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Dr. Shakil Afridi has received a 33-year term imprisonment due to his involvement with the raid against Al Qaida chief Osama bin Laden. Over the course of his incarceration divergent views have been formed within U.S. and Pakistan over his reputation. This study speaks to the literature on reputation, an important topic in collective memory study and cultural sociology. Specifically, it uses this particular case to address a general issue: social construction of reputation in different public spheres that transcends national boundaries. The purpose of this research is to analyze who is creating, challenging, and refuting Dr. Shakil Afridi’s reputation and why. This research employs qualitative methodology that explores the lack of social uniformity within two national spheres. The unit of analysis is the media outlets in United State and Pakistan. The study was able to understand the motivations behind Dr. Shakil Afridi’s reputation from the standpoint of U.S. policy makers, Pakistani Military and Government along with the two media. It also highlights how reactive reporting by the media can lead into divergent views of a news story. In the case of Dr. Shakil Afridi, it led to two very different viewpoints over his reputation.
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**Introduction**

The story of Dr. Shakil Afridi reads like a Shakespearean tragedy that has no winners and a climactic tragic end. Unlike, various Shakespeare novels, this story does not have a dramatic conclusion as of today. Dr. Afridi is currently serving his thirty-three year sentence at Peshawar Central Jail in North West Frontier Province (NWFP) of Pakistan.\(^1\) His story starts out as a comic book saga of a doctor who helps CIA find the most notorious terrorist in the world. The fantasy of going undercover and working for the most powerful agency (CIA) in the world can be an alluring endeavor even for an intellect like Dr. Afridi. His work as a spy has caused an uproar in Pakistan and has divided the nation on various grounds. Dr. Afridi has also found many friends within the US political arena. Some lawmakers have suggested that Dr. Afridi should be given US citizenship along with the prize money for finding Osama Bin Laden.\(^2\) The Osama Bin Laden affair has been devastating to the relations of US and Pakistan. This divide has created lots of angst within US/Pakistan relations, which were not that impressive to begin with in the recent past. Many within the Pakistani and US media have suggested that Pakistan is being cornered into taking up a position. They believe that Pakistan is at an important period of history where it has to choose between modernity or strict Islamic conservatism to survive within the new world. Dr. Shakil Afridi represents everything that is good about Pakistan on the international level, but for the elites within the country his character creates problems. His story has created a national debate within Pakistan that questions its religious identity,

---


nationalism and ethnic background. This is the first time in Pakistan’s recent history that country and its inhabitants are looking within to find a solution for its shortcomings. It is an important discourse that needs to be investigated thoroughly for the sake of regional and global stability. Many scholars believe that Pakistan is a modern state as a functionary but not a nation. The main objective of this study is to understand who is creating, challenging and promoting Dr. Shakil Afridi’s reputation within the two public spheres. The study will also look at which factors (identity, nationalism and ethnic divide) are in play within Dr. Afridi’s reputation construction and where is the national discourse heading over his memory.

The study borrows the definition of reputation as “a socially recognized persona: an organizing principle by which the actions of a person can be linked together”. They are more than just a mere historical recollection; rather, they have a clear narrative that can be contested, debated and reengineered to suit a purpose. Currently, challengers to Dr. Shakil Afridi’s reputation are framing the debate within the larger context of ‘war on terror.’ The study will look at these discourses within two public spheres. Majority of Pakistanis along with its bureaucratic and Government establishment views Dr. Shakil Afridi highly negatively. On the contrary, Dr. Afridi is a positive figurehead within US and European circles. The paper will look at both positive and negative correlations that are inciting a much greater debate within Pakistan on its national identity. This research does not take a position on moral or political perspective but rather looks at the mechanisms behind reputation construction.

The study will also delve into the historical overview of Pakistan and its issues surrounding Islamic identity. Islamic idealism played a pivotal role in carving out the reputation of Dr. Afridi. It framed the problem within social and moral obligation. From the perspective of Islam, the intentions of Dr. Afridi were at the forefront. What was he trying to accomplish by collaborating with a foreign agency? Are his deeds genuinely intended for the greater good of the Pakistani society? These questions must first be put into the Pakistani interpretation of State Islam. This study will also look at how Islam came into being part of the identity of Pakistan to better understand the current environ.

The background will also provide an insight to research on how Pakistani elites believe that Dr. Shakil Afridi is a traitor to the state. There are three types of elites within Pakistan: Military, Political, and Technocrats. Each elite holds its own place within the society, but at times of turmoil, they collectively chose a position. The most fascinating character of this discourse was at display during the incarceration of Dr. Shakil Afridi on the grounds of helping United States of America against Bin Laden. It is extremely crucial to understand how these elites came into being and what tools they use for influence. Media is also causing a stir within Pakistan, and many outsiders see these institutions as an independent body that has tremendous influence over the masses. It was also fascinating to see how the print, online, and television all came to the differing conclusions on Dr. Shakil Afridi as the elites. This showcases that the Pakistani media is free to choose its positions within Pakistan even if it is going against state interests.

Methodology

This research will involve a qualitative methodology that will explore the lack of social conformity over major issues. Although, this research will not forward an original
theory, it will utilize the approaches presented by Fine and Schwartz. These approaches are situated within sociology and expand on collective memory studies. The study borrows the definition of collective memory, as “a representation of the past embodied in both historical evidence and commemorative symbolism.” The two approaches are within the scope of collective memory; one views reputation within the realms of politics and the other within the cultural system. Although, these are vague interpretation on theoretical grounds they provide a framework for the inquiry.

This study will investigate on responses within mass media from two nation-states and test the positive and negative correlation between two public spheres. The research within the mass media will be through reputable news agencies from United States and Pakistan. The most reputable English news source within Pakistan is its oldest newspaper called Dawn International. Muhammad Ali Jinnah (founding father) was the founder of Dawn in 1941, and he wanted a liberal voice of reason for a new nation. It has an impressive following within Pakistan and abroad. It also functions as a twenty-four hour news channel along with print and online publication. The dates of the articles collected from Dawn news is from 15 June 2011 till 27 September 2012 and all are in English language.

Pakistan’s largest independent media outlet is the Jang Group. The daily Jang (Urdu) is the most circulated newspaper in Pakistan. Khalil Rahman is the founder of Jang Group of Companies that includes Geo TV (Urdu television channel), GEO News (24/7 Urdu news and talk show channel), The News International (English newspaper), Mag Weekly (English magazine) and Awam (Urdu magazine). He founded the company in 1946, but Jang newspaper has been publishing since 1939. Jang group has received various

---

international awards for journalism but also been highly criticized over the years by the ruling government of Pakistan. The articles collected through Jang group are in Urdu and English from 24 May 2011 till 14 October 2012.

Another highly influential news outlet within Pakistan is Nawa-i-Waqt (Urdu newspaper). Hameed Nizami was the founder of this conservative newspaper back in 1940. It has an exceptionally large circulation, and it appeals to working middle class within Pakistan. It is also relatively cheaper than Jang newspaper and does not have many frills of an ordinary liberal paper. It also operates Waqt News channel that can be seen all over the world due to its satellite partners. It also has an Urdu magazine called Phool (flower) that is in response to Awam from Jang group. The articles and news stories collected through Nawa-i-Waqt are in Urdu language and are from 16 June 2011 to 17 September 2012.

The study will also employ a leading business newspaper within Pakistan called Business Recorder. M.A. Zubairi was the founder of Business Recorder in 1965 with an aim of replicating Wall Street Journal. Business Recorder group also operates Ajj (24/7 Urdu channel) television that features nightly news and entertainment (soaps, talk shows, comedy, songs, etc.). Business Recorder has a wide reach within Pakistani business community. Ajj TV can be seen worldwide due to its partnership with various satellite providers. The articles are in English language from 24 July 2011 to 7 October 2012.

BBC also operated within Pakistan and the subcontinent since its inception in 1922. BBC operates a radio station along with Urdu newspaper that is now exclusively online. The study employs this resource due to its importance within the subcontinent and its history. It also gives an insight to how the west is looking at the news within Pakistan. All
articles and stories collected are in Urdu language. The articles are from 15 July 2011 to 11 September 2012 and are extensive in their coverage. They paint a picture of Pakistan within the western narrative, which is fascinating to read and understand. BBC radio (Urdu) is immensely popular amongst the elderly populace.

New York Times, CNN, Wall Street Journal, Washington Post, Huffington Post, Time Magazine, NPR, GQ and Economist lead the sources within US media. The study also brought in foreign media sources such as Al Jazeera, Daily Mail, BBC and The Sun and The Mirror. The articles range from 11 July 2011 to 21 February 2013. In addition to articles, various television talk shows, and news stories were also part of the collected sources. The empirical analysis will focus on substance rather than opinions. The main reason behind the collection of articles and resources is to gain an understanding between the two public spheres. The study will compare and contrast the way media portrays the news story surrounding Dr. Shakil Afridi. It is within these two spheres that we can assess the theoretical findings of Fine and Schwartz.

**Theories**

This research is situated within collective memory studies that will focus on reputation construction of Dr. Shakil Afridi. It will explore from the theoretical framework presented by Fine and Schwartz on where do reputations exist and how do they formulate within societies. The main reason for this research is to understand who is creating, challenging and refuting Dr. Shakil Afridi’s reputation. Although, Dr. Shakil Afridi is neither well known as Lincoln nor infamous as Benedict Arnold, his analysis will test the theory on reputation construction. Are reputations (based within collective memory) solely based on well-known and established individuals within a society? I contend that anyone
who is famous enough to have interests attached to his or her reputation can be a subject to the Fine and Schwartz’s theory. Regardless of history or lack thereof as in the case of Dr. Shakil Afridi.

Schwartz argues that collective memory cannot be reduced to politics alone. He sees memory as part of “cultural system,” which he defines as both, “a mirror (reflecting society to itself) and a lamp (illuminating how society should see itself).” He focuses on how the past is symbolized and how it will function as a mediator for the present. In case of Dr. Shakil Afridi, the Pakistani government and its military elites would like to make an example. They need someone that can deflect some of its shortcoming while serve a purpose for future generations. I contend that they have a vested interest to make Dr. Afridi’s story into a national debate on loyalty to the state. This discourse would have an impact on Pakistani society, as they will see Dr. Afridi as a traitorous man who does not represent their idealism. On the other hand, United States sees Dr. Afridi as a man of principle who was instrumental in their efforts to hunt Bin Laden. According to their interpretation (media and government), majority of the Pakistanis deemed Bin Laden as a threat to their society. So, Dr. Afridi was only doing his civic duty to safeguard Pakistani interest by helping a foreign ally.

Unlike historical overviews on facts that ask “what” within a specific timeframe, this research will deal with “how and why.” Schwartz models this concept from Clifford Geertz who defines cultural system as a pattern of “inherited conceptions expressed in

---

7 Ibid., 2000. 8. Print.
symbolic forms by means of which men communicate, perpetuate, and develop their knowledge about and attitudes toward life.”8 Schwartz further states that collective memory, as a cultural system is a symbolic filter where “experience - political or otherwise – is apprehended.”9 Schwartz states,

“the past is matched to the present as a model of society and a model for society. As a model of society, collective memory reflects past events in terms of the needs, interests, fears, and aspirations of functions: it embodies a template that organizes and animates behavior and a frame within which people locate and find meaning for their present experience. Collective memory affects social reality by reflecting, shaping, and framing it.”10

The essence of Schwartz’s argument is that we must not only know why the past is interpreted but also how it is being interpreted. Schwartz frames the theory behind politics of memory as part of the political struggle on historical or commemorative grounds. He finds this argument as to simplistic in understanding how reputations are manufactured. As a result, Dr. Shakil Afridi’s case is a perfect example to look for complexities surrounding the reputation construction. His reputation is debated not only in Pakistan but also in United States. In other words, Dr. Afridi’s reputation is part of an international debate on how a society should behave as a loyal citizen of the world. But the debate in Pakistan is hotly different then in western media. Dr. Afridi is presenting a model for society due to his actions against the state of Pakistan. The military and government elites of Pakistan are

interpreting his actions as perfidious in nature and they contend that it does not reflect the majority. Consequently, Dr. Shakil Afridi is made to be a collaborator against the very state that had given him so much respect, power, elite status and a profession of respect.

On the contrary, the politics of memory sees the power struggle between defining the conditions and working its perimeters. Fine argues, “reputations are matters of contention – they are in play.”11 His understanding is that historical memory can be defined and redefined based on present conditions. Fine suggests “reputational claims stems from interests.”12 These interests are highly subjective but can shape, build, or destroy identities. Lori Ducharme and Fine believe that negative historical reputations results from two essential processes: “(I) the reconstruction of biography, through selective emphasis on historical events … and (II) the evaluation of motives, that is, the process by which accounts are presented, challenged, honored, ascribed and assessed…”13 In case of Dr. Shakil Afridi, United State media has taken a political position of highlighting his resourcefulness in hunting Bin Laden. Within Pakistan, the debate expands into Islamic identity, nationalism and ethnicity. The interests (challengers) that are pushing this discourse are key to understanding how Dr. Afridi’s reputation is molding public opinion.

The goal of this research is to look for the linkages between proposed reputation and that of the identity of the proponent (reputational entrepreneur).14 According to Fine,
“reputations are socially constructed and not entirely grounded in objective reality or in the functional needs of groups. In this view, reputations are a result of the socio-political motives of groups that gain resources, power, or prestige by the establishment of reputations. History, then, is constructed through the establishment of reputations of central narrative figures. To this end, “entrepreneurs” engaging in the politics of memory promote, protect, and defend their interests – interests that may sincerely define as consistent with those of society at large.”¹⁵

Fine’s theory on politics of memory is simple in promoting the idea that those who have power and interests can define and manipulate reputations. He further defines reputational entrepreneur as “family members, friends, and political associates of famous people, and editors and biographers.”¹⁶ He further denotes that, “each reputational entrepreneur has an interest to advance by making claims about the target – even if that interest is only to tell a compelling story or to create a smooth conversation.”¹⁷

The study will also look at the support group surrounding the proposed claim by the reputational entrepreneur. It is important to understand if there are consequences to oppose an established reputation. This study will look at these two particulars and construct an empirical and analytical data gathering that will size up, Dr. Shakil Afridi and his reputation within the two above positions.

**Collaboration theory**

---

There is no general consensus about collaboration theory within sociology but many within the field have forwarded their interpretation on the subject. One such interpretation is from Timothy Brook who has used historiography, historical remembrance and contemporary politics to describe issues of collaboration globally. One of the most interesting aspects of his research underlines the theory forwarded by Fine and Schwartz about political and cultural system. He also believes that “collaboration is not purely a political issue;” it may as well “be a cultural issue.” He extends his research with proposing four distinct ways that truth can disappear with history. These four analytical tools can be instrumental in understanding Dr. Shakil Afridi’s reputation construction within the two public spheres.

Mark Caprio explains that the term “collaborator” is very difficult to define for the purpose of precise classification. He further states:

“The term “collaborator,” as used pejoratively to describe someone whose actions or attitudes in support of a foreign occupation can be considered treasonous, is controversial primarily because it judges suspect individuals based on a context politically different from that which they committed their alleged crimes.”

He further explains that the accused held a totally different sense of state and nation than the accusers. In the case of Dr. Shakil Afridi, the Pakistani government along with Military and the news media accused his of conspiring against Pakistan by providing vital

information to a foreign agency (CIA). On the contrary, Dr. Afridi refutes that he provided any sensitive information that led to the eventual raid on Osama Bin Laden compound. Timothy Brooks further suggests that, “*those who appear to have chosen the reality of collaboration may have been engaging in a calculus of options and risks different from the simplicities that hindsight, and the nationalist narrative that thrives on it, hands to us.*”

In the case of Dr. Shakil Afridi, he has not been able to forward his version of the story to the public. Although, his family has contested claims made by the Government and Military of Pakistan, there has not been any word from Dr. Afridi.

Timothy Brook highlights four ways that truth can disappear with history. These four ways are: nationalism, political competition, humanitarian judgment and moral condemnation. The first condemnation is nationalistic and it distinguishes patriots of the state and the betrayers. It is a directed effort by the state to set clear distinction between the two and promote nationalistic pride against the accused. In the case of Dr. Afridi, the concerted effort was made from the Pakistani media along with the government and military elites to quickly label him as a traitor. On the contrary, the US media was quick to point out the importance of Dr. Afridi in the eventual raid on Osama Bin Laden’s compound. This discourse played an important role within the two public spheres in shaping the reputation of Dr. Shakil Afridi. As suggested by Brook, “*When you speak for the nation, history is always on your side. When you allow discourse to determine narrative, truth disappears with history.*”

---


The second adjudication proposes that the history of collaboration is all about partisan-politics within the state. Brook explains that, “collaboration and resistance are internally determined by the struggle between political competitors.” In the case of Dr. Shakil Afridi, the democratically elected government of Pakistan and the powerful Military elites were struggling to explain various questions about Bin Laden and his compound. At times the democratically elected government was directly blaming the Pakistan Armed forces for their ineptness and unprofessionalism. This could have been a nightmare scenario as in the past the Military brass has taken over the country via coup d’état. In the end, both the military and the civilian government came to realization that the brunt of this fiasco can be blamed on a single figure, Dr. Shakil Afridi.

The third is the humanitarian judgment, which suggests that the collaborator helped outside forces in waging or continued war against the people oh his state. According to Brook, “This judgment understands war as wasteful and pointless violence, and criticizes collaborators for helping to promote war or contribute to its rewards.” Dr. Shakil Afridi is being blamed for the continued war efforts that are being waged against Pakistan and Afghanistan by ISAF and Jihadi forces (Taliban, Al Qaeda, etc.). He is also being blamed for fake vaccination campaign that is now jeopardizing the health of millions (children) in Pakistan. He is vilified not only by Pakistanis but also non-government organizations (UN, Oxfam, etc.) that are working in the region.

Lastly, the fourth way of judging collaboration is by moral judgment. This judgment is also visible in the other three modes but on its own accord can be very robust in the face of deconstruction by historians, politicians and opinion makers. As Brooks
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22 Ibid., 2013.
23 Ibid., 2013.
states, “nationalism, political partisanship, and humanitarianism can be dismantled as inadequate bases for evaluating collaboration by reducing them to their particular interests.” On the contrary, morality trumps nationalism and political identity and positions “steadfastness above capitulation, honor above expediency.” Morality was the core question surrounding the actions taken up by Dr. Shakil Afridi. His patriotism, religion, profession and ethnic identity were being compared with the norms of Pakistani society. These norms centered on moral righteousness of being a Pakistani, devout Muslim, physician and an ethnic Pashtun.

The framework presented by Timothy Brook is not without error as suggested by Prasenjit Duara who suggests that too much credence is given to nationalism as a mobilizing ideology. Others, like Suk-Jung Han suggest, that the nationalistic voices have been dominant throughout history because they suppressed the collaborators and their stories. In the case of Dr. Shakil Afridi, the Pakistani government along with its military has done a masterful job for keeping him out of the limelight. He has not given any credible interviews to any local or foreign news agency. He is being held in Peshawar Jail where he is to spend thirty years imprisonment before release. It is still up to debate whether we will get to know or understand his side of the story.

Who is Dr. Shakil Afridi?
Dr. Shakil Afridi is originally from Khyber Agency district of FATA (Federally Administered Tribal Area) which is part of North West Frontier Province (NWFP) of Pakistan. Khyber Agency borders Afghanistan to its west and was a gateway during Afghan-Soviet conflict for goods and materials. It was also a forward operating base for Afghan Mujahidin during the conflict. Khyber also became the heroin capital of Pakistan as laboratories flourished during the Afghan-Soviet conflict.28 After the invasion of US and NATO forces in Afghanistan (2001), many of the Taliban fighters along with their sympathizers sought refuge in Khyber and other parts of FATA region. Since the invasion, US have targeted this region directly with drone attacks while Pakistan military has led several operations to weed out the insurgent groups.29 According to several intelligence reports (US and Pakistan) various insurgent groups have occupied this region and made life difficult for the locals.30 FATA is home to Tehrik-e-Taliban (TT), Tehrik-e-Taliban Pakistan (TTP), Laskhar-e-Islam (LeI) and Tehrik-e-Nafaz-e-Shariat-e-Mohammad (TNSM) along with various sympathizing groups.

Dr. Afridi comes from a very humble beginning where he saw the devastation of warfare that had torn his neighborhood apart. Many injured during the Afghan-Soviet conflict came through Khyber Agency Hospitals that were the initial caretakers of the Mujahidin fighters. These memories will serve a purpose for Dr. Afridi commitment to becoming a medical doctor by profession. In a region where illiteracy runs rampant (66%)

he managed to gain basic education despite the odds. He enrolled in Khyber Medical College, which is part of University of Peshawar. He graduated in 1990 with a specialization in general surgery. The title of ‘medical doctor’ in Pakistan is highly sought and prized. The competition to becoming a medical doctor is stringent due to lack of medical schools within Pakistan. For Dr. Shakil Afridi to go through this process and graduate with a specialization was a remarkable accomplishment. His practice grew over the years remarkably as he was the most specialized doctor operating in Khyber Agency. He was appointed the Chief Surgeon at Jamrud Hospital where his duties expanded tremendously as an administrator. He took part in vaccination projects with various foreign NGO’s (non-government organizations) that are trying to curb polio in Pakistan. His activities were that of a modeled citizen, and his work exemplified a successful man.

Dr. Shakil Afridi was at its highest point of his career as many of his colleagues suggested. He was genuinely helping the people of FATA with massive vaccinations campaigns. He was also the recipient of aid packages from foreign NGOs like “Save the Children” who allegedly introduce Dr. Afridi to CIA agents. According to the reports, CIA orchestrated a fake vaccination project to extract DNA from Osama Bin Laden’s family. It alleges that Dr. Shakil Afridi met with his foreign handlers up to twenty-five times and received instructions on various subject matters. The report also suggested that
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Dr. Afridi received compensation from his handlers in access to $66,000. After the initial arrest, the US officials were quick to deny any and all allegation connecting them to Dr. Afridi. The constant pressure from the news media and eventual sentencing made the situation much worse. Leon Panetta along with Hillary Clinton admitted that Dr. Shakil Afridi worked with CIA in the hunt of Osama Bin Laden.

The US policy makers were in a tough situation at the onset of the investigation into the debacle of the Bin Laden raid. On one side, the Pakistani Military along with the entire country felt humiliated with the brash attack on its sovereignty. On the other side, Pakistan had closed all vital supply routes into Afghanistan. Further, Pakistan gave a stern warning against drone attacks inside its territory. Pakistan had a legitimate case to gripe against US, earlier, twenty-four soldiers were slain due to an accidental NATO bombing on a Pakistani post. That debacle caused much stir within Pakistan and rampant nationalistic protests along with anti-American sentiments rose dramatically. Osama Bin Laden raid would worsen the situation within Pakistan to a new height.

Dr. Shakil Afridi became a pawn in international relations spat between US and Pakistan. Throughout the NATO led conflict, Pakistani leadership insisted that Osama Bin Laden died during his escape from Afghanistan. The Pakistani leadership added to the
story by stating that if he is not already dead than he is residing between Afghan-Pakistan mountainous border regions. This premise gave immediate deniability to the Pakistani regime, but it came at a huge price. US discovered Bin Laden living only minutes away from its prestigious Kakul Military Academy and some suggested that Pakistan knew something about this foreign visitor. Storylines from Pakistani media and US ran differing views on the matter all the while leadership kept a tight lip in its immediate aftermath. Afridi will become the symbol of Pakistani intelligence and military failure and angst of the public. Two differing views on Dr. Shakil Afridi came to light at this critical time. Chris Bummitt and Riaz Khan of Huffington Post summed it up very eloquently:

“In the United States and other Western nations, Afridi was viewed as a hero who had helped eliminate the world's most-wanted man. But Pakistan army and spy chiefs were outraged by the raid, which led to international suspicion that they had been harboring the al-Qaida chief. In their eyes, Afridi was a traitor who had collaborated with a foreign spy agency in an illegal operation on its soil.”39

These views on the surface reflected the political environment within two nation-states, but serious investigation into the incident revealed something more. In Pakistan, the talk show circuit quickly spun the story towards the ‘war on terror.’ They questioned motives behind Pakistani leadership in joining the NATO coalition. Some analyst even suggested that Dr. Shakil Afridi has done no wrong if Pakistan is sincere on its commitments to the war on terror. Other analysts were quick to point out that due to Dr.

Afridi’s ethnic (Pashtun) background he was the perfect person to carry out this operation. Various politicians questioned Dr. Afridi’s moral judgment as a medical doctor. They contended that, how can a medical doctor who has taken an oath to saving lives, can actually be responsible for taking lives. Some within the media questioned the identity of Pakistan. How can an Islamic Republic of Pakistan help non-Muslim coalition attack Afghanistan (predominantly Muslim country)? These storylines polarized the debate within Pakistan on two grounds: political and cultural.

The US media and pundits have raised various questions and concerns surrounding the issue of Shakil Afridi. The problem within the media is that they are only looking at this issue strictly as a political misgiving. The US media has summed up Dr. Shakil Afridi’s imprisonment as part of collateral damage on the war on terror. US need Pakistan and its vital supply routes in order to maintain a strong presence in Afghan-Pakistan border. Pakistan needs a fall guy for its military misgivings that led to the raid on Bin Laden compound. Enter Dr. Shakil Afridi who represents the largest Pashtun tribe (Afridi) in the region is a medical doctor and a Muslim. These were the precepts of jump-starting US and Pakistan relations. If US keep its request for Dr. Shakil Afridi low on the official levels, than Pakistan will open its supply routes and help with logistics on the war on terror. In order to understand why Dr. Shakil Afridi’s story has so many twists and turns, one needs to consider the history of Pakistan. Where does Pakistani identity come from and why is it still unresolved? What are the different ethnic groups that make up Pakistan? Is there a unifying force within Pakistan?

*Background Overview*
Pakistan is a state with defined geographical borders and governing institutions, but some argue that it is not a nation. Indian partition was part of the colonial disposition with various ethnicities that historically never got along with each other. The two-nation theory came about as a construct of British colonialism. This theory created a divide between the two geographical bodies based on religious values. Indian Muslims now had a homeland that they can call their own, Pakistan. One oversight of this divide, ethnicity, and how they will get along with each other under a banner of a modern state. The Muslim homeland was not geographically asymmetrical between East (modern day Bangladesh) and West Pakistan (modern day Pakistan). Democratic majority resided in East Pakistan, which were ethnic Bengalis. West Pakistan was a fractured mix of Punjabi, Sindhi, Balochis, Pasthuns, Kashmiris, and Mohajirs (Urdu speaking Muslim Indians who migrated to Pakistan).

The identity of Pakistan is Islamic in essence, but cooperation amongst its inhabitants are particularly problematic. At its inception, the Hindu majority of India was a primary concern for the minority Muslim community. Now with a homeland of its own, the concerns were about the Islamic identity. The founding fathers of Pakistan (Muhammad Ali Jinnah, Agha Khan III, Liaquat Ali Khan, and Allama Iqbal) were not ideologues of religious convictions; rather they felt this agitation would work to achieve independence. Once they gained independence, the rhetoric of Islamic zealotry had to calm down in order to govern a modern state. Early leaders did try to curb some of the language concerning Islamic identity but to little avail. The thought of Islam being the identity of Pakistan was concerning due to the adoption of Islamic laws within the country. The main question for
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the leaders was: if laws of Islam are to be chosen to govern the country then which jurisprudence should be adopted. Various Muslims sects resided in Pakistan with relative peace under the colonial powers. Now that, a new country has taken shape, all wanted to be part of the power structure.

The first constitution of Pakistan (1956) came about nine years after independence. The reason behind the delay was the constant infighting and lack of visionary leadership. The death of Muhammad Ali Jinnah (Quad-e-Azam) a year into the independence (1948) of the state created a vacuum. President Iskander Mirza dissolved the constitution within two years of its existence due to a coup d’etat. 41 He quickly imposed martial law and appointed General Muhammad Ayub Khan as the Chief Martial Law administrator. This brought about the Pakistani Military into the governing rule of the state, which will have dire consequences for the future. It would be the military elites that would use nationalism as part of its strategy to capture the hearts and mind of Pakistanis. The problem with this approach is that it is extremely short sighted. Nationalism can alleviate surface problems for a short-term. The physical nation building effort should have taken place at the onset of the independence movement. The only real effort that was made by the leadership was through the Islamic agenda that brought more detachment from the country.

The most pivotal event in Pakistani history took place in February of 1953. Political Islam came to the forefront just like it had during the independence movement, but this time it was extraordinarily radical. Movements that were against the creation of Pakistan were now part of the newly independent Islamic state. They were brandishing a radical non-secular vision of Pakistan, which was totally the opposite of its founding fathers.
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principles. Although, many elites within Pakistan were sympathetic to the idea of an Islamic state, they did not want to cede political power in the process of Islamization. Many politicians were using Islamic organizations such as Jamaat-e-Islami against political rivals.\textsuperscript{42} This brought about various radical Islamic organizations into the political arena. The brand of Islam they were promoting was extremely conservative, and its roots were not in Arabia but rather Deoband, India.

Many experts believe that an influential leader by the name of Maulana Abu Ala Maududi was instrumental in inciting the Lahore riots of 1953. In reality, the inciting was a gradual sequence of events that date back to June of 1952. Under the banner of ‘\textit{All Pakistan Muslim Parties Convention},’ eleven prominent Islamic scholars representing various parties got together to frame their demands from the government of Pakistan. The conference also called into order an additional meeting, which took place in January of 1953. Fifteen leading Islamic parties took part in the meeting where they defined the demands and agreed upon its contents.\textsuperscript{43} Further, ‘\textit{Council of Action (Majlis-e-Amal)}’ was formed to examine and implement the demands put forth by the Islamic scholars. The demands were as follows:

1. “\textit{Declare Ahmadis a non-Muslim minority}.”

2. \textit{Dismiss Sir Zafrullah Khan, the foreign minister, because of his Ahmadi beliefs.}

3. \textit{Remove all other Ahmadis occupying key posts in the state.”}\textsuperscript{44}


\textsuperscript{44} Ibid 2010. 62. Print.
The federal government led by the Prime Minister Khawaja Nazimuddin rejected the demands immediately. Although, he sympathized with the notion of Ahmadis as non-Muslims, his intellect gave him the benefit of thinking rationally.\textsuperscript{45} He believed that an individual right to chose a religion is a matter of preference and state cannot dictate nor enforce its subject on religious grounds. Governor-general of Pakistan (Malik Ghulam Muhammad) immediately removed Nazimuddin from his position after the army suppressed the protest in Lahore, which lasted from 1\textsuperscript{st} February to 14\textsuperscript{th} May 1953.\textsuperscript{46} This event played a pivotal role in carving conservative Islamic ideation within political identity of Pakistan. The event also had a lasting impact in terms of law and order pertaining to religious authority within Pakistan. Only two clerics (Maulana Abdus Sattar Niazi and Maulana Abul Ala Maududi) received the death penalty by a military tribunal. Their sentences were later commuted, due to immense public pressure. The same military leadership later commuted sentences for both clerics and freed them from future persecution. This incident showcased that no religious elite can be prosecuted due to engrained sentiments within the Pakistani society. It also emboldened some religious leaders who enjoyed a sizable following within Pakistan.

Groups like Jamaat-e-Islami started to interfere within the politics of Pakistan on the basis of religious piety. All political parties within Pakistan looked at this movement as a potential pitfall for their parties. Many started to prop up their own religious affiliation groups that were now linking with Islamist movements all throughout Pakistan. No political party wanted to be seen as a modernist, secular and non-religious within Pakistan.

Political parties wanted approval from the Islamic leadership. Once they had that coveted approval it made the political process much easier to appeal to the masses.

_Military and Nationalism_

Pakistani military has enjoyed an unchallenged position within the national polity as the guarantors of the Islamic state. Pakistanis have held favorable sentiments towards their soldier and hold them in high accord within the society. In general, they are model citizenry who have stood up to overwhelming odds against a much larger adversary (India). They have also played a pivotal role within Pakistani politics and have impacted the country deeply. Pakistan armed forces have used nationalism and religion as its calling to unify the support for its actions against the state. There have been three bloodless coups in the history of Pakistan, which has resulted in a military dictatorship.\(^47\) These actions were a cause of national concern but the military enjoyed support by the populace due to its position within the country. The seamless shift of power that was taken away from a democratically elected government and given to the military elites due to the coup was remarkable. It seems that the military channels along with the bureaucratic institutions of Pakistan work great together during transition of power. Some experts believe that bureaucratic institutions within Pakistan help create the environment for military to take over.\(^48\)

Lahore riots of 1953 were the first time that the military took direct actions to suppress civil unrest within the country.\(^49\) The military imposed martial law in Lahore and


arrested many religious leaders suspected of inciting the riots. The quick and decisive actions brought Lahore under control of the military leadership led by Major General Muhammad Azam Khan.\textsuperscript{50} The military tribunals were set-up to punish those responsible for the mayhem. The military were surprise by its success to bringing back Lahore to its normalcy within few days. They expected grand opposition after arresting various religious leaders, but the populace remained calm and in favor of the military reprisals. This gave latitude to the military elites within the country who were seeing an opportunity develop for takeover. The military used nationalism specifically the ‘India card’ to unite Pakistan for its objectives.\textsuperscript{51} Unlike the politicians, military leadership had experience fighting for the sacred homeland (Pakistan), and this gave them credibility amongst the Pakistanis.

In 1958, just five years after the Lahore riots, General Ayub Khan appointed himself the President of Pakistan in a bloodless coup.\textsuperscript{52} He came to power after Ret. Major General Iskander Mirza (former Pakistani President) dismissed the constitution and relieved Prime Minister Ferooz Khan Noon’s government.\textsuperscript{53} General Ayub Khan sent Iskander Mirza into exile soon after and had complete control over the country from 1958 – 1969. This would mark the first ever-successful military coup in the country and leave a military dictatorship legacy over Pakistan for years to come. Ayub Khan came to power on the premise that the political elites were ruining the country with bad governance. He wanted to protect Pakistan from all enemies including domestic politicians. This type of


mentality gave credence to the idea that Pakistani military considers anyone outside its institution as enemy of the state. The very same premise would be use by General Zia-ul-Haq in 1978 and General Pervez Musharaf in 1999.

Ethnic divide within Pakistan

Pakistan is divided between five main geographical areas based on language and ethnicity. Pakistan has a population of more than 187 million inhabitants in an area of 796 thousand square miles. The major ethnic groups within Pakistan are Punjabi, Pashtuns, Sindhis, Saraikis, Muhajirs and Balochis. The largest group is the Punjabi, and they occupy the breadbasket of Pakistan. Punjabis are the agrarian backbone of Pakistan and provide the most in agriculture and textiles. The Muhajirs are of Indian decent who came to Pakistan after the partition with India. They are mainly Urdu speaking group who reside in urban population centers of Pakistan. The majority of them reside in Karachi (port city) the largest city in Pakistan. Saraikis reside mainly in South Punjab province and are mainly day laborers and farmers. Many Saraikis have migrated to urban sprawls within Pakistan. They have their own language along with various customs and unique cultural traits. Sindhis reside mainly in the south and are known for their feudal domains. They also have their own language and customs. The Balochis mainly reside in Baluchistan, which is the largest province in terms of the area, but the least populated. They also have their own language and customs. Lastly, a large contingent of Pashtun lives in Pakistan. They have moved all across Pakistan including large city centers like Karachi, Lahore, Islamabad, Rawalpindi, Multan and Hyderabad. They are mainly associated with hard working day laborer, truck drivers, food vendors, carpet vendors and various other businesses. They also
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have a unique language (Pashto) and culture. All these ethnicities live in relative peace amongst each other because there are two things that unite them together: religion (Islam) and nationalism (hatred towards India).

Cracks within the ethnic divide have surfaced in recent times. The main contentious issue at the forefront has been which Islam to follow. Although, the Balochis have had major issues of solidarity and Pashtuns had issues with the Durand line, the issue of Islam takes precedence. This issue was at the center since the inception of the state of Pakistan. Many experts suggest that politics within Islam have ramped up divide within sects. Many Islamist organizations have turned to radical theology to gain prominence within the country and attract foreign funds. This has created a problem all on its own within Pakistan. Prominent countries like Saudi Arabia and UAE (United Arab Emirates) have been linked to funding radical madrasahs (religious schools) in Pakistan. Pakistani government along with military elites has tried to curb some of the foreign influence within the country with little results. The very same madrasahs that helped defeat Soviet Union are now working against US and Pakistan (old allies). This shift has brought Pakistan at odds with radical religious elements that are now waging war against the state. This issue came to the forefront with Dr. Shakil Afridi as Pakistani government contended that he was a double agent who worked for a terrorist organization along with US intelligence agency.

Other national issues also showed up in form of land and water rights. Sindhis contended that Punjab is redirecting its water supply away from Sindh province. Balochis contended that all the money from natural gas is going in the pocket of Punjab and not much is coming back to Baluchistan. There are also several ethnic minority divide based on economics. Muhajirs contend that the majority of jobs in Karachi goes to well connected Punjabis. They also insist that Muhajirs are marginalize within the academia. The Punjabis, Muhajirs contend, receive priority in admissions to the top universities of Pakistan. Punjabis seem to be at the core of many problems within Pakistan. This is more of a myth rather then the reality within Pakistan. Punjabis are the majority ethnic group within Pakistan and they are well represented in all aspects of Pakistan. Although, not all discrimination claims are false, they are sensationalized for maximum coverage.

There are not too many complicated ethnic divide within the country that can lead to national turmoil like genocide in Rwanda or Bosnia. Rather, the ethnicities have lived with each other throughout the centuries without serious conflicts because they had unifying factors such as religion. Now that very same unifying force seems to divide them along with outside pressure to support the ‘war of terror.’ This notion has caused lots of problems within Pakistan and currently there is an active insurgency-taking place against the state rulers. Dr. Shakil Afridi is caught in the middle of a highly complex environment that is currently engulfing the state of Pakistan. He is an ethnic Pashtun who is also a highly influential member of the Pakistani society (doctor) who helped US (CIA) find Bin Laden.

Another fundamental divide that is currently taking place is amongst the religious minorities of Pakistan. Shia Muslims just like Ahmadiyya in 1953 are being targeted for their religious convictions. Unlike Ahmadiyya, Shias in Pakistan make up 10-15 percent of the total population.\(^6^0\) The current President of Pakistan, Asif Ali Zardari, is also from a prominent Shia, Sindhi family. This divide has potential of getting out of control and can lead to a full-blown civil war within the country. The political aspect of the religious divide can also spill into ethnic rift. This can elevate the current religious divide within Pakistan into a regional conflict with Iran, India and Afghanistan taking differing sides.

*Conformity on news reporting*

Immediately following the raid on Osama Bin Laden’s compound on 2nd of May (2011) the Pakistani media were scrambling to find any official involvement from Pakistan. Common sense seems to dictate that Pakistan’s military brass were not only aware of the operation, but they also took part in it. The government and the military were silent on the matter and did not officially comment until 5\(^{th}\) of May 2011. In a move that was heavily criticized within Pakistan, the military spokesmen acknowledge its “*shortcomings in developing intelligence on the presence of Osama Bin Laden in Pakistan*.”\(^6^1\) Despite the admission by the Pakistani military the media within the country kept on reporting in unison with the western media outlets. Many newspapers reports were reprints of


international press organizations like Reuters (UK), Associated Press (US) and AFP (France).

President Barack Obama came to address the nation immediately after the raid against Osama Bin Laden’s compound. The news travelled over the airways, Internet and print immediately following the address. Instead of reporting their own version of the news, Pakistani media relied on the international press for the Bin Laden coverage. Dawn led with the headline: “Jubilation at ground zero for Bin Laden downfall.” 62 This news was borrowed from AFP (France) and also contained picture showing American teens raising the flag in Manhattan, NY. Other news agencies within Pakistan carried similar headlines: “Osama Bin Laden is dead: US Media (The News/Jang Group), 63 Osama’s death: America’s Jubilation (BBC Urdu), 64 US kills Osama Bin Laden and three aides in Abbottabad operation (Nawaiwaqt Urdu), 65 and Osama unarmed when shot dead: US (GEO Network).” 66

In the US media the coverage was a little different in print and television. The print coverage reflected the overall worldly journalistic view over Osama Bin Laden’s death. The print headline within US read as: Osama Bin Laden is dead (Wall Street Journal and
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CBS/AP Online,67 Bin Laden Is Dead, Obama Says (New York Times),69 US Kills Bin Laden (L.A. Times),70 Privileged son became the global face of terrorism (Washington Post)71 and OK, He’s Dead. Can We Go Home? (Mother Jones).”72 On the other hand the television coverage by ABC, CBS, NBC, CNN, Fox News and MSNBC was more towards the reaction of the death of Bin Laden. The television coverage highlighted the jubilation on the streets of New York and Washington D.C.73 The coverage was about the reaction of triumph and patriotism. It was very different from the print and the President’s address to the nation. The news story kept showing the street reaction to the killing of Bin Laden. Some of the experts on talk shows such as “Rachel Maddow” and “Anderson Cooper 360” were inciting patriotic fervor on screen to highlight this great achievement. The discourse however, turned to questioning Pakistan’s role in aiding Bin Laden. Many questions were being raised about the connection between Pakistani Intelligence Agency (ISI) and Bin Laden. Was Bin Laden really hidden from the world asked Christian Science Monitor?75


Another newspaper highlighted that Pakistan is facing new suspicions on sincerity towards war on terrorism.\textsuperscript{76}

The Pakistani media were caught off-guard with the humiliating stories that were being circulated against the state. They wanted to counter these outrageous allegations by putting forward the question on sovereignty.\textsuperscript{77} This was a very critical topic as it incites Pakistani nationalism. This was also the topic that western news media were avoiding to discuss because it forwards the “pre-emption strike” debate. This debate was a perfect cover for the Pakistani Armed forces to redeem their focus and demoralizing image. The Chief of Pakistani Armed Forces bluntly warned against any raid into Pakistan.\textsuperscript{78} The Pakistani media kept on raising issues against such a bold strike against a country who supposedly is a partner in the war against terrorism. One theme that was quickly pointed out was against its old rival, India. The questions were hypothetical in nature as they asked if India could also do these types of raid against Kashmiri insurgents that are operating inside Pakistan. After the initial shock, anger ran rampant amongst the Pakistanis, but it was not at any one institution. Rather, anger from the masses was at the government, armed forces of Pakistan, intelligence community and the media itself.

Pakistani media kept borrowing news stories about Osama Bin Laden from western sources and reprinting them on their newspapers. This practice continued freely and the reasoning behind this is still very unclear. In my understanding, the Pakistani media were

reporting the general consensus around Pakistan. There was a relief and a subdued joy amongst Pakistanis that Osama Bin Laden is no longer in this world. I was in Islamabad at the time of the raid against Bin Laden and stayed there till 27 May 2011. My family and friends were very happy and now were even thinking that US can scale back their drone program from the tribal belt. Pakistan has sacrificed the most for the war on terror as the numbers suggests. 21,672 civilians and 2,795 soldiers have lost their lives; 8,671 soldiers have been injured; 3,486 bombs have exploded in Pakistan with 283 major suicide bombing; more than 3.5 million Pakistanis are displaced; Damage to Pakistani economy is estimated at $68 billion. These are grim numbers and recovery from this war will take many years and continued support from the western powers. This was the pretext to Pakistani news agencies to continue supporting the message that was being aired by US and the west.

But, the discourse quickly changed to blaming Pakistan for housing the number one terrorist in the world. The very notion of sincerity and honor of every Pakistani was being questioned by the western media. This seemed too much to take for they were not only humiliated by the raid but now were being questioned on their commitment. In my opinion this is the reason why the Pakistani media opted to raise various questions against the raid in conjunction with the international law. The question over sovereignty was very near and dear to every Pakistani. They hold the land of Pakistan as sacred and any notion to violate against its sovereignty is considered an act of war. The Pakistani media were right to incite this type of emotions from Pakistanis at a time where most were demoralized by their

---

standing Armed Forces. They also deflected much of the blame towards the Armed Forces of Pakistan. This was still a period of healing and mending relations back with US. Global media had come over to Pakistan and the Pakistani media personalities were highly sought after for their commentary and insights. Pakistani media were still using excerpts from global news agencies and reprinting many articles. This would continue until 11 July 2011 when Dr. Shakil Afridi was introduced to the global media.

*Introducing Dr. Shakil Afridi to the global media*

On 23 May 2011, various news agencies within Pakistan reported a kidnapping of a doctor by gunmen in Peshawar. 80 Within few hours, the story took a dramatic turn and news outlets recanted the original story without explanation. Later, a new story surfaced that revealed the identity of the doctor as Shakil Afridi and that he is under the police custody. No further reports surfaced until the next day when an investigative reporter (Said Nazir Afridi; no relations to Dr. Shakil Afridi) broke the news in his print column. His report detailed how police stopped a car carrying Dr. Shakil Afridi and three of his colleagues (Dr. Ziaul Haq, Dr. Sher Khan, Dr. Idrees) including a personal bodyguard. According to Dr. Ziaul Haq they were coming back from Jamrud, Khyber Agency to Peshawar when local police stopped them briefly. 81 After a quick chat they were released and headed towards Peshawar. After driving only “50 yards” the car was pulled over again, but this time by Special Police Force (SPF). 82 They all complied with the orders of the police officers and showed their identifications. After thoroughly checking the
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80 Samaa, Dawn, GEO, Express, ARY, Dunya and Indus news ticker 23 May 2011;
identification of the occupants inside the car, Dr. Shakil Afridi was taken by police in a marked police SUV. The other passengers were allowed to leave with a small explanation on why they are taking Dr. Afridi. The police officer explained that Dr. Afridi is involved in “anti-state activities” which was immediately refuted by his colleagues. This was still very early as the news outlets were still trying to grasp the storylines. Some agencies within Pakistan were cautious in exploiting this further as it may not be a big story for the future. It is a norm within Pakistan that someone is being picked up by Special police units for outrageous charges but if the person is of high value he is usually released within hours. In this case Shakil Afridi is a prominent physician with a very high and recognizable position within Pakistan Ministry of Health.

Earlier reports were all over the place as many news agencies within Pakistan were trying to get more information on Pakistan’s official response over the lapse on intelligence. They also followed the foreign media closely as they did not want to be the one left in the dark. The Pakistani media wanted to break this story rather than have a foreign media (US) lead them to it. The Pakistan Army were the first to acknowledge that they arrested various individuals both Pakistanis as well as foreigners and were questioning them thoroughly. The report also acknowledged that a Major within Pakistan Army was also under arrest by the authorities that help provide intelligence for CIA operation. The report collaborated earlier accounts by New York Times and The Guardian that at least

83 Ibid., Web 07 Mar. 2013.
five people were arrested in connection to the CIA operations.\textsuperscript{86,87} Pakistan Armed forces vehemently denied these allegations, as the source was not named in any of the reports.\textsuperscript{88} While going back and forth, both Pakistani and US media started to take differing direction. US media stuck to political ramifications of the operation while Pakistani media went in various different directions, which included identity, nationalism and ethnic divide within the country. The most interesting thing that came out of this fiasco was the angry debate about the ‘war on terror’ and how Pakistan had lost itself within the great game. The media personalities took to the screen and asked highly provocative questions about the direction that the country is heading towards and how its people are lost in the mix. The core of the question was about understanding where Pakistan stood within the ‘war on terror?’ They were making headwinds about how the state was sending mixed signals to its populace. On one hand, Pakistan condemns drone attacks in public while supporting its strategic depth within the tribal belt.\textsuperscript{89}

On 11 July 2011, an article in New York Times blew open the story of a CIA led fake vaccination campaign. The news suggested that a Pakistani doctor named Shakil Afridi ran a fake vaccination campaign in conjunction with CIA.\textsuperscript{90} From this moment on


the story was the most relevant news for all Pakistani media outlets that wanted the full and in-depth scope. Various media outlets led with an expert panel that understood the intelligence matters and included prominent guests like Retired General Hamid Gul (ex-ISI Chief) and Former President General Pervez Musharraf. This news story was a blessing in disguise for the Government of Pakistan along with its Military brass. This would be a perfect diversion for some of the anger that was on them by the citizenry and the media. The Pakistani media were embarrassed that they did not break the story that took place in their backyard. Although, they were the first ones to report the arrest of Dr. Shakil Afridi, no one followed up. In my opinion, this is the reason why the Pakistani media concentrated on reinventing the story. They wanted to highlight some of the pressing issues that had plagued the country since its inception. The media thought that Dr. Shakil Afridi would be a perfect platform to start on these major discourses that have divided the state.

*The debate*

The media had lost out on a story of a lifetime when they did not follow up on the arrest of Dr. Shakil Afridi. The Pakistani government was under immense pressure from both outside as well as inside of Pakistan. Demoralized and shocked, the Pakistani military were searching for answers. Talk show hosts were imposing important questions to its audience against the government, military establishment and the ‘war on terror.’ The people were caught in the middle and did not know what to believe. At this very time Dr. Shakil Afridi was making headline news all over the world. Immediately following the raid, Pakistanis were favorable to the news of Bin Laden’s demise. Even today, 55% of all
Pakistanis held negative opinion on Al Qaeda and its leadership. What they question is how US, who acts as an ally to Pakistan, can infringe upon its sovereignty without any recourse. Sensing the delicateness of the issue at hand, the Pakistani media jumped on the story with a renewed vigor. Besides attacking the ineptness of the military, they went after the government for not doing anything immediately following the incursion. This was the premise of the debate that would grip Pakistani media for more than a year. They help mold this debate into a reflection on Pakistan’s identity, nationalism and ethnic divide. This debate would not have been possible if Dr. Shakil Afridi was not a polarizing figure. These debates helped define Dr. Afridi’s reputation within the mass media. The differing perspectives were adopted but it was not by design rather it was a phenomena that was generated due to the environment.

The Pakistani media ran the story of Dr. Shakil Afridi on three different formats. One was the reporting of everyday occurrences in court proceedings; second was the in-depth expert analysis on a talk show (similar to Larry King Live); thirdly, producing investigative stories about Dr. Shakil Afridi and the impact of the aftermath. This format gave an unusual notoriety to the news story. The affair can be compared to the O. J. Simpson trial without the cameras in the courtroom. The media hounded anyone and everyone who was remotely connected to Dr. Shakil Afridi and his family. It got so bad for the immediate family of Dr. Afridi that they had to go into hiding. Some within the media
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thought that the family had were kidnapped by intelligence. Other rumors suggested that they flew out of Pakistan with the help of CIA.

*Molding Dr. Shakil Afridi’s reputation*

Pakistani media started probing the story surrounding Dr. Shakil Afridi after the Guardian and New York Times published the story on 11 July 2011. The media posed an important question on the usefulness of foreign NGOs in Pakistan. The experts suggested that Pakistan could not rely on foreign NGOs without national security risks. In an extraordinary move the government of Pakistan sided with the experts and refused to give extension to visas for foreign aid workers.\(^93\) There are over 200 US-based NGOs working in Pakistan and many were deeply concerned. On television talk shows and in print, US-NGOs were blaming CIA and Dr. Shakil Afridi for using the humanitarian cover for intelligence gathering. They questioned Dr. Shakil Afridi and his professionalism along with CIA and there lack of understanding the big picture. Interaction chief Samuel A Worthington stated that,

“the CIA’s use of cover of humanitarian activity for this purpose casts doubt on intentions and integrity of all humanitarian actors in Pakistan, thereby undermining the international humanitarian community’s efforts to eradicate polio, provide critical health services and extend life-saving assistance during times of crisis like the floods seen in Pakistan over the past two years”\(^94\)

---


Hamid Mir, a renowned journalist and host of a popular talk show (Capital Talk) questioned Dr. Shakil Afridi’s intentions, professionalism, legality and national divide.\[^95\] This was a theme for other talk shows that were raising similar questions and concerns over the matter. He questioned why US opted to use a physician who is a great symbol of pride within Pakistan for spying purposes? He also indicated that there is massive external pressure (US) on the Pakistani government for the immediate release of Dr. Afridi. The panel of experts termed that pressure as unjust. He also pressed the prime minister of Pakistan (Yousaf Raza Gillani) over the closing of the supply route to NATO. He demanded if the Government would succumb to the pressures of US and reopen it in an exchange for Dr. Afridi? Asma Arbab Alamgir (Advisor to Prime Minister of Pakistan) rejected the foreign pressure (US) as political motive that is intended for internal appeasement. She carefully crafted the debate into the government position stating, “our legal system is free and that Dr. Shakil Afridi will be held accountable for his actions.”\[^96\]

She was also keen in pointing out that Dr. Shakil Afridi cannot be a symbol of pride for Pakistan and its government. Rather, he is disloyal to the country of his birth and should be tried within the laws of the state. The government’s message was clear and to the point. It seemed as if everyone received the same memo on the talking points for Dr. Afridi’s case.

*Hero or traitor*

The laws of Pakistan were at the center of the debate over Dr. Shakil Afridi. The media sought expertise from constitutional lawyers to explain how Dr. Afridi can be


charged with treason. The problem with this course of action was that of the domicile of Dr. Afridi. He was a resident of Federally Administered Tribal Area (FATA) and the rule of law that would apply to him was that of a tribal consortium. The British Raj in the Pashtun tribal region enacted the Frontier Crimes Regulations (FCR). These laws are still applied by the Government of Pakistan to the residents of FATA. The media and the people of Pakistan wanted Dr. Shakil Afridi to be tried under Pakistani courts or military tribunal. The reason for that was due to his position as a physician. He was an employ of Government of Pakistan and was appointed by the government officials. Hinting at this point various news agencies looked at article 5 and 6 of the Pakistani constitution. They raised the question about the “loyalty of the state and obedience to the constitution and law” against Dr. Shakil Afridi. Article 5 states:

“1. Loyalty to the State is the basic duty of every citizen.

2. Obedience to the Constitution and law is the [inviolable] obligation of every citizen wherever he may be and of every other person for the time being within Pakistan.”

The media and some government officials also observed that Dr. Shakil Afridi should also be charged with high treason. According to article 6 of the constitution:

“1. Any person who abrogates or subverts or suspends or holds in abeyance, or attempts or conspires to abrogate or subvert or suspend or hold in abeyance, the Constitution by use of force or show of force or by any other unconstitutional means shall be guilty of high treason.

2. Any person aiding or abetting [or collaborating] the acts mentioned in clause (1) shall likewise be guilty of high treason. An act of high treason mentioned in clause (1) or clause (2) shall not be validated by any court including the Supreme Court and a High Court.

3. Majlis-e-Shoora (Parliament) shall by law provide for the punishment of persons found guilty of high treason.”

Dr. Shakil Afridi was made out to be a traitor in front of the Pakistani media and the government had also taken up similar stance. Urdu newspapers ran very provocative stories charging Dr. Afridi as a hero to America and a traitor to Pakistan. These stories painted a very negative image of United States and Dr. Afridi.99 Some contended that Dr. Afridi brought much shame to the image of Pakistan. Other news outlets suggested that CIA was working against the state of Pakistan because of its nuclear capabilities.100 An article published online titled, “Conspiracy to Breakup Pakistan,” by GEO News (Urdu) suggested that this is a plan that is being undertaken by western interests.101 It further suggested that India and Israel is involved against the state of Pakistan with United States leading the way. United States countered the allegation and held the line that “Dr. Shakil Afridi did not work against Pakistan or its interests.”102 They also made clear that United


States is not concerned about Pakistani nuclear assets and believe that adequate security measures are in place. The White House spokesmen were ready to answer all questions that were directed at them over Dr. Shakil Afridi. They made a genuine effort to sway the Pakistani public opinion against Dr. Afridi. US government representatives went on a media blitz in Pakistan, talking to Urdu newspapers, TV talk shows and creating positive ad campaigns.

The Government of Pakistan also took immediate actions in terms of enacting sanctions against those who were involved with Bin Laden affair. This included immediate and extended family of Dr. Shakil Afridi. People connected to the investigation were “barred” from leaving the country. Further more, the government seized all assets including bank accounts of Dr. Shakil Afridi. Some experts, showed concerns about these actions and called them illegal. Others suggested, this was only a start and more should be done against those connected to the raid. Although, these actions were not unprecedented in the history of Pakistan, the way they were being progressed was surprising. Dr. Shakil Afridi had not been charged with any crime yet his assets were being seized and his family was barred from leaving Pakistan. Some within the media suggested that Dr. Shakil Afridi and his family have become the scapegoats for the military’s ineptness and government’s incompetence.

The outside pressure led to some progressives to rethink the case against Dr. Shakil Afridi in the public light. They focused on the legality of the case against Dr. Afridi and


how the governing elites were using laws as weapon to suppress the unfortunate. Even retired military officers took jab at the government and the military for presenting such a poor case against Dr. Afridi. Brigadier (retired) Asad Munir wrote a very provocative piece in the Express Tribune that caught a lot of attention from the media and public. He stated: “is he (Dr. Shakil Afridi) a traitor? I think not. Was he involved in espionage, the answer is again ‘no’. Did he help in locating Osama? No, because he did not know that Osama was hiding there when he was asked to collect the DNA samples.”

Even some of politicians were examining the case of Dr. Afridi from a different viewpoint. Former senator Iqbal Haider wrote an extensive article that charged that the government and the military establishment used “absurdities in the name of justice” against Dr. Shakil. Senator Haider also dismissed the media’s argument that Dr. Afridi committed high treason against the state of Pakistan. He suggested that according to the Pakistani Penal Code the word treason has not been defined nor are there any cases in the past for further clarifications. Haider suggested that, according to the Minister of Defense, the only thing Dr. Afridi did wrong was not to tell the Pakistani authorities about the information regarding Bin Laden. The case against Dr. Afridi was boiling down to simple logic and for a period it looked like charges of treason against him will not stick.

---


In United States the government officials were defiant stating that, “we will not let Pakistan dictate our interests.” Hillary Clinton suggested that there is no real reason to detain Dr. Shakil Afridi and that he was working for both US and Pakistani interests. Leon Panetta went one step further suggesting that Dr. Shakil Afridi provided key information to US in the hunt for Bin Laden. This discourse was playing in front of both public spheres (US and Pakistan) and the media were concluding differing perspectives. Dr. Shakil Afridi was in the middle of an international debate over who is right and wrong. As suggested by his younger brother, “Dr. Shakil Afridi is the sacrificial lamb for both US and Pakistan.” The United States took an unprecedented action by introducing a bill that would honor Dr. Shakil Afridi with congressional gold medal. The architect of this bill Dana Rohrabacher, had earlier suggested for the succession of Baluchistan from Pakistan. This gave the impression that the design of the US was to divide Pakistan. The Pakistani media were extremely livid with this development and pressed on with negative stories about Dr. Shakil Afridi and US policies. The Pakistani media kept the pressure on government officials and military elites to reexamine the friendship with NATO allies and US. This exacerbated the effort of goodwill that was made on the behalf of the White

---
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House. The Government of Pakistan also reacted very angrily and suggested that NATO supply route is in real jeopardy of permanent action.

Islam, Pakistani and Pashtun

Dr. Shakil Afridi is a Muslim; a national of Pakistan (born in FATA); and an ethnic Pashtun (minority within Pakistan but majority in FATA). He is also a physician who is employed by the Government of Pakistan within the Ministry of Health. He represents a very interesting case within Pakistani society. He is considered an elite due to his wealth and position within the social order. So, he enjoys a very favorable position within Pakistan and is considered a hero within FATA. It was a great challenge for the Pakistani media and the government to depict him as a negative personality. He was one of hundreds of doctors who worked on vaccination campaigns with foreign NGOs. The Pakistani press along with governing elites wanted to challenge Dr. Shakil Afridi but did not want to spook other NGOs in the process. This would be a hard task to follow because hardline extremist within the country called for an end to vaccination and removal of all NGOs from Pakistan. Some medical experts expressed concerns over the long-term implication of such actions. Polio had nearly been wiped out of Pakistan and experts contended if the vaccinations stopped it would come back.

With nationalism as the only reconciliatory tool for the government and the Pakistani military, it had to be used carefully to send a clear and precise message. The problem was the shortsightedness of the message as it was infringing on old difficulties of the state. The press inadvertently started to question the identity of Pakistan and ethnic

---

divisions. Sana Bucha, famous media personality openly questioned how Pakistani military and the Government is sidelining a Pashtun (Dr. Afridi) for bigger game.\textsuperscript{115} She contended that Pakistani intelligence willingly gave information to US who used its own resources on the ground to substantiate the claims. She further claims, that this is how the vaccination ruse came about because US resources were not able to identity if Bin Laden resided in Abbottabad. She concluded with a haste statement suggesting that, “we will never really know whose side he was on. We were never meant to.”\textsuperscript{116} Sana Bucha was not alone to bring up the concerns based on ethnicity but it was important for her because she is also an ethnic Pashtun. She had a hard time breaking into news media as women who had been educated in the west. Although, she had a very influential father, many news outlets wanted her to report on lighter topics. They did not want her to be a political analyst leading into local and national politics.

Others within the Pakistani media kept within the lines of the government message suggesting that Dr. Afridi collaborated with a foreign intelligence agency. On the talk show titled, “Sochta Pakistan (Thinking Pakistan)” Moeed Pirzada contends that Dr. Shakil Afridi was a collaborating agent but did not know or understand what he was collaborating to.\textsuperscript{117} Some experts within Pakistan raised doubts that this type of generalization maybe true for an ordinary Pashtun but not Dr. Shakil Afridi. There was an underlining prejudice that is widely held within Pakistan that all Pashtuns are nuts or illiterate. The caveat was


pointed out by many experts as derogatory and discriminatory towards the intelligence of Pashtuns in Pakistan. Majority of the Pashtuns are day laborers that can be credited with building of modern Pakistan. They have been sidelined due to their spontaneous nature and wild temperament. Their tradition of badal (revenge) has also been a folklore legend within Pakistan. These prejudices have kept many Pashtuns on the fringes of Pakistani society and as a collective they feel left out of the nation-state dynamics. Although many efforts of reconciliation have been made in recent times, the case against Dr. Shakil Afridi does not help.

On the other hand, the western media was looking at Dr. Shakil Afridi in a different light. Experts like Peter Bergen was comparing Dr. Shakil Afridi to Jonathan Pollard who spied against US for a friendly country (Israel). He contends that Pakistan has a right to charge Dr. Afridi who they deem is responsible for Bin Laden raid. Other international news agencies like Al Jazeera also contended that Pakistan has the right to go against Dr. Shakil Afridi. They took on a different route showcasing how Pakistani government and Military were humiliated by United States. Robert Granier states:

“From the Pakistani viewpoint, the United States’ obvious lack of trust in having declined to solicit their assistance in verifying bin Laden’s presence in Abbottabad or in trying to effect his capture is a national insult. And in having launched a secret commando raid on Pakistani territory, in an Army town no less, the Americans have deftly turned insult into national humiliation. To a Pakistani, the notion that one of their
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nationals would have been complicit in these perceived outrages against their sovereignty is simply unforgiveable, no matter that his assistance was marginal at best - he apparently never did acquire the hoped-for DNA - and that he could certainly not have anticipated the nature of American actions to come."\textsuperscript{119}

Pakistani media were contending that Dr. Shakil Afridi was paid heavily for his cooperation with CIA. They suggested that the doctor was paid $10,000 for setting up his fake vaccination campaign.\textsuperscript{120} Another allegation was that United States gave ample warning to Dr. Shakil Afridi to leave the country.\textsuperscript{121} Western media along with the US government confirmed these allegations and further suggested that Dr. Afridi chose not to leave.\textsuperscript{122} This was interpreted as arrogance on the part of Dr. Shakil Afridi. The Pakistani media spun the story suggesting that just like Raymond Davis, American government will take Dr. Shakil Afridi from Pakistan. These stories were unfortunate as Pakistani nationalists were digging in for a long fight against any foreign pressure as well as internal strife. This would mean that nationalism as a tool for reconciliation purposes would not be fruitful if the government sided with Dr. Shakil Afridi. The people of Pakistan wanted Dr. Afridi to leave.


Afridi to pay for his doing even though the logic suggested otherwise. There was a collective notion of anguish against Dr. Shakil Afridi and his actions. In Pakistan the people wanted Dr. Afridi to be punished so he could be a warning to the future generations. In United States, Dr. Afridi was a political talking point against Pakistan. They can use him to negotiate and blackmail the country for future and keep Pakistan firmly within their sphere of influence. The problem was not the government but rather the people of Pakistan. Many nationalists’ politicians within Pakistan had come forward in criticizing the government, military and even United States. People like Imran Khan (PTI Chairman) were gaining ground and held numerous rallies to show there resolve against Dr. Shakil Afridi. PTI, Islamist organization and other political parties saw a chance to rise in power by denouncing the ruling government along with United States. They all contended that Dr. Shakil Afridi should be held accountable and his trial should be televised for all of Pakistan to see.

**The verdict**

The popular narrative surrounding the trial of Dr. Shakil Afridi was that he should be tried under the Pakistani laws. The problem was that he is a resident of FATA. FATA dictates that their residents can only be tried under FCR (Frontier Crimes Regulation). Many within Khyber Agency contended that Dr. Afridi is being tried under the FCR so he could not face the death penalty. Many within Khyber Agency contended that Dr. Afridi

---


should not be facing FCR because the crime was committed in Abbottabad. One of the lawyer based in Khyber Agency suggested, “\textit{he (Dr. Shakil Afridi) had committed the crime in Abbottabad, far away from the Federally Administered Tribal Areas, and he was arrested in Peshawar. He should have been tried in a Pakistani court instead of the FCR to execute him on the treason charge.”} Pakistani government along with the military establishment did not want Dr. Afridi’s trial to spark mass protest within Pakistan. The government was also looking to smooth relations with United States so FCR was considered a better option than the Pakistani courts or military tribunal.

The trial was not televised and despite aggressive efforts by the media Assistant Political Agent (APA) of Bara kept a tight lid on the proceedings. The trial was led by four-member tribal court, which was headed by Mohammad Nasir Khan. The verdict of guilty came on 23 May 2012 and Dr. Shakil Afridi was sentence to 33 years. The news agencies wrongly reported that he was charged with treason for the Bin Laden affair. Rather, Dr. Shakil Afridi was charged for his militant links to Lashker-e-Islam. The tribal court contended that Dr. Shakil Afridi had established links with Mangal Bagh who was the chief of Lashker-e-Islam (banned terrorist organization). The tribal court also fined Dr. Afridi Rs. 320,000 ($3,256.32). The charges read as following:


(FCR) and sections 121-A (conspiracy to commit offence against the state), 123 (concealing with intent to facilitate design to wage war against state), 123-A (condemnation of the creation of the state and advocacy of abolition of its sovereignty) and 124 (assaulting president, governor, etc, with the intention to compel or restrain the exercise of any lawful power) of the Pakistan Penal Code (PPC).

The APA awarded 10-year sentence and imposed Rs100,000 fine on the accused under Section 121-A PPC, 11-year sentence and Rs100,000 fine under Section 123 PPC, 10-year sentence with a fine of Rs100,000 under Section 123-A PPC and a three-year sentence with fine of Rs20,000 under Section 124 PPC, read with Section 11 of the FCR”".

Overall the Pakistani populace was happy to see that Dr. Shakil Afridi was charged and sentenced for 33 years. In United States the government was disappointed and in some circles very angry. The government did acknowledge that Dr. Shakil Afridi was instrumental is finding Bin Laden. They also acknowledged that Dr. Afridi was not spying on Pakistan and that he is being unfairly treated. The tone within Obama administration was shifting, as they were glad that Dr. Shakil Afridi was not sentenced to death. According to Mansur Mehsud (director for research at the FATA Research Centre), “This appears to be an effort to patch things up with the United States, while also satisfying the people of

Pakistan that Afridi has been punished.” Government of Pakistan and its military establishment were happy to see this chapter close. The people of Pakistan were exhausted by the whole affair and felt that in the end the government did not buckle under immense foreign pressure. The media within Pakistan contends that this will not be the last time we hear about Dr. Shakil Afridi. Due to safety concerns Dr. Shakil Afridi made another news headline when he was moved from FATA jail to Peshawar central jail. Not much attention was given to this news story within Pakistan and it seems like after the verdict the people and the news media have moved on with their lives.

Rebuttal from Dr. Shakil Afridi?

On the eve of eleventh anniversary of 9/11, FoxNews reporter Dominic Di-Natale was able to attain an exclusive interview with Dr. Shakil Afridi from his jail cell in Peshawar, Pakistan. The title of the article “(EXCLUSIVE: Jailed doc who helped nail Bin Laden warns Pakistan sees U.S. as worst enemy)” questions the economic and military support US provides to Pakistan. On the other hand, it also questions the sincerity of Pakistan as an ally over the war on terrorism. This was the first time anyone in the world has heard from Dr. Shakil Afridi (allegedly) and he was very candid about his experiences. He alleges that Pakistan intelligence agency (ISI) contends that, “the Americans are our worst enemies, worse than the Indians.” He further denotes that, “I tried to argue that

---

133 Ibid., 2012.
America was Pakistan’s biggest supporter – billions and billions of dollars in aid, social and military assistance -- but all they said was, ‘These are our worst enemies. You helped our enemies.’”\(^\text{134}\) Throughout the article, Dr. Afridi rants about how Pakistan and its intelligence agencies are supporting the militancy to extract money from US. He also talks about how the ISI tortured him continuously throughout the interrogation process and that is how they were able to obtain the confession.

Dr. Afridi gave very little details about his involvement with CIA and its operation to nab Osama Bin Laden. He did state that, “I didn’t know about a specific target apart from the work I was given to do,” he said. “The house was famous for its name, Waziristan House. I was aware that some terrorists were residing in that compound, but I didn’t know whom. I was shocked. I didn’t believe I was associated in his killing.”\(^\text{135}\) Dr. Afridi also claimed that CIA wanted him and his family to leave Pakistan via Afghanistan. He suggests that due to earlier incident where he was kidnapped and held for ransom while travelling in the tribal region he was scared by the very thought. After being captured and held at an undisclosed ISI prison, Dr. Afridi alleges, that they made him work as a physician. He contends, that he help many ISI officers with prescribing medication and treatment options.

News outlets within Pakistan were quick to follow up on the alleged interview and asked for access to Dr. Shakil Afridi. The government of Pakistan was quick to respond to the alleged interview as, “totally false, as is usual with Fox News.”\(^\text{136}\) The government officials also claimed that Peshawar Jail has cell phone/telephone jammers inside the

\(^{134}\) Ibid., 2012.

\(^{135}\) Ibid., 2012.

facility. Various western news agencies also questioned the authenticity of the interview. Western journalists immediately went to the family and lawyer of Dr. Shakil Afridi to authenticate the interview. Both the family members along with the lawyer rejected that Dr. Shakil Afridi gave any interviews to Fox News. They further stated that the security around Dr. Shakil Afridi is very restrictive and there was no way that he could have been on a phone for 45 minutes as alleged by Fox News.

To analyze this aspect of the story one must understand the uniqueness of the story surrounding Dr. Shakil Afridi. Everyone (US, Pakistan, media, etc.) is constructing Dr. Shakil Afridi’s reputation based on his or her own interests. Maybe for Fox News reporter, this was his ticket to stardom within the organization. Maybe Fox News executives wanted to bring an important topic to the forefront especially during general elections. Maybe they wanted Dr. Shakil Afridi to be included on the anniversary of 9/11. These hypotheticals can only be answered if Dr. Shakil Afridi can one day be interviewed on television and explain his side of the story. It is very difficult if not impossible to authenticate Fox News exclusive interview of Dr. Shakil Afridi. This is the reason why I have marked this topic with a question mark. Can this really be a authentic rebuttal from Dr. Shakil Afridi?

The conclusion

Today, Dr. Shakil Afridi is spending his time in solitary confinement (for his own safety) at Peshawar jail. He is no longer front-page news around Pakistan or the world. It seems ironic, but many in United States have never heard of him or his torment. Although, many congressmen and senators have taken up causes to free him, their efforts remain unfulfilled. Dr. Afridi is going back into obscurity as the Government of Pakistan and its
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military elites originally planned it. He was great for deflecting the blame away from the ineptness of the Pakistan military that let US Special Forces attack a heavily fortified garrison city of Abbottabad. He refracted much criticism away from the ruling government and its intelligence service (ISI) that could have been held responsible for harboring Bin Laden. On the other hand, the media (US and Pakistan) got its use out of Dr. Afridi as well. They ran his story on a continuous basis for a year. They investigated the doctor thoroughly but from differing viewpoints. The conclusion from both public spheres was the same: reputation of Dr. Shakil Afridi is still highly contested and no one wants to revisit the whole affair.

Fine argues that reputations are always in play and they are visited and revisited based on interests. In the case of Dr. Afridi, it seems that everyone had an interest at a particular time. That time is long gone and the only thing that is left is questions that seem to have no answers. Early on both the US along with Pakistani media were reporting from the political perspective of the story behind Bin Laden raid. 11 July 2011 changed everything. When the story of fake CIA vaccination campaign broke the initial shock turned into humiliation for Pakistan. The Pakistani media were also caught off guard, as they broke the story of a doctor being arrested outside of Peshawar, but did not follow through. The foreign media were present in Pakistan and contacted Washington to ask about Dr. Shakil Afridi. They got an inside source which broke open the CIA ruse of the fake vaccination campaign along with ‘Save the Children’ link.138 US continued to report the political aspect of the story and did not care much to the sentiments of the Pakistanis. US media ignored the ground conditions in Pakistan, which was very critical due to the
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recent past. Pakistan was just recovering from the Raymond Davis affair. The NATO supply route had recently been restored and the US-Pakistan relations were looking on the up swing. The raid on Osama Bin Laden compound was seen as the last straw for to cut all ties with US. The Islamists were thanking US for cutting aid to Pakistan immediately after sentencing Dr. Afridi. Pakistan was drifting into isolation and could have easily become a failed state unless it had a clear and precise plan of action. The most influential *reputation entrepreneurs* as mentioned by Fine, were the Government of Pakistan and its military establishment. They molded the argument away from blaming the institutions of Pakistan and deflected it to Dr. Shakil Afridi. The Pakistani media did a masterful job in challenging and even refuting some of the government claims. In the end however, it was the government and the military that came out winners in this fiasco. They sentenced Dr. Shakil Afridi to 33 years behind prison and held firm under the US pressure.

Schwartz’s theory did not come into play until 11 July 2011. Pakistani media wanted to expand Dr. Shakil Afridi’s story and sought creative ways to bring pressing questions surrounding the state. I do not believe that it was by design that his identity as a Muslim and ethnic Pashtun was at play. Rather, I believe it was a mere coincidence that the media started shining light on issues surrounding state religion and ethnic divide. Dr. Shakil Afridi is an ethnic Pashtun who are minority within Pakistan. Dr. Afridi was convicted under the rules and regulations of FCR, which resides in FATA. In FATA
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majority of the people are ethnic Pashtun and the government along with its military leaders wanted Dr. Afridi to be held responsible by his own peers. It was a masterful effort on the part of establishment, as Pakistan was not held responsible for his conviction. On the other hand, Pakistanis saw that he was punished for his collaboration against the state. Dr. Afridi became a symbol of behavior that is despised within the Pakistani society. He is now considered the standard bearer within the history of Pakistan as the only traitor of the modern state. That infamy will not only be a model of society, but also a model for society to the future generations of Pakistanis.

Dr. Shakil Afridi is in his late forties and is very likely that he may not serve the entirety of his sentence. I believe that this story will have another chapter that will be quietly consumed within Pakistan and US. Pakistan will be holding elections this year and it is very likely that a new party will rise to take up power. The two frontrunners are Imran Khan (PTI) and Nawaz Sharif (PML-N). The new government might use Dr. Shakil Afridi as a bargaining chip for more aid. Some experts suggest that there might be a prisoner exchange between US and Pakistan. Currently, United States is holding Dr. Afia Siddiqui on charges relating to terrorism. Many politicians within Pakistan along with experts suggest that there should be an exchange between Afia Siddiqui and Dr. Shakil Afridi. One op-ad contends that Pakistan missed its opportunity to exchange Raymond Davis with Afia Siddiqui. The article suggested that this moment might be the last chance to free Dr. Siddiqui. It also states that both countries will come out as winners at the end.

---

As of today, Pakistan has rejected handing over Dr. Shakil Afridi to United States or any other country. They contend that he is a very dangerous man who has deep links with terrorist organizations within Afghanistan and Pakistan. It seems as if it is to early for reevaluating the past. Dr. Shakil Afridi might be off the front page, but he is still important to the psyche of Pakistan. He represents everything that has gone wrong within the war on terror. Dr. Afridi had everything within the worldly realm. He was important, thriving physician, successful businessmen and lovable family life. Some even suggests that he was a humble Muslim, a devoted Pakistani nationalist and proud ethnic Pashtun. The real question then becomes why did he help a foreign intelligence service find Bin Laden? The government and military establishment of Pakistan feel that Dr. Afridi like traitors cannot be a norm within the state. They wanted to show their resolve in handling the situation at hand. The majority of Pakistanis believe that Dr. Shakil Afridi is a traitor to the country. Within that statement, I believe the government and its military leadership proved that they still held much sway over public opinion. Regardless, of what the US media and progressives within Pakistan think, in the end the power rests within the elites.
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