

War on Terror: Interplay between Press (Daily the Nation & Daily Times of India) and Governments (Pakistan & India) Policies

Prof. Dr. Ghulam Shabbir , Ali Hassan, Abdul Rehman Madni and Nauman Ahmed

Abstract

This paper aims at exploring the relationship of press and government policies i.e. interplay between press and government policies. This is an effort to sort out whether daily Nation and Daily Times of India toed the policies of their respective governments regarding war on terror. To some extent both newspapers follows the policies of their government but overall analysis shows that both newspapers given more editorials against war on terror and didn't toed the policy of their governments. The data regarding this study was collected through content analysis of editorials of daily Nation and daily Times of India and statements of the foreign office or foreign ministers of respective countries i.e. Pakistan and India.

Keywords: Pakistan, India, War on Terror, Terrorism

Significance

After the terrorist attacks on (twin towers in New York and Washington) the U.S. on September 11; the world was completely in shocked. These incidents have influenced the subsequent idea of humanity. Organization of Islamic Countries and UNO strongly denounced these incidents; condolences were extended to USA and presented complete assistance in fetching the master minds of these heinous acts to justice. Terrorism in all its forms is a threat to the global community and should be eradicated from all over the world. In tandem with the international community, Pakistan acted as a front line state in war against terrorism due to obligations under the implementation of the resolution of 12 September 2001. Pakistan Foreign Minister said, Pakistan is proud of the contribution made to war eradicating the evil of terrorism that causes of humanity and the United Nations. Today, terrorism is very complex phenomena perceived in international politics and international relations. . The invasion of Soviet Union in Afghanistan in 1979 and then US intervention in 2001 with title of war against terrorism is the only pretext that Crenshaw (1981) work contributed to this debate by demonstrating how media are calculated as strategic decisions victim of terrorists.

Interplay Between Press and Government Policies

Sayeed stated that in foreign policy every country wants to imperative approach towards its foreign policy (Abdullah, 2012). Jones (1970) defined foreign policy as "Foreign policy may be the pursuit of universal purposes in a global field of human communication". Media is an important institution and it plays an important role for shaping government's foreign policy. Media play a dominant role towards government. In democratic systems the tensions are mainly created by the media and government officials (Cohen 1963). The news media is the better to be known as the effected factor on the foreign relations and the foreign policies (Larson 1986). Harris (1999) said that the main focus of news media is on to the particular individuals and government leaders rather to give the background knowledge and the latest trends in politics. Sometime media

role is more effective than the representative of nation. During 1991 both countries (Iraq and America) Presidents fully rely on the CNN channel and formulate their policies accordingly.

Government takes action as regard the foreign policy by putting inhabitants' comfort to have frontage on them. Nowadays, government follows the duty of taking quick decisions rather than delayed ones. Technological advance has reached a high speed and the one institution that is much benefitted by it and that is the media. Media is the factor that influences a lot over foreign policy. Media is the voice of common people and pressurizes government on their action to make policy about certain issues. Foreign policy involved the diplomatic, economic, social, cultural, political, informational and military instruments towards the national interest. These are directly related to the press issues as well (Halme, 1996). The role of media is very controversial. Media involves at the every stage of foreign policy making. Political leaders take media as a serious tool in the process of building foreign policy. Previously it was considered that media is only for delivering messages in foreign policy now it is very cleared that media itself a great part of this process. Media is not just the part of international environment but media is the part of internal environment of the state. Government sets the policies according to the policies of the state communication's general pattern called media. Media at a time performs double functions, input and output. Media carries input variables by setting the foreign policy with government and it carries out variables by scrutinizing the government officials and to relate them with the foreign policy. The policy making is taken in the environment set by the media. Media influence the policy makers by setting agendas and framing the factors and compelled them towards their own policies (Navel, 2002).

Media play a very complex role in making the foreign policy. This role is sometimes direct or indirect in other means. Different PR professionals and the media experts take part in this process. Government officials consult with them and make decisions accordingly (Srivastaver, 2009). Comb (2003) found that after 11 September; the U.S. Department of Defense has received over 5,000 visits of media on military installations in over 1500 special interviews to the press, and has held over 225 press conferences. This allows the culture medium and liaison between media and Government, so that media is also aware of different issues happening in the wake of war against terrorism. Mockaitis (2003) pointed out that even if media hype is not the ultimate purpose of, the terrorist organizations yet they consider that media coverage to the terrorist attacks is the excellent mode of attracting the attentions of pubic and to fulfill their hidden vested interests. Media coverage of incidents of terrorism is the means to attract the attention and to promote their vested interests. In spite of continuous attack of U.S. media and adverse publicity regarding Osama bin Laden, shared the media coverage with President Bush in the top media channels (Mockaitis, 2003).

Hypothesis:

- H₁ Daily The Nation and daily Times of India will be more unfavorable to war on terror than being favorable
- H₂ Daily Times of India will be more unfavorable than daily The Nation

Researchers conducted content analysis (quantitative) in order to measure the interplay between government and press relationship. Researchers tried to find out that whether the respective newspapers of both the countries follow the foreign policy of their respective countries or not. This will give a clear cut idea about the newspapers' policy and government policies regarding war on terror. Editorials of the respective newspapers were selected for content analysis. Results of the study which were presented in table

given below i.e. editorials of newspapers were compared with the statements of foreign office of their respective countries. Selected time period for this research was from 11 September 2001 to 31st December 2008. Purposive sampling technique was selected in order to collect the data.

Table 1: Editorials' treatment with War on Terror

Newspapers	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Total
Daily Nation	31.47*	38.07	30.45	100
Daily Times of India	26.20	50.340	23.44	100

*: Figures showing percentage

Findings clearly show that the both newspapers daily Nation and daily Times of India have given more unfavorable editorials on the issue of war on terror i.e. 38.07% and 50.34% respectively than neutral and favorable comments. Results also indicate that Daily Nation gave 30.45% neutral editorials and Times of India gave 26.20% positive editorials to issue of war on terror and these are smallest proportion in either of other categories (Table 1).

The foreign minister Khursheed Mahmood Qasoori on 20th August 2007 refuted the American policy on War on terror and toed the Pakistan Press policy by saying, "We can do no more than this in war against terrorism. No one should expect more than what we are doing Pakistan was carrying on forceful operation against Al-Qaeda operatives. Dubbing Pakistan a heaven for Al-Qaeda terrorists is an irresponsible statement. The need is there " let us see why it is happening so in Muslim world. We all have to work together to eradicate terrorism and extremism. Our army is taking action against the terrorists in tribal areas, he remarked. Our soldiers are rendering the sacrifices of their lives for the sake of national integrity. If a mentality builds up in Pakistan on the very fashion the statements being given by US officials then what will happen".

In contrast Daily Nation gave the stances regarding American policy towards WOT in its editorial "More Drones" June 13, 2008 and toed the government policy "Non-legally speaking, however, it seems arguable that, whilst the Pakistani government seems willing to accept the US' participation in 'collective action', US forces have often elected to act unilaterally inside Pakistani territory with a view to furthering their own national policy goals regardless of the risk of contravening international law pertaining to the sovereignty, state responsibility, and use of force etc. These topics of international law would be discussed briefly in the next section, before we go on to discuss the legality of the U.S drone attacks inside the sovereign territory of Pakistan."

In contrast Times of India in February ,02, 2007 in its editorial "Terror Hurts Pakistan as much as India" refuted the government of Pakistan and Pakistan press stance over role of Pakistan in WOT by saying that

"There were hopes that the war against terror would treat both jihads on par. But the U.S. has decided to ignore the one against India. It needs Pakistan as a strategic ally for its Afghanistan operation, and it especially needs the intelligence available from Pakistan's Inter-Services Intelligence, or ISI, the very body that first sponsored the Taliban. India believes that ISI also sponsors the terrorists in Kashmir. As long as the U.S. works closely with ISI and with Pakistan's military dictator, President Pervez Musharraf, there is no hope that the terrorism directed against us will ever be addressed."

Indian Foreign minister Jaswant Singh commented on 29th December after the attack on Indian Parliament about Pakistani policy against terrorism

“December 13 attack on parliament is not acceptable. These violent attacks hand groups have no place in modern world. Pakistani administration must be clear about war on terror. It have to act against those terrorist elements which are creating trouble for India. We demand more strict actions them. If there will be no action then it will have deep impact on the peace of whole region. We will not tolerate these attacks and President Musharraf must fulfills his promise to eradicate the hideouts of terrorists in Pakistani occupied Kashmir”

Conclusion:

To conclude from the results of above mentioned table and the statements given by the foreign minister of both the countries we can deduce that both the newspaper remain more unfavorable towards the policy of their respective governments regarding war on terror. It proves H_1 of the study that both the dailies will be more unfavorable to war on terror that being favorable. From the above mentioned statements it is also appears that Daily Times of India is more unfavorable than daily the Nation regarding war on terror. It also supported the H_2 of the study that is daily Times of India will be more unfavorable towards war on terror than daily the Nation

About the Author

Prof. Dr. Ghulam Shabbir is Chairman Department of Media Studies, The Islamia University of Bahawalpur, Pakistan.

Ali Hassan is Lecturer in Department of Media Studies, The Islamia University of Bahawalpur, Pakistan.

Abdul Rehman Madni is Teaching Assistant in Department of Communication studies, University of Sargodha, Pakistan

Nauman Ahmed is M.Phil Scholar in Department of Political Science, The Islamia University of Bahawalpur.

References

- Abdullah, Mudassar. (2012). "Coverage to War on Terror issue by Pakistani Television and viewers Perception", University of Sargodha.
- Cohen, B. (1963). *The Press the Public and Foreign Policy*. Princeton: University Press.
- Combs, C. C. (2003). *Terrorism in the 21st Century*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Crenshaw, P. (1981). *The Psychology of Terrorism: An Agenda for the 21st Century*, Department of Government, Wesleyan University.
- Halme, S. J. (1996). *The Modern Media: The Impact on Foreign Policy*. (Published Thesis), University of Surrey, England
- Harris, (1999). (Cite in Bryant, Jennings and Thompson, Susan (2002). *Fundamentals of Media Effects*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Helmes, S. (2005). Al-Qaida, 11 September 2001, in *making sense of Suicide Missions*. Oxford: Oxford University of press
- Jones, R. E. (1970). *Analyzing Foreign Policy: An introduction to some Conceptual Problems*. London: Rutledge & Kegan Paul.
- Larson, (1986). (Cite in Bryant, Jennings and Thompson, Susan (2002). *Fundamentals of Media Effects*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Mockaitis, T. R., Rich, p. B. (2003). *Grand Strategy in the War against Terrorism*: London Press
- Navel, C. (2002). *The Role of the Media in Foreign Policy Decision Making. A theoretical Framework in Conflict and Communication*, online, Vo. 1, No. 2. Retrieved from <http://icswww.leeds.ac.uk/papers/pmt/exhibits/801/naveh.pdf>
- Srivastava, S. (2009). *The Role of the Media in foreign policy: A dicsion making*. Retrieved on 1-6-2012 from http://utcc2.utcc.ac.th/amsar/PDF/Document52/Shubham_template.pdf