

Nasim Ishaq^{*}
Noshina Saleem^{**}
Hanan Ahamd^{***}
Salma Amber^{****}

COVERING U.S. LED INVASION OF AFGHANISTAN: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE TREATMENT OF *THE ECONOMIST, TIME AND THE HERALD*

Abstract

This study analyzed three leading international news magazines The Economist, The Herald and Time treatment on American armed operations in Afghanistan through the prism of the Galtung war/peace journalism indicators. The researchers studied qualitatively and quantitatively 347 news items of the above-mentioned newsmagazines. One way Anova and chi-square were used to find out the relationship between the study's variables. The findings indicated that The Economist and Time used regularly the frame of war reporting whereas peace journalism frame was frequently used in The Herald. There was an indispensable contrast in the treatment of The Economist, The Herald and Time about American armed operation in Afghanistan. The Economist as well as Time planted partisan and legitimated U.S. military operations as the most appropriate solutions to punish Osama Bin Laden for being the mastermind of 9/11 incident and to crack down Taliban regime in Afghanistan which was the main source of Al-Qaida network. Whereas The Herald embraced the peace reporting outlines and frequently conceded the voice to the unvoiced casualties by highlighting the nonmilitary personnel losses, coincidental losses and agonies of the casualties of U.S. military operations in Afghanistan.

Key Words: Peace Journalism, War Journalism, Framing, U.S. Military Operations, Afghanistan

Introduction

Media has great power in shaping up public perception regarding any event or happening in local, regional, national and international level. Sometimes this power indulges the media and public in conflict like situation. Media innovatively

^{*} Dr. Nasim Ishaq (Assistant Professor at Govt Fatima Jinnah College Chuna Mandi Lahore, Pakistan)

^{**} Dr Noshina Saleem, (Assistant Professor at Institute of Communication Studies, University of Punjab, Lahore, Pakistan) Corresponding Author

^{***} Dr. Hanan Ahamd (Professor & HoD at Journalism and Media studies department, University of Management and Technology)

^{****} Dr. Salma Amber (Assistant Professor at Mass communication department, GCU, Faisalabad)

gives treatment to political, monetary and social topics unbiasedly for the general public and media can bring progressive and constructive modification in the public by giving important data on strife, clash, and emergency as well as notwithstanding amid military operations and wars. Various researches indicated that the media representations of war, conflict or crisis are intertwined with country's diplomacy and foreign policy (Bui, 2012). Wanta and Lee (2004) elucidate that "the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 demonstrated to policymakers, the mass media, and the public, the need for a more global perspective in coverage of international news" (p. 365). Herman (1994) composed that media holders are the rich individuals. They control and circulate those substances to their enthusiasm. Media networking basically reliant on the world class wellsprings while gathering the information about the conflict, clash and war.

This study has tried to explore the way through which *The Economist*, *The Herald* and *Time* framed "U.S military operations in Afghanistan". The researchers apply Galtung's war/peace journalism indicators from 12th September 2001 to 31 December 2011.

Rationale of Selecting Newsmagazines

Newsmagazines were taken due to their extensive worldwide readership. Newsmagazines compose a vital part of the broad communication and an imperative foundation of evidence through which concepts, assessments and slants are circulated. Magazines amuse, illuminate and influence the reader's discernment on a national level. Griffin (2004) elicited the significance of newsmagazines in these words. "Newsmagazines hit the stands more than a week after the event they report, they serve as a kind of news digest compressing, recapitalizing, elaborating upon and sometimes critiquing the television and newspaper reports even after a week. Because news magazines follow a longer news cycle than television or daily newspapers, a more detailed, in-depth or analytical view of events is often available" (p. 382).

In this study three newsmagazines *The Economist* from United Kingdom, *The Herald* from Pakistan, and *Time* from United States were selected due to their enormous readership, widely used for researches, and worldwide coverage.

Research Questions

1. What is the dominate frame used in the news items of *The Economist*, *The Herald* and *Time* about the reporting of "U.S. military operations in Afghanistan" in relation to Galtung's war/peace Journalism theory?
2. What are the prominent indicators of war journalism regarding the treatment of "U.S. military operations in Afghanistan" in *The Economist*, *The Herald* and *Time*?
3. What are the prominent indicators of peace journalism regarding the treatment of "U.S. military operations in Afghanistan" in *The Economist*, *The Herald* and *Time*?

Literature Review

Several studies (Hallin & Gitlin, 1993; Hackett & Zhao, 1994 ; Khan, 2008; Lee, 2004; Noshina, 2007; Noshina & Hanan, 2014; Ryan, 2004; Safdar., Budiman., & Norish, 2014; Scheuer, 2008; Shabbir,2011; Siraj,2006; Stormack, 2004) have enfolded up that American media particularly during clash, war and military operations do not exhibit the entire picture of reality, whereas it favor U.S. policies and overlook alternative , as reunion, peace progression and discussion with evidences and arguments. The basic focus of mass media analysis concerning to the World War I and II was that how government utilize their respective media (TV, radio, films, newspapers, etc.) for monitoring and surveillance of the information and sometimes backing propaganda for their specific national interest (Welch, 2005). Various media researches on conflicts, wars and military operations affirmed that sometimes media work under government pressures when military operations going on (Gilboa, 2000; Nye, 2008; Entman, 2008, cited in Bui, 2012, p. 14).

Ryan's study "framing the war against terrorism, U.S. newspaper editorials and military action in Afghanistan" uncovers that the editorial board for the America's (10) vastly circulated newspapers portrayed the melancholies of 9/11, marked Arabs as the crooks by seriously reliant on American governments for all the pertinent data. These intellectuals were not eager to find different perception from the leading American group. They were not providing any room for dialogue, evidences and legitimized that the military operations against Afghanistan was the final solution (2004).

Several studies have explored that most of the time media toe the U.S. government point of view regarding the Taliban and its military operations in Afghanistan. These studies also maintained that the media frequently highlighted that how much these operations were important as well as justified to provide freedom to Afghan females from the brutality of Taliban's when they governed Afghanistan in 1996. "Taliban forced people to go to the mosque for prayers and did not allow women to do jobs out of their homes; rather they were dying for hunger" (Barovick et al, 2001).

Luther and Miller (2005) research exposed the existence of mainframes in manuscripts by pro and anti-war administrative sets, the keen inspection of arguments display the reasoning and illegal stance of the armed operations. It uncovered that leading sets of society adore more compassionate treatment as compare to the depiction of marches that dislike the leading inclination in media. The findings of the research article also tinted that the media experts are frequently slanted to the utilization of positive prompts to illuminate the pro-war protest whereas media marginalized the anti-war protest. Media treatment of any event affected, influenced and shaped the viewer's perception as Kiouisis (2008) analyzed that media treatment was linked with American community attitudes toward other countries. Her study echoed that how mass media coverage of any event changed points of view of the U.S. public and affected her personal life and many other Iranian living in America. Wanta (2004) also endorsed that U.S. media give coverage of any event and country according to American's national concentrations (as cited Shahghasemi, 2011).

American mainstream media prefer to follow the overseas strategy of her country. Media slant varies according to acquaintance or rival. Treatment of states and intercontinental leaders change with the passage of spell, according to particular state's image at U.S administration (S. Noshina, 2006). When U.S. bombarded Kabul, then their media also portrayed Afghans as foes. Shaheen (2001) disclosed that Afghan community was distressed as of ambiguity, multi-nation immersion in Afghanistan as well as endures clash and conflict among ethnic sets for control. Now U.S. coalition added their depressions. Accompanying, "the U.S. media have for decades portrayed Arabs as uncivilized, religious zealots, who are ignorant, stupid, brutal, heartless and violent" (cited in Ryan, 2004, p. 379).

Theoretical Frame Work

The concept of framing and Johan Galtung's war/ peace journalism indicators used as the theoretical foundations to justify the research questions. Gitlin (1980) "framing theory" and Johan Galtung's "war/peace journalism theory" were applied in this research to reconnoiter in what way "*The Economist, The Herald and Time* frame U.S. military operations in Afghanistan" since 12th September 2001 to 31st December 2011. Many researchers like Rahman and Eijaz (2014), Dvir-Gvirsman (2010), Bui (2012) Lee, 2010, Sheafter and Gabay (2009), Siraj (2008), Dimitrova and Ahern (2007), Noshina, (2007), Lee and Maslog (2004, 2005) and several other scholars used both "Framing theory" as well as Johan Galtung "war/peace journalism theory" while analyzing the coverage of media substance during the crash, fight, armed operations and battle.

Framing Theory:

It will be exactly applicable to analyze how the mass communication tools offer eminence to specific matters repeatedly and neglect others intentionally. Indeed, frames mark the world for the media experts who cover them as well as the viewers who trust these information (Gitlin, 1980). Mass media have an influential part in the development of joint perception (Tuchman, 1978).

Reese (2001, 2007) attempted to capture the changing procedure of exchanging sense that happens in the framing method whereas highlighting the associations that might experience changes over time. He composed that frames are sorting out standards that are "socially shared and persistent over time, that work symbolically meaningfully to structure the social world" (Reese, 2001, p. 11; also, cited in Fahmy and Neumann, 2012, p. 3).

Galtung War/Peace Journalism Theory

This theory was originated in the 1970s, at what time Johan Galtung (1973) sketched parallels and divergences between peace reporting and war reporting. He argued that War Journalism, has a slant towards ferocity by virtue of concentrating on the proceedings taking place in a clash, conflict and their impartial reporting, for illustration around the number of casualties and technological power regarding arms. It doesn't investigate the causes and penalties of military operations and indiscernible impacts of conflicts. "War journalism tends to view the conflicts in terms of defeat or victory for the either side. On the other hand, peace journalism offers an alternative approach to the journalists" (Gaultang, 1998; cited in Aslam, 2011, p.119). This research mainly attempt to follow the Galtung's theory of war/

peace journalism and framing theory to analyze either *The Economist*, *The Herald* and *Time* projected the ferocity, propaganda, statements of the ruling groups, and triumph oriented frames while giving treatments to the clash, fights and military operations or covering the different slants like “invisible effects of war”, “causes and consequences”, “multi-party orientation”, etc. to settle the crash/ battle as well as armed action.

Methodology

This study, through quantitative and qualitative analysis examined, *The Economist*, *The Herald* and *Time* framing of “U.S. military operations in Afghanistan” in their news items. Total 347 news items published in the above-mentioned newsmagazines regarding “U.S. military operations in Afghanistan from 12th September 2001 to 31st December 2011” were taken as sample in this study. A news item (“articles, brief articles, essays, editorials, reports and notebook, information article, special report, opinion article, interview”) was considered as a unit of coding, whereas each paragraph on news item was considered as unit of analysis. SPSS 17, version was used for data coding and analysis. One way Anova and Chi-Square tests were used to find out the relationship between the study’s variables. Following is the list of war/peace journalism indicators which were studied in this study:

List of war/peace journalism indicators War/Peace Journalism Frame	Categories	Coding Categories for Frames
“War Journalism”	“Visible effects of war”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • News items concentrate on injured and casualties throughout “U.S. military operations in Afghanistan”. • Marginalized reporting regarding the anxiety and psychological shock throughout American armed actions. • Stealing resources, diet substances, hurt private as well as administrative organizations, are highly covered etc.
Peace Journalism	“Invisible effects of war”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uncovering long tenure affects for battles (local peace damaged, alliance and association among the states being loss, anxiety, emotional shock, misplaced persons, impairment to community, mutilation to norms and values, etc.
War Journalism	“Differences-Oriented”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highlights the declarations on areas of variances between the American government and Taliban as well as suspected Al-Qaida members in Afghanistan that aides to worsening to clash and fight.
Peace Journalism	“Solution-Oriented”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus at the ranges of correspondences that might prompt to the results of clash.

War Journalism	“Elite-Oriented”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highlights on American and European administrations, armed generals and leading groups that backing military operations as players and source of concerned information. • Asserts to arrest and murdered Taliban and members of Al-Qaeda network in Afghanistan. • Overlooks the presence of acquitted citizens. • Persisted on American authority for eradicating Taliban and Al-Qaeda web.
Peace Journalism	“People-Oriented”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emphases on ordinary individuals and sufferers of American armed actions as an eye witness and basis of evidences. • Point outs the existence of families, women, incapacitated and older residents in the ranges of armed acts. • News reports point out the casualties of citizens.
War Journalism	“Here and now”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The framework of armed actions overlooked including the consequences of operations on the grassroots. • News items only covered what is going on and who are the contributors in it. • Does not discuss the hurting and shock that might be triggered after armed Operations.
Peace Journalism	“Causes and consequences”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • covers the origins, unseen financial revenues • Dogmatic power, Emotional rivalry and imminent costs of it. <p>Discovers the prime aspects accountable for the clash and the fight.</p>
War Journalism	“Dichotomizes the good and bad guys”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Taliban government, Al-Qaeda members, heather in Afghanistan or anywhere in the world are malevolent and are • accountable for American armed actions.
Peace Journalism	“Avoid labeling of good guys and bad guys”.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Taliban and affiliates of Al-Qaeda aren’t labelled as virtuous people or wicked people. • Does not embrace them accountable for American armed operations.
War Journalism	“Two-party Orientation”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • America conquests whereas the followers of Taliban as well Al-Qaeda network in Afghanistan will misplace.
Peace Journalism	“Multi-party Orientation”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gives treatment to the arguments of all parties including Taliban, Al-Qaeda members in Afghanistan and American government.
War Journalism	“Partisan”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prejudiced to American armed actions. • And predominantly supported American stance.
Peace Journalism	“Non-Partisan”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nonaligned not supporting any party engaged in American armed actions in Afghanistan.
War Journalism	“Zero-sum Orientation”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • American armed attacks are vindicated. • Highlighted the statements and discussions regarding the success of American commanded coalition marines and downfall of Taliban, Al-Qaeda and Osama bin Laden.

Covering U.S. Led invasion of Afghanistan: A Comparative Analysis

Peace Journalism	“Win-win Orientation”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Numerous areas and topics, lead to resolution of clash.
War Journalism	“Uses of demonizing language”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frequently published the words like Malicious, terrorist, ferocious, chase the target, catch the vicious, radical and ferocious, etc.
Peace Journalism	“Avoid demonizing language”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use more exact portrayal, designations or titles that individuals liked.
War Journalism	“Stop talking about Peace treaties”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marginalized the reporting about negotiations and peace process.
Peace Journalism	“Report about the aftermaths of War”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frequently published the reports on the significance of negotiations and peace process.

Finding and Analysis

Table 1

War/Peace Journalism Frame in News Magazines regarding U.S. led invasion of Afghanistan

Newsmagazines	Count	War journalism frame in Afghanistan	Peace journalism frame in Afghanistan	Total
<i>The Economist</i>	Count	124	39	163
	% within newsmagazine	76.07%	23.93%	46.97%
	%Cross magazines	50.7%	39%	100%
<i>The Herald</i>	Count	10	42	52
	% within newsmagazine	19.23%	80.77%	14.98%
	%Cross magazines	4.84%	42%	100%
<i>Time</i>	Count	113	19	132
	% within newsmagazine	85.60%	14.39%	38.04%
	%Cross newsmagazine	45.75%	19%	100%
Total	Count	247	100	347
	% within newsmagazine	71.2%	29%	100%
	%Cross magazines	100%	100%	100%

Table 2

Indicators of War Journalism Frame in the News Magazines regarding U.S. led

invasion of Afghanistan

News Magazine	Visible Effect of war	Difference Oriented	Elite Oriented	Here and Now	Dichotomy	Two-party Orientation	Partisan	Win-Win Orientation	Uses demonstrating Language	Avoiding peace treaties	Total
<i>The Economist</i>	17	03	08	40	20	00	15	14	01	06	124
% within news magazine	13.28%	2.34%	6.25%	16%	8%	00%	6%	5.6%	0.4%	2.4%	100%
% cross news magazines	6.8%	1.2%	3.2%	%	42.55%	00%	37.5%	50%	14.29%	54.54%	50%
<i>The Herald</i>	03	00	00	05	02	00	00	00	00	00	10
% within news magazine	30%	00%	00%	50%	20%	00%	00%	00%	00%	00%	100%
% cross news magazines	1.2%	00%	00%	2%	0.8%	00%	00%	00%	00%	00%	4.0%
<i>Time</i>	02	02	07	29	22	07	20	14	06	04	113
% within news magazine	1.89%	1.89%	6.60%	26.6%	20.7%	06.2%	18.8%	13.21%	5.66%	3.77%	100%
% cross news magazines	0.8%	0.8%	2.8%	11.7%	8.9%	2.8%	8.0%	5.6%	2.4%	1.6%	46%

s

Total	22	05	15	74	44	07	35	28	07	10	247
% within news											
magazines	8.9%	2.0%	6.0%	30%	18%	2.8%	14%	11%	2.8%	4%	100%
% cross news											
magazines	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	00%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table 3

Indicators of Peace Journalism Frame in the News Magazines on U.S. led invasion of Afghanistan

News Magazines	Invisible Effect War	Solution Oriented	People Oriented	Causes and Consequences	Avoided or good guys	Multi-party Orientation	Non-Partisan	Zero Sum Orientation	Avoided Uses Demonguing Language	Stay reporting about peace treaties	Total
The Economist	06	01	14	07	00	01	01	00	00	09	39
% within news magazine	15.3%	2.56%	35.8%	17.9%	00%	2.56%	2.56%	00%	00%	23%	
% cross news magazines	26.1%	100%	43.75%	50%	00%	16.7%	25%	00%	00%	43.48%	100%
The	07	00	16	05	00	05	02	00	00	07	42

Herald

% within
news 16.6 00% 38% 12% 00% 12% 4.7 00% 00% 16.6% 100%
%
magazine

% cross
news 30.4 00% 40.48 35.71 00% 83.3 75% 00% 00% 35.43 42%
%
magazine

s
Time 10 00 03 02 00 00 00 00 00 04 19

% within
news 52% 00% 15.8 10.2 00% 00% 00% 00% 00% 20% 100%
%
magazine

% cross
news 53% 00% 9.1% 10.5 00% 00% 00% 00% 00% 21% 19%
%
magazine

s

Total 23 01 33 14 00 06 03 00 00 20 100

% within
news
magazine 23% 1% 33% 14% 00% 6% 3% 00% 00% 20% 100%

s
% cross
news 100% 100% 100 100% 00 100% 100 00% 00% 100% 100%
%
magazine

s

Discussions

Leading War/Peace Journalism frame in *The Economist*, *The Herald* and *Time* about “U.S. led invasion of Afghanistan”.

War journalism found leading frame in the news items of *The Economist* and *Time* about “U.S. led invasion of Afghanistan”. On the other hand, *The Herald* was inclined to peace journalism. The results exposed that (n=163) news items were printed in Britain based newsmagazine “*The Economist*” about ‘U.S. military operation in Afghanistan’, (124) 76.07% reflected war journalism slant and (39) 23.93% were tilted towards peace journalism.

Pakistani newsmagazine “*The Herald*” published (n=52) news items on U.S. military operation in Afghanistan, (10) 19.23% were supported the American armed operations and (42) 80.77% were tending to the peace reporting. However, (n=132) news items were printed in American newsmagazine “*Time*”, around (113)85.6% were proceeding war journalism slant and (19)14.4% were sloped towards the reporting of peace (see Table 1). *The Economist*, *The Herald* and *Time* were varied in their embracing of the frame of war/peace in their reports regarding “U.S. military operations in Afghanistan”.

Prominent indicators of war journalism in *The Economist*, *The Herald* and *Time* about U.S. led invasion of Afghanistan.

The Economist printed (n=163) news items concerning ‘U.S. military operations in Afghanistan’ that used the frame of war and peace journalism in its news items. 124 (76.1%) news items of this newsmagazine were inclined towards war journalism. Though, among of 124, forty (32.25%) news items preferred “*here and now*” as the leading indicator of war journalism. On the other hand, twenty (16.12%) and seventeen (13.70%) were promoted “*dichotomy*” and “*visible effect of war*” respectively.

The Herald printed (n=52) news items about “U.S. military operations in Afghanistan” although, ten (19.23%) news items were promoted war journalism, out of five (50%), three (30%) and two (20%) news items were voted “*here and now*”, “*visible effects of war*” and “*Dichotomy*” as the vital indicators whereas reporting the topic. *Time* inscribed (n=132) news items about the said topic, out of one hundred and thirteen (85.60%) were advocated war journalism; twenty (25.66%), twenty-two (19.46%) and twenty (17.7%) “*here and now*”, “*Dichotomy*” and “*Partisan*” were the core indicators of war journalism (see Table 02).

Prominent indicators of Peace journalism frame in *The Economist*, *The Herald* and *Time* about “U.S. led invasion of Afghanistan”.

The Economist printed (n=163) news items regarding “U.S. military operations in Afghanistan” that advocated war/ peace journalism in their reports. Out of, 39 (24%) were selected the frame of peace journalism. The findings exposed that “*people Oriented*” fourteen (35.8%) and nine (23.0%) “*stay on reporting about peace reporting*” regarding the repercussions of war was overriding indicators of Peace Journalism. *The Herald* published (n=52) news items on the issue. Out of 52, forty-two (81%) news items used peace journalism. *People Oriented* 16 (38%) was the leading indicator. Whereas, *Time* wrote (n=132) news item on the topic, out of one hundred and thirty two, only nineteen (14.3%) news items were promoted peace journalism; ten (53%) selected “*invisible effects of war*” as the chief indicator of peace journalism regarding U.S military operations in Afghanistan (Table 3).

Visible effects of war; casualties, physical harms and association lose as the outcome of American armed attacks in Afghanistan appear as leading angle in news items of *The Economist* and *Time* instead of emotional trauma, strain, shock and unbalance association among states and nations as the upshots of American armed operations in Afghanistan.

News items of *Time* frequently justified military operations by narrating that common Afghans hated the Taliban and wished to get rid of them. American attacked at Taliban's and Al-Qaeda network was being strongly appreciated by common Afghans. *Time* wrote: "Corpses of Taliban's Arab and deliberate Pakistani jihadists were labeled with scratches of disrespect. Afghan bills were filled with their mouths, noses and their body wounds. Injured fighters were beaten to death by common Afghans, their dead bodies humiliated and left in roads" (Gibbs, 2001). *The Herald* engraved regarding unnoticeable effects of military operations by highlighting the miseries of innocent civilians of Afghans and prisoners in Afghan jails: "Pakistanis, Arabs and Afghan Prisoners kept in Bagram air base and treated them mercilessly. Most of the detainees were unaware of their guilt" (Sethna, 2011, p. 48).

Time and *The Economist* in most of their news items wrote about the supersonic weapons of U.S. and coalition forces. These newsmagazines were humiliating tiny Afghanistan army forces and proudly mentioned the infinite power of Western and American coalitions. *The Economist* wrote: "The world's greatest military, economic and diplomatic power would steadily and relentlessly hunt down its enemy, while doing everything it can to maintain a coalition of support from a remarkably wide range of countries" ("For family and", 2001).

The Herald as compare to *The Economist* and *Time* frequently covered the American armed actions in Afghanistan in the peace perspective than the slant of war. Indicator of "solution Orientation" recurrently used in *The Herald*. After 9/11 this newsmagazine preferred to report the conflict between Taliban and U.S. administration in peace frame. *The Herald* narrated: "Afghan Government wants to solve the issue", "Taliban hopeful of some sympathetic views towards the Muslim world specially Pakistan", "Taliban has refused to take action against Bin Laden without sufficient proof", "refused to hand him over to the U.S. without any evidences" (Abbas, 2001).

The Herald discussed the alternative angle like how these types of armed operations against underprivileged nations without proofs could be evaded in the future. This newsmagazine points out the vulnerability of the Afghans collectively and engrossed at peace discourses and consultations instead of armed operations.

Time and *The Economist* frequently used *here and now* indicator of war journalism and discussed the situation of the battle ground and details of the weapons used during U.S. military operations. The use of vigor and latest armed expertise was measured to be an actual way of handling the 'aggressive ecclesiastics', by dealing least space to elucidate their perilous impacts on the fatalities and the environment. *The Economist* published: "The fighting in Afghanistan has confirmed the effectiveness of sophisticated long-distance weapons and unmanned drones to spy on and attack enemies without exposing soldiers to undue risk" ("Military intelligence", 2002).

Mostly these newsmagazines marginalized causes and consequences of these operations. Although upshots of 'U.S. military operations in Afghanistan' were seriously assessed in one of the editorial of *The Herald*:

One cannot, after all, stockpile weapons indefinitely and not use them. As such, Osama or no Osama, the bombing of the world's poorest country by the world's richest country is just a case of an overburdened military machine seeking to be unburdened. The U.S. intends to test her super sophisticated nuclear technology (Editor's note, 2001, p.15).

Conclusion

This study has discussed leading frame of war and peace journalism through the lens of "Galtung's war/peace journalism theory" and supplementary found out prominent war and peace journalism indicators connected to "U.S led invasion of Afghanistan" in *The Economist*, *The Herald* and *Time* from 12th September 2001 to 31st December 2011.

This study concluded that qualitative examination also strengthens the empirical findings that the administration of American and United Kingdom planned armed operations and reinforced them. *The Economist* and *Time* were very categorical that the American commanded alliance forces must not bid any peace discussions to the Taliban and the members of Al-Qaeda networks. *Time* mentioned its war journalism stance in one of its news items: "terrorist bosses and their hosts", "Afghan fundamentalist administration", "atrocious scale and nature of assault on New York and Washington, DC on September 11 were enough to carry most of the coalition supporters together' to assist America in military operations" ("The propaganda war", 2001). In contrary of it, *The Herald* addressed the peace frame like giving voice to victims of military operations, highlighted the property damage of the innocent deprived people. It wrote that "the fact that the massacre was executed by U.S. warplanes and gunships; it has raised no eyebrows in the higher capitals of the world" (Khan, 2001, p.65). In another news item *The Herald* argued: "American brutal bombing of Afghanistan, will solely serve her personal interests" (Akhtar, 2001).

It is now time for peace journalism with the media actively pursuing the goal of conflict resolution through dialogue. Though, media is an influential tool that circulates information and predisposed the point of views of the masses but it should show its part to verbose the pressure, clash and conflict by playing its part as arbitrator to organize consultations for all sets tangled in war. It is the prime responsibility of media that it should manage to act as a substance to make the globe safer residence to live.

This study, like most of other studies (Aslam, 2014; Dag, 2013; Galtung, 2005; Lynch & McGoldrick, 2005; Lynch & McGoldrick, 2007; Lyon, D, 2007a; Lyon, D, 2007b; Malakwen, 2014; Ottosen, R, 2005; Ottosen, R, 2010; Ottosen, R, 2005; Rahman & Ejaz, 2014; Siraj, 2012) recommended that the distinct consideration should be given to peace journalism alongside war journalism. So, the tangible impartiality will not be attained except a stable and impartial treatment is not practiced by the media, equally in routine matters and throughout clash, conflict, and military operations as well as in warlike situations.

Covering U.S. Led invasion of Afghanistan: A Comparative Analysis

References

- Abbas.Z. (2001,March). Pakistan's Bin Laden Imbroglio. *The Herald*
- Akhtar, S. A. (2001, January,). The politics of identity. *The Herald*
- Aslam, R. (2011). "Peace journalism: A paradigm shift in traditional media approach." *Pacific Journalism Review*17(1): 119--140.
- Barovick et al. (11/26/2001). Years ago in Time.158(23). *Time*
- Bui, N. (2012). War/ Peace Journalism Approach in Vietnamese Online Media Coverage of South China Sea Dispute. *Global Journalism*, Orebro University,MA thesis.
- Dag, H. (2013). *Peace journalism or war journalism? A comparative analysis of the coverage of Israeli and Turkish newspapers during the Gaza flotilla crisis* (master's thesis). Concordia University, Montreal, Canada. Retrieved from <http://spectrum.library.concordia.ca/977030/>
- Editor's note, 2001.*The Herald*
- Erjavec, K. (2004). The Newsweek war on terrorism: A construction of Risk. In S. Nohrstedt& R. Ottosen (Eds.), *U.S. and the others global media image on the war on terror* (p.95). Sweden: Nordicom
- Fahmy ,S, R. Neumann. (2012). "Shooting War Or Peace Photographs? An Examination of Newswires Coverage of the Conflict in Gaza (2008-2009)" *American Behavioral Scientist*56(2): 1--26.
- For family and fraternity. (Oct, 2001). *The Economist*
- Gitlin, T. (1980).*The whole world is watching: Mass media in the making and unmaking of the new left*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Graber, D. A. (Eds.). (2000). *Media powers in politics* (4thed.). Washington, D.C.: University of Illinois Chicago.
- Griffin, M.(2004). Picturing American War on terrorism in Afghanistan and Iraq. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 5(4), 381-402.
- Hackett, R. A., & Zhao, Y. (1994). Challenging a master narrative: Peace protest and opinion/editorial discourse in the U.S. press during the Gulf War. *Discourse & Society*, 5(4), 509–541. Doi: 10.1177/0957926594005004005
- Hallin, D. C., & Gitlin, T. (1993). Agony and ritual: The Gulf war as popular culture and as television drama. *Political Communication*, 10, 411-424.
- Herman, E.S., & Chomsky, N. (1994). *Manufacturing consent: The political economy of the mass media*. London, UK, Vintage.
- Khan, A. (2008). The Image of Pakistan in Prestigious American Newspaper Editorials: A Test of the Media Conformity Theory. *Strategic Studies*, 28(3), 105-128.
- Kiousis, S., &McDevitt. M. (2008). Agenda setting in civic development: Effects of curricula and issue importance on youth voter turnout. *Communication Research*, 35(4), 481–502.
- Lee, C.-H. (2004). News Coverage of U.S. War With Iraq: A Comparison of The New York Times, The Arab News, and The Middle East Times, The University of Texas at Austin. PhD thesis.
- Luther, C.A., & Miller, M.M. (2005).framing of US 2003 Iraq war demonstration: An analysis of news and partisan texts. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 82(1), 78—96.
- Lynch, J. (2007). A course in Peace Journalism. *Conflict and Communication online* 6(1).

- Lynch, J., & McGoldrick, A. (2005). *Peace journalism*. Stroud, UK: Hawthorn Press
- Lynch, J., & McGoldrick, A. (2007). Peace Journalism. In C. Webel & J. Galtung (Eds), *Hand book of peace and conflict studies*. New York, NY: Rout ledge.
- Lyon, D. (2007a). Good Journalism or peace journalism. *Conflict & Communication Online*, 6(2),1-9
- Lyon, D. (2007b). "Good journalism or Peace Journalism? --Counterplea." *Conflict and Communication online* 6(2): 1-5.
- Military intelligence,(November, 2002)-The Economist.
- Malakwen, B. K. (2014). Media Initiatives and the Promotion of Peaceful Coexistence among Communities in Kenya. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 4(11).
- Noshina, S. (2007). *U.S. Image in Pakistani English dailies Dawn, The Nation and The News with special reference to Pakistan-United States relationship during post cold war era* (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). Institute of Communication Studies, University of Punjab. Lahore.
- Noshina, S. & Hanan, M. A. (2014). Media and conflict resolution: Towards building a relationship model. *Journal of Political Studies*, 21(1), 179-198
- Ottosen, R. (2005). The Norwegians Media Image of the War in Afghanistan: Peacekeeping or Aggression? *Nordicom Review*, 26(1), 95-110.
- Ottosen, R. (2010). "The war in Afghanistan and peace journalism in practice." *sage pub*, 3(3): 1-18.
- Rahman, B. H. & A. Eijaz. (2014). Pakistani Media as an Agent of Conflict or Conflict Resolution: A Case of Lal Masjid in Urdu and English Dailies. *Pakistan Vision* 15 (2): 238-264.
- Ryan, M. (2004). Framing the War against Terrorism: US newspaper editorials and military action in Afghanistan. *Gazette: The International Journal For Communication Studies*, 66(5).
- Safdar, A., Budiman, M. A. & Hamid, A. B. N. (2014). Media conformity of foreign policy: coverage of war on terror by the British press. *J.R.S. P*, 51(01).
- Scheuer, M. (2009). *Marching towards hell America and Islam after Iraq*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Sethna. R.(December, 2011). No one told us we were guilty. *The Herald*.
- Shabir, G., Ali, S., Iqbal, Zafar. (2011). US Mass Media and Image of Afghanistan: Portrayal
- Siraj, S. A., & Hussain. S. (2012). War media Glora in Pakistan: A perspective on Taliban conflict. *Global media Journal*, 5(1).
- Siraj, S. A. (2006). *Image of Pakistan in the US Media: Exploring News Framing*. *Mass Communication, University of Southern Illinois Carbondale*, USA. Post Doctorate Dissertation. Retrieved from http://eprints.hec.gov.pk/3773/1/Final_Report.pdf
- The propaganda war. (2001, October). *The Economist*, p.11
- Wanta, G., & Lee, C. (2004). Agenda setting and international news: Med influence on public perceptions of foreign nations. *Journalism & Mass Communication*. Retrieved from <http://jmq.sagepub.com/content/81/2/364.short>