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Abstract / The debate surrounding the coverage of the Iraq War in Arab and western news media has pinpointed the ethical role of the news media in the mediation of suffering. This article analyses the mechanism of mediating war in the front-page articles from four pan-Arab newspapers, printed during the war in 2003. The article draws on Boltanski's discussion of emotional politics or what he terms politics of pity, the aim of which is to trigger sympathy for the Other. The news texts included here are analysed according to their rhetorical strategies and to whether they aim at consolidating a certain ethical stance towards the war. Finally, the article attempts to answer the question of whether this coverage has contributed with rational arguments to the general public debate about the war, thereby fulfilling its role as mediator to the pan-Arab polity.
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Introduction

The media coverage of the Iraq War is one example of the recent debate about the ethical responsibility of news media in covering conflicts and wars. Some Arab media outlets, for instance, were accused of agitating the conflict by zooming in on victims and/or giving airtime and print space to controversial statements and images, while some western media, such as the American media, were accused of assuaging the conflict by giving less space to anti-war voices (Mellor, 2005: 2–3). The debate, then, highlights the presumed power of the news media in influencing public opinion and perhaps shaping the public reaction to such conflicts. The debate is also an indication of the ethical role of the news media particularly in the mediation of suffering (e.g. Chouliaraki, 2006b).

The aim of this article is to analyse the mechanism of mediating war in selected Arabic articles printed during the Iraq War, which was indeed a global event (Kellner, 2004: 329) involving several world nations. There has been some criticism in western media reports about the way in which the Arab media framed the war sufferings, particularly with an exaggerated focus on victims and casualties. The following analysis proves that there was no unified rhetorical strategy in pan-Arab press; rather, the article shows the different strategies deployed among four pan-Arab newspapers, which target audiences inside and outside the Middle East region.
The article unfolds as follows: first, I discuss how war coverage has become an ethical and moral discourse involving audiences/readers in interwoven narratives of war suffering. In particular, I draw on Boltanski’s (1999) discussion of emotional politics or what he terms the politics of pity, the aim of which is to trigger sympathy for the Other. The remaining sections then show the relevance of this politics of pity in the discourse of Al Quds Al Arabi newspaper, contrasting it with the rhetorical strategies adopted in other newspapers. The articles are analysed according to their rhetorical strategies, i.e. their appeal to emotion (pathos), logic (logos) or credibility (ethos) and how the news texts draw on different genres such as description and narrative genres (Chatman, 1991) to consolidate a certain ethical stance towards the war.

War as a Moral Discourse

Several of the Arab studies on the Iraq War coverage have focused on the visual and narrative aspects of this coverage. For instance, Shouman (2005) provides an interesting analysis of the visual elements in three pan-Arab newspapers, namely Al Ahram, Al Sharq Al Awsat and Al Hayat. He argues that most of the photos triggered sympathy for the Iraqi civilians and yet the majority of the photos were not accurate, in as much as they ignored several significant aspects of the war, for example, the depiction of Iraqi forces or Iraqi detainees. Also, the analysis shows the dependence on three major sources, namely, AFP, Reuters and AP, rather than on the photographers of each newspaper. Zayani and Ayish (2006) provide a visual and narrative analysis of the coverage of the fall of Baghdad on three pan-Arab satellite channels. The analysis shows how these media framed the Iraqis from either a pro- or an anti-Saddam perspective, not to mention the absence of ordinary Iraqis such as doctors from this portrayal. The analysis also shows newspapers provided a personification of the fall of Baghdad rather than providing an in-depth discussion of the new regional order. Al Qadri (2004) provides a preliminary reading of the way some western media outlets as well as Arab satellite channels covered the war. In her analysis of the Arab coverage, she provides an example of the ‘aestheticization of war’ (see Chouliaraki, 2006a), where the war visuals and sounds were foregrounded at the expense of the suffering caused by this war.

Chouliaraki (2006a) provides a more detailed analysis of this aestheticization of war suffering and shows how western news media apply certain mediation strategies enabling them to resolve the tension between covering war objectively and foregrounding the suffering resulting from this war. This strategy, or what Chouliaraki calls the ‘aestheticization of suffering’, depends on the integration of verbal and visual codes that may result in mitigating the suffering caused by this particular war. Indeed, the mediation of war suffering plays a major role in constituting the relationship between audience and sufferers in terms of empathy, justice, denunciation or merely aesthetic reflection despite the claims that this relationship offers an unbiased reflection of reality. Thus, it is not enough to provide hard facts about the causes of suffering, but the news media must also integrate particular cases of sufferers in an interwoven narrative of the objective world and subjective emotions, which then may arouse the spectator’s pity and provoke his or her commitment.
Moreover, Chouliaraki (2004: 186) stresses that there is a tendency to moralize politics in the media or ‘the contemporary reformulation and reconstitution of political rationalities and practices in discourses of ethics’. The spheres of politics and morality are therefore undoubtedly converging (Boltanski, 1999; Tester, 1999, 2001). Boltanski (1999: 5) elaborates more on emotional politics or the role of emotion in the political sphere, distinguishing between two types of emotional politics: politics of pity and politics of justice. While the former does not question the justification of suffering and focuses instead on the victims and their suffering, the latter has one goal, namely, to justify suffering, and so the sufferer must be depicted as a victim seeking justice. The politics of pity aims at triggering the spectators/readers’ action without questioning the causes that brought about this suffering in the first place. On the other hand, the politics of justice evokes a sense of the urgent need to restore the revoked rights of the victims and thus restore balance to the world.

To trigger sympathy for war sufferers, reporters have no choice but to abandon rather dry, factual description and lean instead on emotional tales, or as Boltanski (1999: 23) puts it, ‘The spectator of suffering cannot speak about what he has seen in objectivist terms, even if in a great many instances this seems today to be the best way to warrant the seriousness of a description which aspires to the status of truth.’ Another means of mediating the spectacle of suffering is, as Boltanski (1999) argues, through the topic of denunciation, i.e. the feeling of anger towards a persecutor who is accused of causing the suffering of victims, thereby foregrounding the persecutor and backgrounding the sufferer’s condition and distress.

The aim of the analysis is to show the means by which the rhetorical features in the text may position the readers’ ethical stance towards the actors and sufferers in the war. As I show in the following analysis, Al Quds Al Arabi relied heavily on the politics of pity to trigger sympathy for the Iraqis. One of the strategies used to enforce this politics is the use of metaphors. Al Quds Al Arabi, for instance, constantly used the metaphor of the USA as a ‘butcher’ committing ‘massacres’ to enforce the victimization of rather helpless Iraqis. Moreover, the articles from Al Quds Al Arabi focused on denouncing the Allied forces as persecutors, assigning them an active role (of transgression), while Iraqi victims are kept in the background as helpless sufferers.

Methodology

The following analysis is based on genre analysis or the analysis of the rhetorical strategies employed in the news texts. The genre analysis helps show how the text, as a semiotic code, serves to encourage the readers to act upon the information in the text in a particular way. Among the features examined in genre analysis are the narrative style, e.g. disposition, descriptive or narrative genre (Fairclough, 1992: 127), voices in the text, setting and the use of visuals (e.g. photos) to serve an overall rhetorical strategy, e.g., to appeal to the readers’ emotion (Foss, 1996). Such an analysis is prompted by questions such as, what reaction does the text elicit from the audience? How is the news text related to other texts (intertextuality)? How do the visuals serve the rhetorical purpose of the text? (See, for example, Chandler, 1997.)
The news texts collected for the following analysis serve as a basis for comparing and contrasting the rhetorical strategies used in war coverage. The newspapers selected were *Al Ahram* (Egyptian), *Al Quds Al Arabi* (Palestinian), *Al Sharq Al Awsat* (Saudi) and *Al Hayat* (Saudi-owned and Lebanese-run). The aim of this comparative approach was to give new insights into the differences between suppliers of Arab media themselves (Alterman [2000], for instance, calls for such comparative studies to be conducted in order to uncover the differences between Arab media outlets). Another important point of investigation was to examine the émigré pan-Arab news media, e.g. *Al Hayat* and *Al Sharq Al Awsat*, and their effect on the national news media’s coverage. In this respect, comparing data from the above two newspapers with data from *Al Ahram* and *Al Quds Al Arabi* (which focus on the national coverage of Egyptian and Palestinian affairs respectively), will fill this gap.

The phenomenon of publishing outside the Middle East region is not new: the first wave began in the 19th century (Abu Zeid, 1993), with journalists fleeing political and economic situations in their homelands; a second wave followed from the middle of the 1970s. Some of the Arab newspapers in London (and probably other cities as well) are now returning to the Arab region in an attempt to minimize the high costs resulting from their operations abroad. In addition, the technology to which they managed to gain access in their western headquarters has been made superfluous due to the globalization of technology in the whole world, including the Arab region (Ghareeb, 2000), despite the censorship that is still practised one way or another in the Arab states.

Among these newspapers, three in particular have enjoyed a high circulation and currently represent a forum for important issues for Arab readers (Alterman, 1998); these are *Al Hayat*, *Al Sharq Al Awsat* and *Al Quds Al Arabi*. These, and the international edition of *Al Ahram*, are included in the following case study as representatives of the elite newspapers, which usually serve as suitable sampling material. This is because the prestige media usually provide thorough coverage of foreign affairs in both news texts and commentaries (Wells and King, 1994: 653), thus serving as an agenda setter for other news media outlets. Furthermore, prestige newspapers enjoy a good reputation that is in itself a motivation for their reporters to produce fair and balanced news reports (Lacy and Simon, 1991: 366). The elite newspapers also appeal to ‘globalist’ segments of readers, and thus they tend to include a more global approach than do the local newspapers, not to mention that the prestigious press usually has a larger number of correspondents than has the local press (see Mellor, 2007: Ch. 6 for an overview of these four pan-Arab newspapers). The following section gives an overview of the selected dates and the news stories chosen for analysis.

**Dates to Remember in a Global War**

The war broke out on 19 March 2003 (or 20 March at c. 4:00 a.m. Baghdad time). The first operation was called ‘Operation Iraqi Freedom’, targeting Saddam Hussein and other leaders in Baghdad. Approximately a week after the war broke out, international news media circulated the news of the first civilian causalities of Iraq, which
was supposed to contradict what the Allied forces had said about the war being ‘a clean’ war with the minimum of casualties among civilians. The first report on casualties was on 27 March 2003 following the missile attacks on Nasr Market in Baghdad. One important date of the war timeline was 9 April 2003, which witnessed the fall of Baghdad and the US forces taking control of the city. Officially, the major war operations were declared over on 1 May 2003 although some battles are still going on to-date between American forces and Iraqi rebels.

The following analysis focuses on the front-page stories on the following important dates in each of the four pan-Arab newspapers selected:

- 19 March 2003, which was the day when the war broke out:² the articles chosen from each newspaper deal with the preparation for the war and the American soldiers taking positions around the outskirts of Iraq.
- 27 March 2003, which witnessed the first civilian casualties among Iraqis: the articles selected here deal with the stage of the Iraq War that witnessed the first shootings and the resistance acts by the Republican Guard Troops.
- 9 April 2003, which witnessed the fall of Baghdad: the articles focused on the situation in Baghdad and Saddam’s destiny.

In general, the focus of Al Quds Al Arabi was on the war and its casualties, from an Arab standpoint. Thus, the war was foregrounded as the main global event. The assemblage of articles showed a movement in space, moving between Iraq, Europe and the USA. Al Sharq Al Awsat maintained an Arabian Gulf focus giving space to Gulf countries’ statements, e.g. Saudi Arabia, while Al Hayat had an all-round view of the war, where the main focus was the ordinary Iraqi people, with interviews and quotes from both western and Arab sources and articles by reporters from Baghdad and other cities. In contrast to both Al Hayat and Al Sharq Al Awsat, the role of Egypt was foregrounded in Al Ahram, perhaps because this is primarily a national newspaper distributed outside the region.

It is important to recall that news texts are anchored in various discourses and are from various sources, e.g. politicians, media professionals, lay people. Thus, the outcome is a hybrid discursive vehicle that is mediated to the audience/readers as a commodity. This hybridity is needed to give this vehicle its ideational character as a representation of social reality. Being a commodity for consumption, moreover, news texts should also serve an interpersonal function in as much as they seek to establish a rapport with their audience by drawing on everyday and common experiences. The analysis of how news texts establish both the ideational and interpersonal functions (see Fairclough, 1995) may take as its point of departure textual components of the news text as a genre and how these elements are deployed to fulfil these functions.

Establishing a Rapport with the Readers

This section draws particularly on the interpersonal function of news texts and the textual vehicles used to serve this function. I argue that the Arab newspapers rely
on the visual rather than textual to establish rapport with their audiences. Moreover, some newspapers, particularly *Al Quds Al Arabi*, draw on the textual in their usage of metaphors, which in turn are drawn from popular experience. Moreover, the deployment of the visual results from the constraints of using the Arabic written language or Modern Standard Arabic (MSA) to serve the same function. I argue that the constraints of MSA and the fact that the speech of lay people is still converted into MSA (rather than quoted in colloquial language/dialect), may reduce the level of solidarity between the news text and its audience and hence result in the dependence on the visual element as well as metaphors to fulfill this role.

If Arab news professionals cannot establish a rapport with their readers by using popular or colloquial words in hard news, they can nonetheless achieve the same goal by depending on visual elements, e.g. photos related to everyday life. For instance, on 27 March 2003, and in their reports on the first casualties of the war, the four Arab newspapers printed photos depicting ordinary people amid chaos. *Al Ahram*, for one, printed several photos showing Iraqi people, some of them even showing a dead man’s body. In fact, this visuality as an interpersonal function can be generalized to cover other conflicts. Thus, for example, *Al Quds Al Arabi* (on 27 March 2003) printed, along with a photo of ordinary Iraqis, a photo on its front page depicting Palestinian lay people carrying the body of a man, shot in an Israeli raid; as in the image featured in *Al Ahram*, the man was covered in blood.

Images can also be deployed to serve a moral aim. For instance, *Al Ahram* (9 April 2003) printed an image featuring American armed soldiers trying to enter a house in Baghdad while three men were sitting peacefully by the front door. The image stresses the power, or almost brutality, of the American soldiers versus the helplessness of the Iraqi men.

Similarly, *Al Quds Al Arabi* (27 March 2003) had a photo of a small child sitting alone, and in the background, we see a military tank, as if saying that the main victims were the innocent children. The centre of reporting then is not the masculine character of the war as a battle between two groups, but an unfair act of aggression against women and children. Moeller (1999: 8) argues that the media’s use of children in the news is a means to highlight particular political or civic issues that are deemed ‘irresolvable’. Thus, the use of children can cause moral outrage, and a child depicted in a tragic context highlights the intensity of the event. She referred to this use of images as ‘martyr images’ (Moeller, 1999: 11). Moreover, the photo that foregrounds an Arab child, while backgrounding artillery, may have been produced in an international agency to highlight the individuality of suffering: it ‘becomes the experience of a lone individual’ (Kleinman and Kleinman, 1997: 7). Yet, the same photo was recontextualized in *Al Quds Al Arabi* and anchored in another discourse, that of pity. It was used to trigger sympathy for victims and assert the cruelty and injustice of the war and the invaders. It is worth noting that although the photos printed in the Arab newspapers originate from international agencies, such as AP, Reuters and AFP, signs (whether texts or images) do not produce homogeneous but rather heterogeneous meanings that can be used to validate a certain discourse, e.g. pity.
Invoking the Readers’ Pity

Highlighting the victimization of sufferers is one strategy to trigger the audience’s sympathy towards war victims and disapproval of the military operations as a cause of this suffering. Although it could be expected that all Arab newspapers in this study would engage in such a discursive strategy, highlighting the sufferings of the war victims, it was only Al Quds Al Arabi that deliberately deployed this strategy. This paper has constantly applied the strategy of ‘pity’ towards the ‘mass victimization’ of Iraqis as war sufferers and one pillar of this strategy was the use of metaphors. On 19 March 2003, immediately before the war broke out, the newspaper reported on the evidence gathered to prove the determination of the USA to lead the war on Iraq. The following extracts printed on 19 March 2003 show how Al Quds Al Arabi deployed the metaphor of ‘storm’ to describe the USA and assigned to it great powers in order to increase sympathy with the Iraqis, who were evidently meant to be seen as the victims of these clashes:

Al Quds Al Arabi 19 March 2003

The new American storm blew on Iraq, with evidence of military operations ongoing in the north with Turkish help, while the American presidential envoy to the Iraqi opposition said that the Iraqi Kurds had put their forces under the control of the American leadership.

And Powell said to the journalists, ‘we have now a coalition of countries seeking to join us and it comprises 30 countries that announced their joining this list. There are another 15 countries that do not want to reveal their identity for one reason or another but they will support the coalition.’

And the American officials distributed a list of the countries that they said would be part of the coalition, among them countries that were categorized as allies ‘of the post-military conflict’ . . . But American media/press reports confirmed that the American planes will be using Saudi bases in battles and that the Saudi territory will be open for humanitarian and logistic operations for American forces inside Iraq. The reports said that the British forces will move toward Basra and will take over the control in the south generally while the American forces will move directly towards Baghdad . . .

The expected American military operations are described here metaphorically as a new storm that would hit Iraq. The adjective ‘new’ is used symbolically denoting that this war was not the first against Iraq (a reference to the 1991 Gulf War). Seeing the operation as a storm implies the innocence of Iraq, which would be hit by an unstoppable, almost nature-like, storm, thus intensifying the victimization of Iraq. Also, ‘storm’ indicates the strength of the USA, the source of the storm, and this power is reasserted in the reference to the Kurdish troops that surrender their power to the control of the American leadership.

The power of the USA is indicated by the use of the adverb ‘now’, showing the power of the American officials (here Powell) to control events in the here-and-now. This is also asserted by the use of the future tense (‘will support the coalition’) showing the determination of the USA to pursue the military action and its ability to mobilize world nations around this cause. The power of the USA is also highlighted through the use of active transitive verbs (‘blew’, ‘said’, ‘distributed’, ‘will move towards’); for example, the American forces were said to intend to use the
Saudi bases (‘will be using Saudi bases in battles’) while the Saudi decision to grant this right to the Americans was concealed by the adjective ‘open’ (‘the Saudi territory will be open for . . . operations’).

*Al Quds Al Arabi* deployed another metaphor, namely that of the ‘butcher’, as in the following extracts from the issue of 27 March 2003, which reported on the shooting at Nasr market. The newspaper sought to humanize victims by highlighting their helplessness both through the use of metaphors of the USA as a butcher (slaughtering and burning Iraqis – particularly women and children) and through the use of direct adjectives that stressed the brutality of the American troops:

*Al Quds Al Arabi 27 March 2003*

The United States of America has added a new line to its ‘ample’ massacre-record in Iraq with the bombing of a crowded market in the Shaab quarter north of Baghdad yesterday morning. . . . Baghdad witnessed more than 30 explosions yesterday morning, which resulted in the destruction of several houses and civil buildings. Burned body parts and human organs were seen spread in the market in the Shaab quarter. The American-British bombing of Basra resulted in an unlimited number of martyrs and injured among civilians, while the Iraqi resistance succeeded in preventing the forces surrounding Baghdad from attacking it. The Iraqi capital was subject to a new brutal bombing yesterday evening as several explosions were heard in the densely populated city centre. The American president George W. Bush hinted that the war in Iraq will be long. . . . The Iraqi Information Minister Mohammed Said as-Sahaf said yesterday that the American-British bombing of Nasriya city in Iraq had resulted in the destruction of 200 houses and the injury of more than 500 civilians.

The USA is assigned the role of butcher or executioner with an established record of massacres (it ‘added a new line to its massacre-record’) in Iraq. The adjective ‘new’ also enforces the belief that the USA has practised this massacre-policy before in Iraq, thus again defining clearly the roles of Iraq and the USA, as victim and perpetrator respectively.

I argue here that the reference to the city, Baghdad, as being witness to more than 30 explosions serves the victimized status of Iraq by referring to a whole city rather than singling out specific persons or quarters, thus intensifying the acts of aggression against the city. Likewise, the results of bombings are said to cause the ‘destruction of . . . civil buildings’ without specifying areas or buildings by name, which again points to the ‘mass’ effect of the war on the whole infrastructure and people, rather than limiting it to single places and/or persons. This is intensified by the reference to the bomb causing an unlimited number of civilian casualties, who are regarded as being ‘martyrs’ of this unfair ‘massacre’. This generalization is repeated over and over again through the text, e.g. the reference to the ‘Iraqi capital’ that witnessed a ‘brutal bombing’ in areas that are ‘densely populated’, thus, again, intensifying the victimized role of Iraq.

This victimization of Iraq is further enforced by the use of verbs denoting the passivity of actors (‘Baghdad witnessed . . . were seen . . . Iraqi capital was subject to . . .’) while the verbs relating to the US action are transitive showing the US power to decide the course of war (‘added . . . American-British bombing of Basra resulted in . . . injured . . . Bush hinted that . . .’). The Iraqi resistance, however, was granted an active role, albeit modest, amid this battle between powerful and victimized, in
as much as it ‘succeeded’ in preventing a further attack. The Iraqi resistance is used here as an umbrella term rather than specifying members of this resistance movement. Also, the Iraqi minister’s quotation is deployed to give verisimilitude to the account about the civilian deaths as a result of this bombing.

In sum, *Al Quds Al Arabi* relied heavily on the politics of pity centring on the victimization of rather helpless Iraqis in front of the powerful persecutor, the USA. The focus then is on *denouncing* the persecutor and revealing its transgression, while the victims are generalized to include a whole nation (Iraqis) or a whole group (women/children). Thus the persecutor is foregrounded, given an active role (of transgression), while victims are kept in the background as helpless sufferers. Moreover, *Al Quds Al Arabi* reporters managed to forge their link with their audiences by drawing on common experiences from their daily lives, e.g. storm (sand storms), butcher, massacre (which brings to mind the massacres experienced by Arab peoples during civil wars or under occupation such as the Sabra and the Shatila massacres, which targeted Palestinian refugees in Lebanon).

**War as a Masculine Activity**

In contrast to the discourse of pity promoted by *Al Quds Al Arabi*, *Al Ahram* preferred to portray the Iraqis as active actors, thus overcoming their helpless role and transcending to a much more active part in the war. This then, as I argue, masculinizes the war discourse, by presenting it as a war between two equally powerful opponents and by describing the battles as ‘fierce’, which apparently surprised the American forces, as illustrated in the following headline (26 March 2003):

*The Republican Troops around Baghdad defend against an intensive American-British shelling for the second day in a row.*

*Washington sends military enforcement from the USA and Europe and is expecting a decisive fierce battle around the Iraqi capital.*

The protagonist here is the force of Republican Troops that ‘defend’ their country against the antagonist (American-British forces). In spite of their limited resources, the troops’ bravery forces the antagonist to call for military enforcement. The battle then is between two foes equal in power with one of them drawing on their military resources (the USA) and the other drawing on the moral power or bravery of their troops (Iraqi forces). The verb associated with the protagonist is a transitive active verb (‘defend’), which enforces the resistance of the Iraqi troops. The moral force of the Iraqi troops seems to prevail over global forces (‘from the USA and Europe’) as indicated in the use of temporal reference, ‘for the second day in a row’.

The article goes on to evaluate the fierceness of the battle:

*And after three hours of fierce fighting in Nasriya, the American naval forces managed to cross a bridge on the Euphrates River heading towards Baghdad; the Iraqi fierce resistance resulted in the martyrdom of 100 Iraqis and the AFP correspondent said that the ‘smell of human flesh’ spread in the city which lies 375 km from Baghdad.*
The text foregrounds the scene and length of the battle (‘three hours of fierce fighting’), suggesting that it was not easy for the American forces finally to ‘cross a bridge on the Euphrates River’. The resistant Iraqis are adorned with ‘martyrdom’ as a reminder that their resistance was not wasted, but was for a noble aim. Yet, the use of fact-giving details (such as figures, ‘100 Iraqis’ or ‘375 km’, or the reference to the news agencies – AFP), is reminiscent of the factual features of the news as a genre.

The foregrounding of the Iraqi resistance serves as a rhetorical strategy to masculinize this resistance in order to assure the reader that the Iraqis are capable of defending their country. For instance, the resistance has nearly forced the British troops to re-draw their plans concerning Basra, although they still consider the city a legitimate target:

**Al Ahram 26 March 2003**

*The British forces reversed their strategy to isolate Basra under the pressure of the strong Iraqi resistance and decided to consider Basra as a legitimate military target.*

Moreover, the Iraqis are represented here as a unified nation, united in their act of resistance:

*The Iraqi President Saddam Hussein called for the Iraqi tribes to resist the American and British forces everywhere without waiting for orders from the military leaders.*

Thus, although made up of different tribes, the Iraqis are morally bound by their sense of nationalism. By displaying the tribes in this way, the text disregards any real tensions or conflicting interests between these different tribes or factions, not to mention the different attitudes of these groups towards the war and the fall of Saddam.

Although at this stage of the war Baghdad was falling, *Al Ahram* still highlighted the resistance of the Iraqis, quoting, in the headline, the words of As-Sahaf that Iraqi will not give up and will continue resistance. The ‘fierce’ battles around the presidential compound were seen as just the beginning as new ‘Iraqi forces were preparing’ to join the battles, thereby implying that the Iraqi resistance was rather stronger than estimated:

*The American forces continued their penetration into Baghdad and enforced its control yesterday amid fierce Iraqi resistance against the advancing forces.*

*Meanwhile, fierce battles between American and Iraqi forces took place around the presidential compound and the invasion forces captured the Jumhuriya bridge. . . . A military leader said that 50 Iraqis were martyred in the battle.*

*On the other hand, Mohamed Said As-Sahaf, Iraqi information minister, said in his press conference yesterday that the Americans suffered a kind of hysteria and rush and they believed that by killing civilians they would win the war, but they would not win and Iraq would not surrender.*

Note, again, how the resistance is described as ‘fierce’ and the current battles as decisive, thus assigning the Allied forces and Iraqi troops the same military clout. Despite the fierceness of the Iraqi resistance, it could not stop the ‘martyrdom’ of
some Iraqis thus highlighting the Iraqis’ legitimate fighting that will grant them either victory, if they win, or martyrdom, if they die. The Allied forces managed, despite the ‘fierce’ Iraqi resistance, to penetrate into Baghdad, but their action is associated with the verb ‘capture’ to emphasize that they are wresting an Iraqi possession from the Iraqis’ hands. Their action is also rather ‘irrational and hysterical’ as highlighted in As-Sahaf’s words quoted above. Here, the American forces, although militarily more powerful than the Iraqi forces, seem to be preparing themselves for ‘fierce’ battles and not underestimating the power of their enemy, the Iraqi troops. Moreover, the Iraqi troops are depicted as being strong enough to inflict heavy losses on the American forces and thus they were capable of hindering the Americans’ progress.

Unlike Al Quds Al Arabi, Al Ahram downplayed the victimization of women and children. For instance, it laid stress on the fierce Iraqi resistance, which was shown not only textually, but also in the photos selected for the front page on the same day. The photos depicted Iraqi men leading artillery or holding weapons while women and children were not included in this image. Again, focusing on the male resistance rather than female victimization masculinizes the war discourse. The masculinization of the Iraqi resistance is enforced here in the reference to the battles between the American and Iraqi forces as ‘fierce’, and the rather ‘noble’ role of the resistance to respond to a ‘massacre’ that mainly targeted ‘civilians’ by inflicting unlimited loss on the enemy.

**War as a Distant Adventure**

In contrast to the masculinization strategy of Al Ahram, Al Hayat depicted the war as a distant operation relying mainly on the descriptive genre to provide as many facts as possible about the military operations. Thus, Al Hayat affirms the objectivity of its news, thereby legitimizing the news story as a mere reflection of a distant reality:

**Al Hayat 19 March 2003**

As the final countdown to war approaches by midnight tonight, the White House confirmed its determination to enter Iraq with a coalition force of 30 countries in order to disarm the Iraqi banned weapons, even if President Saddam Hussein left, and were preparing to begin the military operations after evacuating inspectors and embassies in Baghdad. American officials stress that the USA ‘showered’ soldiers in southern Iraq with pamphlets urging them to surrender and not to resist an approaching invasion amidst speculations on the whereabouts of the war, set to be waged before the end of the 48-hour-ultimatum, which President George Bush set for the Iraqi president to leave the country with his family or else face war. It was announced in Washington yesterday that the Bush administration had formed a coalition of 45 countries to disarm the Iraqi banned weapons ‘immediately’ . . .

The article begins by emphasizing the ‘countdown to war’, and the climax of the tension between, on the one hand, the Iraqi former president and, on the other, the US administration. The main actor is ‘the White House’, which is the focus of this article, referring to the US administration as a whole. This is further reinforced in subsequent references such as ‘the Bush administration’ or ‘American officials’, thereby stressing the strategic planning of the war operation and throwing it into
sharp relief against the isolated, individual acts of ‘Saddam Hussein’ unsupported by other Iraqi officials. The setting is the USA and the voices cited in the article are either American officials or officials based in the USA (e.g. the French ambassador to the USA). While elaborating on the power of the USA supported by its allies (‘45 countries’, not to mention the possible support of France), little mention is made of the Iraqi citizens and their reactions to the coming war, except in the accompanying photo showing a large queue of cars carrying Kurdish families said to be fleeing from northern Iraq. The photo is shot from a bird’s eye view, which further emphasizes this distance from the war and the Iraqis as a whole. The facts provided in the news texts, although meant to enforce the objectivity of the news, conceal another function of the text, namely its evaluative feature. Thus, the facts seem to centre on one actor (the USA) and a foe (Saddam Hussein), where the former is supported internationally and the latter is isolated and feared due to his irrational decisions (i.e. using chemical weapons or jeopardizing the lives of his soldiers by defying the ultimatum). In this way, the style shifts slightly towards a narrative style with a protagonist and an antagonist, and the relationship between them is characterized by an unequal distribution of power.

Unlike in Al Ahram, where the Iraqis were depicted as unified tribes, the above text depicts the Iraqis as fragmented groups; each can be addressed differently according to the interest of each group. For instance, the army soldiers were addressed by the ‘pamphlets’ inviting them to surrender, thereby separating those soldiers from the main plan of the former president of using the soldiers to defend Iraq against the Allied forces.

On the other hand, and once the war began, Al Hayat took another turn by adopting the narrative style to tell the readers of a new episode of the war narrative. Al Hayat begins its front-page reports (on 27 March 2003 and 9 April 2003) with ‘and’, which I see as a means to anchor the present report in relation to previous ones while adding a new episode to an overall war narrative:

**Al Hayat 27 March 2003**

And on the seventh day of the American-British war on Iraq, the missile bombing caused a massacre in the capital Baghdad as more than 15 civilians were killed and 30 others were injured by two missiles. . . . (my emphasis)

*Fierce battles broke out between American and Iraqi forces over the control of a bridge on the Euphrates river. . . . According to the testimony of correspondents, Iraqis managed to destroy an unlimited number of artilleries . . . .

**Al Hayat 9 April 2003**

And on the twentieth day of the American-British war on Iraq, the American forces sought to tighten their grip around Baghdad . . . . (my emphasis)

Both articles begin with ‘and’ to imply the continuation of this text, describing a new episode of the war and linking it to previous articles. The aim, I argue, is to mark the coherence of the news articles in Al Hayat during the whole period of the war while maintaining the boundary of the events to one specific locale. The phrases ‘seventh day’ and ‘twentieth day’ are other signs of this continuation.
The above text also shows the shift in style, moving from the descriptive genre to the narrative style. Here, the protagonist’s role has been reversed and has been assigned to the ‘Iraqis’ rather than to the American-British forces, who are now depicted as the antagonist causing ‘a massacre’ in Baghdad. The narrative enforced the ‘masculinity’ of the war operation, describing the battles that broke out between the Iraqis and the American forces as ‘fierce’ adding that the Iraqis had actually ‘managed to destroy an unlimited number of artilleries’. The Iraqi people are depicted as one unified entity (‘the Iraqis’) standing against the coalition forces, fighting ‘fierce’ battles despite their limited resources compared to the resources of the Coalition forces. The portrayal of their courage is enforced by the use of phrases such as ‘destroy[ing] an unlimited number of artilleries’, and is also reflected in the headline: ‘Massacre in Baghdad and the Republican Guard causes huge losses for the Coalition forces in Najaf’. This bravery is confirmed by the ‘statements of correspondents’, thereby adding authenticity and credibility to the news sources (ethos).

The role of reporters and correspondents here then is to verify the news and act as eyewitnesses to the course of war. This is further elaborated upon in the reference to the newspaper itself as the source of new information:

**Al-Hayat 27 March 2003**

However, the American deputy State Secretary Richard Armitage confirmed that the American forces ‘will do whatever it takes’ in order to topple the Iraqi regime even if they had to fight inside the cities. He said in an interview to Al Hayat, to be published tomorrow . . .

Previous research on Arabic journalistic discourse has shown that quoting sources adds authenticity to news reports (Al-Shabbab and Swales, 1986: 38). Citations are thus a means of displaying the news institution’s objectivity by presenting the opinions or statements uttered by one or several parties on a certain issue. Moreover, in adding the institutional voice, as in the above extract, the news media stress their own participation in the event.

The last article from Al Hayat (9 April 2003) brings back the USA as the main protagonist stressing once more the power of the US military forces, given that the ‘Baghdad defences’ were failing. The main topic now is to decide what would happen in postwar Iraq showing the tense discussions among world leaders:

*As President George Bush and the British Prime Minister Tony Blair agreed in the Northern Ireland summit to give the UN ‘a vital role’ in Iraq after toppling Saddam Hussein, the French president Chirac stressed that the international organization should alone carry out the rebuilding of Iraq.*

The Iraqi people are again missing from this account and the previous masculinization of the Iraqi soldiers’ bravery has now diminished with the progress of the American military inside Baghdad. Although the Iraqis had ‘tried’, they had not succeeded in ‘slowing the American forces’ progress’, and this progress is underlined by the accompanying image of American soldiers crossing bridge in Baghdad passing by the body of an Iraqi man lying on one side of the bridge.

On the whole, Al Hayat texts can be categorized as mainly belonging to the descriptive genre, in as much as they include details and information from various
settings and involving different actors as an indication of the authenticity of the news gatherer. Markers such as ‘on the other hand’ or temporal prepositional phrases, which usually occur at the beginning of the sentence, play an important role in the news genre in Arabic. Their presence is not just a matter of stylistic variation, but is actually dictated by the rhetoric of news discourse as a genre, to the extent that an attempt to delete them would result in a distortion of the cohesive links within the news text. Such phrases mark the dynamic pace in moving from one event and one comment to another, stressing the role of the journalist as on-looker (Mellor, 2007: 142–7), one who stands above the events and marks down their sequence, and yet maintains the power to move back and forth in space and time to add to this account of reality. Defined beforehand, these spaces are restricted to the political and military fields, gathering information and commentaries from authoritative voices there.

**Blending Genres**

Like *Al Hayat*, *Al Sharq Al Awsat* blends different rhetorical strategies and genres. First, its text from 19 March 2003 provides a ‘description’ of events and actors, highlighting in particular the role of the USA as a super military power. The US government is depicted as having the power to determine future events, e.g. whether there will be war, and whether Saddam and his sons will stay in Iraq. Another example is the following extract, where the White House spokesman tells the world media the future scenario prepared by the US government:

**Al Sharq Al Awsat 19 March 2003**

> On the other hand, Washington said that it did not see any indication of Saddam’s abiding by the ultimatum and considered this to be ‘another mistake’ committed by Saddam if he did not leave. While the American forces in Kuwait were getting ready yesterday for the attack, one of its leading generals said that victory in Iraq will happen ‘within days’. He said that Saddam’s decision to stay in Iraq will be ‘another mistake committed by Saddam Hussein’. Fleischer said that the Allied forces formed by the USA will enter Iraqi to disarm it even if Saddam left. The American representative of the Iraqi opposition, Zalmai Khalil Zad, said yesterday that the Kurdish Iraqi battalions will put their force under the American command should an American military operation be launched against Iraq.

This is a series of statements issued from Washington indicating the course of future events, determining what will be happening and evaluating the moves taken by the opponent (‘did not see any indication of Saddam’s abiding by the ultimatum and considered this to be “another mistake” committed by Saddam’). One American authority was quoted as asserting the victory even before it took place (‘victory in Iraq will happen’), although his assertion that it will happen ‘within days’ seems to be controversial as it was the only bit in his speech that was highlighted by quotation marks. The US allies inside Iraq (i.e. Zalmai Khalil Zad) also acknowledged the US power, confirming their intention to ‘put their force under the American command’. Thus, statements issued by the Allied forces (concerning the overall war strategy) were quoted in the future tense, which reinforced the idea of the power of the USA in determining the course of the war.
At a later stage of the war (on 27 March 2003) and with the first bombing that hit civilian areas, Al Sharq Al Awsat adopted another rhetoric to stress the masculinization of Iraqis rather than portraying them as passive victims of the war. The headline below begins by highlighting the ‘Iraqi ambush’, and the number of casualties (14 dead) is not related to any party (Allied forces or Iraqi) and hence can be read as referring to the casualties among Allied forces as a result of this ambush. This resistance urged the USA to send more supplies from the USA to the Gulf (as stated in the sub-headline [not shown]) and spoke of ‘Iraqi Special Troops’ entering the fray, thus marking a crucial stage in the war and resistance:

Al Sharq Al Awsat 27 March 2003

An Iraqi ambush to a supply convoy and 14 dead in two bombings on Baghdad

. . . Thousands of fighters from the Republican Guards troops and ‘Fedayeen Saddam’ moved from Baghdad . . . to stop the progress of the American forces towards the Iraqi capital. And while a fierce battle went on yesterday over the control of a bridge near Najaf, the Pentagon admitted that the Iraqi forces destroyed an unlimited number of artilleries.

The ferocity of the Iraqi resistance is implied in the phrase ‘thousands of fighters’, which forms the main subject of the first sentence of the news text. The text also stresses the ‘fierce’ battle that took place in Najaf city, which compelled the Pentagon to ‘admit’ to the loss of an ‘unlimited number of artilleries’.

Thus, Al Sharq Al Awsat moved from the descriptive genre to the narrative with the change in the course of the war. Moreover, like Al Hayat, Al Sharq Al Awsat resumes the utilization of the descriptive genre in the last text (9 April 2003) by focusing on the details of the US military power and its equipment (a bomb of 2000 pounds). Besides, the American intelligence system is depicted as an ‘efficient’ system that acted upon supposedly reliable information just ‘45 minutes’ after receiving it, and the soldiers are rather precise in their movements as they began their mission ‘12 minutes’ after receiving the instructions to do so. The Iraqi resistance now is described as ‘a counter attack’ rather than the ‘fierce’ resistance it was described as before. Despite the fact that the resistance managed to shoot down an American plane, the detail of the American forces’ success in ‘rescuing the pilot’ undermines this act, and demonstrates the military power of the allied forces:

Al Sharq Al Awsat 9 April 2003

An American plane, targeting the fortified hiding holes, dropped four destructive bombs, each weighing 2000 pounds on a building in Baghdad . . .

And 45 minutes after receiving this information, the American middle leadership in Qatar launched a B1 missile to throw four bombs, each weighing 2000 pounds, on the building at 3 p.m. the day before yesterday, local time . . .

One of the crew members of the missile B1 said that they attacked the building 12 minutes after receiving instructions to do so.

In sum, two texts of Al Sharq Al Awsat (19 March and 9 April 2003) claimed the objectivity of the news texts by means of description and fact giving, e.g. the incorporation of figures. The result is that the texts fail to invoke any sympathy for
the Iraqis who have been absent from this description, and instead the topic centres on the US and other political powers. Yet, the third text of 27 March 2003 shifts to another rhetorical genre, namely, narrative, where the Iraqis are depicted as united and brave protagonists resisting the foreign invasion of their country. The result, again, is that the suffering of the war is mitigated as the readers feel assured that the Iraqis are capable of defending their country, rather than drawing attention to the humanitarian cost of this resistance.

Implication on the Arab Public Sphere

To sum up, Al Quds Al Arabi depicted the American forces as a powerful agent (American hegemony) while Iraqis were seen as passive victims. This passive role, however, has been overcome in the accounts of Al Ahram, and to some extent in Al Hayat and Al Sharq Al Awsat particularly on 27 March 2003, so as to acquire an active role as equal ‘fighters’. The aim is to enforce resistance to the Allied forces and trigger sympathy with the resistance. Moreover, metaphors were deployed to enforce the strategies of pity vs mitigation. Al Quds Al Arabi, for instance, relied on such metaphors as ‘butcher’ to maximize the cruelty of the USA/Allied forces while amplifying the weakness of the victims of this power, namely the Iraqis. Thus, each of the four newspapers selected here chose to foreground the Iraqis either as victims or fighters, while in some other newspapers the Iraqis were completely absent from the front-page coverage. The question now is whether this coverage has contributed with rational arguments to the general public debate about the war, thereby fulfilling its role as mediator to the pan-Arab polity.

Indeed, none of the articles overviewed here managed genuinely to throw light on the Iraqis’ suffering; rather, the news texts achieved the contrary aim, and mitigated this suffering. The overvictimization of the Iraqis (in Al Quds Al Arabi) by generalizing their loss to be the loss of a whole city (e.g. Baghdad) sidelined the particular incidents of suffering among civilians. In this way, the internal divisions among Iraqis were ignored in order to emphasize their alleged unity in a nationalistic battle against their enemy. Likewise, the masculinization of the war (in Al Ahram) and the foregrounding of the Iraqi resistance resulted in mitigating the suffering of ordinary Iraqis by ignoring the ordeals of those civilians. Moreover, presenting the war as a drama of several episodes, as shown in the Al Hayat texts, portrayed the war only as an aesthetic event with different settings and actors, rather than a real event with genuine suffering. Finally, the descriptive genre adopted in Al Sharq Al Awsat to provide facts and figures presupposed a detached observer with no commitment to what they were seeing. This detachment, as Boltanski (1999: 29) argues, is ‘valued as a guarantee of impartiality’ (original emphasis). Moreover, the blending of descriptive and narrative genres is a sign of the tension in journalistic practices (Chouliaraki, 2006a), a tension between impartiality as detachment or non-commitment and attachment. Some journalists resort to the detached style to indicate their objectivity, while others may resort to the attached style, as justified by one British journalist as follows: ‘if you don’t have a sense of commitment, a sense of attachment to what you’re seeing, you’ll never be able to write it’ (cited in Tester, 1999: 38).
Indeed, the public sphere is based on commitment to certain causes, or as Boltanski (1999: 30) puts it:

*A public sphere therefore is not only turned towards the ideal of an aperspectival objectivity, as the laboratory will be later. Consideration of suffering modifies the conditions of debate especially by imposing on it an urgency which demands a commitment from people for a cause,* (original emphasis).

Prerequisites for this commitment are (1) visibility of the sufferer and (2) a call for action. The news texts examined here, however, lack both conditions: they seem to sideline the ordinary Iraqis’ ordeal and they do not call for a certain political action to alleviate the suffering of those Iraqis. To make the sufferers more visible to the public opinion, there is a need to present their dilemma and even the internal conflicts among themselves, or as Boltanski (1999: 31) sums it up:

*In the ideal of the public sphere, a local suffering can be conveyed without deformation in such a way that it is there for anyone to examine it, that is to say, for all those who, from the fact of their receptivity arising from their lack of prior commitment, are free to examine this suffering and find themselves sufficiently affected by it to become committed and take it up as their cause.*

For instance, when the situation worsened in Basra, *Al Quds Al Arabi* chose to focus on the incidents of killings among civilians en masse, thereby sidelining other important factors such as the lack of electricity and water and the impact of this on daily life, not to mention the lootings that disturbed the city’s inhabitants.

Furthermore, foregrounding the Iraqi resistance did not serve as a call for action to alleviate this suffering, because resistance was portrayed as a simplified narrative rather than showing the complex situation with different views among the Iraqis. This simplification has been characteristic of Arab coverage (as shown, for example, by Zayani and Ayish, 2006). Moreover, Al Qadri (2004: 57, n. 12) recounts an example of this simplification of resistance when one military expert was asked how the Iraqis with their traditional weapons could fight the advanced US military artillery. According to the expert, that was a simple matter: ‘the fighter enters the artillery and throws a bomb into the tank to kill the crew . . . and God is capable of everything!’

In sum, to report faithfully on the Iraqis’ suffering, news reports could combine both factual details and personal stories of suffering ‘by combining with a single statement both a realistic world reported by an uninvolved spectator observing from anywhere and, in view of the ban on pure factuality, a world of people who are affected and for whom concern promises commitment’ (Boltanski, 1999: 34).

**Conclusion**

This article provides an illustrative case study of sampled front-page articles from four of the most widely circulated pan-Arab newspapers. The article examines the different rhetorical strategies adopted in four pan-Arab newspapers (*Al Quds Al Arabi, Al Ahram, Al Hayat and Al Sharq Al Awsat*). It shows how these strategies differed among the newspapers to influence the readers’ view of the war. While *Al Quds Al Arabi* relied on images and metaphors that magnified the cruelty of the
Allied forces as ‘perpetrators’, Al Ahram chose to focus on the ‘fierce’ Iraqi resistance, or, as I have called it, the masculinization of war. The two other newspapers, Al Hayat and Al Sharq Al Awsat, chose to blend the descriptive and narrative genres to serve different rhetorical aims. The descriptive genre was generally utilized in the beginning of the war to give a detached view of the war as a ‘distant’ event lying outside the readers’ geographical boundaries. Yet, with the reports on the first war casualties on 27 March 2003, the two newspapers shifted to the narrative genre depicting the war as an aesthetic event that failed to invoke the readers’ commitment to an immediate action.

The foregoing analysis contributes to stressing the diversity in the moralization of audiences and in war coverage, whether in masculinizing or feminizing the war. The analysis shows that Al Quds Al Arabi adopted ‘the politics of pity’, focusing on the Iraqis as the passive victims of a brutal invasion, while Al Ahram portrayed Iraqis as active actors and ‘fierce fighters’ who were able to stand up and challenge the Allied forces, regardless of the loss that this challenge cost them. In this way, the victims (Iraqis) successfully overcame the victim role and earned the role of active actors in the course of the war. On the other hand, the other two newspapers blended different rhetorical strategies by moving from the descriptive genre and factual textual features to the narrative genre, particularly when reporting the first war casualties.

As I have argued, none of these strategies managed to present faithfully the Iraqis’ suffering. Conversely, the news texts mitigated this suffering either by excluding ordinary Iraqis from the reports or by overemphasizing the role of the Iraqi resistance. Nor did the portrayal of the war as an aesthetic event help in reflecting the Iraqis’ suffering or in urging real commitment.

Notes
1. Al-Hayat is treated here as a Lebanese newspaper, although Saudi owned, because it is run by a Lebanese editor and the Lebanese editorial policy is still apparent in the newspaper; see, for example, Abu Zeid (1993: 412).
2. The issue of Al Ahram for 27 March 2003 was not available and was therefore replaced with the edition of 26 March 2003.

References


Noha Mellor is Senior Lecturer in Media and Cultural Studies, School of Arts and Social Sciences, Kingston University, UK. She is the author of *The Making of Arab News* (Rowman and Littlefield, 2005) and *Arab Journalism: Problems and Prospects* (Edinburgh University Press, 2007).

**Address** Kingston University, FASS, Penrhyhn Road, KT1 2EE Surrey, UK. [email: n.mellor@kingston.ac.uk]