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This study examines the concept of “Failed State” presently in vogue, and how this term has been wrongly used in the news media, the case of Pakistan (since 2005). Edward Newman categorized three types of opinion regarding the concept of failed state among scholars, first one is in the favour and call it a useful, second view considers its a weak and not systematically reliable and last one is highly against this term and calls it an ethnocentric and hegemonic political agenda. This study analyses the case of Pakistan under this context and finding of the study endorses the argument of those scholars, who see the term failed state as an ethnocentric and hegemonic political agenda. This study critically analyses the discourses of news reports and think tanks indexes that labelled Pakistan a failed state. This paper argues that this term has been overlooked and left to the savants for debate. The labelling of failed state by the news media produces drastic repercussions for the labelled nations, hence needs thorough investigation.
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INTRODUCTION

In early 1990s the concept ‘failed state’ originated in the field of Political Sciences and International Relations studies. It followed the dramatic fall and total collapse of the Somali state in 1992. This term was first used and published in Foreign Policy magazine by two American analysts, Gerald Helman and Steven Ratner, both employees of the US State Department in 1992 (Lamba, 2014).

Gerald Helman and Steven Ratner, who coined this term with such arguments, ‘From Haiti in the Western Hemisphere to the remnants of Yugoslavia in Europe, from Somalia, Sudan, and Liberia in Africa to Cambodia in Southeast Asia, a disturbing new phenomenon is emerging: the failed nation-state, utterly incapable of sustaining itself as a member of the international community’. (Ratner, 1992-93, pp. 3-20).

In 1994, the CIA funded a multi-year, multidisciplinary research project called ‘The State Failure Task Force’ based at the University of Maryland. The project was designed to pinpoint the underlying causes of state failure. It was defined as a relatively new label that contained a range of severe political conflicts and regime crises in Somalia, Bosnia, Liberia, Afghanistan and the Democratic Republic of Congo (Call, 2008). It was, however, after 9/11 that this concept gained currency and made its way to the news media. In the wake of September 11, the threat of terrorism has given the problem of failed nation-states an immediacy and importance that transcends its previous humanitarian dimension (Rotberg, 2002). According to Robert Rotberg, seven countries can be called the failed states and these are Afghanistan, Angola, Burundi, DRC, Liberia, Sierra Leone, and Sudan (Rotberg, 2002). Stefan Mair argues that the post-9/11 security paradigm, failed states are considered one of the main threats to international and regional security. But declaring someone a failed state, Mair points out, is still a debate as to what exactly constitutes a failed state (Mair, 2008).
News reports about Afghanistan, Iraq, Somalia, (after some years) Pakistan— and even Mexico— began using this potent noun. No questions asked or interrogation of the concept. Ekalkepe (2007) argues that ‘the War on Terror led agenda has resulted in a focus on the category of states leaning closest to state failure or countries suspected of harbouring Al Qaeda linked groups, leading to skewed analysis and policy priorities’ (Ikpe, 2007). After 9/11, all these states were being perceived as either a failed state or failing on different dimensions that were against Western security interests. Charles T Call (2008) marks that the rediscovery of the definition of the state has arisen in the context of the ‘war on terror’, as failing states are considered dangerous for Western security interests (Call, 2008).

As the term gained prominence, different organizations – think tanks from the West - started publishing their own indexes like failed states, fragile states, state fragility, global peace, human development and index of state weaknesses. And the media grabbed it to use it as means for labelling a country as failed state and with the passage of time the term became an adjective; a popular buzz in media and political circles.

This study discusses the debate of failed state among scholars regarding its validity. To testify the arguments of different scholars this study is specifically designed on Pakistan that how this country has been labelled a failed state by some leading sections of Western news media and on what grounds? This study also explores the role of news media that why they didn’t interrogate the concept and findings of the think tanks reports before labelling it on this country.

**Significance of the Study**

With the rise of post-World War II democracies, respect for national boundaries and non-interference in other nations’ affairs; image warfare, construction and manufacturing of image by media have gained immense importance. In this context framing a country, failed state by the news media has had extreme effects on a nation’s overall growth. This study will be of great importance to all those countries, including Pakistan, that are being labelled as a failed state by the some section of leading news media groups or some think tanks. The study would be a stepping-stone for further research in the usage of this or similar term in media and its negative effects.

**Debate of the Failed State Concept (Literature Review)**

There is no concrete definition exist regarding failed state, as according to StefenMair, it is still in debate that what exactly constitutes a failed state (Mair, 2008)? In the Oxford dictionary of human geography (Castree, Rogers, and Kitchin, 2013) the failed state is defined ‘A state in which one or more of the fundamental conditions of sovereign government are absent’. These conditions include the presence of a recognized government, that government’s monopoly on the legitimate use of physical force, the provision of basic public services, and the ability to represent that country on the international stage. Here the question arises that if out of four conditions, one or two are absent on ground or weak then it can be called a failed state or not?

Failed state or fragile state is a controversial term in the circle of political sciences and International relations studies. Edward Newman (2009) categorizes three types of opinion regarding this concept, first one is in the favour and call it a useful, second view considers its a weak and not systematically reliable and last one is highly against this term(Newman, 2009).

The first group of scholars are in favour of that term and taking it as a useful and identifiable category for analysis and the threats they represent basically change the way that we need to think about security (Newman, 2009). Derick Brinkerhoff (2005) argues that the label of failed state has been employed to describe extreme cases of collapse such as Somalia and Liberia (Brinkerhoff, 2005). Chester Crocker (2003) points out in his work on failed state that state failure is a gradual process and he urges that for better and safer world, US government needs efforts to tackle terrorism and rogues (Crocker, 2003). Croker further says that the failed states like Afghanistan are safe haven for terrorists. Haims, Gregory Streans, David Treverton and Marla Gompert (2008) endorse the term of failed state, they argue that “Failed states present a variety of dangers: religious and ethnic violence; trafficking of drugs, weapons, blood diamonds, and humans; transnational crime and piracy; uncontrollable territory, borders, and waters; terrorist breeding grounds and sanctuaries; refugee overflows; communicable diseases; environmental degradation; warlords and stateless armies” (Haims, Gompert, Treverton, and Stearns, 2008).

It is interesting to know that many scholars look this term through the eye of Western interests. Stephen D. Krasner and Carlos Pascual (2005) argue that the weak and failed states pose an acute risk to U.S. and global security (Stephen and Carlos, 2005). Stuart Eizenstat, John Edward Porter and Jeremy Weinstein (2005) consider failed states as threat to US security and the global harmony (Stuart Eizenstat and Jeremy, 2005).

Rosa Ehrenreich Brooks (2005) characterize failed states as a massive economic inequities, warlordism and violent competition of resources (Rosa Ehrenreich, 2005). Daniel Thurera (2008) argues that ‘a state is usually considered to have failed when the power structures providing
Edward Newman further explains that this group scholars are on the view that failed states undoubtedly represent a paradigm change for international security, demanding new principles and methods in response (Newman, 2009).

The second camp are those analysts who are open-minded about this concept but considers it a weak and not systematically reliable because of no clear definition, indicators or understanding on their security implications exist for the term failed states (Newman, 2009). These scholars also emphasize that given the nature of such states, big hurdle is gathering reliable data. Edward (2009) argues that the idea of failed states is not a solid base and it is misunderstood or simply exaggerated, and so policies making on that ground is something dangerous(Newman, 2009). Stewart Patrick (2006) argues that ‘there can be no one-size-fits-all response to addressing either the sources or consequences of these weaknesses(Patrick, 2006). Justin Logan and Christopher Preble (2008) point out that if the concept of “failedness” provides very limited information to us about these states, why assemble such a category at all (Logan and Preble, 2008)? Stefan Mair (2008) argues regarding this term that two points of contention lies first one is identifying the indispensable functions of a state and the second one is in the controversy over the degree of failure in key functions that makes a state a failed state (Mair, 2008).

The third camp of scholars are highly against this term and they see it as an ethnocentric and hegemonic political agenda aimed at de-legitimizing states that fail to conform to the worldview of dominant states (Newman, 2009). These viewpoint analysts believe that the failed states idea is seen as a part of a broader agenda to reform developing countries, or an attempt to demonize the ‘other’ as a pretext for control and intervention. Adam David Morton (2005) argues that the new doctrine on failed states is deployed as part of a reconstruction of Cold War strategic thinking and practice within a ‘new Cold War on terrorism’ (Morton, 2005). Morten Boos and Kathleen M. Jennings (2005) call the concept of failed state a misnomer (Boas and Jennings, 2005). They further say that the policy making on the basis of assumption would be flawed. Ekalkepe (2007) points out that there are many countries those are weak but not so fragile as to risk imminent collapse but are unwilling or unable to do welfare for their people (Ikpe, 2007). Charles Call (2008) argues that the concept of the failed state has fuelled a tendency towards single, technocratic formulas for strengthening states, which emphasize coercive capabilities (Call, 2008). Call declares the term is an inadequate, even misleading, for virtually every country it purports to describe and he urges that the scholars should abandon the concept of state failure.

Newman (2009) further explains that the scholars of this camp called the concept of ‘failed’ states is politicized to such an extent that it is analytically useless and they argue it is not just a result of unintentionally weak or spurious methodology (Newman, 2009). These scholars categorized this term as political construction, formulated to serve interventionist hegemonic interests and specific political agendas. They categorized it as the worst and most pernicious example of negative ‘securitization’ that exists (Newman, 2009).

William Easterly and Laura Freschi (2010) argue in their article that on the five basic points the failed state or state failure is a failed concept:(i) State failure is leading to confused policy making because it is causing the military to attempt to counter terrorism under the unproven assumption that “failed states” produce terrorism. (ii) State failure has failed to produce any useful academic research in economics. (iii) State failure” has no coherent definition.(iv) The only possible meaningful definition adds nothing to our understanding of state behaviour, and is not really measurable. (v) State failure appeared for political reasons because if we use the number of articles in Foreign Affairs mentioning “state failure” or variants, then it first appeared around the same time as the CIA task force, and then really took off after 9/11 (Easterly and Freschi, 2010).

METHODOLOGY

In literature review we find the debate on the concept of failed state in the circles of political sciences and International relations scholars. To testify the concept of failed state and the three leading arguments regarding this term, its needs a case study on one of the labelled failed state. Pakistan has been selected for this study. This country has been labelling a failed state since 2006. This study critically analyses the discourses of the very first news of the leading Western news media group(BBC) that called Pakistan a failed state and their source for labelling this. In this case, this study analyses the both, the report or findings of the failed/fragile states index and the news story of the BBC regarding that.

Critical discourse analysis is selected for this study because of its relevance. According to Teun A. van Dijk (2001), critical discourse analysis (CDA) is a type of discourse analytical research that primarily studies the way social power abuse, dominance, and inequality are enacted, reproduced, and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context (Van Dijk, 2001). Anders Hensen and David Machin (2013) argue that CDA deals what exactly features of languages showing and what selection of language (words) have been used to accomplish particular kinds of communication aims (Hansen and Machin, 2013). Teun (1993) points out that unlike politicians and activi
go beyond the immediate, serious or pressing issues of the day (Van Dijk, 1993). Teun further exemplify that unlike most social and political scientists, critical discourse scholars want to make a more specific contribution, namely to get more insight into the critical role of discourse in the reproduction of dominance and inequality (Van Dijk, 1993).

**Brief about Pakistan**

Pakistan is a part of South Asia, and is also called threshold of the sub-continent. Pakistan shares borders with China, India, Afghanistan and Iran. In its south is, Indian ocean and Persian gulf which is a major water course for international trade, particularly that of oil, its location has enhanced its geo-political and strategic importance in world affairs. The total land area of Pakistan is 803,940 SQ km, with population of nearly 190 million. Pakistan is the sixth largest nation of the world. According to IMF (International Monetary Fund – 2015) Pakistan is 43rd largest economy (GDP nominal) of the world and 26th in the chart of GDP-PPP. The main sources of economy are agriculture, minerals, services and industry.

Pakistan’s relation with China and Iran are very friendly but has mostly been unstable with India and Afghanistan since independence. Pakistan has fought three wars with India. China is the largest business and strategic partner of Pakistan and always helps Pakistan in every field of life. Due to unstable relations with India and an important geo-political position, Pakistan holds the seventh largest army in the world, equipped with nuclear and all modern defence technology. Pakistan has achieved great success in the defence industry and now exports weapons, including fighter jets to other countries.

Pakistan has been suffering the worst kind of terrorism and extremism since it coalition with US in the war on terror. The country got berries of terrorism after the US invasion of Afghanistan and its policy in the region. In the war against terrorism, Pakistan has suffered a loss of over fifty thousand lives, as well as the loss of almost $80 billion to the economy (T. News, 2014). The Government of Pakistan has started massive operations (2014) against all anti-state elements instead of small on-going operations. In the large-scale operations most of the terrorists were killed or caught by security forces. In the effect of progressive military operations, incidents of terrorism sharply decreased, which also has been admitted by a recent US state department report (State, 2015). The gifts of war on terror, extremism and terrorism have badly destructed all walks of life of this country. Pakistan is a developing country and facing problems such as poverty, low literacy levels and a weak justice system. But despite all of these problems, the country is showing rapid growth.

**Labelling Failed State and the News Media**

In early years of war on terror only seven countries (not Pakistan) were considered failed states, pointed by Robert Rotberg (2002). However in 2005, Foreign Policy magazine published an index under title ‘failed states index’ and this index produced a large list of failed states. Leading news media groups including CNN and BBC started using that index as a source for calling some nations, the failed states. In fact the term ‘failed state’ got boom when the first index appeared in the news market. Consequently, the discussions on failed states were started and it was sold like hot cakes in the news media, the world over.

There are different indexes produced by Western think tanks and widely published by news media. The leading indexes are failed states, fragile states, state fragility, global peace, human development and index of state weaknesses but the most familiar one is failed state/fragile state index. These indexes have played a vital role in labelling any country a failed state.

Regarding these indexes, Edward Newman points out that there are different indexes, determining state failness or fragility, published by different think tanks but their findings are different (Newman, 2009). Newman marks a question here that either their methodologies or sources of data are different or different agendas behind producing the ranking? The noteworthy point raised by Newman can be seen and observed in figure 1 (table) that how these indexes depicting different agendas?

**Labelling Pakistan a Failed State**

In the early years of war on terror, Pakistan was eulogised by the Western news media on becoming an ally of US and Allied forces. The efforts of Pakistan were appreciated on all grounds and the Western news media praised President Musharaf in spite of the fact that he was a dictator (Obad, 2003). However in 2006, Foreign Policy magazine published an index in which they ranked Pakistan world 9th most failed state. The leading news media groups projected this news and since then Pakistan has been depicted as failed state by some sections of Western news media.

**Critical Discourse Analysis of Failed States Index and News Media Reports**

There are different think tanks that publish indexes of failed state or fragile state, but interestingly the scores of these indexes are different (figure#1). The failed /fragile states index ranked Pakistan 13th most failed state (2015) but in Human development index Pakistan is on 42nd (descending order) in the index. In States fragility Index and Global peace index this country is placed on 28th and
Figure 1. Table of failed states indexes, ranking by different think tanks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Failed State Fragility Index 2015</th>
<th>Human Development Index (Descending) 2014</th>
<th>State Fragility Index (2014)</th>
<th>Global Peace Index (Descending order of 162 countries) 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>South Sudan</td>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>Central African Republic</td>
<td>Syria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>Congo</td>
<td>D.R of Congo</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Central African Republic</td>
<td>Central African Republic</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>South Sudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Congo (D. R.)</td>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>South Sudan</td>
<td>Central African Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>Somalia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>Congo(D.R.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>Guinea dial</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>North Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>Guinea-Bissau</td>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>Guinea-Bissau</td>
<td>Libya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Cote d'Ivoire</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>Israel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>Gambia</td>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>Yemen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Guinea Bissau</td>
<td>Côte d'Ivoire</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>Djibouti</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>Lebanon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>Venezuela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>Philippine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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9th number respectively. For this study failed states index has been selected because of its most common usage in the media. The index of failed/fragile states is produced by Funds for peace (FFP) and hosted by Foreign Policy magazine. Funds for peace (FFP) is an American think tank, established in 1957. Since 2005 they have been publishing failed states index but since 2014, they changed its title to fragile states index. They claim that their index is widely used by international groups, countries and organizations including United Nations for evaluating the state of a country.

In their first index (2005), they gave 89.4 points (figure 2 and 3) to Pakistan with the position of 34th in the chart of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 1. Cont.</th>
<th>Uganda</th>
<th>Benin</th>
<th>Cameroon</th>
<th>Chad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Cote d'Ivoire</td>
<td>Rwanda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>Iran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td>Lesotho</td>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>North Korea</td>
<td>Comoros</td>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td>Cameron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>Papua Guinea</td>
<td>New Sierra Leone</td>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Myanmar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Congo (Republic)</td>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>Burundi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>Gambia</td>
<td>Niger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Timor-Leste</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>Mali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>Eritrea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>Congo-Brazzaville</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>Djibouti</td>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Djibouti</td>
<td>Swaziland</td>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>El Salvador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>Mauritania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Comoros</td>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Guinea-Bissau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>Equatorial Guinea</td>
<td>Equatorial Guinea</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Newman (Newman, 2009) produced this table but it has reproduced with fresh data.
failed states of the world. But surprisingly the next year they ranked it to a world 9th most failed state of the world with the score of 103 points without giving any justification. Since then, ranking of Pakistan has been remaining in between 9 to 13th in the index.

Dr Lamba points out that branding a country as a failed state is the first step to enslave it—politically, economically and culturally (Lamba, 2014). If we go through all the year (2005) news reports on Pakistan, nothing especial was reported only a massive earthquake in the northern areas of the country. But it was overcome with the support of the entire nation. In security and economical point it was a peaceful and prosperous year without any big incident of terrorism. Pakistan has been facing bomb blasts and suicide attacks since 2007 before this there was no wave of terrorism. So could we say that since 2006, Pakistan was declared as failed state but on what grounds? The question needs to be answered: Is that behind some systematic evaluation, negligence or some empirical agenda?

It needs to remind that in 2005-06 the growth rate of Pakistan was 7 plus and at that prosperous period, this country was framed a failed state by the leading section of Western news media(B. News, 2006) on the basis of this think tank report.

In any report or index, the key question is, what is the source of information of that organization. But after analysing failed/fragile states indexes its revealed that most of their information are incorrect. In 2014, this index (peace, 2014) ranked Pakistan 10th most failed state in the world. In an article published in the same index regarding Pakistan, they pointed out some crises or information, on that ground they analysed this country. But interestingly out of five information mentioned in that report two were wrong. They stated: Prime Minster of Pakistan was arrested on corruption charges, but it’s not true. Raja Pervez Ashraf ex-Prime minister of Pakistan never ever arrested. It was written that after the protest government was agreed to dissolve the parliament and appoint caretaker government to oversee the election but election was held on its time.

So its needs to be checked what their sources of information are? Either they have some credible network, getting information from authentic sources or it is a table cook index? And why the news media didn’t examine these facts?

I asked through an email about these above incorrect information (mentioned above) and also asked for their data sources. In reply they said that they would provide but no answer. According to Dr Lamba, they (administration of failed states index) refuse to release any of the raw data that goes behind the index that they publishes (Lamba, 2014).

William Easterly and Laura Freschi (2010) argue that the concept of failed state or state failure appeared for political reasons because “if we use the number of articles in Foreign Affairs mentioning “state failure” or variants, then it first appeared around the same time as the CIA task force, and then really took off after 9/11 (Easterly and Freschi, 2010). In the case of Pakistan, in year 2005 the US National Intelligence Council (NIC) and Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) in a jointly prepared global future assessment report pointed out that “by year 2015 Pakistan would be a failed state (Report, 2005). And the very next year of that report, Pakistan was
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Noam Chomsky argues that media work on ‘doctrinal system’ where the message of the elite is put out, he further says that the global elite - like the Pentagon-controls what type of message is to be broadcasted in print and in electronic media (Chomsky, 2008). US armed forces, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (serving that time), Admiral Mike Mullen said in his speech at the Failed States Index 2011 launching event that ‘this group (funds for peace) focused on failed states and actually, I think we’re all focused on failed states, whether we’re actually focused on them or not’ (Mullen, 2011). If the statement of Mike Mullen is analysed and examines it with the findings of failed states index, it clearly marks the point, raised by Noam Chomsky, the doctrine system. Such kind of doctrine system was also seen in Iraq war, when US media was running a war campaign against Iraq on false presentation of facts.

Syed Siraj (2006) concludes in his research on Pakistan’s image in US media that American media news framing of other country’s image depends upon the US interest in that country as well as the American foreign policy (Syed, 2006). From 9/11 to till the end of 2004, it’s observed in many studies that US media was very friendly and projecting Pakistan in favourable light on many grounds especially as their front state ally. However in 2005, after the CIA and NIC joint report on Pakistan (Report, 2005), it has been seen a clear change of Western media stance against Pakistan.

Seth Jones (2007) writes in his article that he conducted interviews some US military officials and according to them the tipping point for Pakistan was 2005 (Jones, 2007). So was it the time of shifting US policy against Pakistan? After that so called ‘tipping time’ several media groups started accusing Pakistan for helping Taliban insurgents in Afghanistan, the blame game started. British Channel 4, broadcasted a short documentary in 2005 under the title ‘Pakistan’s double game’ accusing Pakistan on multiple grounds (Obaid, 2005). Its coincidence or some hidden agenda that in same year, 2005 first failed state index was published and ranked Pakistan 34th but very next year, the so called tipping time, they declared it world most 9th failed state (according to FFP, the report of every year is based on the study of it’s previous year). This entire situation confirming Nathan Roger’s study (Roger, 2013), which argues that mass media system has been shifted to rhizomatic (grows horizontally under the ground) media system. Roger points out that such system relates to
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Figure 3. Ranking of Pakistan in failed state index (2005 to 2015)
(Source: Funds for peace official website http://fsi.fundforpeace.org)
deterioralized (take the control of) circulations and weaponization of images and this has resulted the paradigm shift from techno-war to image war (Roger, 2013, p. 170).

According to Denis McQuail (2001), it is clear that the media are everywhere dependent on the rest of society, reactive to more fundamental impulses and subordinate to sources of real economic and political power (McQuail’s, 2001, p. 486). This economic and political power affects on every aspects of the life of common people especially in this case how they perceive other nations through eye of the media.

Media framing is a fundamental journalism theoretical framework by which an issue is portrayed in the news media. News media frames fix boundaries around a news story or some specific matter in the part of agenda setting. The failed states index (2006) constructed a frame in which Pakistan was a failed state. Leading Media giants (including BBC) followed this frame without exploring the facts and drummed it across the world that Pakistan is a failed state. BBC is one of the leading agenda-setter in Western news media. They followed this frame with very harsh headline that Pakistan is a top failed state.

The report - compiled by the US Foreign Policy magazine and the US-based Fund for Peace think-tank - ranked 146 nations according to their viability. Pakistan’s "plunge" Pakistan moved from 34th last year to ninth in the new report - one of the sharpest changes in the overall score of any country on the list. The contributing factors were Pakistan’s inability to police the tribal areas near the Afghan border, the devastating earthquake last October in Kashmir and rising ethnic tensions, the report said.

In examining the above news story, which endorsed the think tank report, it transpires that ‘Pakistan is a top failed state’ the words were not even used in FFP report. Such captions reflects the desire of BBC, how a poorest kind of journalism that is. They even didn’t realise the drastic effects of such story on that country’s economy and image. It was a clear failure or negligence of that media group or they follow some hidden agenda as mentioned by Noam Chomsky the ‘doctrine system’.

Schuefele (1999) argues that we are dealing with two types of frames, media frames and individual (receiver) frame and both kinds of frame are can be either independent (a cause) or dependent (an effect) (Schuefele, 1999). According to agenda setting theory leading media groups set the agenda and rest of the media follow it. In this case it has been seen same practice. FFP index of failed states constructed frame and was projected by BBC and then followed by rest of news media. News coverage’s, reports, talk shows, conferences, in every part of the news media (including Pakistan’s) following same agenda or the frame of failed states index, and with the passage of time it is used now as an adjective to countries like Pakistan. Some of the news stories are selected for better understanding that how word failed has been related to Pakistan by the world news media after the FFP report and BBC story:

"Pakistan 'is a top failed state' a leading story of BBC B. News (2006), broadcasted and published on May 02, 2006. In that story BBC just endorsed the failed state report about Pakistan and no questions asked about the report reliability or authenticity. BBC is one of the largest news media groups of the world; its news is always considering trust worthy and carries importance around the globe. In this news story, they mentioned three issues that on what basis Pakistan earned this position, stated in FFP report. But before publishing this story and declaring a country - failed state, on the basis of some think-tank report, it was the duty of the editor to crosscheck the information. They mentioned the contributions factors but didn’t dig out the facts. Tribal areas conditions have been same for the last many decades, nothing changed in that last one year. There was a massive earthquake in the northern areas of Pakistan including Kashmir in 2005, that’s correct but it is also true how entire nation did support the victims with full national spirits to combat that catastrophe. How fast they recovered and back to life, it was a sign of vibrant nation not the failed one. In last, they mentioned ‘rising ethnic tensions’, but in fact, in 2001 there were 154 incidents of ethnic violence reported across the country and in 2005 the figure fell to 62 and next year 38 incidents were recorded.

In this news story, they mentioned three issues that on what basis Pakistan earned this position, stated in FFP report. But before publishing this story and declaring a country - failed state, on the basis of some think-tank report, it was the duty of the editor to crosscheck the information. They mentioned the contributions factors but didn’t dig out the facts. Tribal areas conditions have been same for the last many decades, nothing changed in that last one year. There was a massive earthquake in the northern areas of Pakistan including Kashmir in 2005, that’s correct but it is also true how entire nation did support the victims with full national spirits to combat that catastrophe. How fast they recovered and back to life, it was a sign of vibrant nation not the failed one. In last, they mentioned ‘rising ethnic tensions’, but in fact, in 2001 there were 154 incidents of ethnic violence reported across the country and in 2005 the figure fell to 62 and next year 38 incidents were recorded.

"Pakistan 'is a top failed state' a leading story of BBC B. News (2006), broadcasted and published on May 02, 2006. In that story BBC just endorsed the failed state report about Pakistan and no questions asked about the report reliability or authenticity. BBC is one of the largest news media groups of the world; its news is always considering trust worthy and carries importance around the globe. In this news story, they mentioned three issues that on what basis Pakistan earned this position, stated in FFP report. But before publishing this story and declaring a country - failed state, on the basis of some think-tank report, it was the duty of the editor to crosscheck the information. They mentioned the contributions factors but didn’t dig out the facts. Tribal areas conditions have been same for the last many decades, nothing changed in that last one year. There was a massive earthquake in the northern areas of Pakistan including Kashmir in 2005, that’s correct but it is also true how entire nation did support the victims with full national spirits to combat that catastrophe. How fast they recovered and back to life, it was a sign of vibrant nation not the failed one. In last, they mentioned ‘rising ethnic tensions’, but in fact, in 2001 there were 154 incidents of ethnic violence reported across the country and in 2005 the figure fell to 62 and next year 38 incidents were recorded.

Schuefele (1999) argues that we are dealing with two types of frames, media frames and individual (receiver) frame and both kinds of frame are can be either independent (a cause) or dependent (an effect) (Schuefele, 1999). According to agenda setting theory leading media groups set the agenda and rest of the media follow it. In this case it has been seen same practice. FFP index of failed states constructed frame and was projected by BBC and then followed by rest of news media. News coverage’s, reports, talk shows, conferences, in every part of the news media (including Pakistan’s) following same agenda or the frame of failed states index, and with the passage of time it is used now as an adjective to countries like Pakistan. Some of the news stories are selected for better understanding that how word failed has been related to Pakistan by the world news media after the FFP report and BBC story:
How the news media have failed to interrogate the concept of failed state, the case of Pakistan
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CONCLUSION

A country that is 43rd largest economy (GDP nominal) of the world and 26th in the chart of GDP-PPP, nearly US $70 billion international trade, producing huge number of doctors, engineers, PhDs and experts in all field, holding 7th largest army equipped with Nuclear and of all kind of modern weapons and to call it a failed state-what a joke. 
Dr Lamba very well said that branding a country as a failed state is the first step to enslave it- politically, economically and culturally (Lamba, 2014).

This study analysed the failed/fragile states index regarding Pakistan’s position and found their information are incorrect and biased. But leading news media BBC just followed the frame of that index and marked this country a failed state and then rest of the media followed this trend, which put drastic effects on this country’s image and on its economy. This study also discovered that when did the foreign policy of US government changed against Pakistan; the results of the index also changed and Pakistan fell in the line of failed states. Hence it is proved that this term is a political construction and to serve specific political agenda. This article also confirms the viewpoint of scholars (Bøås and Jennings, 2005; Call, 2008; Easterly and Freschi, 2010; Ikpe, 2007; Morton, 2005) who see the term failed state as an ethnocentric and hegemonic political agenda. The central argument of this paper is, declaring a county failed state, on the basis of any index report is not justifiable and it produces very negative effects on the entire country’s growth. From the foregoing it transpires that the concept of failed state is not clear, hence this term is not reliable and many scholars of international standing have suggested to abandon this term. It is important to mention here that index of FFP changed its title to fragile states index but large number of news media still using the term of failed state, which should be, abandon as suggested by many scholars.

Christine (2010) argues that in short, the Failed States Index is clearly only one side of the die (Fair, 2010). Christine points out that while sitting at a computer crunching numbers, even with expert input as the index apparently uses, the larger story is missed. Media by large just branded the country like Pakistan a failed state without getting know the inner condition. It was the responsibility of the news media to confirm the reliability of those indexes, their methodology, source of information and as to whether these reports are based on facts or dishing out some empirical or hegemonic agenda. All of these questions pointed out in this paper, actually it was the duty and responsibility of the news media but they failed to even question.
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