

A comparative study of Pakistani and British press regarding the framing of Afghanistan war 2001

Aasima Safdar*

Adrian M. Budiman

Norsiah binti Abdul Hamid

*School of Multimedia Technology and Communication,
University of Utara Malaysia*

*Corresponding auhtor; email: aasima.safdar@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study analyzed how Afghanistan war 2001 was framed by Pakistani and British press. What frames were employed by the newspapers of these two countries in the reporting of Afghanistan attack. For this purpose four newspapers were chosen from Britian and Pakistan namely The Dawn, The Nation, The Independent and The Guardian. The editorilas of these newspapers were analysed by employing the technique of thematic analysis. By analysing the data, it was found that Pakistani and British press mostly framed the coverage of Afghanistan war in a negative stance but at certain points Britsh press adopted positive or neutral stance. Anti war frame was dominnently employed by Pakistani newspapers but humanitrian and rebuilding frames were also observed. Likewise, British press mostly covered Afghanistan under anti war frame but at some points pro war frame was also observed. Overall, it was noted that Pakistani press was more dominated by opposotional and critical themes than British newspapers.

Keywords: *media frames, British and Pakistani press, war on terror, Afghanistan attack 2001*

INTRODUCTION

The tragedy took place in the US when the terrorists on September 11, 2001 crashed four hijacked planes. Two planes smashed into World Trade Center in New York City, the third plane into Pentagon

and the fourth plane into the ground in Pennsylvania. It killed nearly 3000 passengers and damaged more than 30 million square feet area in Lower Manhattan (Bram, Orr & Rapaport, 2002). The Bush administration immediately framed these attacks as ‘act of war’ but within few hours this framing was replaced by “war on terror” (Zhang, 2007). Consequently, this redefined “American foreign policy and its national security strategy” (Snauwaert, 2004, p. 121). As President Bush declared that the attacks were “more than acts of terror. They were acts of war” (Bush, 2001a). After these attacks, America launched war against terrorism and in its first phase, Afghanistan was attacked on October 7, 2001 by US and coalition forces (Rose, 2002). The objective of the war was to combat against Al-Qaeda and Taliban who were considered as the guilty party of 9/11 atrocity.

Media Coverage of September 11 Attacks and War on Terror

The coverage of the 9/11 attacks and war on terror were the big stories in world media and particularly in the West. In Britain the 9/11 attacks were portrayed as an “act of war” rather than just an act of terrorism. BBC news adopted the frame of “Attack on America” (McNair, 2010). The day following the September 11 attacks, nearly all British newspapers published news about the demolished towers with offending gesture (Kennedy, 2001). Greensdale notes that the most distinguished feature of British news coverage was the depiction of US ‘as one of us’ (Kennedy, 2001). The British channels were also flooded with the stories of 9/11, Afghanistan, Al-Qaida and press conferences of US government officials and gave little space for dissenting or neutral view points (McQueen, 2010). Principally the British media demonstrated feelings of annoyance and fear towards the incident of 9/11 when the Prime Minister of United Kingdom, Mr. Tony Blair declared solidarity and compassion for Americans and mentioned that several British people also killed in terrorists attacks, indicated the media to frame the event as an “attack on us” by “them”. Later the attack in Afghanistan was portrayed as a legitimate response to the disastrous incident of 9/11 (McNair, 2010).

Similarly, the coverage of 9/11 attacks and war on terror was also a big event for Pakistani media. Previously, the press was more concerned about domestic, political and social issues but now it had to cover an international conflict at its doorstep. Pakistani news channels and newspapers gave extensive coverage to the incident of

9/11 and thereafter the campaign against terrorism. The statements of Pakistan's government in the national press got more credence than the coverage of US, NATO, Taliban and Afghanistan; and in respect to the framing of war, the Pakistani media did not show favorable impressions towards the US policies against terrorism (Ahmad, Mahsud & Ishtiaq, 2011).

After 9/11 attacks, the US announced its war against Terrorism and started its action against Al Qaeda in Afghanistan. On October 07, 2001, the US army attacked Afghanistan with its allies. In this war, Pakistan and British Governments decided to support America. British army participated in this war and Pakistani government provided logistic and political support to the US. However, the War on Terror was championed by the US. America attacked Afghanistan and Iraq in the context of War on Terror but present article did not focus on US media. This article explored that how Pakistani and British press framed Afghanistan attack 2001 as both were major allies in the war on Terror. What frames were utilized by the press and what themes dominated the coverage of war. The comparative analysis of press from Britain and Pakistan depicted the differences in the framing of war on terror from two perspectives.

Media Framing

The term frame is mostly referred to as "topic" but Reese (2007) regards it as "organizing" and "structuring" work. In like manner, de Vreese (2005) concludes that frame underlines the prominent aspects of the issue. In fact, frames categorize the world for the journalists who report them and the audiences who trust these reports (Gitlin, 1980). The application of framing strategies is common in communications and reporting of news.

Nelson and Boynton (1997) argue that frames affect public thought by emphasizing particular principles and information, and portray them as an issue of significant value whereas if they appear in a different frame, that frame may depict the reality alternatively. In the case of war on terror, many studies describe how different media outlets frame the incident. Some of the media support this war; particularly American and Western media but on the other hand, Middle Eastern and Muslim countries adopt an oppositional stance and some channels or newspapers are concerned about the consequences of war.

Kinder and Sanders (1990) have said that frames are often entrenched in political discussion, this is quite identical to the idea of media frames and the individual frames that depict the “internal structures of the mind” (p.74). Entman (1991) mentions the difference between individual and media frames, explaining the individual frame as “information-processing schemata” of individuals and media frames as “attributes of the news itself” (p.7). In fact, news frame “creates a structure on which other elements are built” (Cappella & Jamieson, 1997, p. 39). Bateson stated that frames demarcate “a class or set of messages (or meaningful actions)” (1972, p.186), accordingly, people understand and estimate the social reality in framed communication (Clair, 1993).

As a matter of fact, media plays a decisive role in accepting and publicizing frames offered by other media channels, newspapers or social actors. Subsequently, world is framed through journalists (Jamieson & Waldman, 2003) but occasionally, we find political voices more dominant than others. This practice is common due to media’s reliance on government sources (Fishman, 1980). Many researchers argued that most US media supported its government in its coverage of war on terror and highly depended on official sources (Kellner, 2004; Levenson, 2004; MacArthur, 2003; Ryan, 2004). However, the present study investigated how often the Pakistani and British press followed their respective government policies, rely on government sources or adopted a neutral and critical approach. In this way, the study investigated what media frames were used by Pakistani and British press in the coverage of Afghanistan war of 2001.

Pakistan and British Governments’ Response to War on Terror

It was noticed that Pakistan and British governments adopted pro-US policies in the perspective of War on Terror after 9/11 attacks. Richard Armitage, the United States (US) deputy secretary of state, said to Lieutenant General Mahmood Ahmed, Pakistan’s Inter Service Intelligence (ISI) chief, on September 12, 2001 that “you are either one hundred percent with us or one hundred percent against us – there is no grey area” (Abbas, 2005, p. 217). Immediately after this Pakistan’s government announced its full support to war on terror. Pakistan provided logistic support, intelligence sharing and also shared air bases to US forces for attacking Taliban in Afghanistan.

Moreover, Pakistan provided over flight rights, access to Pakistani air, naval and land bases. Pakistan government ignored sentiments of Pakistani public that were against War on terror (Malik, 2008). Former President Musharraf discarded all diplomatic relations with Taliban government due to US pressures and accepted all the US's demands without any hesitation (Rashid, 2008). The US administration appreciated Pakistan's support to war on terror and Pakistan was declared as "major non-NATO ally (Kronstadt, 2004). However, Pakistan government gave enough support to the US in their war on terror but US government always pressurized Pakistan to "DO more". The situation was quite complicated for Pakistan government (Rana & Gunaratna, 2007). The US's increasing demands to Pakistan in the war on terror annoyed Pakistani society and media. Pakistani media frequently criticized Pakistan Government's decision to support the war on terror.

Likewise, the British response on 9/11 attacks was also immediate. Prime Minister Blair commented that terrorist attacks were not "just an attack on people and buildings but an attempt to provoke, through terror, such chaos that it engulfed our way of life, the very values we hold dear." President Bush stressed that "war against terrorism is not, however, just America's fight ... This is civilization's fight" (Marsh, 2003, p. 66). Blair offered immense support to the US on the War on Terror. Tony Blair said that Britain would stand shoulder to shoulder with their American friends. He emphasized that British nation "will not rest until this evil is driven from our world" (Marsh, 2003, p. 56). President Bush endorsed British support on the War on terror and said during his speech to joint session of American Congress on September 20, 2001 that Britain was the true friend for America (Marsh, 2003). These assertions indicated great cooperation on the War on Terror between the US and Britain. Blair government supported attack against Afghanistan. British forces participated in the air bombardment against Taliban and also enhanced intelligence cooperation for US forces (Marsh, 2003). Blair also provided diplomatic support to the US and convinced other countries to support the US on the war. At this point, the British public opinion was also supportive to attack Afghanistan. The discussion above indicated that British and Pakistan governments decided to support the US actions in war against Terrorism and also participated in the war.

Framing of War on Terror and Afghanistan Attack 2001

However, from the perspective of media coverage of war on terror, it was noticed that world media gave immense importance to this issue. Particularly, in America and the Western countries it was the prime story. The studies on the US media indicated that the US media mostly supported government policies and projected the frame of 'war on Terror' in its coverage (Reynolds & Barnett, 2003; Haes, 2003; Entman, 2003; Ryan, 2004; Kellner, 2004).

In the case of British press, Franks (2003) noted that during the 'War on Terror' the British Army pressed the media to maneuver the facts in favor of war. As Franks (2003) remembered, a British Army Commander told him that the military wanted a 'particular message delivered to particular audiences', and that media is, 'a tool, a weapon, a battle-winning asset' (Franks, 2003). Similarly, Robinson, Goddard, Parry and Murray (2009) identified British media's conformity to the official viewpoint by relying on government sources and notion of patriotism. On the other hand, the researchers also found considerable data on causalities and humanitarian issues. Somehow it indicated towards the objective and balanced coverage trends of British media as well. There were certain elements in UK media that distinguished it from US media regarding the coverage of terrorism.

Papacharissi and Oliveria (2008) presented a comparative analysis of US and UK newspapers about the reporting of terrorist attacks. They found that US newspapers gave more coverage to military aspects, political personalities and excluded the information associated with diplomatic perspective while UK papers were concerned about the all international players related to the issue of terrorism, more use of global resources and foreign experts, alternative policy options and diplomatic assessment of terrorist attacks. They argued that national government policies of US and UK generally influenced the media strategies about the coverage of any issue.

As Britain and America had been involved in Iraq and Afghanistan, it was mostly observed that British press projected both military and diplomatic arguments but US media seemed to be more focused on war strategies and pro war ideas. Although this might be true but Susan (2004) came up with different findings. She analyzed '*The Independent*', the British daily. It was observed that the newspaper presented both positive and negative images of America regarding the war on terror. During the initial days of September 11,

attacks America was portrayed as a victim but later on it was presented as combatant or a “country out of revenge at every cost” (p. 18). *The Independent* chose this frame due its liberal ideology because the paper does not hesitate to express its opinion against the government. By the same token, Hammond (2003) proclaimed that British main stream media, for instance, Channel Four and Daily Mirror had included many references of criticism on American imperialism and also presented reports related to anti-war protests and condemnation.

However, in the case of Pakistani media, it was not welcoming towards the country’s involvement in war on terror; even it criticized President Musharruf policies regarding combating terrorism. The Pakistani media was also skeptical about the impact of US policies on the Pakistani citizens and the future of Pakistan (Singh, 2003). The war on terror had been widely criticized in local language press of Pakistan. The journalists framed America negatively and even declared it the ‘biggest evil’ ‘the real terrorist’ wrote by Pakistani columnist (Shah, 2010). At the start of ‘war on terror’ somehow Pakistani media adopted a positive and neutral stance towards American policies but with the passage of time the US aggressive policies against Afghanistan, Iraq and allegations against Pakistan’s relations with Taliban enraged the media. Furthermore Pakistani local press adopted stricter stance against US strategies and focused on national interest of the country (Khan & Safdar, 2010). As a result, the Pakistani press was also not very supportive towards the Pakistani government’s activities against terrorism; elite media had a neutral standpoint towards countering terrorism activities of government. However, these media were concerned the issues of national security, development projects and peace agreements. Media does not toe Pakistan’s foreign policy regarding the issue of war on terror (Khan & Imran, 2011).

The Pakistani media did not support the government alliance with US in ‘War on Terror’; it framed America as a constant threat for Pakistani interests. Nawa-e-Waqt declared that US president is ‘aiming directly’ at Pakistan. Likewise, Dawn wrote, “we do not wish to become an enemy of the United States, but neither are we prepared to be the target of an enemy dressed as a friend” (Terradellas, 2008). The growing cross border attacks by US forces from Afghanistan area are worsening Pakistan US relation as Pakistani authorities had expressed their extreme resentment. In these circumstances the Pakistani media was filled with anti American sentiments and highly

critical of American activities in the tribal area of Pakistan (The Layalina Review, 2011). The discussion above demonstrated that the Pakistani media was in an aggressive mood that had denounced war on terror and moreover advocating some changes in the realm of Pakistan's foreign policy.

By keeping in view the previous literature, the present study explored the stance of coverage by Pakistani and British press. The research questions were given below.

RQ: How Afghanistan war 2001 framed by Pakistani and British newspapers?

RQ: What frames were employed by the Pakistani and the British press in the coverage of Afghanistan war 2001?

METHOD

For this study qualitative research design had been employed because this design had holistic approach and descriptive in its nature. This provided an opportunity to the researcher to build a complex and holistic picture, analyzes words, reports, information and conducts research in a natural setting (Creswell, 1994). Similarly, Shank (2002) defined qualitative research as "a form of systematic empirical inquiry into meaning" (p. 5). In this research, the qualitative approach analyzed the coverage of war on terror in British and Pakistani newspaper editorials. It examined the whole text and information in the editorials. For analysing the text of newspaper editorials, the study employed the technique of thematic analysis.

Thematic analysis was one of the qualitative techniques that were mostly employed by the researchers. It identified 'what' and 'how' themes take place into text (Popping, 2000) through "careful reading and re-reading of the data" (Rice & Ezzy, 1999, p.258). Thematic analysis was utilized to analyze classifications and patterns within data. It described data with rich detail and interpretation (Boyatzis, 1998). Braun and Clarke (2006) define thematic analysis as a qualitative systematic method for "identifying, analyzing and reporting patterns (themes) within data. It minimally organized and described your data set in (rich detail). However, frequently it went further than this, and interpreted various aspects of the research topic" (p. 79).

Thematic analysis was further assisted by computer-assisted programs that facilitate the data analysis process such as Atlas-ti, Nudist or NVivo. Thus, computer software programmes facilitated the coding process of thematic analysis but it was only the first step (Boyatzis, 1998). The next step was data interpretation that was quite imperative that explained the coded data in the relevant context.

Population for the Study

For this study two British newspapers namely *the Guardian* and *the Independent* and two Pakistani newspapers *the dawn* and *the nation* were selected. Newspapers were retrieved from the Lexis Nexuses database and newspaper web sites.

The population for this research study included all editorials using the word “war on terror” or “9/11”, or “Al Qaeda”, or “Afghanistan war 2001”, or “Osama bin Laden” in the headline or leading paragraph in the selected newspapers from 07 October 2001 to 01 March 2002. This time period was chosen because Afghanistan was attacked on 07 October 2001. The coverage of five months was analyzed.

Unit of Analysis

The entire editorial including title, headline, body text and theme was taken as unit of analysis. The rest of the articles, photographs and editorial cartoon on editorial page were excluded from the study. The editorial was chosen for the study because editorial depicted the opinion of its newspaper and organization. Moreover, the editorial also gave impression regarding the political affiliation of the newspaper and depicted the newspaper policy. The editorial depicted the opinion of a newspaper on the particular issue rather than objective reporting. That's why editorials for this study were chosen.

Analytical Strategy

By applying thematic analysis the researcher investigated how Pakistani and British press framed the coverage of Afghanistan attack 2001. For analyzing the content from newspapers, the study employed Inductive and deductive thematic analysis. The editorials of Pakistani British newspapers were chosen as the unit of analysis.

The researcher started to analyze data based on the prior categories derived from previous literature but during analysis new themes and categorizes emerged from data.

In this study three types of coding was utilized: open coding, axial coding and selective coding (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Open coding involved labeling and classifying the phenomenon that was pointed by the data. Coding did not bring descriptions of the different aspects of data but it captured its meanings (Charmaz, 2006; Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Axial coding: during this process the data was analyzed again by making associations between categories and its subcategories (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). The analysis explained the phenomenon implanted in the data. Selective coding integrated the categories to a structure or theoretical framework. Based on the following method data from British and Pakistani editorials was analyzed. For this purpose the researcher used NVIVO 10. The data indicated the positive, neutral or negative themes of the data. The data pointed out different media frames and prominent issues. At the last stage, the researcher found out core categories from the data. These core categories depicted findings of the study.

FINDINGS

By analyzing the coverage of British newspapers (*The Guardian* and *The Independent*), it was observed that the negative themes were more dominant than positive or neutral. Similarly pakistani press (*The Dawn* and *The Nation*) also framed Afghanistan war in a negative stance mostly. However, *The Nation* newspaper appeared to be more critical against war on terror, Afghanistan attack and the Government policies of Pakistan in this context.

Framing of Afghanistan war by the British Press

First discuss the findings from the British press. From the perspective of positive and neutral framing, it was noted that British newspapers highlighted positive public opinion, European support to Afghanistan attack, allied victories in Afghanistan and justifications of war. In certain editorials *The Guardian* and *The Independent* wrote that they supported action against Afghanistan. As *The Guardian* wrote during October and November 2001 that military action against Afghanistan

was justified because America was brutally attacked by the enemy. For this reason, it was the legitimate act to defend the nation from further loss. The US was also successful in getting UN backing for the attack but not very much active support. *The guardian* also mentioned morning's Guardian-ICM polls that predominantly supported attack on Afghanistan.

During November and December 2001, there were certain editorials noted from *The Guardian* and *The Independent* which hailed early victories of the allied forces in Afghanistan. *The guardian* stated that Taliban easily surrendered even within a month. This development was unexpected. Afghanistan was also ready for new government setup with UN backing. It was quite astonishing for those who believed that Afghanistan campaign would be difficult with the passage of time. *The guardian* wrote that it was quite successful campaign for Mr. Bush in which Taliban surrendered so early but later on they had to be engaged with ground actions that were more dangerous and there was also a threat of prolonged guerilla war fair. *The Independent* suggested that the military campaign in Afghanistan must be accompanied by political initiatives. As *the Independent* stated on November 14, 2001 that;

“THE IMAGES beamed from Kabul yesterday were as old as war itself: the triumphal entry of the victorious fighters; the joyous reception from the liberated population; and the bloodied corpses of those identified with the old regime who failed to flee in time. As the advance guard of the Northern Alliance walked into Kabul at dawn, the taboos of the Taliban were broken. Music played on the radio; men shaved off their beards; women uncovered their heads” (*The Independent*, November 14, 2001, p. 3)

The negative framing of the war mostly included the stories related to the criticism on heavy bombardment, collateral damages, US's lack of interest towards humanitarian and diplomatic concerns, Bush's axis of evil and objections against Northern Alliance as a proxy force. *The guardian* framed the attack as an 'indiscriminate devastation'. It stated that;

Huge earth-shaking explosions, horizons filled with flame and smoke, doomsday clamor and an indiscriminate devastation:

these are the familiar, unnerving symptoms of a bankrupt policy, of plans lacking or gone awry, of exponential escalation and dread futility. Familiar because the world has seen the Americans go this way before, in Vietnam, in Cambodia and in Iraq, with no good result (*The Guardian*, November, 02, 2001).

Later on many of editorials observed from *The Guardian* and *The Independent* which condemned heavy bombardment and collateral damages in Afghanistan. In this respect the editorials criticized the US's pro war policies. In October and November 2001, *the Independent* condemned indiscriminate bombardment by the forces. It was stated that CIA had failed to provide correct intelligence regarding the location of Al Qaeda leaders and the areas to be bombed. By doing intensified bombing they damaged their campaign. Their campaign could be successful when they achieved their targets, by enhancing bombardment they were damaging public support to the war. Through heavy bombardment, the US would not be able to frame its image as a victim; there were plenty of reasons for which the people disliked America. The continuous bombing would enrage the Muslim world and it could be exploited by the extremists. It was needed that bombing should be paused for two days; the aid agencies could provide food. *The Guardian* argued that contrary to this situation, the US government was only concerned to target the militants and avoided the human aspect. Even it mentioned the US commander-in-chief statement regarding the bombardment in Afghanistan;

“Here was the US commander-in-chief once again asserting the moral right to use any means, including military force, to destroy anybody he might arbitrarily deem to be a terrorist, terrorist sympathiser, or otherwise an enemy of America, at home or abroad” (*The Guardian*, November, 23, 2001, p. 23).

Moreover, *The guardian* commented that after war, it should be US's prime responsibility to reconstruct the country to eradicate poverty and disparities which were producing extremists like Osama Bin Laden. However, *the Independent* argued that after defeating Taliban, America planned nation building in Afghanistan but its strategy to form acceptable political setup was not apparent. It was more committed to military gains. It seemed that US was determined to kill or capture Osama and Al Qaeda leaders and not much interested

in post Taliban setup. British government's stand was that after Taliban fall there should be stable government installed. The Britain should be determined to this and the US should not leave Afghanistan as it did after Soviet withdrawal.

The above mentioned findings noted that British press mostly employed anti-war frame in its coverage of the war. As well as certain editorials from the British newspapers also discussed the plight of refugees and prisoners of war which indicated humanitarian frame. Moreover, British press urged on the US to reconstruct Afghanistan after war that pointed towards rebuilding frame. Lastly, few editorials indicated towards pro-war frame which included the themes of victories of war, support to military action and condemnation against al Qaeda.

Framing of Afghanistan War by the Pakistani Press

However, from the perspective of Pakistani press it was noted that Pakistani coverage was dominated by anti war frame but humanitarian frame and rebuilding frames were also observed. But there was none of the editorial framed the war under pro war frame. The editorials which framed the Afghanistan war in a negative stance included the discussion related to negative public opinion, protests, consequences of war, criticism on the United States policies, collateral damages, casualties, Government process in Afghanistan, the United States' lack of interest in reconstruction process and the extension of War on Terror.

In certain editorials *The Nation* pointed towards protests and negative public opinion against Afghanistan war. *The Nation* wrote in its editorial on October 14, 2001 that after the start of Afghanistan war, there were many protests in different cities of the world such as Kathmandu, Rio de Janeiro, Srinagar, Chennai, Hyderabad, Kolkata, Tehran, Bangkok, Kuala Lumpur, Dhaka and largest processions in Pakistan. The protestors framed the attacks as terrorism. The protestors in Palestine called the United States as "the head of terrorism" and the protestors from Tehran called President Bush as "father of terrorism". *The Nation* argued that after 9/11 President Bush adopted vengeful mood against Al Qaeda and Osama. It was stressed if the United States was determined to attack Afghanistan, it had to provide concrete evidence and should make it clear either its campaign was limited to Osama or extended to wipe out Al Qaeda.

In many editorials *the Nation* and *the Dawn* discussed the rising causalities in Afghanistan and mentioned worldwide concerns against it. It was argued that the aim of the campaign should be to restrict terrorism not to get revenge. Otherwise, the present world would be reduces to old ages of development. Due to civilian casualties, powerful resistance was emerging in the Muslim world and also in the European world. There were protests and anti war allies that stressed to stop killing of people. The United States used cluster bombs in Afghanistan. The world community had raised questions regarding the terrorism campaign. *The Dawn* stated that the humanitarian organizations condemned the use of cluster bombs.

After the collapse of Taliban Government in Afghanistan, *the Dawn* showed its concerns to the deteriorating security conditions in Afghanistan. On February 04, 2003, *the Dawn* highlighted the United Nations' apprehensions against the chaotic conditions of the country. It was argued that the 4000 strong international peacekeeping force were stationed in Kabul and rest of the country was unprotected. The war lords had become strong and did not accept the writ of Kabul Government. In these conditions the aid agencies were unable to provide relief to the civilians. There was lawlessness, attacks on the United Nations personals, incidents of violence, robberies and bomb blasts. *The Nation* stressed on the United Nations role in post war reconstruction of the country. France, Russia and China also wanted strong United Nations presence in Afghanistan. These countries were of the opinion that forces should be used to fight terrorism but later on diplomatic and economic options should be adopted to root out the terrorism. Pakistan was of the opinion that in Afghanistan there should be multi ethnic and broad based Government should be formed. Due to that none of the faction felt deprived and resented. Such type of Government could give prosperity to Afghanistan and all faction could coexist.

There were certain editorials by *the Dawn* criticized the extension of War on Terror to Iraq. On December 01, 2001, *The Nation* commented that the hawkish elements in Bush administration had stressed President Bush to "seize the opportunity to oust" Saddam. They even knew that there was no logical link between 9/11 and Saddam but they were ready to punish Saddam. It was argued that Bush administration was not only willing to attack Iraq but also other countries such as Iran, Sudan, Somalia, Syria and Muslim majority reason Philippine. *The Nation* wrote that;

“Stop it here” (*The Nation*, December 11, 2001, p. 6)

Above mentioned aspects framed the War on Terror in a negative stance but there were certain editorials which portrayed the struggle in a neutral stance. These editorials included the discussion regarding the formation of new Government in Afghanistan, Pakistan's relations with the new Government and the role of United Nations. It was also suggested that the US should reduce its presence in post war scenario and Pakistan Government should also less interfere in the Government making process of Afghanistan.

The Nation endorsed President Musharraf's view point that the military campaign in Afghanistan should be followed by economic and political rebuilding. It was hoped that after war, the United States would fulfill its promise regarding the economic and political rehabilitation of Afghanistan. With the start of Afghanistan campaign president Musharraf suggested that broad band and multi ethnic Government should be installed in Afghanistan by including moderate Taliban. Pakistani press argued that the broad band Government could stabilize the country and would discourage fighting between hostile groups. It would be a good opportunity for diverse groups to coexist. Otherwise, the anarchy in Afghanistan would affect Pakistan and would lead to regional instability. It was also stressed that the United States should reduce its presence and the United Nations should facilitate the process of neutral Government in Afghanistan.

Overall, Pakistani press was much concerned about the rebuilding of Afghanistan. Pakistani newspapers criticized many issues regarding Afghanistan war such as collateral damages, the United States' lack of interest in rebuilding and the United States' pro war policies. *The Dawn* gave immense importance to the rebuilding and the broad band Government in Afghanistan. Concluding, it was observed that anti-war frame and rebuilding frame were frequently used by Pakistani press in the coverage of Afghanistan war 2001.

DISCUSSION

After 9/11 Pakistani and British press gave immense coverage to War on Terror. There was number of editorials analyzed from British and Pakistani newspapers which discussed the War on Terror, Afghanistan war 2001 and other issues related to the 9/11 attacks or the War on

Terror. There were certain difference observed between the Pakistani and the British press regarding the framing of the War on Terror but at the same time, there was one similarity. The coverage of War on Terror was dominated by anti-war frame by both the British and the Pakistani newspapers. There were number of editorials observed which adopted negative frame to cover the War on Terror. There were many negative themes were observed from British and Pakistani newspapers relating to the framing of the War on Terror. However the newspaper in both countries was negative on the War on Terror but there were certain differences.

While discussing the War on Terror, Pakistani newspapers used more hard language, tone and expression than Britain newspapers. Both newspapers criticized America for its aggressive polices regarding Muslim countries but Pakistani newspapers expressed more anger and annoyances against America. Furthermore there were more editorials that discussed War on Terror from Pakistani newspapers than British press.

After 9/11 attacks British press criticized America for its injustices to Arab world, failure of US intelligence agencies and America's vengeful actions against the Muslim countries. However, Pakistani newspapers commented on the mistreatment and hate crimes against the Muslim community in America. They also criticized the United States post 9/11 policies and framed them as aggressive actions. Pakistani newspapers argued that the United States used 9/11 to extend its aggressive agenda against the Muslim countries and served its interests in oil enrich areas of the Central Asian States and the Middle East. Moreover, the United States gave more free hand to Israel which increased its repression against Palestinians after 9/11 and framed Palestinian fighting as Palestinian brand of terrorism. Ayisha (2002) found in her study on Arab media that it mostly criticized America for its pro Israel polices against Palestine. The Arab coverage was supportive to Palestine cause and negatively framed America and Israel.

The present article indicated that regarding the War on Terror, British press was concerned about the consequences of war that would cause civilian casualties, disrupt world economy and dangerous area in Afghanistan could give tough time to allied forces. It was also expressed that War on Terror had no clear objectives and it was a vengeful action against Afghanistan without strong evidences against Osama. However, Pakistani newspapers were more concerned

regarding the implications of the War on Terror on Pakistan. It was argued that by supporting War on Terror, Pakistan had to face more security challenges from Afghanistan Taliban and from those factions from Pakistan that had soft corner for Taliban. Secondly, Pakistan had to face the burden of refugees from Afghanistan that was an extra burden on Pakistan economy. Likewise, Pakistani press was much concerned regarding negative framing of Pakistan by the western media. It was argued that when Pakistan was supporting War on Terror; why Western media adopted hostile posture against Pakistan's agencies. Pakistani highlighted public protests inside Pakistan and hate crimes against Pakistanis in the United States. Pakistani press stressed that War on Terror set bad precedent for other countries. The aggressive countries justified their oppressive activities in their occupied areas in the name of War on Terror such as Israel and India.

During Afghanistan attack 2001, the British press highlighted critical argument against war, civilian casualties and heavy bombardment in Afghanistan. But there were certain editorials noted which supported the war and hailed the early victory of allied forces in Afghanistan. They expressed their concerns regarding the evidence against Osama but at the same time, the press considered the attack justified against Afghanistan. Nevertheless, from Pakistani perspective, it was noted that Pakistani press was more critical against Afghanistan war than the British press. Pakistani newspapers highlighted public protests inside the country and discussed their impact on Pakistan's stability. Pakistani newspapers debated on the lack of evidences against Osama and criticized Pakistani Government for supporting War on Terror without having strong evidence against Osama.

During war process, it was noted that Pakistani newspapers described more incidents of civilian casualties than British press. Pakistan newspapers described the number of casualties and provided details regarding civilian killings. It was narrated that US and Northern Alliance massacred many Taliban and Pushtoon in Afghanistan. Moreover, Pakistani press was more concerned regarding the rebuilding of Afghanistan. From the start of Afghanistan attack, Pakistani press focused on future political set up in Afghanistan. It was continuous theme that was noted frequently. During the coverage of Afghanistan war, there was no pro war frame was noted by Pakistani press. The press adopted anti war frame, rebuilding and humanitarian frame. Similarly, Khan and Safdar (2010) found that Pakistani press

adopted negative stance against War on terror, Afghanistan attack 2001 and US policies in the region and stressed on the national interest of Pakistan. Similarly, British press also adopted anti war, rebuilding and humanitarian frame but there were certain editorials noted which adopted pro war frame by supporting the war in Afghanistan. Hammond (2003) also found in his study that British media such as Channel Four and Daily Mirror criticized American imperialism and included stories related to anti war protests and condemnation.

Overall, it could be concluded that framing of War on Terror was dominated by anti war frame by the newspapers of Pakistan and Britain but Pakistani press adopted more critical and oppositional stance against the war than the British press. Sometimes, British press appeared to be neutral or supportive to their Government policies but Pakistani press was completely against the Afghanistan attack and criticized Pakistan Government's support to it. However, press from both the countries emphasized to address the root causes of terrorism.

REFERENCES

- Abbas, H. (2005). *Pakistan's drift into extremism: Allah, the army and America's war on terror*. New Delhi: Pentagon Press.
- Ahmad, I.M., Mahsud, N.M., & Ishtiaq, T. (2011). Pakistani press and war against terrorism in democratic era. *Berkeley Journal of Social Science*, 1(5).
- Ayisha, M.I. (2002). Political communication on Arab World Television: Evolving pattern. *Political Communication*, 19, 137-154.
- Boyatzis, R.E. (1998). *Transforming qualitative information: Thematic analysis and code development*. London: Sage Publications.
- Braun, V. & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in Psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101. ISSN 1478-0887
- Bram, J., Orr, J., & Rapoport, C. (2002). Measuring the Effects of the September 11 Attack on New York City. *FRBNY Economic Policy Review*, (November), 5-20.
- Bush, W. (2001). Remarks by the president in photo opportunity with the national security team. Retrieved 12 September 2001, from <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010912-4.html>.

- Cappella, J. N., & Jamieson, K. H. (1997). *Spiral of cynicism: The press and the public good*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory. A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Clair, R.P. (1993). The use of framing devices to sequester organizational narratives: Hegemony and harassment. *Communication Monographs*, 60 (June), 113-136.
- Cresswell, J.W. (1994). *Research design: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- De Vreese, H. C. (2005). News framing: Theory and typology. *Information Design Journal + Document Design*, 13(1), 51–62
- Entman, R. M. (1991). Framing U.S. coverage of international news: Contrasts in narratives of the KAL and Iran air incidents. *Journal of Communication*, 41(4), 6–27.
- Entman, R. M. (2003). Cascading activation: Contesting the White House’s frame after 9/11. *Political Communication*, 20, 415–432.
- Franks, T. (2003). Not war reporting – just reporting. *British Journalism Review*, 14(2), 15-19. Retrieved from http://www.bjr.org.uk/data/2003/no2_franks.htm.
- Fishman, M. (1980). *Manufacturing the news*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Gitlin, T. (1980). *The whole world is watching: Mass media in the making and unmaking of the new left*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Haes, J.W.H. (2003). September 11 in Germany and the United States: Reporting, reception, and interpretation. In A.M. Noll (ed.), *Crisis communications: Lessons from September 11*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Hammond, P. (2003). The Media War on terrorism. *Journal for Crime, Conflict and the Media*, 1(1), 23-36.
- Jamieson, H. K., & Waldman, P. (2003). *The press effect: Politicians, journalists, and the stories that shape the political world*. New York: Oxford University Press,
- Kennedy, P. (2001, September 16). The genie is out of the bottle. The Independent. Retrieved from <http://agument.independent.co.uk/commentators/story.jsp?story-94233>.
- Kellner, D., (2004). Media propaganda and spectacles in the war on Iraq: A critique of U.S. broadcasting networks. *Cultural studies, Critical Methodologies*, 4(3), 329-338.

- Khan, M. A. & Imran, F. (2011). Treatment of Pakistani elite press about government activities against war on terror: A media conformity approach. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 19(3), 331- 341.
- Khan, M. A. & Safdar, A. (2010). Image of U.S. in Pakistani elite newspaper editorials after 9/11 incident: A comparative study of the Dawn and Nawa-i-Waqt. *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences*, 30(2), 325-339.
- Kinder, D. R., & Sanders, L. M. (1990). Mimicking political debate with survey questions: The case of white opinion on affirmative action for blacks. *Social Cognition*, 8(1), 73–103.
- Kronstadt, A. K. (2004). Terrorism in South Asia. CRS Report for Congress, December 13, 2004.
- Levenson, J. (2004). The war on what, exactly? Why the press must be precise. *Columbia Journalism Review*, 43(4) , 9-11.
- MacArthur, J. R. (2003). The lies we bought: The unchallenged “Evidence” for War. *Columbia Journalism Review May/June*, 62–3. Reterieved from <http://www.cjr.org/year/03/3/macarthur.asp> on 31 May 2003.
- Malik, H. (2008). *US Relations with Afghanistan and Pakistan*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Marsh, S. (2003). September 11 and Anglo-American Relations: Reaffirming the special relationship. *Journal of Transatlantic Studies*, (1), 56-75.
- McNair, B. (2010). UK media coverage of September 11. *Journal of Media Sociology*, 2(1-4), 29-37.
- McQueen, D. (2010). Panorama’s coverage of 9-11 and the war on terror. In Political Studies Association (PSA) Conference: Sixty Years of Political Studies: Achievements and Futures, 29 March-1April 2010, Edinburgh University, Scotland.
- Nelson, J. S., & Boynton, G. R. (1997). *Video rhetorics: Televised advertising in American politics*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Papacharissi, Z., & Oliveria, F. M. (2008). Analysis of frames employed in terrorism coverage in U.S. and U.K. Newspapers. *Press/Politics*, 13(1), 52-74.
- Popping, R. (2000). *Computer-assisted text analysis*. London: Sage.
- Rana, M. A., & Gunaratna, R. (2007). Al-Qaeda fights back inside Pakistani Tribal Areas. Pakistan institute for peace studies, Islamabad.

- Rashid, A. (2008). *Decent into chaos*. New York: Penguin Group.
- Reese, D. S. (2007). The framing project: A bridging model for media research revisited. *Journal of Communication*, 57 (1), 148-54.
- Reynolds, A., & Barnett, B. (2003). America under attack: CNN's verbal and visual framing of September 1. In S. Chermak , F. Bailey & M. Brown (Eds.), *Media representations of September 11th* (pp. 85-102). New York: Praeger.
- Rice, P., & Ezzy, D. (1999). *Qualitative research methods: A health focus*. Melbourne, Australia: Oxford University Press.
- Robinson, P., Goddard, P., Parry, K., & Murray, C. (2009) Testing models of media performance in Wartime: U.K. TV News and the 2003 Invasion of Iraq. *Journal of Communication*, 59(3), 534–563. doi:10.1111/j.1460 2466. 2009. 01435.x
- Rose, L. (2002). U.S bombing of Afghanistan not justified as self defense under international law. 59 *Guild Practitioner*, 65, 65-75.
- Ryan, M. (2004). Framing the war against terrorism: US Newspaper editorials and military action in Afghanistan. *Gazette*, 66(5), 363-82.
- Shah, H. (2010). The inside pages: An analysis of the Pakistani Press: The Tongue-tied Press of Pakistan: Comparing English and Urdu Newspapers. The Center for Strategic and International Studies. Retrieved February 24, 2012, from <http://www.pdfdetective.com/pdf/the-inside-pages-an-analysis-of-the-pakistani-press-34817.html>.
- Shank, G. (2002). *Qualitative research. A personal skills approach*. New Jersey: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Singh, R. (2003). Covering September 11 and its consequences: A comparative study of the press in America, India and Pakistan. In N. Palmer (ed.), *Terrorism, war, and the press*, (pp. 27-43). Hollis, NH: Hollis Publishing Company.
- Sнауwaert, T. D. (2004). The Bush Doctrine and Just War Theory. *OJPCR: The Online Journal of Peace and Conflict Resolution*, 6(1), 121-135.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Susan, F. (2004). *A mediated reality of September 11th and the "War on Terrorism": America portrayed in the independent*. The Language and Social Interaction Division, AEJMC Annual Convention. New Orleans, LA.

- Terradellas, V. (2008). Pakistan: Light at the end of the tunnel. *Catalan International View*, 2 (autumn), 44-46.
- The Independent (2001). *This evidence would not convict in court - But it does justify a limited war*. Retrieved from LexisNexis Academic database on 5th October, 2001.
- The Independent (2001). *Fools rush in*. Retrieved from LexisNexis Academic database on 14 November, 2001.
- The Layalina Review. (2011). Pakistan-US Relations strained by media. Retrieved March 2, 2012, from http://www.layalina.tv/Publications/Review/PR_VII.20/article1.html.
- The Guardian (2001). *Britain's loyalty test: Multicultural values must be defended*. Retrieved 02 November, 2001, from LexisNexis Academic database on.
- The Guardian (2001). *Listening time for Bush: He must heed the advice of friends*. Retrieved 23rd November, 2001, from LexisNexis Academic database on.
- The Nation (2001). *Pak troop deployment*. Retrieved 11th December, 2001, from LexisNexis Academic database on.
- Zhang, J. (2007). Beyond anti-terrorism: Metaphors as message strategy of post-September-11 U.S. public diplomacy. *Public Relations Review*, 33(1), 31-39.