



RESEARCH PAPER

War and Peace Journalism Perspective in the Leading Press on US-Afghan Taliban Peace Talks

¹ Javeria Karim* ²Dr. Shahid Hussain

1 PhD Scholar, Department of Mass Communication, AIU, Islamabad, Pakistan

2 Assistant Professor, Department of Mass Communication, Allama Iqbal Open University, Islamabad, Pakistan

PAPER INFO	ABSTRACT
Received: February 28, 2022 Accepted: June 12, 2022 Online: June 14, 2022	This study analyses the war and peace framing perspective on the US-Taliban peace deal in selected newspapers from July 2018 to February 2020. During this period, the formal peace talks between these countries were at their peak after US representative Zalmay Khalilzad's appointment. This study has critically evaluated the framing of elite press, which have essential stakes in this negotiation process. The included countries in this study were Pakistan, US, Russia, and Afghanistan. Content analysis was used to analyze news stories, articles, and editorials of four English newspapers taken from selected countries, <i>i.e.</i> Dawn, New York Times, The Moscow Times, and Afghanistan Outlook. The study's central focus was to figure out the Taliban factor in Afghanistan, especially the approach used by selected Press in responding to the initiative of peace talks between the US and Afghan Taliban. The researchers found that all press predominantly reported in the peace journalism approach during peace talks and adopted neutral approach towards Taliban. The sample newspapers also favored the peace process and focused on solution of the issue by engaging multiparties. The findings of this study are quite in line with the existing scholarship that media adopt peace journalism approach during peace process. Also, the media of different countries framed the situation according to their set policies and interest while presenting their national matters.
Keywords: Elite Press, Peace Talks Taliban, US, War And Peace Journalism	
*Corresponding Author: javeriakarim12@gmail.com	

Introduction

There is no denying that media has appeared in all societies as a vital socio-political entity and can influence thought and habits through their discourses at governmental and individual levels. With the critical contributions of mass media, people become more educated and perceive a dispute from multiple angles. The study on war and peace journalism shows that mass media representation is a significant problem for combatants, the public, and media practitioners (Zelizer & Allan, 2011). For that reason, journalists and researchers have debated how the media is reporting on conflicts and conflict resolution, as well as how it impacts public opinion from the last couple of decades. In this way, the Galtung model of peace journalism is considered the most effective approach to critically reviewing the war and peace journalism attributes of conflict journalism. Many authors have primarily applied the peace journalism approach to the international conflict, including the Israel-Palestine dispute, the Kashmir confrontation, Middle East tensions, the invasion of Afghanistan, and other conflicts in Africa and Asia (Rehman & Husain, 2019; Asmatullah, Haseeb, & Fazal, 2020; Fahmy & Kim, 2008; Goretti, 2007; Jawad, 2013; Jones, 2010; Mandelzis & Peleg, 2017; Ozohu-Suleiman & Ishak, 2014; Ross & Tehranian, 2008; Strömbäck & Nord, 2004). In addition to these theoretical contributions, we plan to

promote our practical research tips for implementing peace journalism on US-Taliban negotiation process.

Taliban in Afghanistan and Peace Process

The world trade Centre's incident between the US & the Taliban in 2001, not only changed international politics but its real effects were seen in the rest of the world. The major objective of this war was to dismantle Al-Qaeda and destroy its safe havens in Afghanistan by removing the Taliban from power. The US demanded Osama Bin Laden from the Taliban government, and denial from the Taliban brought another devastating war on Afghanistan. USA attacked Afghanistan with the support of coalition forces of NATO (Adamec, 2005). The essence of war changed into a multi-dimensional, complicated and ambiguous one after defeating the Taliban. They were defeated apparently, but many of their leaders were alive, including Mullah Omar & Osama bin Laden, which was the key goal of US (Sheikh & Greenwood, 2013). In May, 2011 US forces also killed bin Laden in Abbotabad operation (Jahangir, 2013). The following month, US Defense Secretary Robert Gates stated for the first time that the US government was holding reconciliation talks with the Taliban (Majidyar, 2014). The peace process in Afghanistan, on the other hand, has been ongoing for several years with little significant progress (Idrees, Rehman, & Naazer, 2019).

In peace negotiations, the dilemma of peace talks with the Taliban is not the only problem (Sheikh & Greenwood, 2013; Wolf, 2019). Both stakeholders have also stated the need for a diplomatic settlement of Afghanistan's conflict (Raja & Ajmal, 2016). For the Taliban, reconciliation means restoring what they lost after the American invasion. Although the Kabul government is seeking to reinforce the new dispensation, it reduces violence and establishes its rule (Nabeel, 2018; Qarqeen, 2015; Shinn & Dobbins, 2011). Even on behalf of US President Barack Obama, Afghan President Ashraf Ghani issued a peace offer to the Taliban, which included the group's recognition as a political party, the relaxation of restrictions, the release of captives, and a review of the constitution (Safi & Ruttig, 2018). However, the bid was refused by the Taliban. Taliban believed that the Afghan government was not the final decision-maker on regional peace issues, thus they insisted on speaking with the US directly (Vinay, 30 Oct, 2019).

In July 2018, Donald Trump administration directed its ambassadors to pursue direct talks with the Taliban. Former US envoy to Afghanistan Zalmay Khalilzad was appointed to the post of Afghanistan Reconciliation by Secretary of State Mike Pompeo in September 2018. As a result, the Taliban and the United States have engaged in a series of peace talks. Several attempts have been made, with regional and international actors falling into line. After a wavering interruption, the US and the Taliban's negotiating teams have resumed peace talks for the tenth round of negotiations (Ouwens, 2020). After more than a year of official talks between US and Taliban representatives, the two parties reached an agreement on February 29, 2020, creating the framework for the withdrawal of US armed forces from Afghanistan, and talks between Kabul and the Taliban began coe.

The present study attempts to contribute to the current scholarship through an analysis of the war and peace journalism perspective of the US-Taliban peace talks. The peace effort in Afghanistan will change the world's political scenario, so it will be interesting to analyse the media's actions. Do the media adopt the strategy of peace journalism to solve the problem and contribute to the reconciliation of the Afghan people, or presents the same conflicted attitude as defined in many studies that media follow the elite perspective while reporting war and peace events (Entman, 2004; Hallin, 1989; Lance, 1990).

Literature Review

The media plays a crucial role in foreign relations because people are much dependent on the media that provide timely, reliable information about desired angles (Dag, 2013; Ross, 2017). Communication itself is a crucial factor in resolving disputes and conflicts which can generate knowledge and consideration to the other (Peleg, 2007). The failure of the media to provide timely and accurate information could be a major factor in the conflict escalation (Lake & Rothchild, 1996; Tayeebwa, 2017). In fact, as a matter of recognition in the human consciousness, the role of the mass media in the distribution of information may be both constructive and deconstructive for peace in society. Otherwise, the media's deconstructive function can be demonstrated through news content that increases the risk of violent retaliation among competing players (Imtihani, 2014).

In this way, proponents of peace journalism look to peace and conflict studies for direction. They recognize that differences and disputes will never go away completely, but they must not become a source of conflict. Violence, on the other hand, is not a solution to conflicts; rather, these contradictions must be productively transformed (Galtung, 2000; Lynch & Galtung, 2010; Lynch & McGoldrick, 2005; Ross & Tehranian, 2008). Media can be used powerfully to portray disputes from a more comprehensive viewpoint, *i.e.* (parties, priorities, and issues) by identifying violence as the problem itself and proposing conflict resolution methods (Jawad, 2013; Kempf, 2007; Nohrstedt & Ottosen, 2008)

Galtung's notion of peace journalism has made an important contribution to understanding the war-media nexus and its potential for escalation or de-escalation of conflict (Galtung, 2006). This approach is predominantly West-oriented. Media reporting of conflicts has been analysed from a long time. It was mainly established in response to the wartime roles of national and vernacular media in numerous conflicts, including World Wars I and II, the Cold War era, and the Vietnam invasions. The continents of Asia and Africa came to the conclusion that the media did not act as unbiased observers in international wars (Hutcheson, Domke, Billeaudeaux, & Garland, 2004; Mitra, 2018; Nohrstedt & Ottosen, 2010; Rawan & Hussain, 2017; Tenenboim-Weinblatt, Hanitzsch, & Nagar, 2016). Researchers findings regarding peace journalism approach have originated the dominance prevalence of war journalism in conflicts reporting by media *i.e.* (Hussain, 2016; Fawcett, 2002; Nohrstedt & Ottosen, 2010).

However, in their studies under the discipline of peace journalism, some scholars confirmed that different media covered inter-state or intra-state disputes independently and preserved their independence by choosing not to support their policy internationally (Hallin, 1989; Robinson, Goddard, Parry, & Murray, 2009). According to Spencer (2003) the media is not inclined to peace since conflict is news and peace is not news. Researchers conclude that, due to political, financial, and technical causes, conventional media disputes are inflamed (Bratic & Schirch, 2007; Knightley, 2002; Shinar, 2004, 2007).

To another place, many academics and scholars in Pakistan have been attracted to the academic discipline of peace journalism, and extensive literature is available in the form of publications and academic studies (Asmatullah et al., 2020; Hussain 2018; Hussain & Siraj 2019; Rehman & Hussain, 2019; Siraj, 2008). In these studies, the researchers found that Pakistani news media, such as the daily Dawn, frequently supported national interests and documented politico-religious and security disputes in war journalism fashion. They found that media contents are indexed to elitist perspectives while reporting war and peace events (Entman, 2004; Hallin, 1989; Lance, 1990).

The media of different countries framed the situation according to their set policies and interest while presenting national matters (S. Hussain, 2016; Saleem, 2007; Sultan, 2013; Zahid, Malik, & Ehtisham, 2018). Nevertheless, few studies also counter this narrative

by arguing that it is not necessarily required for media to support their state's point of view because media in the countries were free to frame matters, give coverage, and make judgements (Yousef, 2012). In a comparative analysis, Shinar reveals that even when reporting peace talks, the media tend to use war frames (Shinar, 2007).

Fawcett (2002) demonstrates that the Irish media find conflict frames more appealing than reconciliation frame. Many scholars have argued that while media cannot resolve conflicts, it can help the process by providing fair representation, humanising the conflict, and giving voice to the voiceless (Lynch, 2008; Lynch & Galtung, 2010; Ross & Tehranian, 2008). In this study, the researchers will comparatively analyze how media of these countries report on the Taliban peace talks, what perspectives are highlighted, and is media framing is in line with responsible and constructive reporting which we called as peace journalism (Kempf, 2007; Lynch, 2008, 2014).

Theoretical Framework

Frames are the mental processes that allow us to arrange our thoughts and ideas and make sense of the world. These processes are frequently unintentionally introduced by us in our everyday routine lives, but how we decode the truth around us has a huge role to play (Scheufele & Tewksbury, 2006). The research focused on the Galtung framework of peace journalism and war journalism. Peace scholars, media theorists, and journalists focused their attention on the issue of how the media could be used as a catalyst for conflict resolution by the end of the 20th century (Galtung & Jacobsen, 2002; Galtung & Ruge, 1965). Peace journalism is defined by Lee et al., (2017) as an engagement and interpretive strategy to emphasise peace efforts, tone down ethnic and religious differences, avert more conflict, focus on society's framework, and facilitate conflict resolution, restoration, and reconciliation. The theory's proponents maintain that peace journalism is the appropriate way to make the masses increasingly understand that there are other ways to conflict rather than violence (Lynch & McGoldrick, 2005; Ottosen, 2005).

Shinar (2007) describes peace journalism as a normative style of responsible and proactive media coverage of conflict aimed at contributing to peace-making, peacekeeping, and improving the attitudes towards war and peace of media owners, advertisers, practitioners, and viewers. Peace journalism and war journalism are classified by Johan Galtung into four distinct variables, each with its own linguistic orientation and practices. Peace vs. war, reality vs. propaganda, people vs. elite, and victory vs. solutions are all issues to consider. Peace journalism is solution-oriented, gives voice to the voiceless, humanises the 'enemy,' exposes lies on both sides, highlights peace efforts, and focuses on the invisible effects of violence, whereas war journalism focuses on aggression and triumph, demonises the 'enemy,' focuses on 'our' suffering, prioritises official sources, and only highlights the visible effects of violence.

- H1.** There will be significant difference found in war and peace journalism frames of (Daily Outlook Afghanistan and Daily Dawn) as compared to (Moscow times and New York times) while reporting the US-Taliban peace process.
- H2.** News stories contain more peace journalism approaches than editorial and others while reporting the peace deal of these selected newspapers.
- H3.** Official sources-based stories contain more peace journalism as compared to news agencies in the selected newspaper.
- H4.** Reporting on diplomatic relations between US-Taliban will be higher while reporting peace deals in selected newspapers than others.

Material and Methods

In this study, four leading newspapers were selected from four countries: Daily Dawn from Pakistan, New York Times from the USA, The Moscow Times from Russia, and Daily Outlook from Afghanistan for content analysis. The study population was all news items related to the US-Taliban peace deal published in selected newspapers during a specified period. These newspapers' data was taken from online newspaper sources for the period starting from July 2018 to the end of February 2020. The stories were selected by searching keywords 'Taliban peace deal with US' & US-Taliban peace talks for a selected period. The retrieved data first organized date wise and then through systematic sampling techniques, every third story was selected for analysis. In this way, Total 226 number of stories were selected from Daily Dawn, 285 stories from New York Times, 15 stories from Moscow Times, and 248 stories from Afghanistan Outlook. Each story was classified for kind in addition to the identification of information in (News, Editorial and others), byline (national and foreign news agencies), the total number of words in a story, frames (war journalism, peace journalism & Neutral), Topics/Aspects are (Diplomatic and Political settlements, fight and talks, economic development and conflict) and slant (favorable to peace and unfavorable to peace and Neutral stance). War and peace journalism indicators ranges from zero to eight. Galtung indicators of war and peace journalism were adopted for the coding procedure, which is given below.

Visible vs. Invisible effects of war

If news contents focus on war/conflict-based reporting will be considered as a war indicator. In contrast, if the news story covers the conflict situation, it affects the country's long-standing diversity and democratization process.

Elite vs. People-oriented

The story covered elite persons being their mouth-piece except for suffering and giving voices to the ordinary people.

Background info vs. Causes and consequences

The story covers breaking news aspects of the conflict with little background information, versus explaining the parties' position, which was involved in the agreement, might lead to a solution.

Partisan vs. non-Partisan

The story shows biases and creates a distinctive sharp divide among groups that will be considered partisan. In contrast, the news report covers both sides of a debate and is balanced by providing the same number of factual statements.

Reactive vs. Proactive

The story focus on violence before reporting will be included as reactive versus criticizing the clashes, qualifying violence as a wrong way to solve disputes.

Victory vs. Solution-oriented

If a news story covering solutions were leaving for another war versus peace is equal to nonviolence and creativity.

Two-party vs. Multiparty involvement

The story focuses on one party wins; one party loses, verses story gives voice to many parties involved in resolution without winning and lose concept.

Neutral Indicator

A story that comprises none of the two, *i.e.*, war and Peace Journalism in the paragraph/s or number of neutral values in a story, is more outstanding than the war and peace approach. The story will be coded as neutral.

Analysis of Research findings

In terms of the peace process, Afghanistan's reconciliation process is a relatively new and fascinating phenomenon in which many countries are involved. The first research question was regarding the extent of coverage given to US-Taliban peace talks by the sample press.

Table 1
Distribution of Sample Press by Frequency, Percentage and Mean Story Length

Variables	Country Name	Frequency	Percentage	Mean Story length in Words
Newspapers	Daily Outlook Afghanistan	248	32	841
	Daily Dawn	226	29	595
	The New York Times	285	37	1210
	Moscow Times	15	2	516
Story type	News story	342	55	906
	Editorial	184	17	739
	Other	248	28	1007
News Frames	Peace journalism	402	52	813
	War journalism	210	27	1073
	Neutral	162	21	884
Total		774	100	

Findings shows a significant variation from each selected press in terms of coverage and its mean story length. In Frequencies distribution (Table 1) the accumulative data of stories consist of 774 from four newspapers. The New York Times is leading in the coverage of peace talks stories 285 (37%) with 1210 mean length, Afghanistan publishing 248 (32%) stories with 841 mean story length, followed by Daily Dawn had 226 (29%) stories with 595 mean story length, and Moscow Times had 15 (2%) with 516 mean lengths of a story. The following is a breakdown of the sample by story type: There were 342 (55%) news stories with 906 mean length, 184 (17) editorials with 739 mean length, and 248 (28) other stories (which included letters to the editor, columns, features, and so on) with 1007 mean story length in words. Another type of news frames are included as peace journalism frames which covers 813 mean story length with (52%) as compared to war journalism frames 1073 with (27%). The above table shows that during the coverage of peace talks war journalism frame was prominent.

In the (Table 2), The analysis of the regional press reveals that peace journalism is a prominent indicator in Daily outlook Afghanistan (153), followed by Dawn (63.7). whereas the indicator of war journalism is prominent in New York Times (46.3). The newspapers focused in particular on countries' diplomatic efforts to ease tensions and withdraw troops from Afghanistan.

Table 2
Framing of War and Peace Journalism in Terms of Countries

Name of Countries		Newspaper	PJ	WJ	Neutral	P Value
Regional States	Afghanistan	Daily Outlook Afghanistan	153 (62)	50 (20)	45 (18)	Chi-square 7.137 (.028)
	Pakistan	Daily Dawn	144 (64)	27 (12)	55 (24)	
	Total		297	77	100	
Power States	USA	New York Times	96 (34)	132 (46)	57 (20)	Chi-square 9.018 (.011)
	Russia	Moscow Times	09 (60)	01 (07)	05 (33)	
	Total		105	133	62	

Overall analysis reveals that in the regional countries press most of the stories covered 297 peace frames followed by neutrals (chi-square = 7.137; P = .028). However, in power states 133 war frames higher than 105 peace frames followed by 62 neutral (chi-square = 9.018; P = .011). The overall coverage in both categories of the newspapers was different and regional states press were more focused toward peace journalism than war journalism. While, power states specially New York times was more focused towards war journalism. These findings contradict previous research on war and peace journalism reporting, such as (Fawcett, 2002; Shinar, 2004; Wolfsfeld, 2004) who asserts that the journalist's "normal mode of operation is to cover tension, conflict, and violence", even while covering peace talks, the media prefers to utilize conflict frames than conciliation frames.

The following four topics were featured prominently in all news coverage on the peace talks: Diplomatic and Political development (60%), then Fight and talk strategy (15%), followed by Humanitarian assistance (23%) and Status of conflict (02%) were found.

Table 3
Framing of War and Peace journalism in Terms of Talks

Topics	Peace frame	War frame	Neutral	P value
Diplomatic development	242 (60)	22 (11)	35 (22)	Chi square=42.737 P = .000 Cramer's V 0.435
Fight and talk strategy	60 (15)	106 (52)	88 (54)	
Humanitarian assistance	91 (23)	25 (12)	33 (20)	
Status of conflict	09 (02)	57 (25)	06 (04)	
Total	402 (100)	210 (100)	162 (100)	

The reporting of peace talks events, i.e, Political development, Afghan reconciliation, Afghan Led-Afghan owned peace process, US withdrawal, produced more peace journalism than war journalism. The events such as where fight and talks both were occurring at a similar time more war journalism frame was seen in majority numbers (52%). In the news reports on peace events 402 stories were reported in the peace journalism category and 210 news reports on war journalism. Results found significant difference in all topics (Chi-square = 42.737; P = .000).

As shown in the above (Table 4), In daily Outlook Afghanistan and daily Dawn, the most important categories of peace journalism are invisible effects of war, solution-oriented, causes and consequences, multiparty involvement and Proactive. While the most important predictors of war journalism are elite orientated. The key peace journalism

indicators from the US in the New York Times are Invisible effects of war, Multiparty involvement and proactive. Prominent war journalism includes Elite oriented, Use of demonizing language and Dichotomizes. In Moscow Times, the most important categories of peace journalism are invisible effects of war, and Multi-Party involvement. While the most important predictors of war journalism are elite oriented. Overall, from nine indicators in all countries more specifies invisible effects of war followed by multiparty involvement in Peace journalism categories and elite oriented approach in WJ category. The invisible effects of war revealed the story is all about peace promotions and there is avoidance of conflict. Multi-party coverage gave voices to many parties involved in the conflict, The elite orientation coverage dealt with political and prominent people are involved in a story.

Table 4
Distribution of War and Peace journalism Framing Indicators

Frames	Categories of PJ/WJ	Daily Outlook Afghanistan		Daily Dawn		New York Times		Moscow Times	
		Peace	War	Peace	War	Peace	War	Peace	War
Frame A	Invisible vs Visible	162 (18)	27 (05)	172 (20)	26 (5)	157 (18)	101 (10)	10 (20)	05 (15)
Frame B	People vs Elite oriented	81 (09)	103 (18)	32 (04)	145 (30)	54 (06)	217 (22)	01 (02)	09 (26)
Frame C	Causes vs Here & now	128 (14)	49 (09)	85 (10)	68 (14)	127 (15)	101 (10)	08 (16)	04 (12)
Frame D	Non-Partisan vs Partisan	58 (06)	79 (14)	47 (05)	58 (12)	50 (06)	102 (10)	02 (04)	06 (18)
Frame E	Proactive vs Reactive	123 (13)	61 (11)	133 (15)	59 (12)	138 (16)	98 (10)	08 (16)	02 (06)
Frame F	Solution vs Victory	140 (15)	22 (04)	89 (10)	39 (08)	46 (05)	62 (06)	01 (02)	03 (09)
Frame G	Multiparty vs Two-party	116 (12)	68 (12)	125 (15)	47 (10)	178 (21)	60 (06)	12 (24)	00 (00)
Frame H	Harmony vs Dichotomizes	43 (05)	95 (17)	92 (11)	28 (06)	49 (06)	110 (11)	04 (08)	03 (09)
Frame I	Avoid vs Use demonizing language	66 (07)	65 (11)	86 (10)	10 (02)	69 (08)	123 (13)	04 (08)	02 (06)
Total		917	569	861	480	868	974	50	34

From the findings of Daily Dawn and Times of India we can say that their media support their national stance while framing Afghan Issue and Dawn support to peace talks and more peace journalism approach Wanta, Golan, and Lee (2004), Zahid et al. (2018), and Shahghasemi, Heisey, and Mirani (2011) also endorsed that US media give coverage of any event and country according to the American core values and themes of strength and power whereas simultaneously demonizing the enemy or opponents (Coe & Neumann, 2011; Davis & Sosnovskaya, 2009). It was argued that the US media-sensationalized war by focusing on victories (Graber, 2003). One of the analyses of international news coverage reported considerable closeness in coverage of the Elite press, including the US and Russia (Sola, 1952). Researchers believe media can actively promote peace and provide better alternatives if perspectives of common people are shared (Galtung, 2006; Kempf, 2007) and first two indicators (War effects and people vs elite orientation) usually occur in contemporary commercial media (Asmatullah et al., 2020; Thussu & Freedman, 2003). The Frames related to solution versus victory based, most of the media focused on peace talks

and solution are the only way to resolve conflict. Furthermore, media coverage gave voices to multi parties involved in the peace talks then two-party involvement, same findings corresponded with results of (Kempf, 2007).

As shown in (Table 5), In country-wise analysis, findings illustrated that Daily Outlook Afghanistan (22%) support the Taliban, while daily Dawn was supporting (15%). Data validates that maximum coverage by Moscow times was (33%) positive towards Taliban than The New York Times (29%).

Table 5
Tone/slants used for Taliban across Countries

Newspaper	Favourable to Taliban	Unfavourable to Taliban	Neutral	Total	P Value
Daily Outlook Afghanistan	55 (22.2)	80 (32.3)	113 (45.6)	248 (100)	Chi square 112.419 (.000)
Daily Dawn	33 (14.6)	15 (6.6)	178 (78.8)	226 (100)	
New York Times	85 (29.8)	99 (34.7)	101 (35.4)	285 (100)	
Moscow Times	05 (33.3)	00 (0.0)	10 (66.7)	15 (100)	

Whereas The New York Times gave (35%) negative towards Taliban followed by others. Overall findings depict that USA and Afghan newspapers gave negative and neutral coverage to the Taliban in news stories as compared to positive.

Table 6
Distribution of War and Peace Indicators Overall Framing

Sources	PJ	WJ	Neutral	Total	P Value
National news agencies	140 (35)	50 (24)	48 (30)	238	Chi square 9.559 (.049)
International news agencies	97 (24)	64 (30)	50 (31)	211	
Journalist	165 (41)	96 (46)	64 (39)	325	
Total	402 (100)	210 (100)	162 (100)	774	

In (Table 6), the findings of the study revealed that journalist published more peace journalism frames (41%) in news stories which is the highest in number followed by National news sources (35%) and international news sources (24%). Similarly, Journalist produces more war journalism frames (46%), than international news sources (30%) followed by National news sources (24%). Overall peace journalism frames (402) were prominent by all sources than war journalism frames (210), and neutral frames (162). Statistically, the difference is moderately significant (9.559, P=.049). News media mainly rely on official sources and journalist, also define government narrative specially reporting on the conflict issue, which makes the media narratives very much tuned to the consideration of national interests (Hallin & Mancini, 2004; Kovach & Rosenstiel, 2014; Voltmer, 2013).

Table 7
Distribution of War and Peace Indicators Overall Framing

Story Type	PJ	WJ	Neutral	Total	P Value
News story	164 (41)	114 (54)	64 (39)	342	
Editorial	113 (28)	36 (17)	35 (22)	184	

Other	125 (31)	60 (29)	63 (39)	248	Chi square 17.352 (.002)
Total	402 (100)	210 (100)	162 (100)	774	

Findings of the study revealed that all the sampled newspapers published editorials, news stories and others i.e, Columns, opinions and letters to the editor during a selected time. The story type analysis in terms of war and peace frames data reveals that maximum news coverage given to the peace talks issue in more war perspectives (54%) way as compared to the peace perspectives (41%). Similarly, editorials with characteristics of peace journalism (28%) and war journalism (17%) were found. Peace journalism editorials mostly focused on resolving the conflict, encouraged dialogue, and highlighted the plight of ordinary people. Overall, news story presented peace journalism (402), then war journalism (210) followed by neutral (162). Statistically, the hypothesis that news stories are more likely to reflect peace journalism than editorials and articles (17.352, $P=.002$) has good support in findings. Findings from the reporting of the Afghanistan conflict demonstrated that during conflicts involving national interests, media become nationalistic and patriotic, putting quality and excellent journalism on the back burner (Hayat & Juliana, 2016; Hussain, 2016; Shabir Hussain, Siraj, & Mahmood, 2021; Nadeem, 2017; Siraj & Hussain, 2012; Zahid, Farish Ullah, & Ehtisham, 2013; Zahid et al., 2018).

Conclusion

This study discusses the ongoing US-Taliban conflict resolution via the lens of peace and war journalism, as conceived by Johan Galtung and later functionalized by Jake Lynch and McGoldrick. Like other institutions, the findings of this study suggest, the media acted more like an extended arm of the state. Four newspapers were analyzed from selected countries. which reveals the central thrust of peace journalism from all newspaper. In studies result all selected newspaper mainly adopted peace journalism approach. These findings reflect the same results of previous researches, which reflects that during peace situation media works in a similar way. These findings reflect the same results that media promote peace frames during peace talks (Westcott & Wright, 2016; Irvan, 2006; Wolfsfeld, 2001 Lauk, 2008, Ochilo, 1993). According to the findings of the study, the media might be more harmful than useful to peacebuilding efforts in national conflicts (Fawcett, 2002; Lee & Maslog, 2005; Myint, 2017). Whereas, in a conflict-ridden environment the escalatory patterns identified in media reporting. Also, they observed some traces of peace journalism in conflict reporting, despite the prominence of escalatory reporting (Gouse, Valentin-Llopis, Perry, & Nyamwange, 2019; Lee & Maslog, 2005). These four newspapers from four countries openly sided with government and their official sources to report the issue, as per their countries interest and stakes are involved. One important finding of this study is the support to the scholarship that prevalence of war and peace journalism is related with the types of events. While war journalism was dominant during violent events, the press mainly reported the peace events in peace journalism fashion. This challenges perspectives of by the critics of peace journalism (Wolsfeld, 2004; Hanitzch, 2007) who fear media substantially erode peace process. The press of all countries in this article relevant patterns of war and peace journalism. Reliance on invisible effects of war from peace journalism and elites from WJ of these talks are the two dominant indicators. These indicators highlight that during peace talks mainly reported through all perspective where the elites are able to share with the people that they are always working for restore peace with the involvement of many parties.

References

- Adamec, L. W. (2005). *Historical dictionary of Afghan wars, revolutions, and insurgencies*: Scarecrow Press.
- Asmatullah, K., Haseeb, u., & Fazal, R. K. (2020). Reporting Insurgencies in South Asia: A Peace Journalism Perspective. *Pakistan Social Sciences Review*, 4(2), 556-568.
- Bratic, V., & Schirch, L. (2007). Why and When to Use the Media for Conflict Prevention and Peacebuilding. *European Centre for Conflict Prevention*, 2(6), 9.
- Coe, K., & Neumann, R. (2011). Finding foreigners in American national identity: Presidential discourse, people, and the international community. *International journal of communication*, 5(1), 824.
- Dag, H. (2013). *Peace journalism or war journalism? A comparative analysis of the coverage of Israeli and Turkish newspapers during the Gaza flotilla crisis*. Concordia University.
- Davis, H., & Sosnovskaya, A. (2009). Representations of otherness in Russian newspapers: the theme of migration as a counterpoint to Russian national identity. *Journal of Intercultural Communication*, 21(1), 14-16.
- Entman, R. M. (2004). *Projections of power: Framing news, public opinion, and US foreign policy*: University of Chicago Press.
- Fahmy, S., & Kim, D. (2008). Picturing the Iraq War: Constructing the image of war in the British and US press. *International Communication Gazette*, 70(6), 443-462.
- Fawcett, L. (2002). Why peace journalism isn't news. *Journalism Studies*, 3(2), 213-223.
- Galtung, J. (2000). The task of peace journalism. *Ethical perspectives*, 7(2).
- Galtung, J. (2006). Peace journalism as an ethical challenge. *Global Media Journal: editerranean Edition*, 1(2), 1-5.
- Galtung, J., & Jacobsen, C. (2002). *Searching for peace: The road to TRANSCEND*: Pluto Pr.
- Galtung, J., & Ruge, M. H. (1965). The structure of foreign news: The presentation of the Congo, Cuba and Cyprus crises in four Norwegian newspapers. *Journal of Peace Research*, 2(1), 64-90.
- Goretti, L. N. (2007). Peace journalism applied: an assessment of media coverage of the conflict in Northern Uganda. *Conflict and Communication online*, 6(2), 22-37.
- Gouse, V., Valentin-Llopis, M., Perry, S., & Nyamwange, B. (2019). An investigation of the conceptualization of peace and war in peace journalism studies of media coverage of national and international conflicts. *Media, War & Conflict*, 12(4), 435-449.
- Graber, D. (2003). Styles of image management during crises: justifying press censorship. *Discourse & Society*, 14(5), 539-557.
- Hallin, D. C. (1989). *The «Uncensored War»: The Media and Vietnam, with a New Preface*: London: University of California Press.
- Hallin, D. C., & Mancini, P. (2004). *Comparing media systems: Three models of media and*

politics: Cambridge university press.

- Hayat, & Juliana. (2016). A Comparative Analysis of Pakistani English Newspaper Editorials: The Case of Taliban's Attack on Malala Yousafzai. *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities*, 24(3), 1089.
- Hussain. (2016). Media coverage of Taliban: Is peace journalism the solution? *Asia Pacific media educator*, 26(1), 31-46.
- Hussain, S. (2016). Media treatment of the internally displaced persons from swat. *Global Media Journal: Pakistan Edition*, 9(1), 12.
- Hussain, S. (2018). Taliban Conflict in Pakistan: Analysis through the Prism of Peace Journalism *Journalism 'a Peacekeeping Agent' at the Time of Conflict* (pp. 117-129): Brill.
- Hussain, S., Siraj, S. A., & Mahmood, T. (2021). Evaluating war and peace potential of Pakistani news media: Advancing a peace journalism model. *Information Development*, 37(1), 105-121.
- Hutcheson, J., Domke, D., Billeaudeau, A., & Garland, P. (2004). US national identity, political elites, and a patriotic press following September 11. *Political communication*, 21(1), 27-50.
- Idrees, M., Rehman, A., & Naazer, M. A. (2019). Afghan Peace Process and the Role of Pakistan in Engaging the Stakeholders. *Liberal Arts and Social Sciences International Journal (LASSIJ)*, 3(2), 20-34.
- Jahangir, A. (2013). Changing dynamics of South Asian balance-of-power. *Journal of South Asian Studies*, 1(1), 50-58.
- Jawad, A. Q. (2013). *Media Focus in Afghanistan News Coverage*". (Masters), University of Arkansas, Fayetteville. <http://scholarworks.uark.edu/etd/665>
- Jones, S. G. (2010). *In the graveyard of empires: America's war in Afghanistan*: WW Norton & Company.
- Kempf, W. (2007). Peace journalism: A tightrope walk between advocacy journalism and constructive conflict coverage. *Conflict & Communication Online*, 6(2), 3-4.
- Knightley, P. (2002). Journalism, conflict and war: An introduction. *Journalism Studies*, 3(2), 167-171.
- Kovach, B., & Rosenstiel, T. (2014). *The elements of journalism: What newspeople should know and the public should expect*: Three Rivers Press (CA).
- Lake, D. A., & Rothchild, D. (1996). Containing fear: The origins and management of ethnic conflict. *International security*, 21(2), 41-75.
- Lance, B. (1990). Toward a theory of press-state relations in the United States. *Journal of Communication*, 40(2), 103-127.
- Lee, & Maslog. (2005). War or peace journalism? Asian newspaper coverage of conflicts. *Journal of Communication*, 55(2), 311-329.
- Lee, F. F., Chan, M., Chen, H.-T., Leung, D. K., Kalogeropoulos, A., & Nielsen, R. K. (2017).

Reuters Institute Digital News Report 2017 Asia-Pacific Supplementary Report. Available at SSRN 3070264.

- Lynch, J. (2008). *Debates in peace journalism*: Sydney University Press.
- Lynch, J., & Galtung, J. (2010). Reporting Conflict: New Directions in Peace Journalism: New Approaches to Peace and Conflict. *Australia: University of Queensland Pr.*
- Lynch, J., & McGoldrick, A. (2005). Peace journalism: a global dialog for democracy and democratic media. *Democratizing global media: One world, many struggles*, 269-312.
- Majidyar, A. (2014). Negotiating with the Taliban: Lessons from history. *Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute (AEI)*. Accessed February, 13, 2019.
- Mandelzis, L., & Peleg, S. (2017). War journalism as media manipulation: Seesawing between the Second Lebanon war and the Iranian nuclear threat. *Peace Journalism in Times of War: Peace and Policy*, 13(1), 81-82.
- Mitra, S. (2018). Socio-cultural contexts and peace journalism: A case for meso-level comparative sociological investigation of journalistic cultures. *Journalism*, 19(11), 1517-1533.
- Myint, Z. M. (2017). *Peace journalism and framing in the Northern Rakhine State of Myanmar*. Kansas State University.
- Nabeel, F. (2018). The Role of Great Powers in Resolving Afghanistan Conflict. *Stratagem*, 1(1), 66-83.
- Nadeem, M. U. (2017). Pakistani print media and Taliban: A test of media conformity theory. *VFAST Transactions on Education and Social Sciences*, 13(2), 1-6.
- Nohrstedt, & Ottosen. (2008). War Journalism in the Threat Society: Peace journalism as a strategy for challenging the mediated culture of fear? *Conflict & Communication*, 7(2), 3-4.
- Nohrstedt, & Ottosen, R. (2010). Brothers in arms or peace?: the media representation of Swedish and Norwegian defence-and military co-operation. *Conflict & Communication Online*, 9(2), 4.
- Ottosen, R. (2005). The Norwegian media image of the war in Afghanistan: Peacekeeping or aggression? *Nordicom Review*, 26(1), 95-109.
- Ouwens, P. J. (2020). *There are Two Sides to Every Coin: An Analysis of the US-Taliban Peace Negotiations (2018-2019) A reassessment of William I. Zartman's ripeness theory with the Afghanistan conflict as a case study*. Utrecht University.
- Ozohu-Suleiman, Y., & Ishak, S. A. (2014). Local media in global conflict: Southeast Asian newspapers and the politics of peace in Israel/Palestine. *International Journal of Conflict and Violence (IJCV)*, 8(2), 284-295.
- Peleg, S. (2007). In defense of peace journalism: A rejoinder. *Conflict & Communication*, 6(2), 3-4.
- Qarqeen, F. (2015). *Afghan Peace Talks: Negotiating with the Taliban*. Department of International and Comparative Politics.

- Raja, M. k., & Ajmal, A. (2016). The Afghan Peace Process: Strategic Policy Contradictions and Lacunas. *IPRI Journal XVI*(1), 59-74.
- Rawan, B., & Hussain, S. (2017). Reporting Ethnic Conflict in Karachi: Analysis through the Perspective of War and Peace Journalism. *Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities (1994-7046)*, 37(2), 89.
- Rehman, H. u., & Husain, S. (2019). Resurgence of Violence In Indian Occupied Kashmir: Analysis Of Indo-Pak News Media. *Journal of Research in Social Sciences*, 7(1), 176-185.
- Robinson, P., Goddard, P., Parry, K., & Murray, C. (2009). Testing models of media performance in wartime: UK TV news and the 2003 invasion of Iraq. *Journal of Communication*, 59(3), 534-563.
- Ross, S. D. (2017). Peace, Conflict, and Communication: A Focused Bibliography of Recent Contributions. *Peace Journalism in Times of War: Volume 13: Peace and Policy*, 13(3), 149.
- Ross, S. D., & Tehranian, M. (2008). Peace journalism in times of war, Peace and Policy. *Piscataway, New Jersey: Transaction*, 13(1), 5.
- Safi, K., & Ruttig, T. (2018). Understanding Hurdles to Afghan Peace Talks: Are the Taleban a Political Party? *Afghanistan Analyst Network*, 27.
- Saleem, N. (2007). US media framing of foreign countries image: An analytical perspective. *Canadian Journal of Media Studies*, 2(1), 130-162.
- Scheufele, D. A., & Tewksbury, D. (2006). Framing, agenda setting, and priming: The evolution of three media effects models. *Journal of Communication*, 57(1), 9-20.
- Shahghasemi, E., Heisey, D. R., & Mirani, G. (2011). How do Iranians and US Citizens perceive each other: A systematic review. *Journal of Intercultural Communication*, 27(1), 4-5.
- Sheikh, M. K., & Greenwood, M. T. J. (2013). *Taliban talks: Past present and prospects for the US, Afghanistan and Pakistan*: DIIS Report.
- Shinar, D. (2004). Media Peace Discourse: Constraints, Concepts and Building Blocks. *Conflict & Communication*, 3(1), 8.
- Shinar, D. (2007). Epilogue: Peace Journalism-The State of the Art. *Conflict & Communication*, 6(1), 6-7.
- Shinn, J., & Dobbins, J. (2011). *Afghan Peace Talks: A Primer*: Rand Corporation.
- Siraj, & Hussain, S. (2012). War media galore in Pakistan: A perspective on Taliban conflict. *Global Media Journal: Pakistan Edition*, 5(1), 49-50.
- Siraj, & Hussain, S. (2019). Coverage of Taliban conflict in the Pak-Afghan press: A comparative analysis. *International Communication Gazette*, 81(4), 305-326.
- Siraj, A., & Shabbir, H. (2012). War media galore in Pakistan: A perspective on Taliban conflict. *Global Media Journal: Pakistan Edition*, 5(1), 49.
- Sola, P. L. (1952). *The "prestige Papers": A Survey of Their Editorials*: Stanford University Press.

- Spencer, G. (2003). Pushing for Peace: the Irish government, television news and the Northern Ireland peace process. *European Journal of Communication*, 18(1), 55-80.
- Strömbäck, J., & Nord, L. (2004). Reporting More When Knowing Less: A Comparison of the Swedish Media Coverage of September 11 and the Wars in Afghanistan and Iraq.
- Sultan, M. (2013). Portrayal of Pak-US relations in Elite Press of Pakistan and United States during Raja Pervaiz Ashraf Regime (June 2012-December 2012). *Journal of Mass Communication Journalism*, 3(2), 149.
- Tayebwa, W. (2017). From Conventional Towards New Frames of Peace Journalism: The Cases of Uganda and Burundi. *Peace, Security and Post-Conflict Reconstruction in the Great Lakes Region*. Dakar: Codesria. Available online.
- Tenenboim-Weinblatt, K., Hanitzsch, T., & Nagar, R. (2016). Beyond peace journalism: Reclassifying conflict narratives in the Israeli news media. *Journal of Peace Research*, 53(2), 151-165.
- Thussu, D. K., & Freedman, D. (2003). *War and the media: Reporting conflict 24/7*: Sage.
- Vinay, K. (2019, October 30). Absence from Afghan peace talks has hurt India. It's time now to engage with Taliban. *The Print*.
- Voltmer, K. (2013). *The media in transitional democracies*: John Wiley & Sons.
- Wanta, W., Golan, G., & Lee, C. (2004). Agenda setting and international news: Media influence on public perceptions of foreign nations. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 81(2), 364-377.
- Wolf, S. O. (2019). The 2019 Intra-Afghan Peace Conference: Another political feint by the Taliban.
- Wolfsfeld, G. (2004). *Media and the Path to Peace*: Cambridge University Press.
- Yousef, Z. (2012). Perception of Pak-Afghan Relations in American and Pakistani Press, Media's Perspective of Foreign Policy (May 2011 to December 2011). *Open Access Scientific Reports*, 1(10), 1-6. doi:10.4172/scientificreports.491
- Zahid, Farish Ullah, & Ehtisham, A. (2013). Coverage of Pak-India Relations in the Elite Press of Pakistan (June 2013-August 2013). *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences*, 3(17), 19.
- Zahid, Malik, A., & Ehtisham, A. (2018). ANALYSIS OF PAK-US AND INDO-US RELATIONS IN PAKISTANI, INDIAN AND AMERICAN PRESS. *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences (PJSS)*, 38(1), 6-8.
- Zelizer, B., & Allan, S. (2011). *Journalism after september 11*: Taylor & Francis.