

## **Kargil War, the Most Dangerous Conflict among Many Indo Pak Conflicts after Nuclear Tests 1998: A Study of Daily Dawn and Jang Editorials[ 1<sup>st</sup> May 1999 to 31<sup>st</sup> July 1999]**

Syed Shujat Hussain\*

### **ABSTRACT**

*This study is going to analyze the Editorials treatment of Daily Dawn and Daily Jang on Kargil war which broke out right after nuclear tests 1998. Kargil war carried enormous importance because it was considered as the core reason for erupting prospective first nuclear war between two neighboring countries India and Pakistan. This study will carry content analysis of editorial from Daily Dawn and Daily Jang, reason is to know the portrayal of the Kargil situation by both leading newspapers editorials. This study will be conducted to discover whether the dawn and Jang worked upon the conflict resolution when the war was gradually becoming more critical and challenging for the region's security and stability.*

*Media is assumed as an influential and vocal interpreter of events and happenings, its ultimate duty is to report the real scenario of an incident and attempt to resolve the prevailing conflict. When it comes to state's security and national interest then there will be a chance that Print Media would support national or governmental stance and policies but most of the time, it is assumed and acted as the most neutral and unbiased reporter of the situation. By utilizing the editorials of Dawn and Jang, this study will find out the Editorial pattern of both the newspapers regarding conflict resolution in Kargil war. This study will examine whether these newspapers Editorials possess conflict resolution approach, or aggravate the conflict in highly critical situation of Kargil war especially post nuclear tests scenario.*

**Keywords:** Kargil War, media, conflict, Indo Pak, Nuclear tests

### **Introduction:**

Media is supposed to be the pillar of a state which works to stabilize country's stance in front of global community and safeguard national interest at their level of expertise. Now days, media has taken the place of most independent technique of opinion dissemination and real coverage of events. When it comes to India Pakistan relations and uncountable conflicts, influence of print media is extensive. Kargil war was a historic instance when the world seen enormous power of media that was equally capable of molding people's as well as officials' opinion and their mindset.

Role of print media in a conflict depends upon various factors as Andrew Puddephatt mentioned in his book "Conflict and the Role of Media" Which role the media takes in a given conflict, and in the phases before and after, depends on a complex set of factors, including the relationship the media has to actors in the conflict and the independence the media has to the power holders in society."(1) In case of India and Pakistan leading newspapers reporting during Kargil War, it was quite evident that the most independent and neutral approach holder newspapers

---

\* Research Scholar, Dept. of Mass Communication, University of Karachi  
Email: shujaathussain275@gmail.com Date of Receipt:31-5-2016

took the position and supported the hostilities to grow. The reason can be easily interpreted in the light of above mentioned quote that in Indo Pak relations, there are various factors that play important role in shaping the nature of procedures and methods of print media to execute their working and achieving their goals.

This study tries to discover the print media treatment of Kargil war right after nuclear tests 1998, in print media two leading newspapers of Pakistan Daily Dawn and Daily Jang have been taken to analyze the content they published in the form of editorials as editorials are supposed to be the representation of newspaper's official policy. By content analysis of Dawn and Jang editorials during the time of Kargil war and furious nuclear war circumstances, it is an attempt to explore whether they both work for the resolution of that conflict or to lower down the tension that was elevating when the war aggravated.

When this whole issue of Kargil war seen in the context of South Asian region, the most significant factors are peace and stability in South Asia along with the implications on international scenario, as it was the crucial and deadliest instance of the history because of the fear of nuclear warfare between India and Pakistan as Mr. Kasuri said; "This fighting took place in the backdrop of a recently nuclearised South Asia."(2) and at that time, media especially press of both sides are working with full swing. It was the first ever "Live" war that given huge detailed coverage and this conflict soon turned into news propaganda war with claims and counter claims. It was not a conventional war but in the words of Musharraf "it was a tactical warfare"(3), the war was limited to a certain territory but when the war was escalated the risk of nuclear confrontation was increasing. Media on both sides of the border highly activated and vocal about the issue except a few newspapers, most of the print media tried to win the propaganda war through using bitter and hostile language. As Mr. Khurshid Mehmud Kasuri said in his book "Neither a Hawk, Nor a Dove", "As early as 18<sup>th</sup> century, Napoleon understood the importance of the news and media when he said, 'four hostile newspapers are more to be feared than a thousand bayonets.'"(4)

### **Rationale of the Study:**

Kargil war possessed an important role in the history of India Pakistan rivalry, this issue was the result of unsettled border disputes and border demarcation. Many conflicts evolved between these two neighboring countries were purely because of controversial border problems like Kashmir, Siachin, sir creek northern areas and marine water disputes. It was started when Indian army got to know that the hills vacated during the winter season captured by highly armed group later they were identified as Kashmiri Mujahideen backed up by Pakistan army. In May 1999, world came to know about this issue and then an infinite chain of event happening started. Indian media was more vocal and loud regarding disseminating its governmental stance and they showed that India have already won the war but Pakistani media was weak, ineffective and cautious because the news came from military sources and with their approval, media just forwarded them. M. Siddique

Al Farooque mentioned, “scarcely had the ink of the Lahore Declaration (signed between Pakistani Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif and the then Indian Prime Minister Atal Bihari Vajpayee on 21<sup>st</sup> February 1999) dried off when Pervaiz Musharraf launched the Kargil operation on May 8, 1999(5).

Reason behind conducting this study is to examine and analyze content of Dawn and Jang editorials, this activity will help to know the role of print media in de-escalation of deadly conflict and figure out the attempts made by these newspapers for resolving the conflict as media is the important source of information and their portrayal of an event helps people to analyze the issue after media analysis. Rationale behind taking editorials for this analytical study is that editorials are supposed to be the institutional opinion of newspapers as Van Dijk said: “The main function of editorial is the expression and persuasive communication of opinion.”(6) According to Dijk, editorial formation has three staged strategy, first is to define the situation and provide a brief account regarding the news event, secondly, evaluate the related actors and their action in the situation and thirdly, draw a pragmatic conclusion in the form of recommendations, expectations and warning. This study endeavors to know whether Dawn and Jang’s editorials support government policy or manage to give its own independent stance over the issue. Another important aim of this study is to explore the fact that how far these newspapers editorials work for the betterment of the situation or resolution of the conflict.

### **History of Daily Dawn and Daily Jang:**

#### **The Daily Dawn**

The daily Dawn is among the three largest English language newspaper and considered as the most authentic, neutral and elite newspaper, it was established by Quaid-e-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah on 26 October 1941 in Delhi, initially it was a weekly publication and for the purpose to support Indian Muslim’s right of independence and dissemination of All India Muslim League policies and agenda. It has 109,000 weekday circulation across the country. It publishes syndicated articles from renowned western newspapers The Guardian, The Independence, Los Angeles Times and The Washington Posts. Dawn group of Newspaper publishes some other daily and weekly like The Star, The Herald, Aurora and Spider Magazine. It carries influence over the elite, government and decision maker class of Pakistan.

#### **The Daily Jang**

The daily Jang is the oldest and published under the largest group of newspapers, it is the most popular Urdu language daily in Pakistan and considered as the newspaper of masses but it has dominant influence over policy makers of the state. It was founded by Mir Khalil ur Rehman on 1939 in Delhi and this newspaper is considered as the most oldest newspaper of the country. Jang group publications are comprised of The News, Daily Awam, weekly Urdu magazine Akhbar-e-Jahan, English magazine MAG and Daily Waqt published from Lahore. It has a huge circulation around 800,000 copies daily.

### **Research Questions:**

For attaining the better results, it is necessary to set some research questions and then try to explore their logical answers with argument and evidence. To know the mode of Kargil war treatment in the editorials of Daily Dawn and Times of India, there are some research question that help to know the nature of event portrayal.

1. How did Dawn portray the Kargil conflict through its editorials?
2. How did Jang portray the same conflict through its editorials?
3. Did the editorials of Dawn and Jang put special attention towards the resolution of Kargil conflict?

### **PROBING QUESTIONS FOR DETERMINING THE EDITORIAL PORTRAYAL OF KARGIL WAR AND ITS RESOLUTION**

1. What kind of information, the editorial is giving either it is informative, interpretive, criticizing, condemning, appreciating, giving tribute or satirical or giving resolution?
2. Is the editorial granting any real/ historical data?
3. Is it negatively semantic if yes then mention the phrase?
4. Is there any historical inaccuracy found in the editorial?
5. Is there any factual mistake found in the editorial?
6. How an editorial can be classified thematically either it discusses United Nations participation in the Indo Pak conflict, or World's influential states (Super Power) or related non state actors like Kashmiri freedom fighters, Hurriyat Conference, associated armed groups like Lashkar-e-Taiba, Jaish-e-Muhammad and Jamaat-ud-Dawat.

### **Background of the Study:**

When the region of sub continent divided into two states named India and Pakistan, colonial legacies were started at the very instance, British left the region but they also left various issues unresolved and unsettled as they wanted these states to be hostile and enemy of each other. Many border issues were evolved after independence like demarcation of northern areas, Siachin, Ladakh, marine water issues and Kashmir, Kashmir is a main matter from which, Kargil issue emerged and a limited war was fought between India and Pakistan. Alastair Lamb mentioned this thing in these words, "when the revised Mountbatten plan was announced in early June 1947, no formal mechanism existed for the accession by the rulers of the princely states to either Dominion should the rulers so wish."(7)

Kashmir is the main matter of conflict between India and Pakistan and its reason is deep rooted in the history of partition. This legacy started when Indian princely states were given the right to get annexed with any state (India and Pakistan) but the problem is, some states had Muslim majority with Hindu ruler and some states had Hindu majority but the ruler was Muslim. Kashmir was a Muslim majority state ruled by a Hindu raja and he conspired with Indian government and gets annexed with India against the will of Kashmiri people. Afterward

Kashmir issue arose and Pakistan fought a war with India, after the war Kashmir was divided into two parts Jammu and Kashmir (disputed area on Indian side) and Azad Kashmir (Pakistan side). Establishment of LoC and these two parts of Kashmir were according to the UN resolution which also called Indian government for a referendum in its part to know the people's will and future of Kashmir but India didn't act upon UN resolution and that's why this problem still persists. This fact was elaborated in Mr. Abdul Sattar's (former foreign minister of Pakistan) book "Pakistan Foreign Policy 1947-2012" he said, "Neither Pakistan nor Pakistan took any initiative, however, towards implementation of the commitment in the Shimla Agreement to discuss 'a final settlement of Jammu and Kashmir.'"(8)

After Lahore Declaration, Kashmir issue was gone in background and it was the need of time to reawake the issue again and Kargil war is the part of the plan. Kashmir problem was never resolved on the table of negotiation and peace talks therefore, military establishment tried to resolve the conflict through military strategy and power but they totally forgot the history that when India tried to gain its territorial interests through power, it always became victorious but whenever Pakistan followed the same path, it faced humiliation and failure as well as embarrassment on global diplomatic front as Pakistan has never possessed the strong diplomatic, political and economic influence like India.

Musharraf mentioned in his book that India was continuously violating LoC and moving towards Pakistan side, he said, "Our sources of information were very reliable. India had been creeping forward across the LOC even after the Simla Agreement which was reached between India and Pakistan after the war of 1971 and define the line of control. India had tested us at Chorbat La, Qamar sector and Siachin in Northern areas. Finally frequent visits of the Indian defense minister, George Fernandez to the Siachin and Kargil area during the summer and autumn of 1998 suggested that India was in a way to a new military venture against us."(9) Pakistan army was continuously observing the situation and aware of India's false reporting about Pakistan attacking on Siachin then Musharraf as the chief of army staff called FCNA commander to know the real situation. He told that no official incursion is underway and it was only a mere Indian propaganda but on the other side, in late October and early November 1998, at least five Indian assumed attacks were reported(10). Indian intentions were not positive at that time and it only needed chaotic and war like situation.

### **Geo- Political background of Kargil:**

Mr. Hussain said(11) that Kargil was a part of Baltistan district of Ladakh before the independence of India and Pakistan, the region of Ladakh possessed multiple linguistic, ethnic and religious communities. District of Baltistan was divided after first Kashmir war through LoC and Kargil was gone to Indian side. Importance of LoC is just undeniable because according to Simla agreement both countries agreed that won't engage in any military or armed conflict with respect

to LoC(12). Kargil war was fought in an area where the climate is extremely intense, Kargil district is located 205 km from Srinagar where summers are usually cool and in winter, temperature is used to be minus 48.

Indian army posts were on the ridges and war was fought in the area of Drass where 160 km long series of ridges were situated. This area faces extreme weather in winter as it is assumed as the coolest place in the world but also considered as the most difficult battle field and for military operations. In Kargil, a limited war was fought and the only aim was to vacate peaks with the height from 13000 feet to 18000 feet(13). India was at highest level of vulnerability by waging this limited war because military activities were very difficult and expensive from Dras to Batalik where this limited war was fighting. With extreme weather and challenging position, Indian army was not able to retrieve its posts which were vacated in extreme winter season and in spring they always returned back as it was a silent agreement between Indian and Pakistan army. Mr. Musharraf said, “as a normal practice, Indian used to move two reserved brigades from the Leh area each winter to Srinagar valley.”(14)

#### **Kargil Conflict and its initiation:**

Kargil war was actually initiated when Indian forces got to know about the infiltration into the area along the LoC in early May 1999 and later it was discovered that infiltrators were Pakistan army and their assisted Mujahideen, this fact was mentioned by Malik in his book, “In early May 1999, Indian army got information that some intruders occupied the peaks near Darass by local shepherd(15). Army tried to examine the real ground situation by sending a group of soldiers for investigation but they shot down, initially they thought that these intruders are Kashmiri Mujahideen but after close investigation and observation of tactics and techniques used by these infiltrators from the height of the hills, they had to believe that the plan was on a broader scale.

When Indian army and political leadership realized the intensity of situation, Indian government started to plan out military option for countering the attacks. It launched Operation Vijay and 200,000 Indian troops mobilized along with twenty gthe limits of war and engaged air force into the battle but this move didn't prove successful as Pakistan shot down two MIGs on 28 May(16). There are various reasons of Indian weak position like extreme rough terrain, high altitude and weather but the most damaging fact for Indian army was, heights were captured by the militants and it was so easy for them to target Indian positions.

Although India and Pakistan both possessed nuclear capability at that time but this war remained a conventional limited warfare, international community was quite scared of this nuclear powers confrontation and tried hard to make combating partners agree on negotiation. Nuclear deterrence was seen in this scenario with its full impact and they both couldn't change the nature of war from

conventional to nuclear battle. Kargil war with its conventional nature brought enormous loss to India because tough terrain of the area made it difficult to deploy heavy machinery and ammunition, they ultimately used helicopter and the militants easily targeted them from the heights. In June, a major development was happened from Indian side by deploying Bofer guns into Drass district and this move brought advantage for Indian army as they recaptured a post On 13<sup>th</sup> June and tiger hills on 30<sup>th</sup> June(17).

### **Pakistan Government and Army leadership in Kargil war:**

An important fact regarding Kargil war was that civilian government was not sufficiently aware of this military operation. This story starts in mid November 1998 when a meeting was held by Lt. Gen. Mahmud as he wanted to meet Chief of Army Staff Gen. Musharraf and Chief of General Staff Lt. Gen. Aziz. When this meeting was arranged, General Officer Commanding (GOC), frontier Constabulary of the Northern Areas (FCNA) and Major General Javed Hassan was also present there and they all wanted to launched an anti-India military operation which had been planned out(18). The plan was about capturing Darass-Kargil highest hills which always vacated by Indian army in winter, it was a highly secret plan and its information and details was only limited to very few people. It is very important to know the character and role of these people and their influence over the war and its execution. The most important person and decision maker was Gen. Pervaiz Musharraf.

General Pervaiz Musharraf: According to Kiani, Musharraf followed “Need to Know” notion throughout the Kargil operation and only informed and ordered those people who were needed to act upon the orders(19). Musharraf conducted the whole operation in highest level of secrecy as he said, “The operation had to be taken by limited forces, and security was crucial. Any leakage of information would have set off a race to the watershed, as had happened at Siachin. The terrain and resources were to India’s advantage, for such a race. Our information therefore was shared on a “need to know basis.”(20)

Prime Minister was also informed about the operation in December 1998 but not completely brief about the pros and cons of this military venture. The reason and justification of this operation presented that Kashmir issue is need to be revitalized and a drastic shift in status quo is highly needed to highlight Kashmir issue. By capturing Indian posts vacated in winter season, they will be punished for Siachin incursion also. This action was approved by PM Nawaz Sharif without realizing the after effects and international reaction as both states were newly nuclear states.

The most distressing fact regarding Kargil war and its initiation was both political and military leadership was not clear and certain about the aftermaths and consequences of war. It was a very damaging instance for the people of India and Pakistan that nobody didn’t care about the repercussions and vulnerability

associated with this terrifying war. Pakistan initially stated that peaks were captured by Mujahideen and there is no role of Pakistan army in it but afterward Pakistan accepted the role of its soldiers who infiltrated into the Indian side of LoC.

Kargil war was a wrong and miscalculated event in the history of Pakistan because its prospects were not completely calculated by the army as well as government. It was a secret plan but its motives and results were kept hidden even from the army, this move was rejected by former Benazir government only because of its highly damaging effects on nation and state's foreign affairs and Nawaz regime had to face same detrimental effects and enormous pressure from international community. It was a step that must not have been taken by the military and political leadership of that time as it lacked long term planning. Operation Gibraltar is the biggest example of miscalculated planning like Kargil, it also disturbed the relations of India Pakistan on a large scale although it was completely supported by the government if that time. There are many similarities in Kargil and Gibraltar operation like infiltration of Pakistani soldiers in disguise of Kashmiri civilians into the Indian held Kashmir and cut their military supply. Another objective was to provoke local Kashmiris for rebellion but the plan was a total failure and India soon got the information of this plan and as a result it triggered attack on Lahore and Sialkot in September 1965.

On 17 May Prime Minister was briefed about Kargil operation in a secret meeting but Nawaz Sharif didn't enquire the plan keenly except asking about Pakistani position whether it is strong or not? But when the world started criticizing the role of political leadership then he pretended that he didn't received complete information about the mode of operation before 17 May(21). According to the information, this operation was explained to the political leadership in a manner that Pakistan army will be coming back with Kashmir in their hands but the reality was quite contrary. Mr. Sartaj Aziz opposed this military move and found it illogical and unnecessary, he said in his book, "Our air force or artillery would not be able to help them because we are treating it as a mujahedeen operation and not a full scale war. How long will their ammunition or other supplies last?"(22)

In Kargil war, there must be some insight analysis of the situation because before the war of 1965, Kargil belonged to Pakistan but after the war, India captured it but it was restored through Tashkent Agreement on 10<sup>th</sup> July 1966 but in 1971, India again occupied it and made it its own possession by force. In 1984, India again violated LoC and waged a war on Siachin and occupied it when Pakistani forces were not so active there. India always done serious violation of Pakistan's territorial integrity and UN resolution (The Story of Kargil, n.d.) like it violated Simla Accord in 1972 when it seized Chorbatla sector and in Qamar areas of Darass sector captured 12 posts in 1988(23). India also sneaked on Siachin and started the world's most expensive war, it was an area which was described by



Gen. Zia that “Siachin! Where not even a blade of grass grew at this location.”(24) This occupation was the absolute violation of Simla Agreement and LoC but international community didn't bother to raise its voice against this offense but when it comes to Kargil issue, the whole world was stood for Indian support.

### **US intervention and Role of Nawaz Sharif:**

The global community was very much happy with the Lahore Declaration as well as the leadership of India and Pakistan, “When Lahore declaration was signed, Nawaz Sharif was seemed so hopeful and deliberate to end fifty years of hostility between India Pakistan(25). When Kargil war happened, position of Nawaz Sharif became so awkward as on one side, he was highly desperate to establish long lasting friendly relations with India but on the other hand, he allowed such a deadly military operation. Actually he was not completely unaware about the Kargil military operation, he was informed and briefed by the army and he was told that after taking this step, Pakistan's position over Kashmir would become stronger and dominating and Pakistan would easily gain enormous benefits on politico diplomatic front. Mr. Kasuri said, “In an interview with Indian magazine, Chaudhary Shujaat Hussain, then interior Minister, recalled attending a meeting before 17 May 1999 where the Prime Minister was briefed about Kargil. According to him, PM Nawaz Sharif wanted to move on both tracks and not so interested in Kargil as much as in getting his name associated with the success in Kashmir.”(26) After Kargil war, Pakistan became too much isolated on political and diplomatic fronts as Mr. Kasuri said in his book, “I feel that Kargil isolated Pakistan and brought international censure upon it as typified by the G-8 statement of June 20, 1999 calling ‘infiltration of armed intruders’ by Pakistan in Kargil as ‘irresponsible’.”(27). For tackling the situation, Nawaz regime had to take some drastic steps because the situation was growing complicated and more difficult for Pakistan because Indian and international pressure was increasing day by day and Nawaz Sharif was feeling distressful and demoralize at that time as Mr. Musharraf mentioned in his book, “Neither side's leadership had an appetite for war, but India worked hard to isolate us diplomatically. International pressure had a demoralizing effect on Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif.”(28) PM Nawaz was also felt stuck into the situation because he was very much worried about the reaction of army and any military coup(29). Mr Shehbaz Sharif met with US officials and became agree to issue an official warning that military coup is not acceptable for US.

The biggest threat from Kargil war for US was nuclear confrontation as both the countries got their nuclear capability before one year of Kargil incident. In case of nuclear clash, world would become more insecure and vulnerable due to immature behavior of India and Pakistan. Kargil issue captivated the attentions of global community very fast just because of the fear of nuclear destruction and proliferation. Mr. Kasuri said in this regard, “The reason that Kargil gained international significance was primarily because both countries had acquired nuclear capabilities. Nuclear weapons played a significant role in this crisis,

largely through threat and bluster, and the latent threat (sometimes made explicit) ensured intense and widespread coverage in the world's press.”(30)

Washington got indulged into the issue and frequently conveyed the message to both the state to stop violating LoC and Pakistan to withdraw its forces immediately. For initial discussion Undersecretary Thomas Pickering and Rick Inderfurth met the ambassadors of both the countries and delivered them the message of their government. Afterward Albright called Pakistan PM and conveyed the same message but it didn't work(31).

India and Pakistan both were in an illusion that US would support them but US saw the situation on its own merit. US didn't support Pakistan against India although they have long time alliance. Pakistan was receiving extreme pressure to stop the war but PM Nawaz was in critical position as on one hand, he couldn't step back because army was not ready and on the other hand international and regional powers were putting pressure to solve the issue. PM Nawaz seek help from Clinton and called him on 2<sup>nd</sup> July for figuring out the acceptable solution for both the parties. Clinton called Vajpayee and asked about his stance over the issue, he was very clear and stern in his stance of Pakistani forces withdrawal and no negotiation until the aggression from Pakistani side continues.

One positive thing that he mentioned was, he still agreed and supported Lahore Declaration or direct peace talks with Pakistan as the solution of Kashmir issue. Finally Nawaz Sharif was agreed upon complete withdrawal of forces from Kargil sector and signed Washington Accord on 4<sup>th</sup> July 1999. Gen. Musharraf was not agreed with this decision and this decision created serious rifts between both of them, “A military victory was converted into a political defeat.”(32)

### **Literature Review:**

On Kargil issue, there is enormous amount of literature created and still coming out as Kashmir issue is still alive and main reason of conflict between the states. This war is strange in a way that it was a big surprise for Indian side and they never expected such unusual and unconventional confrontation with Pakistani army and Kashmiri mujahideen. Mr. V.P. Malik said in his book “Kargil”, “The Kargil Review Committee Report stated that our intelligence agencies were weak in both gathering intelligence and assessing the inputs. Overall, the report came to the conclusion that the Pakistani intrusion was a complete surprise to the government of India and its intelligence agencies.”(33) He highlighted the level of shock and surprise of Indian side that they never experienced before especially from Pakistani counterpart.

Sharma (2000) in his work “Dateline Kargil” said that Indian army was not aware of the magnitude of the crisis, he presented the number of casualties and capital loss of government like in Kargil war 524 Indian soldiers were killed, 1,363 wounded and Rs: 1, 984 crore spent over this unconventional high altitude

battlefield. Huge capital was spent for maintaining the survival of troops at those altitudes not only for the period when war was fighting there but it continues round the year.

India tried to win this war on ethical ground because it was a silent agreement between both the countries that both forces will vacant the hills in winter season because of extreme weather on that high altitude and in summer, they will come back to their posts but Indian posts were occupied during winter and Indian forces knew this fact very late. Sharma S. R. (2000) discussed about war ethics and commented on Kargil war between India and Pakistan and defined some theoretical assumptions to conduct the affairs of war. He also highlighted the Indian politic-military domination over Pakistan and discussed the future prospects of politico-military relations between these two states.

Mazari (2003) identified (34) that western audiences considered Kargil Review Committee Report as factual report on Kargil as Pakistan didn't attempt to clarify the world its stance and position over the issue. She also highlighted the danger of ignoring the Kashmir issue by Pakistani government especially after the deadliest instance of Kargil War when the world was highly cautious and scared of nuclear war between the countries. This study revolves around military aspect of Kargil war and its political dimensions. On the other hand, Farooque (2006) discussed (35) Pakistani inquiry committee under the order of Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif to expose the people responsible of Kargil set back but a military coup toppled elected government and saved the real faces behind the defeat.

### **Research Methodology:**

The basic technique of the research that has been chosen is content analysis for this study. Editorials of Daily Jang and Daily Dawn from 1st May 1999 to 31 July 1999 have been taken for the process of content analysis, editorials represent newspaper's official opinion and through content analysis of these editorials of Daily Dawn and Jang, the portrayal of Kargil conflict and war would be evidently seen. As Henry and Tator (2002) said that editorials are supposed to be the influential mean to introduce and disseminate the newspaper own point of view to the world.

### **The Universe:**

This term refers the specification of the body of the content or the demarcation of amount of data to be taken and analyzed. In this study, editorials of two leading newspapers of Daily Dawn[17 Editorials] and Daily Jang [34 Editorials] have been taken as the content for examining published during the time of Kargil war.[1<sup>st</sup> May 1999 to 31<sup>st</sup> July 1999]

### **Sample:**

The editorials from Daily Dawn and Jang during Kargil conflict 1999 are selected as the working samples of the study.

### **Unit of Analysis:**

Editorial of Daily Dawn and Jang newspaper is the unit of analysis.

### **Dawn's Editorial Treatment of Kargil War:**

During the Kargil war, Dawn editorials continuously tried to lower down the anger and intensity of war, every editorial tried to normalize the situation like in an editorial, "It is pity that right at a time when these sub continental neighbors were making a concentrated effort to normalizes their relations, the tensions between the two sides should have boiled over."(36) This statement is clearly transferring the message of regret and sadness as the previous peace and trust building measures taken by both the countries in the form of Lahore Declaration and Bus Service became useless after the start of Kargil war in the region that simply sabotage all the efforts of normalizing the situation. The editorial further added, "The two governments which are moving to an eye ball – to – eyeball position need to be advised that they should pull back at once in order to avert a war. The need is indeed for the governments of Islamabad and New Delhi to see reasons. The time has also come for active diplomatic intervention by outside power". This statement is clearly putting the most viable and immediate solution of the problem, in other words, it is talking about conflict resolution techniques of diplomacy and peacemaking. It is an evident fact that Dawn always try to go for a better and peaceful solution rather to heighten the tension and play blame game.

In the editorial 'Poised on the Brink' (37), it clearly mentioned that nothing is supreme than the sovereignty of Pakistan and Pakistan is free to take any defensive measures in reaction of Indian armed attack inside Pakistan's territory. It says, "Indian, planes whether by design or accident can stray across the Line of Control, thus compelling Pakistan to take defensive measures as it did two days ago, indeed India should be under no illusion that any act of aggression on its part would not invite an appropriate response from Pakistan". This editorial shows that in spite of being neutral and peacemaking approach holder, Dawn instantly raised its voice against India's aggressive step of entering into Pakistan's territory when its fighter planes crossed the border and this incident made the situation worse and tense.

In another editorial(38), it emphasized upon the solution of the matter and asked for the attention of both sides to act maturely. It mentioned a vey brilliant point that political and military leadership must not follow the old traditional sort of hateful slogans or notions by writing, "Politicians and Generals in both countries should not allow themselves to become prisoners of such notions which gave birth to rigid and irrational behavior". The best part is, Dawn's editorials always addressed both the nations because no one is innocent and blameless in this India Pakistan whole situation and there should be mutual attempts for improving the situation otherwise blame game will only bring more catastrophe. Same editorial further added, "If therefore, some Kashmiri groups are giving the Indian army a tough time of it in

the Kargil area, how is Pakistan to blame for it? It is easy to say that Pakistani regular soldiers are aiding the freedom fighters, easy to say but hard to substantiate". Although this statement seems very pro-government but with a very valid and rational argument that Indian government couldn't present a proof to the world that it was Pakistani army venture but facts supported Indian stance, this editorial shows the flaws of Indian opinion and supports national government stance.

In the editorial "Time to Halt the Escalation"(39), it condemned the Kargil type of ventures that surely not beneficial for any party as it hurts the credibility of offender and security of the other one. For Pakistan, this incident raised mistrust and reliability loss in front of global community and by using lots of force and military initiatives, India became an armed threat for the region. Editorial says, "If India is prevaricating to enable its army to secure its military objectives in the current campaign, it is a dangerous game to play. In the editorial "Why this Obduracy"(40) clearly defined the reluctance of Indian government when Pakistan sent Mr. Sartaj Aziz for talks to stop the mounting tension between the state, "it is for India to re-examine its ambivalent position on the question of lowering the temperature along the Line of Control. Putting false notion of prestige aside, it must find a "Convenient" time for the Pakistan foreign minister's visit to New Delhi soon". It was the time when both countries must have talk at least communicate no matter talks might not lead to the resolution of the situation but for clearing misconceptions, it was mandatory.

Dawn also tried to present a real, clear and fair picture of Kargil war through its editorial(41), it said, "The Indian army backed up by the Air Force, continues to pound the mujahideen but with little success. The Indians themselves have admitted that the going was tough because of the difficult terrain and the snow in which they have to operate. Even though an Indian Army spokesman has claimed successes and said, "We are slowly reaching our goals", he also admitted that the fighting was 'bitter', an indication of Indian success in the heavy casualties they have suffered. While officially the Indians have admitted, "48 dead and 175 wounded", foreign wire agencies quoting field officers say the Indian losses run into hundreds. This editorial depicted the image of Indian battlefield; Indians were facing attacks from the mountain and it is always very hard to defend from an enemy placed on height as they can easily observe the movement and activities of the enemy and the counterpart cannot be able to hide its upcoming war decisions and movement. It was a true picture of real situation of Kargil and this editorial shouldn't be seen through biased eye because Indians were highly vulnerable in Kargil war due to difficult terrain and poor combating position.

In the editorial, the fact was mentioned, "The military operations in occupied Kashmir have been continuing for more than a decade now and there is nothing new about them. If at all there is anything new, it lies in the level of force India is using to crush the freedom movement."(42) Here the editorial is highlighting a

pure Pakistani stance and national demand for the Kashmiris people, the important thing is, it didn't call Kashmiri freedom struggle as mutiny and mujahideen as insurgent, intruders or guerilla fighters which shows that in spite of having neutral approach, it didn't ignore the national stance over Kashmir issue. In another editorial(43), it again emphasized on the need of peaceful resolution of this Kargil and Kashmir issue as it says, "Pakistan is interested in a peaceful resolution of the Kashmir dispute, a settlement based on the UN resolutions and which takes into account the wishes of the Kashmiri people. It is not interested in adventure or war, something, which for whatever reason, India is finding difficult to understand". This editorial is on one hand, putting a solution of the problem but on the other hand, it is also pointing out the historic stubbornness of Indian and inflexible stance over Kashmir conflict.

World has witnessed that Pakistan and India have fought three wars because of Kashmir issue and Kashmir is the point where they both must be considerate and rational regarding the solution of this crucial problem. Dawn highlighted the problem with the permanent solution which can stop Kargil like incident to happen, it suggests in the editorial 'one sided approaches' (44), "Kashmir has seen the cause of two wars between Pakistan and India. Without balm being applied to the wounds on its soul, it could yet be the flash point for a third. Through this editorial writing, Dawn conveyed its belief that India's intentions are aggressive and confrontational that can be easily seen in Siachin and along LoC, it also urged the world to look at this aspect and Indian activities. It declared Kashmir as the core issue which must be resolved in order to prevent from war.

There were many back channel diplomacy techniques used by both the countries especially Pakistan and Dawn devoted an editorial for appreciating this effort, in the editorial of 1st July 1999, it was mentioned that Chinese delegation met with Indian officials and conveyed them the message of Pakistani government that Pakistani government aspires to negotiate and reduce the mounting tension. "According to spokesman, we said this is what Pakistan is seeking but the trouble is that the other side has been dodging us and is out participating in the process to resolve the issue". Dawn always appreciates the efforts of peace and stability in the region no matter Pakistan or India is the initiator. Here it also criticized Indian reluctance for solving the issue although its immediate neighbor got involved in it. The editorial(45) discusses the inflexible stance of India while the global community was putting pressure on both the opponents to start dialogue but India had the stance that Pakistan first ask intruders to vacate the hills then there will be some talks on Indian conditions. It pointed out a valid point, "If it is only India's wish-list which has to be fulfilled then what is the point of talks and diplomacy?" This is a kind of rational and sensible approach where the weaknesses of both the rivals are visible as well as discussable. It is not talking about only Pakistan's flaws and its support to Kashmiri mujahideen in this specific regard but also showing actual side of India and its stubborn behavior.

On 7<sup>th</sup> July 1999, Dawn editorial was titled as “In support of peace” and it talks about Indian claim of LoC violation by Kashmiri Mujahideen. It categorically said that before mujahideen, India itself violated Line of Control and so as Simla Agreement 1972 when it captured Siachin and entered into the cease fire line. It shows very critical eye of the editor that tried to unveil the truth hidden under the dust of past. It is an argumentative approach which makes this daily a neutral and balanced kind of newspaper. “Beyond the heights of Kargil” published on 8<sup>th</sup> July 1999 elaborated the situation and new developments very keenly and tactfully, on one side it is discussing the weak aspect of Kargil operation that tactically it was a brilliant effort but strategically it was a damaging. On the other hand, it is condemning Indian extreme stance over Kashmir and almost everything related to Pakistan. At the end, it sensibly pointed out Indian hegemonic plans related to the acquisition of Kashmir and ask Pakistan not to take Kargil sort of step in future. As it said, “But where Pakistan is concerned, there are obvious limits to what it can do in pursuit of this heroic struggle without officially involving the government of the day”.

Dawn’s balanced and mature opinion gained recognition from India also, there is an editorial about reducing the hostilities from counterpart as it says, “Without an end to active hostilities, how can Pakistan ask the Mujahideen to come does and be picked off like sitting ducks by the Indian artillery?”(46) This must be taken into account that without being positive and cooperative with each other, peace will become a dream between these two countries. During Kargil war media didn’t behave maturely and instead of defusing tension, it played a vital role in elevating hatred and tension on both sides of border. In an editorial, “For a positive climate”, it was mentioned that It is equally important that they agree on a code of conduct requiring them to tone down the propaganda war they have been waging against each other over the last several years. Even some softening of the media hype and bluster on Kashmir on both sides would help create a positive climate for a peace dialogue in the subcontinent.”(47) It again raised a very valid point and a real matter of concern that was a main factor for messing up the Kargil situation. The media war that later became negative propaganda war was a big reason of rising hostilities between India and Pakistan at that time and by highlighting this matter, Dawn proved itself a neutral and a balanced kind of newspaper.

At another instance, it mentioned the need of genuine and sincere dialogues as a solution of every conflict between India and Pakistan. From the perspective of conflict resolution techniques, talks, discussion, dialogues and negotiation are the best way to avoid confrontation but in case of Indo Pak dialogue, because of inflexibility and staunch stance over matters, these talks are always become useless that’s why it says in the editorial, “Both countries are now nuclear powers and obsessed with question of security. If these are not sufficiently compelling reasons for a sincere attempt at dialogue, one wonder what else can be. At the same time, talking for the sake of talking is a recipe for greater frustration.”(48)

### **Jang Editorial Treatment of Kargil War:**

In the middle of the month of May 1999, world got to know about the Kargil issue that the highest battle ground has been set in the Kargil district at Tiger Hills. Daily Jang which is the largest Urdu language newspaper of Pakistan started writing about the war from 17<sup>th</sup> May 1999, first editorial regarding the specific issue was titled as, “India will have to choose between peace and confrontation”, in this editorial India was badly condemned for its violation of LoC and firing across the border as it say, “This time Pakistan strongly retaliated against Indian violation of border and as the result Kargil Cantonment has been under attacked. Due to this action, India has lost its land communication with Siachin posts”. It further said that India deserved that Pakistani reaction because in past, India continuously doing this sort of adventures and numerous Pakistani citizens had to sacrifice their lives and now its India’s turn to face the same circumstances. On the other hand, it emphasized on the need of real dialogues instead of opting for war but the tone was quite harsh and seemed hawkish addressing approach.

Blood Stained Facts of Control Line, What they are telling? The editorial published on 29<sup>th</sup> May 1999 says about the Indian official views regarding the developing situation of Kargil and LoC as India faced enormous lost in terms of lives, planning and logistics and had to admit its failure in stopping attack from counterpart. It also mentioned Indian Air attack in Kargil sector and Indian warning that it can widen its area of attack inside the territory of Pakistan. This editorial is not only an answer to Indian aggressive intensions but also urged global community to come forward for the resolution of Kashmir issue as without solving Kashmir problem, nothing can be improved and better. There is a long battle between India and Pakistan over Kashmiris but another fact is evident that what the Kashmiri people actually think, in Jang news was published about the Kashmiri leader Pandit Purwar Bhooshan Mangal, he said: “Not war but we have to sort out the solution of Kashmir problem through dialogue. Kashmir is of Kashmiris, it must bring back to them, in Kashmir, there isn’t any tension among Muslim community even Muslims are protecting out properties and houses. The behavior of Kashmir Muslim political leaders with Hindu community is positive and they give us respect. Even today, our ladies use to meet and go to the Muslim families without any hesitation.” (Jang, 2015)

On 29<sup>th</sup> May 1999, another editorial published that was calling parliament and international opinion makers to know the real situation as it was the time when situation was not completely unveiled and many facts regarding the war were behind the curtain therefore, the editorial asked international community to observe the situation closely and try to understand the secret military agenda of Indian army. According to the editorial, India is working upon a long term multipurpose military agenda and world has to unveil it by seriously analyzing the scenario. This editorial is quite suspiciously discussing the Indian army movement especially the border violation by Indian Air force and high level artillery transfer along with LoC. Although at the end of editorial, the need of



talks and peaceful resolution has always been mentioned by the editor but the language and aggressive terminologies change the whole impact of the writing.

Indian refusal of negotiation after President Clinton Letter, the editorial published on 7<sup>th</sup> June 1999 and it talks about the official letter written by Clinton administration to Indian government, it asked India to prefer peaceful negotiation instead of war but India as usual, refused the option as it always says that Kashmir is not a bilateral problem but it is a domestic matter of the state. According to editorial, India deliberately trying to expand the war to get some long term benefits and after achieving those hidden interests, it would think about dialogue. The editorial is discussing issue on the basis of speculations not facts and this thing is helping in mounting the tension because blame game never bring the solution of the problem. On 10<sup>th</sup> June, it wrote “negotiation is the only solution” and in this editorial it says that after enormous international pressure, finally India has invited Pakistan’s foreign minister to India for lowering down the tension between the two countries but without any agenda. It was mentioned already by Indian officials that this visit is only for reducing the aggression and tension between the state. Talks will be limited to Kargil, Kashmir will not be discussed and during the negotiation, we won’t reduce military activities along with LoC This editorial is criticizing India double standards and pointing out hatred in their official policies and stance.

In the editorial of 13<sup>th</sup> June, the fact was highlighted that the upcoming dialogues are hopeless and useless because this step of negotiation is taken not for improving the situation but due to international pressure that called for tension diffusion and war avoidance. India came up with the conditions for negotiations that couldn’t be accepted by Pakistani counterpart so; it was a formality to show its concern over Kargil war. This editorial is strictly pointing out Indian negative intentions and acts and also its avoidance to settle Kashmir problem. Pakistani stance could be altered if India showed any flexibility, Pakistan has always been quite compromising while it comes to resolving core issues between india and Pakistan like Mr. Irshad Ahmed Haqqani said in an interview, “If India wants to move fast we are ready for past pace and if India gets slow, we are also prepared for it.”(49)

In another editorial, the horrifying nature of war has been described and other way outs have also mentioned that were totally neglecting by Indian side. In editorials of Jang, one thing is quite prominent that it only addresses India for improving the scenario not Pakistan that makes Pakistan a totally guiltless partner of the conflict. Jang’s approach towards Kargil war is dominantly one sided and full of Indian condemnation. Jang editorial also discussed biased US behavior in the Kargil issue on 17<sup>th</sup> June 1999 when Clinton asked Pakistani government to call army back to its previous positions in order to stop war and peace process cannot be initiated without taking this step but for Indian side, US adopted a sympathetic approach and didn’t put the same demand. According to the

editorial, if US taking Indian side in the dispute then it would be very hard for Pakistan to act upon international intentions of cease fire unless they try to resolve the core issue of Kashmir.

During Kargil war, G8 conference was held in Germany where world's biggest industrial giants met and showed their concerns over Kargil confrontation as both combating partners were nuclear powers and it was a real matter of concern for the world because this war could be turned into a nuclear war. The editorial of Jang on 22 June 1999 talks about that G8 conference and its joint statement in which they all were agreed to stop war between India and Pakistan, suggested peaceful negotiation as the ultimate solution of the problem but they supplemented Indian stance that this war is a result of armed Infiltrators and the area must be evacuated from them. Editorial criticized national diplomatic personnel who didn't defend Pakistani stance across the world moreover, it also condemned Indian refusal of G8 Joint statement in a very harsh manner.

Jang says in "OIC Resolutions in favor of Pakistan" (3 July 1999) that Pakistan successfully presented its opinion and demands in OIC conference and they all have endorsed by more than fifty Islamic states. In this 26<sup>th</sup> OIC conference, Pakistan's case and its stance over Kargil along with Kashmiri freedom movement and their right of self determination was accepted which was a great success for Pakistan. OIC asked India for peaceful talks and resolving core conflicts that always been a reason of aggression and violence. The editorial again asked India to come on negotiation table and also pointed out its inflexible opinion over Kashmir. The editorial of 10<sup>th</sup> July criticized double standards of Indian government that on the one hand, it calls itself a peace loving nation and considered Nawaz Clinton meeting an important instance but on the other hand, during election campaign, they are spreading hatred and aggression against Pakistan. In other words, BJP is using Kargil as election campaign slogan which is nothing but madness. Jang condemned this Indian act and mentioned Indian domestic weaknesses that must be settled despite of spreading war phobia inside the state.

Jang editorial of 20<sup>th</sup> July calls Pakistani government to unveil all the facts regarding Kargil issue in front of Pakistani people and international community so, India couldn't be able to mislead the world. For the first time during the whole crises, this editorial asks Pakistani government to do something despite of blaming Indian counterpart. India should respect the LoC and resolve all the territorial matters according to Simla Accord, Jang editorial (23 July, 1999) presented the solution of highly tensed situation along LoC. It was actually the official demand of Pakistani government for reducing the hostilities and also for putting international pressure on India. This editorial only wants India to come for dialogue like it did at Simla in 1972 and sort out the better options for the sake of humanity.

## Editorial Charts for Qualitative and Quantitative Analysis

### Daily Dawn

#### Kargil War May 1999 to July 1999

Date	27May	29May	30May	3June	8June	10June	13June	15June	29June
1) Kind of Editorial									
• Informative	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
• Interpretative	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
• Criticism	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
• Condemnation	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
• Appreciation	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
• Tribute	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes
• Satirical	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	No
• Is it giving any resolution of the conflict?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2) Either Granting any Real/Historical Data	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
3) Semantic	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
4) Any Historic Inaccuracy	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
5) Any Factual Mistake	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
6) Thematic Classification									
• UNO	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
• International Actors Stance (Especially USA,UK, China, Russia and France)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
• Non state Actors (Freedom Fighters, Lashkar-e-Taiba, Hurriyat Conference, Jamaat-ud-Dawa and Jaish-e-Muhammd)	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
7) Headlines of Editorials	Before it gets any Worse	Poised on the Brink	Playin g With Fire	Time to Halt the Escalation	Why this Obdu racy	Talks at last	Is it a Step Forward	A situati on Threat ening to get out of hands	PM's China Visit

### Daily Dawn

#### Kargil War May 1999 to July 1999

Date	20June	26June	1July	4July	7July	11July	24July	28July
1) Kind of Editorial								
• Informative	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
• Interpretative	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
• Criticism	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
• Condemnation	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No
• Appreciation	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes
• Tribute	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
• Satirical	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
• Is it giving any resolution of the conflict?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2) Either Granting any Real/Historical Data	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

3) Semantic	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
4) Any Historic Inaccuracy	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
5) Any Factual Mistake	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
6) Thematic Classification								
• UNO	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	No
• International Actors Stance (Especially USA,UK, China, Russia and France)	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
• Non state Actors • (Freedom Fighters, Lashkar-e-Taiba, Hurriyat Conference, Jamaat-ud-Dawa and Jaish-e-Muhammd)	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
7) Headlines of Editorials	Will the G8 act?	one sided approaches.	The Tidings from Beijing	Unlocking a bad situation	In support of peace”	Waiting for an Indian response	The inevitable Rider	For a positive climate

**Daily Jang  
Kargil War from May 1999 to July 1999**

Date	17 May	19 May	27 May	29 May	30 May	1 June
1)Kind of Editorial						
• Informative	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
• Interpretative	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
• Criticism	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
• Condemnation	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
• Appreciation	No	No	No	No	No	Yes
• Tribute	No	No	No	No	No	No
• Satirical	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
• Is it giving any resolution of the conflict?	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
2)Is it either granting any real/historic data?	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
3)Is it negatively semantic?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
If Yes then Phrases	Laaton kay Bhoot	Sifarti Akarfoo	Khooni Drama	Muashi Dhamaka	-	Lagam , Saaz Baaz
4)Is there any historic inaccuracy?	No	No	No	No	No	No
5)Is there any factual mistake?	No	No	No	No	No	No
6)Thematic Classification						
1)Is it included UNO stance?	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
2)Is it Included International actor stance? (Especially USA, UK, China, Russia and France)	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
3)Is it included any non-state actor stance? (Freedom Fighters, Lashkar-e-Taiba, Hurriyat Conference, Jamaat-ud-Dawa and Jaish-e-Muhammad)	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Headlines of Editorials.	Bharat ko Aman ya Tasadum main se kisi ka hatmi faisla kerna hoga	Bharat k Inteha pasand hosh kay nakhun lain	Control Line k khooni haqaiq kia bata rahe hain	Parliament or aalmi raae aamma ko foran aitmad main lije	Laraka tayyaray bhejne k bajae muzakra t ki maiz py aain	Bharat musale hat or saalisi k lie tayyar q nahi hai?

Date	5 June	7 June	8 June	9 June	10 June	13 June
<b>1)Kind of Editorial</b>						
• Informative	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
• Interpretative	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
• Criticism	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
• Condemnation	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
• Appreciation	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No
• Tribute	No	No	No	Yes	No	No
• Satirical	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
• Is it giving any resolution of the conflict?	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
2)Is it either granting any real/historic data?	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No
3)Is it negatively semantic?	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
If Yes then Phrases	Haiti, Saaz Baaz	Jaddal o Qattal	Jungjuy ana Soch	-	Akarfoon	Majnoonana Koshish
4)Is there any historic inaccuracy?	No	No	No	No	No	No
5)Is there any factual mistake?	No	No	No	No	No	No
<b>6)Thematic Classification</b>						
1)Is it included UNO stance?	No	No	Yes	No	No	No
2)Is it Included International actor stance? (Especially USA, UK, China, Russia and France)	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
3)Is it included any non-state actor stance? (Freedom Fighters, Lashkar-e-Taiba, Hurriyat Conference, Jamaat-ud-Dawa and Jaish-e-Muhammad)	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Headlines of Editorials.	Bharti hawabaz ki rehail or Pakistan ka jazba e Khair Sagali	Clinton k khat k bad muzakra t se bharat ka inkar	Is Khittay main chohti jang ko hr qeemat par roka jae	China k aala satahai fouji wafd ki bahim mushawrat k lie Pak. aamad	Pak Bharat muzakra t k siwa chara kar nahi	Delhi k muzakra t se qabl hi bharat ki Ifitira pardazi an

Date	15 June	17 June	21 June	22 June	23 June	25 June
<b>1)Kind of Editorial</b>						
• Informative	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
• Interpretative	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
• Criticism	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
• Condemnation	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No
• Appreciation	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
• Tribute	No	No	No	No	No	No
• Satirical	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
• Is it giving any resolution of the conflict?	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
2)Is it either granting any real/historic data?	No	No	No	No	No	No
3)Is it negatively semantic?	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No
If Yes then Phrases	Pagal Pan	Ghuss Bethion	-	-	-	-
4)Is there any historic inaccuracy?	No	No	No	No	No	No
5)Is there any factual mistake?	No	No	No	No	No	No

<b>6)Thematic Classification</b>						
1)Is it included UNO stance?	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
2)Is it Included International actor stance? (Especially USA, UK, China, Russia and France)	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
3)Is it included any non-state actor stance? (Freedom Fighters, Lashkar-e-Taiba, Hurriyat Conference, Jamaat-ud-Dawa and Jaish-e-Muhammad)	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
<b>Headlines of Editorials.</b>	Jang sirf tabahi or halakat ka rasta hai	US ne khul k Bharat ki tarafdari ka rawayya q apnaya?	Masla Kashmir par wazir azam ka naya muagqif	G8 ka mushtarka elanya Khatray ki ghanti	Bharat ko Shahino ki qoumse wasta aan para hai	Kia Chohti Pak Bharat Jang shuro hone wali hai?

<b>Date</b>	<b>29 June</b>	<b>30 June</b>	<b>2 July</b>	<b>3 July</b>	<b>5 July</b>	<b>6 July</b>
<b>1)Kind of Editorial</b>						
• Informative	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
• Interpretative	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
• Criticism	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
• Condemnation	No	Yes	No	No	No	No
• Appreciation	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
• Tribute	No	No	No	No	No	No
• Satirical	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
• Is it giving any resolution of the • Conflict?	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
<b>2)Is it either granting any real/historic data?</b>	No	No	No	No	No	Yes
<b>3)Is it negatively semantic?</b>	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No
<b>If Yes then Phrases</b>	Chakkay chura diye	-	Barhak, Mudakhlal kar	-		-
<b>4)Is there any historic inaccuracy?</b>	No	No	No	No	No	No
<b>5)Is there any factual mistake?</b>	No	No	No	No	No	No
<b>6)Thematic Classification</b>						
1)Is it included UNO stance?	No	No	No	No	No	No
2)Is it Included International actor stance? (Especially USA, UK, China, Russia and France)	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
3)Is it included any non-state actor stance? (Freedom Fighters, Lashkar-e-Taiba, Hurriyat Conference, Jamaat-ud-Dawa and Jaish-e-Muhammad)	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
<b>Headlines of Editorials.</b>	Tanaza Kashmir ka Tas fiya, abhi ya kabhi nahi	Ilaqai satah par kia ho raha hai, Qoumko aitmad main lain	Bharat, soorat e haal ki sifarti,, siasi or askari taawaelain	Pakistan ki himayat main OIC ki qarardadain	Wazir e Azam ki Sadar Clinton se mulaqat or tawaqoaat	Washington main hone walay faislay, kia jeetay kia haaray

Date	7 July	9 July	10 July	14 July	17 July	19 July
<b>1)Kind of Editorial</b>						
• Informative	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
• Interpretative	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
• Criticism	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
• Condemnation	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
• Appreciation	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes
• Tribute	No	No	No	Yes	No	No
• Satirical	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
• Is it giving any resolution of the Problem?	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
<b>2)Is it either granting any real/historic data?</b>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>3)Is it negatively semantic?</b>	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No
<b>If Yes then Phrases</b>	Hutdharmian	-	Jangi Junoon	-	-	-
<b>4)Is there any historic inaccuracy?</b>	No	No	No	No	No	No
<b>5)Is there any factual mistake?</b>	No	No	No	No	No	No
<b>6)Thematic Classification</b>						
1)Is it included UNO stance?	No	No	No	No	Yes	No
2)Is it Included International actor stance? (Especially USA, UK, China, Russia and France)	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
3)Is it included any non-state actor stance? (Freedom Fighters, Lashkar-e-Taiba, Hurriyat Conference, Jamaat-ud-Dawa and Jaish-e-Muhammad)	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
<b>Headlines of Editorials.</b>	LOC ka taqaddus, Awamk zehnon main sulagtay hue sawal	Jo kuch bhi karain Pakistan ka mu fad muqaddam rakhain	Aman Pasandi kay daway or jangi junoon barpa krne ki muhim	Bharat or aalmi raaye aamma se hamari tawaquat poori ho sakain gi?	Elaan e Washington kay asraat ka jaaeza lyne ki nai zaroorat hai	Kia Kargil ka mahaz waqai khamosh ho gya?

Date	20 July	22 July	23 July	27 July
<b>1)Kind of Editorial</b>				
• Informative	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
• Interpretative	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
• Criticism	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
• Condemnation	No	No	No	Yes
• Appreciation	No	No	No	No
• Tribute	No	No	No	No
• Satirical	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
• Is it giving any resolution of the conflict?	Yes	No	Yes	No
<b>2)Is it either granting any real/historic data?</b>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>3)Is it negatively semantic?</b>	No	Yes	No	Yes
<b>If Yes then Phrases</b>	-	Akarfoon	-	Gauoo Mata
<b>4)Is there any historic inaccuracy?</b>	No	No	No	No
<b>5)Is there any factual mistake?</b>	No	No	No	No
<b>6)Thematic Classification</b>				
1)Is it included UNO stance?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2)Is it Included International actor stance? (Especially USA, UK, China, Russia and France)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
3)Is it included any non-state actor stance? (Freedom Fighters, Lashkar-e-Taiba, Hurriyat Conference, Jamaat-ud-Dawa and Jaish-e-Muhammad)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>Headlines of Editorials.</b>	Pakistan ki kanyabi kay daway, Haqaaiq sanmay lain	Kashmir par na guzeer muzakra at baar awar or munsifana hone chahiye	Bharat Control line ka taqaddus bahal kr k muzakrat karay	Do tarfa Muzakrat kay liye Us ka yak tarfa dabao

### Qualitative Analysis of Jang and Dawn Editorial:

When it comes to analysis and conclusion of Jang and Dawn editorials according to the information given by above mentioned charts one thing is very clear and evident that while portraying the Kargil war through editorial treatment of Daily Jang and Dawn, first thing that was observed is whether they tried to stop the war to aggravate and adopted neutral and logical approach. Dawn raised its voice for the resolution of the Kargil conflict and criticized both India and Pakistan for their wrong moves. One aspect which is missing in Jang editorial is the way and tone of addressing as it shows the inclination of newspaper and its policy and Dawn showed its consistency and mature behavior throughout the crisis by describing the fact or even the personal say in a lowered and peaceful manner. Its aim was to reduce the tension and sort out the solution of the problem without confronting national interest and policy over the matter. Jang described the whole scenario and criticized the happenings without considering that its hawkish opinion and impression could ruin the situation more or heighten the tension.

According to the charts, first probing question is about the kind of editorials whether it is informative, interpretive, criticizing anything, condemning, and appreciating, giving tribute, satirical and providing resolution of the conflict. When it comes to Dawn, its editorials regarding Kargil issue are always informative and interpretive; it mentioned information in a specific context and



allowed its reader to extract exact meaning and objective of any statement. For the Kargil war, Dawn editorials criticized and condemned at various instances but not with hatred. It pointed out the flaws of Kargil operation and called it a strategic failure, it criticized Pakistan army at many points but its aim was not just criticism for the sake of criticism, it was for highlighting the mistakes of establishment and giving them a chance not to repeat them because at the time of Kargil war, these mistakes were actually blunders that made Pakistan isolate among the world and more insecure in term of nuclear weapons. It pointed out Indian weaknesses and negative attitude also, condemned and criticized it but through a stable, calm and balanced way so the situation would lower down and tensions would have diminished. Dawn editorials were not satirical most of the times, they used very mild, neutral and convincing terms for elaborating the tension but as far as, Jang is concerned it always condemned India very badly and addressed it like an enemy which carried very damaging effects over the situation. At many instances, its language of editorial was negatively semantic and many phrases have been recorded that were inappropriate and had bitter impression like Ghusbethiye, Jangi Junoon, Gauoomata, Akarfoon etc. Dawn never used these kinds of phrases that elevated tension and hostilities between the countries. Both dailies gone for the resolution of the Kargil issue but both have different treatment of words and mode like Dawn always mentioned that hostilities must be ended and mistakes should be avoided but Jang strongly criticized India at every move with hawkish and extremist tone. Recorded editorials of Jang and Dawn from May 1999 to July 1999 did not allow publishing any historical or factual mistake regarding the issue, they always given real and historical data. Editorials have been thematically classified according to some prominent categories like if an editorial talks about UN stance and its role into the situation or world's super powers or economic giants' stance such as US, UK, China, Russia, France and Germany and finally is it included any non-state actor stance like Freedom Fighters, Lashkar-e-Taiba, Hurriyat Conference, Jamaat-ud-Dawa and Jaish-e-Muhammad. This shows the involvement of related and affected entities in the Kargil war, when both newspapers editorials include their stance then it exhibits their role in the conflict whether they worked for diminishing the tensions between the states or they aggravate the war through their responses and actions. Their struggle for resolving the conflict was the main matter of concern for the editorials of Jang and Dawn that how far they could go through the peace and conflict resolution journey in the way of Indo Pakistan conflicts.

### **Quantitative Analysis of Jang and Dawn Editorials:**

After analyzing the editorial charts of Jang and Dawn, a huge difference have founds in term of numbers and ratio. For Daily Jang and Dawn, there are total 34 and 17 editorial respectively recorded into the charts, and total six probing questions were asked. For question number 1 which asked about the kind of the editorial and there were eight options that describe the nature of editorial like is it informative, interpretive, criticizing, condemning, appreciating, giving tribute, negatively satirical

and is it providing resolution of the conflict. Second question is, either the editorial is granting any real/historical data or not, third is about its semantic nature that either any negative semantic phrase has found in the editorial or not, fourth is about any historical inaccuracy, fifth asked about any factual mistake in an editorial and sixth and the last question is about thematic classification of the editorial. Three themes have mentioned in the question, one is about UNO that did the editorial talk about UNO stance or role or participation in the Kargil conflict, second theme is regarding world's super powers stance in the respective issue and the last theme is about involved non state actors like Hurriyat conference, freedom fighters, Lashkar-e-Taiba, Jamaat-ud-Dawa and Jaish-e-Muhammad.

### **Daily Jang Editorials** **Quantitative Analysis of Editorials from June 1999 to July 1999**

1) Kind of Editorial	YES	NO	Total No of Editorials
• Informative	32	2	34
• Interpretative	34	0	34
• Criticism	32	2	34
• Condemnation	15	19	34
• Appreciation	9	25	34
• Tribute	4	30	34
• Satirical	22	12	34
• Is it giving any resolution of the conflict?	14	14	34
2) Either Granting any Real/Historical Data	16	18	34
3) Semantic	16	18	34
4) Any Historic Inaccuracy	0	34	34
5) Any Factual Mistake	0	34	34
6) Thematic Classification			
• UNO	9	25	34
• International Actors Stance (Especially USA,UK, China, Russia and France)	23	11	34
• Non state Actors (Freedom Fighters, Lashkar-e-Taiba, Hurriyat Conference, Jamaat-ud-Dawa and Jaish-e-Muhammd)	17	17	34

### **Daily Dawn Editorials** **Quantitative Analysis of Editorials from June 1999 to July 1999**

1) Kind of Editorial	YES	NO	Total No of Editorials
• Informative	17	0	17
• Interpretative	17	0	17
• Criticism	14	3	17
• Condemnation	8	9	17
• Appreciation	3	14	17
• Tribute	1	16	17
• Satirical	3	14	17
• Is it giving any resolution of the conflict?	11	6	17
2) Either Granting any Real/Historical Data	13	4	17
3) Negatively semantic	0	17	17
4) Any Historic Inaccuracy	0	17	17
5) Any Factual Mistake	0	17	17
6) Thematic Classification			
• UNO	8	9	17
• International Actors Stance (Especially USA,UK, China, Russia and France)	6	11	17
• Non state Actors (Freedom Fighters, Lashkar-e-Taiba, Hurriyat Conference, Jamaat-ud-Dawa and Jaish-e-Muhammd)	7	10	17

### **Conclusion:**

The findings of the study reveal that Jang and Dawn both mentioned the need of resolving the Kargil conflict and stopping the war but Dawn have more desire of peace than Jang according to the numbers or quantitative analysis of related editorial charts. Dawn portrayed the Kargil conflict through its editorials in a very balanced and calm way; it didn't try to elevate the existing tension and hostilities but always try to show the weaknesses and ignorance of both the sides. Its editorials are highly informative and interpretive that always conveyed the exact message which the editor actually aspired to deliver to the common readers, policy makers as well as cross border audience. Dawn criticized in most of its editorials but it was not one sided biased criticism, editorials usually carried criticism over the right aspect or happening of the war where governments showed their irresponsible behavior and stubbornness. Dawn condemned the Indian side for not being cooperative for negotiation and always posed conditions for talks. It was not much appreciative for both the sides, on very few instances, it appreciated the role of Pakistani government and intervening powers like China when its official delegation visited to India for reducing the tension increasing in the region.

During the whole Kargil scenario both the combating sides didn't do anything that could be acknowledged therefore, in Dawn's editorial, no tribute has been given. The most appreciating thing is, Dawn didn't use satirical language throughout the conflict and always expressed its views in a balanced and acceptable way, it didn't talked bitter and condemning for India but it emphasized upon the peaceful solution of the problem that is resolution of the conflict through dialogue. Dawn always tried to present some historic data for enhancing its argument and made the discussion rational and tolerable for India and Pakistan both. It didn't believe in creating hatred and mounting hostilities through its editorial but always avoid negative expressions and hateful language for the opponent, this aspect showed its policy of cooperation and peace of the region. No factual mistake and historical inaccuracy has been found in the editorials of Dawn during the Kargil war, it exhibits its honest services towards its country and regional peace as if it happened then it might cause any other bitter or controversial debate between India and Pakistan and they could have involved in any other conflict. This factor is also significant for the masses of both the sides that there is at least one platform which is trying to spread trust and peace across the border.

Three themes can also be discovered into the series of editorial during the Kargil war, UN role which was somehow mentioned in the editorials but not in satisfying numbers, in the same way, global powers' influence and stance was not much prominent in this analysis which shows that this conflict can only be solved with the efforts and will of both involved states India and Pakistan. Even the entities and important partners of the issue like Kashmiri mujahideen, Hurriyat conference, and non state actors like Jaish-e-Muhammad, Jamaat-ud-Dawa and

Lashkar-e-Taiba are not prominently seen in the discussion although they must have been involved in the conflict and its resolution. Dawn believes Kashmir as the sole reason of confrontation between the states therefore, this issue must be resolved immediately through talks and both the states must compromise over their years old stance.

When it comes to comparison then Daily Jang was the one which had been chosen for the portrayal of Kargil conflict through its editorials. The nature of its editorial are informative and interpretive but Jang editorials criticized the issue and opponent a lot, it was also notices during analysis that it quite bitterly pointed out the Indian side for its wrong and aggressive moves in Kargil war. Dawn also criticized the conflict and Indian hegemonic nature but not that much harshly as Jang did. It also badly condemned India for not going towards peaceful resolution of the problem, it also repeatedly mentioned Indian past legacies and moves against Pakistan and it left Pakistan guiltless in the discussion which is not right and just argument in a debate. At very few instances, it appreciated some steps from India or global community but most of the time; it was mentioning only negative side and approach towards the matter. No tribute was given to anyone but it consistently talked about the resolution of the conflict and tried to make the opponents scared by describing the horrific three wars between India and Pakistan. Jang's editorials were based upon historical events and authentic information but they interpreted in a negative way that only paved the way to more hatred and tension. It provided historical data and information but not in adequate amount, there isn't any historical inaccuracy and factual mistake found in Jang's editorials. Thematically, it discussed UNO role or stance in Kargil war at very few instances but international actors' stance and related non state actors (Kashmiri mujahideen, Hurriyat conference, Jaish-e-muhammad, Jamaat-ud-Dawa and Lashkar-e-Taiba) stance was quoted quite often during Kargil war. It shows that Jang give more importance to global influential powers and believes that they can play a better and effective role in resolving the conflict.

Both the newspapers exhibited and portrayed the conflict according to the national policy of the country but they adopted different tones and mode of expression like Dawn adopted cooperative, conflict resolving and balanced strategy while describing the war situation and its repercussions for India and Pakistan whereas Jang utilized a stern, biased and hawkish viewpoint over the matter although it also believed that dialogue is the only way out to refrain from a nuclear confrontation and more deadly war but it described this fact through strict and criticizing manner. Both the newspapers aspired to lower down the level of hostilities and war hysteria but their mode of expression was different that proved Dawn has a more moderate, peaceful, stable, neutral and unbiased portrayal of Kargil war as compare to Jang but they both seek for the resolution of Kargil conflict through peaceful techniques.

## REFERENCES

1. Puddephatt, Andrew. (2006). *Conflict and the Role of the Media*. Copenhagen, Germany: International Media Support.
2. Kasuri, K. M. (2015). *Neither a Hawk Nor a Dove*. Karachi: Oxford University Press
3. Musharraf, P. (2008). *In the Line of Fire*. NY USA: Simon and Schuster.
4. Kasuri, K. M. (2015). Op.cit.
5. Farooque, M. S. (2006). *White Paper Kargil: Adventure or Trap*. Lahore: Sagar Publishers.
6. Van Dijk, T. (1996). Opinions and Ideologies in Editorials. International Symposium of Critical Discourse Analysis, Language, Social Life and Critical Thought, Athens. In Izadi, Foad. (2007). *Journal of Communication Inquiry*, 31 (2)
7. 1999, Kargil Conflict (n.d.) Retrieved from <http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/world/war/kargil-99.htm>
8. Lamb, A. (1997). *Incomplete Partition, The Genesis of the Kashmir Dispute 1947 -1948*. Karachi: Oxford University Press
9. Sattar, A. (2006). *Pakistan Foreign Policy*. Karachi: Oxford University Press.
10. Musharraf, P. (2008). Op. cit.
11. Ibid
12. Hussain, J. (October 21, 2006). *Kargil: what might have happened*. Daily Dawn. Retrieved from [www.dawn.com](http://www.dawn.com)
13. Cheema, P. I. (2003). *The Armed Forces of Pakistan*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.
14. Qadir, S. (n.d.). *An Analysis of Kargil Conflict 1999*. Retrieved from <http://indianstrategicknowledgeonline.com/web/An%20Analysis%20Kargil%20Conflicts.pdf>
15. Musharraf, P. (2008). Op. cit.
16. Malik, A. M. (2015). *Hum Bhi Wahan Maujod Thy*. Lahore: Sang-e-Meel Publications
17. Qadir, S. (n.d.). Op. cit.
18. Ibid.
19. Malik, A. M. (2015). Op. cit.
20. Kiani, K. (January 28, 2013) *Kargil Adventure Was Four-Man Show: General*. Daily Dawn. Retrieved from <http://www.dawn.com/news/782010/kargil-adventure-was-four-man-show-general>
21. Musharraf, P. (2008). Op. cit.
22. Malik, A. M. (2015). Op. cit.
23. Aziz, S. (2009). *Between Dreams and Realities*. Karachi: Oxford University Press.
24. Chari, P. R., Cheema, P. I., Cohen, S. (2007). *Four crises and a peace process: American engagement in South Asia*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.
25. Hyder, K. (2012, 12 April). *Siachen Glacier: World's highest battleground*. Aljazeera. Retrieved from <http://www.aljazeera.com/blogs/asia/2012/04/108956.html>
26. Malik, A. M. (2015). Op. cit.
27. Kasuri, K. M. (2015). Op. cit.
28. Ibid
29. Musharraf, P. (2008). Op. cit.
30. Riedel, B. (2002). *American Diplomacy and the 1999 Kargil Summit at Blair House*. PA, USA: Center for the Advanced Study of India.
31. Kasuri, K. M. (2015). Op. cit.
32. Riedel, B. (2002). Op. cit.
33. Cheema, Z. R. (May 15, 2013). *Some "Facts" about Kargil Conflict, 1999*. Retrieved from <http://nativepakistan.com/kargil-war-1999-real-facts-about-kargil-conflict/>
34. Malik, V. P. (Gen). *Lessons from Kargil*. Retrieved from [http://www.satp.org/satporgrtp/publication/idr/vol\\_17\(1\)/VPMalik.htm](http://www.satp.org/satporgrtp/publication/idr/vol_17(1)/VPMalik.htm)
35. Mazari, S. M. (2003). *The Kargil Conflict 1999: Separating Facts from Fiction*. Islamabad: Institute of Strategic Studies
36. Farooque, M. S. (2006). *White Paper Kargil: Adventure or Trap*. Lahore: Sagar Publishers
37. Before It Gets Any Worse [Editorial]. (1999; May 27). Dawn
38. Poised on the Brink [Editorial] (1999, May 29) Dawn
39. Playing With Fire. [Editorial] (1999, May 30) Dawn

39. Time to Halt the Escalation [Editorial] (1999, June 3) Dawn
40. “Why this Obduracy” (8 June 1999)
41. Talks at last [Editorial] (1999, June 10) Dawn
42. Ibid
43. Will the G-8 Act? [Editorial] (1999, June 20) Dawn
44. One Sided Approaches Will Not Work. [Editorial] (1999, June 26) Dawn
45. “Unlocking a bad situation” [Editorial] (4 July, 2016)
46. “Waiting for an Indian response” [Editorial] (July 11, 1999). Dawn
47. For a Positive Climate in South Asia [Editorial] (1999, July 28). Dawn
48. The Inevitable Rider[Editorial] (1999, November 24) Dawn
49. Haqqani, I. A. (2003, May 7). CNN Interview. *Daily Jang*