

## A Critical Discourse Analysis of Religious Othering of Muslims in the Washington Post

*Muhammad Tahir*

Department of Management Sciences, Air University, Multan, Pakistan

---

**Abstract:** This paper is a Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) of representation of Muslims in an article published in the Washington Post. It is about the protests carried out by Muslim individuals, and groups in different parts of the world against the publication of the blasphemous cartoons of the Prophet Muhammad (SAW) in the European newspapers. This paper is an attempt to explain how the writer of the article perceives and describes an event, that is, protests of Muslims, under the influence of the shared or common ideology of his group. It employs van Dijk's (2004) analytical framework to explore the underlying ideologies of the text related to in-group and out-group presentation at the level of meaning. Findings show that the writer regards the Muslims participating in the protests as *others* and uses various semantic devices such as hyperbole, implication, lexicalization, etc to represent them and their things negatively. On the other hand, those social actors whose actions and opinions are close to, or at least not much different from, his ideology have been represented positively through the ideological moves of evidentiality, consensus, authority, etc. Findings of this paper will also be helpful in understanding the power of language as an ideological tool in the production and dissemination of us-and-them ideologies.

**Key words:** Critical Discourse Analysis • Newspaper Discourse • Ideology • Muslims • In-group and Out-group Representation

---

### INTRODUCTION

This paper is a Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) of contents related to positive self-representation and negative-other representation in an article titled "Opportunists Make Use of Cartoon Protests; Individuals, Groups and Governments Vent Anger over Issues Unrelated to Defense of Islam". This article was published in the Washington Post on February 9, 2006. It is about the activities carried out by the Muslim individuals, groups and government in their protests against the publication of blasphemous cartoons in the European newspapers. Drawing upon [1] theoretical framework which views institutions such as newspapers as representative of ideological groups, this paper carries out a semantic and lexical analysis of this article. Being a representative of an ideological group other than Muslims, the article represents the latter ones as OTHERS. Derogatory terms such as 'suspected', 'enemies', 'ringleaders', 'radicals', 'conservative' etc have

been used for those participating in the protests and a positive term such as 'moderate' has been used for those who do not participate in the protests. The researcher is particularly interested in the ways how linguistic devices make certain representations negative or positive in the same text.

The present paper employs [1] analytical framework to find out explicit as well as implicit discursive strategies used to represent US with positive attributes and THEM with negative attributes. Since ideologies are embedded in discourses, a critical discourse analysis of ideology from representational point of view is most relevant. A number of research studies have proved CDA to be a useful tool for the analysis of language, or discourse at large, in the field of linguistics [2-7]. One of the major objectives of CDA as stated in these research studies is to deconstruct the explicit and implicit ideologies of discourses that "help produce and reproduce unequal power relations" in the society [8]. In other words, vague and ambiguous statements are

clarified to find out their possible role in sustaining the unequal relations of power in the society. The latent 'ideologies under the cover of apparently harmless and neutral discourse undergo a dissection or post-mortem procedure called CDA to expose the toxic, debilitating agents' [9].

Since ideologies need a medium to function, it will be useful to discuss next the ideological role of the medium (here, newspapers) that express and reproduce such ideologies. This is with reference to [10] who holds that genres are expressed in different modes or mediums which are important to be studied for a comprehensive analysis of genres and their ideologies.

**Newspapers and Editorials:** One of the major functions of newspapers, as its name implies, is to report news. This reporting, however, does not remain limited to only one type of news [11]. In order to make big business, newspapers offer a variety of news such as business news, political news, sports news and many more. In addition, they give 'commentary on the news, express opinion through their editorial sections, pass on special information and advice to readers, and often include features such as comic strips and serialized novels.' to increase and satisfy their readership [12].

In this whole process, the way newspapers report news to their readership matter a lot. [13] argues that information in newspaper '...may well be presented with an ideological 'spin' that makes it difficult for the reader to make an independent decision on what his/her actual viewpoint of these events actually is.' Importantly, readers' opinions are also likely to be affected by the fact that newspapers are not individuals but institutions with their own vested interests and, therefore, decisions regarding inclusion and exclusion of news and voices are made carefully within them [14]. It is, therefore, not wrong to regard newspapers as ideological groups that represent and support their *things* and disapprove the others' through linguistic devices in text and talk.

Not surprisingly, like news, editorials also act as a mouthpiece of a particular newspaper and its ideology. [15] argues that

... today newspapers are, however, usually corporately owned and the editorial function is used to publicize the policies and opinions of the newspaper as an institution. Nevertheless, the editorial is also used to criticize and stir up emotions potentially to bring about change.

Some research studies proves editorials to have emerged as one of the most important genres of

newspapers particularly in the literate circles for the simple reason that people regard them as a reliable source of information about political, religious, cultural, and national issues in a country [15,16]. Another reason of turning to experts' opinions is the readers' difficulty in concluding something out of overwhelming amount of information being broadcasted/published daily [17,18]. Both of these perceptions make it easier for print media to shape the way the world should be seen by their ideological groups – 'a homogenous group of people with shared beliefs and values whose defining features is the newspaper that they read' [13].

Editorials express and communicate opinions in an effective and persuasive way. According to [19] one of the most significant features of newspaper editorials are their series of arguments given to back up their stance against something or the *other*. They comment on news events from different angles and provide summary in form of recommendations, warnings or predictions. In doing so, various strategies are employed including the use of polarized vocabulary to describe political actors and events and specific rhetorical structures of discourse [20]. The use of these strategies is ideological in a sense that they disseminate positive information about 'US' and negative information about 'THEM'. In such a situation, an analysis of the ideological role of editorial genre is quite significant from a research point of view in the present paper.

**Theoretical and Methodological Perspectives:** Before I deal with an analysis of positive-self representation and negative-other representation in the newspaper article, it is necessary to briefly discuss some theoretical and methodological perspectives in which these ideologies are to be made explicit (for details see [21]).

'Ideologies' have been defined as 'some kind of ideas, that is, belief systems' [5]. Since people hold and express different opinions about social issues such as ethnicity, racism and inequality, existence of different sets of ideas or belief systems in society is a reality. To [5], those who share these belief systems form one collectivity of social actors. [5] further argues that '...not any collectivity develops or needs an ideology...this is only the case for some kinds of group' who do so in relation to other group. Thus, there are political, social, and professional groups and each of them represents its shared/common beliefs or belief systems in its discursive and social practices.

Importantly, the way these groups represent themselves before the world denotes their social identity

which is based on their shared beliefs – ideologies. Groups represent themselves differently on various issues which accounts for the existence of different types of ideologies in society; for instance, racist and anti-racist ideologies, feminist and chauvinist ideologies, communism and anti-communism ideologies, etc. Ideologies also function to control and organize a group's social and discursive practices, attitudes, goals and interests as [5] argues:

...a racist ideology may control attitudes about immigration, a feminist ideology may control attitudes about abortion or glass ceilings on the job or knowledge about gender inequality in society, and a social ideology may favor a more important role of the State in public affairs.'

It is in this context that the present paper identifies newspapers as ideological groups both inside and outside a community. That is, though [5] does not seem to touch upon this aspect, mutual vested interests can move different media groups within one community form a major alliance against another one from a different community. For instance, where some research studies show that newspapers give opposing opinions on a single event within one community i.e. English [13,22], another one shows that same newspapers (or others of their type) take mutual stance against their common OTHER coming of another community i.e. Muslims [16].

This negative-other representation and even positive-self representation is explicitly and implicitly materialized through certain linguistic devices in newspaper discourses. In order to detect such ideologies one needs to carry out a systematic critical analysis of discourses. But there is no single monolithic approach to critical analyses of discourses. There are a number of approaches in different disciplines such as text analysis and discourse analysis whose frameworks can be effectively used for analysis of texts according to their amenability. In this paper, where focus is on ideologies of in-group positive representation and out-group negative representation particularly through meaning and lexis in a lengthy text (i.e. newspaper article), the researcher has found [1] framework more suitable.

Van Dijk being one of the key figures in CDA, holds that ideologies as socially shared belief systems of groups, are both social and cognitive [cited in 23]. Socially, they sustain group-related representations (identity, values, norms, goals, tasks, position, mutual relationships and resources), monitor group-related practices including text and talk. The members of a social group make use of ideologies to justify and legitimize their

dominance, and disseminate their ideas as well as values. Cognitively, they organize, control, and even change the mental models i.e. attitudes, of social groups. On the basis of the ideologically biased models and socially shared beliefs as discussed above, members of different social groups use certain strategies to produce and comprehend text and talk [5, 24] regards texts not only as a source of information about some reality but also as a means under the influence of personal and organization ideologies to produce and construct reality. Metaphorically, he describes text as 'tip of the iceberg' and, thus, assigns a text analyst the responsibility of deconstructing the hidden meanings of texts [25].

In order to uncover the sources of dominance and inequality prevailing in society, van Dijk suggests discourse analysis, social analysis and cognitive analysis of texts [cited in 9]. In regard to CDA, [26] identifies macro and micro levels for analysis. Macro level, being more abstract, deals with power relations between groups and institutions such as power as control; access and discourse control; context control; the control of text and talk; mind control; inequality; and dominance. The micro level deals with the power relations between social actors of a group. It comprises language, discourse, verbal interaction, social practices, paraverbal activities and so on. [1] analytical framework employs two macro strategies i.e. positive self-representation and negative other-representation. The discursive moves that mediate these ideologies include 'actor description', 'victimization', 'authority', 'vagueness', 'categorization', 'presupposition', 'polarization', 'consensus', 'number game', 'disclaimer', 'self-glorification', 'evidentiality', 'lexicalization', 'irony', 'implication', 'hyperbole'. A brief description of the terms is as follows (for a fuller description, see [1]):

- Actor Description: The way we describe members of a particular group either positively or negatively.
- Authority: Quoting authorities' statements to support a claim.
- Categorization: Associating people with different groups.
- Consensus: Creating mutual agreement or solidarity
- Disclaimer: First presenting an idea as something positive and then denying it later by using certain terms e.g. 'but', 'yet', 'however', etc
- Evidentiality: Using facts to support a claim.
- Hyperbole: A device for deliberate exaggeration of meaning.

- Implication: Conveying a meaning indirectly.
- Irony: Saying something and meaning something else.
- Lexicalization: Selection of words for negative representation of the *other*.
- National Self Glorification: Representing someone positively by glorifying their country.
- Number Game: Using numbers/statistics to make a claim appear credible.
- Polarization: Categorizing *our* members of group with good attributes and *their* members with bad attributes.
- Presupposition: Implying or understanding without being stated.
- Vagueness: Creating ambiguity and uncertainty in meaning.
- Victimization: Telling negative things about those who do not belong to US.

Language and particularly the social context in which it is used are also critical in Norman Fairclough's approach to CDA. His theory of ideology is based on this assumption that 'language is an irreducible part of social life, dialectically interconnected with other elements of social life, so that social analysis and research always has to take account of language [27]. Unlike many social scientists and linguists who concentrate less upon linguistic features and social effects of texts in their analyses respectively, [27] recommends both social and linguistic analysis of discourses.

To conclude, linguistic theories are of the view that ideologies – including negative-other and positive-self representation – are embedded in discourses and, therefore, critical discourse analysis can be used as a successful tool in exploring the discursive strategies that mediate these ideologies.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Let us analyze the following article titled "Opportunists Make Use of Cartoon Protests; Individuals, Groups and Governments Vent Anger Over Issues Unrelated to Defense of Islam". It must be remembered that [1] framework has been used for analysis.

- Like tens of thousands of protesters this week, the crowd that gathered Wednesday in the southern

Afghan town of Qalat came to speak out against cartoons in European newspapers mocking the prophet Muhammad (SAW).

- But the protest soon took a much different direction. Afghan demonstrators began chanting against the hiring of Pakistanis to do reconstruction work. Pakistanis in the crowd began chanting against the United States and tried to force their way into the local U.S. military base. When the crowd encountered Afghan security forces, a suspected Taliban member fired a weapon. Afghan police returned fire. By the time the smoke cleared, at least three protesters were dead and more than a dozen people were injured.
- "They forgot all about the cartoons," said Gulab Shah Alikheil, the regional governor's spokesman.
- Furor over the caricatures of Islam's most revered figure may have triggered the wave of recent demonstrations among Muslims worldwide. But as the protests escalate, they are morphing into an opportunity for individuals, groups and governments to push agendas that often have little or nothing to do with defending Islam. Rallies ostensibly held for religious reasons have become chances to vent economic frustrations, settle local scores or gain political leverage.
- "We have condemned the cartoons and said those responsible should be brought to justice," said Mulwi Sayed Imam Mutawali, deputy head of a religious council in the southern Afghan city of Kandahar. "But there are some enemies of Afghanistan that want to take advantage of this issue. They just want to advance their own aims." Mutawali said his council initially supported the protests but has decided to demand they stop because they have been hijacked by people with ulterior motives. At least 10 people have been killed in Afghan protests over the past three days.
- "There's a sincere feeling of being wounded" by the cartoons, said Paul Fishstein, director of the nonprofit Afghanistan Research and Evaluation Unit. "But there's also the chance for certain forces to make mischief, to take advantage of a situation where people are upset."
- The list of suspected ringleaders using the controversy to their own benefit here is a long one,

from al Qaeda and the Taliban to local militia commanders and former governors. All are believed to have something to gain by steering otherwise peaceful protests into melees.

- "Ordinary Afghan citizens who are protesting do not walk around with hand grenades in their pockets," said a U.S. military spokesman, Col. James Yonts, referring to a protest Tuesday in which demonstrators lobbed grenades into a NATO base. "That leads us to believe there is something else behind this."
- Afghanistan is not the only place where motives are in question. The autocratic Syrian government was widely believed to be behind protests Saturday that resulted in the burning of the Danish and Norwegian embassies in Damascus. In Lebanon, where the Danish Embassy burned a day later and Christian landmarks were targeted in violence, local news organizations reported that Syrian agents had protesters bused in to help stir up trouble.
- In Indonesia, the Islamic Defenders Front, a radical Muslim organization, said the cartoons have made organizing easier. "The moment has unified us," said the group's East Java chairman, Habib Abdurrahman Bahlaida. "The West had a bad plan to pull Muslims apart. Instead, they are pulling us together." The group, which claims 5 million members, attacked the Danish and U.S. consulates in the city of Surabaya on Monday.
- But such groups are a tiny minority in Indonesia, where about 90 percent of the 240 million inhabitants are Muslims. Some moderate leaders on Wednesday appealed for calm and said the protests were being exploited by extremist groups. "Do not go overboard and get trapped into a situation that can be used by elements bent on painting an image of Indonesia's Islam as an intolerant, rigid and anarchic society," said Din Syamsuddin, a leader of Muhammadiyah, an Islamic group that claims 30 million members, the Reuters news agency reported.
- In Pakistan, too, conservative Muslim groups appeared to be using the uproar over the cartoons to gain leverage. In Peshawar, the capital of North-West Frontier province, several thousand people rallied Tuesday in a protest led by the provincial government, which is headed by an alliance of radical religious parties. "We must at least throw out the ambassador of Denmark," said Qazi Hussain Ahmad,

leader of Jamaat-e-Islami, the largest religious party in Pakistan.

- In Afghanistan, President Hamid Karzai was among the first to condemn the cartoons. For several days after rallies erupted elsewhere in the world, few other Afghans seemed to notice. But that changed quickly: Each day since Monday, Afghanistan has been the scene of especially violent demonstrations.

The author of this article is a columnist for an American newspaper and, therefore, may be regarded as member of an ideological group. The same may be assumed about the readers, the analyst, and the authors in other newspapers. In this context, this text is being read, interpreted and examined / analyzed as an ideological text.

The topic of the text is a critique of those activities individuals, groups and even governments carried out as protest against the publication of blasphemous cartoons of the Prophet Muhammad (SAW) in the European newspapers. Though the title seems to provide a gist of the article, it also *topicalizes* the negative information about the *other*. [26] regards it as an ideological function of topics. The writer does not mention any clear national, religious, ethnic, and racial identity of these 'opportunists' in the title, but his use of the term 'Islam' refers to Muslims, particularly those who participated in these protests. Then he has opted for the term 'Opportunists' for these Muslims instead of any other euphemistic or less derogatory counterpart such as 'temporizer' or 'timeserver'. The term being negative in connotation *implies* that the writer treats Muslims as members of the other group in the article; hence, negative other-representation. The title indirectly refers to two types of groups in these protests: one is consisted of those who carried out these protests over irrelevant issues as the writer claims; and, presumably, the second one comprises some people who participated in these cartoon protests and hijacked them (made use of them). Similarly, the word 'defense' in the noun phrase 'defense of Islam' *presupposes* that Islam is in some sort of danger; however, who are or what is 'the danger' has not been mentioned.

In the beginning of the first paragraph in the article, the writer employs the ideological move of *number game* in the sentence "Like tens of thousands of protesters this week...gathered...to speak out against cartoons..." so that his given information may appear credible before the

readers. The reader's social memory or mental model regarding 'crowd' is also addressed here. The figures 'tens of thousands' and the term 'crowd' in the co-text (neighbouring words) work together to give the reader an idea of a large number of people participating in the protest. This paragraph also carries an *apparent empathy* with the Muslim participants as realized by the *disclaimer* 'but' in the beginning of the second paragraph. In spoken and written texts, the first part of the discourse preceding a disclaimer in the second one is mostly used to avoid having readers' negative opinion. Thus the writer expresses *apparent empathy* with the Muslim protesters for positive-self presentation.

Negative-other presentation comes in the first sentence of the second paragraph. The *disclaimer* 'But' shows deviance of the crowd from its main purpose i.e. protest against cartoons. Semantically, the word 'different' also carries a negative connotation here. It means 'not like something or someone' (e.g. 'Our two sons are different from each other' [28] and has been used as synonymous to 'wrong' in the sentence; hence, the sentence could be perceived by the reader as 'the protest soon took a much wrong direction'.

Afterwards, the writer's ideological description of people *categorizes* them into different (ideological) groups. The sentence "Afghan demonstrators began chanting against the hiring of Pakistanis..." describes the Afghans and Pakistanis as two different ideological or *other* groups. Similarly, the next sentence 'Pakistanis in the crowd began chanting against the United States' describes the Pakistanis and Americans (United States) as two different groups. It is important to note that the members of the former groups have been described negatively as out group for they have been alleged to "force their way into the local U.S. military base." and the latter one described as in-group. The phrasal verb '(to) force way' means 'to push and use physical force to get into...something' [28] and, therefore, contains semantically negative connotations. This is the ideological move of *lexicalization* which the writer employs for negative other-representation.

In order to understand the ideological *implications* in the third-last sentence of the paragraph "When the crowd encountered..." the reader needs to know its specific socio-political context. That is, mostly Afghan security forces have been deployed to protect U.S. military base in Afghanistan. Thus, 'a suspected Taliban member' who 'fired a weapon' is being *categorized* as a

member of another *other* group. Needless to say, the word 'suspected' shows *vagueness* in the writer's opinion and the words 'fired a weapon' without any proper reason represents the Taliban member in a negative way (*actor description*). The representation of the Afghan police is positive in the sentence 'Afghan police returned fire' because their firing has been described as a reaction to the Taliban's action. The association of positive attribute with the Afghan police represents them close to, if not belonging to, in-group (*polarization*). In the last sentence "By the time the smoke cleared, at least three protesters were dead and more than a dozen people were injured." the rhetorical strategy for argumentation i.e. Number Game, is used to tell about the extremely negative outcome of the protest due to the *others'* activities – chanting slogans, forcing their way and firing. In the same sentence, the writer also uses a passive voice to leave *vague* who killed three protesters and injured dozen of people to avoid representing Afghan security forces negatively who have been deployed to protect US military base.

In the third paragraph, the writer uses the ideological move of *authority*. He cites words – though incomplete – of an authority (Gulab Shah Alikheil, the regional governor) to support his earlier argument (of protesters' deviance from their purpose) so that his discourse may appear credible before the reader.

In the first line of the forth paragraph, the writer resorts to the discursive strategies of *categorization* and *implication*. An indirect reference to Prophet Muhammad (SAW) as 'Islam's most revered figure' presupposes/implicates that he does belong to *their* religion and not to *ours* (i.e. most probably, Christianity) (*categorization*). The same sentence contextually connected with the next one beginning with the *disclaimer* is once again an instance of *apparent empathy*. The writer's (positive) assumption over worldwide spread of protests changes into a claim '...protests...are morphing into an opportunity...' with a strong affinity between the subject and the verb. The stylistic strategy of lexicalization has also been used for negative-other representation. That is, the word 'morphing' represents the protesters as inanimate 'images' who could neither think nor act for themselves. And they could be changed into what their master wishes for their political and ideological agendas that '...often have little or nothing to do with defending Islam.' Similarly, the use of the word 'agendas' instead of

less derogatory terms such as ‘objectives’ or ‘goals’ carries semantic negative connotation about the *other*.

In the fifth and sixth paragraphs, the writer uses the ideological strategies for argumentation i.e. *authority*, which is a well-known persuasive move. He cites the deputy head of a religious council in Kandahar (Afghanistan) and director non-profit Afghanistan Research and Evaluation Unit to support his viewpoint that people are there in the protests to take advantage for themselves. According to [5], citing someone from the ideological opponents as an argument to approve one’s stance is ‘a well-known fallacy implying that if one of them says so himself (sic) then it must be true’.

Moreover, the *lexical items* used in Mulwi Sayed’s statement need to be analyzed to see how discourse helps the reader know which ideological group he stands close with. He uses a euphemistic term ‘responsible’ instead of a derogatory counterpart like ‘blasphemer’ for those who published the cartoons – the Europeans – and opts for a derogatory term ‘enemies (of Afghanistan)’ instead of any euphemistic counterpart like ‘non-patriots’ for those who tried to make use of protests – the Afghans. Thus the discursive devices Mulwi Sayed employs in the discourse show his stance closer to the *other* group than his own group. In the end of the fifth paragraph, the writer argues his stance through the discursive strategy of *number game*: “At least 10 people have been killed in Afghan protests over the past three days.”

Importantly, the identity of the *opportunists* has been partly revealed in the seventh paragraph. The writer mentions not the names but some groups such as al Qaeda, the Taliban, local militia commanders and former governors that constitutes the *other*. Negative representation of these groups has been made through words like ‘suspected’ and ‘ringleaders’ (*lexicalization*). The underlying *implication* of the second sentence represents them as ‘terrorists’ who create terror by changing ‘peaceful protests into melees’. However, the writer does not state clearly the facts that cause his belief and what actually their ‘gain’ is (*vagueness*).

In the eighth paragraph, the writer makes use of the argumentative strategy of *authority*. To substantiate his claim he quotes U.S. military spokesman, a member of the in-group, as saying “Ordinary Afghan citizens ..... do not walk around with hand grenades.....” Then there is an *implication* in the statement: Ordinary Afghan citizens do not carry grenades but those who carry are also

Afghans either by nationality or race. Important to note is mostly the vague and clear mentioning of out-group and in-group members for their negative and positive representation respectively; for instance, Col. James Yonts, NATO, Paul Fishstein, etc in comparison with local militia commanders, former governors, etc.

In the ninth paragraph, the use of a conjunctive phrase ‘not the only place’ with reference to Afghanistan *presupposes* the existence of another country like Afghanistan. [27] identifies this ideological *implication* as ‘existential assumption’ which is about what exists. Interestingly, in the first sentence, the writer *victimizes* the country whereas, in the second sentence, he vehemently and confidently victimizes the government and not the country. In order to understand the underlying ideology of the sentence, the reader needs to know the current political situation in both the countries. Afghanistan’s current government is considered to be pro-American and is fighting Taliban with the support of USA. On the other hand, Syrian government is anti-American and, therefore, described as ‘autocratic’ which carries negative connotation. The use of adverbial phrase ‘widely believed’ in the context of ‘burning of the Danish and Norwegian embassies’ alludes to *consensus* existing among the members of the in-group. This sentence also carries an *implication* – the Syrian government did not abide by international laws/norms regarding security of foreign embassies. Moreover, *victimization* of the *other* is indirectly blunt. That is, he accuses the Syrian government for these protests on behalf of majority’s opinion which, presumably, belongs to in-group. Importantly, the witnesses who believe and report the involvement of the Syrian government in these protest in the second-last and last sentences respectively, have not been named; hence, a *vague* evidence. The word ‘targeted’ also needs our attention. It points towards a deliberate effort of the *other* in damaging the Danish Embassy and Christian landmarks; hence, negative-other representation through *lexicalization*.

In the tenth paragraph, the writer makes use of the ideological device of *polarization* which is a semantic strategy for associating negative attributes with THEM. The Indonesian Muslim organization, the Islamic Defenders Front has been described as ‘radical’. The term ‘radical’ when used for someone sounds negative for it means one who wants complete and thorough social and political change [28]. It further brings the image of a person who is revolutionary and rebellious and not

evolutionary and patriot. The term is also ironical in a sense that it has been used for those who claim to be 'Islamic Defenders' but instead of defending Islam they are involved in other irrelevant activities as repeatedly argued by the writer in the article.

Interestingly, there are some opposing *implications*: (a) the sentences 'The moment has unified us' and 'Instead, they are pulling us together' implicate that Muslims are not united but divided; and (b) 'The West had a bad plan to pull Muslims apart.' implicates that Muslims are united. The discursive strategy of *evidentiality* for negative-other representation is used here in a different way. This is happening by referring to *authority*. Most of the persons the writer cites to strengthen his claim, hold higher and responsible positions in the article; for example, Mulwi Sayed Imam Mutawali, deputy head of a religious council, and Paul Fishstein, director of the nonprofit Afghanistan Research and Evaluation Unit. Here, though the writer mentions a Muslim organization with 5 million members, he cites remarks of Habib Abdurrahman who is a chair of only one of its groups. This rhetorical device is likely to undermine the remarks of Habib Abdurrahman. Quite similarly, he employs the ideological move of *number game* for negative-other representation in the last sentence where he refers '5 million members' as their claim but not his.

In the beginning of the next paragraph (i.e. eleventh), the use of the *disclaimer* 'but' which is an *apparent concession* and *number game* or *evidentiality* in '90 percent of the 240 million' rejects the claim of the *other* group to have a vast membership; hence, undermining their claim of being united as well. In a striking contrast to the terms 'radical' (in the tenth paragraph) and 'extremist' (in the eleventh paragraph) used for some Muslim groups/organizations, the term 'moderate' has been used for Din Syamsuddin, a Muslim leader who or whose organizations represent a different ideology. As discussed earlier, quoting one (*authority*) from the out-group with a different or varying viewpoint is the ideological move of *evidentiality* which adds objectivity, reliability and hence credibility to the ongoing argument (i.e. there are opportunists in the protests). Two more instances of *authority* which relate to the semantic move of *evidentiality* are present in the passage. These are two argumentative strategies: Din Syamsuddin – a leader of one of out-groups – has been quoted to prove presence of opportunists in Muslims' rows and report of Reuters

news agency about Muhammadiyah and its registered members has been quoted to strengthen Din Syamsuddin's position; hence, undermining the image of Islamic Defenders Front in the previous paragraph.

In the beginning of the twelfth paragraph, the overall ideological strategy of negative-other representation is implemented at the level of *lexicalization*. The term 'conservative' has been used for those Pakistani Muslims who are accused to gain leverage in the protests. Obviously, the semantic features of it are different from those of 'radical' used in the tenth paragraph. Thus, someone who is conservative 'does not like changes in ideas or fashion' [28]. Both the terms points towards existence of two extremes within one Muslim community. We should also remember the term 'moderate' in the previous paragraph used for those who are in-betweens. In short, the writer uses varying vocabulary to express his underlying concepts and beliefs about the members of the out-group as per their views, actions, and position.

In the same sentence, *hyperbole* 'uproar' has been used instead of the term 'protest'. It is a semantic rhetorical device which is used for enhancement of meaning. Hence, protest – a public demonstration – has been implied as 'noise' and 'disturbance'. In the second sentence, the writer mentions the name of the city 'Peshawar', its political importance as 'the capital of North-West Frontier province', the speech event and the participants 'several thousand people rallied (rally) and the organizers 'the provincial government and religious parties to show involvement of all ranks of people in the protests. In the end, the writer uses the argumentative device of *evidentiality*. That is, he uses hard facts i.e. quote from the speech of a religious leader (Qazi Hussain Ahmad) "We must at least throw out the ambassador of Denmark" to prove that protests against cartoons *really* did not intend to defend Islam.

In the second sentence of the last paragraph, *hyperbole* has been implied by using a special metaphor 'erupt'. Literally, the term refers to the explosion of a volcano; hence, 'if a volcano erupts, it explodes and sends smoke, fire, and rock into the sky' [28]. In this context, the term 'erupt' along with the neighbouring words 'rallies' 'world' and 'changed quickly' comes up with extremely negative *implications*. That is to say, the rallies that came suddenly against the cartoons brought negative and horrendous outcomes such as 'noise', 'destruction', and 'enmity' into the world.

## CONCLUSION

Since ideologies do not act in a void we see texts whether spoken or written as representative of ideologies shared by a group of people such as lesbians and conservatives or institutions such as newspapers and churches that have produced the text in relation to their *other*. In order to see how ideologies are disseminated and legitimized through discourses (particularly newspaper discourses) we have critically analyzed an article titled "Opportunists Make Use of Cartoon Protests; Individuals, Groups and Governments Vent Anger over Issues Unrelated to Defense of Islam" published in the Washington Post on February 9, 2006. These protests were held against the publication of blasphemous cartoons of the Prophet Muhammad (SAW) in European newspapers. For the purpose of analysis, [1] analytical framework has been employed to explore certain semantic devices used to make in-group and out-group presentation possible from a certain perspective.

Our analysis finds the article replete with instances of positive-self and negative-other representation. The author of the article particularly represents the Muslim individuals, groups and governments participating in, or supporting, the protests for political leverage as *others*. His core argument in the article is the hijacking of these protests by those who have their own vested interests rather than defence of Islam. Thus we find their description negative in the article. On the other hand, the presentation of those who did not participate in the protests for fear of being misused is positive; hence, they are close to the writer's ideology or ideological group.

Arguably, the writer describes the protests and the protesters under the influence of his group's or institutional ideology. He uses a number of semantic moves to create a certain image of Us and Them in the mind of the reader. For instance, mostly he has used the ideological moves of Authority, Lexicalization, Evidentiality, Hyperbole, Disclaimer, and Number Game to represent the *other* negatively. On other side, a positive representation of *us* has been materialized mostly through ideological moves of Vagueness, Consensus, Authority and Lexicalization. Importantly, the function of these semantic devices is twofold: they present a positive image of *self* to imply a negative image of the *other* and vice versa.

To conclude, newspaper discourse helps the writer construct different representations of different ideological groups in such a way that they may appear as realities for an innocent reader. It is, therefore, not as easy to

distinguish a reality from a representation as one may think. It more becomes difficult in case of its effects on masses. However, a systematic study of discourse can be of great help in this regard. In our paper, for example, Critical Discourse Analysis has proved to be a very influential tool in exploring the underlying ideologies of positive-self and negative-other representation.

## REFERENCES

1. van Dijk, T.A., 2004. Politics Ideology and Discourse. Retrieved from <http://www.discourse-in-society.org/teun.html>
2. Fairclough, N., 1995. Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language. Longman.
3. Fairclough, N., 2001. Language and Power. Longman.
4. Lock, T., 2004. Critical Discourse Analysis. Continuum
5. Van Dijk, T.A., June 2006. Ideology and Discourse Analysis. Journal of Political Ideologies, 11(2): 115-140.
6. Van Dijk, T.A., 1997. The study of discourse. In T. van Dijk. (Ed.): discourse as structure and process, discourse studies: a multidisciplinary introduction, Sage, pp: 1-34.
7. Wodak, R., and M. Meyer, 2001. Methods of critical discourse analysis. In Wodak, R. and Meyer, M: methods of critical discourse analysis. Sage.
8. Fairclough, N., and R. Wodak, 1997. Critical discourse analysis. In T. van Dijk (Ed.): discourse studies: a multidisciplinary introduction, Sage, 2: 258-84.
9. Rahimi and Sahragard, January 2006. A Critical Discourse Analysis of Euphemization and Derogation in Emails on the Late Pope. The Linguistics Journal, pp: 2.
10. Jogthong, C., 2001. Research articles introductions in Thai: Genre analysis of academic writing. PhD thesis, West Virginia Univ., Morgantown, West Virginia, pp: 01 .
11. Crystal, D. and D. Davy, 1969. Investigating English Style. Indian University Press, pp: 173.
12. Danesi, M., 2002. Understanding Media Semiotics. Bloomsbury Academic, pp: 69
13. Reah, D., 1998. The Language of Newspapers. Routledge.
14. Thornborrow, J., 1999. Language and the media. In Linda Thomas and Shan Wareing (Eds.): language, society and power: an introduction, Routledge, pp: 51.

15. Logonikos, I.T., 2005. Ideology in editorials: a comparison of selected editorials in English-medium newspapers after September 11, M.A thesis, Rhodes Univ., Grahamstown, South Africa, pp: 21 .
16. Sajid, A.M., 2011. Representations of Islam: A study into the discourse of Pakistani and Western newspapers, PhD thesis, Bahauddin Zakariya Univ., Multan, Pakistan.
17. Hutleng, J.L., 1973. *The Opinion Function*. Harper and Row.
18. Stonecipher, H.W., 1979. *Editorial and Persuasive Writing: Opinion Functions of the News Media*. Hastings House Publishers.
19. Van Dijk, T.A., 1996. Opinions and ideologies in editorials. Retrieved from <http://www.discourse-in-society.org/editoria.htm>
20. Van Dijk, T.A., 1995. Discourse analysis as ideology analysis. In C. Schäffner and A. Wenden (Eds.), *language and peace*, DartmouthPublishin, pp: 17-33.
21. Van Dijk, T.A., 1998. *Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach*. Sage.
22. Conboy, M., 2007. *The Language of the News*. Routledge.
23. Schaffner, C., 1995. Editorial. *Current Issues in Language and Society*, 2(2): 109-114.
24. Van Dijk, T.A., 1998. *Critical Discourse Analysis*. Retrieved from: <http://www.hum.uva.nl/~teun/cda.htm>
25. Van Dijk, T.A., 1997. *Political Discourse and Political Cognition*. Congress Paper on Political Discourse, Aston University July 1997. Retrieved from <http://www.let.uva.nl~teun>
26. Van Dijk, T.A., 2005. *Ideology and Discourse: A Multidisciplinary Introduction*. Retrieved from <http://www.discourses.org/UnpublishedArticles/Ideology%20and%20discourse.pdf>
27. Fairclough, N., 2003. *Analyzing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research*. Routledge, pp: 27.
28. *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English*, (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). (1995). Longman.