*Faizullah Jan**
*Inam ur Rehman***

Conceptualizing Terrorists in Pakistani Print Media

ABSTRACT

This paper analyzes how newspaper readers conceptualize militancy, militants, and terrorism in Pakistan. This paper argues that he way a particular discourse conceptualizes a terrorist also, by implication, suggests a particular way of dealing with them. Some discourses may imply a military solution and others may require a political solution depending upon how the terrorists are discursively constructed. Analysis of these discourses about terrorists draws our attention to the hegemonic and counter-hegemonic discourses and their relation to power. Study of these discourses allows us to view the print media as a site of contestation where individuals exercise their agency by discursively challenging and resisting hegemonic discourses. We have used Gramsci's theory of hegemony as discussed by Boggs (1984), Ives (2004), and Mouffe (1979) to identify hegemonic discourses that construct reality in a particular

* Lecturer, Department of journalism & Mass Communication, University of Peshawar
** Lecturer, Department of Journalism & Mass Communication, University of Peshawar

way to perpetuate unequal power relations. This paper concludes writers become conduits through which the state transmits its ruling ideas and establishes its regressive hegemony by making people consent to their exploitative conditions in which they suffer violence and oppression without questioning the role of the state.

Key Words: *Pakistan, Terrorism, Militancy, Gramsci, Laclau, Mouffe.*

Introduction

Pakistan based terrorists are increasingly becoming more brazen in their attacks on civilians, government officials, military personnel and key state installations. In response to these attacks, there is a spate of letters to the editors of Pakistani newspapers that conceptualize terrorists and offer solutions to contain them. This paper analyzes letters concerning militancy and terrorism in Pakistan that are published between January 1, 2011 and September 30, 2011 in the "letter to the editor" section of the English daily newspaper *Dawn*. The purpose of this paper is to address how the letters to the editor of *Dawn* conceptualize terrorists and militants. Moreover, the paper will discuss what ideological functions these various conceptualization of terrorists serve.

These letters contain various competing discourses about the identity of terrorists. The way a particular discourse conceptualizes a terrorist also, by implication, suggests a particular way of dealing with them. For instance, some discourses may imply a military solution and others may require a political solution depending upon how the

terrorists are discursively constructed. These discourses may also perpetuate unequal power relations through hegemonic discourses that not only underplay the role of state in the creation of these terrorists groups but also try to establish a particular discourse as natural and unchallengable. Analysis of these discourses about terrorists draws our attention to the hegemonic and counter-hegemonic discourses and their relation to power. Study of these discourses allows us to view the print media as a site of contestation where individuals exercise their agency by discursively challenging and resisting hegemonic discourses.

Theoretical Frameworks

We have used Gramsci's theory of hegemony as discussed by Boggs (1984), Ives (2004), and Mouffe (1979) to identify hegemonic discourses that construct reality in a particular way to perpetuate unequal power relations. In our discussion of the construction of social reality through discourse and its relationship with power, we have followed the framework provided by Laclau and Mouffe as discussed by Jorgensen and Phillips (2002).

Gramsci's Hegemony

Gramsci's concept of hegemony is based on his linguistic theory. He developed this concept in his debateover the issue of establishing a 'standard' language that would transform a diverse and heterogeneous population of recently unified Italy of his times into a collective unity. Using language issue as a metaphor, Gramsci argued that language is inseparable from other domains of social life. Therefore

the question of establishing a national language is closely linked to issues of politics, power and state formation (Ives, 2004).

According to Gramsci (1971), the ruling elites consolidate their power over the people by coercion and consent; though coercion alone can be counterproductive and can weaken the power of the ruling elites. To achieve political durability, the dominant ruling class, especially in the advanced capitalist countries, seeks to win the "popular support or ideological consent." Hegemony is thus the creation of this popular consent that justifies the rule and interests of dominant class as just, natural and unchallengeable. By consenting to the ruling ideas, the subordinate groups participate in their own oppression and exploitation (Boggs, 1984). However, hegemony is a process; it is a constant struggle that can never be completed (Ives, 2004). In order to perpetuate hegemony, the hegemonic apparatus strives to transmit ruling ideas through various channels available to it; hegemony is temporarily achieved when people internalize ruling ideas and values and accept them as 'common sense' (Boggs, 1984).

Gramsci (1971) distinguishes between regressive hegemony and expansive or progressive hegemony. Hegemony can be regressive if it accommodates the subordinate groups in a way that neutralizes their interests and prevents them from opposing the dominant group. On the other hand, hegemony can be progressive if it creates a "national popular collective will" (Mouffe, 1979, p. 191) that genuinely embraces the diverse interests of the subordinate groups. Gramsci (1971) believes that the hegemony of bourgeoisies cannot be progressive as their class interest would come in conflict with the interest of the popular classes,

whereas, the proletariats can establish progressive hegemony as their interest lies in ending all forms of exploitation (Mouffe, 1979).

By placing the hegemonic process in the superstructure, Gramsci (1971) introduces a political element in the superstructure. In this way, Gramsci breaks away with the economic determinism of historical materialism that argues that economic base determines the superstructure. Instead, he argues that the superstructure is not epiphenomenal but it in itself is an important political field that can influence the base (Ives, 2004). Gramsci's modification of base/superstructure model is significant as it provides people space to resist and challenge the dominant groups by creating alternative meanings in the superstructure (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002).

Laclau and Mouffe's Discourse Theory

Laclau and Mouffe's(2001) discourse theory argues that we construct meaning through discourse; the social world is the outcome of the discourses that attempt to give meaning to the reality that exists outside us. Language in itself is unstable and is open to different constructions of meanings; though some meanings might become naturalized and accepted as 'truth' however, they are always threatened by competing discourses. Therefore, the fixation of meanings is an ongoing process that is never completed. Due to the existence of different discourses that present different and often competing worldviews and ways of talking, they are often locked in a 'discursive struggle' to establish their meaning as fixed and natural (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002). This discursive struggle can either result in reproduction of

existing social reality or it can be dislodged by an alternative discourse. Therefore, change at the discursive level can change our social reality and can thus have a real and material effect (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002).

Jorgensen and Phillips (2002) argue that Laclau and Mouffe's discourse theory does not distinguish between discursive and non-discursive dimensions but rather treat all social phenomena as discourse. Discourse theory argues that social reality is organized according to the same principles as language; whether it is spatial organization, categorization of humans, or any other social practices, it follows the same principles that a language follows. Discourse theory is thus a single theory that equally applies to language and the rest of social phenomena without reducing everything to language (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002).

Discourse theory gives primacy to politics as the discursive struggle, that is, a key term in the theory is a political act (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002). The struggle for establishing social reality through discourse is achieved only if all other possible discourses are excluded and one particular discourse becomes objective, i.e., it becomes naturalized despite its contingency. However, an objective can become political if an alternative discourse questions its objectivity; the passage from contestation to objectivity requires hegemonic intervention that hides the alternative competing discourses (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002). For instance, a subject is always fragmented or over determined and is pulled by various and often opposing discourses; if the subject appears to occupy one subject position without being in conflict with other positions, then it is the work of hegemonic intervention (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002). In

discourse theory, objectivity is equivalent to ideology as it masks the contingency of a dominant discourse.

Social reality is constructed in discourse; therefore, an organization of society by a discourse is always open to change. A particular discourse that organizes society in a specific way continuously struggles to reproduce itself or else give way to other discourses. This leads Laclau and Mouffe (2001) to declare that society does not exist, as it is never complete. Based on their view that society does not exist as an objective reality and can therefore be organized in multiple ways, they reject the Marxist conception of society that sees class structure as fundamental to any society. If classes appear as natural, it is only because other ways of organizing a society are excluded (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002).

Following Foucault (1972), Laclau and Mouffe (2001) believe that power and knowledge are interlinked. Since our knowledge of the world is a product of discourse that excludes other possible discourses, therefore, discourse cannot exist without power. Power is not an entity that is in possession of an individual or a group but is dispersed in a society. It is both a productive and constraining force that shapes our knowledge and social relations but at the same time it constrains other possibilities. It is politics that points to the contingency of the production of power; theoretically all social phenomena that power produces are contingent and can be formed otherwise, however, we cannot totally escape from the discourses that power produces (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002) as we live in these discourses. Even a discourse analyst who believes in the contingency of the social life cannot completely transcend the existing power structures.

Methodology

In this paper, we follow the research methodology provided by Fairclough (2003) for the analysis of text. Here we discuss five of the six phases of Fairclough's research design and methods: choice of research problem, formulation of research questions, choice of material, analysis, and results.

1.   Choice or research problem

Fairclough (2003) states that critical discourse analysis (hereafter CDA) is an "explanatory critique;" it identifies a problem that the research can help to solve. The research problem can either be identified by the members of the concerned society or the researcher may choose to expose an ideology that creates inequality in a society (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002). CDA is a critical approach that aims to bring a social change by helping the oppressed (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002). In the same fashion, we intend to analyze the text to show the ideological working of power. We do not claim to have access to a 'reality' that the ideology misrepresents; however, we examine the construction of reality through discourse (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002). We use CDA to point out the alternative discourses that the ideology tries to exclude.

2.   Formulation of research questions

CDA creates a distinction between the discursive and non-discursive social world. According to Jorgensen and Phillips (2002), it is an interdisciplinary analysis that studies the dialectical relation between the discursive and the broader social world. Following CDA methodology, we analyze the text in the context of the social practices of Pakistani society.

3. Choice of Material

The choice of research material in CDA is based on the research question, the researchers' familiarity with the relevant material, and his/her access to the research material. For all of the above reasons, we have collected our text for analysis from the online archive of *Dawn*, an English daily newspaper in Pakistan.

4. Analysis

For analysis, CDA proposes a three-dimensional approach in which analysis is done at three different levels: discursive practice, text, and social practice. Discursive practice is concerned with the production and consumption of text. Social practice is analyzed by drawing on the social and cultural theories to analyze the non-discursive dimension of the social practice (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002). The textual analysis studies the linguistic characteristics of text such as the use of grammar, choice of words and metaphors; for instance, we can analyze the text by focusing on "transitivity" and "modality." Transitivity is concerned with how subjects and objects relate to (or do not relate to) the events and processes, whereas modality is concerned with whether a speaker distances themselves from their statement or own their statements.

5. Results

The research is employed to facilitate social change and to strengthen egalitarian discourses. CDA aims to increase the awareness of people about the use of discourse in creating inequality in the social world (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002).

Methods

Our data comprises of sixty-seven letters published in the section "Letters to the Editor" of a Pakistani metropolitan English daily newspaper, *Dawn*. We selected *Dawn* due to its wider circulation as compared to other English-language newspapers published in the country. Besides, it is also the oldest English-language newspaper with, according to Pak Press Ads (2011), a weekday circulation of over 138,000.

We limited our data to the letters that were about terrorism and were published between January 1, 2011 and September 30, 2011. During this period, terrorists launched major attacks against government officials that shocked the nation; on January 4, the governor of Punjab province was shot dead by his own security guard, the guard sympathized with the religious fanatics who wanted the governor murdered due to his criticism of the blasphemy laws that imposes death penalty for 'insulting' Islam; again on March 2, 2011 a minorities minister was assassinated who called for reforming the blasphemy laws. To avenge the killing of Al-Qaeda chief Osama Bin Laden, who was killed in Pakistan on May 2, 2011, the Taliban launched a brazen attack on a heavily guarded Pakistani naval base on May 23, 2011. Besides these terrorist attacks within the country, the world also witnessed the massacre of 93 people in Oslo on June 25, 2011.

Due to the above mentioned incidents, it was more likely that "letters to the editor" section of the newspaper would include letters addressing terrorism in Pakistan in that time period. Anticipating the inclusion of these letters in the newspapers, we started with January 1, 2011 and continued through September 30, 2011. We searched for the letters that included the word "terrorism" or its collocates in their titles; being regular readers of the newspaper, we approached our

data with the understanding that the word 'terrorism' collocates with the following words and their variants: 'Afghanistan', 'army', 'blasphemy', 'bomb', 'death', 'de-radicalization', 'drone strike', 'extremism', 'fanaticism', 'gun' 'insurgency', 'intolerance', 'Islam', 'killing', 'operation' 'Osama', 'military', 'moderation', 'Muslim', 'madrassa', 'peace', 'prophet', 'religion', 'security', 'suicide-bombing', 'Taliban', 'tribal areas', 'tolerance', 'violence', and 'war.'

In total, we found sixty-seven letters that discussed terrorism. Out of these sixty-seven letters, fifty-seven included writers' idea of who terrorists are or how they came into existence. Since the purpose of this paper is to see how terrorists are conceptualized in these letters, we began by coding the letters into various themes based on their conceptualization of terrorists. In coding the themes, we followed the methodology outlined by Ryan and Bernard (2003). We regarded any conceptualization that appeared more than once as a theme. To identify multiple themes in single text, we paid attention to transitions such as new paragraphs or words that indicated a shift in content for instance, 'however', 'nonetheless' etc. Multiple themes in a single letter were coded separately. Some of the initial themes that we found were:

1. Terrorists are people who are misled and brainwashed by the so-called religious leaders. (This theme appeared in 24 letters).
2. Terrorists are bigots, hate-mongers, fanatics or zealots. (This theme appeared in 9 letters).
3. Terrorists are marginalized and disadvantaged people who are "pushed to the wall and the beast within takes over." (This theme appeared in 8 letters)
4. Terrorists are the people who were armed and trained by the state to fight against Soviet occupation of

Afghanistan in the 1980s. (This theme appeared in 8 letters).

5. Terrorists are the product of electronic media that fan religious extremism. (This theme appeared in 8 letters).

6. Terrorists are the products of indoctrination in the form of education. (This theme appeared in 6 letters).

7. Terrorists are misguided and ignorant people. (This theme appeared in 5 letters).

8. Terrorists are religious extremists. (This theme appeared in 3 letters).

9. Terrorists are the product of legislation that promoted intolerance and religious extremism. (This theme appeared in 3 letters).

10. Terrorists are insane. (This theme appeared in 2 letters).

11. Terrorists are foreigners illegally living in the state. (This theme appeared in 2 letters).

12. Terrorists are ideologically driven and want to impose a militant version of Islam on the state. (This theme appeared in 2 letters).

13. Terrorists are local insurgents armed and supported by external enemies. (This theme appeared 2 times).

14. 'Terrorists' are former allies of the United State in its proxy war against the Soviet Union but are now demonized by the west. (An exception to the pattern that appeared once).

After coding the themes through an inductive approach, we found that theme no. 1 was more recurrent whereas no. 14 was an exception to the patterns in the letters. Below we proceed to analyze one set of letters from the category of most recurrent theme (Example 1) and another from the exception to the pattern (Example 2).

Data Analysis

Example 1 (Terrorists are people who are misled and brainwashed by the so called religious leaders)

Our first exemplar is a letter titled "Menace of religious extremism" that was published on May 1, 2011 in *Dawn*. In the letter, the writer, Anwar, writes about a teenaged would-be suicide bomber, Umer, who was apprehended by police while attempting to explode his suicide jacket in a crowded shrine of a Muslim saint. The complete letter is reproduced below:

THIS is apropos of your editorial 'An alarming confession' (April 11). You have rightly highlighted the menace of religious extremism, taking the case of teenager Umer who was indoctrinated by his teachers to spread their own brand of Islam.

The teenager was convinced that Muslims present at a shrine are 'infidels' and deserved to be killed. It is rare that our police catch alive a would-be suicide bomber. Usually, because of paucity of funds and modern forensic tools, the police only publish sketches of suspects who are seldom caught.

But one should seriously ponder what the motivation of a person to give up his/her life could be. A person must have a cause in order to give up his life. For these suicide bombers it is the allure of entering paradise and enjoying a life of comfort as against the miseries in this world.

According to Umer, there are 400 trainees at one location alone. Now that Umer has provided some clue, law-enforcement agencies should get hold of these elements and destroy their hideouts. Our country faces many problems but militancy is the biggest menace which must be crushed.

In line 2 and 3, the writer establishes Umer as a young and impressionable youth who falls victim to the indoctrination of his religious 'teacher'. However, in line 9 and 10, he shifts his stance and presents Umer not as a victim but as a "suicide bomber" who chooses to kill others to earn a 'reward' in the afterlife. He uses the deictic marker "these" (line 9) to position Umer as an other who clearly does not belong to the group indicated by the deictic marker "our" in line 14 to which the writer belongs; Umer like other members of his group is not a law abiding citizen, he is an irrational, selfish and cruel person whose sole reason to kill others is his elusive hope of "entering paradise" (line 10); moreover, he is a weak person who fails to face "the miseries in this world" (line 11). By implication, the writer is a 'good' citizen who is not wanted by "law-enforcement agencies" (line13); he is a rational subject who rationally studies the phenomena of suicide bombing as he writes in line 9: "a person must have a cause in order to give up his life", moreover, unlike Umer he is a survivor who is neither weak nor cruel as he chooses to live and face the "miseries in this world" rather than harm others. In his description of Umer, the writer uses high affinity "modality" (Jorgensen and Phillips 2002:83) that commits him to his statements completely, for instance, "the teenager was convinced" (line 4), "for these suicide bombers it is the allure of entering paradise" (line 10). By using high affinity modality, he presents his opinions as facts; in other words, his views are established facts and contesting them would be denying reality.

After otherizing as someone who was indoctrinated, Umer as an individual, the writer in line 13 shifts his focus to the whole group to which Umer belongs. In line 13, he not only continues to distance himself from the group by using the deictic marker "these", he also dehumanizes them by

dubbing them as "elements" who are shadowy and spectral figures who live in "hideouts" (line 14). In other words, the suicide bombers are doubly others: one, they espouse values that are antithetical to the values of the writer, and two, they due to their inhuman acts fall below the category of humans. The word "element" marginalized their position while also producing them as threats. By constructing the suicide bombers as "elements", he strips them of their political and human rights which lead him comfortably to his conclusion that they be "crushed" (line 15) and their "hideouts" be destroyed.Here what is being "crushed" is a menace—not people—consequently the writer distances himself from a terrorist act of another sort. It seems that while the terrorists fights people, the efforts to destroy and crush the people who are terrorists is framed as an effort to destroy ideology, not people. As a neoliberal subject, he juxtaposes himself as a citizen having political and human rights with the deviant figure of the terrorist who is responsible for his actions and failings. Moreover, the writer by claiming the discourse of eliminating terrorism by force preempts other possible and competing discourses that might envision a non-military approach to ending terrorism.

In his construction of the suicide bomber as a cruel, selfish, irrational, impressionable and a weak person, the writers simplifies the phenomena of terrorism. In his construction, he erases other factors that can possibly be equally responsible for the menace of terrorism. One such erasure is the role of the state in creating terrorism. His only reference to the state or state institutions in his description of terrorists is in line 5, 6 and 14. In line 6, he attributes the failure of state institutions such as police in apprehending the terrorists to "paucity of funds and modern forensic

tools"; with respect to "transitivity" (Jorgensen & Phillips, p.84), he begins his sentence with the limitation of the state institution (paucity of funds), and pushes the part of his statement that implies the inability of police to provide safety to the end of sentence. Moreover to avoid blaming the state for deteriorating law and order situation, he does not dwell on the role of the state in arming and training militants in the past to further its own interests nor does he discusses state's responsibility of providing safe condition for its citizen that would protect people like Umer from exploitation. In contrast to his use of high modality in describing Umer and other terrorists, he uses low modality when he refers to the state; he uses the word "usually" (line 5) to refrain from committing himself to his statement that may imply questioning the role of the state.

Example 2 (Terrorists are bigots, hate-mongers, fanatics or zealots)

Our second exemplar is a letter published on May 26, 2011 under the title "Post-Osama scenario: two options". In this letter, the writer, Geelani, criticizes Pakistan's continued support of the United States in its global "war on terror." In the aftermath of the killing of Osama Bin Laden in Pakistan by American forces, the writer argues that Pakistan should negotiate peace with the Taliban. The complete letter is reproduced below:

01 The killing of Osama bin Laden in mysterious circumstances has given Pakistan only

02 negative outputs of the starkest kind.

03 Quite frankly, we have been paying incredibly dearly for fighting America's war on

04   Muslims (who were lionised by President Reagan as Mujahideen, and later by employing 05 mass deception techniques, have been labelled terrorists through the contrivance of

06   9/11).

07   There are only two courses of urgent action now. Either fight these 'terrorists' under the 08 leadership   of AsifZardari, Rehman Malik, Yousuf Gilani and Baber Awan; or take

09   recourse to a reconciliation process with the Taliban who we have alienated by being

10   slaves of the double-crossing USA.

11   Or negotiate with all Taliban and Al Qaeda elements, remembering, please, that these 12 people   defeated one superpower and brought the other one to its knees, forcing it to

13   sue for a negotiated peace; which negotiations are now reportedly under way in Qatar.

14   And quite frankly again, the Pakistan army cannot fight when armies of incomparably

15   superior arms and resources have been soundly trounced from Cuba to Vietnam. So

16   negotiate peace or suffer defeat!

Like the previous example, this text also uses high modality throughout the text that establishes the opinions of the writer as undisputed facts. In line 4 and 5, the writer mentions the phrase "war on Muslims" that mimics the term 'war on terror', the refrain of Bush administration; similarly, in line 5, his use of the term "mass deception" has overtones of another of Bush's refrain, 'weapons of mass destruction'. In the very beginning of the letter, the writer constructs the

United States as an aggressive and Islamophobic state. On the other hand, the Taliban are described as group who were first courted by the United States as Mujahideen and later labeled as terrorists. His contestation of the appellation of the word "terrorist" for the Taliban becomes obvious when he puts the word in scare quotes (line 7).

After presenting the United States as an aggressor and manipulator, in line 9, the pronoun "we" excludes the Taliban, however, this exclusion is only to establish the Taliban as victims of the United States and presumably Pakistani nation (as it is unclear who is included in the 'we').In line 7, 8, 9 and 10, he again uses high modality and asserts that there are only two alternatives to address the issue of 'victimized' Taliban, either fight the Taliban or negotiate with them. Finally in the coda, he asserts that the only viable solution is to negotiate with them.

However, in his construction of the Taliban as an aggrieved party, he erases their violence and terrorist activities. Moreover, he excludes the discourses that would contest his 'facts'. He also deflects the charges of possible state complicity in harboring Osama Bin Laden, a high profile terrorist; in line 1 he constructs his sentence in a way that focuses on the killing rather than the controversial presence of Bin Laden in the state.

Discussion

Laclau and Mouffe (2001) argue that reality is discursively constructed; however, this construction of reality is "contingent" and can always be displaced by the competing discourses in the field of discursivity; this contingency of meanings allows space for social struggle in which multiple discourses strive to become "objective"; a discourse becomes

156

objective when it establishes a "closure" by successfully excluding other discourses competing in the same social terrain (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002). A discursive fixation of meaning presupposes "nodal points" which in themselves are empty but are filled with meanings through signs in the "chains of equivalence" (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002).

In the light of discourse theory, we can argue that in example 1, the discursive construction of terrorists as irrational fanatics who need to be destroyed competes with other possible discourses that construct the terrorists in alternative ways that imagine different ways to overcome terrorism; for instance, example 2 contests the discursive construction of terrorists in example 1 by depicting them as victims. In order to establish the discourses claimed by these writers as objective, they exclude other possible discourses by presenting their statements as facts that cannot be contested. In other words, the writers aim to achieve a temporary closure in which the contingency of their discourses are forgotten. In these examples, the word "terrorist" serves as a nodal point around which signs are ordered in a way that tries to fix the meaning of terrorist according to the particular discourse. This attempt at fixation of meaning, however, competes with the conflicting chains of equivalence. The outcome of this discursively struggle has material effects as each competing discourse aims to organize society and identities in different fashion (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002).

The discursive struggle in which meanings contest to occupy a social terrain can be likened to hegemonic struggle. Like discourses, hegemony also tries to achieve permanency, however, it is also a process that can never be complete. Moreover, hegemony like discourse also operates in the

superstructure where it contest with counter-hegemonic forces; this contestation in the ideological terrain provides people the space to resist and challenge the hegemony of ruling ideas.

In the context of the two examples, the writers participate in a hegemonic struggle in the discursive field. Moreover, the two texts themselves may show the internalization of hegemonic ideas that they project through their discourses. The absence of criticism of the state in example 1 and its deflection in example 2 point to the hegemonic process, the writers become conduits through which the state transmits its ruling ideas and establishes its regressive hegemony by making people consent to their exploitative conditions in which they suffer violence and oppression without questioning the role of the state.

This paper contributes to the body of research that aims to uncover the hegemonic and ideological discourses that work in the service of power. This study also points to the material nature of discourses that organize societies in a certain way; the outcome of these discursive struggles, as Jorgensen and Phillips (2002) can reproduce, challenge or transform the existing social conditions.

References

About Us. (n.d.). Retrieved December 4, 2011, from http://www.pakpressads.com/aboutus.php

Bernard, R. H. &Ryan, G. W. (2009).*Analyzing Qualitative Data: Systematic Approaches*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Boggs, C. (1984). *The Two Revolutions: Gramsci and the Dilemmas of Western Marxism*. Cambridge: South End Press.

Fairclough, N. (2003).*Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research.* New York: Routledge.

Gramsci, A. (1975).*Selection for the prison notebooks.* London: ElecBook.

Ives, P. (2004). *Gramsci's Politics of Language: Engaging the Bakhtin Circle & the Frankfurt School*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Jorgensen, M., & Phillips, L. (2002).*Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method*. Thousand Oks: Sage.

Laclau, E., & Mouffe, C. (2001). *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics* (2nd ed.). London: Verso.

Laclau, E., & Mouffe, C. (Eds.). (1979). *Gramsci and Marxist Theory*. London: Routledge.

Mouffe, C. (1979). Hegemony and ideology in Gramsci. In *Gramsci and Marxist Theory* (Mouffe, C., Ed.). Routledge: London.