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Abstract

Trump’s new year tweet about Pakistan’s role in the fight against terrorism ignited a controversy and a war of words between Pakistani officials and the US. This thesis studies newspaper coverage of both countries on this particular issue. *Dawn* and *The News International* are chosen from Pakistan and *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post* are selected from US media. The aim of this research is to analyse and compare the media discourse. Critical discourse analysis (CDA) was adopted as the most suitable choice. A sum of eight articles, comprising two from each newspaper, is analysed intensively. Outcomes of the analysis are discussed in relation to ‘framing’ and ‘agenda setting’ theories.

Five key elements from the theories are listed including: language (vocabulary), conflict presentation, sources, related issues and emphasis. Results reveal that Pakistani newspapers use very strong, rather harsh vocabulary while reporting response to Donald Trump’s tweet. The US newspapers adopted literary phrases and less harsh tone to report this issue. Conflict presentation was focused on Trump’s tweet as a central idea in all the newspapers. Pakistani newspapers focused on the coverage of reaction from military and government officials of the country. On the other hand, US newspapers included sources from both countries to have an objective view. But they have included some controversial issues, which do not have a direct link to this debate starting with Trump’s tweet.
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1. Introduction

The main focus of this thesis is a comparison between mainstream newspapers from two different countries in relation to a particular news event. Selected countries are: United States (US) and Pakistan, both of whom are coalition partners in Afghanistan in establishing peace and security. On the very first day of the year 2018, Donald Trump’s tweet regarding the role of Pakistan in Afghan war and the amount of funds provided by United States, started a very heated debate in world press. Especially the US and Pakistani media prominently covered this event; some were highly concerned of its impact on the relationship between the two partner countries. It is well known that news media play a vital role in shaping public opinion. It also has an influence on their way of thinking about a particular event. Especially newspapers have a significant impact on a society by providing information on a daily basis (Basile, 2013). This research is an attempt to critically analyze the articles from two different countries (US & Pakistan) and to compare the way they have framed this particular event. Four English language newspapers are selected for this research, two from each country: ‘Dawn’ and ‘The News International’ from Pakistan while ‘New York Times’ and ‘Washington post’ from US. A sum of eight articles is collected with an equal share of two articles from each newspaper.

1.1. Background

Coalition support fund is a military aid given by US to eradicate terrorism from Afghanistan (Rana, 2017). In return, Pakistani agencies and forces help and facilitate the US led coalition forces in Afghanistan. During this war, there has been a trust deficit between both parties. In the past, US officials have shown numerous reservations but with the help of dialogues, crises were solved and both of them continued to work together (Kronstadt, 2009). President Donald Trump came up with another strategy and through his tweet he bashed Pakistani authorities. He tweeted:
This was re-tweeted more than 52 thousand times. People responded to this particular tweet in various ways. Soon after the appearance of this tweet, other mass media also started to report and discuss this tweet including TV, Radio and newspaper media.

Pakistan and the US are coalition partners in Afghanistan to fight against terrorism and this relationship is the focal point in Trump’s New Year tweet. After the attack of 9/11, the US government responded with military means. President Bush gave the ultimatum to Taliban, either to hand over Osama Bin Laden and his supporters or to be prepared for strikes from USA. Congress also passed legislation in favor of the use of full force to strike. Later, US forces began a bombing campaign in Afghanistan in early October 2001, just a week after the September 11 attacks (Vermilya, 2018). Pakistan is an ally of this war against terrorism and provides logistics support, intelligence and military cooperation. US provide Pakistan with military aid and coalition support fund to help fight terrorism. But there is always mistrust between the two countries when it comes to the utilization of funding and bilateral cooperation. Geopolitically, Pakistan is a very important country in the region and it provides ports, roads, railways, air space and other communication services to the US-led forces. On the other hand, US officials are not always happy with this relationship and occasionally blame Pakistan play of playing a ‘double game’. They are very much concerned with the alleged linkages of Pakistani forces and intelligence agencies with Taliban and Haqqani network (Haley, 2018).

**Who is Haqqani network?** This is a real bone of contention between Pakistan and US. Both countries have different versions about their presence and activities, causing much trust deficit.
**Haqqani network (US version):** According to Voice of America report, The Haqqani network is a militant group that continues to fight Afghan and US forces in Afghanistan and is considered to be the most lethal terrorist group operating in Afghanistan.

Jalaluddin Haqqani, a former anti-Soviet commander in Afghanistan, was the founder of this network. Haqqani is believed to have studied in the Dar-ul-Ulum Haqqaniyaa madrassa (a religious school) in Pakistan, which traditionally has links to Taliban. Jalaluddin Haqqani handed over operational command to his son, Sirajuddin who also acts as deputy leader of the Taliban. The group is reportedly based in Miram Shah, a town in the Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA) in Pakistan. Afghan and US officials have long accused Pakistan’s Inter Services Intelligence (ISI) of covertly providing sanctuaries to Haqqani network. Pakistan denies any links (VOA, 2017).

**Haqqani network (Pakistani version):** The group was formed by Jalaluddin Haqqani, an Afghan mujahedeen commander fighting the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan in 1980s with help of US and Pakistan. Jalaluddin gained notoriety for his organization and bravery, garnering attention from CIA and a visit of US congressman, Charlie Wilson. Later, Jalaluddin became a minister of the Taliban government in Afghanistan. Following the US invasion of Afghanistan, Taliban fighters flooded across the border into Pakistan and regrouped themselves. That included the Haqqani network, which operated from Miram Shah, the biggest town in North Waziristan. Pakistan army with the US support has conducted successive clearing operations. Pakistan intensified a military operation in 2014 and forced many of Haqqanis to go underground or run over the border into their Afghan strongholds (Dawn, 2018).

On the basis of these differences, Pak-US relationship always faces a trust deficit. US wants Pakistan to ‘do more’ against Haqqani network in Pakistani areas but Pakistan claims that Haqqani network has moved to Afghanistan after its military operations.

President Donald Trump and his administration took a decision that funding to Pakistan would be conditional and directly attached to performance. Following this decision, a number of warning statements were issued by Trump’s administration earlier. Pakistani officials were convinced that they already have done much in fight against terrorism and they will continue it even without US funding. Trump’s tweet about ‘lies and deceit’ and ‘no more’ is a consequence of the mistrust prevailing from years, so it is not an isolated phenomenon. It is
important to mention here that it was the very first tweet of the year 2018, which shows how much Mr. Trump is concerned about the issue (Khan, 2018).

1.2. Research question and aim
President Donald Trump is famous of using twitter for political communication. The war against terrorism in general and war in Afghanistan in particular, gains a lot of attention from world media and research scholars. The aim of this research is to analyze the discourse presented by the US and Pakistani media. How have they quoted and discussed the original tweet and how have they framed the response from concerned sectors? How have they made choices in vocabulary, sources and in the structure? Moreover, this research will also look at how the newspaper coverage shaped public opinion through agenda setting. Newspaper media has a significant impact on society. They deliver information on daily basis. News articles also document the world’s history and provide an archive of the way people think, feel and behave at any point in the past. This research is an attempt to analyze how Trump’s tweet was treated in USA and Pakistani newspapers. How have they summed up and utilized different aspect of this debate? How have they highlighted some issues over the others and what kind of emphasis exists? What commonalities they have in their news coverage? This discussion leads to formulating the following research questions:

1) How was Donald Trump’s tweet reported and discussed in American newspapers ‘New York Times and ‘Washington Post’?

2) How was this particular tweet reported and discussed in Pakistani newspapers ‘Dawn’ and ‘The News International’?

3) Similarities and differences between the discourse of US and Pakistani newspapers?
2. Literature review and Theoretical framework
The topic of this research is quite recent so there is no study available on exactly the same issue. But there are some studies done in the past, which have a relevance to the topic and provide a basis for this research. Three such studies have been added under the heading ‘literature review’. Each study has a relevance to this project in one way or the other. First study is about the use of twitter in political discourse with a focus on Trump’s twitter usage and public reaction. Second is about bilateral relationship between United States and Pakistan with focus on Afghan war. Final study included in this chapter is based on critical discourse analysis and comparison of news articles from two different countries, which also provides helpful guidelines to conduct analysis for this research.

2.1. The age of twitter: Donald Trump and the politics of debasement
This study conducted by a communication scholar Brian L. Ott (2017) explores the changing character of public discourse in this age of twitter. It also describes that how twitter’s discourse is simple, impulsive and uncivil. It is demonstrated with an example of Donald Trump’s twitter feed. Due to character limitation, twitter disallows long communication and detailed discussion. To be clear, a tweet must be simple not complex.

Ott says Twitter is similar to smoke signals in terms of message signaling but not similar in terms of effort. In real smoke signals, one must need to gather wood, put them on fire and then create smoke signals. But on twitter it is very easy to create ‘smoke signals’ without any effort. And thanks to wireless technology, which made it possible to tweet virtually from anywhere and it reaches almost everywhere. Ott argues that twitter is highly ‘impulsive’. It can spark a heated debate at any time and the tweets charged by emotions are usually retweeted by several users. He considers that twitter also fosters incivility, which results into impolite, insulting and offensive speech. Twitter is informal and it lacks proper grammar and style and it does not care how it affects others.

Ott analyses Donald Trump’s tweet and how the people have responded his tweets. On November 10, 2012, Donald Trump tweeted, “Thanks- many are saying I’m the best 140 character writer in the world.” A number of Twitter users were quick to point out that it was not clear if anyone had said that. Jim Spellman tweeted ‘many’ is a twitter slang for ‘no more’ while Leslie responded, “when he says ‘many’, he means the voices in his overinflated, inexplicably coiffed head, right?” Response from Jon Sosis was the most incredulous, tweeting, “Trump you are not even the best 140 character writer in your car
right now. Shut your trap you waste of life.’’ Ott has assessed a large number of tweets from Donald Trump and how people had reacted on twitter. He has also analyzed the use of twitter by Donald Trump in pre and post election. He also mentioned that debate on Trump’s twitter was also discussed and reported in newspapers. This point triggered the idea to conduct this research on newspaper articles in relation to Donald Trump’s tweet.

2.2. The US-Pakistan relations after a decade of war on terror
In her research, an American political scientist C. Christine Fair (2012) has described the working cooperation and situation of bilateral relationship between Pakistan and United States. It covers the ten year of war against terrorism in Pakistan. This research still has relevance because the situation is almost the same. Pakistan and United States are still in alliance to fight against terrorism in Afghanistan.

After 9/11 attacks, US decided to attack Afghanistan. Pakistan agreed to support them in the war against terrorism. US provide funds to Pakistan and in return Pakistan gives assistance to US forces and facilitates supply lines to them in Afghanistan. Both parties blame each other for their lack of trust and always show doubt whether other country is sincere in this mutual relationship or not. Fair’s study also includes a number of incidents which affected Pak-US relationship. First, Raymond Davis, a central intelligence agency contractor, killed two Pakistanis in Lahore. American officials said that Raymond Davis had diplomatic immunity and he killed them in self defense. Pakistani officials regarded him as cold blooded murderer. Second matter which Fair has discussed is the military action from American forces in the Pakistani city of Abbot Abad to kill Osama Bin Laden. Pakistan forces were blamed for its failure and the presence of Bin Laden near Pakistan’s capital.

Third event was NATO air strike on Pakistan which killed 24 military personnel. It damaged the Pakistan – US relationship very badly. Despite their gross negligence, US officials refused to apologize. In reaction, Pakistan responded by shutting down the ground base logistical supply routes. Pakistan army and parliament also reviewed the conditions under which supply routes will get resumed and to rebuilt its relationship with United States.

During the same period, another scandal, known as Memogate in Pakistan, further damaged the US-Pakistan relationship. Two main characters of this scandal were Mansoor Ijaz, a Pakistani-American businessman and Husain Haqqani, former Pakistani ambassador to
Washington. Ijaz claimed that the author of the Memogate was Husain Haqqani and it suggested that Pakistan’s civilian leadership, once freed of military influence, would abandon Pakistan’s long-standing policy of Islamist militancy under its nuclear umbrella.

Fair’s research also deals with the issues attached to some terrorist groups which have linkages with Pakistan forces as claimed by US officials.

All of these historical events created mistrust and affected bilateral relationship in negative ways. This thesis also has a direct relation to the present situation in Afghanistan and to describe the level of trust between Pakistan and United States.

2.3. Differing opinions: A critical discourse analysis of two articles
This study by Stephan Thomson (2011) is based on critical discourse analysis of two articles, one from ‘The daily mail’ and other is ‘The Korea herald’. Topic of the news articles is, ‘Korea has buried a huge number of livestock to combat ‘foot and mouth’ disease.’
Thompson applies critical discourse analysis (CDA), a model developed by Norman Fairclough (2003). Main focus is on language usage, choice of vocabulary, quoted sources and representation of the location. Then the social aspect of the topic is also discussed in the article. After having a critical discourse analysis of both articles, author has presented the results as: ‘The daily mail’ articles presented the event in a highly negative way. It used strong vocabulary in the article. On the other hand, ‘The Korea Herald’ has mentioned a few negative aspects of the news and focus to describe the situation in better way. Official sources are quoted ‘exclusively’ which determines that government is selective to provide information. Story is reported in a way to decrease the fear among national and international community.

As a whole, this article provides a good frame work to conduct a critical discourse analysis of similar news articles from different countries.

2.4. Framing
News stories contain both information and frames as well. In general, media frames function to suggest how audience can perceive and interpret a particular issue. These frames can have a significant influence on the audience’s attitude, beliefs and behaviors (Tewksbury and Scheufele, 2009, p. 19).
A widely used definition of framing constructed by Robert Entman is as follows:

“Framing essentially involves selection and salience. To frame is to select some aspects of perceived reality and make them more salient in a communicating text, in such a way as to promote a particular problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation and treatment recommendation for the item described” (Entman, 1993, p. 52)

According to Fairhurst & Sarr (1996) the term ‘framing’ is defined as:

“The ability to shape the meaning of a subject, to judge its character and significance. To hold the frame of a subject is to choose one particular meaning (or set of meanings) over another. When we share our frames with others (the process of framing), we manage meaning because we assert that our interpretations should be taken as real over other possible interpretations”. (p. 3).

The framing skill is based on three main components: language, thought and forethought.

‘Language’ is the easiest to understand because it helps us to focus, classify and put things in categories, remember and retrieve information and in case of metaphoric language, understand one thing in terms of another’s properties (Alexander, 1969, cited in Fairhurst, 2005).

The ‘thought’ component examines the role of mental models in deciding what and how we choose to frame. Finally, the ‘forethought’ component is all about how to exert a measure of control over our spontaneous communication.

Fairhurst & Sarr (1996) have formulated framing techniques as follows:

i. Metaphor: To frame a conceptual idea through comparison to something else.
ii. Stories: To frame a topic via narrative in a vivid and memorable way.
iii. Tradition: Cultural practices that imbue significance in mundane, closely tied to artifacts.
iv. Slogan, jargon or catchphrase: To frame an object with a catchy phrase to make it more memorable.
v. Artifact: Objects with intrinsic symbolic value – a phenomenon that holds more meaning than the object itself.
vi. Contrast: To describe an object in terms of what it is not.
vii. Spin: to present a concept in such a way as to convey a value judgment that might not be immediately apparent, to create an inherent bias.

It is not possible to have a unified definition of framing but it is about choices, for example: choice of words, emphasis, sources and organization of texts. Framing effects can be found in words, perspectives, choice of facts presented and connection between events, issues and agents (Bolin et. al. 2016).

2.5. Agenda setting:
Agenda setting function of the mass media was put forth by Maxwell McCombs and Donald Shaw (1972). They suggested that the media sets the public agenda, in a way that they may not tell you what to think but they may tell you what to think about.

““The news media have a substantial influence on the content of the public agenda, and the phrase “‘setting the agenda” has become commonplace in discussions of journalism and public opinion” (Maxwell & McComb, 2003, p. 5).

Agenda setting is closely related to the term ‘framing’ as discussed earlier. Newspapers discourse plays a strong role in setting agenda and to influence a picture in the reader’s mind. News media also influence the communication process and the understanding of the topic in the news (Maxwell & McComb, 2003).

““Attitude and behaviour are usually governed by cognitions- what a person knows, think, and believes. Hence, the agenda setting function of the mass media implies a potentially massive influence whose full dimensions and consequences have yet to be investigated and appreciated” (Shaw, p. 101). These are the salient features of “‘agenda setting”’ theory which are suitable to explain the patterns in the Pakistani and US newspapers.
3. Methodology
This chapter describes how the research process took place and how the different parts of the project were completed and placed in order to reach the final shape.

3.1. Topic selection
The journey of this master’s thesis started with brainstorming to find a workable topic. The plan was to search a topic based on a recent controversy in the international scenario. A tweet from US president Donald Trump caused a heated debate in print, broadcast and social media. Media coverage of this controversy created a research idea and the author of this thesis decided to get more information about the topic to finalize it. Even the topic is very recent but it may have an impact on further research. Topic is based on bilateral relationship between US and Pakistan and the mutual cooperation for fighting terrorism in Afghanistan. Since the issue was in discussion on all forms of media so there was a need to narrow it down to a centre. Due to limited time and space the author has decided to focus on the discussion of this topic in the print media. The main purpose of the study is to compare, how US and Pakistani media has portrayed the news and discussion about Trump’s New Year tweet about Pakistan.

Fig.1: Illustration of research methodology adopted for this research
3.2. Case study:
Once topic was finalized, there was a need to have a proper case which could be further discussed and analyzed. A total of four newspapers are taken for this research, two from each country. Since, discussion was very intense in the beginning of the year so the first week of the year from January 1, 2018 to January 07, 2018 was chosen. Language of all newspapers is English and they are top ranked in national and international media. Selection of these newspapers is based on the presence and coverage of their international issues.

*Dawn*: It is Pakistan’s oldest English newspaper and has the largest reader base. The newspaper was founded by Mr. Jinnah, the founder of Pakistan, in 1941. Purpose of its foundation was to have a voice for Muslim league in the community. It is owned by the Dawn group of publishers and has a circulation of 109,000 newspapers per day. *Dawn* is considered as a liberal, centrist and progressive newspaper. (Pakwired, 2014).

*The News*: Another big name in English language newspaper of Pakistan is ‘The News’. It is published from four cities including London, so it is also named as ‘The News International’. It is owned by Jang group of newspapers who also own Geo television network. *The News International* has a daily circulation of 140,000 newspapers and holds a moderate political leaning (ibid).

*The New York Times*: In terms of circulation, it is not the largest newspaper in the United States but it is famous for its international content. With a circulation of 571,500 thousand copies daily, *The New York Times* is ranked high among the US newspapers. It was established in 1851 as a penny paper that would avoid sensationalism and report in an objective manner. It is also known as a liberal newspaper (Britannica, 2018).

*The Washington Post*: Another big name in United States newspaper market and usually marked as a great newspaper in the country. It was established in 1877 as a four-page organ of the Democratic Party. Circulation of *The Washington Post* is 474,767 newspapers per day (WP, 2013).

3.3. Theories and method
Starting with the literature review to get background knowledge through previous studies, it was tricky to find the scholarly work related to the topic. Since the topic is very recent so there was no study available which covers this particular topic. But there are studies available, which address the key issue one way or the other. Main purpose of the study is to
critically analyze the media discourse from both countries and then to relate it with the existing theories in media field. Critical discourse analysis (CDA) is selected as a method to come up with a deep analysis of the text.

Media framing is used to present a conflict or an issue in a particular manner to attract the attention of audience (De Vreese et al. 2001). To reflect the outcome of the text analysis, two main theories are included in the theoretical framework. Media framing and agenda setting are the chosen theories which are already discussed in the previous chapter.

3.4. Critical discourse analysis
One way of defining Critical discourse analysis is:

“A critical approach to discourse analysis typically concentrates on data like news reporting, political interviews, counseling and job interviews that describe ‘unequal encounters’ or embody manipulative strategies that seems neutral or natural to most people” (Teo, 2000, p.12).

Van Dijik (1993) argues that CDA is suitable to analyze media discourses as the theory has unambiguously socio-political orientation and the objective of CDA is to discover and analyze the role of text in producing hegemony (p. 249).

Another CDA researcher, in her work (Wodak, 2001, p. 10) argues that language itself is not powerful but powerful people’s usage and manipulation of the language bestow powers. Furthermore, Wodak (2002, p. 15) describes that all discourses lead to their histories and if we want to understand a discourse, we must understand its historical context.

According to Fairclough (1995a) the objective behind applying critical approach in discourse analysis is to highlight the correlation between properties of text and social process. Media discourses carry certain ideologies widely held as apprehensions and descriptions believed by social actors (1995b). Fairclough’s model seems more suitable for this research rather than other theoretical approaches. CDA is a circular process in which social parties affect the way text is produced and text helps to influence society via shaping the reader’s view point. Fairclough model is based on three levels of analysis: Textual analysis, discursive practices and social practices. Since, this research is carried through selected texts from newspapers so only textual analysis will be used and discussed further.
3.5. Textual analysis

According to Fairclough (1995) there are two main aspects of the text to consider this kind of analysis: first has to deal with the structure of proposition and the second with the sequence and the combination of propositions.

3.5.1. Lexical analysis: the choice and meaning of words:

The analysis of a particular set of words used in a newspaper text is almost always the first stage of the text and discourse analysis. Richardson (2007, p. 47) explained that all words carry connoted as well as denoted meanings and they can be interpreted differently. Journalists have to choose one word out of many synonyms while reporting or writing a news item.

3.5.2. Naming and reference:

The way people are named in the text has impact on the way in which they are viewed. A name given by the author or a journalist to a person is not merely a name; it gives social status and category. As Blommaert explains:

“Apart from referential meanings, acts of communication produce indexical meaning: social meaning, interpretative leads between what is said and the social occasion in which it is being produced. Thus the word ‘sir’ not only refers to a male individual, but it indexes a particular social status and the role relationships of deference and politeness entailed by this status” (2005, p. 11).

3.5.3. Sentence construction: Syntax and transitivity

Transitivity is very important because it describes the relationship between participants and their role in the process as reported in the text. “The study of transitivity is concerned with what kind of actions appear in the text, who does them and to whom” (ibid, p. 54).

Central idea to the study of transitivity is, there are choices in construction of the text and the text produced could have been presented differently. Simpson (1993) argues that transitivity
is based on participants, process itself and the circumstances in which text have been produced. Another important aspect of transitivity is the use of active or passive voice. A quick example is ‘John kicked the ball’. This is called active construction of sentence: the verb ‘kicked’ is used in active form since the subject or actor comes before the object. This very same process can be transformed into passive construction: ‘The ball was kicked by John’. Furthermore this text could be constructed without actor/subject, ‘the ball was kicked’. In this situation we do not know who kicked the ball and of course this is less important as compared to the text including actor/subject (Richardson, 2007, p. 55).

3.5.4. Sentence construction: modality

In textual analysis, modality is considered to be counter part of transitivity and it refers to the judgment of the claim made in the text. It determines the degree of commitment and attitude of the writer towards the text. It is usually indicated by the use of modal verbs such as: may, could, should, will and must or their negations such as: may not, should not, could not, will not and must not. It shows how a writers or journalists evaluate a same event in different ways. Someone can write: ‘he could have been more forceful’ or ‘he should have been more forceful’. These two ways of reporting a same event not only provide information about the event but also the writer’s views (ibid, pp. 59-60).

3.5.5. Presupposition

There are some hidden and presupposed meanings in the text. ‘A presupposition is taken for granted, implicit claim embedded within the explicit meaning of a text or utterance’ (ibid, p. 63). According to Reah (2002), there are three linguistic structures common for presupposed meanings. Firstly, change of state verbs like stop or continue and implicative verbs like manage or forget invoke presupposed meaning in the text. For example, ‘stop’ presupposed a movement and ‘forget’ presupposed a great deal including an attempt to remember.

Secondly, definite articles and possessive articles trigger presuppositions. For example, ‘the challenge facing the modern world’ presupposes a challenge exists.

Thirdly, presuppositions are present in question form like who, why, when etc.

3.5.6. Metaphors
It is a familiar concept known as perceiving one thing in terms of another. For example when we talk about economy like ‘over heated’, stagnating, tiger economy, bubble economy, financial boom etc. are used as metaphors to understand the economical and financial affairs. In journalism, certain types of metaphors are associated to the specific genre (ibid, p. 66).

3.5.7. Neologism

This is relatively new term and it is associated with the use of existing words and phrases in different forms and combinations to create new meanings (Jasinski, 2001).

There are three visible categories of ‘neologism’ in journalism. First, by the use of prefix and suffix to form a new word. Most common example is to use ‘gate’ as a suffix to designate a scandal. After the ‘Watergate’ scandal is U.S, there has been Iran gate, Lewinsky gate and Rather gate. Camill gate, Cherie gate and squidgy gate in UK and memo gate in Pakistan.

Secondly, Neologism can be created by word meanings, either by grammar or by developing new meanings. For example: ‘Google’ and ‘eBay’ are used as verbs rather than nouns in journalistic text. On the other hand, in war reporting; ‘neutralize’, take out, ‘engage’ are the words used instead of ‘kill’. Term ‘co lateral damage’ is commonly used as ‘civilian killings’.

Thirdly, neologism can be created through blending two words or their parts. For example: word ‘brunch’ is a mix of breakfast and lunch and smog came from (smoke + fog). Newspapers, mainly tabloids tend to coin and introduce these types of words in journalism (ibid, 69).

3.6. Data collection and analysis

Data collection is another important part of research. After finalizing the newspapers from both countries, an equal number of news articles were required from each country to have a balanced approach. News archive of all the newspapers was the main source to have the required data in hand. Starting from online search with the key word like, ‘‘Trumps New Year tweet about Pakistan’’ and relating it to all the newspapers added to this research. For example, searching for related articles from The New York Times, ‘‘Trump’s New Year tweet about Pakistan in The New York Times’’. Through this search, it became possible to reach the articles which were relevant to the issue. Since the aim was to analyze two articles from each
newspaper so the most relevant articles are sorted out. Relevance was based on a basic criterion that each article should have covered Trump’s tweet and/or the response from the concerned authorities from both countries. After collecting a total of eight articles, a deep analysis has been done by using suitable tools from CDA method. Detailed analysis of all the news articles is presented in the coming chapter.

3.7. Discussion and conclusion:
Outcomes of the analysis part are further discussed in relation to the theories including Framing and agenda setting of the media. At first stage, media coverage of Pakistan and United States media (newspapers) is discussed separately and then compared to find the similarities and differences between the two. To answer the research question in a precise way, results from the discussion section are presented in the conclusion.

3.8. Limitations:
There are some limitations to this research which are as follows:

Firstly, the absence of social and broadcast media in this research project. National/international broadcast media as well as social media are very popular now a days. Interestingly, the issue addressed in this research started with a ‘‘tweet’’ so one can argue that why the social media aspect is not included in the research? On the other hand, question of the absence of broadcast media is also valid. But all this comes under the limitations of this research project. There are always several ways of conducting a research, same was the case in the beginning of this research. Author has considered all the possible aspects but the most feasible was carrying this through newspaper media. This study focuses on the discussion started in news media after Trump’s tweet but not focusing on the tweet itself. However, the scope of this research does not cover the discussion on social media and broadcast media, but suggests conducting further research on the topic.

Secondly, it focuses on relatively short period covered for analysis. However, the criterion to select this time period justifies it because the debate was on peak during that span. Since the issue started with Trump’s tweet on January 1, 2018 and attracted the attention of international media. During first week of the year, the topic was in limelight that is why the articles from the first week of the year are chosen to carry this research. Nowadays, media is vibrant and new issues come into focus every day. Old news with similar issues does not create anything interesting for the readers. There was a discussion on Donald Trump’s tweet before and after the selective period but the key focus of the research is Trump’s New Year
tweet about Pakistan with reference to its role in Afghanistan. Similarly, there is an ongoing
discussion on Pakistan-US bilateral relationship and their alliance for fighting terrorism but
this project only deals the discussion within the selective time period.

3.9. Validity, Reliability and generalizability
One way to ensure the validity of research is to constantly check and question the employed
method. Meyer (2001) argues CDA’s findings based on a careful analysis of the features in
the texts and their mutual relation validates the findings. A systematic analysis as applied in
this research could be a way to secure scientific quality of this research. This study includes a
proper theoretical framework, based on two theories namely; news framing and agenda
setting. Deacon et al. (2007) suggest analyzing the media contents in their original form (no
translations or changes). In this thesis, all the selected news articles are analyzed in their
original form, which ensures the validation of this research process.

Another important factor is the ‘reliability’ of this research. According to Neuendorf (2002),
assessing reliability is connected with having consistent observations when the research is
carried out. As a researcher, we must be fully equipped with theoretical and methodological
knowledge, which helps to apply scientific approach and prevent from ideological readings.
Author has connected all the findings to the existing theories and previous knowledge by
providing academic references. It helped a lot to avoid personal inclination for or against any
of the actors and hence increased reliability.

‘‘Generalizability is defined as the degree to which extent the findings can be generalized
from the study sample to the entire population.’’(Polit and Hungler, 1991, p.645) However,
qualitative studies do not focus on representation of their sample which means study may or
may not be the representative of the entire population. A sum of 8 articles from four English
language newspapers are collected and analyzed in this research. To have a balanced
approach, two articles from each newspaper and four articles from each country are sorted.
Author has emphasis on deep analysis of the collected articles rather than having a large
number of articles with shallow analysis. Within the given time and space, it is a humble
quest to dig deep into the story and discuss the key point in relevance to the existing theories.
Since this research is based on selected newspaper articles from only four newspapers so this
may not be generalized as representative of the entire media from each country.
4. Analysis
In this chapter all the selected articles are analysed by using suitable tools from CDA (critical discourse analysis). It is divided into four main parts on the basis of four newspapers which are analysed as follows:

4.1. Daily Dawn: This sub section of analysis chapter includes two news articles based on discussion related to Donald Trump’s New Year tweet about Pakistan. Both of the articles are analyzed as follows:

4.1.1. Pakistan has given us nothing but lies and deceit: US president Donald Trump (Appendix 8.1)

This article was published on Jan 1, 2018. Title of this article is an abstract of the Donald Trump’s tweet which depicts a clear theme of the article. Reader can notice that this statement is delivered by the US president Donald Trump but how and by using which means of communication, is not mentioned in the title. It creates curiosity and interest to go through main text of the article after reading the headline.

This statement by Donald Trump is termed as “accusing” Pakistan of giving Washington ‘nothing but lies and deceit’ and Islamabad thinks of US leaders ‘as fools’. Washington and Islamabad represent United States and Pakistan respectively in the article.

Then next part of the Donald Trump’s tweet is discussed with an emphasis on the word “fool” and “foolishly” by quoting the original tweet as US president said that Islamabad thinks of US leaders as fool and Washington had foolishly given Pakistan this huge amount in aid. In return, Pakistan had given “safe haven to the terrorist we hunt in Afghanistan, with little help”. The last caution in the tweet is ‘no more’ but it is not clear in the tweet if they are considering any ‘punitive’ actions, writer claims.

Inspite of the fact that article has discussed each and every part of the tweet, the original tweet of the president Donald Trump is also included and published to make the discussion more credible and authentic.

As counter narrative, response from Foreign minister of Pakistan is also added in the story, who said that Pakistan will ‘soon’ show to the world the “difference between facts and fiction”. This statement shows that Pakistan foreign minister did not accept the claim in Donald Trump’s tweet and considered it as fiction, not truth.
Report includes the reaction from the foreign office of Pakistan by using strong phrases like, Foreign office ‘summoned’ the American ambassador, David Hale, to record its ‘protest’ against ‘accusatory statement’ tweeted by Trump. ‘‘Summoned’’ has connotations as order to come for a meeting and when combined to ‘‘protest’’, it is presupposed that there is some event, which is not acceptable for Pakistani foreign office. The third phrase in the text is ‘‘accusatory statement’’ which also connotated as blame which is not proven yet. So the linguistic analysis of these strong terms clearly depicts the quick and strong response from foreign office against trump’s statement. When describing the version of US embassy spokesman about ambassador meeting at foreign office, the tone is rather lighter and diplomatic. The word ‘‘development’’ is used for the process which is much milder than ‘‘summoned’’ and ‘‘protest’’.

Furthermore, author has included information about the meeting of the national security council held by prime minister of Pakistan. Participants of the meeting are mentioned mainly, minister of interior, defense and foreign affairs, the services chiefs and other civil and military officers. Federal cabinet was also expected to meet and discuss the development on this issue. By mentioning the names and ranks of the high level officials who are going to meet clearly shows the severity of the matter.

In the second half of the story, US official version is added and the author tried to explore the possible reason behind Donald Trump’s tweet. According to the writer, this could be an aftermath of the event when Trump announced his administration’s latest national security strategy. Then the main points from this announcement are added that US president reminded Pakistan about its ‘‘obligation’’ to help America ‘‘because it receives massive payment’’ from Washington. Trump said, ‘‘we have made clear to Pakistan that we want to see decisive action against terrorist groups.’’ A pentagon report was reported on December 17, about the cooperation between two countries and a warning of ‘‘unilateral steps’’ from Washington. Subsequently, US vice president, in his surprise visit to Afghanistan on Dec 22, warned that Trump has ‘‘put Pakistan on notice’’. Writer of this news article considers it the ‘‘harshest’’ warning given to Islamabad over 16 years of the US – Pakistan cooperation in Afghan war. Moreover, Trump administration was also considering withholding $255 million from a fund meant to provide for military training and equipment to Pakistan.

As a reaction to these announcement from the US officials, spokesperson of Pakistan army had a press conference and asserted that the aid from the US was ‘‘reimbursement’’ for
support we gave to the coalition for its fight against Al Qaeda. “Had we not supported, they would never have been able to defeat Al Qaeda”, he added. The use of words here is friendly as well as the hidden meanings are strong. For example, Pakistan wants to continue working with ‘friends’ but cannot compromise on ‘national honour’. Pakistan does not want a conflict with friends but we will ensure the ‘security’ of the country, he claimed. Reporter tries to balance the discourse by considering this was the ‘strongest ever’ reaction from Islamabad since the US officials began ‘alluding’ to the possibility of ‘unilateral action’. Here the word ‘alluding’ is used to describe the US official’s talks, which connote the meaning of confusion, lack of clarity, and creating illusions between the two countries.

Again, the foreign office statement is quoted by using a phrase ‘hitting back’ to US, which also have strong and harsh connotation. Foreign office ‘warned’ against the ‘malicious campaign’ being used to ‘trivialize’ Pakistan’s achievements in war against terrorism. This statement from foreign office shows that Pakistan is an important ally for fighting against terrorism in Afghanistan and Trump administration is trying to object its role and importance in this war. Moreover, ‘allies do not put each other on notice’. This statement is the answer to the speech from US vice president in Bagram, Afghanistan when he told, ‘Trump has put Pakistan on notice’.

As a whole this news article covers almost all the aspects related to the ‘new year tweet’ from Donald Trump. It has discussed the tweet itself and the reaction from Pakistan officials and the tweet from foreign minister. It also covers the linkage between recent past development in Pak-US relation and the emergence of this particular tweet on very first day of the year 2018.

Since Pakistan military forces are involved in fighting against terrorism in Afghanistan and the discourse on military aid and coalition fund is directly related to them, response from military spokesman is also added in the article. Choices made for words are strong which depict a strong and solid reaction from military officials.

4.1.2. Trump’s tweet on Pakistan sparks war of words (Appendix 8.2)

This article is published in daily Dawn on Jan 2, 2018, the day after Donald trump tweet about Pakistan. It is a follow up of the discussion started from the day before. Discussion about the elements in the tweet itself is almost repetition of the first article but it focuses more on the reaction from Pakistan officials and development on this issue.
In the very beginning of the article, ties between Pakistan and US have been discussed with a reference to the activities that took place during last month of year 2017. These meetings and discourse of Trump administration is very well discussed in the previous article. Donald Trump’s tweet is considered to be a ‘setback’ in Pak-US relationship here. Then the sharp response from Pakistani leadership is discussed. Author has claimed that Trump’s tweet is an attempt to change the nature of the relationship between two countries by saying that it was based on ‘nothing but lies and deceit’.

There is a discussion about the speculations in the US capital after this tweet. Some people are linking it to escalation of India-Pakistan relationship. It is important to notice, there is no reported discussion in Pakistan about India but in US people are connecting this tweet and the crisis with India-Pakistan relations.

Talking about the event that US ambassador was summoned to Pakistani foreign office, the phrases ‘worsening ties’ and ‘strong protest’ are used, which meant that Donald Trump’s tweet is affecting Pak-US relationship and Pakistan foreign office has rejected his statement in a very strong manner. Presupposed meanings of these two phrases shows that there were good ties between the countries but this tweet has affected it and strong protest is meant for the rejection and condemnation of allegations from Donald Trump administration.

This article also includes that Trump’s tweet came few days after Pakistani inter-services public relation (ISPR) chief said that Pakistan have done enough and it was time for the US and Afghanistan to ‘do more’ in Afghanistan. In line with the Wodak (2011) historical perspective of discourse analysis, the term ‘do more’ has a significant historical value. This term was used by the ex-president of US, Barack Obama, in an interview during his visit to India in January 2016. He said Pakistan can and must ‘do more’ in Afghanistan to crush terrorism in Afghanistan (Dawn, 2016). In this perspective, Trump’s administration is towing the legacy of Obama’s administration and both have similar demands. Moreover, ISPR chief also urged the US to check India’s anti-Pakistan role, not only from Afghanistan but also from the line of control and the working boundary.

Foreign minister of Pakistan, Khawaja Asif Ali came up with a very strong reaction on Trump’s tweet after having a meeting with prime minister of Pakistan. He said Pakistan had already done enough and have already said ‘no more’ to America so Trump’s ‘no more’ is of no importance. Further, he added that Pakistan is ready to provide all the details about US aid. He showed his anger by saying that Mr. Trump was disappointed with the US defeat in
Afghanistan and was accusing Pakistan in retaliation. Here is a denial of every claim made in Trump’s tweet. It shows that if US is not successful in Afghanistan, that is their failure but Trump is blaming Pakistan in frustration. The foreign minister in the next paragraph of the article also rebuts trump’s claim by saying that the funds include reimbursements for the services rendered by Pakistan. He also lists a number of services including country land, roads, rail and other kinds of logistic support and that Pakistan were supposed to be reimbursed. The word ‘reimbursement’ have presupposed meanings that a country have already lost its resources to help US in fighting terrorism in Afghanistan and those losses were supposed to be compensated by the US. Then he emphasizes on the geo-political importance of Pakistan and its key role in Afghanistan by adding, ‘‘Afghanistan’s neighbors can find a peaceful solution for regional peace and security’’. This statement has hidden meanings that US cannot hold peace in Afghanistan without the cooperation of regional forces, Pakistan in particular. He also suggested dialogue with Taliban to establish peace in the region.

In response to the threat of ‘unilateral strikes’ from US, he said: ‘‘the country will defend its sovereignty’’. Every statement of foreign minister is a vigorous denial of the claims made by Donald Trump in his tweets. ‘‘Foreign policy direction is directed by national interest’’, he added. This statement carries a meaning that Pakistan is an ally in fighting terrorism in Afghanistan but it has to protect national interest and sovereignty at the same time. There is no compromise on defense boundaries of the country and any unilateral strike will be tackled with a proper defensive action.

Defense Minister Khurram Dastagir’s following tweet has a similar rhetoric and seems to be a direct answer to the Trump’s tweet.

Pak as anti-terror ally has given free to US: land & air communication, military bases & Intel cooperation that decimated Al-Qaeda over last 16 yrs, but they have given us nothing but invective & mistrust. They overlook cross-border safe havens of terrorists who murder Pakistanis.

It is possible to compare this tweet with Donald Trump’s tweet in the following pattern and how it refuted to the claims made by Donald Trump in his tweet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trump’s Tweet (US president)</th>
<th>vs</th>
<th>Khan’s tweet (Defense minister, Pakistan)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The United states has foolishly given Pakistan</td>
<td>Pak as anti-terror ally has given free to US</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
More than 33 billion dollars

land & air communication, military bases &

Intel cooperation

In aid

that decimated Al-Qaeda

Over the last 15 years

over last 16 yrs

They have given us nothing but lies & deceit

but they have given us nothing but

Invective & mistrust

They give safe haven to the terrorists we

They overlook cross-border safe havens of

hunt in Afghanistan

terrorists who murder Pakistanis.

It is evident from this comparison that Pakistani defense minister has denied all the claims in Trump’s tweet. He also adopted the same linguistic, structural and writing style which meant a “tit for tat” response.

At the end of the article, it has been reported that there will be another cabinet meeting on the same day and a ‘national response’ will be expected after this meeting. Using this particular phrase, ‘national response’ connotes that the whole nation and the national leaders are on the same page and they all are forcefully refuting Donald’s Trump tweet and the allegations related to this.

4.2. The News International: Another big and widely read English newspaper of Pakistan is ‘The News’. It is also considered an international newspaper because it is published from London in addition to the main cities of Pakistan including Islamabad, Karachi and Lahore (Pakwired, 2014). Two articles are chosen from ‘The news’ on the basis of their relevance to the topic and analyzed as follows:

4.2.1. Trump’s salvo indicates upcoming harder line: US expert (Appendix 8.3)

This article is published on Jan 2, 2018 and mainly based on the opinion of a US expert, Michal Kugelman, senior South Asia associate at the US think tank The Wilson Center. Linguistic analysis of the headlines shows that ‘Trump’s Salvo’ is strong wording with the meaning of continued harshness. According to the dictionary (Merriam-Webster) ‘salvo’ keeps the meaning of ‘a simultaneous discharge of two or more guns’, a sudden burst,
bombardment, gunfire, a spirited attack etc. Metaphorically speaking, the phrase “Trump’s salvo” connotes a vigorous stance of US administration against Pakistan regarding its role to eradicate terrorism in Afghanistan. Since this tweet came in the very beginning of the year so it also indicates that Pakistan is going to face more pressure in coming days of the year. The word ‘hard line’ clearly exemplify the severity of the situation.

In the beginning of the article the word ‘shocking’ is preferred to illustrate the overall reaction of the tweet. The word shocking could be defined as extremely startling, distressing or offensive, which causes surprise, horror or disgust (ibid). Michal Kugelman viewed that we should not consider this tweet as announcing a complete aid cut-off. “We are dealing with a very unpredictable president known to issue statements and tweets that are later contradicted”, he added. This statement of an expert from US think tank poses a big question mark on Donald Trump’s claims and seriousness of his tweets. In another article, Washington post has published a research-based article and claimed that, “as of Jan. 1, President Trump has made 1,950 false or misleading claims since taking office. He now averages 5.6 per day”.

Further in the text, Kugelman emphasis on the ‘timing’ and express it by saying “most striking to me” which depicts the importance of Donald Trump’s claim. Since it was the very first tweet of 2018, it suggests that Pakistan is very much in his mind. Then he referred it to a story published in New York Times that the Trump administration was strongly considering whether to withhold $255 million aid to Islamabad. This amount for “foreign military financing” was withheld pending in August 2017 and was tied to “Pakistan’s action against internal terror networks”.

This story also mentioned that “the United States had provided Pakistan more than $33 billion in aid since 2002”; this specific line is echoed in Trump’s tweet with an additional prefix “foolishly”. These evidences illustrate that it might be the influence of this news article read by the president and it lingered in his mind. But at the same time, according to Kugelman, the US government has been considering indefinite aid suspension for some time. He related this threat of aid suspension to the past drone strikes inside Pakistan’s settled areas in case “Islamabad does not meet the US demands of action against Haqqani network”.

In the final part Kugelman warned that as a reaction of US aid suspension, Pakistan can also block important NATO supply routes to Afghanistan. According to Reuters report, there are two important routes used for NATO supply, one through Khyber Pass (Pakistan) to the
Afghan town Torkham and on to Kabul. The other route goes through Pakistan’s province of Baluchistan, towards the border area of Afghanistan and on to the city of Kandahar. Almost one third of the total NATO supplies are transported via these two routes.

4.2.2. US assistance no more needed, says Miftah (Appendix 8.4)

Previous article was based on the views and statement of an expert from the US think tank, The Wilson center. The second article from The News is comprised of reactionary statements from Dr. Miftah Ismail, an advisor to prime minister of Pakistan on finance, revenue and economic affairs. This article was published on Jan. 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 2018, the same day as of the previous article. Headline is a direct and critical response to the rumors of aid suspension from Trump administration. Sentence construction is simple, short and clear and keeps the meaning that the collision support fund and other military aid provided by US is no more required and Pakistan can survive and keep fighting against terrorism without it. Details are included further in the text. In the very first sentence of the article, Trump tweet is categorically denied by saying, “there is no truth at all” in his claim. He argued that “President Trump often says things which turn out to be false”. Then the role of Pakistan to combat terrorism is described by saying that Pakistan became frontline state against terrorism to ensure global peace after 9/11. In this fight, Pakistan faced over $100 billion damage to its economy and a loss of over 50,000 precious lives of troops, policemen and civilians. The word “colossal” is preferred to show the degree of damages faced by Pakistan. Lexically it is meant for something ‘huge’, ‘gigantic’ or extra ordinary big in size. This word has a strong impact on readers mind that how big is the loss faced by Pakistan as an ally, fighting against terrorism.

He said there is no truth in Trump’s claim about $33 billion aid to Pakistan because more than half of the amount was related to coalition support program (CSP) and Pakistan was reimbursed with $14 billion against expenses of $21 billion incurred on the war. It means that Washington owed $7 billion more to Pakistan. Analyzing this whole discourse, illustrates that the aid provided by US official was an imbursements to the losses and damages faced by country and United state still owed more to Pakistan. He also includes the use of air and roads for NATO supply through Pakistan which has already discussed in the analysis of previous article. He also mentioned that Pakistan forces have flushed terrorists out of Pakistan but the US has failed to tackle them in Afghanistan. This is the reason “The US top man” (pointing on Donald Trump) trying to shift responsibility to Pakistan for its failure in Afghanistan. This
stance is different from all the previous discourse that Pakistani official has claimed that Trump’s tweet is an excuse for their failure in Afghanistan.

Talking about the economic conditions of Pakistan, his emphasis was on CPEC-related activities, which shows safe and bright economic health of the country. CPEC stands for ‘China Pakistan Economic Corridor’. According to Britannica report, CPEC is a massive bilateral project to improve infrastructure within Pakistan for better trade with China and other countries in the region. The project was launched in 2015 with an estimated value of $46 billion. The goal of CPEC is to transform Pakistan’s economy and to connect Pakistani sea ports of Gwadar and Karachi to China. This would reduce the cost and time of transporting goods and energy such as natural gas to China. The announcement of joint space and satellite ventures between Pakistan and China, spurred by CPEC followed in 2016. CPEC is considered to be a huge project and numerous countries from Asia and Europe has shown interest in participating in the initiative.

By mentioning CPEC in the text and its importance in economic growth, Pakistani official connotes ‘dual meaning’, firstly, it has a positive impact on Pakistan economy and secondly, it determines the degree of mutual interest, bilateral relation and cooperation between Pakistan and China. Since China is a huge economy and an emerging power in the world, so by saying ‘NO’ to US administration, Pakistan can survive with regional cooperation especially with China.

At the end of the article Dr. Miftah stated that our government is pooling in finances for Zarb-e-Azb and Raddull Fassad operation. These two are the big military operations executed by Pakistan military forces to sweep terrorist groups from the northern areas of Pakistan. As a final comment, he said that Pakistan would continue fight against terrorism at all cost. This discourse has an impact on reader’s mind that how serious are Pakistan forces to eradicate terrorist groups from the country to have peace and stability in the region. Even if Trump’s administration will suspend the military aid Pakistan, it will continue fighting against terrorism with all its own sources.

4.3. New York Times: Two articles from the New York Times are chosen and analyzed as follows:

4.3.1. Pakistan dismisses Trump’s tweet on aid as ‘incomprehensible’ (Appendix 8.5)
The global meaning of the headline of this article is Pakistan has not only denied Donald Trump’s tweet, also consider it as ‘incomprehensible’ which connotes ‘unintelligible’ or ‘impossible to understand’. Lexical choice of the word is a direct reflection of the reaction from Pakistani officials after the tweet.

In the very beginning of the text, it is presented that Pakistan has given ‘no importance’ to the claim by US president who says that Pakistan has accepted billions of dollars from United States but done nothing against terrorist networks. Then it focuses on last phrase of the trump’s tweet “No more” and considered it as warning from Mr. President. This article also includes that David Hale, the American ambassador to Pakistan was summoned to ministry of foreign affairs in Islamabad and a ‘diplomatic protest’ was lodged, which connotes a neutral tone and seems according to the rules of business.

Reflection on the coverage of Pakistani media is also mentioned by describing that Mr. Trump’s comments were dominating in Pakistani news media, which shows the sensitivity of the matter. Afterward, an emergency meeting of National Security Council (NSC) was held and it concluded that, “despite all unwarranted allegations, Pakistan cannot act in haste and will remain committed to playing a constructive role towards an Afghan led and Afghan owned peace process”.

Other part of the article includes that how Mr. Trump’s tweet and Pakistani response influence the working relationship between the two countries. The phrase ‘a nose-dive’ is used to express this effect, which is meant for ‘rapid decline’ or ‘sudden collapse’. It also relates this tweet to the recent high profile visits of US officials and their frustration on Pakistan’s performance against terrorist networks. But Pakistani officials say they have done ‘more than enough’. Pakistani officials say privately, United States has failed in Afghanistan and looking to blame Pakistan for that failure. Furthermore, Pakistani officials also denied the presence of militants groups especially Haqqani networks in Pakistan. Here, while reporting about Haqqani network, it is introduced within the text as “which is allied with the Afghan Taliban and is responsible for many lethal attacks inside Afghanistan, have havens inside Pakistan”. By reading this paragraph it is presupposed that Haqqani network is involved in all these terrorist activities and they have ‘safe haven’ in Pakistan; this phrase is already reflected in Trump’s tweet. For a common reader, it is obvious to relate Trumps claim of ‘safe haven in Pakistan’ to Haqqani network and their terrorist activities.
In the next part of the article, the response from Pakistan military during news conference is included and it says, military spokesman warned United States against taking any unilateral anti-terrorism action on Pakistan soil. Adding the term “anti-terrorism action” as an affix, enhances the acceptability of unilateral action on Pakistani soil. In the real statement, only the term “unilateral action” was consumed but here in this article “unilateral anti-terrorism action” is used which connotes totally different impact on readers mind. It also includes that Pakistan military is working to build a fence along the Afghan border to avoid infiltration and trying to settle the issues related to afghan refugees camps in Pakistan.

On the other hand, Pakistani government official also insists that Mr. Trump has got his figures wrong that United States had “foolishly” given $33 billion since 2002. According to Miftah Ismail, an advisor to prime minister on finance, revenue and economic affairs, “our billings were for $22 billion and we got only $14 billion. So we think U.S. owes us $8 billion.” In response to the Trump administration’s recent threat about aid, Ismail said that the $255 million was a tiny fraction of Pakistan’s gross domestic product. “So, not a great deal of money.”

This article also describes that Pakistan leadership was comforted by a strong expression of support from China. The spokesperson of China’s foreign ministry said, “Pakistan has made great efforts and sacrifices for combating terrorism and made prominent contributions to the cause of international counterterrorism, and the international community should fully recognize this.”

In the final part of this article, it reflects the discussion on television talk shows and the word ‘lampooning’ is preferred to illustrate the opinion of the guests in the talk shows. According to the Cambridge dictionary, it means ‘criticizing a person or an organization in a humorous way’. The whole gesture of participants and their discussion is characterized as “chest thumping”, which connotes the meaning of ‘strong’ and ‘arrogant’ behavior. But some of the critics said that there is a need for greater introspection in Pakistan which suggests examining the ideas, thoughts and overall rhetoric by Pakistani officials.

Abstract from the interview of Muhammad Nawaz Chaudhry, a former Pakistani ambassador is added to strengthen the above mentioned argument. According to his opinion ‘Pakistan should fill the gap in its policy’ and we cannot take the bilateral relationship to a dead end. “We are living in denial” and the world, especially United States is not accepting our narrative, he added. While quoting Mr. Chaudhry’s narrative, “Hafiz Muhammad Saeed”, he
is portrayed as a “founder of a militant group”, “most wanted” person who is behind the 2008 attacks in Mumbai, India. Furthermore, he claims that the sanctions on Mr. Saeed’s party by Pakistani government are not real. This order was just “playing to the gallery”, he added. As a final remarks he said, “rather than becoming belligerent, we need to be realistic and go with the world opinion.”

4.3.2. Pakistan, the endlessly troublesome ally (Appendix 8.6)

Headline of this article depict that the article is about alliance between Pakistan and United States. But it has portrayed with a negative connotation, the alliance is problematic. It also represent the mistrust in bilateral cooperation by the phrase “endlessly troublesome” ally. It attracts the attention of the reader with presupposed meanings that there is a discussion about the negligence and misconduct which Pakistan is doing; even it is an important ally to United States.

In the very beginning of the article, it says, “Pakistan is long posed dilemma for the United States”. Lexical interpretation of this sentence is, a situation where it is hard to choose one out of two similar or equal things, same is for a decision. Here it describes as, “should America provide it with aid and treat it as an ally because of its potential to help fight regional extremists or should ties and funding be restricted or even severed, because of its connections to those groups?” This statement connotes that Pakistan has a potential to help fight against terrorists but they also have connection with terrorist organization. They are not doing their job so US administration is considering restriction on it. Trump administration is considering freezing almost all military aid to Pakistan and Donald Trump himself took a very harsh stand, but are they serious to manage the reaction of this decision?

Then it highlights the geopolitical importance of Pakistan in the region and the possible measures Pakistan could take after the aid halt. The list starts with the shutdown of American access to Afghanistan, since almost every flight into Afghanistan goes through Pakistani airspace and most of the supply is carried through Pakistani roads and rails. It also includes that Pakistan could also strengthen its relation with China, which is already investing a lot in Pakistan to improve infra structure and economic cooperation. This article points out that China could be the possible beneficiary of Trump decision to estrange United State from its long-term partners.
Next part of this editorial deals with the short history of ups and downs in bilateral relationship between US and Pakistan. Americans last cut off assistance to Pakistan in 1990 after Pakistan tested nuclear weapons and this created distrust between two countries. But after Sep. 11, 2001, the relationship was transformed overnight. The United States demanded Pakistan to cooperate in fighting against Al-Qaida and Taliban and it was given major new aid in return. Here the role of Pakistan in this connection is described as “a double game”, “accepting American funding while backing militants groups who protect Pakistani interest in Afghanistan and Kashmir.”

Furthermore, it says that Pakistan’s army mounted a serious action against Pakistani Taliban during 2014. But its security services continue to support the Haqqani network and Lashkar-e-Taiba. According to this article, Haqqani network is a Taliban faction that has killed American forces in Afghanistan and is behind many large-scale attacks on Afghan cities. It also describes Lashkar-e-Taiba as an extremist group that targets India and Kashmir. Pakistan forces also failed to uncover the presence of Osama Bin Laden in Pakistan. Supporting Trump’s claim, it says, this is not the first time that US officials are pointing out this matter. In 2011, Adm. Mike Mullen, former chairman of joint chief of staff, told a Senate committee that the Haqqani network was a “veritable arm” of Pakistani security services.

In the last part of the article, it suggest that it is not easy for President Trump to walk away from Pakistan, which has often provided vital intelligence and has the world’s fastest growing nuclear arsenal. As Pakistani response, it includes that initially Pakistani officials reacted harshly but later, a foreign ministry statement talked about mutual respect and patience as the two countries address common threats. It also suggests that Trump could marshal other diplomatic tools, to see if more constructive cooperation with Pakistan is possible. One idea is to utilize his new friendship with the leaders of Saudi Arabia and United Arab Emirates, to shut down the fund raising efforts of Haqqani network and Taliban. This would require quiet negotiations, not shouting, it suggests.

4.4. Washington post: Similar to other three newspapers, two articles from this newspaper are analyzed with CDA tools as follows:

4.4.1. ‘No more!’ Trump tweets to Pakistan, accusing it of ‘lies & deceit’ (Appendix 8.7)

Headline is based on the contents of Donald Trump’s tweet about Pakistan, in which he is accusing Pakistani officials for ‘lies & deceit’ and warns them for ‘no more’ aid.
Contrarily, the main text of the article starts with the response from Pakistan’s defense minister instead of Donald Trump’s tweet. It depends on the choice of the author how the article is structured. Here in this case, response from Pakistan is preferred to be published in the beginning of the article. It says, “Pakistan defense minister responded angrily to the tweet by president Trump.” He said, ‘United States has given Pakistan “invective & mistrust”’ in return. Use of the word ‘angrily’ makes the response stronger and reflects the mood.

Then, Trump’s New Year tweet is included in the text in its original form followed by the reaction from defense minister of Pakistan. Again the term ‘hit back’ is preferred to describe the response from Pakistan defense minister. Lexical meanings of ‘hit back’ are to attack or criticize someone who has attacked or criticized you. So it has presupposed meanings that it is merely a reaction to something which has happened already. Defense minister Khurram Dastgir wrote on twitter that Pakistan, as an “anti terror ally” of the United States, had given Washington “land and air communication”, military bases and intelligence cooperation that “decimated Al-Qaeda over last 16 yrs” while America “has given us nothing but invective & mistrust.”

Report about the cabinet meeting which is going to be held next day, is also included in the article and described as a response to the “Twitter attack”. Again, this term shows the controversy started with the harsh tweet from Donald Trump, and any response to this is justified and merely a natural reaction. An interview of Khawaja Muhammad Asif, foreign minister of Pakistan, is also added in the text. This interview was broadcasted on Geo Television, which belongs to the same media groups as of “The News” international newspaper. He said, country is ready to publically provide accounting of “every detail” of US aid it has received. He also said, ‘We have already told the U.S. that we will not do more, so Trump’s ‘no more’ does not hold importance.’

The next passage deals with the statement of White house spokesman Raj shah, who said White House is not planning to spend $255 million in military aid to Pakistan. That decision was reported by CNN. This discussion led to speculations that the Trump administration is dissatisfied with the way Pakistan has dealt with the ‘Haqqani network’ and other terrorist groups.

Further, the statement of Michael Kugelman, deputy director of the Asia program at the Wilson Center in Washington is included who said, ‘we should not overstate the policy significance of this tweet.’ It’s more likely to be an expression of ‘frustration’ or a statement
of intent rather than an actual declaration of a new policy, he added. This expert does not seem to agree that Trump’s tweet is a policy statement; rather it could be a personal intention or frustration expressed in Trump’s tweet.

This article includes another angle, which is reaction over Trump’s tweet in India. It says, “In India, news of Trump’s tweet was met with celebration in some quarters, a healthy dose of skepticism in others.” It also mentions another tweet in the past when Trump wrote, US administration want to develop a much better relationship with Pakistan and its leaders. Article says that Indian officials were worried after that tweet because they were expecting a stronger stance against Pakistan.

So this time, Indian officials welcomed Trump’s tweet against Pakistan. The goodwill from India appeared for a variety of reasons. Reportedly, they were not happy that Pakistan freed Hafiz Mohammad Saeed from house arrest in November. Hafiz Saeed is introduced in this article as, “the Islamic cleric-who led the militant group that carried out the terrorist attacks on Mumbai in 2008”. He was house arrested from January 2017 and freed in November the same year.

In the last part, the visit of US vice president Pence to Afghanistan and his statement is quoted. He said, “Trump had put Pakistan on notice” that it has provided “safe haven” for terrorist groups. “Those days are gone.” His statement is described with a word “warning” because after a while Donald Trump came up with his tweet reflecting the same thoughts as of vice president Pence. Even the phrase “safe haven” is common both in Pence’s warning and in Trump’s tweet as well. “Those days are over” by Pence also got reflected in Trump’s tweet as “No more”. This sequence shows that the Trump’s New Year tweet about Pakistan is not in isolation but a sequel of the statements from other officials of US administration.

4.4.2. Pakistan strike back at Trump’s tweet: ‘Unwarranted’ and ‘completely incomprehensible’ (Appendix 8.8)

Headline of the article depicts the reaction from Pakistani officials on Donald Trump’s tweet. It also provides a central theme of that reaction by using two terms including ‘unwarranted’ and ‘completely incomprehensible’.

In the start of the article, again it is emphasized that the claim in Trump’s tweet is contradictory to the facts and Pakistani officials totally denied it. The real tweet from Donald Trump is added in the text to provide background knowledge for the readers. Then, the
statement of Prime minister of Pakistan is quoted after a meeting with other political leadership. It says that Trump’s tweet caused disappointment as far as bilateral relationship is concerned. Further it adds, the language and articulation of US administration is not factual and it seems to be an attempt to damage relationship of generations.

Article also included that Pakistani leadership shows no haste to respond impulsively despite they considered it as baseless allegations. They also denied Trump’s claim of sheltering Haqqani network that had close relation to Taliban groups. The word ‘scapegoat’ is used to describe the situation in which US official wanted to blame Pakistan for their failure in Afghanistan. Then this article includes a statement from Ex-foreign minister of Pakistan who said, “Trump tweets every morning as he think it is a constitutional necessity”. This statement shows how people are making fun of Trump’s everyday tweets. Further, he mentioned that United States should consider our efforts against Al-Qaida and military operation in northern part of the country.

In other part of the article, two interviews are included. Both interviewees belong to Pakistan but have difference of opinion on this matter. Addition of both angles of the discussion “far and against” makes the article quite balance.

First interview of Amjad Shoaib is added, He is a defense analyst and retired Pakistani lieutenant general. He said, “It seems the relationship is headed to the point of no return where both countries could opt for different paths”. These are very harsh remarks and he considered it as an end to bilateral cooperation. Here “opt for different paths” is meaningful, he is suggesting both Pakistan and the US should find other ally in the region. This should be seen in the context of several Pakistani analysts and officials suggesting that Pakistan should go along with China instead of United States. Shoaib described Trump administration’s behavior and language as “shameful”, “insulting” and “disgusting”. These are harsh words and show the anger and the mood of Pakistani experts who play a vital role in shaping public opinion.

Article also included a statement of a spokesman for China’s foreign ministry, Geng Shuang, who spoke in support of Pakistan. He said Pakistan has done tremendous efforts in combating terrorism, the international community should fully acknowledge that. Critical discourse analysis of this statement from China’s foreign ministry and a very harsh response from Pakistani former army man shows a clear relevance, especially when Shoaib says both
countries should opt different paths. After that, articles also describes, how the military aid to Pakistan shrunk during last few years.

Another interview in the article is of Husain Haqqani, the former ambassador of Pakistan to United States, who is an analyst with the Hudson Institute. According to him, Trump’s tweet is not a surprise because US administration has been signaling for months that it intended to take harder line than previous administration. He said, military is convinced that fight in Afghanistan would be much easier without Pakistan’s support to terrorist groups. He said that this is the first time that Donald Trump’s talk directly about the issue; maybe a new thing for the public. Defense secretary, Jim Mattis appeared before congress and said we should try ‘‘one more time’’ to work with Pakistan. But Husain Haqqani thinks that he may be disappointed at the meeting with Pakistani general last month. He wanted to talk about the issues related to Taliban support from Pakistan but Pakistan kept saying what they have always said: ‘‘denials.’’

Finally, Husain Haqqani said that Donald Trump’s words must now be backed with consequences otherwise it might be interpreted as hollow warnings.
5. Discussion

This section describes the relation between outcomes of analysis and the chosen theories. News framing and agenda setting are the two main theoretical concepts.

5.1. Framing in Pakistani newspapers

News framing is about choices of, for example: words (language), emphasis, sources and organization of texts. Framing effects can be found in words, perspectives, choice of facts presented and connection between events, issues and agents (Bolin et. al. 2016).

On the basis of Bolin’s theory, the following key factors are adopted to discuss news framing with reference to the findings from the analysis chapter:

- Language (usage and tone)
- Conflict presentation
- Sources
- Related issues
- Emphasis

5.1.1. Language

Since the original text of Donald Trump’s tweet is added and discussed in all of the articles, which carries strong words and phrases. But the language used to describe the reaction from Pakistani officials or the opinion from other sources also has a very harsh tone. For example, words ‘protest’ and ‘strong protest’ are used to express the anger from Pakistani officials, ‘summoned’ for the meeting with US ambassador to Pakistan. Another harsh idiomatic phrase, ‘trump’s salvo’ appeared in the headline of article (4.2.1). The term ‘salvo’ has been used as a metaphor to express his hard line against Pakistan. Some other reactionary phrases included in the text reflect harsh tone. Those terms are, ‘hitting back’, ‘warning against malicious campaign’, no compromise on ‘national honour’ etc.

5.1.2. Conflict presentation

As expressed in the articles, main conflict is difference of opinion between Pakistan and United States officials. The conflict started with the New Year tweet in which Donald Trump blamed Pakistan for ‘lies and deceit’ in bilateral cooperation for fighting terrorism in Afghanistan. It seems the conflict is very well presented in all of the articles and easy to
understand for the reader. It has been presented in the ‘action and reaction’ manner. Articles also provide the historical link to the conflict to get background knowledge of the key issue.

5.1.3. Sources

Central idea of every article is Donald Trump’s tweet so the verified official twitter account, @realDonaldTrump is the main source of all the discussion. Officials from United States administration are also quoted to provide the background of Trump’s tweet. Similarly Pakistani officials, including a statement from prime minister, are included in news articles. Two of the articles are interviews-based. Article (4.2.1) includes the opinion of a US expert, Michal Kugelman, senior South Asia associate at the US think tank The Wilson Center. The crux of his interview is ‘‘both countries need mutual cooperation’’. If the US withdraws financial aid, Pakistan can block supply routes to NATO forces in Afghanistan. The other article (4.2.2) is comprised of reactionary statements from Dr. Miftah Ismail, advisor to prime minister of Pakistan on finance, revenue and economic affairs. He focused on the economic activities related to CPEC (China-Pakistan economic corridor) and Pak-China relationship. Military sources from Pakistan are also included to describe the way Pakistan army has reacted to this issue. Reaction from military circles was strong and they denied Trump’s allegations. They also condemned and opposed any kind of unilateral action by NATO forces in Pakistan.

5.1.4. Related issues and events

‘‘Haqqani network’’ is a key issue behind this controversy and mistrust. United States wants more actions against this network because they are involved in the killing of US forces in Afghanistan. Pakistani sources denied their presence and claim that Pakistan army has done two massive operations in northern part of the country to eradicate terrorist groups.

Another issue, which is highlighted in Pakistani media, is, the failure of the Trump administration to fight in Afghanistan and that they just want to blame Pakistan and its armed forces.

Pak-China relationship is also highlighted in the coverage. China–Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC) is described in article (4.2.2) as a key support to Pakistan economy.

5.1.5. Emphasis
Overall emphasis of all Pakistani articles is, ‘‘we condemn Trump’s New Year tweet and consider it as based on fiction, not facts’’. Further it emphasizes that Pakistan already have done enough to fight terrorism in the region and now United States should do more in Afghanistan. It also emphasizes that any unilateral action on Pakistani soil will not be acceptable and the country will secure its honour. It also emphasizes on Pak-China relationship and considers CPEC initiative as an economy booster.

Following table shows the summary of this discussion about Pakistani newspapers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dawn</th>
<th>The News</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language (vocabulary)</strong></td>
<td>War of words, set back, worsening ties, strong protest, warned, no compromise, national honour</td>
<td>Trump’s salvo, hard line, most striking, US top man, Unpredictable president</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conflict presentation</strong></td>
<td>Focused on reaction of the tweet, Pakistani stance presented more than the US; Trump’s tweet damaged bilateral relations, tit for tat</td>
<td>Discussed tweet itself, effects on bilateral relation and reaction from both parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sources</strong></td>
<td>@realDonaldTrump, US officials, Pakistani officials, spokesperson of Pakistan army</td>
<td>Michal Kugelman (senior South Asia associate at the US think tank The Wilson Center), Dr. Miftah Ismail, advisor to prime minister of Pakistan on finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Related issues</strong></td>
<td>Haqqani network, Trump’s administration’s failure in Afghanistan</td>
<td>China-Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC) and its positive impact on Pakistan economy, NATO supply routes via Pakistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emphasis</strong></td>
<td>Trump’s tweet has no facts, condemn tweet, after two military operations there are no safe havens for terrorist networks</td>
<td>Timing of Trump’s tweet, Pakistan will continue the fight against terrorism even without US aid; CPEC is economy booster for</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table: 1. A summary of CDA findings of Pakistani newspapers

5.2. Agenda setting in Pakistani newspapers
The term agenda setting is closely related to news framing. Newspapers discourse plays a strong role in setting agenda and to influence a picture in the reader’s mind. Media also influences the communication process and the understanding of the topic in the news (Maxwell & McComb, 2003).

On the basis of the above discussion, Pakistani media wants to make people realise that Trump’s tweet has no truth in it and all the claims are false. Pakistan has done enough in war against terrorism and willing to continue bilateral cooperation but with dignity. The funds Pakistan got from United States were not just an aid but reimbursement to the resources we utilized as an ally of this war against terrorism.

Economy of Pakistan is stable and showing positive trends due to CPEC related activities. China is a friend of Pakistan and it backed up our stance. After having two massive operations in northern part of the country, there are no more safe havens for terrorists in Pakistan and we would not allow any unilateral action from US forces on the soil.

5.3. Framing in U.S. media (newspapers)
News framing of the articles selected from US newspapers is also discussed with the help of similar factors as follows:

5.3.1. Language:
Since the discussion of the entire articles surrounds Donald Trump’s tweet and the original tweet is quoted as it is, there has been no twist noted in it. Similarly while adding statements of spokesperson or officials, exactly same words are included with “quotation marks”. Otherwise in general text, words used are less harsh, rather neutral. Most of the terms shows literary taste and have hidden meanings when connotated through the context. For example in the article (4.3.2) while describing the variety of reaction from Pakistani media analysts, it has been referred to two phrases including, “chest thumping” and “lampooning”. These terms have hidden meanings that how people have reacted to Donald Trump in a literary way. Again the bilateral relationship between US and Pakistan has been metaphorically presented
with a phrase “long posed dilemma”. However, an article from Washington Post wrote, “strike back” to express Pakistani reaction. It also wrote “unwanted” and “completely incomprehensible” which carries a bit stronger tone.

5.3.2. Conflict presented

In US media (newspapers), Conflict has been presented in historical perspectives. Focus is, not only the tweet itself but also the issues related to it and the reasons that led to this tweet. It also discussed that the relationship between Pakistan and United States has always been in trouble and has faced ups and downs in the past. By reading articles, it is easy to get the clear idea of the conflict and its background.

5.3.3. Sources

A number of sources are included in the articles starting from Trump’s tweet and the officials belong to Trump’s administration. It also included Pakistani sources like defence minister, foreign minister, military spokesman. Interestingly two Pakistani former ambassadors to United States were also quoted in two different articles.

In article 4.3.1, an interview of Muhammad Nawaz Chaudhry, former ambassador is presented who said Pakistan should revisit the policy and put more effort to change world perception.

Hussain Haqqani, another former ambassador, his interview was also quoted in the article 4.4.2. He also agreed to Trump administration’s stance to deal with Pakistan and recommend that action would be taken in relation to Trump’s tweet.

5.3.4: Related issues and events

Discussion about Haqqani network was present in all the articles belonging to US media and they recommend more actions against this network. In addition to Haqqani network, it also demanded from Pakistan to take more actions against Hafiz Saeed who is blamed for Mumbai attacks in 2011. The response from Indian people on this particular issue was reported in US media that the harsh tweet from Donald Trump was taken as a celebration in India. The word Kashmir (a disputed territory between India and Pakistan) appeared exclusively in the New York Times article (4.3.2).

5.3.5: Emphasis
Of course, emphasis of the whole discussion in US media was to do more against Haqqani network and other Taliban groups. Pakistan will not receive any aid if they will not proceed according to the United States demand of actions. Indian response is played up.

Following table shows the summary of this discussion about US newspapers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>New York Times</th>
<th>Washington Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language</strong></td>
<td>No importance, dismisses tweet, diplomatic protest, chest thumping, lampooning, a nose dive in relation, troublesome ally</td>
<td>Strike back, unwanted, incomprehensible tweet, twitter attack, scapegoat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conflict</strong></td>
<td>Started with Trump’s tweet and its reaction, focused on Pakistan-US relationship, also included how this tweet can effect bilateral cooperation</td>
<td>In addition to the discussion about Trump’s tweet and reaction from Pakistan, it has included the response from India, mixed feelings in India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sources</strong></td>
<td>US officials, Pakistani officials including military spokesman. Interview of M. Nawaz Chaudhry (a former Pakistani ambassador to the US)</td>
<td>Kugelman and Jim Mattis (US officials), Pakistani officials and reporter from India, Interview of Hussain Haqqani (another former Pakistani ambassador to the US), spokesman from foreign ministry – China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Related issues</strong></td>
<td>Haqqani network, Hafiz Saeed, Mumbai attacks 2008, Kashmir issue</td>
<td>Haqqani network, Hafiz Saeed, CPEC activities in Pakistan and role of China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emphasis</strong></td>
<td>Pakistan should do more against terrorist networks, Pakistan should reconsider the strategy, Trump should use diplomatic ties with UAE and Saudi Arabia in this</td>
<td>Pakistani stance against tweet to consider it incomprehensible, tweet reflects the strategy of Trump’s administration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.4. Agenda setting in US media (newspapers)
Discussion about news framing of United States media shows which agenda has been tried to set the reader’s mind. It shows that the claim of Trump’s administration is justified and Pakistan should do more against Haqqani network. But at the same time it recommends that we should give Pakistan one more chance in this connection. US stance should be hard but not so much that it leads to negative impact on bilateral relations. Including the demand of action against Hafiz Saeed on Indian behalf could be interpreted as that US has other working partners in the region where Pakistan and China are located. Overall agenda is to have a public opinion in favour of the expected actions from Trump’s administration.

5.6. Similarities between Pakistani media and US
There are few similarities between Pakistani media and US. First of all, presentation of conflict is almost similar. Both have presented Trump’s tweet as a central focus of all the discussion. Both have clearly reported the reactionary statements from Pakistani civil as well military officials. Though the linguistic style was not similar but the core issue is presented in the similar way. Both accept and present that Trump’s tweet is not isolated but has direct connection to the previous statements from US administration.

There is an urge present in both countries’ media to resolve the issue and no side would go so far to damage bilateral relationship. Media from both countries believe that fight against terrorism in Afghanistan will be much easier with the help from neighbouring countries. To be objective, both sides have included expert opinion from United States as well as from Pakistan. Both sides have reported and discussed the choices available for substitute; Pakistani media has portrayed China and US media has portrayed India as a substitute in the region.

5.7. Differences between Pakistani media and US
There are also few differences between Pakistan and US media reporting on this particular issue. First of all, the lexical choices made by two sides are different. Pakistani media has adopted a hard line to express the reaction against Trump’s tweet. Very strong and harsh words are used to condemn the allegations from Donald Trump. Contrarily, US media seems
to be very careful about the language usage. Wherever needed to express strong reaction, they preferred literally phrases with neutral tone and hidden meanings.

Another difference is the sources quoted in the articles. Pakistani media has quoted all the sources and interviews in favour of Pakistan or neutral but no one with opposing arguments. On the other hand, US media tried a balanced approach by adding sources with for, against and neutral opinion.

There is a clear difference while reporting about “Haqqani network”. Pakistani media has categorically denied that there is no support for the network in Pakistan while US media has reported that they have links with Pakistan forces. Pakistani media claims that after the execution of two massive operations in northern areas, there are no more safe heavens for the terrorists. But US media opposes this claim by quoting the statements of US officials.

US media has provided sufficient space to Indian reaction on this controversy but Pakistani media did not add even a single line about it. Another similar situation is the discussion about Hafiz Saeed. US media has provided much space to describe Hafiz Saeed’ involvement in Mumbai attacks and demanded strict actions against him. On the other hand, Pakistani media did not include the discussion about Hafiz Saeed and India in those articles that are reporting a controversy between Pakistan and United States.
6. Conclusion
By using CDA method to analyse all the articles from both countries and reflecting them on selected theories, this part is dedicated to sum up concluding remarks. Obviously, Pakistan and US media have similarities as well as differences in their reporting of the same issue which started with Trump’s new year tweet about Pakistan. The focus of Pakistani newspapers was to cover the reaction against Trump’s tweet. However, ‘The News’ has adopted an objective approach by quoting reactionary opinion from both countries but in two separate articles. ‘Dawn’ has provided one-sided stories based on Pakistani sources at large. It has covered all the reactionary statements from Pakistani authorities and seems to have served as a mouthpiece of political elite. Providing information about CPEC (China Pakistan Economic Corridor) related activities, is a diplomatic way of showing strength and choices in international relations. In a nutshell, Pakistani newspapers leave an impact on readers’ mind that Trump’s tweet is not factual, country has done enough against terrorism and the US should realise this effort.

On the other hand, the US newspapers have covered both parties’ opinion. They have brought in some other issues, which are not presented in Pakistani media. For instance, taking of Mumbai attacks and Kashmir issue into the discussion of the tweet controversy is adding fuel to the fire. It would not help to diffuse, rather increase tension between the countries. The US newspapers want to form public opinion to put more pressure on Pakistan to “do more” against Haqqani network. They also suggest that Trump should utilize diplomatic ties with Saudi Arabia and UAE in this concern.

As mentioned earlier, this thesis is based on the analysis of newspapers and does not include broadcast and social media. There is a possibility to conduct a similar or further research by using alternative media. Since the controversy started on twitter, it would be interesting to conduct a research to analyse that how twitter users have responded to this particular tweet by Donald Trump
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8. Appendices

Appendix: 8.1

Pakistan has given us nothing but lies and deceit: US President Donald Trump

Dawn, January 01, 2018, by Naveed Siddiqui

United States (US) President Donald Trump on Monday began his new year by accusing Pakistan of giving Washington "nothing but lies and deceit".

The US president also tweeted that Islamabad thinks of US leaders "as fools".

He said Washington had "foolishly given Pakistan more than $33 billion in aid over the last 15 years", but Pakistan had in return given "safe haven to the terrorists we hunt in Afghanistan, with little help".

"No more," he added, without specifying what punitive actions — if any — his administration is considering.

The American president's tirade was responded to briefly by Foreign Minister Khawaja Asif, who said Pakistan would "soon" show the world the "difference between facts and fiction."

Later in the day, the Foreign Office summoned the American ambassador in Islamabad, David Hale, to record its protest against the accusatory statement tweeted by Trump, Dawn News quoted a senior FO official as saying.

US Embassy Spokesman Rick Sinelsine confirmed the development, saying Ambassador Hale had been called for a meeting at the Foreign Office at 9pm.

Sinelsine, however, said that he was unaware of the agenda of the meeting.

Meanwhile, Prime Minister Shahid Khaqan Abbasi convened a meeting of the National Security Committee to review the national and regional security situation.

According to Radio Pakistan, the meeting will be attended by the ministers of Interior, Defence and Foreign Affairs, the services chiefs, and other civil and military officers.

Moreover, the federal cabinet was also expected to meet in Islamabad on Tuesday with the prime minister in the chair to discuss recent developments.
The US president's tweet came in the aftermath of an increasingly terse back-and-forth between Washington and Islamabad since Trump announced his administration's latest national security strategy.

During the announcement, the US president had been quick to remind Pakistan of its 'obligation' to help America "because it receives massive payments" from Washington every year.

"We have made clear to Pakistan that while we desire continued partnership, we must see decisive action against terrorist groups operating on their territory. And we make massive payments every year to Pakistan. They have to help," the US president had said.

A Pentagon report to the US Congress, released to the media on Dec 17, had said Washington would also take 'unilateral steps' in areas of divergence with Pakistan while expanding cooperation between the two countries where their interests converge.

Subsequently, US Vice President Mike Pence had, in a surprise visit to Afghanistan's Bagram airbase on Dec 22, warned that Trump has "put Pakistan on notice" in what was the harshest US warning to Islamabad since the beginning of the Afghan war over 16 years ago.

Official sources had told *Dawn* last week that the Trump administration was also considering withholding $255 million from a fund meant to provide military training and equipment to Pakistan, adding to already existing cuts on reimbursements.

The Pakistan Army spokesman, Maj Gen Asif Ghafoor, had at a press conference last week asserted that the aid Pakistan received from the US was "reimbursement for support we gave to the coalition for its fight against Al Qaeda."

"Had we not supported the US and Afghanistan, they would never have been able to defeat Al Qaeda," he had said.

"The armed forces are working with friends and want to continue doing so, but there can be no compromise on our national honour. We do not want a conflict with our friends, but will ensure the security of Pakistan," he had added.

His briefing was considered perhaps the strongest-ever reaction from Islamabad since US functionaries began alluding to the possibility of unilateral action.
Hitting back at the US, the civilian-controlled Foreign Office (FO) had also warned against the "malicious campaign" being "used to trivialise Pakistan's achievements in the war against terrorism", and noted that "allies do not put each other on notice."

The FO had further complained that recent US statements are "at variance with the extensive conversations we [Islamabad] have had with the US administration".

Appendix: 8.2

Trump’s tweet on Pakistan sparks war of words

By: Anwar Iqbal | Iftikhar A. Khan

DAWN, January 02, 2018

In his first message, directed at a foreign nation in the new year, the president pledged to change the nature of a relationship he claimed was based on “nothing but lies and deceit”.

“We are MAKING AMERICA GREAT AGAIN, and much faster than anyone thought possible,” he wrote.

At 4:12am, on Monday, Mr Trump tweeted his warning to Pakistan: “The United States has foolishly given Pakistan more than 33 billion dollars in aid over the last 15 years, and they have given us nothing but lies & deceit, thinking of our leaders as fools.”

*Foreign minister says Islamabad will not do more after US president calls it ‘liar’*

He said: “They give safe haven to the terrorists we hunt in Afghanistan, with little help. No more!”

The message was retweeted and liked by tens of thousands of his followers.

It took only an hour for Foreign Minister Khawaja Asif to come up with a rejoinder. “We will respond to President Trump’s tweet shortly Inshallah...Will let the world know the truth...difference between facts & fiction,” he tweeted.
The timing of Mr Trump’s tweet — at 4 in the morning and more than 12 hours after his last tweet — has caused much speculation in the US capital, with some linking it to reports of a further escalation in India-Pakistan tensions.

In a related development reflecting on worsening ties, the US ambassador in Pakistan was summoned to the Foreign Office and a strong protest over Mr Trump’s remarks was lodged with him, informed sources told *Dawn*.

Mr Trump’s tweets come a few days after Inter-Services Public Relations (ISPR) chief Maj Gen Asif Ghafoor said Pakistan had done enough and it was time for the United States and Afghanistan to do more. He was referring to accusation by the US and Afghanistan regarding the presence of militant bases in Pakistan.

He urged the US to “check India’s anti-Pakistan role not only from inside of Afghanistan but also through the enhanced and increased ceasefire violations along the Line of Control and the Working Boundary”.

His news briefing last week was considered the strongest-ever reaction from Islamabad since Washington began alluding to the possibility of unilateral action.

According to sources, Foreign Minister Asif soon after Mr Trump’s tirade against Pakistan held a meeting with Prime Minister Shahid Khaqan Abbasi to discuss the situation.

In an interview with a private news channel in the evening, Khawaja Asif said Pakistan had already done enough. “We have already said no more [to the Americans] so Trump’s no more is of no importance now,” he added.

“We are ready to publicly provide details of the US aid that has been received by the country,” said the minister, adding that Mr Trump was disappointed with the US defeat in Afghanistan and was accusing Pakistan in retaliation.

He suggested the US should try and negotiate with the Taliban in Afghanistan instead of using the armed forces.

Defence Minister Khurram Dastagir Khan in a separate tweet said: “Pak as anti-terror ally has given free to US: land & air communication, military bases & intel cooperation that decimated Al-Qaeda over last 16 yrs, but they have given us nothing but invective & mistrust. They overlook cross-border safe havens of terrorists who murder Pakistanis.”
Khawaja Asif said: “The claim by Trump regarding the funds, if we account for it, they include reimbursements too for the services rendered by Pakistan.”

“Our land, roads, rail and, other different kinds of services were used for which we were reimbursed. A proper audit took place for the reimbursements,” he said. He asked the US to hold accountable those who failed in Afghanistan.

He also said that only Afghanistan’s neighbours can find a peaceful solution for regional peace and security.

Asked as to what would be Islamabad’s response if the US carried out drone strikes in Pakistan’s settled areas, he said: “The country will defend its sovereignty”.

He said the foreign policy direction is dictated only by the national interest.

A senior military official when contacted said it was time for a united front and single national narrative. He recalled that the ISPR chief in his presser on Dec 28 had said, “we are receiving threats but once it comes to Pakistan we all are one. No more do more for anyone. We fought two imposed wars”.

The ISPR spokesperson had clarified that the Coalition Support Fund, received from the US, is reimbursement of money spent for operations in support of the coalition for regional peace. “Had we not supported, Al Qaeda would not have been defeated,” he had stated.

Another source said the federal cabinet will hold an emergent meeting today (Tuesday) to ponder over the situation arising out of the harsh remarks. A national response is expected after the cabinet meeting to be chaired by Prime Minister Shahid Khaqan Abbasi.

Appendix: 8.3

Trump’s salvo indicates upcoming harder line: US expert

The News, January 02, 2018

ISLAMABAD: In his shocking first tweet of the New Year, President Trump has hinted at US administration’s hard line against Pakistan in near future but experts have warned that it would be too early to call it a policy announcement on complete aid cutoff. “I would urge caution — we shouldn't assume this tweet is announcing an aid cutoff. We're dealing with a very unpredictable president known to issue statements and tweets that are later
contradicted,” said Michal Kugelman, Senior South Asia Associate at the US think tank The Wilson Center.

However, the president’s tweet early Monday morning does indicate “upcoming harder line”, he added. “What's most striking to me about the tweet is its timing — his very first tweet of 2018. It suggests to me that Pakistan, which typically doesn't consume much of his policy attention, is very much on his mind. This may mean he's previewing a new aid cutoff policy, or maybe he just happened to recently read an article on Pakistan that's lingered in his mind,” Kugelman added.

He was referring to a New York Times story published last week which claimed that the Trump administration was strongly considering whether to withhold $255 million in aid that it had delayed sending to Islamabad in August 2017. This amount known as Foreign Military Financing was withheld pending "Pakistani action against internal terror networks."

The same story also mentioned that the United States had provided Pakistan more than $33 billion in aid since 2002, a line that echoed in Trump latest tweet. “The US government has after all been strongly considering indefinite aid suspensions for quite some time,” Kugelman, who is an expert on US policy on Afghanistan and Pakistan, added.

In the past, he had also predicted an expansion of US drone strikes inside Pakistan’s settled areas or withdrawal of Pakistan’s status as a major non-Nato ally in case “Islamabad does not meet US demands of action against Haqqani network”.

However, Kugelman warned that Pakistan can also block vital US and NATO supply routes in retaliation for any extreme measure by Washington. “I'm sure many in Pakistan would hope the NATO supply routes would be shut down in the event of an aid cut, but I think such a response would be likelier if the US took harsher measures such as expanding drone strikes, revoking Pakistan's non-Nato status, or similar measures,” he said. Pakistan's response to an aid cut, he said, would likely be rhetorical, though it may well consider some measures that could undercut US interests in the region.
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US assistance no more needed, says Miftah

The News, January 02, 2018
ISLAMABAD: There is no truth at all in President Trump’s claim that the US provided $33 billion aid to Pakistan in the last 15 years, Dr Miftah Ismail, Adviser to PM on Finance, Revenue and Economic Affairs, told The News.

“President Trump often says things which turn out to be false,” argues the adviser while responding to his Monday morning tweet. Miftah said after 9/11, Pakistan emerged as the frontline state against terrorism to ensure global peace and faced a colossal damage of over $100 billion to its economy other than the loss of over 50,000 precious lives of troops, policemen and officials of other security agencies and civilians.

About the impact of US threat, Miftah said Pakistan’s economic health was safe and bright on account of CPEC related activities. He said Islamabad no more sought the US financial assistance and there was no truth in President Trump’s claim of giving Pakistan $33 billion aid in the last 15 years.

He said out of $33 billion as claimed by Trump, more than half of the amount was related to the Coalition Support Program (CSP) and Pakistan got re-imbursement of $14 billion against the expenses of $21 billion incurred on the war, meaning that Washington owed $7 billion more to Pakistan. “In addition, Pakistan has provided many services to the US including Pakistan’s military bases, related infrastructure and roads for supply of ammunition and food for Nato forces,” he said.

“Our forces have flushed terrorists out of Pakistan and but the US has failed to give tough time to the Taliban in Afghanistan. The US top man is now trying to shift responsibility to Pakistan for its failure in Afghanistan. And more importantly to mention that there are no safe havens of terrorists in Pakistan.”

He said the government was pooling finances from indigenous resources for Zarb-e-Azb and Raddul Fassad operations and vowed that Pakistan will continue the war against terrorists at all costs.
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*Pakistan Dismisses Trump’s Tweet on Aid as ‘Incomprehensible’*

By Salman Masood, Gardiner Harris

New York Times, Jan. 2, 2018
ISLAMABAD, Pakistan — Pakistan has dismissed as “incomprehensible” and of “no importance” a tweet by President Trump saying that it had accepted billions of dollars in aid from the United States while failing to act against terrorist networks.

Mr. Trump, in a tweet on Monday, accused Pakistan of deceit and lies and said that Pakistan gives “safe haven to terrorists we hunt in Afghanistan, with little help.”

“No more,” Mr. Trump warned.

Later that day, Pakistan’s foreign affairs minister, Khawaja Muhammad Asif, dismissed Mr. Trump’s Twitter outburst as having “no importance.”

David Hale, the American ambassador, was summoned late Monday to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Islamabad, the capital, and a diplomatic protest was lodged, Pakistani officials said.

Coverage of Mr. Trump’s comments has dominated the Pakistani news media, and an emergency session of the country’s National Security Council was held Tuesday evening to allow top civilian and military leaders to prepare a response.

While describing Mr. Trump’s remarks as “completely incomprehensible,” a statement after the meeting was temperate. It concluded that, “despite all unwarranted allegations, Pakistan cannot act in haste and will remain committed to playing a constructive role towards an Afghan-led and Afghan-owned peace process.”

Mr. Trump’s post and Pakistan’s response point to a nose-dive in the relationship between the United States and Pakistan, which has become deeply strained in recent months.

In several recent high-profile visits, United States officials have repeatedly expressed frustration over Pakistan’s failure to confront terrorist networks within its borders. But Pakistani officials say they have done more than enough.

Privately, Pakistani officials say that the United States has failed in Afghanistan and is looking to blame Pakistan for that failure. Pakistani officials continue to deny that militants, especially those with the Haqqani network, which is allied with the Afghan Taliban and is responsible for many lethal attacks inside Afghanistan, have havens inside Pakistan.
During a news conference last week, Maj. Gen. Asif Ghafoor, the spokesman for Pakistan’s military, warned the United States against taking any unilateral antiterrorism action on Pakistani soil.

Pakistan’s military says it is working to build a fence along the Afghan border to curb infiltration. Officials also say that the estimated 2.7 million Afghan refugees living in Pakistan need to be repatriated because their presence in the country complicates action against Taliban militants. Pakistani officials say fighters from the Taliban and other groups are able to hide in settlement camps by mingling with refugees.

Pakistani officials also insist that Mr. Trump has his figures wrong, taking aim at his claim that the United States had “foolishly” given it $33 billion since 2002.

“About $14 billion of that $33 billion was part of coalition support fund, which was compensation for services rendered,” said Miftah Ismail, an adviser to the prime minister on finance, revenue and economic affairs, in an interview. “Our billings were for $22 billion and we got only $14 billion. So we think the U.S. owes us $8 billion.”

The United States has been withholding $255 million in military aid in hopes of pushing Pakistan to change its behaviour. The money was authorized in 2016 and put in escrow in August. In recent days, Trump administration officials have debated whether to announce that Pakistan would not receive the money at all.

Mr. Ismail said the $255 million was a tiny fraction of Pakistan’s gross domestic product. “So, not a great deal of money.”

Pakistani leadership was also comforted by a strong expression of support from China.

Geng Shuang, the spokesman of China’s Foreign Ministry, said during a news conference on Tuesday said that “Pakistan has made great efforts and sacrifices for combating terrorism and made prominent contributions to the cause of international counterterrorism, and the international community should fully recognize this.”

While there was characteristic chest thumping on television talk shows, with guests lampooning the United States threats, some critics said there was indeed a need for greater introspection in Pakistan.
“There is a need to fill the gaps in our policy,” Muhammad Nawaz Chaudhry, a former Pakistani ambassador, said in an interview. “We cannot take the bilateral relationship to a dead end.”

“We are living in denial,” he added. “The world, especially the United States, is not accepting our narrative.”

As an example, Mr. Chaudhry pointed to Hafiz Muhammad Saeed, the founding leader of Lashkar-e-Taiba, the militant group behind the 2008 attacks in Mumbai, India, who has continued to live openly in Pakistan despite long being one of the most-wanted militant leaders in the region, with a huge American bounty on his head.

After Mr. Trump’s tweet on Monday, a charity run by Mr. Saeed, Jamaat-ud-Dawa, was prohibited from collecting donations, according to a government order. But Mr. Chaudhry said that the order was just playing to the gallery. “Rather than becoming belligerent,” he said, “we need to be realistic and go with the world opinion.”
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Pakistan, the Endlessly Troublesome Ally

By The Editorial Board

New York Times, January 05, 2018

Pakistan has long posed a dilemma for the United States — should America provide it with aid and treat it as an ally because of its potential to help fight regional extremists, or should ties and funding be restricted, or even severed, because of its connections to those groups?

The Trump administration’s announcement on Thursday that it would freeze nearly all military aid to Pakistan, roughly $1.3 billion annually, is the latest of several times in the last 16 years that funding has been withheld or modified out of American frustration with Pakistan’s support for certain terrorist groups. But President Trump’s bombast and the precipitous way the decision seems to have been made have led to doubts that Mr. Trump has a serious plan for managing the ramifications of this move.

Almost every military flight into Afghanistan goes through Pakistani airspace. Most supplies travel along Pakistani roads and rails. Pakistan could shut down American access at any moment, and some Pakistani officials are threatening to do just that. Pakistan could also ally
more closely with China, which is already investing in major new infrastructure projects and expanding its international leadership at America’s expense, and be more hard-line in its rivalry with India. Indeed, China could once again be the beneficiary of a Trump decision estranging the United States from long time partners.

The president is good at venting grievances, as he demonstrated in his New Year’s Day tweet on the situation: “The United States has foolishly given Pakistan more than 33 billion dollars in aid over the last 15 years,” he wrote, “and they have given us nothing but lies & deceit, thinking of our leaders as fools. They give safe haven to the terrorists we hunt in Afghanistan, with little help. No more!” But while, to some extent, Mr. Trump has a real point, he has given no assurance that he would not make matters worse.

Americans last cut off assistance to Pakistan in the 1990s after Pakistan tested a nuclear weapon and underwent a military coup, creating distrust between the two countries that has never dissipated. But after Sept. 11, 2001, the relationship was transformed overnight. The United States demanded that Pakistan choose sides in the fight against Al Qaeda and the Taliban in Afghanistan, as well as their extremist allies who sought safe haven along Pakistan’s lawless border. Pakistan acceded, and it was given major new aid in return.

Since then, Pakistan has played a double game, accepting American funding while backing militants who protect Pakistani interests in Afghanistan and Kashmir. In 2014, Pakistan’s army finally mounted a serious military campaign against the Pakistani Taliban, which threatens the Pakistani state, and suffered many casualties. But its security services continue to support the Haqqani network, a Taliban faction that has killed American forces in Afghanistan and is behind many of the large-scale attacks on Afghan cities.

There are other perfidies. Pakistan’s security services support the Lashkar-e-Taiba, an extremist group that targets India and Kashmir. They failed to uncover or apprehend Osama bin Laden, who was killed by American special forces in a stunning raid on a compound near Pakistan’s major military barracks in Abbottabad.

In November, a Pakistani court ordered the release of Hafiz Muhammad Saeed, founder of the Islamist militant group behind the deadly 2008 Mumbai attacks in India, 10 months after the government placed him under house arrest. And after Pakistani forces this fall freed a Canadian-American family captured by the Taliban-linked Haqqani network, the government refused the Americans access to one of the abductors.
Meanwhile, Pakistan’s willingness to give refuge to the Haqqanis and their allies is a major reason the war against the Taliban in Afghanistan, where Mr. Trump recently agreed to increase American troop levels, still drags on after 17 years. The Islamic State’s expansion in Afghanistan has complicated the battlefield even more.

Mr. Trump is not the first to call a spade a spade. In 2011, Adm. Mike Mullen, former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, told a Senate committee that the Haqqani network was a “veritable arm” of the Pakistani security service. “Extremist organizations serving as proxies of the government of Pakistan are attacking Afghan troops and civilians as well as U.S. soldiers,” he said.

But President Trump cannot afford to walk away from Pakistan, which has often provided vital intelligence and has the world’s fastest-growing nuclear arsenal. Whether Pakistan will cooperate after the aid freeze remains to be seen. Initially, some Pakistani officials reacted harshly to the announcement, which came as a surprise, but on Friday, a Foreign Ministry statement talked about the need for mutual respect and patience as the two countries address common threats.

Mr. Trump could marshal other diplomatic tools, to see if more constructive cooperation with Pakistan is possible. One idea would be to harness his new friendships with the leaders of Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates to shut down Haqqani and other Taliban fund-raising efforts in the Persian Gulf.

This would, of course, require quiet negotiations, not shouting.
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‘No more!’ Trump tweets to Pakistan, accusing it of ‘lies & deceit’

By Shaiq Hussain and Annie Gowen
Pakistan's defense minister responded angrily Monday to an early-morning tweet by President Trump that accused America's once-close ally of "lies & deceit," countering that the United States had given Pakistan "invective & mistrust" in return. ISLAMABAD —

In his first tweet of the new year, Trump had said the United States had "foolishly" given Pakistan $33 billion in aid over the last 15 years, "and they have given us nothing but lies & deceit, thinking of our leaders as fools."

Trump wrote further: "They give safe haven to the terrorists we hunt in Afghanistan, with little help. No more!"

Defense Minister Khurram Dastgir-Khan hit back on Twitter, writing that Pakistan, as an "anti-terror ally" of the United States, had given Washington land and air communication, military bases and intelligence cooperation that "decimated Al-Qaeda over last 16yrs" while America "has given us nothing but invective & mistrust."

Officials in the country's capital scrambled to arrange a cabinet meeting to be held Tuesday to adopt a response to the Twitter attack, while Foreign Minister Khawaja Muhammad Asif said in an interview on Geo Television that the country is ready to publicly provide an accounting of "every detail" of U.S. aid it has received.

Pakistan was already doing all it could to combat terrorism within its borders, he said.

"We have already told the U.S. that we will not do more, so Trump's 'no more' does not hold any importance," Asif said.

Late Monday afternoon, White House spokesman Raj Shah said the White House does not plan to spend $255 million in fiscal 2016 military aid to Pakistan already appropriated by Congress. That decision was first reported by CNN. The payment has been on hold since August, out of the Trump administration's insistence that Pakistan do more to crack down on extremists who threaten Afghanistan.

The tense exchanges followed days of speculation that the Trump administration — dissatisfied with the way Pakistan has dealt with the Taliban-affiliated Haqqani network and other terrorist groups — was set to dramatically reduce aid to the South Asian nation, long a key partner in the region.
"We shouldn't overstate the policy significance of this tweet," said Michael Kugelman, deputy director of the Asia Program at the Woodrow Wilson Center in Washington. "It's more likely to be an expression of frustration or a statement of intent rather than an actual declaration of a new policy."

According to a November report from the Congressional Research Service, the United States has appropriated $34 billion in direct aid and military reimbursements for Pakistan since 2002, with proposed security and economic assistance at $345 million for this fiscal year. That number is a significant decrease from the $526 million allotted in fiscal 2017.

In India, news of Trump's tweet was met with celebration in some quarters, a healthy dose of skepticism in others. Analysts pointed out that in October Trump had tweeted that the administration was "starting to develop a much better relationship with Pakistan and its leaders."

This worried Indian officials who had hoped Trump would be taking a stronger stance on Pakistan.

The goodwill appears to have flagged for a variety of reasons; administration officials, for example, were reportedly not happy that Pakistan freed Hafiz Mohammad Saeed from house arrest in November. The Islamist cleric — who led the militant group that carried out the terrorist attacks on Mumbai in 2008, which left more than 160 civilians dead — had been arrested last January.

Last month, during a visit to Afghanistan, Vice President Pence had issued a warning to the country; saying Trump had "put Pakistan on notice" that it has provided a "safe haven" for terrorist groups. "Those days are over," Pence said.
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Pakistan strikes back at Trump’s tweet: ‘Unwarranted’ and ‘completely incomprehensible’

By Shaiq Hussain and Annie Gowen
ISLAMABAD: Pakistani officials struck back Tuesday at President Trump and his controversial tweet attacking their country, saying it was "completely incomprehensible" and "contradicted the facts."

In a tweet early Monday, his first of the year, Trump accused Pakistan of "lies & deceit" and lamented that more than $33 billion in security and economic aid had been "foolishly given" by the United States to Pakistan since 2002.

"They give safe haven to the terrorists we hunt in Afghanistan, with little help," the president wrote. "No more!"

Pakistani leaders, including Prime Minister Shahid Khaqan Abbasi, issued a statement Tuesday that expressed "deep disappointment" in the turn of events, coming at a time when they felt the relationship with the new administration had been on a positive trajectory.

They said that "recent statements and articulation by the American leadership were completely incomprehensible as they contradicted facts manifestly, struck with great insensitivity at the trust between two nations built over generations, and negated the decades of sacrifices made by the Pakistani nation."

Pakistan, the leaders said, would not respond impulsively.

"Despite the unwarranted allegations, Pakistan cannot act in haste," their statement read.

Pakistan has consistently denied that it shelters terrorists from the Taliban-affiliated Haqqani network and others, a position at odds with security assessments. Pakistani leaders say they are being made a scapegoat for U.S. failures in the region.

Officials and analysts in Islamabad said the tweet marks a low point for U.S.-Pakistan relations in recent years.

"The problem is that President Trump tweets every morning as if it's a constitutional necessity," said Khurshid Mahmud Kasuri, Pakistan's former foreign minister. "This is no way to conduct diplomacy."
Critics also charge that Trump did not take into account scores of al-Qaeda and terrorist operatives arrested in Pakistan over the years or the military's risky clearance operations in its northwestern regions.

"It seems this relationship is headed to the point of no return where both countries could opt for different paths," said Amjad Shoaib, a defense analyst and retired Pakistani lieutenant general. "American leaders are not acknowledging Pakistan's sacrifices, and their language is very insulting and shameful."

"Trump says we have done nothing," Shoaib continued. "It's disgusting."

As a reminder of the stakes at hand, a spokesman for China's Foreign Ministry, Geng Shuang, spoke in support of Pakistan in Beijing on Tuesday, saying it has made "tremendous efforts in combating terrorism. . . . The international community should fully acknowledge that."

As U.S. aid to Pakistan has steadily declined in recent years, China has moved forward with a $62 billion infrastructure development project in the region, the China-Pakistan Economic Corridor.

U.S. military and economic aid slated for Pakistan has shrunk to around $345 million this fiscal year, according to the Congressional Research Service. However, U.S. officials decided to place $255 million in aid to Pakistan on hold in August and announced they were going to continue the hold Monday.

Trump's tweet should not have come as a surprise, according to Husain Haqqani, a Pakistani former ambassador to the United States and an analyst with the Hudson Institute.

The Trump administration had been signaling for months that it intended to take a harder line than previous administrations with Pakistan, Haqqani said, with the military convinced its fight in Afghanistan would be easier without Pakistan's tacit support of neighboring terrorist groups.

"What's important is that this is the first time that the president of the United States has directly said what some in the foreign policy and national security community have said for some time," Haqqani said. "The bottom line is that the U.S. is completely frustrated by Pakistan."
Trump called for Pakistan to commit to peace in August, speaking of the "billions and billions" of dollars the United States is paying the country at the same time it is housing terrorists. "This will have to change," Trump said.

Later, Defense Secretary Jim Mattis appeared before Congress and spoke of a willingness to try "one more time" to work with Pakistan. But he may have been disappointed at a meeting with Pakistan's generals in Islamabad last month, Haqqani theorized.

"Mattis did not get the kind of response he was expecting," Haqqani said. "He was expecting to talk to Pakistan general to general, but the Pakistanis kept saying what they've always said — denials."

Trumps' words must now be backed up with consequences, Haqqani said, otherwise they risk being interpreted as little more than hollow warnings.