

ENSURING PEACE: COVERING OPERATION AGAINST TERRORISM IN NORTH WAZIRISTAN AGENCY

¹Raja Kamran, Assistant Professor, Department of Media and Communication Studies,
National University of Modern Languages, Islamabad

rkamran@numl.edu.pk

Abstract

The paper “*ensuring peace: covering operation against terrorism in North Waziristan Agency*” is focused to analyse the coverage of four leading newspapers from Pakistan and the United States i.e. two newspapers “Daily Dawn and The News” from Pakistan and two “The New York Times and Washington Post” from the United States, that how the newspapers of the two countries has covered the North Waziristan operation that is started by the Pakistan Army to eliminate terrorists from the region. The paper focused on the questions that 1) *How Pakistani newspapers have covered the North Waziristan Operation?* 2) *How the American newspapers have covered the North Waziristan Operation?* The hypothesis for the study is that *the selected Pakistani and American newspapers will favour the North Waziristan operation* which is proved. The framing theory is applied in the study that how selected newspapers framed the selected issues. The Methodology used is Content Analysis technique of data collection. In the study the categories for the analysis are the stance of Government of Pakistan, stance of opposition of Pakistan, stance of Military of Pakistan, stance of Taliban, stance of United States regarding the operation and Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) issue. The front and back pages along with the opinion pages of the selected newspapers are analysed. The overall results show that all the categories showed supportive stance for the North Waziristan operation except Taliban’s stance. All the selected newspapers positively framed the North Waziristan Operation.

Keywords: War on terror, North Waziristan Operation, North Waziristan Agency (NWA), Pakistan, America, Taliban, Terrorists, Newspapers, Framing

Introduction

As result of the September 11, 2001 attacks in the United States by the terrorists, the United States decided to start a global war on terrorism to eliminate terrorism from the world. Al Qaeda was given the responsibility of these attacks by the United States and it was decided to eliminate the terrorist organization which was based in Afghanistan, the country having a long border with Pakistan. United States along with her allies sent the forces in Afghanistan and started the war against terrorism (Yousaf, Ali & Ahmed, 2013; Ali & Shahid, 2012). Pakistan being neighbour of Afghanistan got prime importance and the United States demanded Pakistan’s assistance in the war against terrorism, Pakistan decided to standby with the international powers against the terrorism and became an ally with the United States. After this decision by Pakistani leadership Taliban and the terrorists’ groups considered Pakistan as their enemy and started their activities of terrorism in Pakistan as well (Yousaf & Ali, 2012). Pakistan suffered a lot as result of the support for the United States as Pakistani military, law enforcing agencies and the civilians were targeted by the terrorists. Bomb blasts, suicide attacks and target killings were made on regular basis in Pakistan. In most of the blasts and attacks made Taliban accepted the responsibility. Taliban made their hideouts in northern areas of Pakistan Swat and North

Waziristan, in Swat military operation named Rah-e-Rast was started in 2009 and as result Taliban was eliminated from the region.

Pakistan army is involved in maintaining the security in Pakistan and tackling insurgency and militancy from the region including the federally administrated and provincially administrated tribal areas i.e. FATA & PATA. Army launched five major along with some minor operations against terrorists to eliminate terrorism from the region as the terrorists' activities of some groups where Tehrik-e-Taliban Pakistan was at top of the list among the militants' groups, Pakistan army used its full force utilizing ground and air weapons during the operation. The military operations by the Pakistani forces since 2001 include the US-led operation enduring freedom made in 2001-2002 aiming to overthrow Taliban regime from Afghanistan where Pakistan contributed an important role in the operation, operation Al Mizan was made during 2002 to 2006 where several smaller operations were made, operation Zalzalā in 2008 was made in South Waziristan, Operations named as Sher Dil, Rah-e-Rast and Rah-e-Haq were made during 2007 and 2009 and operation Rah-e-Nijaat was made in 2009-2010 by the military, the major focus of all these operations was to eliminate the terrorism and extremism from the country (Khan, 2010).

After general elections held in May 2013 in Pakistan the government was held by Pakistan Muslim League (Nawaz), Government of Pakistan tried to build consensus various times with Taliban to cease fire as their activities were operational from the other areas like North Waziristan and their leadership was hiding there. Taliban started peace talks with the government but after various meetings by the Government and Taliban delegates including the joint meetings consensus was not built between the government and Taliban as result the government of Pakistan and the military leadership decided to start operation against the Taliban sitting in North Waziristan named as Zarb-e-Azb on June 15, 2014 which is considered as a turning point in the war against terrorism (Ali, 2014). The focus of the study is to analyse that how the elite press of Pakistan and the United States covers the operation as both the countries are the major stake holders in the war against terrorism.

Objectives of the study

- To analyse the Stance of Government of Pakistan regarding the operation
- To analyse the Stance of opposition of Pakistan regarding the operation
- To analyse the Stance of Military of Pakistan regarding the operation
- To analyse the Stance of Taliban regarding the operation
- To analyse the Stance of United States regarding the operation
- To analyse the Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) issue

Literature Review

The terrorist attacks on twin towers in New York on 11 September 2001 left the darkest shadows on international relations and altogether shaken the flow of modern history. The region that indulged from head to toes in after effects of this terrorist attack short after was AF-PAK. The term used by American military and civil administration to describe Pakistan and Afghanistan. Another phenomenon that jumped out from this scenario was the role of mass media in such crises and Military operations. Norris, Kern and Just (2003) describes the role of media in 9/11's context as well as other previous such engagements; they say the key issue is the question about the role of media in covering such acts. They question about the

objectivity of media and conclude by examining the 9/11, the second intifada and the Chechen crisis that journalism attracts controversy and it is more in practice when the question is about news coverage in extreme political conflicts. Norris et al (2003), in order to theorise the study of “how US media frame issues of national interest in news coverage” they point out two factors of framing in a broader sense. First, do mass media take side of the terrorist, giving them credibility, establishing legitimacy of their action in public, and thus unintentionally doing encouragement for such acts in future. Second, the government being the facilitator for news sources, having offered a strong framework of interpreting events by security experts and public officials wins the side of press. Thus press err the side of government by endorsing her security policies and strengthening the political leadership for how they implement them.

Many studies (Enders & Sandler, 1999; Cronin, 2003; Rapoport, 2001) opined that terrorism which occurs on American symbolic hits to get the attention of the common public and thus provoke a well-liked response that would surely overturn the existing political order. Previous investigations have described that the press exaggerate the genuine risks of terrorism. Bassiouni (1981) claimed that terrorists mould their choice and execution of target to make sure media diffusion of both the event and underlying message to get terror-inspiring effects. Entman (2003) concluded that the media safeguard the boundaries of culture and preserve domestic dissension within conventional boundaries when reporting crises such as international terrorism. for the duration of its campaign to attack Iraq, post 9/11, the Washington applied not only public relations tricks but its control over government apparatus to regain frame control on the media. Crenshaw’s (1981) study added to this debate by describing how the media can be a victim of the calculated strategic decisions of terrorists.

Studies on domestic and international terrorism has repeatedly shown that terrorists point their action to the public and so utilize the press in order to have the most powerful possible impact (Wood & Peak, 1998, Edwards & Wood, 1999, Roxane, 2002). Wilkinson (1997) and Crenshaw (1981) described the dynamics of the terrorist groups to disorient a state through common insecurity, by antagonizing, exploiting the dissatisfactions of general public, which draw media publicity. As Ghanem (1997) opines, the agenda in first-level agenda setting points to objects, while the majority of previous literature have discovered an issue agenda, focused on nations as the tools on the agenda in a first level study.

News coverage of an act of terrorism speaks with both citizens and government, including an international audience of government officials and public (Vultee & Wilkins, 2004:14). The question about terrorism and the role of media covering it often revolves around two dimensions - whether media coverage gives legitimacy and credibility to the terrorists’ groups’ cause on the side of governments, taking sides with their counterterrorist efforts at any costs. In the perspective of the media providing legitimacy for the terrorists, several scholars have seen it as terrorists and the media having a symbiotic relationship where they are mainly dependent on each other, thus boosting terrorists’ access to the press. In the study the framing theory is employed as the basic purpose of the study is to test that how the selected issues are framed by the elite press of Pakistan and the United States.

Research Questions:

RQ1: How Pakistani newspapers have covered the North Waziristan Operation?

RQ2: How the American newspapers have covered the North Waziristan Operation?

Hypothesis:

The selected Pakistani and American newspapers will favour the North Waziristan operation.

Methodology

For the current study the “Content Analysis” method of mass media research is used. Wimmer and Dominick (2011) says that content analysis is the technique that is used in almost all the areas of mass media research and this method is considered as a popular medium among the mass media researchers as it is efficient to investigate the media content in print and electronic media. According to Sarantakos (1998) content analysis is defined as a documentary method aiming at both the qualitative and quantitative analysis of the content of the media such as texts, films, pictures and other forms of verbal, non-verbal and written communication in media and communication studies. Content analysis is also thought to be a method to study and analyse the communication in a systematic and objective way to measure different variables (Kerlinger, 1986).

Universe

The universe of the study includes the front page, back page and the opinion page (editorials and columns) of the selected newspapers from Pakistan that are “Daily Dawn and the News” and the US newspapers that include “Washington Post and the New York Times”. All the front pages, back pages, editorials and columns which are related to the above mentioned categories A, B, C, D, E & F with reference to the North Waziristan operation during the selected time period i.e. from June 1, 2014 to July 31, 2014

Sampling

In the present study the entire universe that is the front page, back page and the opinion page (editorials and columns) of all the selected newspapers is considered as the sample as the editorials and columns of the selected newspapers are to be analysed from June 1, 2014 to July 31, 2014.

Unit of Analysis

In this study the unit of analysis is considered to be all the words, sentences, paragraphs, news or the entire editorial or column, which indicate the presence of any of the related categories that are considered for the study.

Time Period

All editorials and columns of the selected newspapers from Pakistan that are “Daily Dawn and the News” and from the US which includes “Washington Post and the New York Times” from June 1, 2014 to July 31, 2014 are considered for the content analysis.

Categories

The categories in the content analysis are considered as the heart of the analysis that is used to classify the content of the media (Wimmer and Dominick, 2011). The data collection process in the content analysis method becomes possible by constructing the categories that are considered as a set of the criteria or a measure that is integrated round a particular theme or a value (Sarantakos, 1998). The following categories are formulated for the present study.

- A. Stance of Government of Pakistan regarding North Waziristan Operation
- B. Stance of opposition of Pakistan regarding North Waziristan Operation
- C. Stance of Military of Pakistan regarding North Waziristan Operation
- D. Stance of Taliban regarding North Waziristan Operation
- E. Stance of United States regarding the operation regarding North Waziristan Operation
- F. Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) issue

To measure the directions of the selected editorial and columns contents of the selected newspapers from both countries the researcher is using the method that Berelson (1952) referred as “the totality of the impression”. According to this notion totality of impression that infect aims in establishing the “directions” for the study that to which direction the selected categories goes. According to Yousaf and Ali (2012) to find out the directions of the contents from the selected newspapers, the data would be graded on a three-point scale

(+) as *Favourable/Supportive/Positive*

The news on front page, back page and the editorials and columns which are in support of the operation are considered supportive and favourable regarding the study or which are supporting the operation.

(-) as *Unfavourable/Opposite/Negative/Critical*

The news on front page, back page and the editorials and columns are believed as unfavourable, negative, opposite or critical, which are negative in tone and their general attitude is unfavourable regarding the study or opposing the operation.

(0) as *Neutral/Balance*

The news on front page, back page and the editorials and columns are judged as neutral or balanced if the content cannot be distinguished having emphasis on either favourable or unfavourable aspects of any issue regarding the operation.

Data Analysis

Table 1

Newspaper				
	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Daily Dawn	97	30.7	30.7	30.7
The News	116	36.7	36.7	67.4
The New York Times	49	15.5	15.5	82.9
Washington Post	54	17.1	17.1	100.0
Total	316	100.0	100.0	

Table 1 shows that Pakistani Newspapers Daily Dawn has given 97 (30.7%) coverage and The News has given 116 (36.7%) coverage whereas the United States Newspapers The New York times has given 49 (15.5%) and Washington Post has given 54 (17.1%) coverage and overall 316 (100%) coverage is given by the newspapers by both Pakistani and American newspapers.

Table 2

Directions				
	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Supportive	225	71.2	71.2	71.2
Non Supportive	58	18.4	18.4	89.6
Neutral	33	10.4	10.4	100.0
Total	316	100.0	100.0	

The table shows the directions that overall there are 225 (71.2%) stories supportive towards the North Waziristan operation, 58 (18.4%) stories are non-supportive whereas 33 (10.4%) neutral stories for the North Waziristan operation.

Table 3

		Statistics					
Newspaper	Location	Government	Opposition	Military	Taliban	United States	IDPs
Daily Dawn	Front Page	10	9	9	10	3	9
	Back Page	3	3	8	2	0	10
	Opinion Page	4	2	3	0	2	10
The News	Front Page	12	7	11	8	3	17
	Back Page	5	5	0	3	0	5
	Opinion Page	5	7	12	4	3	9
The New York Times	Front Page	6	0	6	0	9	3
	Back Page	2	0	0	1	2	4
	Opinion Page	3	0	4	0	3	6
Washington Post	Front Page	5	1	3	3	10	7
	Back Page	1	0	0	0	5	2
	Opinion Page	2	0	2	0	5	8

Table 3 shows that Daily dawn published 10 stories on front page, 3 on back page and 4 on opinion page showing government stance regarding North Waziristan operation, The News published 12 stories on front page, 5 on back page and 5 on opinion page showing government stance regarding North Waziristan operation, The New York Times published 6 stories on

front page, 2 on back page and 3 on opinion page showing government stance regarding North Waziristan operation whereas Washington Post published 5 stories on front page, 1 on back page and 2 on opinion page showing government stance regarding North Waziristan operation. Daily dawn published 9 stories on front page, 3 on back page and 2 on opinion page showing opposition stance regarding North Waziristan operation, The News published 7 stories on front page, 5 on back page and 7 on opinion page showing opposition stance regarding North Waziristan operation, The New York Times published no story related to opposition stance regarding North Waziristan operation whereas Washington Post published only 1 story on front page showing opposition stance regarding North Waziristan operation. Daily dawn published 9 stories on front page, 8 on back page and 3 on opinion page showing military stance regarding North Waziristan operation, The News published 11 stories on front page, 0 on back page and 12 on opinion page showing military stance regarding North Waziristan operation, The New York Times published 6 stories on front page, 0 on back page and 4 on opinion page showing military stance regarding North Waziristan operation whereas Washington Post published 3 stories on front page, 0 on back page and 2 on opinion page showing military stance regarding North Waziristan operation. Daily dawn published 10 stories on front page, 2 on back page and 0 on opinion page showing Taliban stance regarding North Waziristan operation, The News published 8 stories on front page, 3 on back page and 4 on opinion page showing military stance regarding North Waziristan operation, The New York Times published only 1 story on back page showing Taliban stance regarding North Waziristan operation whereas Washington Post published only 3 stories on front page showing Taliban stance regarding North Waziristan operation. Daily dawn published 3 stories on front page, 0 on back page and 2 on opinion page showing US stance regarding North Waziristan operation, The News published 3 stories on front page, 0 on back page and 3 on opinion page showing US stance regarding North Waziristan operation, The New York Times published 9 stories on front page, 2 on back page and 3 on opinion page showing US stance regarding North Waziristan operation whereas Washington Post published 10 stories on front page, 5 on back page and 5 on opinion page showing US stance regarding North Waziristan operation. Daily dawn published 9 stories on front page, 10 on back page and 10 on opinion page showing IDPs issue in North Waziristan operation, The News published 17 stories on front page, 5 on back page and 9 on opinion page showing IDPs issue in North Waziristan operation, The New York Times published 3 stories on front page, 4 on back page and 6 on opinion page showing IDPs issue in North Waziristan operation whereas Washington Post published 7 stories on front page, 2 on back page and 8 on opinion page showing IDPs issue in North Waziristan operation.

Table 4**Government of Pakistan Stance regarding North Waziristan operation**

Newspaper	Location		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Daily Dawn	Front Page	Supportive	10	20.0	100.0	100.0
	Back Page	Supportive	3	11.5	100.0	100.0
	Opinion Page	Supportive	4	19.0	100.0	100.0
The News	Front Page	Supportive	12	20.7	100.0	100.0
	Back Page	Supportive	4	22.2	80.0	80.0
		Neutral	1	5.6	20.0	100.0
	Opinion Page	Supportive	5	12.5	100.0	100.0
The New York Times	Front Page	Supportive	6	25.0	100.0	100.0
	Back Page	Supportive	2	22.2	100.0	100.0
	Opinion Page	Supportive	3	18.8	100.0	100.0
Washington Post	Front Page	Supportive	5	17.2	100.0	100.0
	Back Page	Supportive	1	12.5	100.0	100.0
	Opinion Page	Supportive	2	11.8	100.0	100.0

Table 4 shows the Government stance regarding North Waziristan operation that Daily Dawn has given 10 (20%) supportive coverage on front page, 3 (11.5%) supportive coverage on back page whereas 4 (19%) supportive coverage on opinion page. The news has given 12 (20.7%) supportive on front page, 4 (22.2%) supportive and 1 (5.6%) neutral coverage on back page whereas 5 (12.5%) supportive coverage on opinion page. The New York Times has given 6 (25%) supportive coverage on front page, 2 (22.2%) supportive coverage on back page whereas 3 (18.8%) supportive coverage on opinion page. The Washington Post has given 5 (17.2%) supportive coverage on front page, 1 (12.5%) supportive coverage on back page whereas 2 (11.8%) supportive coverage on opinion page.

Table 5**Opposition Stance regarding North Waziristan operation**

Newspaper	Location		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Daily Dawn	Front Page	Supportive	5	10.0	55.6	55.6
		Non Supportive	4	8.0	44.4	100.0
	Back Page	Supportive	2	7.7	66.7	66.7
		Non Supportive	1	3.8	33.3	100.0
	Opinion Page	Supportive	2	9.5	100.0	100.0
The News	Front Page	Supportive	4	6.9	57.1	57.1
		Non Supportive	3	5.2	42.9	100.0
	Back Page	Non Supportive	1	5.6	20.0	20.0
		Neutral	4	22.2	80.0	100.0
	Opinion Page	Supportive	3	7.5	42.9	42.9
		Non Supportive	3	7.5	42.9	85.7
		Neutral	1	2.5	14.3	100.0
The New York Times	Front Page		0	0		
	Back Page		0	0		
	Opinion Page		0	0		
Washington Post	Front Page	Supportive	1	3.4	100.0	100.0
	Back Page		0	0		
	Opinion Page		0	0		

Table 5 shows the Opposition stance regarding North Waziristan operation that Daily Dawn has given 5 (10%) supportive and 4 (8%) non supportive coverage on front page, 2 (7.7%) supportive and 1 (3.8%) non supportive coverage on back page whereas 2 (9.5%) supportive coverage on opinion page. The News has given 4 (6.9%) supportive, 3 (5.2%) non supportive coverage on front page, 1 (5.6%) non supportive whereas 4 (22.2%) neutral coverage on back page and 3 (7.5%) each supportive and non-supportive coverage whereas 1 (2.5%) neutral coverage on opinion page. The New York Times has given no coverage whereas Washington Post has given only 1 (3.4%) supportive stance.

Table 6**Military Stance regarding North Waziristan operation**

Newspaper	Location		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Daily Dawn	Front Page	Supportive	9	18.0	100.0	100.0
	Back Page	Supportive	8	30.8	100.0	100.0
	Opinion Page	Supportive	3	14.3	100.0	100.0
The News	Front Page	Supportive	11	19.0	100.0	100.0
	Back Page		0	0		
	Opinion Page	Supportive	12	30.0	100.0	100.0
The New York Times	Front Page	Supportive	6	25.0	100.0	100.0
	Back Page		0	0		
	Opinion Page	Supportive	4	25.0	100.0	100.0
Washington Post	Front Page	Supportive	3	10.3	100.0	100.0
	Back Page		0	0		
	Opinion Page	Supportive	2	11.8	100.0	100.0

Table 6 shows the Military stance regarding North Waziristan operation that Daily Dawn has given 9 (18%) supportive coverage on front page, 8 (30.8%) supportive stance on back page whereas 3 (14.3%) supportive stance on opinion page. The news has given 11 (19%) supportive coverage on front page, no coverage on back page whereas 12 (30% supportive stance on opinion page. The New York Times has given 6 (25%) supportive coverage on front page, no coverage on back page whereas 4 (25%) supportive stance on opinion page. The Washington Post has given 3 (10.3%) supportive coverage on front page, no coverage on back page whereas 2 (11.8%) supportive stance on opinion page.

Table 7**Taliban Stance regarding North Waziristan operation**

Newspaper	Location		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Daily Dawn	Front Page	Non Supportive	7	14.0	70.0	70.0
		Neutral	3	6.0	30.0	100.0
	Back Page	Non Supportive	2	7.7	100.0	100.0
		Opinion Page	0	0		
The News	Front Page	Non Supportive	8	13.8	100.0	100.0
		Back Page	1	5.6	33.3	33.3
	Back Page	Neutral	2	11.1	66.7	100.0
		Non Supportive	3	7.5	75.0	75.0
		Neutral	1	2.5	25.0	100.0
The New York Times	Front Page		0	0		
	Back Page	Non Supportive	1	11.1	100.0	100.0
	Opinion Page		0	0		
Washington Post	Front Page	Non Supportive	3	10.3	100.0	100.0
	Back Page		0	0		
	Opinion Page		0	0		

Table 7 shows the Taliban stance regarding North Waziristan operation that Daily Dawn has given 7 (14%) non supportive and 3 (6%) neutral coverage on front page, 2 (7.7%) non supportive stance on back page whereas no opinion page coverage is witnessed. The News has given 8 (13.8%) non supportive coverage on front page, 1 (5.6%) non supportive and 2 (11.1%) neutral coverage on back page whereas 3 (7.5%) non supportive and 1 (2.5%) neutral coverage on opinion page. The New York Times has given no coverage on front page and opinion page whereas has given 1 (11.1%) non supportive coverage is given on back page. Washington Post has given only 3 (10.3%) non supportive coverage on front page.

Table 8

United States Stance regarding North Waziristan operation					
Newspaper	Location		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Valid Percent
Daily Dawn	Front Page	Supportive	3	6.0	100.0
	Back Page		0	0	
	Opinion Page	Supportive	2	9.5	100.0
The News	Front Page	Supportive	3	5.2	100.0
	Back Page		0	0	
	Opinion Page	Supportive	3	7.5	100.0
The New York Times	Front Page	Supportive	8	33.3	88.9
		Neutral	1	4.2	100.0
	Back Page	Supportive	2	22.2	100.0
	Opinion Page	Supportive	2	12.5	66.7
		Neutral	1	6.2	100.0
Washington Post	Front Page	Supportive	10	34.5	100.0
	Back Page	Supportive	5	62.5	100.0
	Opinion Page	Supportive	5	29.4	100.0

Table 8 shows the United States stance regarding North Waziristan operation that Daily Dawn has given 3 (6%) supportive coverage on front and 2 (9.5%) supportive coverage on opinion pages. The News has given 3 (5.2%) supportive coverage on front and 3 (7.5%) supportive coverage on opinion pages. The New York Times has given 8 (33.3%) supportive and 1 (4.2%) neutral coverage on front page, 2 (22.2%) supportive coverage on back page and 2 (12.5%) supportive and 1 (6.2%) neutral coverage on opinion page. Washington Post has given 10 (34.5%) supportive coverage on front, 5 (62.5%) supportive coverage on back whereas 5 (29.4%) supportive coverage on opinion pages.

Table 9

IDPs issue in North Waziristan operation						
Newspaper	Location		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Daily Dawn	Front Page	Supportive	5	10.0	55.6	55.6
		Non Supportive	2	4.0	22.2	77.8
		Neutral	2	4.0	22.2	100.0
	Back Page	Supportive	4	15.4	40.0	40.0
		Non Supportive	3	11.5	30.0	70.0
		Neutral	3	11.5	30.0	100.0
	Opinion Page	Supportive	4	19.0	40.0	40.0
		Non Supportive	3	14.3	30.0	70.0
		Neutral	3	14.3	30.0	100.0
The News	Front Page	Supportive	8	13.8	47.1	47.1
		Non Supportive	6	10.3	35.3	82.4
		Neutral	3	5.2	17.6	100.0
	Back Page	Supportive	4	22.2	80.0	80.0
		Non Supportive	1	5.6	20.0	100.0
	Opinion Page	Supportive	5	12.5	55.6	55.6
		Neutral	4	10.0	44.4	100.0
The New York Times	Front Page	Supportive	2	8.3	66.7	66.7
		Non Supportive	1	4.2	33.3	100.0
	Back Page	Supportive	2	22.2	50.0	50.0
		Non Supportive	1	11.1	25.0	75.0
		Neutral	1	11.1	25.0	100.0
	Opinion Page	Supportive	1	6.2	16.7	16.7
		Non Supportive	2	12.5	33.3	50.0
		Neutral	3	18.8	50.0	100.0
Washington Post	Front Page	Supportive	7	24.1	100.0	100.0
	Back Page	Non Supportive	2	25.0	100.0	100.0
	Opinion Page	Supportive	8	47.1	100.0	100.0

Table 9 shows the IDPs issue in North Waziristan operation that Daily Dawn has given 5 (10%) supportive, 2 (4%) non supportive and 2 (4%) neutral coverage on front page, Daily Dawn has given 4 (15.4%) supportive, 3 (11.5%) non supportive and 3 (11.5%) neutral coverage on back page whereas Daily Dawn has given 4 (19%) supportive, 3 (14.3%) non supportive and 3 (14.3%) neutral coverage on opinion page. The News has given 8 (13.8%) supportive, 6

(10.3%) non supportive and 3 (5.2%) neutral coverage on front page, The News has given 4 (22.2%) supportive and 1 (5.6%) non coverage on back page whereas it has given 5 (12.5%) supportive and 4 (10%) neutral coverage on opinion page. The New York Times has given 2 (8.3%) supportive, 1 (4.2%) non supportive coverage on front page, The New York Times has given 2 (22.2%) supportive, 1 (11.5%) non supportive and 1 (11.5%) neutral coverage on back page whereas it has given 1 (6.2%) supportive, 2 (12.5%) non supportive and 3 (18.8%) neutral coverage on opinion page. Washington Post has given 7 (24.1%) supportive coverage on front page, 2 (25%) non supportive coverage on back page whereas 8 (47.1%) supportive coverage on opinion page.

Discussion

The study “Framing of Operation against terrorists in North Waziristan Agency, Pakistan in Elite Press” shows that Pakistani Press Daily Dawn and The News has given more coverage to the North Waziristan operation than the United States press The New York Times and The Washington Post. Overall results regarding the operation show the maximum supportive stance by all newspapers followed by non-supportive and the least coverage to neutral behaviour. The full supportive stance of the Government is observed without witnessing any non-supportive stance, the Opposition’s stance was mixed but that too with maximum support of the operation, Military’s stance is observed as entirely supportive towards the operation, maximum non supportive stance of Taliban was covered with some neutral coverage, the entirely supportive stance of the United States was also witnessed while analysing the coverage and the Internally Displaced persons (IDPs) issue also witnessed mixed stance but with maximum supportive stance. The results show that entirely the selected categories except Taliban’s stance showed maximum support for the operation in North Waziristan. Further the study shows that most of the stories about the operation is given on the front pages of the newspapers followed by the opinion page and the least coverage is witnessed on the back page. The study shows that the North Waziristan operation is given maximum support in all the selected categories which include the Stance of Government of Pakistan regarding North Waziristan Operation, Stance of opposition of Pakistan regarding North Waziristan Operation, Stance of Military of Pakistan regarding North Waziristan Operation, Stance of United States regarding the operation regarding North Waziristan Operation, Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) issue in North Waziristan operation except one category that is Stance of Taliban regarding North Waziristan Operation which showed maximum non supportive stance. The overall study keeping the importance and nature of the issue in front shows that all the stake holders which are involved in the operation are categorized separately to analyse their coverage. The results also prove the hypotheses that the Pakistani and the United States newspapers both support the North Waziristan operation. So, overall coverage of the Pakistani and the United States press is supportive for the North Waziristan operation showing that government’s stance. Opposition and military’s stance, United States stance and IDPs issue are positively covered favouring the operation except Taliban’s stance which is negative because the operation is going against them so they will show the negative behaviour regarding the operation. The study shows that all selected newspapers from Pakistan and United States showed a favourable stance regarding all the selected categories except one category which is Taliban’s stance. Overall study shows the support for the operation by the Pakistani and United States press which shows that the selected newspapers positively framed the North Waziristan Operation.

References

- Ali, J. (2014). Operation Zarb-e-Azb: A turning point in war against terror. *Business Recorder*, August 2, 2014
- Ali, E. & Shahid, K. (2012). *Media and Foreign Policy: A study of Pak-U.S. relations in U.S. and Pakistani Press, Post 9/11 Era (2001-2011)*. Lambert Academic Publishing, Germany.
- Crenshaw, P. (1981). *The Psychology of Terrorism: An Agenda for the 21st Century*, Department of Government, Wesleyan University.
- Cronin, A.K, (2003). Behind the Curve: Globalization and International Terrorism, *International Security* 27, no. 3 (winter 2002/2003).
- Entman, R. M. (2003). Cascading activation: Contesting the White House's frame after 9/11. *Political Communication*, 20.
- Edwards, G. C., & B. D. Wood. (1999). Who Influences Whom? The President, Congress, and the Media. *American Political Science Review* 93
- Enders, W. & Sandler, T. (1999), *The Political Economy of Terrorism*, Cambridge University Press.
- Ghanem, S. (1997). Filling in the tapestry: The second level of agenda-setting. In M.E. McCombs, D.L. Shaw & D. Weaver (Eds.), *Communication and democracy: Exploring the intellectual frontiers in agenda-setting theory*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Kerlinger, F. (1986). *Foundation of behavioral research* (3rd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Khan, Z.A. (2010). Military operations in FATA and PATA: implications for Pakistan. Retrieved on August 2, 2014 from http://www.issi.org.pk/publication-files/1339999992_58398784.pdf
- Norris, Kern and Just (2003). Framing terrorism.
- Rapoport, D.C. & Weinberg, L. (2001). *The Democratic Experience and Political Violence*, (Cass Series on Political Violence, 9).
- Sarantakos, S. (1998). *Social research*. Hampshire, London: Macmillian press.
- Vultee, F. & Wilkins, L. (2004). News as a Public Service: Thinking Through Coverage of Disasters and Terrorism. White Paper on Disasters and Terrorism by Missouri School of Journalism.
- Wood, B. D. & Peake, J. S (1998). The Dynamics of Foreign Policy Agenda Setting, *The American Political Science Review* 92 (1).
- Wilkinson P. (1997). The Media and Terrorism: A reassessment, *Terrorism & Political Violence* 9(2).
- Wimmer, R. D. & Dominick, J. R. (2011). *Mass Media Research*. (9th Edition), Wadsworth, USA
- Yousaf, Z. & Ali, E. (2012). Coverage of Pak-US Relations in Elite Press of Pakistan And US during the Democratic Government of Pakistan People's Party; March 2008 To February 2012 (Media & Foreign Policy Perspective). *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science (JHSS)* Volume 6, Issue 1

- Yousaf, Z. (2012). Perception of Pak-Afghan Relations in American and Pakistani Press, Media's Perspective of Foreign Policy (May 2011 to December 2011). Open access scientific Reports. 1:491.
- Yousaf, Z., Ali, E., & Ahmed, M. (2013). Media & Foreign Policy: Portrayal of Pak-U.S. Relations in Elite Press during Pervaiz Musharraf & George W. Bush Regime; September 2001 to August 2008. Interdisciplinary Journal of Physical and Social Sciences. Volume 3, Issue 2