

Is Pakistan Terrorist? Front-page Perspective of Mainstream American Newspapers during Obama's First-year

Awais Gillani, Xiang Zhou

School of Journalism and Communication, Wuhan University, PO box 430072, P.R. China

Abstract

US President Barack H. Obama's first year of presidency, January 2009 – January 2010, observes unprecedented surge in overt and covert counterterrorism operations of American military and intelligence and drone strikes in Pakistan which is a non-NATO ally and a frontline state in the "War on Terror" since 9/11. For the last two and half years, Mr. Obama's counterterrorism policies are being criticized by American academia, politicians and media and giving a speech at National Defense University in May 2013, President Obama vows to rebuild Pak-US relations. This article takes a closer look that what went wrong between the two countries and how the mainstream US press covered the phenomenon and played its social and democratic role for informed citizenry during Obama's first year. Since US press works on the behalf of American public and creates a liaison between government and the people on important foreign policy issues thus it is pertinent to explore that how American mainstream newspapers opine about Pakistan's position in South Asia, Pakistani politics and army/ISI, nuclear assets and US aid diplomacy in relation to Obama's counterterrorism war to win the "War on Terror." Applying Thematic Analysis method with the framework of Social Responsibility Theory of Press, propaganda and propaganda principles of Anne Morelli, the study finds that the press instead of reporting on Pakistan is running an anti-Pakistan information operation parallel to the military, foreign policy and strategic agenda of the "Golden Triangle" (the White House, the State Department and the Pentagon) to force Pakistan to bow in front of American demands to fight the "War on Terror" at the cost of its men, material, internal and external security and political stability. The mainstream newspapers support the idea of the "Golden Triangle" to control Pakistani politics, army and nuclear assets and they are manipulating public perception and opinion accordingly instead of doing objective reporting. Thus the study discovers obnoxious criticism against Pakistan based on incorrect, superficial and subjective reporting that portrays Pakistan as a country that uses terrorism as its official policy hence it is a threat to regional and world peace and poses danger to US security, foreign policy and strategic interests in the South Asian region.

Keywords: American newspapers and Pakistan, Press and foreign policy, 9/11, War on Terror, India-Pakistan-US relations, Kashmir, Al Qaeda, Osama Bin Laden and Taliban, ISI, Drone/UCAV, Nuclear proliferation, US aid, Propaganda, Social responsibility of press, Thematic analysis.

1. Introduction

Studies and literature show that Pakistan and its civilian and security institutions remain under much criticism in American and Western electronic and printed press and draw terror and chaos related headlines and a consistent mutual mistrust exists between Pakistan and America (Khan, 2008, Moeller, 2007, Lodhi, 2009, Fair, 2009). This study focuses on the front-page coverage of Pakistan in the *New York Times* (NYT), the *Washington Post* (Post), and the *Wall Street Journal* (WSJ) in the first year of US President Barack H. Obama's first term presidency, January 2009 – January 2010. Mr. Obama's counterterrorism policy is facing intense criticism in American and Western media for the last two and half years but it is important to see that how the mainstream American press was reporting on his counterterrorism policy in his first year because this study will help to understand the root of the problem and will facilitate further studies to understand Obama's counterterrorism policy, Pak-US relations, South Asian security situation and media coverage of the "War on Terror" with reference to Pakistan.

The question arises, if Obama's counterterrorism policy is facing criticism now in media then how it was being reported in his first year of presidency? Did it serve any public good or help to bring peace in the world, especially in South Asia? If nothing such happened according to current criticism by the US media and politicians (Carter, 2012, Giuliani, 2015, Paul, 2013, Paul, 2015) then on whose agenda the American press was working? Can peace be achieved in the world if press will truly serve as a public opinion forum under Social Responsibility Theory of the Press for the larger benefit of people?

Studies have been conducted on Pakistan's coverage in American press but the current study will exclusively analyze the themes and patterns of the front-page of above mentioned prestigious newspapers because front-page

is considered the face of a newspaper and even a casual reader reads the headlines and develops an opinion. The study includes both the liberal and conservative mainstream American newspapers. The *NYT* and the *Post* are liberal press whereas the *WSJ* is conservative. Newspapers are labeled as conservative and liberal on the basis of their ideological tilt and affiliation for presidential election in 2008 and 2012 (Woolley and Peters, 2008, Lewison, 2012). Pew survey of 2014, ranks the *NYT* and the *Post* as liberal based on their audiences and readership whereas the readership of the *WSJ* slightly leans towards liberal based on a 10 point scale (Blake, 2014).

Media play a significant role in developing public opinion and polls and think tanks' reports show that Americans do not have a positive view about Pakistan (Craighill, 2011, Koblentz, 2014) hence the study uses Thematic Analysis method of Braun and Clarke (2006) to deeply understand the coverage phenomena related to the "War on Terror" and counterterrorism to explain it in proper themes and patterns with a theoretical framework of Social Responsibility Theory of the Press, propaganda and Anne Morelli's propaganda principles. American electronic and printed press claims objective reporting under the golden principles of Social Responsibility Theory of the Press (Pitner, 2009), thus the study will see, is it true or not?, because the thumb rule for objective reporting is that "On the one hand ... on the other ... in the end only time will tell" (McGoldrick, 2006).

Announcing Afghan-Pakistan strategy (AFPAK Strategy) and commenting about Pakistan's porous border with Afghanistan, the US President Barack H. Obama (2009) says:

... this border region has become the most dangerous place in the world, But this is not simply an American problem -- far from it. It is, instead, an international security challenge of the highest order ... The safety of people around the world is at stake.

The president further says that people in America and Pakistan want an end to terror and Pakistanis are the one who have suffered a lot from the havoc created by Al Qaeda and Taliban. These terror agents gave Pakistan nothing but "... we stand for something different", yet based on Pak-US relations in the past and distrust between the two countries America can no more give a "blank check" to Pakistan. In his policy speech, the President tells very clearly that Pakistan "needs to root out the terrorists" and America "must isolate al Qaeda from the Pakistani people." President Obama urges Pakistan to cooperate more in military and intelligence operations but if Pakistan does not put more efforts then America will take action "one way or another." The President is giving an unambiguous message that by taking unilateral actions he will escalate the "War on Terror" more vigorously than President Bush and he thinks that Pakistani public and government is sympathetic to Al Qaeda elements. At the end of the policy speech, President Obama says that his administration promises a "New day" for Pakistani people because America supports peace and security, justice and opportunity, That is who we are, and that is what history calls on us to do once more" (Obama, 2009).

President Bush's policies and President Obama's promise of "New day" has cost more than 80,000 lives to Pakistan (Physicians for Social Responsibility, 2015) and Geo TV Network current affairs program reports that in the year 2009 alone 2344 people died in Pakistan in 2097 bomb blasts of which 97 were suicide (Aaj Kamran Khan Ke Sath, December 8, 2009). Although President Obama admits that since 9/11 Pakistan is sacrificing with men and material on daily basis, even then he wants to solve the problem with "bullets and bombs" strategy instead of using the strategy of "winning the hearts and minds" of Pakistani people. Mr. Obama comes into the White House on the slogan of "Change" but his AFPAK policy speech echoes the 2006 National Defense Strategy which says that "hard core among our terrorist enemies cannot be reformed or deterred; they will be tracked down, captured, or killed" quoted in Ward (2014, p.72). It is reported in the leading press that the US is fighting an unofficial war in Pakistan and, Scahill (2009) quotes the question of a Pakistani journalist who says that:

The immediate question is, How do you define the active military pursuit of military objectives in a country with which not only have you not declared war but that is supposedly a front-line non-NATO ally in the US struggle to contain extremist violence coming out of Afghanistan and the border regions of Afghanistan and Pakistan? (Scahill, 2009)

AFPAK strategy is the basic document to understand Obama's counterterrorism policy in Pakistan and the leading press gives front-page coverage to Pakistan in the context of this policy speech.

According to different media reports, studies and the Bureau of Investigative Journalism, Pakistan faced highest number of civilian casualties, drone strikes, suicide and terror attacks in 2009-2010 (Bentley and Holland, 2013, Cavallaro and Sonnenberg, 2012, Mir, 2011, Walsh, 2010, Roberts, 2011, Coll, 2014, The Bureau of Investigative Journalism, 2014, The Bureau of Investigative Journalism, 2015). On one side Pakistan was under the attacks of American drone strikes, and overt and covert military and intelligence operations by CIA, Joint

Special Operations Command (JSOC) and Blackwater and on the other Taliban and Al Qaeda were taking revenge from common Pakistanis by killing them to pressurize the Pakistani government to stop assisting America in the “War on Terror.” Olney (2011) notes that In the result of American overt and covert operations in Pakistan “militant attacks against the Government of Pakistan leveled off with approximately 30 attacks per month in 2010” and militants attacks increased from “29 to 340 percent.”

Many studies show that America created and supported Taliban and Bush family not only had family and business ties with Laden family but also Osama Bin Laden was CIA agent who fought American funded Soviet-Afghan War with Afghan Taliban to defeat Communism (Ravimandalam, 2004, p.2 White Jr, 2012, p.2, Ahmad, 2001, Cooke, 2007, Cave, 2001). Despite promises, the US and British government not only failed to provide concrete evidence about Osama Bin Laden’s involvement in the tragic incident of 9/11 but also according to the official website of FBI he was neither blamed nor required for such an attack (Cooke, 2007, p.187, Griffin, 2008, pp.188-191, Griffin and Scott, 2007, pp.103-106) but even then Pakistan was under American war threat for not cooperating in the mythical “War on Terror” (Tarpley, 2005) despite the fact that the most wanted antagonist, Osama Bin Laden, had already died in 2001 (Fox News, December 26, 2001). According to the newly appointed Vice Chancellor of Oxford University, the US overreacted on the incident of 9/11, quoted in Ward (2015). The final result of this overreaction was more mistrust and misunderstanding that neither helped Pakistan nor the US and in March 2010, Pakistani Foreign Minister makes clear to the Americans in Washington that Pakistan has “already done too much” and Pakistan asks the US to understand its problem instead of pressurizing to do more (Gannon, 2010, Baabar, 2010).

It is quite paradoxical that the US is not officially at war with Pakistan but even then both President Bush and Obama and three defense secretaries regularly instructed JSOC to step up intelligence and killing activities in Pakistan (Priest and Arkin, 2011). Time will tell whether or not these American actions against a sovereign and non-NATO ally country come under the violation of international law and Geneva Convention but such actions did not get the attention of mainstream America media in spite of the fact that Pakistani media gave extensive coverage to such stories but they were discarded and rejected by the US mainstream media as false, baseless and sheer propaganda (Scahill, 2009). Disclosing the agenda of President Obama for Pakistan, Cameron P. Munter, Obama’s ambassador to Pakistan, says that he did not realize that “his job was to kill people” (McKelvey, 2012). Mr. Obama’s slogan and promise for “change” and “something different” for Pakistan does not turn into reality for Americans and Pakistanis rather he has extended the agenda of his predecessor (Savage, 2009, Eli, 2010, Los Angeles Times Editorial 2011, Gorka, 2014, Boyer, 2013). President Obama (2013) says that America has lost much over “Trillion dollars” and 7,000 soldiers in the “War on Terror” but now American life and the world is much safe and time has come to end the this war but his policy has been fired back because his counterterrorism policies have caused more terrorism and are under much fierce criticism (Sedney, 2015, Gourevitch, 2014, Eland, 2014, Oliver, 2014, The Economist, 2013, Mothana, 2012, McKelvey, 2012, Engelhardt, 2014, Aslam, 2011, Becker and Scott, 2012).

Media reporting on the failure of US policy and defeat in war is not a new phenomenon. The criticism on Mr. Obama’s counterterrorism policy reminds us the media coverage of Vietnam War. Snow and Taylor (2006) note that “In a democracy, when things go wrong at home, it becomes much more difficult to project a positive image abroad.” Similarly, retaining a positive image at home becomes challenging for the “Golden Triangle” and media when things get out of control both at home and abroad then American media seem to work on the behalf of people because America is a democracy. When America meets with defeat in an international conflict, its soldiers get killed, human rights activists organize protests and political consensus breaks on a contentious foreign policy issue then press starts reporting against war and the mainstream press like *NYT* publishes secret pentagon papers (as it happened during Vietnam War) and tells people that American soldiers are dying in Vietnam thus the American government under the cover of responsible government to people calls backs the troops to avoid further humiliation of permanent defeat and gives an impression of great American values and independent and vibrant media that work for the people and keep check on the actions of the government taken on the behalf of the people.

What is the “War on Terror”? Where from this phrase come? Who is the enemy called “Terror”? Why coverage patterns about terror in the media serve the agenda of war that Mr. Obama expended exponentially which he openly admits while giving a counterterrorism policy speech at National Defense University (Obama, 2013). President Bush coined the phrase “War on Terror” and the media reporters and analysts gave this phrase a global fame without its deep and critical analysis that what actually does it mean? May be it is done on the behalf of “Golden Triangle” – the White House, the Pentagon, and the State Department – as *The History of Mass Media in the United States: An Encyclopedia* notes that “... there always remain a symbolic relationship between media

and Golden triangle” (Blanchard, 2013, p.368). But beyond “symbolic relationship” the “Golden Triangle” has direct involvement in the media industry (Rickard, 2015, Allan and Zelizer, 2004, Shoemaker and Reese, 1996, p.197) to create false stories dipped in danger, fear and violence to win the support of the public.

Atrocity news about Pakistan convinced the already terrified American nation that whatever their government is doing in Pakistan is better for the world peace. According to Donna Schlagheck “violence creates “psychological impact for the purpose of achieving political objective”, quoted in (Blanchard, 2013, p.367), which Mr. Obama has achieved well and proudly said that American lives are safe now. Brzezinski writes that 9/11 has left a great fear impact on American mind and “Terrorism is not an enemy but a technique of warfare ... Constant reference to the “War on Terror” did accomplish one major objective: It stimulated the emergence of a culture of fear. Fear obscures reason, intensifies emotions and makes it easier for demagogic politicians to mobilize the public on behalf of the policies they want to pursue” (Brzezinski, 2007). Talking to Israeli television, President Obama says that:

We’re always trying to balance a politics of hope and a politics of fear ... as a consequence of a reactive fear, we made what I believe were very damaging strategic mistakes ... And wars ... And we lost lives, and we lost credibility in the world stage ... we lost our values ... my job as President ... and you as a journalist [is] ... to feed hope and not just feed fear (Dayan, 2015).

President Obama is right because in the case of Pakistan, Obama administration and mainstream American press did not maintain balance between politics and fear with deliberate and conscious effort.

In the constructed year January 2009 – January 2010, the mainstream press helped the American government in implementing its policy in Pakistan by continuously terrorizing the American public from an unknown enemy called “Terror.” But this is not a new technique of the American press. A bulk of literature and academic studies on Press-Government relations in America on foreign affairs are of the view that the US media work as a terror and fear spreading machine by terrifying the Americans using name-calling technique for their enemies, such as beast, monster, butcher, evil religion, axis of evil etc. The most notable enemies that received such name-calling are General Cornwallis (British General), General Weyler (Spanish General), Emperor Kaiser Wilhelm II (German Emperor), Hitler, Russian Communism, Saddam Hussain, WMDs, Al Qaeda, Taliban, ISIS, AQAP, ISI, Islam, Islamic bomb, Islamic extremism, Jihad, Osama Bin Laden etc. But the front-page story of the *Post* published on June 12, 2009 exaggerated fear to a new level by reporting that the struggle of Pakistan against terrorism and Taliban is “the struggle seems to go against their very DNA of Pakistani people” (Witte, 2009a). This is an intense fear feeding journalism with an absolute absence of facts and on ground investigative and objective reporting.

Media scholars are of the view that newspaper usually do not do actual and factual reporting based on ground realities by doing investigative reporting in the historical, social and political context of the problem related to a foreign country and news reporters mostly rely on official sources. Snow (2003, pp.42-43) quotes John McArthur of *Harper’s* who says that since reporters are in hurry to meet the deadline” thus they use the past stories of their own news organization as their “principal historian source” and the story repeats over and over again and it infects the news accuracy like a “computer virus.” The above mentioned story of the *Post* in which terrorism is linked with Pakistani DNA is a kind of story which is infected with inaccuracy because President Obama (2013) accepts the fact that Pakistan has lost thousands of soldiers and common citizens in the “War on Terror.” Pakistani army has done several military operations against Taliban and American military admits that Pakistan has killed and caught more Taliban and Al Qaeda members than the NATO forces (Innocent, 2009). But, what can be more expected from a global opinion making machine like the *Post* because this is the very newspaper that did not publish any apology or Special Editor Note on wrong reporting about the presence of WMDs in Iraq, despite the fact that commenting about his speech in the UN on WMDs, Mr. Collin Powel said that “his speech was a “blot” on his record, “terrible,” and “painful” whereas the *NYT* ran a special Editor’s Note about the unqualified and questionable information (Blumenthal, 2007) but the *Post* did not apologize for the wrong information it gave to the people to justify American war on Iraq which caused death and psychological trauma for millions of Iraqis. In this context, can we really trust the analogy of the *Post* about terrorism and Pakistani DNA?

Addressing to a seminar at Area Study Center for Africa, North and South America, Quaid-I-Azam university, Islamabad, Pakistan, Mayfield (2008), the Counselor of American Public Relations at US Embassy, Islamabad, said that President Bush wants to end “tyranny” and he wants to follow the strategies of President Reagan. President Reagan was unilateralist, so was Mr. Bush and so is Mr. Obama because their policies are unilateralist and their rhetoric and actions echo distinctive “American Internationalism” and “Militarism.” President Reagan

had mastery over propaganda and his strategy was:

... leak a scare story about foreign enemies, grab the headlines. If, much later, reporters poke holes in the cover story, so what? The truth will receive far less attention than the original lie, and by then another round of falsehoods will be dominating the headlines (Snow, 2003, p.42).

What purpose a “scary” story will serve? It will definitely alert the security sense of people and they will look at the President to save them from the forthcoming danger because “his main job is to save American lives” (Obama, 2009). 9/11 has made the job easy and it will always help the “Golden Triangle” to terrify the people from those whom they want to whack and the press will follow their orders blindly because the editor-in-chief in America is the American President as Lyndon B Johnson claimed, quoted in Shoemaker and Reese (1996, p.172).

2. Methodology

The front-page stories of the three mainstream American Newspapers – The *New York Times*, The *Washington Post*, and The *Wall Street Journal* – are gathered from ProQuest National Newspapers database by entering the term “Pakistan” in the search box and by clicking the option of front-page with a time limit from January 2009 to January 2010. In total, 119 stories are published by the three leading newspapers on their front-page. The *New York Times* publishes 73 stories, the *Washington Post* publishes 33 stories and the *Wall Street Journal* publishes 13 stories.

Thematic Analysis method is used to identify and analyze patterns to discover the coverage pattern about Pakistan in the front-page stories of leading American newspapers. Thematic analysis can be used to develop and construct arguments across a data set to find “repeated patterns of meaning” (Braun and Clarke, 2006). The data corpus is analyzed to provide a rich thematic description to get a complete sense of important and dominant themes and patterns. The data was coded on the basis of research questions with a theoretical approach of Social Responsibility Theory of the Press, propaganda and propaganda principles of Anne Morelli. Codes were both data and theory driven keeping in mind the research questions because they help to identify features in a meaningful way regarding the phenomenon. Themes are identified at explicit and latent level for better description, interpretation and to examine underlying ideas, assumptions and conceptualizations in the data corpus of front-page stories based on the theoretical framework.

3. Research Questions

Like all qualitative studies, this study also revolves around one broad question that how the counterterrorism efforts of Pakistan in the “War on Terror” are given front-page coverage in the leading American newspapers in the first year of Obama’s presidency, January 2009 – January 2010? Following are the narrower research questions. The answer to these questions will provide answer to the broader question.

- 1: What is the nature of Pak-US political and security relations in the first year of Obama’s presidency and how and with which perspective Pakistan received the press coverage and what was the end result?
- 2: Is Pakistan a country that is using terrorism as its official state policy and is it really a threat to American interests in the world and South Asian region?
- 3: How the leading press is giving coverage to the covert and overt American counterterrorism operations and drone strikes in Pakistan?
- 4: Does the leading press give sound policy options to strengthen Pak-US relations at government and public level to get desired results in the “War on Terror”?
- 5: Being a democratic and social institution what is the working principle of the mainstream American press? Is it working under Social Responsibility Theory of the Press or is it working as a propaganda and fear creating machine on the behalf of the American government to justify the undeclared war against Pakistan?

4. Theoretical Framework

Social Responsibility Theory of the Press, propaganda and propaganda principles of Anne Morelli are the primary theoretical and guiding principles of this study.

Propaganda theory was given by Harold Lasswell. *History of Mass Media in the United States: An Encyclopedia* narrates that “Propaganda seeks to bring a desired change through manipulation or deception. It may also be factual but presented in a manner that misleads an individual or group” (Blanchard, 2013, p.539). To Lasswell, the purpose of propaganda is to stimulate the desired response and to negate all those responses that are not desired (Baran and Davis, 2011, p.83). Lasswell and Lippmann considered media as an external agent to deliver

information to isolate audience member (Baran and Davis, 2011, p.587). The more the audience is divided, the more it will be easy to mislead them to get the favorable results. According to Lippmann, propaganda works better when people are unsophisticated about an issue (Lippmann, 1946). The propaganda principles of Anne Morelli are described well by Nicta (2009) which are listed as under:

- 1: We don't want war, we are only defending ourselves
- 2: The other guy is the sole responsible for this war
- 3: Our adversary's leader is evil and looks evil
- 4: We are defending a noble purpose, not special interest
- 5: The enemy is purposefully causing atrocities; we only commit mistakes
- 6: The enemy is using unlawful weapons
- 7: We have very little losses, the enemy is losing big
- 8: Our cause is sacred
- 9: Those who doubt our propaganda are traitors

Social Responsibility Theory of Press is based on the findings and recommendations of Hutchins Commission on Freedom of Press which was established in 1942 and released its findings in 1947. Today, American media proudly claim to work under the golden principles of this theory (Pitner, 2009). This theory emphasizes on the importance of free and objective press that could give accurate news reports and may scrutinize other social institutions for the betterment of society and to foster “productive and creative “Great Communities” by becoming the voice of all people not just the politically and economically powerful people that dominate the society (Baran and Davis, 2011). Denis MacQuail summarizes its principles as follows, quoted in Baran and Davis (2011, p.116):

- 1: Media should accept and fulfill certain obligations to society.
- 2: These Obligations are mainly to be met by setting high or professional standards of informativeness, truth, accuracy, objectivity, and balance.
- 3: The media should avoid whatever might lead to crime, violence, or civil disorder or give offense to minority groups.
- 4: The media as a whole should be pluralist and reflect the diversity of their society, giving access to various points of view and to rights of reply.
- 5: Society and the public have a right to expect high standards of performance, and intervention can be justified to secure the, or a, public good.
- 6: Journalists and media professionals should be accountable to society as well as to employers and the market.

5. Thematic Analysis

5.1 Pak-US Civil and Military Relations: Bad Past, Seeking Good Future Based on Mistrust

President Obama, before his arrival to the White House, had announced that he will take unilateral action if Pakistani government does not cooperate in the “War on Terror” whereas Pakistanis were hoping for good relations (Rodriguez, 2009). But after 4 days of taking oath President Obama ordered unilateral drone strikes in Pakistan and the *Post* ran a front-page headline – 2 U.S. Air Strikes Offer Concrete Sign of Obama’s Foreign Policy in Pakistan – on January 24, 2009 and said that “first high-profile hostile military action taken under Obama’s four-day-old presidency.” The story also quoted Secretary Clinton that, “... those in Pakistan who do not join the effort will pay the price ... we will not relax Pakistan.” The prestigious newspaper also said that, “The shaky Pakistani government of Asif Ali Zardari has expressed hopes for warm relations with Obama.” The story also gave the point of view of Mr. Shuja Nawaz (Director of the South Asia Center at the Atlantic Council in Washington) who said that Obama’s bombing will not work rather “he has to win over people.” In short, the leading press told in advance that Pakistanis are viewing bumpy relations ahead. In this context, Pak-US civil and security relations in the midst of “War on Terror” can be categorized into five sub-themes during Obama’s first year – January 2009 – January 2010:

- 1: Implementation of Shariah Ordinance in Swat and Truce with Taliban
- 2: Pakistani Corrupt Politicians and Rogue Army: Supporters of Regional and World Terrorism
- 3: Swat Operation and IDPs

4: US Do More Attitude: South and North Waziristan Operation

5: Obama's West point Speech: More Public Praise and Less Criticism Strategy for Pakistan

5.1.1 Implementation of Shariah Ordinance in Swat and Truce with Taliban

Rosenberg and Hussain (2009) write in the *WSJ* page A1 story – Pakistan' Leader Stirs Fresh Turmoil – that President Zardari was backed by the US because he showed commitment to fight against militants but contrary to his vows he made a truce with Taliban leader, Sufi Muhammad, and implemented Shariah Ordinance in Swat. For the leading press Sufi was a Taliban leader but actually he was not because in 2006 he asked people to boycott the Taliban (Dastageer, 2015) and of course Shariah is still the demand of a large majority of people in Pakistan especially in Swat and tribal areas of Pakistan and the US must respect the wish of the people. But, Perlez (2009a) writes in the *NYT* front-page story – Pakistan Makes Taliban Truce, Creating a Haven – on February 17, 2009 that by making truce Pakistan has rebuffed American demands. The story quotes Mr. Holbrooke's statement that these militants are direct threat to "our leadership, our capitals, and our people," and further states that the sympathizers of religious extremists are in politics, judiciary, middle class, armed forces and even in media. This charge is a lethal propaganda and without any investigation labeling Pakistani institutions as supporters of terrorists is clearly a kind of reporting on the behalf of American government which wanted Pakistan to take military action in Swat.

It is fact that the democratic Pakistani government made truce with Taliban on the demand of Swati people for peace in the region but the *NYT* instead of analyzing the reasons of this political decision and its practical implications publishes another story on the same date – Taliban Threats are Heard in New York – and confirms the statement of Mr. Holbrooke and further creates stir and menace by saying that Swati people think that army and militants are brothers. According to BBC, one Pakistani soldier said that Pakistan is a country "where soldiers are slaughtered ... their bodies may be found but not their head" quoted in (Innocent, 2009). Negating the principles of Social Responsibility Theory of the Press, the *NYT* does not take input of Pakistani army to confirm whether or not they are "brothers" of militants. This journalism surely proves that Pakistani army and militants are two sides of the same coin thus Morelli's propaganda is working to extend the policy goals of the "Golden Triangle" to prove that the enemy – Pakistani civilian and security institutions – is evil and traitor which is not obeying to American demands. Surprisingly, Obama administration and the Afghan government have been doing peace talks with Taliban and they were allowed to open office in Qatar and even in 2015 the US is doing dialogue with Taliban. Both the Indian and American press praise American efforts for peace and see Pakistan with suspicion that it is not in the favor of peace (Associated Press, 2015, Bengali and Latifi, 2015, DeYoung, 2013, Rubin, 2012), whereas Zenko (2015) writes in *Foreign Policy* that Pakistan is among those six countries where "63 percent of all [terror] attacks occurred." Peace is in the best interest of Pakistan but the mainstream American press has lost truth, objectivity and balance in the case of Pakistan and is unwilling to understand and analyze the facts from Pakistani point of view.

Question arises, why the press is creating sensation and doing propaganda to advocate the stance of the government? The answer of this question lies in the AFP/PAK strategy of President Obama when he announced to deploy 17,000 American troops in Southern Afghanistan. The strategy was to kill and disperse militants with drone strikes and American and Pakistani troops will kill them on the other side. But, General Kiyani – the then chief of army staff – did not agree to move armed forces from eastern border because of security threat from India as Sanger (2009a) writes in the *NYT* page A1 story – Obama Expands Missile Strikes Inside Pakistan – that Obama is facing the same challenges that Bush faced. The *NYT* further says that Pakistani intelligence agencies "maintain shadowy links to Taliban even as they take American funds to fight them" but the story also says that Pakistani intelligence agencies gave intelligence on two occasions to the US about the Taliban leader Baitullah Mehsud – alleged Murderer of Pakistani Prime Minister, Benazir Bhutto – but the US did not take any action. The *NYT* is contradicting its own claim in the same story i.e. on one side Pakistan is supporting terrorists and on the other it is providing information to the US to hunt them. Schmitt and Parlez (2009b) write on February 23, 2009 in the *NYT* that General Kiyani wants public support for Army action because Pakistanis are against American lethal drone strikes for the reason that such strikes are violation of their sovereignty and innocent citizens die whereas in retaliation militants aggressively attack resulting common people and Pakistani political leaders, soldiers and security personnel are getting killed on daily basis.

The study does not find any critical analysis of Obama's extra-judicial killing policy in Pakistan through drones and secret operations because according to Morelli's propaganda principles the cause of America is sacred and enemy is evil, and the US is winning whereas the enemy is facing heavy losses. If murdering the common people was a smart strategy of the US in the "War on Terror" then question arises that why *NYT* remains silent from

June 2004 till May 29, 2012 when it publishes a story “Secret ‘Kill List’ Proves a Test of Obama’s Principles and Will” (Becker and Scott, 2012). Since the US wants to end the Global War on Terror (GWOT) thus probably the reason is that the “Golden Triangle” itself wanted to break the silence over killing through the *NYT*, as some critics believe, or probably the death of few American citizens in drone strikes and the reports of human rights organizations forced the mainstream media to break silence over the “War on Terror” policy of the US. According to AP Poll published on May 1, 2015, three quarter Americans support killing non-American citizens outside the American soil but the poll does not tell them that a majority who die in drone strikes are innocent people which the US government denies (Dilanian and Swanson, 2015). This type of coverage serves the White House rhetoric because fear and danger are the constant themes of American administration and the coverage is according to the propaganda principles of Anne Morelli and a clear negation of the principles of Social Responsibility Theory of the Press.

5.1.2 Pakistani Corrupt Politicians and Rogue Army: Supporters of Regional and World Terrorism

On May 4, 2009 the *NYT* publishes a front-page story – U.S. Options in Pakistan Limited; Nation Rife With Security Issues, Infighting, Anti-American Sentiment – and describing the problems of Mr. Obama the newspaper writes that the “U.S. is fighting Pakistan-bases extremist proxy war, through an army over which it has little control, in alliance with a government in which it has little confidence” but the same story also lauds Pakistani cooperation in the “War on Terror” by reporting that the US forces are given permission to work secretly in Pakistan to take action against militants and extremist forces but even then the *NYT* suggest for more “anxious criticism” to pressurize Pakistan to force it to cooperate more according to the American demands. It is surprising that why the *NYT* wants America to get the control of Pakistan army? Since Pakistani armed forces are not under American control according to the American wish thus the same newspaper in its November 30, 2009 front-page story quotes an American official who said, “Everyone knows this is a complex relationship” and the story quotes Obama’s statement, “Keep the pressure on” (Baker et al., 2009). This criticism comes under Morelli’s propaganda principle that we are right, the enemy is wrong thus war propaganda machine is being used to force Pakistan to obey otherwise media will continue tarnishing Pakistan’s image in the world.

The US also used pressure tactics with General Musharraf who is the most unpopular leader in Pakistan according to our prestigious American press but instead of learning the lesson from past, the leading press started a campaign against Pakistan’s top civil and security executives and portrayed the picture that soon Pakistan which is a nuclear country is going to fall in the hands of Taliban and the world is at the brink of destruction. Fighting for a noble cause is a propaganda technique under Morelli’s propaganda principles and works best to serve the agenda of the “Golden Triangle.” If the democratic government of Pakistan does something against the will of people then of course it will lose its public support and a weak government cannot help the US in fighting its most ambitiously fought \$6 trillion war (Blimes, 2013). Instead of advising the US government to work on winning the hearts and minds strategy, the noble press follows propaganda strategy that the US is savior of the world and Pakistan being a non-stable country poses danger to world because Al Qaeda and Taliban will capture its nuclear assets thus Obama’s War is noble and probably this is the reason that Mr. Obama won the Nobel Peace Prize, but recent criticism in American and Western media show that militancy, aggression and violence has increased in the world in the result of Obama’s counterterrorism policies and the shine of Mr. Obama’s Nobel Peace Prize has been dimmed.

Page A1 story of the *WSJ* by Rosenberg and Hussain (2009) is purely a character assassination story about President Zardari to insult him under the propaganda technique of name calling. This story can be considered extremely unethical because it is used to tarnish his personality to force him to cooperate in the counterterrorism plan of the Obama administration which is based on “insanity” according to Brooks (2015). President Obama and his officials asked president Zardari to focus on Al Qaeda and Taliban but not to create domestic political unrest. The story says that Mr. Zardari’s attitude with his cabinet members is coarse and he uses intemperate language with them and gives them shut up call, make fun of their looks, and to one senator he called “impotent” and to another female minister, who was later appointed as ambassador to US, called “witch.” The story further says that Zardari is “known for corruption allegations that made the nickname for him as “Mr. Ten Percent.” The *WSJ* tells the world that nobody knows who is running the country and because of the fear of Taliban, Mr. Zardari has locked himself in the highly secured “Red Zone” area, his relation with the military and Prime Minister Gilani are sour and the nuclear Pakistan is close to revolution. The irony of this media coverage is that the *WSJ* even does not know that Pakistan has a parliamentary form of government in which Prime Minister has all the powers but the prestigious *WSJ* is just following the policy line of Obama administration to pressurize President Zardari to implement American policies in Pakistan because he became president with the backing of US (as it is reported in the press). To portray the President of Pakistan as criminal, corrupt, unsophisticated,

incompetent person serves two purposes i.e. (1) to force Pakistan to accept whatever the American demands are and (2) to convince the world and Americans that in this great time of crisis the US has to rely on this person thus America is bound to take unilateral action against the wish of Pakistani government and people.

No war can be fought without public support and the “War on Terror” is an ideological war, and common Pakistanis are being killed by the believers of this extremist ideology on one side and on the other US drone hellfire missiles are making them their prey. Instead of evaluating Obama’s “bullets and bombs” strategy which is undermining Zardari position in the country as head of the state, the three mainstream newspapers are running character assassination campaign against the head of Pakistani government. Following the pack journalism, the *Post* runs a headline against Zardari on March 04, 2009 and on March 16, 2009, both the leading newspapers, the *NYT* and the *Post*, further enhance the propaganda of Zardari’s failure and the very next day (March 17, 2009) the *NYT* runs a headline which says “For U.S., Drones Are Weapons of Choice in Fighting Against Qaeda” (Drew, 2009). Now the mainstream American media and politicians are raising legal, ethical and moral questions on the use of armed drones (UCAVs – Unmanned Combat Aerial Vehicles) as a counterterrorism strategy especially after the death of American citizens in drone strikes outside the American soil. Truth, objectivity, balanced reporting lost in propaganda which is a sheer negation and violation of Social Responsibility Theory of the Press and such a subjective coverage on the behalf of “Golden Triangle” served no purpose but caused criticism for President Obama in the world and increased anti-Americanism in Pakistan.

Militants’ attacks on Sri Lankan national cricket team, Lahore Police Academy and other important security installations in Punjab and across the country were of great concern for Pakistan and America. The *Post*’s page A1 story of Constable (2009a) raises questions about insurgents’ shift into the urban areas of terror ridden, unstable, nuclear armed country, Pakistan, and on the same date, i.e. March 31, 2009, the *NYT* following the pattern of the *Post* publishes story and raises the same concerns (Tavernise et al., 2009). Pakistani army starts military operation on May 6, 2009 but the mainstream press publishes 19 stories on the front-page from April 05, 2009 till May 5, 2009 with an overlapping thematic pattern against Pakistani army, Islam and Islamic political parties which are considered as stepping stone for Taliban. It is also discussed that Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif (the then opposition leader and ex prime minister) has links with Islamic parties and he might be the best choice to help the US in the “War on Terror.” Now, Mr. Nawaz Sharif is the Prime Minister but even then extremist are killing people. Though the intensity of killing in Pakistan is less comparing to 2009-2010 because of military operation against extremist elements with the support of Pakistani public and politicians yet overall terrorism has increased in the world but not in America and deaths from terrorism have increased more than “4,000 percent” since 2000 (Zenko, 2015).

Gall and Schmitt (2009) of the *NYT* publish a stunning headline that says “U.S. Questions Pakistan’s Will to Stop Taliban” and report that top military officers of Pakistan have family ties with insurgents that is why they are reluctant to take action against them. Top brass of Pakistani military has also been killed in the “War on Terror” hence *NYT*’s reporting is propagandistic to justify the words of Mr. Obama that the US needs to root out Al Qaeda from the Pakistani society (as mentioned earlier). The study finds serious internal inconsistencies and contradictions in the coverage pattern of American mainstream press about Pakistan. On one side the leading press reports that insurgents are slaughtering the people in Swat and cutting their noses and airs and on the other it says that people of Pakistan support them. It is hard to understand that how can Pakistanis support the murderers of their loved ones and in the one year coverage the press reports only twice that people are fighting against Taliban. But, it is the propaganda following the agenda of Obama administration to malign all the segments of Pakistani society to build pressure on Pakistani politicians and army for military action against Taliban according to American demands which may further destabilize the country. But because of the absence of on ground and investigative reporting, the leading press ignored the fact and relied on the official sources which were in favor of mounting pressure on Pakistan to “do more” in the “War on Terror.”

The dilemma is that neither Obama administration nor the American press have trust in Pakistani security institutions. Mazzetti and Schmitt (2009) report that the “S Wing” of ISI supports Mullah Omar, Gulbuddin Hekmatyar, and other militant groups like Lashkar-i-Taiba and Jaish-i-Muhammad and provides them moles to keep one step ahead from American forces and recruits militants from *Madaris* (Religious Schools) on the behalf of the these militants. Though the *NYT* presents the point of view of former DG ISI – General Javed Ashraf Qazi – who says that Americans’ opinion is biased and with mistrust both countries cannot move forward in the “War on Terror.” The leading newspaper fails to analyze the statement of General Qazi and does not try to understand Pakistan’s position. Morelli’s propaganda principle works here best that America is right and the enemy (non-NATO ally – Pakistan) is wrong because for Washington it is a just war that is being fought for a just cause.

Within weeks after truce with Taliban and consistent American drone strikes militancy spreads into the urban areas of Pakistan and a new campaign starts in the American press that Taliban will soon be in Islamabad. In the month of April 2009 (before the visit of President Zardari to Washington on May 6-7, 2009) the three leading newspapers publish headlines that Taliban are very close to capture the capital – Islamabad. On May 6, 2009, giving an interview to CNN, Mr. Zardari says that by capturing one or two mountains, the Taliban cannot topple his government and Mr. Zardari asks CNN that why American media link Pakistani intelligence agencies with militants; if CIA gets information about Al Qaeda, does it mean that CIA has direct link with it?; these are mere sources and every intelligence agency has them (Focus With Faiza, 2009). But, the leading newspapers negating the Social Responsibility Theory of the Press neither gives him coverage nor publishes his point of view about ISI's link with militant organizations rather the *Post* publishes a front-page story on May 04, 2009 and tells the world that President Obama will ask his counterpart (Mr. Zardari) to solve his political problems and prepare the nation to fight against Taliban (DeYoung, 2009c). Contrary to this when Indian Prime Minister was invited by Mr. Obama as his first state guest in 2009, the *Post's* correspondent interviews him in New Delhi and tells him that "People in the United States don't understand why are we in Afghanistan" and he replies because of 9/11 (Weymouth, 2009).

9/11 is a media spin that is being repeatedly used in American politics and media to terrorize the people and to pressurize countries like Pakistan with which America is in forced relationship and playing "cat-and-mouse game" as DeYoung (2009b) writes in the *Post*. President Obama has also stated many times that people ask why America is in Afghanistan. America has spent \$6 trillion (Blimes, 2013) in the "War on Terror" and even then Americans do not know that why America is in Afghanistan? Thus, the leading press extending the agenda of Obama is telling the reason of American presence in Afghanistan by using all the propaganda techniques to terrify the world from Pakistani army and its hidden and secret links with Al Qaeda and other militants.

Propaganda attacks on the ignorance of people, thus media successfully create news themes and patters on the whims and wishes of the government because in democracy like America people cannot be forced to follow the governmental agenda thus the best way is to make them follow by controlling their minds and by terrifying them and it is easy in America because according to many studies, polls and studies, Americans have little interest and knowledge about world affairs (Iyengar et al., 2009). But, they do value democracy, liberty, equality, justice, freedom and like every normal nation in the world they like peace and security thus American media exploits these noble norms on the behalf of the government that such and such people are antihuman and our values tell us to stand against them but at the surface American civil and military establishment tries to achieve its political and security objectives. Thomas Jefferson has already informed the people "If a nation expects to be ignorant and free, it expects what never was and never will be ... The people cannot be safe without information. Where the press is free and every man is able to read, all is safe" (We The People Radio Network, 2007). Hutchins states that the purpose of the press and its owners is to inform and educate the people and developing public opinion for the common good and press must be free from the government control (Ravimandalam, 2004, p.19) but American mainstream press is negating the principles of the Social Responsibility Theory of the Press in case of coverage about Pakistan.

5.1.3 Swat Operation and IDPs

On May 6, 2009 when Mr. Zardari visits Washington, Pakistani army, which is not in favor of the violent military solution to curb the terrorism, starts military operation in Swat and more than three million people displace (Fair et al., 2014) which is the largest community of IDPs in the world according to the leading American press, though the press gave the figure more than two million. These IDPs are additional burden on the war weary and feeble economy of Pakistan. Instead of appreciating the efforts of Pakistan, the leading newspapers publish front-page stories on May 5, 2009 and creates suspicion regarding Pakistani military's ability to fight a guerilla war and under name calling propaganda strategy associate Mr. Zardari's visit with aid hunting. To win the hearts and minds of people, Prime Minister Gilani asks the world for aid and assures that Pakistani army will win this war and the press reports that the refugees are neither happy with Taliban nor with America, Pakistani government and military. Lots many local organizations come forward to help the refugees but the US press starts doing propaganda against them that Islamic organizations are doing charity work and militants are pouring into the camps of IDPs (Witte, 2009b). To help the needy is an American value under classical liberalism. Similarly, in every religion it is virtuous to help the needy and Islam is not an exception thus linking Islamic charity with Islamic extremism is bigotry and propaganda on the part of mainstream American press. The reporting and thinking of the mainstream American press about Islam doesn't match with the Obama's Cairo speech and President Bush's thinking about Islam (Woods, 2005, pp.545-546). Parlez and Shah (2009) also report that Islamic charity organizations are "exhorting men to jihad." Linking charity with Jihad is purely a

subjective reporting. Moreover, Jihad is being used in the western media as a generic term which usually refers to wars and killing whereas “war” is just one aspect of Jihad whose literal meaning is “struggle” and the best struggle is against one’s own greed and bad actions. Either the western press does not know much about Jihad or using it as a propaganda tool to create fear in the public whose psyche has been permanently affected by 9/11.

The *Post*’s front-page story – Seeking Truth and Trust in Pakistan; Envoy Tries to Convince Refugees That U.S. Is on Their Side – reports that many IDPs see the US as an “instigator of the war and threat to Pakistan’s sovereignty ... Pakistanis do not want to be associated with their unpopular ally” (DeYoung, 2009a). The leading press reports that Mr. Holbrooke is surprised that the US is the largest contributor of aid but even then Pakistani people are against America. The worthy envoy forgot that Obama administration and the leading press wanted violent solution hence violence only begets violence and hate. Over three million people leave home and the leading press does not write a single word about their plight, hardships and miseries except reporting that the camps of IDPs have become the source of recruitment for extremists. The people of Swat told Mr. Holbrooke that their camps are filthy, they have shortage of food, people are unemployed, local courts do not give them justice whereas Taliban gave them justice and solved the problems of locals hence many poor people joined them and the government did not pay them the displacement compensation money which was about \$300 and the envoy said that he will talk to President Zardari and expressed his wish to “do more” for IDPs. The people of Swat gave the solution to the envoy to counter and eradicate terrorism but the envoy did not recommend to the US government to invest in the people of Swat and tribal areas for lasting peace. Contrary to this, for the Western and American press, Malala Yousafzai (Youngest Nobel Peace Prize winner) is the only brave girl in Swat who stood for women emancipation and spoke against Taliban and she is “Media darling”, as Mufti (2014) titles her in *Columbia Journalism Review*, to tell the atrocity stories about Pakistan to the world. But when the Nobel Peace Prize winner “Media darling” meets with President Obama and his family in the Oval Office and asks him to win the hearts of mind of people by investing in the people instead of bombing them with drones, the mainstream press and the White House does not make her statement a headline and tries to hide it from public (Hart, 2014, *Democracy Now*, 2014, *The White House - Office of the Press Secretary*, 2013). Pakistani Foreign Minister also tells Mr. Holbrooke that the US must take concrete practical steps to win the trust of Pakistanis instead of doing “lip service” (Koehlmoos, 2010). Contrary to this, American press and government started pressurizing Pakistan for a new operation in South and North Waziristan and anticipated the defeat of Pakistan army.

The camps of IDPs are monitored by Pakistani military hence labeling their camps as Jihadi recruitment centers is a baseless reporting which further spoiled Pak-US relations. It is a strange reporting because on one side Pakistani army is fighting against these militants but on the other it is recruiting them to kill their own soldiers. Contrary to the predictions of US press and government, military operation remains quite successful, Swat is made clear and the mountains captured by Taliban are taken back and IDPs are sent to back home but the mainstream press continuing its propaganda against Pakistani army says that although Taliban faced losses, Pakistani army could not capture even one Taliban commander. Talking to Pakistani media Mr. Holbrooke says that Osama Bin Laden might not have seen the damage he has done in Swat because he is “living in a cave” (DeYoung, 2009a). Neither Pakistani nor American press critically analyzed the statement of the envoy. If Osama is hidden in a cave and he even does not has the capacity to see that what he has done to the people of Swat then how can he run a global terrorist organization which forced America to waste trillions of dollars of tax payers money on such a lame person.

Addressing to the annual dinner of radio and television correspondents at the White House, president Bush says there are no WMDs in Iraq, “they may be under here” and the whole American public opinion making machine laughs with the President (Gazeboman, 2004). Press is an open forum for public debate to form a better public policy but the American press is on a propaganda mission following the policy goals of the “Golden Triangle” as “Dan Rather’s pledge on the David Letterman show: “George Bush is the President ... Wherever he wants me to line up, just tell me where” (Rutenberg and Carter, 2001). If this is the journalistic standard of American press on contentious foreign policy issues then their laugh on the WMD joke of Mr. Bush is much justified and uncovers the fact that press in the US is the mouthpiece of the government and it has lost its value as a social and democratic institution which is not working under the Social Responsibility Theory of the Press. Mainstream US newspapers’ coverage pattern regarding Pakistan is not much different than WMDs.

5.1.4 US Do More Attitude: South and North Waziristan Operation

While Pakistani army gets busy in operation in Swat, President Obama gives his famous Cairo speech on June 4, 2009 and the *Post* giving the reference of Obama’s Cairo speech writes a story under the headline – Pakistan’s Next Fight? Don’t Go There – and reports that no president in future can call the American troops back “without killing or capturing” Osama Bin Laden and his deputy Ayman al-Zahwari who has taken refuge in South

Waziristan (Schmidle, 2009). Similarly the *NYT* writes a front-page story with a headline – Pakistan Objects to U.S. Expansion in Afghan War – on July 22, 2009 and says that Pakistan only wants to fight those Taliban who are threatening and destabilizing the country and it does not want to cooperate with America against Afghan Taliban fearing that they will get into Pakistan through porous Pak-Afghan border and will create havoc in the country (Schmitt and Parlez, 2009a). The *NYT* further writes that despite the fact, Obama administration admires Pakistani military's efforts against extremist forces yet expresses frustration as well on Pakistan's failure to take full action against those Islamic militants who are using Pakistan as their base. Describing the history of South Waziristan the press informs beforehand that "A battle there would no leisurely game of badminton" (Schmidle, 2009) and discussing the thousand years history of the region the press writes that no army has every succeeded there and labels the people of Waziristan as unruly, disobedient and tough.

Contrary the fact that General Musharraf has already done operation there in 2004 and 2007 and Pakistan army has faced fatal losses in the tough mountainous terrain of Waziristan even then without caring the lives of Pakistani soldiers the leading press does not find another solution to solve the problem of militancy and extremism, rather the press blames Pakistan to pick proxies by supporting Lashkar-i-Taiba, Haqqani group, Molvi Nazeer, and other Afghan Taliban and according to Obama administration these groups are attacking on 68,000 American troops who are stationed in Afghanistan. The press reports that Pakistan considers these groups an asset in post-American Afghanistan. The US pressurized Pakistan to take action against them, but Pakistan said that these militants are in Afghanistan and American forces may capture or kill them there because Pakistan cannot compromise on the safety of its border with India. In the result of Swat operation, Taliban attacked on GHQ and many other important security installations and American press gave such events a massive coverage which defamed Pakistani government and army in the world. In the result of these attacks Pakistan army launches a full scale operation in South Waziristan.

The press reports that Al Qaeda and other militant networks were nurtured by Pakistani state and now they are taking it down and Al Qaeda is recruiting Arab, German, Swedes, French, African, Uzbek, Chechen, and African militants and they have links with Punjabi militants. General Petraeus named this union of militants as "industrial-strength insurgency." The front-page story of the *NYT* – U.S. Asks more From Pakistan in Terror War – published on November 16, 2009 presented the statement of General Jones who "urged Pakistan to combat extremists who fled to North Waziristan." It was said so because ignoring the concerns of Pakistan, Mr. Obama had deployed 30,000 more troops in Southern Afghanistan. With the coverage of the press and statements and actions of the White House and the Pentagon it is very clear that Pakistan is being dealt under the section 2, clause (a) of Joint Resolution of the Congress which says:

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES.

(a) **INGENERAL.**—That the President is authorized to use all necessary and appropriate force against those nations, organizations, or persons he determines planned, authorized, committed, or aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001, or harbored such organizations or persons, in order to prevent any future acts of international terrorism against the United States. (Public Law 107–40 107th Congress Joint Resolution, 2001)

According to this Joint Resolution of Congress, Pakistan is an enemy, a terrorist country, hence the American main stream press gives coverage to Pakistan accordingly which is biased, slanted, unrealistic, superficial, non-professional, propagandistic and against the golden principles of Social Responsibility Theory of the Press.

5.1.5 Obama's West point Speech: More Public Praise and Less Criticism Strategy for Pakistan

On December 1, 2009, President Obama giving a speech at West Point Military Academy says that Pakistani army has done operation against militants in Swat and South Waziristan because innocent people are being killed by these militants from "Karachi to Islamabad" and the US is the largest international supporter for IDPs. The president accepting the fact says that in past Pak-US relations remained quite rough but those days are over now and he offers friendship to Pakistan with mutual trust, respect and benefit. The press reports that Obama has offered Pakistan, public praise, less criticism, intelligence and economic corporation but he also demands from Islamabad to abate the use of insurgents to achieve the policy goals. The press reports this new relationship as a "cat-and-mouse" game (as mentioned earlier). American policy and its media reporting of Pakistan are of dual nature, on side the Obama administrations is trying to redefine the nature of Pak-US relations, but on the other Pakistan is considered as a supporter and promoter of terrorism.

After 7 days of Obama's West Point speech, the *NYT* runs the statement of General James who asks Pakistan to take action or "set aside" to let the American do it against Haqqani group and other Afghan Taliban (Sanger and Schmitt, 2009). The leading press publishes several front-page stories in which the nature of Pak-US relations is

discussed openly and the press publishes statements of Pakistani military and academia as “Alliance with the United States is too costly to bear ... it is really beginning to irk and anger us” (Perlez, 2009b). It is surprising that on one side American administration says that they cannot win this war without the help of Pakistan and on the other they are accusing and threatening their ally. A senior Pakistani official had already told the *Post* on May 4, 2009 that “What are the Americans trying to do, micromanage our politics? ... This is not South Vietnam” (DeYoung, 2009d). If this was the situation then why the American press on the behalf of American public did not tell the “Golden Triangle” that it needs to change its tone and policy with Pakistan because Obama’s “bombs and bullets” and “carrot and stick” strategy will not work rather “wining the hearts and minds” is the only solution. But the study finds that neither press nor the American administration did anything to fill the social and cultural gap between American and Pakistani people rather leading press flamed the negative emotions against Pakistan by publishing terror, danger and fear related stories and presented Pakistan as villain of South Asia that is not letting the US succeed in the “War on Terror.”

At the end of the year, the leading press tags Pakistan as a complicated and irritated ally that is very suspicious of American moves because in 1980s, after the defeat of Soviet Union, the US stops Pakistan’s aid and leaves Pakistan alone with millions of Afghan refugees and CIA funded and trained guerilla fighters, as it is admitted by Hillary Clinton (saeed, 2014, octoberman104, 2011). At the end of the year the American press publishes the opinion of Pakistanis regarding withdrawal of American troops from Afghanistan and politicians and academia in Pakistan believe that it will create power vacuum there and Al Qaeda and Taliban will definitely take revenge from Pakistan for doing military actions against them on the American demands hence press reports that Pakistanis favor political strategy over military strategy. Political solution was the right choice as Cook (2005) also recommended the same but both the American press and the “Golden Triangle” ignored it and the end result was devastating. On December 3, 2009, Pakistani former ambassador to the US – Dr. Maliha Lodhi – tells the leading press that “bombs and bullets” strategy will not work (Tavernise and Gall, 2009). But the American press following the line of the American administration favors and supports bombs, bullets and drones’ hellfire missile strategy of the US and uses all the propaganda tools and fear and danger strategy to justify the American way of war against a non-NATO ally country, Pakistan. This is a sheer negation and violation of Social Responsibility Theory of the Press in a democracy like America.

In this one year coverage, press relies on the official sources instead of doing investigative reporting. The end result is more distrust and much wider gulf between Pakistan and America at government and public level which cannot help at all to win the “War on Terror.” Tavernise and Gall (2009) giving a crux of Pak-US relations from January 2009 to January 2010 write that Mr. Obama tried to change the nature of Pak-US relations but trust deficit is so high that it is very “unlikely that Islamabad will be more attentive to an apparently war-weary U.S. and NATO than it was to a fire-breathing Bush administration eight years ago.” Pak-US relations in the first year of Obama’s first term presidency end with great mistrust and disrespect for each other at government and public level and the press failed to serve as a democratic institution in reporting and solving the contentious issues, resulting Pakistan destabilized more internally and externally and the US could not achieve its security and policy goals in AFPAK border region and Afghanistan.

5.2 Drones are the Best Choice in the “War on Terror”

The study finds that drone attacks are best option in Pakistan both for Obama administration and American press despite the fact that common people mostly die in such attacks. This is the same mainstream media that is criticizing Obama’s drone policy now because it has killed some alleged Al Qaeda American national terrorists outside the American soil especially Anwar al-Awlaki, who was never convicted by any American court, and his 16 years old son because he had not a “responsible father” according to the spokesperson of President Obama and Republican senator Rand Paul said that the response of president’s spokesperson on the death of al-Awlaki’s son is “reprehensible” (Democracy Now, 2013). American media (especially social media) and public called it a violation of 5th amendment which says that the US government cannot kill its citizens without due process of law. The *NYT*, American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) and Center for Constitutional Rights have sued the US government for all target killing because according to Scott Shane of the *NYT*, the reporters of the *NYT* “are all for transparency” (Democracy Now, 2013).

The study gets the impression that American politicians and press are very indifferent to the life of other people especially Pakistanis because the *NYT* is the very newspaper that publishes a front-page story – For U.S., Drones Are Weapons Of Choice in Fighting Qaeda – on March 17, 2009 and doing the marketing for drone aircrafts quotes Defense Secretary Robert M. Gates who “urged the weapon buyers to rush out “75 percent solution over a period of months” rather than waiting for “gold-plated” solutions” (Drew, 2009). The story further states that drone costs only “\$4.5 million apiece” comparing to \$143 million fighter jet or “\$3 billion destroyer” that US

cannot afford now. This story is of 1617 words yet it writes only one sentence about civilian casualties in drone strikes i.e. “Complaints about civil casualties, particularly from strikes in Pakistan, have stirred some concerns among human rights advocates” (Drew, 2009). The transparent *NYT* (as Scott Shane claims) does not pay any attention to American ambassador in Pakistan who opposed such strikes and later said he did not know that he was on assassination mission in Pakistan (McKelvey, 2012). Mr. Scoot Shane’s front-page stories about drone strikes are fairly balanced because he gives a wide range of perspective on drone issue but the study finds this diverse perspective reflects only in drone related stories that are published after Obama’s West Point speech in which President Obama proposed less criticism policy/ strategy for Pakistan. Mr. Scott Shane in his front-page story of the *NYT* – C.I.A. Death Prompts Surge In Drone War – published on January 22, 2010, reports that drone warfare had complete consensus between Republicans and Democrats and Congress fully supported such attacks (Shane and Schmitt, 2010). The mainstream press giving coverage to the opinion of Pakistani Prime Minister Mr. Gilani, Pakistani security officials and tribal leader reports that for Pakistan drone attacks are not only counterproductive but also raise anti-Americanism and undermine war efforts because drone cannot kill the ideology and if one Taliban leader dies in a drone attack another will take his place.

Though the leading press raises legal and moral questions on the use of armed drones/ UCAVs in Pakistan, the press promoting the war strategy of the “Golden Triangle” says that drones are the only choice for the US at the cost of anti-Americanism in Pakistan. The *NYT* claims to be transparent in its reporting yet this transparency might only be for those few American citizens who have been murdered in drone strikes but as far as the case of hundreds of innocent Pakistanis is concerned who are made victim of drone hellfire missiles in the name of collateral damage or poor ground intelligence the main stream press remains silent in the first year of Obama’s presidency, January 2009 – January 2010. Drone/UCAV is the new wonder weapon of America hence the press putting aside its social responsibility to initiate a debate on the controversial and extra-judicial killing tool works under the propaganda principles of Anne Morelli to prove that whatever America is doing outside the American soil against non-Americans is good for peace but the same American action against American people becomes the violation of law and human rights both for American press and politicians. The Social Responsibility Theory of the Press does not allow double standard yet as far as propaganda is concerned, American mainstream press is working remarkably well.

5.3 Pakistan is Threat to India – An Asset for the US in South Asia

President Obama invites Indian Prime Minister, Mr. Manmohan Singh, as his first state guest in 2009. Before his visit to Washington, the *Post* interviews him in New Delhi on November 11, 2009 and publishes it as a front-page story – Pakistan Has Nothing To Fear From India. Commenting about Pakistan, Indian prime minister says that “We have been the victim of Pakistan-sponsored terrorism for ... 25 years ... It’s tragedy that Pakistan has come to the point of using terror as an instrument of state policy” quoted in Weymouth (2009). Contrary to the headline of the *Post*, Pakistan gave documentary proofs to Vice President Mr. Joe Biden during his visit to Islamabad in January 2011 regarding Indian involvement in disturbing the security situation of the region and Mr. Biden admitted the facts that Pakistani concerns about India are right but the press fails to do any further analysis that how and why India is disturbing the situation in Pakistan? Giving a speech at Dhaka University in Bangladesh, Indian Prime Minister Mr. Modi openly admits India’s active role to divide Pakistan by separating East Pakistan (Bangladesh) from West Pakistan in 1971 (The Express Tribune, 2015, The New Indian Express, 2015, The Indian Express, 2015, The Times of India, 2015, Dawn, 2015, News World Today, 2015) but even then Pakistan is considered a threat for India and using terrorism as a state policy. Pakistani military officials, academia and security analysts have raised concerns about Indian supported terrorism in Pakistan for long a time, but the study does not find the representation of Pakistani apprehensions against India on the front-page of mainstream US newspapers. Many Pakistani politicians, leaders including former Pakistani army chief and president of Pakistan General Musharraf have repeatedly said that Indian intelligence agency, RAW, is creating disturbance in Pakistan but the study does not find a single sentence in the mainstream American press that Pakistan is facing security threats from India. America considers India as its closest ally in South Asia hence keeping in view the coverage pattern of the American press it seems that it is not the policy of the leading American press to critically analyze the Indian actions in South Asian region by considering the complaints of Pakistan whereas it is working quite opposite.

The leading American press is of the view that Pakistan’s constant worry is American commitment to improve Indian defense. During Mr. Singh’s visit to Washington in 2009, the US signs many defense treaties with India including civil nuclear deal. The *NYT*’s front-page story quotes White House’s spokesman – Robert Gibbs – on the issue of civil nuclear deal with India as “... it is certainly something we want to see happen” (Warrick and DeYoung, 2009). Walter Russel Mead, Senior US foreign policy fellow at Council on Foreign Relations

(CFR), giving an interview to Geo TV Network says that India's security and defense is America's central policy in South Asia because America sees India in the context of China, Japan and Australia and India is moving towards stability with ratio of 8 to 10% whereas Pakistan is moving towards instability and US sees Pakistan in the context of Central Asia and Middle East (Geo News, 2010). Mr. Obama has visited India twice (in November, 2010 and January, 2015), but he did not visit Pakistan which is stood on the front-line in the war against terror since 9/11. On July 17, 2009, Secretary Clinton giving an interview to CNN-IBN said that Obama administration wants to see India as major player in South Asia and "I made it very clear that we see India as a partner, a global partner ... We're going to deepen and broaden our relationship on so many fronts" (U.S. Department of State, 2009).

There are consistent themes and patterns in the mainstream American press that for Pakistani military India is the biggest enemy, and Pakistan is not ready to deploy its armed troops on the Afghan border where American army is fighting against Taliban because for Pakistan its eastern border is more important for the reason that India may attack on Pakistan. The American press also reports that Pakistan is frustrated that the US does not acknowledge the fact that Pakistan has threat from India. Ikram Sehgal – Pakistani defense analyst – talking to ARY One World TV channel says that Indian army has doctrine of "Cold Start Strategy" to launch a swift and unexpected attack on Pakistan without the permission of Indian government with a time limit of 72 hours so that Pakistan could not get a chance to prepare its nuclear weapons or before China could step in (Focus With Faiza, 2009). But, the study finds that the mainstream press fails to report even once that Pakistan has such kind of apprehensions from India. The leading press following the propaganda principles of Anne Morelli is developing public opinion that it is Pakistan that is solely responsible for creating disturbance in South Asia and especially in India. This is a biased and subjective reporting on the behalf of "Golden Triangle."

Kashmir is a nuclear flashpoint issue between India and Pakistan. The leading press reports that Kashmir issue is so sensitive that Indian officials get very angry at American mediation to solve this problem. During his presidential campaign, Mr. Obama says that he will encourage dialogue between India and Pakistan to solve the issue and Indian national security advisor, Mr. M. K. Narayanan, said "If Obama does have any such views ... he is barking up the wrong tree" (Warrick and DeYoung, 2009). During Prime Minister Singh's visit to Washington, President Obama says "It is not the place of United States to try, from the outside, resolve all those conflicts" (DeYoung, 2009b). The study finds that American mainstream press considers Pakistan responsible for terror activities in India and in Indian occupied Kashmir with its militant organization Lashkar-i-Taiba that is being run by Hafiz Saeed who urges people for Jihad in Kashmir and it is reported that this militant organization has support of Pakistani people and army and despite the fact that Hafiz Saeed was involved in Mumbai attacks, Pakistani High Court released him. Professor Mead of CFR using a technical foreign policy term "Revisionist" said that Pakistan wants change in the border (Geo News, 2010). This is the reason that Kashmir is usually not shown the part of Pakistan or a disputed territory in the map of India and Pakistan by the international community rather it is shown as Indian territory which is a clear violation of the resolutions of the UN (Map of India, 2015).

Many reports are on record that India has violated United Nations resolutions on Kashmir and it has more than 700,000 heavily armed troops in Indian held Kashmir and does not accept the demand of people Kashmir for plebiscite (Amnesty International, 2015). Indian army is violating human rights and raping Kashmiri women and brutally killing men, women and children but even then there is no story on the front-page of the leading press and it is quite astonishing that for Professor Mead, Pakistan is a "Revisionist." India is an asset of the US in South Asia to counter China and Pakistan, hence following the agenda of "Golden Triangle" the mainstream press is propagandizing the issues to give an impression that Pakistan is anti-Indian and anti-American. The study finds such coverage a severe violation of Social Responsibility Theory of the Press because this kind of biased reporting serves no purpose but brings two nuclear countries eye ball to eye ball and mainstream press gets further chances to do lethal propaganda to demonize Pakistan in the world to mount international pressure on Pakistan to fulfill American demands at the cost of the lives of common Pakistanis and its internal and external security and devastating economic situation.

5. 4 Pakistan is a Dark Venomous Villain of the Nuclear Underworld

Pakistan launches full scale military operation against Al Qaeda and Taliban in Swat on May 6, 2009 and Pakistani president also reaches Washington on the same date but on May 4, 2009 the *NYT* writes in its front-page story that "... a senior C.I.A. officer has been sent to Pakistan to determine whether nuclear technology had been passed to Osama Bin Laden" (Sanger, 2009b). This is the height of sensational, propagandist, lethal, poisonous and irresponsible reporting from the very newspaper that calls itself "a self-conscious keeper" of American nation's historical record (Bennett, 1990). On one side the American envoy,

Mr. Holbrooke, visiting the camps of IDPs on June 16, 2009 (as mentioned earlier) says that Osama Bin Laden is hidden in a “cave” and he may not see what damage he has done, on the other the Obama administration is skeptical that Osama Bin Laden has been given the nuclear technology by Pakistanis and the mainstream prestigious press is in such a hurry to follow the agenda of the “Golden Triangle” that it does not even ponder that Pakistan is going to launch full scale military operation against Al Qaeda and Taliban after two days and Pakistan will certainly not want Osama Bin Laden to nuke Pakistani forces in retaliation of Swat, South and North Waziristan operation. The question also arises that how Osama Bin Laden will use the atom bomb or nuclear technology if he is in a “cave” and is not even capable to see what is happening outside and his force, Al Qaeda, is under the American drone attacks on one side and on the other Pakistani army is killing and capturing the Taliban and Al Qaeda leaders and members.

What is more stunning is the attitude of leading press towards Indian nuclear expansion program. According to the prestigious American press, India’s nuclear program is linked with China and other nuclear powers hence the debate over Indian nuclear program ends. Contrary to this, the press reports that Pakistan is the only country among the nuclear nations whose nuclear arsenal is under the control of Pakistani army instead of civilian authority and army is under attack of Taliban and Al Qaeda hence Pakistanis may give their nukes to Taliban instead of giving them to America. Again, it is surprising that why US wants to get the control of Pakistani nuclear assets? The American press calls the father of Pakistani nuclear program, Dr. Abdul Qadir Khan, a “rogue” scientist and the mainstream press blames him to sell the nuclear technology to Iran, North Korea, and Libya through black market. The *NYT* quotes the statement of the creator of AFPAC Strategy, Bruce O. Ridel, who says that Pakistan is the country that “has more terrorist per square mile than any place else on earth and it has a nuclear weapons program that is growing faster than any place else on the earth” (Shanker and Sanger, 2009).

The lethal propaganda of American mainstream media is playing with the emotions of the people by making fear and danger a permanent part of their psychology to achieve the political and security goals of the “Golden Triangle.” Ignorance provides fertility to nurture the seed of propaganda into a fully grown poisonous tree and this sweet venomous fruit cuts the channel of human reasoning and human mind falls into unchained slavery and poses no more threat to the grower of propaganda seed. Balanced, factual and investigative reporting is the job of the press which it is not doing.

5.5 Get US Aid, Do Not Support Militants: Beggars Have No Choice

Studies are of the view that short-term aid does not help in counterinsurgency missions to win the hearts and minds of the people rather it may further deteriorate the situation in countries like Afghanistan and Pakistan and it may even damage the military and strategic goals (Williamson, 2011). The leading press reports that Pakistan is the third largest American aid receiver country in the world. The press reveals the fact that for the last 30 years American military aid to Pakistan is very close to the heart of Pakistani army. There are numerous recurring patterns in the front-page stories of the leading press that Pakistan is getting military and civil aid but does not take action against its home grown militants whom it considers strategic assets to counter India and to control the post-American Afghanistan. The US on one side longs for bi-lateral relations with Pakistan on the basis of mutual trust and benefit and on the other uses carrot and stick policy with Pakistani civil and security administration by ignoring the common Pakistanis.

The study gets the impression that the US considers Pakistani army as an army of peasants and is using its services on rent to fight the “War on Terror” as it had used in 1980s when CIA with the help of ISI backed Islamist fighters fought a proxy war against Soviet Union in Afghanistan and Hollywood also made movies like Rambo 1, 2, 3 to support the Jihad and CIA/ISI backed Holy Warriors. When this rental army feels difficulty to follow the demands of the “Golden Triangle” by raising concerns then General James Jones, US National Security Adviser, reaches Pakistan, “carrying more sticks than carrots” to pressurize Pakistani army to take action against militants according to the American demands. Aid is “carrot” that comes under American classical liberalism trait and “stick” is American “distinctive internationalism” to force Pakistan to cooperate with the “Golden Triangle” without taking into consideration the Pakistani fragile political, social, economic and internal and external security situation. The American press is the promoter and supporter of American “carrot and stick” policy towards Pakistan which is persistently ignoring journalistic norms in the case of Pakistan.

The leading press reports that Obama administration vows to give non-military aid to Pakistan to win the hearts and minds of people to successfully win the “War on Terror.” Secretary Clinton also announces millions of dollars especially for the Pakistani people because she wants to “turn the page” in the relationship between Pakistan and the United States beyond their security cooperation and efforts to combat violent extremism”

(Kaufman, 2009). This aid is meant for education, health, energy infrastructure, IDPs of Swat, Tribal areas, higher education, police training, transportation infrastructure, Benazir Bhutto Income Support Program (Kaufman, 2009). But, the press does not discuss the aid announced by Secretary Clinton for the people of Pakistan because it does not create stir, sensation, fear, danger rather it helps to improve relations between American and Pakistani public. The study finds that the public good is not the policy of the press rather creating divisions is the main agenda and policy of the mainstream press instead of bridging the social and political gulf and mistrust between the two countries.

The issue which the leading press pays special attention is controversial Kerry-Lugar Bill which President Obama approves on October 2009 through which the US decided to give Pakistan \$7.5 billion under five years aid program. This aid bill is met with harsh criticism by Pakistani media, people, civil and military officials because it requires America's monitoring of everything from how Pakistan spends the money to the way the military promotes seniors officers. Ikram Sehgal – Security analyst – says that the aid is snacks because America gives \$12 billion to Egypt and Jordan per year to maintain peace in the Middle East (Focus With Faiza, 2009). The leading press reports on the front-page that aid bill also demands Pakistan to drop its support for militants groups. The press reports that the army chief of Pakistan calls the aid bill “insulting and unacceptable” and he forces president Zardari to discuss the issue with Obama administration. This type of reporting gives the impression that Pakistani army has the capability to dictate the civilian government especially when the government is corrupt or weak and has no standing in world. Another angle of this coverage is that army is the most powerful institution in Pakistan and it can even overrule the decision taken by the civilian government which is usually backed by the US. Such coverage gives an impression that Pakistan is not purely a democratic country rather it is a military state.

Pakistanis are generally against American aid because it is a general impression in Pakistan that politicians are corrupt and even the aid for the people goes into the pockets of powerful politicians and bureaucracy. Instead of analyzing the aid issue in the social and cultural context of Pakistan to improve the Pak-US relations at public level, the press sees aid policy in the context of strategic and security interests of America in South Asia. The repeating pattern in the leading press about aid is that America gives money to Pakistan and it does not listen to American demands. President Zardari visits Washington on May 6, 2009, on the same date Pakistani Army launches a full scale operation against Taliban, but the front-page story of the *Post* published on May 05, 2009 says that it is an action that can be coincided with “aid-seeking visit” by Pakistani President (Constable, 2009b). Humiliation is also a propaganda technique which the American mainstream press is using against Pakistan to defame all the segments of Pakistani society to develop negative public opinion about Pakistan and violating the Social Responsibility Theory of the Press, the mainstream American press failed to inform the common American tax payer public about the aid policy of their government towards Pakistan.

6. Conclusion

The front-page stories of the leading American newspapers are creating fear, danger, sensation and hatred against Pakistani people and civil and security institutions. Pakistan in totality is presented as a country that promotes and supports terrorism as its state policy and it is not letting succeed America in the “War on Terror” and it is a threat to America's strategic policies and asset, India, in South Asia. Despite the proclaimed claims of objective and fair reporting, high journalistic norms and ethics, the liberal and conservative mainstream press in America is not working as a social institution for informed citizenry under American democracy rather it is creating a buffer between people and the actions of the American government in a foreign country like Pakistan. The mainstream press in America sees Pakistan only from made in America strategic lens that ceases its ability to understand the social, political, economic, development, cultural, religious and security complexities and challenges of Pakistan. The press instead of creating healthy debate on the role of Pakistan in counterterrorism efforts and giving sound policy options to resolve the tussle between America and Pakistan to successfully end the “War on Terror” with desired objectives is iterating propagandist and atrocity stories following the pack journalism with uniformity in the content in conservative and liberal press alike. By working on the behalf of the American government and those who control it, the press is damaging American values which made America a great country and nation in the world. American tax payer public is poorly informed on the military engagement in distant lands under the command of the “Golden Triangle” which is surely not a hallmark of American democracy. The leading American newspapers are supporting and extending American doctrines of militarism and unilateralism whose outcome is catastrophic both for America and other countries like Pakistan. To regain peace in the world, the study feels a compelling need to revive the social and democratic function of the press in America under Social Responsibility Theory of the Press which is forgotten both by media practitioners and scholars.

The study suggests that American press must have true experts on Pakistan which are also rare in American academia. Kashmir issue is a nuclear flashpoint between India and Pakistan thus independent and objective studies are required that how Western press is looking into the matter according to the resolutions of the United Nations since 1948. Drone attacks, ISAF and NATO forces' attacks on Pakistan army in AFPAK region, and US secret operations in Pakistan are the factors that spoiled the relations of two countries but American media and civil and military institutions put all the onus on Pakistan for not gaining desired objectives in the "War on Terror" thus research studies are the need of time that how US media is reporting on such American actions and what is their impact on the "War on Terror." Pakistan has shifted its strategic alliance from America to China and Pak-China strong strategic bond based on mutual respect, trust and benefit is of much worry both for India and America thus it is important to see whether or not Pakistan's media bashing in America is the result of this development. American mainstream press is least informed about Pakistani society thus it is imperative to study that in the context of "War on Terror" how American press covers Pakistani society which is the follower of Islam.

The study concludes that the mainstream American press is keeping American public in dark about Pakistan and it is not doing a professional and objective journalism while covering Pakistan rather it is running an information operation program based on grey, white and black propoganda following the propoganda principles of Anne Morelli to support and extend the strategic and foreign policy goals of the "Golden Triangle" which is certainly a violation of the golden principles of Social Responsibility Theory of the Press. If American press continues the practice to demonize Pakistani civil and security institutions then Pak-US relations cannot be improved and American public will continue thinking Pakistan as a terrorist country which surely will not help to bring peace in the South Asian region. The study feels a dire need to revive the actual role of American press for informed citizenry based on truth about American intervention in distant lands through direct and proxy wars otherwise fear and terror that is being spread by the US politicians, civil and security officials and press against presumed enemies based on propoganda will not only damage American psyche on permanent basis but also it will create unrest and violence in the world and inside America.

References

- AAJ KAMRAN KHAN KE SATH. 2008. Geo TV Network, December 8, 2009.
- AHMAD, I. 2001. *How America courted the Taliban* [Online]. Global Research. Available: <http://www.globalresearch.ca/articles/AHM202A.html> [Accessed June 10, 2015].
- ALLAN, S. & ZELIZER, B. 2004. *Reporting war: Journalism in wartime*, Routledge.
- AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL. 2015. *India: Accountability still missing for human rights violations in Jammu and Kashmir* [Online]. Available: <https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/news/2015/07/india-accountability-still-missing-for-human-rights-violations-in-jammu-and-kashmir/> [Accessed July 10, 2015].
- ASLAM, M. 2011. A critical evaluation of American drone strikes in Pakistan: legality, legitimacy and prudence. *Critical Studies on Terrorism*, 4, 313-329.
- ASSOCIATED PRESS. 2015. *Afghanistan dialogue with Taliban could begin in March* [Online]. New York Post. Available: <http://nypost.com/2015/02/21/us-considering-slowing-exit-from-afghanistan-pentagon-chief/> [Accessed April 10, 2015].
- BAABAR, M. 2010. *We have done a lot, it's time for US to deliver: Qureshi* [Online]. Pakistan Defense. Available: <http://defence.pk/threads/the-pak-us-strategic-dialogue.50996/> [Accessed June 10, 2015].
- BAKER, P., SCHMITT, E. & SANGER, D. E. 2009. Obama's Speech on Afghanistan to Envision Exit. *The New York Times*, November 29, 2009.
- BARAN, S. & DAVIS, D. 2011. *Mass communication theory: Foundations, ferment, and future*, Cengage Learning.
- BECKER, J. & SCOTT, S. 2012. *Secret 'Kill List' Proves a Test of Obama's Principles and Will* [Online]. U.S.: The New York Times. Available: <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/05/29/world/obamas-leadership-in-war-on-al-qaeda.html?pagewanted=all> [Accessed February 5, 2015].
- BENGALI, S. & LATIFI, A. M. 2015. *Afghan president pursues peace with Taliban — his way* [Online]. Los Angeles Times. Available:

- <http://www.latimes.com/world/afghanistan-pakistan/la-fg-afghanistan-ghani-us-20150322-story.html> [Accessed April 2, 2015].
- BENNETT, W. L. 1990. Toward a theory of press-state relations in the United States. *Journal of communication*, 40, 103-127.
- BENTLEY, M. & HOLLAND, J. 2013. *Obama's Foreign Policy: Ending the War on Terror*, Routledge.
- BLAKE, A. 2014. *Ranking the media from liberal to conservative, based on their audiences* [Online]. Available: <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/the-fix/wp/2014/10/21/lets-rank-the-media-from-liberal-to-conservative-based-on-their-audiences/> [Accessed March 10, 2015].
- BLANCHARD, M. A. 2013. *History of the mass media in the United States: An encyclopedia*, Routledge.
- BLIMES, L. 2013. *The financial legacy of Iraq and Afghanistan: How wartime spending decisions will constrain future national security budgets (HKS Working Paper RWP13-006)* [Online]. Harvard Kennedy School. Available: <https://research.hks.harvard.edu/publications/workingpapers/citation.aspx?PubId=8956> [Accessed March 5, 2015].
- BLUMENTHAL, S. 2007. *Walter Lippmann and American journalism today* [Online]. Open Democracy. Available: https://www.opendemocracy.net/article/walter_lippmann_and_american_journalism_today [Accessed March 26, 2015].
- BOYER, D. 2013. *Bush policies still alive in Obama White House* [Online]. The Washington Post. Available: <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2013/apr/24/bush-policies-still-alive-in-obama-white-house/?page=all> [Accessed March 3, 2015].
- BRAUN, V. & CLARKE, V. 2006. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative research in psychology*, 3, 77-101.
- BROOKS, R. 2015. *U.S. Counterterrorism Strategy Is the Definition of Insanity* [Online]. Foreign Policy. Available: <http://foreignpolicy.com/2015/06/24/u-s-counterterrorism-strategy-is-the-definition-of-insanity/> [Accessed June 28 2015].
- BRZEZINSKI, Z. 2007. Terrorized by 'War on Terror'. *The Washington Post*, March 25, 2007.
- CARTER, J. 2012. *A Cruel and Unusual Record* [Online]. The New York Times. Available: http://www.nytimes.com/2012/06/25/opinion/americas-shameful-human-rights-record.html?_r=4 [Accessed March 3, 2015].
- CAVALLARO, J. & SONNENBERG, S. 2012. *Living under drones: death, injury, and trauma to civilians from US drone practices in pakistan*.
- CAVE, D. 2001. *The United States of oil* [Online]. Available: http://www.salon.com/2001/11/19/bush_oil/ [Accessed May 15, 2015].
- COLL, S. 2014. *THE UNBLINKING STARE: The drone war in Pakistan* [Online]. Available: <http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2014/11/24/unblinking-stare> [Accessed August 18, 2015].
- CONSTABLE, P. 2009a. Insurgent Threat Shifts in Pakistan; Assault on Police Academy Indicates Risk Has Moved Beyond Tribal Areas. *The Washington Post*, March 31, 2009.
- CONSTABLE, P. 2009b. The Taliban Tightens Hold In Pakistan's Swat Region. *The Washington Post*, May 5, 2009.
- COOK, R. 2005. *The struggle against terrorism cannot be won by military means* [Online]. Available: <http://www.theguardian.com/uk/2005/jul/08/july7.development> [Accessed February 10, 2015].
- COOKE, J. B. 2007. *Reporting the War: Freedom of the Press from the American Revolution to the War on Terrorism*, Macmillan.
- CRAIGHILL, P. M. 2011. *Poll Watchers: Americans have strongly negative view of Pakistan* [Online]. The Washington Post. Available: http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/behind-the-numbers/post/poll-watchers-americans-have-strongly-negative-view-of-pakistan/2011/05/11/AFJ4dF7G_blog.html [Accessed April 5, 2015].
- DASTAGEER, G. 2015. *Sufi speaks out against TTP* [Online]. Available: <http://www.dawn.com/news/1179447> [Accessed May 10, 2015].

- DAWN. 2015. *Modi's remarks criticised* [Online]. Available: <http://www.dawn.com/news/1186998> [Accessed June 12, 2015].
- DAYAN, I. 2015. *Obama talks on Israeli TV about Netanyahu, Israel and David Blatt [TRANSCRIPT]* [Online]. Nation. Available: http://www.jewishjournal.com/nation/article/president_barack_obama_speaks_with_ilana_dayan_transcript [Accessed June 4, 2015].
- DEMOCRACY NOW. 2013. *White House Changing Story on Anwar al-Awlaki? A Debate on NYT's Inside Account of '11 Drone Strike* [Online]. U.S.: Democracy Now.org. Available: http://www.democracynow.org/2013/3/11/is_white_house_changing_its_story [Accessed March 25, 2015].
- DEMOCRACY NOW. 2014. *In Less-Reported Remarks, Nobel Winner Malala Yousafzai Backs Socialism, Opposes Drone Strikes* [Online]. Democracy Now. Available: <http://www.democracynow.org/2014/10/13/headlines#101313> [Accessed April 20, 2015].
- DEYOUNG, K. 2009a. Seeking Truth and Trust in Pakistan; Envoy Tries to Convince Refugees That U.S. Is on Their Side. *The Washington Post*, June 16, 2009.
- DEYOUNG, K. 2009b. U.S. offers new role for Pakistan; A broader partnership Importance of country to Afghan effort recognized. *The Washington Post*, November 30, 2009.
- DEYOUNG, K. 2009c. U.S. Options in Pakistan Limited; Nation Rife With Security Issues, Infighting, Anti-American Sentiment. *The Washington Post*, May 4, 2009.
- DEYOUNG, K. 2009d. U.S. Options in Pakistan Limited; Nation Rife With SecurityIssues, Infighting, Anti-American Sentiment. *The Washington Post*, May 4, 2009.
- DEYOUNG, K. 2013. *U.S. to launch peace talks with Taliban* [Online]. The Washington Post. Available: https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/us-to-relaunch-peace-talks-with-taliban/2013/06/18/bd8c7f38-d81e-11e2-a016-92547bf094cc_story.html [Accessed July 1, 2015].
- DILANIAN, K. & SWANSON, E. 2015. *AP Poll: Americans approve of drone strikes on terrorists* [Online]. Associated Press. Available: <http://bigstory.ap.org/article/922aad9300ed4868b89e999f7cd02bf7/ap-poll-americans-approve-drone-strikes-terrorists> [Accessed May 2, 2015].
- DREW, C. 2009. For U.S., Drones Are Weapons Of Choice in Fighting Qaeda. *The New York Times*, March 17, 2009.
- ELAND, I. 2014. *Congress Should Vote and Say No to Obama's New War* [Online]. U.S.: The Huffington Post. Available: http://www.huffingtonpost.com/ivan-eland/congress-should-vote-and_b_5824892.html [Accessed March 3, 2015].
- ELI, L. 2010. *Obama uses Bush plan for terror war, include tactics he had criticized* [Online]. US. Available: <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/sep/9/obama-uses-bush-plan-for-terror-war/?page=all> [Accessed March 10, 2015].
- ENGELHARDT, T. 2014. *The Biggest Lesson From the War on Terror? It Didn't Work* [Online]. The Nation. Available: <http://www.thenation.com/article/193297/biggest-lesson-war-terror-it-didnt-work#> [Accessed January 25, 2015].
- FAIR, C. C. 2009. Pakistan's own war on terror: What the Pakistani public thinks. *Journal of International Affairs*, 63, 39.
- FAIR, C. C., KALTENTHALER, K. & MILLER, W. J. 2014. Pakistani Opposition to American Drone Strikes. *Political Science Quarterly*, 129, 1-33.
- FOCUS WITH FAIZA. 2009. *Washington Summit: Gains for Pakistan* [Online]. ARY One World. Available: <http://www.awaztoday.com/playvideo.asp?pageId=3436> [Accessed May 6, 2009].
- FOX NEWS. December 26, 2001. *Report: Bin Laden Already Dead* [Online]. Fox News. Available: <http://www.foxnews.com/story/2001/12/26/report-bin-laden-already-dead.html> [Accessed June 3, 2015].
- GALL, C. & SCHMITT, E. 2009. U.S. Questions Pakistan's Will To Stop Taliban. *The New York Times*, April 24, 2009.

- GANNON, K. 2010. *Pakistan to ask for more understanding at US talks* [Online]. Available: http://www.boston.com/news/world/asia/articles/2010/03/19/pakistan_to_ask_for_more_understanding_at_us_talks/ [Accessed March 27, 2015].
- GAZEBOMAN. 2004. *Bush Administration feeding you 'Bull'* [Online]. YouTube. Available: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uh4U-Tbqbx4> [Accessed March 25, 2015].
- Kehnay Mein Kia Harj Hai*, 2010. Directed by GEO NEWS. Pakistan.
- GIULIANI, R. 2015. *Giuliani: Hillary Clinton's Biggest Liability is Her 'Trustworthiness'* [Online]. Fox News. Available: <http://insider.foxnews.com/2015/04/15/giuliani-hillary-clintons-biggest-liability-her-trustworthiness> [Accessed April 16, 2015].
- GORKA, K. C. 2014. *The Flawed Science Behind America's Counter-Terrorism Strategy* [White Paper]. The Council on Global Security.
- GOUREVITCH, P. 2014. *WHAT OBAMA DIDN'T SAY* [Online]. Available: <http://www.newyorker.com/news/daily-comment/obama-didnt-say> [Accessed January 10, 2015].
- GRIFFIN, D. R. 2008. *9/11 Contradictions: An Open Letter to Congress and the Press*, Interlink Books.
- GRIFFIN, D. R. & SCOTT, P. D. 2007. *9/11 and American Empire: Intellectuals speak out*, Interlink Books.
- HART, P. 2014. *Missing Malala's Message of Peace: Drones Fuel Terrorism* [Online]. Fair Blog. Available: <http://fair.org/blog/2014/10/14/missing-malalas-message-of-peace-drones-fuel-terrorism/> [Accessed April 20, 2015].
- INNOCENT, M. 2009. *Pakistan and the Future of US Policy*, CATO Inst.
- IYENGAR, S., HAHN, K. S., BONFADELLI, H. & MARR, M. 2009. "Dark Areas of Ignorance" Revisited Comparing International Affairs Knowledge in Switzerland and the United States. *Communication Research*, 36, 341-358.
- KAUFMAN, S. 2009. *Clinton Announces Millions in Assistance for Pakistani People* [Online]. IIP DIGITAL. Available: <http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/english/article/2009/10/20091029140518esnamfuak0.6337549.html#axzz3aEsrYGAy> [Accessed March 25, 2015].
- KHAN, A. 2008. The Image of Pakistan in Prestigious American newspaper editorials: a test of the media conformity theory. *Strategic Studies*.(XXVIII).
- KOBLANTZ, G. D. 2014. *Strategic Stability in the Second Nuclear Age*, Council on Foreign Relations.
- KOEHLMOOS, R. L. 2010. Positive Perceptions to Sustain the US-Pakistan Relationship. DTIC Document.
- LEWISON, J. 2012. *WSJ endorses Paul Ryan for president* [Online]. Available: <http://www.dailykos.com/story/2012/08/09/1118242/-WSJ-endorses-Paul-Ryan-for-president#> [Accessed March 10, 2015].
- LIPPMANN, W. 1946. *Public opinion*, Transaction Publishers.
- LODHI, M. 2009. The Future of Pakistan-US Relations: Opportunities and Challenges. DTIC Document.
- LOS ANGELES TIMES EDITORIAL 2011. *Obama administration's anti-terror architecture: Too much like Bush* [Online]. Available: <http://articles.latimes.com/2011/apr/10/opinion/la-ed-obama-20110410> [Accessed March 10, 2015].
- MAP OF INDIA. 2015. Available: <http://www.mapsofworld.com/india/> [Accessed February 15, 2015].
- MAYFIELD, K. W. March 3, 2008 2008. *RE: The National Security Strategy of USA- 2006 and Pak-US Relations*
- MAZZETTI, M. & SCHMITT, E. 2009. U.S. Says Agents Of Pakistan Aid Afghan Taliban. *The New York Times*, March 26, 2009.
- MCGOLDRICK, A. 2006. War journalism and 'objectivity'. *Conflict & communication online*, 5, 1-7.
- MCKELVEY, T. 2012. *A Former Ambassador to Pakistan Speaks Out* [Online]. The Daily Beast. Available: <http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2012/11/20/a-former-ambassador-to-pakistan-speaks-out.html> [Accessed April 10, 2015].

- MIR, A. 2011. *Pakistan: The suicide-bomb capital of the world* [Online]. Available: http://www.atimes.com/atimes/South_Asia/MI16Df04.html [Accessed August 18, 2015].
- MOELLER, S. D. 2007. *The "good" Muslims: US Newspaper Coverage of Pakistan*, International Center for Media and the Public Agenda, University of Maryland.
- MOTHANA, I. 2012. *How Drones Help Al Qaeda* [Online]. Available: <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/06/14/opinion/how-drones-help-al-qaeda.html> [Accessed March 15, 2015].
- MUFTI, S. 2014. *Media darling - Malala Yousafzai's long and delicate dance with the press* [Online]. Columbia Journalism Review Available: http://www.cjr.org/feature/media_darling.php [Accessed April 20, 2015].
- NEWS WORLD TODAY. 2015. *Modi's Statement Acknowledges India's Involvement In 1971 Events Latest Updates* [Online]. YouTube. Available: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=APpPB6ahYtw> [Accessed June 12, 2015].
- NICTA. 2009. *10 principles of war propaganda* [Online]. European Tribune. Available: <http://www.eurotrib.com/?op=displaystory:sid=2009/1/12/21515/1314> [Accessed March 20, 2015].
- OBAMA, B. 2009. *Remarks by the President in Address to the Nation on the Way Forward in Afghanistan and Pakistan* [Online]. The White House - Office of the Press Secretary. Available: <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/remarks-president-address-nation-way-forward-afghanistan-and-pakistan> [Accessed March 1, 2015].
- OBAMA, B. 2013. *Remarks by the President at the National Defense University* [Online]. The White House. Available: <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2013/05/23/remarks-president-national-defense-university> [Accessed April 27, 2015].
- OCTOBERMAN104. 2011. *How the US created (al CIAda) al Qaeda* [Online]. YouTube. Available: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mNeCHDbMeoo&t=1m13s> [Accessed March 3, 2015].
- OLIVER, J. 2014. *Drones* [Online]. Available: <http://www.hbo.com/last-week-tonight-with-john-oliver/episodes/01/19-september-28-2014/video/clip-drones.html> [Accessed March 7, 2015].
- OLNEY, L. A. 2011. *Lethal targeting abroad: exploring long-term effectiveness of armed drone strikes in overseas contingency operations*. Master's thesis. Goergetown University.
- PARLEZ, J. & SHAH, P. Z. 2009. In Refugee Aid, Pakistan's War Has New Front. *The New York Times*, July 2, 2009.
- PAUL, R. 2013. *Rand Paul Filibusters John Brennan Over Drone Policy - March 6, 2013* [Online]. YouTube. Available: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UWCXjyp_hys [Accessed April 10, 2015].
- PAUL, R. 2015. *Sen. Paul announces 2016 White House bid, touts 'message of liberty'* [Online]. Fox News. Available: <http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2015/04/07/sen-rand-paul-set-to-join-2016-presidential-field/> [Accessed April 10, 2015].
- PERLEZ, J. 2009a. Pakistan Makes a Taliban Truce, Creating a Haven. *The New York Times*, February 17, 2009.
- PERLEZ, J. 2009b. Rebuffing U.S., Pakistan Balks at Crackdown. *The New York Times*, December 14, 2009.
- PHYSICIANS FOR SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY 2015. *Casualty Figures after 10 Years of the "War on Terror" Iraq Afghanistan Pakistan*. Physicians for Social Responsibility, Physicians for Global Survival, International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War.
- PITNER, S. 2009. *What is the Social Responsibility Theory?* [Online]. Available: <https://suite.io/suzanne-pitner/1scz2bm> [Accessed April 20, 2015].
- PRIEST, D. & ARKIN, W. 2011. Top Secret America: A Look at the Military's Joint Special Operations Command. *Washington Post*, September 2, 2011.
- PUBLIC LAW 107-40 107TH CONGRESS JOINT RESOLUTION 2001. PUBLIC LAW 107-40—SEPT. 18, 2001. In: CONGRESS, U. S. (ed.). U.S. Congress.
- RAVIMANDALAM, S. 2004. *Newspaper and news magazine coverage of the USA PATRIOT Act before it was passed into law, September 11, 2001—October 26, 2001*. Master's thesis. Ohio University.

- RICKARD, S. 2015. *US involved in terrorism, media manipulation: Analyst* [Online]. Prsss TV. Available: <http://www.presstv.com/Video/2015/02/07/396626/US-tremendously-involved-in-terrorism> [Accessed March 5, 2015].
- ROBERTS, L. 2011. *Pakistan: timeline of suicide bomb attacks 2007-2011* [Online]. Available: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/asia/pakistan/8511518/Pakistan-timeline-of-suicide-bomb-attacks-2007-2011.html> [Accessed August 18, 2015].
- RODRIGUEZ, A. 2009. *Pakistanis see a start, await action* [Online]. Los Angeles Times Available: <http://articles.latimes.com/2009/jun/05/world/fg-muslims-pakistan5> [Accessed May 10, 2015].
- ROSENBERG, M. & HUSSAIN, Z. 2009. Pakistan's Leader Stirs Fresh Turmoil. *The Wall Street Journal*, February 26, 2009.
- RUBIN, A. J. 2012. *U.S.-Taliban dialogue in Qatar raises peace hope* [Online]. The Hindu. Available: <http://www.thehindu.com/news/international/ustaliban-dialogue-in-qatar-raises-peace-hope/article2842888.ece> [Accessed March 5, 2015].
- RUTENBERG, J. & CARTER, B. 2001. *COVERING (UP) THE "WAR ON TERRORISM": THE MASTER FRAME AND THE MEDIA CHILL* [Online]. U.S.: The New York Times. Available: <http://www.nytimes.com/2001/09/20/business/a-nation-challenged-the-media-draping-newscasts-with-the-flag.html> [Accessed March 25, 2015].
- SAEED, M. 2014. *Hillary Clinton USA created Al Qaeda* [Online]. YouTube. Available: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NsZg_maF0ow [Accessed March 3, 2015].
- SANGER, D. E. 2009a. Obama Expands Missile Strikes Inside Pakistan. *The New York Times*, February 21, 2009.
- SANGER, D. E. 2009b. Pakistan Strife Raises U.S. Doubt On Nuclear Arms. *The New York Times*, May 4, 2009.
- SANGER, D. E. & SCHMITT, E. 2009. Pakistan Told to Ratchet Up Taliban Fight. *The New York Times*, December 7, 2009.
- SAVAGE, C. 2009. *To Critics, New Policy on Terror Looks Old* [Online]. US: The New York Times. Available: <http://www.nytimes.com/2009/07/02/us/02gitmo.html> [Accessed March 1, 2015].
- SCAHILL, J. 2009. The secret US war in Pakistan. *The Nation*, November 23, 2009.
- SCHMIDLE, N. 2009. Pakistan's Next Fight? Don't Go There. *The Washington Post*, June 14, 2009.
- SCHMITT, E. & PARLEZ, J. 2009a. Pakistan Objects to U.S. Expansion in Afghan War. *The New York Times*, July 22, 2009.
- SCHMITT, E. & PARLEZ, J. 2009b. U.S. Unit Secretly in Pakistan Lends Ally Additional Support. *The New York Times*, February 23, 2009.
- SEDNEY, D. 2015. America's Counterterrorism Policy Is Failing. *Time*.
- SHANE, S. & SCHMITT, E. 2010. C.I.A. Deaths Prompt Surge in U.S. Drone Strikes. *The New York Times*, January 22, 2010.
- SHANKER, T. & SANGER, D. E. 2009. Pakistan Is Seen Rapidly Adding Nuclear Arms. *The New York Times*, May 18, 2009.
- SHOEMAKER, P. J. & REESE, S. D. 1996. *MEDIATING THE MESSAGE*.
- SNOW, N. 2003. *Information War: American Propaganda, Free Speech and Opinion Control Since 9/11*, Seven Stories Press.
- SNOW, N. & TAYLOR, P. M. 2006. The Revival of the Propaganda State US Propaganda at Home and Abroad since 9/11. *International Communication Gazette*, 68, 389-407.
- TARPLEY, W. G. 2005. *9/11 synthetic terror: Made in USA*, Progressive Press.
- TAVERNISE, S. & GALL, C. 2009. Rattled Nerves In Afghanistan And Pakistan. *The New York Times*, December 3, 2009.
- TAVERNISE, S., GILLANI, W. & MASOOD, S. 2009. Rampage in Pakistan Shows Reach of Militants. *The New York Times*, March 31, 2009.

THE BUREAU OF INVESTIGATIVE JOURNALISM. 2014. *Drone Warfare : More than 2,400 dead as Obama's drone campaign marks five years* [Online]. Available: <https://www.thebureauinvestigates.com/2014/01/23/more-than-2400-dead-as-obamas-drone-campaign-marks-five-years/> [Accessed August 18, 2015].

THE BUREAU OF INVESTIGATIVE JOURNALISM. 2015. *Almost 2,500 now killed by covert US drone strikes since Obama inauguration six years ago: The Bureau's report for January 2015* [Online]. Available: <https://www.thebureauinvestigates.com/2015/02/02/almost-2500-killed-covert-us-drone-strikes-obama-inauguration/> [Accessed August 18, 2015].

THE ECONOMIST. 2013. *Al-Qaeda returns - The new face of terror* [Online]. The Economist. Available: <http://www.economist.com/news/leaders/21586832-west-thought-it-was-winning-battle-against-jihadist-terrorism-it-should-think-again> [Accessed June, 25 2015].

THE EXPRESS TRIBUNE. 2015. *Modi's anti-Pakistan remarks 'regrettable': FO* [Online]. Available: <http://tribune.com.pk/story/900400/fo-should-take-note-of-modis-statements-against-pakistan-khursheed-shah/> [Accessed June 12, 2015].

THE INDIAN EXPRESS. 2015. *Modi's 'nuisance' remarks in Bangladesh 'unfortunate': Pakistan* [Online]. Available: <http://indianexpress.com/article/india/india-others/modis-nuisance-remarks-in-bangladesh-unfortunate-pakistan/> [Accessed June 12, 2015].

THE NEW INDIAN EXPRESS. 2015. *Pakistan Slams Modi's Statement in Dhaka* [Online]. Available: <http://www.newindianexpress.com/world/Pakistan-Slams-Modis-Statement-in-Dhaka/2015/06/09/article2857898.ece> [Accessed June 12, 2015].

THE TIMES OF INDIA. 2015. *'Modi's remarks in Bangladesh aimed at fanning hatred against Pakistan'* [Online]. Available: <http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/india/Modis-remarks-in-Bangladesh-aimed-at-fanning-hatred-against-Pakistan/articleshow/47614611.cms> [Accessed June 12 2015].

THE WHITE HOUSE - OFFICE OF THE PRESS SECRETARY. 2013. *Readout of the President and the First Lady's Meeting with Malala Yousafzai* [Online]. The White House -Office of the Press Secretary. Available: <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2013/10/11/readout-president-and-first-lady-s-meeting-malala-yousafzai> [Accessed April 20, 2015].

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE. 2009. *Interview With Rajdeep Sardesai of CNN-IBN* [Online]. U.S.: U.S. Department of State. Available: <http://www.state.gov/secretary/20092013clinton/rm/2009a/july/126197.htm> [Accessed March 25, 2015].

WALSH, D. 2010. *Pakistan suffers record number of deaths due to militant violence* [Online]. Available: <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2010/jan/11/pakistan-militant-violence-death-toll> [Accessed August 18, 2015].

WARD, C. 2014. *Applying deterrence strategy to agents of asymmetrical threats*. Master's thesis. Monterey, California: Naval Postgraduate School.

WARD, V. 2015. *New Oxford University vice-chancellor says US 'over-reacted' to 9/11* [Online]. The Telegraph. Available: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/education/educationnews/11645939/New-Oxford-University-vice-chancellor-says-US-over-reacted-to-911.html> [Accessed June 3, 2015].

WARRICK, J. & DEYOUNG, K. 2009. *CIA Helped India, Pakistan Share Secrets in Probe of Mumbai Siege* *The Washington Post*, February 16, 2009.

WE THE PEOPLE RADIO NETWORK. 2007. *Famous Quotes From History* [Online]. We The People Radio Network. Available: http://www.wtprn.com/Famous_Quotes.html [Accessed April 5, 2015].

WEYMOUTH, L. 2009. 'Pakistan has nothing to fear from India': Interview by Lally Weymouth in New Delhi. *The Washington Post*, November 22, 2009.

WHITE JR, J. B. 2012. *The Strategic Mind of Zbigniew Brzezinski: How a Native Pole Used Afghanistan to Protect His Homeland*. Master's thesis. University of Mississippi.

WILLIAMSON, J. A. 2011. Using humanitarian aid to 'win hearts and minds': a costly failure? *International review of the Red Cross*, 93, 1035-1061.

WITTE, G. 2009a. For Pakistanis, a Fight Against Their Own; Confronting Taliban Tests Bonds of Faith And National Heritage. *The Washington Post*, June 12, 2009.

WITTE, G. 2009b. Pakistani Refugee Crisis Poses Peril; Amid Army Offensive, Extremists Are Filling Needs That the Government Can't. *The Washington Post*, May 25, 2009.

WOODS, R. B. 2005. *Quest for identity: America since 1945*, Cambridge University Press.

WOOLLEY & PETERS. 2008. *2008 General Election Editorial Endorsements by Major Newspapers* [Online]. Available: http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/data/2008_newspaper_endorsements.php [Accessed March 10, 2015].

ZENKO, M. 2015. *Terrorism Is Booming Almost Everywhere But in the United States* [Online]. Foreign Policy. Available: http://foreignpolicy.com/2015/06/19/terrorism-is-booming-almost-everywhere-but-in-the-united-states-state-department-report/?wp_login_redirect=0 [Accessed July 1, 2015].

Syed Awais Hassan Gillani is a doctoral student at the School of Journalism and Communication, Wuhan University, People's Republic of China. He is deeply grateful to his doctoral mentor, Professor Dr. Xiang Zhou, for her unconditional support and guidance through all these years of his doctoral study. He wants to extend his heartiest gratitude to his previous supervisor, Professor Dr. Hans Frey (Late), who helped him significantly while doing a Master of Philosophy in American Studies at the Area Study Center of Africa, North and South America, Quaid-I-Azam University, Islamabad, Pakistan. He is deeply grateful to Professor Dr. Cornelius B. Pratt of the School of Media and Communication, Temple University, USA, for sharing scholarly readings with him and giving him a book specifically related to research methods in journalism and communication. Those resources helped him design the framework for his doctoral research and for this study. He is extremely thankful to Dr. Nancy Snow, a professor of Public Diplomacy at Syracuse University's Newhouse School of Public Communications. Dr. Snow's work inspired him a lot and she is his virtual mentor. He owes a huge debt of gratitude to Ms. Saarah Sarosh Chaudhri of the University of South Florida, USA, for helping him obtain the data for this study. Without her support this study would not have been possible. [email: awaisgillani@whu.edu.cn].