Enemy framing and the politics of reporting religious conflicts in the Nigerian press*. *Media, War & Conflict*, 6(1), 7-20.
 35. *Never the twain shall peacefully meet* Nov. 17, 2001. *The Economist*.
 36. Orrù, P. (2014). *Racist Discourse on social networks. A discourse analysis of Facebook posts in Italy*. *Rhesis. International Journal of Linguistics, Philology and Literature*, 5(1), 113-133.
 37. Powell, et,al. (April, 2004). *Shifting Power*. *Time*. 163(17)

38. Rahman, B. H. (2007). Images of Muslim women in International newsmagazines: A case of Time and Newsweek (1997-2002). (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Institution of Communication Studies. University of Punjab.
39. Ray, D. (2004). Frames in the U.S. Print Media Coverage of the Kashmir Conflict (Unpublished Master's thesis, University of South Florida.
40. Robinson, S. (2003, April). into the fire with Warrior McCoy. *Time*. 161(14), 39.
41. Ryan, M. (2004). Framing the War against Terrorism: US newspaper editorials and military action in Afghanistan. *Gazette: The International Journal for Communication Studies*, 66(5).
42. Siddiq. S. (2005, January). Willd Choss. *The Herald*.16b.
43. Steuter, E., & Wills, D. (2009). Discourses of Dehumanization: Enemy Construction and Canadian Media Complicity in the Framing of the War on Terror. *Global Media Journal: Canadian Edition*, 2(2).
44. Steuter, Erin & Wills, Deborah. (2008b). At war with metaphor: Media propaganda and racism in the war on terror. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
45. Stuck with you; America and Pakistan. (2011, March). *The Economist*, 46.
46. Taliban welcome. (2005, January). *The Economist*, 374(8409), 30.
47. The new enemy -War on America; How will America respond? (Sept, 2001). *The Economist*
48. Thompson, M., & Shannon, E. (2004). The Verdict on Rumsfeld. *Time*. 164(10).
49. Who did it? The perpetrators. (2001, September).*The Economist*
50. Wilkins-Laflamme, S. (2018). Islamophobia in Canada: Measuring the realities of negative attitudes toward Muslims and religious discrimination. *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie*, 55(1), 86-110. Zagorin, A. (2003, July).