

Objectivity Under Fire:

Media Coverage of the 10th Anniversary of the Start of the Iraq War

Greg Mantell

Spring 2014

**Committee members:**

Martha Steffens, chair

Barbara Cochran

Amy McCombs

## Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
Chapter 2: Weekly Field Notes.....	7
Chapter 3: Cox Media Group Evaluation.....	46
Chapter 4: Physical Evidence.....	50
Chapter 5: Research Analysis.....	87
Appendix A: Original Proposal.....	127
Appendix B: Changes to Original Proposal.....	159

## **Chapter One: Preface and Introduction**

### **Preface**

Ever since college I have been fascinated by the study of ethics and political science (besides my lifelong love of writing).

So when I decided to give up my comfortable corporate job in Los Angeles and go back to school to get a master's in journalism, perhaps it is not surprising I settled on the topic of media coverage of the 10th anniversary of the start of the Iraq War for my master's project.

With this coverage, the complex issues of war and government and morality would intersect with the question of how the media would approach some of the deepest, most philosophical issues people face. I find theory of government, such as democratic peace theory (explored at more length in this paper) fascinating. While I have chosen to pursue a professional project rather than a master's thesis, I like the fact that my project nonetheless tackles some serious philosophical issues of war and peace, democracy and freedom.

It was also a chance to shine some light on the Fourth Estate and provide a moment of reflection on how well the media did, and attempt to contribute to journalism of the highest standards.

In addition, I must admit that because of one of my favorite hobbies, genealogy, I have spent a lot of time contemplating how my family history's fit into the overall scheme of world history and conflicts such as the Revolutionary War, War of 1812, Civil

War, and World Wars I and II. Perhaps the average American does not think of these wars much, but I think about them all the time.

Covering war is a difficult proposition for media objectivity. As though the logistical challenges of field reporting weren't tough enough, different people (whether journalists or the audience) hold very different beliefs about the morality and ethics of war. Although the range of positions is wide, conventional wisdom says there are two common ways of thinking about war: Pacifists oppose all war, while others think of war as a necessary evil. Even among those who feel war is sometimes necessary, people can, and do, disagree about what whether a particular conflict is truly just or wise.

How then is the media to approach covering war, given the wide-ranging and very political beliefs people have about war in general and a given conflict in particular? The 10th anniversary of the Iraq War presented an excellent opportunity to study how well the media handles this difficult situation, by examining the ways news organizations frame a particular conflict and whether political opinions sway news coverage.

Above and beyond this case study in media objectivity under pressure, I wondered if, by studying the Iraq War coverage, it would be possible to identify some suggestions for how the media could improve upon its war coverage.

Indeed, as we shall see, the Iraq War anniversary provides food for thought for both of these issues.

## **Introduction**

This goal of this study is to undertake a critical examination of the media's coverage of the 10th anniversary of the start of the Iraq War, when U.S. and British public sentiment had shifted away from the overwhelmingly pro-war opinion of the war's early years. . In particular, the study will compare how four elite newspapers--two in the U.S. and two in the United Kingdom--framed news coverage of the anniversary and consider the extent to which important concepts from political science, such as democratic peace theory, informed news and analysis coverage of the war anniversary. The study will also analyze the extent to which the newspapers considered the larger global and historical context of the war when covering the anniversary. The American papers to be considered are The New York Times and The Wall Street Journal, and the British ones are The Times and The Guardian (the latter of which did an extensive series on the 10th anniversary.)

Some would say human history is nothing but one war after another. Coverage of war presents certain challenges for journalists--reporting on an event that most would consider, to be at best, a necessary evil. Even with the best of intentions, can journalists ever be completely objective? How can reporters, whether at the mundane factual level or at the loftier moral level, determine who is right and who is wrong, without regard for, or deference to, their own national background or "home team"? Easy or obvious answers may not be the correct ones. Is such objectivity even desirable if the opposing side in a war is a repressive dictator whose victory would spell the end of a free press, free speech, and even freedom itself? If the role of media is to educate citizens and shed light on government, does the media have a role to play in advocating democracy and free speech over dictatorship and repression? Should the media still sit on the fence even if a

loss in a war could hurt societal freedoms? Or, is it ok and “natural” for reporters to side with the home team, as TV stations, radio stations, and newspapers might do when covering sporting events? And moreover, even if objectivity is the goal, what are some practical steps reporters and producers can take to try to keep their own personal biases out of the coverage?

The Iraq War anniversary presents ample opportunity to study media coverage of a highly divisive political issue. There has been much study of the media’s coverage of the Iraq War while the conflict was in progress, especially comparing the American and foreign media’s coverage of the early years of the war. These studies often find media in other countries were more critical of the war, at least in the early days. But there has been little research (if any) about the media’s coverage of the 10th anniversary of the start of the Iraq War, perhaps not surprising since the event only happened earlier this year on March 19th.

It is the goal of this study to help fill that gap.

Media coverage of the fighting provided logistical and practical issues--from security to obtaining information in the field and finding multiple, reliable sources. The anniversary of the war, however, created an opportunity to speculate on the significance of the war free from many of those constraints. And unlike reporting from the battlefield, which tended to be limited to the facts of “what happened” and “giving both sides,” reporters could roam much wider when assessing the war. The opportunity to wax philosophical is also an opportunity to wax political and provide a less restrained, “deeper” analysis. But with this opportunity, a reporter must especially guard against any

tendency to slant the news and frame it in particular ways that might reflect the reporter's politics.

In most wars, and certainly in the Iraq War, it takes two to tango. There was a long, complicated history involving the United States, the West in general, Iraq, Saddam Hussein, and its neighbors. Therefore, if news coverage of the Iraq War anniversary was not biased, one might expect a robust, wide-ranging, no-holds-barred critique of the pros and cons of the actions and transgressions of both sides. In contrast, if coverage of the Iraq War anniversary was biased, one might suspect the actions of one side or the other were critiqued more soundly by the media. In addition, since the outcome of the war is not set in stone, and one presumes no one can predict the future with complete accuracy, then one assumes in balanced reporting multiple outcomes of the war might be considered. On the other hand if the media coverage were biased, only single views--rather than multiple, alternative views--about the success or failure (or even, more neutrally, the results)--of the war may have been considered. Alternative views may have been downplayed or ignored.

The media's approach to coverage of the war anniversary can be examined by studying the terms and themes used to describe the war's outcome, whether reporters placed the war in any sort of larger historical context, and considering the extent to which the coverage was informed by ideas about war and government from political science, such as democratic peace theory.

It goes without saying that writers and philosophers have considered notions of war and peace, freedom, ethics, and government for thousands of years.

It is not the goal of this study to insist that the media's coverage or analysis of the Iraq War must resemble a philosophy dissertation. But while an analysis of the war anniversary need not reach the level of sophistication of a treatise on government or politics, nonetheless one might expect that news coverage discussing such important societal issues might draw on the larger historical and philosophical canon of literature that has developed over centuries. Certainly the founders of this country relied heavily on fundamental concepts from the history of political science when writing our nation's Constitution and founding documents, such as the Declaration of Independence. Perhaps it is not unreasonable to assume the media might also have some familiarity with these ideas as well and rely on a richer framework for analyzing the outcome of the war rather than merely relying on the water cooler political discussions of the day.



## **Chapter Two: Weekly Field Notes**

### **Week 1 Report**

#### **Internship.**

I began working at Cox Media Group on Wednesday, January 22nd. We did all the first day paperwork, took a tour of the office, and met everyone, etc.

The first day I went out into the field with the cameraman and interviewed participants in the anti-abortion “March for Life.” I asked people where they were from and when someone was from one of our affiliate states, I interviewed the person. I also helped transcribe half the interviews we did to help the reporter, chose sound bytes, and watched as he edited the video into a file to be sent to the appropriate affiliate station.

Everyone helps answer the phones and I will do that as needed.

The following day I went into the field with another photographer for three interviews. In two cases, I was a “stand in” for the reporter at one of our affiliate stations out of state. We dialed in and the reporter asked questions while the person in the room looked at me. I also helped carry the equipment. For the second interview, I interviewed the head of a public interest tax group about whether the NFL should remain a non-profit organization. We then fed the interview to our Florida station. The third interview was the most interesting, with an 83-year-old woman whose parents were early civil rights activists who were killed in Florida in 1951.

I also pitched a story about a report released by the Society for Epidemiologists about a new dress code for doctors. I have tentatively set up an interview in Arlington for Monday, the 27th.

I will also be helping out with the State of the Union coverage, interviewing members of Congress before and after the event. I will pick up my press credentials on Monday.

In general, I am happy with the internship. I liked the people and it seems to be off to a good start. I want to make sure I come up with some good story ideas to pitch. I do have some serious investigative story ideas but I am not sure the ideas will work for them since some are outside their station markets and one idea is in New York. I am going to look for data journalism story ideas; this is one reason they said they hired me. I emailed Marty to pick her brain about some business story ideas to pitch.

I also get the opportunity to do stand ups whenever I want in the field and I plan to take them up on this. This used to be a requirement before they began paying interns (this year!) but it is still a perk. I have to buy the right (dark) coat to wear for outside shots in the cold.

My main concern or challenge is to make sure I do as much as I can to be a standout at this internship and not just be someone taking up space.

### **Seminar.**

For seminar, we went to the American Political Science Association and NPR.

Jeff Biggs at the former pointed out the differences between the American and Westminster parliamentary forms of government, the latter used in the United Kingdom

and Canada. He also described the role of their fellowships and some of the people they have selected for them.

Plus, he discussed the role of think tanks and lobbyists in DC. I have decided to get on the mailing lists for the Brookings Institute and Heritage Foundation and a few others as a result. He had some wry commentary on the future of journalism.

He also commented on the direction of the Republican Party and admitted he is a Democrat.

The NPR tour guide showed us its new headquarters and production facility. I always enjoy seeing behind the scenes how organizations work and what the environment is like. We also got tips from a Mizzou grad who now works there about how to make your internship a successful experience.

### **Research.**

I met with Marty (in person), and Barbara and Amy (by phone), on January 16th about refining my Master's Proposal. We agreed I will compare the news coverage of two leading American and two leading British newspapers of the 10th anniversary of the start of the Iraq War (within a 30 day window of the anniversary.) We agreed I would focus on the New York Times and Wall Street Journal for American papers and The Times and Guardian for the U.K. papers. Marty said she wants an update in three weeks.

I did quite a bit of reading over break (including Aristotle's Politics and Locke's Two Treatises of Government) just to be fresh on important political science concepts while I write the paper. I am now re-reading Kant's Critique of Practical Judgment. (These authors or works were all mentioned in the articles I read for research on

democratic peace theory, a cornerstone of my paper.) This week I will be selecting the news articles for the project.

I also obtained by my research cards for the Library of Congress and National Archives and plan to throw myself into the academic portion full force this week, now that I am getting a sense of what my normal weekly schedule will be. I don't like studying at home because my roommates watch TV all the time. I get along fine with them but this isn't the way I like to study.

Enjoying DC a lot!!

## **Week 2 Report**

### **Seminar.**

We visited staff for Missouri Senator Clair McCaskill--Anamarie Rebori and John LaBombard.

They told us about how they handle the media and image for McCaskill. They said she is more media savvy than many members of Congress and will often "speak from the heart" on issues, even though this can be a disaster for some in Congress. However, for the Sunday morning shows they will do more prep work with her than they would for ordinary media interviews. They talked about the give and take between the media and members of Congress. They also said the local Missouri media is their highest priority since it represents the people who put McCaskill in office.

We also took a tour of the Newseum. I was especially moved by the Berlin Wall and 9/11 exhibits, and I always like looking at the old newspapers.

We took a tour of Al Jazeera's studio for "America Tonight," also in the Newseum. A producer told us about Al Jazeera's philosophy and how it tries to be different from other news shows—mostly by going in depth. He also said Al Jazeera strives to avoid any political bias and also tries to avoid the fluff common in most news media.

### **Research.**

I continued reading Kant's Critique of Practical Judgment and continued working on the revised proposal due later this week.

### **Professional Project.**

This was a great week for work and it seems as though every day they trust me a bit more and give me more to do.

Monday I covered a House committee on sex trafficking at the Super Bowl and put together a VOSOT for our TV stations. I also interviewed the Executive Director of the Society for Health Care Epidemiology of America (SHEA) for a story I pitched on SHEA's new dress code for doctors, nurses, and others to address possible hospital infection. I also contacted the American Hospital Association and American Medical Association for their reaction.

Tuesday we spent all day getting ready for the State of the Union. The cameraman and I set up shop in Cannon House Office Building. There were 30 members of Congress on the list for me to interview; about half showed up so I did over a dozen interviews.

Then I stopped by the House Legislative Records Office to do some digging to see if Rep. Radel from Florida, who just resigned, had set up a legal defense fund. It

turned out he didn't have one, but one of our Reps from Florida (Corrine Brown) did, so I began looking into her fund. Then, when I got back to the office, they told me I had to go to the Sofitel Hotel to interview the Mayor of San Francisco, who was Rep. Honda's guest at SOTU that night.

It turned out Rep. Honda and his press person (Ken Scudder) and I shared a common background in Chicago, so I reached out to the press person to set up a lunch for coffee. I'm trying to develop some sources on Capitol Hill. (We're supposed to have coffee tomorrow.)

Wednesday I went with my boss, Patrick Terpstra, and was camera man while he interviewed members of Congress coming out from a hearing to see whether they had read the entire 1,000-page farm bill. I think initially he planned to have me do the interviewing and he would be the cameraman. But I wanted to show versatility and he seemed impressed I knew how to shoot and quipped, "Maybe we should hire you to be a shooter."

Thursday I continued investigating the Corrine Brown piece and filed a FOIA request with the FBI to obtain all records related to drone use in the U.S. They agreed, and actually said C.R.E.W had also made the request—but the documents won't be ready until July, so that won't be helpful for an immediate story. I also edited at three VOSOT's for our affiliate station on a variety of issues.

I bought a dark coat for stand ups on Friday and look forward to shooting some soon for my reel.

I'm trying to come up with more investigative story ideas but I also see there may need is for more routine daily stories for our affiliate TV stations.

### **Week 3 Report**

#### **Internship.**

This was again a productive week at work. On Monday (2/3) I did a lot of research into how much money Senators Marc Rubio and Bill Nelson from Florida received from lobbyists. This was a good exercise in data journalism and involved adding up 400 lobby contribution forms. I spent most of the day doing this.

On Tuesday I interviewed Congressman Bridenstine and Senator Inhofe from Oklahoma about the Keystone pipeline. I turned this into a VOSOT and a web story that was picked up by most of our TV stations:

[www.wftv.com/news/news/senators-write-president-obama-demand-keystone-xl-ndC2K/](http://www.wftv.com/news/news/senators-write-president-obama-demand-keystone-xl-ndC2K/)

I also edited a VOSOT for my story on Keystone and another VOSOT for a colleague's story on the POTUS pot hearings with Obama's drug czar.

Wednesday I searched the campaign finance reports at Hart House Office Building. I also spent time further researching Corrine Brown's legal defense fund and contacted her office, which claimed the purpose of the fund was to pay her expenses in a federal lawsuit challenging her district's boundaries.

Thursday I helped a reporter waiting to (ambush) interview a Congressman coming out of the IRS hearing.

Then I had lunch with Ken Scudder, the new Press Director for Congressman Mike Honda of California. He also went to UChicago so we chatted about school, DC,

politics, etc. This was my first time attempt to develop a source by having lunch with someone. We both paid for our own lunch since we couldn't remember who could buy what for whom.

Back at the office I edited a VOSOT on the Senate's voting down long-term unemployment compensation.

Just as the day was winding down, I got an email from the House Ethics Committee announcing an ethics issue for Congressman Mullin. Because I was the only person in the office who signed up for this Committee's alerts, and because it didn't hit the AP wire for a while, I got a "win" by being the person to give the news to my boss. We immediately jumped on the story and they sent me over to his office with a camera to get a statement from his press person. That got a lot of positive feedback from my colleagues.

This is a link I forgot to send last week for my story on health care worker dress code:

[www.ktvu.com/news/news/national/time-dress-code-doctors-group-says/nc7tt/](http://www.ktvu.com/news/news/national/time-dress-code-doctors-group-says/nc7tt/)

### **Seminar.**

For seminar we toured Bloomberg and met Mike Dorning, one of Bloomberg's White House correspondents.

He talked about the Bloomberg business model and how the company is able to make money and grow when so many other news organizations are downsizing. Thank the Bloomberg terminal, which keeps the organization awash in money. Clients pay



\$20,000 per year for the terminal, which has an immense amount of financial information of interest to businesses and investors.

He said they are expanding in emerging markets, besides the biggies--U.S., China, Russia, Brazil, etc.

He also talked about how he got started in the business, working for a small newspaper in Alabama after college. He eventually ended up at the Chicago Tribune, taking a job in the business section since he didn't want to be out in the suburbs. (He is originally from the suburbs.)

Later in the day, I stopped back by the office and went to a presentation for the National Association of Black Journalists. They were visiting DC this week.

### **Research.**

I worked on my revised Master's proposal this week and sent it to Marty.

I revised the proposal to include to clarify that it covers only news articles (not editorials), that I am comparing the coverage of four papers (NY Times, WSJ, Guardian, and Times), and that I am using a 30-day window.

I began going through online articles from the newspapers included in my sample, especially The Guardian, which had an enormous spread on the war anniversary:

<http://www.theguardian.com/world/series/iraq-war-10-years-on>

Some of the Guardian's many stories were news articles but many were opinion pieces. Personally, I don't think the paper did a good job, at least online, of clarifying which is news and which are opinion. (Yes, you and I wouldn't have any trouble

distinguishing the two, but I think the average person would easily be confused or not even be aware of the difference.)

Despite the massive coverage, so far I don't see much indication that they put the war in much of a context in comparison with others wars (comparing deaths, cost, etc.). Sort of like writing a business story about Microsoft's earnings but never mentioning the previous quarter's results or how others in the industry are doing.

I have started looking at some articles online for the NYT, WSJ, and Times. But I also contacted school to see how I can use the schools online subscription while I am DC so I don't have pay wall issues, which have been a hindrance so far.

I plan to refine the frames as I discussed with my faculty committee but I need to see more articles from the other papers in order to do so.

I have gotten in a good study routine, having found a few good places to study--relying on the Library of Congress and neighborhood public libraries for when LOC is closed (on Sundays).

This will help me stay on track since it is too hard to work at home with nice (but TV-addicted) roommates.

## **Week 4 Report**

### **Internship.**

I continued to expand on my duties at work this week.

I wrote and edited my first package on Monday on Attorney General Holder's extending the federal government's recognition of same-sex marriage benefits.

I also worked with the Center for Responsive Politics on research my story on lobbyist contributions to candidates in states where we have TV stations.

Tuesday I was sent to the Capitol with a camera to try to interview Rep. Markwayne Mullin from Oklahoma as he left a committee hearing to ask him about his ethics investigation. He went out the back door to try to get away. But when I realized he wasn't coming out the front with everyone else, I went around to the side exit. I saw Mullin already beating a hasty retreat down the hallway with two aids so, camera rolling, I ran after him and asked him what he was under investigation. He didn't stop or look around; his aid stopped and gave the same 'no comment' statement as before, but it looked good on camera to see him slither away--and I felt perfectly good about the situation since we were trying to get him to tell his constituents about why he was being investigated. I showed Barbara the tape when she came by for the office visit that afternoon:

<http://www.fox23.com/news/local/story/Mullin-avoids-FOX23-cameras-in-Washington-D-C/KL314GDxW0CDkdS6fVrkuA.csp?rss=77>

On Wednesday I did a story on the latest Affordable Care Act Enrollment numbers, which we sent out to our stations as soon as the media embargo was lifted in the afternoon. I also did a VOSOT and radio script on the Student Protection Act (anti-predator bill).

Wednesday night we had a snowstorm that shut down the city, so Thursday we were out in the field much of the day interviewing people about the storm. Officially I went out to watch the company car (since we were going to park illegal). But I soon

became the location or people scout and identified the people making snow angels and joggers the reporter would interview.

Later in the day they sent me out to do my first standup--for a package I wrote on the storm. They also showed me how to voice it in the booth and I began editing it Friday.

### **Seminar.**

A reporter for USA Today talked to the class about what it's like to be a foreign / war correspondent.

She said there wasn't much difference between disaster reporting and "regular" reporting--from a reporting point of view. The main difference had to do with logistics and thinking through your plan for how to get to your destination, and how to get around and survive (food, water, safety), once you are there.

Her main words of advice were, "See a bathroom, use a bathroom"--since you never know when you will get stuck somewhere without a restroom.

Probably the saddest story she told us had to do with a young man who refused to leave the side of his dead girlfriend (whose body was trapped in the rubble after the earthquake) until she was buried.

She has covered the Indian Ocean tsunami, Haiti earthquake, Iraq, and other scenes of death and destruction.

I enjoyed seeing a taping of the "Kalb Report" earlier in the week, and this type of in-depth interview is exactly what I would like to do career wise for the long run. I liked the fact that Kalb didn't have to follow any of the normal TV news formulas; he could simply have a probing, intelligent conversation with someone (Thomas Friedman from

the New York Times.) The substance is what mattered not the style. Technical considerations didn't triumph over the journalism. There was no concern about whether the package started with "nat sound," whether the sound byte was only 5 seconds, and whether the story was "visual."

### **Research.**

The MU library told me how I can access all of the papers I need online, so that is a big help.

I also have a good study routine worked out at the Library of Congress and neighborhood libraries. I continued to read Kant and take notes and also continued my analysis of the newspaper coverage of the war.

### **Week 5 Update**

#### **Internship.**

Monday (Feb. 17th) I wrote and edited a package for one of the reporters on Attorney General Holder's releasing a memo detailing decision to extend same-sex marriage benefits to federal employees even in states where gay marriage isn't legal. We also decided I would do a version of this package for myself since I wrote it, meaning I would later shoot a standup and voice the package for my reel.

Overall it was a slow news day because of the federal holiday (and much of what we do revolves around Congress.)

My boss asked me to help them find several databases (maybe three to five) over the course of my internship that they could dive into for story ideas. So I started digging for stuff from the EPA, FAA, FCC, FTC, HHS, NHTSA, etc., etc.

Tuesday the 18th I covered a story at the Hyatt Hotel, behind our building, on the “Future Engineers” competition for schools from across the country. Each team had to design a model of a sustainable, eco-friendly city of the future. They were five teams present from our TV markets, so I interviewed all five and shot video of all five. The tripod was a pain in the ass and a nightmare to deal with and I had my boss show me how to use it properly when I went back to the office. I then edited five separate VOSOT’s for each of our markets. (I chose the SOT and my colleague wrote the stories to save time while I edited.) That took the whole day and we sent the videos out on the satellite feed just in time. (The footage looked fine in Avid but I thought it seemed dark on TV; I would have bumped up the brightness a bit in Avid if I had known there was an issue.)

On Wednesday the 19th, I attended an FTC hearing on how retailers are tracking your mobile phone. My boss asked me to go along with another reporter who was covering the conference--and then at the end I would grab some people from the FTC or the panel to interview about a different issue--the Cryptolocker virus. I then wrote and edited that VOSOT back at the office.

I also did research on the status of a school bus recall by a certain manufacturer--to see whether the buses had actually been recalled and fixed as they were supposed to be.

Thursday the 20th I wrote a VOSOT about the FAA’s new helicopter safety regulations. At 4 p.m., my boss sent me over to the Institute for the Future of America with a cameraman to do an interview about the minimum wage debate. Traffic was

terrible on the way back so I didn't get back to the office until 6pm (and I normally leave at 5pm).

In general the main challenge continues to be finding national stories that appeal to our local markets and can be done as day turns.

**Seminar.**

No seminar this week.

**Research.**

I discovered that the Georgetown Library is open 8 am to 10 pm every day for the visitors, so Sunday I made my first trek over there to study most of the day, since the Library of Congress was closed. I will definitely be doing more of this in the future. I nearly finished Kant's Critique of Practical Judgment (will finish in a day or two). And I started going through the New York Times articles on the Iraq War anniversary.

My ears have perked up once or twice at the office when my boss made off the cuff remarks slamming the war, though the last time someone challenged him a bit, so there does seem to be some disagreement or debate in the office about the outcome.

**Week 6 Update**

**Internship.**

Monday the 24th I wrote and edited a VOSOT on the Supreme Court's hearing on the EPA's power to regulate green house gases. I pulled the SOT off CNN's News Source.

I also did research on my bus recall story and filed a FOIA request with DOT.

I also did research on the lobby contributions story and worked on my version of the same-sex marriage benefits story for my reel.

Tuesday I covered a press conference by environmentalists who are trying to stop the Pebble gold and copper mine, which they say will hurt Bristol Bay's fishing industry. I interviewed a Seattle fisherman for KIRO.

Wednesday the 26th I listened to a committee hearing on homeland security to see if there was mention of the possible withdrawal from Afghanistan (for KIRO).

I also looked into what NASA was doing for the California drought (a press release) for a possible story.

Then I went over to the Heritage Foundation and got Stephen Bucci's reaction to Obama's ultimatum to Karzai on signing the security agreement.

Back at the office I also logged the interview a reporter did with Rep. Adam Smith.

Thursday the 27th was one of the longer days. I covered a Senate hearing on the re-authorization of the Magnuson-Stevens Act, regarding oversight of the nation's fisheries (for KIRO). Afterward I interviewed two Seattle fishing industry people who attended to the hearing and were concerned about possible changes to the act. I wrote and edited a VOSOT, which took longer than normal. There were a lot of specific technical things covered in the hearing and we changed the focus of the story a bit to be more about the local people's being in town for the hearing.

After work went to a goodbye party at a bar downstairs for a colleague who is leaving to be head of the local NBC station's Washington Bureau. He told me to call if I had questions or anything. He told me the reason they have given me so much to do here



at Cox is that I have done a good job. He said they don't always give the interns that much to do.

### **Seminar.**

This week we heard from two IGs--Inspectors General--for the DOD and IRS. Brigid Serchak is chief of public affairs for the inspector general of the Department of Defense, and David Barnes is public affairs liaison for the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration.

They told us about the role of the IGs. They explained the difference between audits and investigations and what they can and can't tell you about both. They also explained the procedures for getting information from them and an idea of when a FOIS request is necessary and when it isn't.

They gave us a lot of information with a ton of contacts for apparently all the government IGs.

I started following a lot of people on Twitter who were on the list.

### **Research**

I finished Kant's Critique of Pure Judgment. I also went through more of The Times and The Guardian stories for my paper.

I also began seriously considering applying for Bloomberg TV's London internship for the summer. Must finish my reel soon so I can get the application in.

### **Week 7 Update**

#### **Work.**

On Monday (3/3) I went to the Republic National Committee's pitch fest, where interested parties pitched their cities to the RNC for hosting the 2016 convention. I interviewed the Mayor of Columbus, Ohio, and did a general VOSOT on the event for all our stations and one tailored especially for the Ohio station.

On Tuesday (3/4) Cox had me go early to the Capitol to cover Obama's budget arriving at the House. I got B-roll and edited a VO for our stations.

Later in the day, Obama spoke about his proposed budget, and I cut a VOSOT about this using some of the footage from earlier in the day.

In the afternoon, I interviewed Rep. Mica from Florida about the inclusion of the Sun Rail project in the budget and did a VOSOT about that.

On Wednesday (3/5) I met my boss at Cannon House office building and helped him as he chased Florida Congressman Grayson for an interview about his wife's restraining order. People in the office debated whether we should do this interview, since it was about his personal life and he hadn't been arrested. But then his attorneys held a press conference in Florida, so we went for it. However, I didn't push to do the interview myself. I held the microphone while my boss asked the questions. I wrote a VOSOT about the Dept. of Health and Human Services' announcing a two-year extension of the time people can keep their existing health insurance policy under the ACA--through 2016.

On Thursday (3/6) I logged the Senate hearing on the Ukraine. Then I did a VOSOT on the vote over the competing proposals by McCaskill and Gillebrand for helping victims of military sexual assault.

I also did two radio scripts on this and researched my story idea on railroad safety.

### **Seminar.**

For seminar I watched “Face the Nation” and in class we discussed the seminar morning show. We discussed what guests the show had and why--and the reasons the shows are still important despite a fairly small TV audience. It’s who watches, not how many people. Barbara said the show’s often set the agenda for discussion the coming week in DC and the administration puts a lot of thought into deciding who they are sending out to give out their message.

Anna Palmer, senior correspondent for Politico, also spoke to us about her job covering lobbyists. She had many insights and thoughts on how lobbying has changed since she started covering the industry. She said she didn’t feel lobbying is inherent evil, noting nurses and teachers and journalists and others have lobbyists. She talked about the 20% rule and the fact that since Obama said he wasn’t going to fill his administration with lobbyists, many people de-registered to not be ruled out for jobs. She felt SuperPACs were undermining the effectiveness of traditional lobby money. She noted the difficulty of proving a direct link between lobby money and votes, though everyone believes there is the potential for influence. She did say members of Congress are much more careful, after several scandals, about taking lobby money and holding fundraisers on issues they are about to vote on. But most Congressmen aren’t shy about taking a meeting with a lobbyists and then having their fundraiser call the lobbyists for money. In the end, she said lobbying is a ‘tool’ in the toolbox for big companies and others. Palmer said good reporting about lobbying is more than reporting on the LDA figures and is

about getting the personal stories from sources; Politico likes to have the juicy, behind the scenes details.

Sunday morning we went to see a taping of “Meet the Press” and met David Gregory and Andrea Mitchell. Mitchell, who had just come back from following Kerry around Ukraine, said the Obama administration doesn’t want Kerry to overshadow the President, so they constantly undermine Kerry’s public speeches by having Obama give a competing or differing sound bite, usually at the same time. She also suggested Susan Rice might be doing this as a way to get back at Kerry for undermining her on Benghazi. Mitchell said Hilary learned early on what she could and couldn’t get away with in the way of getting attention for herself and role as Secretary of State.

### **Research.**

I spent the weekend at Georgetown’s library working on my paper. I searched the databases for article from all the papers (NYT, WSJ, Guardian and Times of London) and read them. I was a little concerned a might be missing some and was trying to see if I could spot check my online search against the actual physical papers but the Georgetown librarian didn’t seem to know if they had them for that far back (March 2013). I mulled over the analysis part of my comparison. I really wanted to check Amanda Buck’s MA project from a while ago to use it as a template or get ideas for assembling the final product. I asked the offsite depository to pull a copy a while ago but the library told me that wasn’t going to be possible because of the mold issues. In February the library said they would be able to scan the project but this week they told me they couldn’t. I asked

Marty and Sue at the library for an alternate project but Marty was able to get in touch with Amanda, so I think I will be able to get a copy.

I also did a serious edit of my demo reel and will continue to work on it.

## **Week 8 Update**

### **Work.**

On Monday, 3/10/14, I interviewed the mayor of Pittsburgh about a new partnership with Dept. of Education for after-school and early-education programs. Because we were focused on the local angle, we ignored Secretary of Education Arne Duncan who was also there and spoke at the National League of Cities event at the Marriott. I wrote and edited a VOSOT about the partnership for our Pittsburgh station. I also filed a FOIA request with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission asking for emails related to the firing of some whistleblowers and correspondence about the safety issues they raised.

On Tuesday, 3/11, I listened in on a background conference call setup by the White House giving an update on the enrollment figure (4.2 million) for the Affordable Health Care Act and wrote a VO for all of our stations with the latest numbers. I also emailed Florida Senators Rubio and Nelson for their reaction to Dianne Feinstein's accusations that the CIA hacked the Senate Intelligence Committee's computers. Rubio's office sent a statement from a transcript of an interview he had just done with Bloomberg and was about to be released. Nelson responded after I left for the day.

On Wednesday, 3/12, I watched Senator Saxby's response to Dianne Feinstein's accusations. In the morning I helped stake out two hearing so we could do an ambush

interview with Rep. Paul Broun about \$10,000 he charged taxpayers to hire a debate coach. But he didn't show up at either hearing.

Later in the afternoon, I was camera man for a stake out with one of our reporters who waited for Secretary of Health and Human Services, Sebellius, to get a comment after a committee hearing to find out how many people (of those who had signed up for health care under the ACA) had actually paid their premiums. She didn't say much but the video turned out great as our reporter followed her and our stations used it.

Wednesday night I interviewed Robin Sproul, vice-president of ABC News, and reporter Martha Raddatz from ABC at the RTDNF Awards. Martha was presenting Robin with a service award. Enjoyed the evening. Good group of students and awardees.

Thursday, 3/13, I interviewed two people after a House hearing on concussions (doing the camera and interviews myself.) I interviewed an athlete and a rep from USA Football. I logged the interview in the system when I got back. The interviews were to be used in a package by one of our reporters on Friday when I was off, though I may turn it into a package for myself as well.

In the afternoon I went back to the House to get B-roll of the Secretary of Homeland Security testifying before a House committee. (Ran into fellow student Alex from ABC on both the way back and forth to the office.)

I also did reporter stand ups three of the four days this week to give me material for my reel.

### **Seminar.**

Friday we went to hear Terry (Terrence L. Bracy) and Jim Brown, lobbyists at Bracy Tucker Brown & Valanzano. Barbara had prepared us well by having us hear a Politico reporter the week before to help us cut through the spin, though they did come across more as nice-guy or public service lobbyists a bit more than I expected, and they seemed fairly forthcoming. Perhaps this is because they tend to represent local and state governments as opposed to mostly big business clients. (Or perhaps I fell for their spin. :)) They said they didn't play the money game the way some did. But since they represent cities and states of politicians--Reps. and Senators constituents, in effect--they were able to get clout without giving a lot of money. Bracy claimed lobbying was more about expertise and information than money per se. He said Washington was floating in so much money from so many sources--anyone with enough money could kill legislation but money alone couldn't pass legislation. They, perhaps schmoozing us, said reporters were the most powerful people in town.

They both told about the sort of indirect way they "stumbled" into lobbying, as it were. Bracy started out on the Hill and ended up with an office in the DOT during the Carter Administration but eventually got canned when the new administration took over. Brown ended up going from behind the scenes camera man at a TV station to an on air reporter when he happened to be at the right place at the right time and was able to get an interview with a politician he knew personally. They got the attention of the station new director and this politician eventually hired Brown for a job handling the press in his home district.

Brown gave an interesting example of how lobbyists can intervene on behalf of their clients. St. Louis wanted a light rail line right-of-way as a gift from a railroad. The company agreed, but when a new president took over, his head of real estate talked him out of it. This put St. Louis in an awkward situation for local matching funds, so the city asked its lobbyist to do something. Brown called one of Missouri's senators on the transportation committee, which oversees railroads. The new president of the railroad was visiting the senator that day. The senator chewed out the president of the company, who agreed to reinstate the ROW gift to St. Louis, lest his company never have any of its interests approved by the Senate Transportation Committee, whose sign off is crucial for many business matters for railroads.

I ended up emailing Terry on Monday since I wanted to see if I could get some background on the California water crisis, which is a big deal for our San Francisco station. He agreed to talk off the record.

### **Research.**

Spent the weekend studying at Georgetown's library. The MU library sent me a copy of Amanda Buck's MA project on Iraq, which is helping me see how to structure my end product. I started re-reading the "Prince," to help inform my political science discussion in the paper. Also reviewed more articles for the textual analysis.

I also spent time editing my reporter demo reel to use to apply for jobs. I uploaded it Sunday night and sent it to Stacey to use for my Gannett interview. I didn't use the stand ups I did at Cox because I exported them in a squished format; the aspect ratio was off a bit. I used material I shot for KOMU.



## **Week 9 Report**

### **Internship.**

On Monday (3/17) I started off the day listening in on the background conference call with “senior administration officials” about the Ukraine sanctions. Then I watched the Obama press conference and pulled a sound byte for a VOSOT I wrote.

The seminar on Inspectors General paid off in a big way this week, since I pitched several story ideas based on OIG reports I found, and I got major bonus points. Later in the day on the 17th, the DOJ of Justice put out a report on a COPS grant program for Tulsa, Oklahoma. There had been some mismanagement of the money, some of which had to be paid back. It became a big scoop for our Tulsa station--and they beat all the competition on the story.

On Tuesday (3/18), a colleague of mine and I went to a press conference at Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE). A major international porn ring was busted and 14 people arrested. However, I was supposed to ask Secretary of Homeland Security Johnson about whether the decision to cur air marshals was a good decision given the Malaysian air flight disappearance. But Johnson only took three questions and bolted out the back door as soon as two questions in a row concerned the Malaysian plane not the child porn arrests. I tried for a one-on-one in advance but his press handlers said no. We had planned to do an ambush interview on the way out, but he went out the back door--not side door--so we couldn't. We did interview (a DEA agent) afterward about the child porn bust and back at the office I wrote and edited a VOSOT for all of our stations on the arrests.

On Wednesday (3/19) I went over to the Heritage Foundation to interview David Inserra about pipeline security and risks (from terrorists and the environment) for a story one of our reporters was working on. Logged the interview when I got back.

Got a big compliment from my boss about the Tulsa IG report story and she told me to take more time that day looking for “more like that.” I did find something about an Atlanta (one of our bigger markets) about the local VA Hospital at the end of the day.

On Thursday, (3/20), I did an interview with Operation Lifesaver--the national train safety advocacy group--about the latest Federal Railroad Administration figures on train deaths--both those involving cars at crossings and people trespassing or playing on the train tracks. This was a data journalism story I pitched for sweeps. It was an exclusive for us, since the Federal Railroad Administration had just released last year’s figures and no one else had reported on it. I did a break down for each of our markets. We also talked to them about partnering with them on their big national safety campaign they are about to kick off.

I also scored another “win” in a big way that day with a story I pitched on a NASA OIG report on NASA’s mismanagement of its smart phones and tablets. It doesn’t know how many it owns and many have been unused, leading to possibly millions in waste. Although NASA, the OIG, and NASA Watch declined to do interviews, I did get the VP of Citizens Against Government Waste. She was great and I wrote a package and VOSOT for our stations. Our Orlando station did a live shot with one of our reporters about the story and the VOSOT went out to everyone. The office was very happy about

this story and I got a lot of compliments for coming up with some strong story ideas that no one else had.

I also sent my demo reel to people at the office this week and asked for feedback on how to best put it together.

### **Seminar.**

Mike McCurry was our speaker this week, the former White House Press Secretary under President Clinton during the Monica Lewinsky scandal. Of course, I had to ask him about that first thing. His response was interesting--while normally he met with the President to make sure they were on the same page about things, this time he said he didn't want to know what was going on. In fact, he said he didn't want to know. The attorneys spoke to the President and gave him a tight script to read and that was it. He pointed out officially the issue was not so much the affair as the fact that the President had lied about it under oath. But when all was said and done, it was about sex and politics. He did think private lives were fair game if they impacted public policy--a drunk who proposed prohibition. He also didn't have a problem with coverage of the affair itself, but he felt there was no moderation and the press could only harp on one issue and ignore other pressing issues. He said he felt there is a less cordial and more antagonistic approach (by the administration) to the press these days. He talked about the fact that Republican and Democratic administrations approach the press with different mindsets. Republicans simply approach it from a marketing point of view. But Democrats rather naively think the press and Democrats are fighting the same mission for the people; as a result, Democrats tend to become bitter and disenchanted when they discover the press

goes after Democrats as much as Republicans. McCurry didn't feel his decision to televise White House press conferences helped the institution. He used to hold a morning meeting with the press to negotiate the agenda for the day, but that event has broken down. All in all, I thought he seemed a bit jaded by politics. He said there is no working together these days--it is all partisan politics and Congress has screeched to a halt. He said Hillary Clinton, if she knew what were good for her, would enjoy her foundation and stay away from a deadlocked Congress, though he conceded she might well run. He talked about why he went back to graduate school to get a degree in religion and said he finds the subject more intellectually interesting than politics. Some people do wonder if he has become part of the God Squad, he said--and he noted most reporters aren't very religious--but he pointed out there are others of faith in government.

### **Research.**

I continued working on my Master's paper. I spent the weekend at Georgetown University Library, doing an exhaustive search through the database for the articles and writing up my analysis. It still needs a bit more polishing but I plan to take advantage of the three-day weekend (since there is no seminar Friday) to get the draft ready to send to my committee. I will be sending a version this weekend.

I also re-read a bit more of "The Prince" to stay fresh.

### **Week 10 Report**

#### **Internship.**

Over the weekend, a train killed a teenage male in California; a couple had been walking on the tracks and the guy shoved his girlfriend out of the way to save her life. On

Monday (3/24) we decided we would use this as a “now” angle for the story I had been researching on deaths involving trespassing on train property. I logged the interview I did the previous with the President of Operation Lifesaver from the previous week, pulled some sound bytes, and wrote a package for one of the reporters. I customized the story to include Federal Railroad Administration data for each of our stations. FRA had just released updated figures that no one had reported on yet. I enjoyed doing a data journalism story.

I also wrote and edited a VO on the decision by the House Ethics Committee to continue its investigation of Rep. McMorris Rodgers from Washington. My boss asked me to come to work early the next day, Tuesday (3/25), and report directly to the Supreme Court. It was a cold, snowy, lousy day outside but a ton of protesters showed up for the Hobby Lobby (abortion contraception) case. I interviewed a woman who is CEO of a pro-life group and I also did some stand ups for my reel.

I was at the Supreme Court from about 7:30 am to noon. When I got back to the office, my boss told me my next assignment was to go interview Trayvon Martin’s mother at the National Press Club, at a press conference for a group of Baptist ministers working to repeal “Stand Your Ground Laws.” I not only interviewed Trayvon’s mother but also the father of Jordan Davis, who was also killed in Florida. I had heard so much about those cases it was a bit unreal to do the interviews and meet the parents. No matter what you may think of Trayvon, and opinions vary, I could only feel for the mother whose son had been killed.

On Wednesday (3/26) I had my first interview at the White House Briefing Room. I interviewed Betsey Stevenson from the Council of Economic Advisers about the CEA report just released on raising the minimum wage for tipped workers. I wrote and edited a VOSOT for our TV stations as well as a radio script.

Also that day, I tried to put our San Francisco station KTVU in touch with NASA about a possible fly-along over the Sierra Nevadas to see what NASA was doing to try to help with the California drought.

I also began talking to the SIGTARP IG about a report on foreclosure issues in California and Florida. On background, the person from the IG's office told me the banks still weren't handling the cases as they were supposed to. He said he would check on whether he could do an on camera interview.

On Thursday (3/27), I interviewed Rep. Hudson from North Carolina by the Will Rogers statue in the Capitol about field hearings being held the next day at LAX on the shooting of the TSA agent and the call for armed police at TSA checkpoints as a result. In the afternoon I had lunch with the General Counsel for the DOJ IG's office to try to develop a rapport and a source. He gave me more background on the kinds of things they work on and I tried to fish for some story ideas.

**Seminar.**

No Seminar.

**Research.**

I worked most of the weekend on my textual analysis for my Master's paper at Georgetown's Library. Although I had been searching online databases, I also decided to

go to the Library of Congress and pull microfilm of the actual newspapers so that I could see the actual placement and position of the articles and to try to spot check that I wasn't missing any of the articles. It turned out to be very helpful and informative--a great way to see how much emphasis and importance the editors placed on the stories. It gave me a lot of food for thought and material to write about. I also finished re-reading "The Prince" to inform the political science portion of my paper.

### **Week 11 Report**

#### **Work.**

On Monday (3/31) I went to the Supreme Court to cover the "patent troll" case, Alice Corp. vs. BLS Bank. Fortunately the weather was a lot better than the day of the Hobby Lobby case! My colleague and cameraman waited for a while for the attorneys to come out but eventually Pater Barnes from Fox Business, who was also covering the case, walked over to his crew and ours, and also told us, that it was a no go--the "corporate suits" weren't doing interviews (unlike the more outspoken protesters on both sides of Hobby Lobby.) I also did a few stand ups for my reel but a construction crew working in front of the Supreme Court made it almost impossible to get good audio. Later I did two "man on the street" interviews with people about their mobile phones and apps they like to use for a package one of our reporters was doing. I also exported a lot of video I have done during the semester for my reel so I could take it home to edit. I also put in a FOIA request concerning SIGTARP foreclosures in Florida and California. I also went through a number of government databases and found five I wanted to explore further for story ideas.

On Tuesday (4/1) I did a VOSOT on Rep. Bridenstine's "tornado bill"--the Weather Forecasting Improvement Act. However, after waiting for him a bit at the Cannon Rotunda his staff said he wouldn't be able to make it. So the camera man and I immediately went off to our next gig at the Capitol--trying to round up Republican Senators as they headed to lunch to interview them about the Affordable Healthcare Act, since the President was announcing the latest numbers later in the day. Back at the office I did two radio scripts on the tornado bill.

On Wednesday (4/2) I interviewed the Secretary of the Air Force, Deborah Lee James, about the elimination of the A-10 fighter program. While the Senate Committee was easy on her, I was proud of the fact that I asked her tougher questions and she eventually bolted from the room, though she handled it well. I got the card from her press person and followed up and got a scoop from her office, because it turned out the job cut figure she was predicting for our base in Georgia was 50% higher than our congressman told us--1,300 jobs in stead of 900 jobs.

The next day (4/3) one of our reporters used that scoop for her package for the day; I met her and the camera man at the congressman's office first thing in the morning to get his "shocked and surprised" reaction to the cuts. I also pitched my investigative story idea on hospital infections and spent time on the phone with the Department of Health and Human Services going over some technical things about the database and crunching numbers on my computer.

### **Seminar.**



This week for seminar we went to law firm of Covington and Burling and heard from Steven Weiswasser, a media attorney and vice president at ABC News. He and his colleagues, including a Mizzou grad, gave various tips about legal matters concerning the press. They discussed things like libel and slander (and the differing standards for public and private individuals), fair use, privacy, and how to cover your bases and a^%\$ when doing tougher investigative stories that could get you sued. Steve also discussed some of the ethics of undercover investigations, drawing on his own time at ABC News, when the network did the Food Lion story. ABC was sued and ultimately won on the libel issue but lost on the trespassing issue and he discussed the hazards of gaining information on false pretenses. Steve also talked about some of the increasing challenges the media is facing with FOIA requests and shield laws under an increasingly aggressive administration. As one of the attorneys said, do shield laws or being compelled to give up your sources even matter in an age when the NSA is probably just looking at your phone records and email?

### **Research.**

I spent more time at the Library of Congress going through all the articles and continuing my textual analysis and writing up my thoughts on the framing and re-writing. To make things more efficient I printed out all of the articles and annotated them. Also I went through the microfilm to get a sense of editorial placement.

### **Week 12 Report**

#### **Work.**

On Monday (4/7) I wrote and edited a VOSOT about a NOAA report on the fact that 10,000 cargo ship containers are lost each year at sea, creating a hazard for ships and the environment.

I also wrote two radio scripts for the piece. I also tried setting up interviews with NOAA and half-a-dozen environmental groups but all of their people were either out of town at meetings in California or Florida, or based in New York or San Francisco.

On Tuesday (4/8), I one-man banded it and went over to cover a Senate hearing on biofuel and interview a former NASCAR driver Richard Childress, who was testifying. He is based in North Carolina, one of our markets. I did a VOSOT and two radio scripts on this.

Then I went back over to the Cannon Rotunda to interview Rep. Suzan DelBene from Seattle about the landslide relief efforts and President Obama's visit--"Why did he wait so long? etc."

On Wednesday (4/9) I went over to a studio across town to interview a train accident survivor from Ohio--a young guy whose legs were cut off by a train when tried taking a shortcut (trespassing) along train tracks. He was in town to do a PSA and help kick off Operation Lifesaver's train safety campaign. All of our markets are in the top 15 for train trespassing deaths so we did a custom piece for each market discussing their figures. This was a follow-up to an earlier piece I had pitched on train safety.

I finished the number crunching on my hospital infection story but the government told me the latest figures come out April 17th, but at least I have a template set up for analyzing the numbers.

The press secretary at Rep. Kingston's office sent me a press release follow-up on the A-10 issue; Kingston and half-a-dozen senators we're holding a press conference the next morning. I forwarded it to my boss, who said, "'How do you get these press releases? I've been here longer than you have and I don't get them.'" So he assigned me to cover the story the next day, which I appreciated because I have been following this story a week.

On Friday (4/10) I shot B-roll at the house hearing to decided whether to hold former IRS official Lois Lerner in contempt of Congress. Back at the office I set up an interview with Rep. Doug Collins for my boss on the same subject. Barbara came by the office for a visit and even though I could have been out covering the Senate press conference on the A-10, I did not want to interfere with her visit. I thought she and my boss and I had a nice talk about work and things, and afterward she and I hashed over various job opportunities and contacts, which I very much appreciated. When she left, I picked up the piece on the A-10 and did a VOSOT on the earlier press conference. (We had pulled video off one of our news feeds.) I also searched around trying to find a military service member with PTSD or depression for one of our reporters to interview for a package he was working on.

### **Seminar.**

This week we had two seminars for no additional price--one in the morning with Clarence Page, a liberal columnist from the "Chicago Tribune" and one in the afternoon with Fred Barnes of "Weekly Standard." Page reflected on the 50th anniversary of the Civil Rights Act. He also talked about the change he has seen in the newspaper industry

over the past decades, how he got into the business, and why he isn't afraid of bloggers, and what it takes to be a good columnist. At the "Weekly Standard," Fred Barnes also talked about the changes in the newspaper business over the years, mentioning that Barbara's career and his intersected along the way. He noted the financial pressure that many papers such as the "Washington Post" face. He said fortunately conservative billionaires are willing to prop up conservative publications such as his--although he didn't say it, I assumed they function as sort of PACs of another type. He talked about bias in the media, noting the liberal press won't cover things like the Lois Lerner contempt hearings (which I had to disagree to myself since our office has done at least three pieces on the IRS hearings over the past two weeks and I personally set up interviews with Republican Congressmen to discuss it.)

### **Research.**

I continued writing and re-writing my paper this week. Barbara told me to get moving and I am. I have been working the section about the frames and re-writing this. I plan to send a version to Marty tomorrow night. Besides the time pressure, one thing that has got me moving is that I decided after our visit to the "Weekly Standard" that I plan to submit some version of the paper to them, since it is a bit critical of the media's coverage of the Iraq War anniversary. My goal in writing the paper was not to do a conservative or political attack on the media; I wanted it to be cool and insightful and disinterested. Still, it occurs to me that they may have more of an interest in publishing it than anyone, so why not...? (Not to say this will publish it, of course, but I don't see any harm in trying.

### **Week 13 Report**

## **Work.**

On Monday (4/14), I interviewed Lauren Pagel, Director of Policy for Earthworks, about environmentalists' reaction to the Ohio Geological Survey study finding that fracking causes earthquakes; I wrote and edited a VOSOT and also wrote two radio scripts on the subject.

On Tuesday (4/15) I wrote and edited a VOSOT and two radio scripts on a Congressional report calling for an end to sales and marketing of e-cigarettes to youth.

On Wednesday (4/16) in the morning I went straight to Hart Senate Office building to check to see which campaign disclosure reports had been received for our Georgia and North Carolina Congressional reps and I emailed the information back to the bureau. I also covered a 3pm press conference on grid security (one year after the attack on the Metcalfe Substation in California). While I was at the press conference our San Francisco station (KTVU) upgraded their request from a VOSOT to a package (and when I got back I helped choose the sound bytes for the skeleton script my boss wrote while I was gone.)

On Thursday (4/27) I downloaded the latest hospital infection data (released that day) on HospitalCompare.org. I began crunching the numbers in an Access database, to pull the hospitals with "worse than national average" for each of our stations. The bureau chief gave me a list of officers who would be honored at the upcoming Police Week Memorial and asked me to pull the names for our markets, which I did. Later in the day, my colleague Lee and I went over to the National Consumers League and interviewed the

director about a social media scams that gets people to turn over serious amounts of money.

### **Seminar.**

Very interesting seminar this week. We met with the Washington Post editor (and Mizzou alum) Jeff Leen, who oversaw the Snowden / NSA investigations. He told us the back-story of how the paper decided to go ahead and publish the information and the issues the staff pondered. He also talked about the skills and experience and approaches that help make a strong investigative reporter. He felt it took five years at least to learn some of these. We grilled him about a lot of things such as whether the Post really deserved the Pulitzer since Snowden handed the paper the NSA information, which the Post never would have gotten otherwise. I tended to agree with his response that the paper deserved some credit for taking a stand and being willing to print the articles and handling the matter responsibly. He said the Post didn't print everything it had (a la WikiLeaks) but instead used editorial judgment and decided some things were genuinely a matter of national security and did not concern the public interest. I also asked him a question about how you sell the powers that be on doing an investigative story (a problem when you work at a TV Bureau that wants to just turn out quick, easy day turn stories.) I guess the answer is work at the Washington Post! I enjoyed hearing him say his staff has pretty much free reign and a fair amount of time and resources to cover just about anything.

### **Research.**

I made substantial progress revising and re-writing the analysis section of my paper and sent several drafts to Marty and Barbara. This week I will be sending the full version to everyone for comments.

### **Chapter Three: Cox Media Group (Broadcast) Evaluation**

For me, the semester in Washington was the highlight of the Master's program. I greatly enjoyed the opportunity to live and work in Washington and get to explore so many aspects of the city. It was highly informative and fun to see the nation's capital up close and personal, getting a much better understanding of the inner workings of the government and the players. The class seminars were well-planned and provided insight into the behind the scenes dynamics of DC. And the cultural resources and activities were endless.

As for work, there were many good things about my internship at Cox Media Group. In general it was a positive, professional work environment and I enjoyed the fact that I got to do so write so many stories and conduct so many interviews. (I've attached the scripts in section X, but there were dozens of other on-camera interviews not included here.) The reporters in the bureau, in general, seemed hardworking and serious and there wasn't a lot of drama.

I found the work easy but, to be frank, on a deeper level, I didn't find a lot of it very intellectually satisfying. I knew exactly what one of our seminar speakers (from Politico) was talking about when she said she wanted to do more than 30-second VOSOTs.

I go out of this program the same way I came into it--wanting to do long-form televisions--a good talk show (a la Phil Donahue or Charlie Rose), an investigative magazine, or a Sunday-morning type show.



Don't get me wrong--I can handle three months in local TV news, and I am glad I had the experience, but for the long run I want something more.

I retained my former newspaper reporter's skepticism of the depth of much of TV news. Although I was able to do some data journalism stories, in general the bureau tended to go for the quick and easy day-turn stories. Too many were pulled straight from the newspaper headlines. Anything too intellectual or deep made everyone run the other way. Business stories were out of the question because they involved numbers.

I understand the need to simplify stories for TV news because of the obvious time constraints. But there's a fine line between simplifying the news and dumbing things down. And I often wondered to myself--are we simplifying this for the audience or for ourselves?

The writing often seemed to be at the second-grade level. We could never mention the name of a congressional committee name or government agency. Everything became "lawmakers" or "the federal government." My boss felt it was impossible to put any acronyms in a story, such as NOAA or AHA, even on the web. Sometimes the final report was edited so generically I wasn't sure it conveyed any actually news.

There was the usual TV news emphasis on the technical--whether a story was "visual" and had "nat sound"--over story quality. The emotional always triumphed over the intellectual.

My boss liked to say what makes a good story--what makes something teasable--is fear.

Since I believe accuracy is paramount in reporting, what was most disconcerting for me is that there is often a tendency in TV writing to say “close enough”--when actually it wasn't. There was a tendency to remove any subtlety or nuance and make everything black or white and to use rather boilerplate English to get the smallest possible word count. I was told the bureau chief felt “some” (as in “some critics say” was a crutch word, so we simply said “critics”--even when the wording often exaggerated or gave a misleading impression. For instance, there might be various critics with ten different positions not just one.)

I think the bureau overall did a good job of trying to remain objective--so much so that sometimes it bent over backward to always include an opposing point of view even when the major stakeholders were on the same page.

I do think the TV industry, in particular local news, needs to think bigger and deeper and outside the box. While the broadcast industry is falling apart around it, local TV news is sticking to the same old formula and routine. But young people aren't watching. When I went home every night, my roommates had Al-Jazeera and made fun of most TV news.

New outlets organizations like Politico, Slate, and others tend to offer more depth. The TV industry needs to learn to get beyond 30-second stories and five-second sound bites.

Local TV newsrooms continue to follow the formulas they are taught in journalism school (no matter whether the graduates went to school, they all said the same

things). But they are making news in a vacuum for other J-School graduates without critical feedback from the audience (or non-viewers).

Despite that extended critique, I will always value the time I spent in Washington. As an America citizen, not only as a reporter, I felt I learned an enormous amount from getting such a close-up look at the federal government. I think this experience will inform my reporting for years to come--and just may end up in a book someday.

## Chapter Four: Physical Evidence

### Internet links:

Hospital infections web story:

<http://www.ktvu.com/news/news/national/time-dress-code-doctors-group-says/nc7tt/>

Keystone Pipeline web story:

<http://www.kirotv.com/news/news/senators-write-president-obama-demand-keystone-xl-/ndC2K/>

Robin Sproul interview:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4KmpnCbZX80>

Martha Raddatz interview:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5LL2X7e47jA>

Chasing Congressman Markwayne Mullin:

<http://www.fox23.com/news/local/story/Mullin-avoids-FOX23-cameras-in-Washington-D-C/KL314GDxW0CDkdS6fVrkuA.csp?rss=77>

Seattle Fishery Legislation Renewal story:

<http://mms.tveyes.com/Transcript.asp?stationid=1495&DateTime=02%2F28%2F2014+05%3A55%3A52&mediapreload=14&layclip=true>

### Scripts:

1) HOSPITAL DRESS CODE VOSOT  
*/HOSPITAL DRESS CODE VOSOT*  
*GMANTELL-WASHINGTON*

*SUPERS: (NO LOCATOR)*  
*EVE HUMPHREYS / SOCIETY FOR HEALTHCARE EPIDEMIOLOGY*

### *ANCHOR INTRO*

THE AMERICAN HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION IS EMBRACING NEW DRESS CODE GUIDELINES FOR DOCTORS AND OTHER HEALTH CARE WORKERS.

### *TAKE VO*

THE RECOMMENDATIONS INCLUDE SHORT SLEEVES FOR DOCTORS AND NURSES.

THE GUIDELINES ALSO ADVISE AGAINST WEARING WRIST WATCHES OR JEWELRY BELOW THE ELBOW THAT COULD COME INTO CONTACT WITH PATIENTS.

A STUDY BY THE SOCIETY FOR HEALTHCARE EPIDEMIOLOGY OF AMERICA FOUND A POSSIBLE LINK BETWEEN ATTIRE AND INFECTION.

*SOT*

"white coats are something you might not see depending on how a health system implements these guidelines."

*VO TAG*

THE GUIDELINES SAY IF DOCTORS WEAR LONG-SLEEVE WHITE COATS, THEY SHOULD LEAVE THEM ON HOOKS OUTSIDE THE PATIENT'S ROOM.

2). DOJ GAY MARRIAGE RADIO SCRIPT

*/DOJ GAY MARRIAGE RADIO SCRIPT*

*MANTELL - DC*

THE JUSTICE DEPARTMENT IS EXPANDING LEGAL BENEFITS TO SAME-SEX COUPLES.

OUR PATRICK TERPSTRA REPORTS FROM WASHINGTON TONIGHT.

*WRAP*

ATTORNEY GENERAL ERIC HOLDER... ISSUING A MEMO GIVING MARRIED GAY COUPLES MANY OF THE SAME BENEFITS OFFERED TO STRAIGHT COUPLES.

FEDERAL COURTS WILL NOW RECOGNIZE SAME-SEX MARRIAGE. GAY FEDERAL INMATES WILL HAVE MARRIAGE VISITATION RIGHTS. CHRIS GACEK AT THE FAMILY RESEARCH COUNCIL BLASTED THE CHANGES.

*SOT*

*family research council intv. jeff7810.new.01 (framerate 29.97)*

*Source Locators*

*13;36;31;06* it's overstepping the authority that was given the justice department

THE NEW RULES DO NOT NEED CONGRESSIONAL APPROVAL.

IN WASH, PT, NT KRMG.

IN WASH, PT, NT WOKV.

3). DOJ GAY MARRIAGE RADIO SCRIPT 2

*/DOJ GAY MARRIAGE 2*

*MANTELL - DC*

MARRIED GAY COUPLES ARE RECEIVING NEW FEDERAL RIGHTS. DETAILS NOW FROM PATRICK TERPSTRA.

*SPOT*

FEDERAL COURTS WILL NOW RECOGNIZE SAME-SEX MARRIAGE.

GAY INMATES WILL HAVE MARRIAGE VISITATION RIGHTS AT FEDERAL PRISONS.

AND SPOUSES OF LAW ENFORCEMENT AND FIREFIGHTERS KILLED OR INJURED IN THE LINE OF DUTY WILL BE ELIGIBLE FOR BENEFITS.

THE NEW RULES WERE INCLUDED IN A MEMO SIGNED BY ATTORNEY GENERAL ERIC HOLDER.

IN WASH, PT, NT WOKV.

4). DOJ GAY MARRIAGE VOSOT

*/DOJ GAY MARRIAGE*

*MANTELL - DC*

*SUPERS: CHRIS GACEK / FAMILY RESEARCH COUNCIL*

*ANCHOR INTRO*

THE JUSTICE DEPARTMENT IS EXPANDING LEGAL BENEFITS TO SAME-SEX COUPLES.

ROLL VO

ATTORNEY GENERAL ERIC HOLDER... ISSUING A MEMO THIS AFTERNOON (MON).

IT GIVES MARRIED GAY COUPLES MANY OF THE SAME BENEFITS OFFERED TO STRAIGHT COUPLES.

FEDERAL COURTS WILL NOW RECOGNIZE SAME-SEX MARRIAGE.

GAY FEDERAL INMATES WILL HAVE MARRIAGE VISITATION RIGHTS.

AND SPOUSES OF LAW ENFORCEMENT AND FIREFIGHTERS KILLED OR INJURED IN THE LINE OF DUTY WILL BE ELIGIBLE FOR BENEFITS.

OPPONENTS SAY STATES SHOULD DEFINE MARRIAGE, NOT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.

SOT

family research council intv. jeff7810.new.01 (framerate 29.97)

Source Locators

13;36;31;06 it's overstepping the authority that was given the justice department

VO TAG

THE NEW RULES DO NOT NEED APPROVAL FROM CONGRESS.

5). DOJ GAY MARRIAGE PACKAGE

*/DOJ GAY MARRIAGE*

*MANTELL - DC*

*SUPERS: JUSTIN GRAY / WASHINGTON*

*ERIC HOLDER / U.S. ATTORNEY GENERAL*

*CHRIS GACEK / FAMILY RESEARCH COUNCIL*

*ANCHOR INTRO*

ATTORNEY GENERAL ERIC HOLDER IS ORDERING A LIST OF NEW BENEFITS FOR MARRIED SAME-SEX COUPLES.  
CHANNEL NINE'S JUSTIN GRAY IS IN WASHINGTON WITH WHAT THIS MEANS HERE IN FLORIDA.

JUSTIN LIVE

THIS IS THE MEMO FROM THE ATTORNEY GENERAL...ISSUED WITHIN THE LAST HOUR...THAT WILL HAVE AN IMMEDIATE IMPACT ON GAY COUPLES IN FLORIDA.

\*\*\*PKG\*\*\*

THE U-S DEPARTMENT JUSTICE OF WILL NOW RECOGNIZE SAME SEX MARRIAGES.  
NEW FEDERAL BENEFITS WILL APPLY EVEN IN STATES LIKE FLORIDA WHERE GAY MARRIAGE IS NOT LEGAL.

SOT

"Just as was true during the civil rights movement of the 1960s, the stakes involved in this generation's struggle for lgbt equality could not be higher."

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT WILL NOW RECOGNIZE SAME-SEX UNIONS IN CIVIL, CRIMINAL AND BANKRUPTCY COURTS.  
GAY FEDERAL INMATES WILL HAVE MARRIAGE VISITATION RIGHTS.  
SPOUSES OF LAW ENFORCEMENT AND FIREFIGHTERS KILLED OR INJURED IN THE LINE OF DUTY CAN RECEIVE BENEFITS.  
AND SAME-SEX COUPLES WILL BE ELIGIBLE FOR THE 9-11 VICTIM COMPENSATION FUND.  
THE FAMILY RESEARCH COUNCIL OPPOSES THE NEW RIGHTS.

SOT

family research council intv. jeff7810.new.01 (framerate 29.97)  
Source Locators

13;36;31;06 it's overstepping the authority that was given the justice department

JUSTIN STANDUP CLOSE- LIVE

THIS IS AN EXAMPLE OF HOW THE PRESIDENT CAN USE EXECUTIVE ORDERS TO TAKE ACTION.  
PRESIDENT OBAMA SAID IN HIS STATE OF THE UNION SPEECH HE WOULD BYPASS CONGRESS IF NECESSARY TO GET THINGS DONE.  
LIVE IN WASH, JG, CHANNEL 9 EYEWITNESS NEWS.

6). *SUPER BOWL SEX TRAFFICKING VOSOT*

*/SUPER BOWL SEX TRAFFICKING VOSOT  
MANTELL - DC*

*SUPERS: WASHINGTON  
REP. ANN WAGNER / (R) MISSOURI*

*ANCHOR INTRO*  
A HEARING ON CAPITOL HILL TODAY LOOKED AT THE PROBLEM OF SEX TRAFFICKING AT THE SUPER BOWL.

*ROLL VO*  
LAWMAKERS WANT TO REDUCE PROSTITUTION AT THESE MAJOR SPORTING EVENTS.  
ACCORDING TO ONE CONGRESSMAN -- 10-THOUSAND WOMEN AND GIRLS WERE FORCED INTO PROSTITUTION AT THE 2010 SUPER BOWL IN MIAMI.

*SOT*  
never in my wildest dreams did i ever think that human trafficking would be so rampant in the united states of america

*VO TAG*  
REPRESENTATIVE CHRIS SMITH SAYS FLIGHT ATTENDANTS AT DELTA AND JET-BLUE ARE PARTICIPATING IN A PROGRAM TO HELP SPOT HUMAN TRAFFICKING VICTIMS WHILE THEY ARE BEING TRANSPORTED TO THIS YEAR'S SUPER BOWL IN NEW JERSEY.  
HYATT, HILTON, WYNDHAM, AND OTHERS HOTELS ARE ALSO WORKING TO BETTER DETECT TRAFFICKING.

7). MULLIN ON HILL VOSOT  
*/MULLIN ON HILL VOSOT  
MANTELL - DC*

*SUPERS: WASHINGTON  
(NO SUPER FOR MULLIN AIDE)*

*ANCHOR INTRO*  
MUSKOGEE CONGRESSMAN MARKWAYNE MULLIN IS BACK IN WASHINGTON AND NOT TALKING ABOUT HIS ETHICS PROBE.

*TAKE VO*  
OUR WASHINGTON BUREAU SAW HIM PARTICIPATING IN A TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE HEARING TODAY (*TUES*). RECORDS SHOW HE ALSO VOTED IN THE HOUSE CHAMBER LAST NIGHT (*MON*).



HIS OFFICE HAS REPEATEDLY DECLINED OUR REPEATED REQUESTS FOR AN INTERVIEW ABOUT A HOUSE ETHICS COMMITTEE INQUIRY OF MULLIN ANNOUNCED LAST WEEK.

THE COMMITTEE HAS NOT PROVIDED DETAILS OF THAT PROBE. MULLIN WALKED AWAY FROM A FOX-23 CAMERA TODAY.

*SOT*

*mullin\_on\_hill.new.01 (framerate 29.97)*

*Source Locators*

09;08;45;29 intern: ...the investigation?

rep: Congressman Mullin... We've already made a statement regarding this. Congressman Mullin is in full cooperation with the House Ethics Committee. He believes he's in full compliance with all ethics rule. There will be no further comment at this time. Thank you.

THE ETHICS COMMITTEE WILL PROVIDE AN UPDATE ON ITS PROBE ON OR BEFORE MARCH 24TH.

8). SCHOOL PREDATOR PROTECT RADIO SCRIPT

*/SCHOOL PREDATOR PROTECT*

*MANTELL - DC*

*ANCHOR INTRO*

IT'S A BILL TO PROTECT STUDENTS FROM SEXUAL PREDATORS.

JON SONNHEIM HAS DETAILS FROM CAPITOL HILL.

*TAKE WRAP*

THE MEASURE WOULD REQUIRE SCHOOLS TO PERFORM BACKGROUND CHECKS FOR NEW AND EXISTING EMPLOYEES WHO COME INTO CONTACT WITH STUDENTS.

SCHOOLS WOULD NOT BE ALLOWED TO HIRE CONVICTED VIOLENT SEXUAL OFFENDERS.

*SOT*

*ASC12105636 (framerate 29.97)*

*Source Locators*

11;02;30;15 this is a moral imperative.."

BILL SPONSOR PAT TOOMEY, SENATOR FROM PENNSYLVANIA.

IT PASSED THE HOUSE UNANIMOUSLY BACK IN OCTOBER.

IN WASH, JS, NT WOKV.

9). SCHOOL PREDATOR PROTECT

*/SCHOOL PREDATOR PROTECT*

*MANTELL - DC*

*SUPERS: WASHINGTON*

*SEN. PAT TOOMEY / (R) PENNSYLVANIA*

*ANCHOR INTRO*

A PENNSYLVANIA SENATOR (PAT TOOMEY) IS URGING HIS COLLEAGUES TO APPROVE A BILL HE SPONSORED TO PROTECT STUDENTS FROM SEXUAL PREDATORS.

*VO*

THE MEASURE WOULD REQUIRE SCHOOLS TO PERFORM BACKGROUND CHECKS FOR ALL NEW AND EXISTING EMPLOYEES WHO COME INTO CONTACT WITH STUDENTS.

THAT WOULD INCLUDE COACHES, BUS DRIVERS AND CONTRACTORS. SCHOOLS WOULD NOT BE ALLOWED TO HIRE CONVICTED VIOLENT SEXUAL OFFENDERS.

*SOT*

*ASC12105636 (framerate 29.97)*

*Source Locators*

*11;02;30;15* i think this is more than a piece of legislation. this is a moral imperative..there is something we know we can do to make our schools safer

THE BILL PASSED THE HOUSE UNANIMOUSLY BACK IN OCTOBER. NO VOTE IS SCHEDULED YET IN THE SENATE.

*EXTRA INFO AND SOT*

SCHOOLS WOULD BE FORBIDDEN FROM ISSUING LETTERS OF RECOMMENDATION FOR EMPLOYEES WHO ARE BELIEVED TO BE PREDATORS

*ASC12105636 (framerate 29.97)*

*Source Locators*

*11;01;16;23* sometimes there is this feeling that well, let's just make the problem someone else's problem...it does happen...it's outrageous and appalling. It needs to be forbidden and our bill would do that.

10). COMPUTER RANSOM VOSOT

*/COMPUTER RANSOM*

*MANTELL - DC*

*SUPERS:*

*SETH SCHOEN / ELECTRONIC FRONTIER FOUNDATION*

*ANCHOR INTRO*

THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION AND FBI ARE WARNING CONSUMERS ABOUT A NEW MALICIOUS SOFTWARE PROGRAM, "CRYPTOLOCKER."

*VO*

IT LOOKS LIKE A REGULAR EMAIL WHEN IT ARRIVES, BUT WHEN YOU CLICK ON A LINK, IT ENCRYPTS EVERYTHING ON YOUR HARD DRIVE - LOCKING YOU OUT.

THE CRIMINALS THEN SEND AN EMAIL DEMANDING YOU PAY RANSOM BEFORE GIVING YOU THE ENCRYPTION CODE THAT WILL UNLOCK YOUR FILES.

*SOT*

*ftc cell kev4059.new.01 (framerate 29.97)*

*Source Locators*

*12;38;12;25* apparently the new iteration is much more successful and much more widespread and has succeeded in extorting ransom from many more people than historical examples of ransomware

EVEN IF YOU PAY, THERE IS NO GUARRANTEE YOU WILL GET THE ENCRYPTION KEY.

THE FTC AND COMPUTER SECURITY EXPERTS SAY THE BEST LINE OF DEFENSE AGAINST THE MALWARE IS TO ALWAYS BACK UP YOUR COMPUTER FILES.

11). COMPUTER RANSOM RADIO SCRIPT

*/COMPUTER RANSOM*

*MANTELL - DC*

*ANCHOR INTRO*

IT'S A NEW THREAT TO YOUR HOME COMPUTER.

PATRICK TERPSTRA HAS DETAILS OF SOMETHING CALLED "CRYPTOLOCKER."

*WRAP*

IT LOOKS LIKE A REGULAR EMAIL WHEN IT ARRIVES, BUT WHEN YOU CLICK ON A LINK, IT ENCRYPTS EVERYTHING ON YOUR HARD DRIVE - LOCKING YOU OUT.

CRIMINALS THEN SEND AN EMAIL DEMANDING RANSOM BEFORE GIVING YOU THE CODE TO UNLOCK YOUR FILES.

SETH SCHOEN AT THE ELECTRONIC FRONTIER FOUNDATION.

*SOT*

*ftc cell kev4059.new.01 (framerate 29.97)*

*Source Locators*

12;38;12;25 apparently the new iteration is much more successful and much more widespread

EVEN IF YOU PAY, THERE IS NO GUARRANTEE YOU WILL GET THE ENCRYPTION KEY.  
THE FTC AND COMPUTER SECURITY EXPERTS SAY THE BEST LINE OF DEFENSE IS TO ALWAYS BACK UP YOUR FILES.  
FROM THE NEWS 96-5 WASH BURO I'M PT.  
IN WASH PT NT KRMG.  
IN WASH PT NT WOKV.

12). COMPUTER RANSOM RADIO SCRIPT 2  
*/COMPUTER RANSOM*  
*MANTELL - DC*

THE FEDS ARE WARNING OF A NEW SCHEME.  
PATRICK TERPSTRA TELLS US... THIS ONE TARGETS YOUR COMPUTERS.

*SPOT*  
IT'S CALLED CRYPTOLOCKER.  
BAD GUYS SEND YOU AN INNOCENT ENOUGH LOOKING EMAIL.  
CLICK ON A LINK AND SUDDENLY EVERYTHING ON YOUR HARD DRIVE IS ENCRYPTED.  
THE HACKER DEMANDS RANSOM TO UNLOCK YOUR COMPUTER.  
AUTHORITIES SAY IT'S ANOTHER REMINDER TO BACK EVERYTHING UP.  
IN WASH, PT, NT WOKV.

13). HELO SAFETY RULE VOSOT  
*/HELO SAFETY RULE*  
*MANTELL - DC*

*SUPERS: (NONE - FILE)*

*ANCHOR INTRO*  
THE F-A-A IS BEEFING UP HELICOPTER SAFETY REQUIREMENTS.

*VO*  
NEW RULES ANNOUNCED TODAY INCLUDE STRICTER PROCEDURES FOR FLYING IN BAD WEATHER, AT NIGHT, AND WHEN LANDING IN REMOTE LOCATIONS.  
THE F-A-A ISSUED THE RULES AFTER REVIEWING ACCIDENTS OVER 19 YEARS.  
THE CHANGES TAKE EFFECT IN 60 DAYS AND APPLY TO AIR AMBULANCES AND OTHER HELICOPTERS.  
ONE INDUSTRY GROUP THINKS THE CHANGES DON'T GO FAR ENOUGH.

HELICOPTER ASSOCIATION INTERNATIONAL SAYS CHOPPERS SHOULD ALSO HAVE TO CARRY NIGHT VISION GOGGLES.

14). HELO SAFETY RULE RADIO SCRIPT

*/HELO SAFETY RULE*

*MANTELL - DC*

*ANCHOR LEAD*

THE F-A-A IS BEEFING UP HELICOPTER SAFETY REQUIREMENTS.  
PATRICK TERPSTRA HAS THE STORY FROM WASHINGTON.

*SPOT*

NEW RULES INCLUDE STRICTER PROCEDURES FOR FLYING IN BAD WEATHER, AT NIGHT, AND WHEN LANDING IN REMOTE LOCATIONS.  
THE F-A-A ISSUED THE RULES AFTER REVIEWING ACCIDENTS OVER 19 YEARS.

THE CHANGES TAKE EFFECT IN 60 DAYS AND APPLY TO AIR AMBULANCES AND OTHER HELICOPTERS.

ONE INDUSTRY GROUP THINKS THE CHANGES DON'T GO FAR ENOUGH.  
HELICOPTER ASSOCIATION INTERNATIONAL SAYS CHOPPERS SHOULD ALSO HAVE TO CARRY NIGHT VISION GOGGLES.

IN WASH, PT, NT KRMG.

FROM THE NEWS 96-5 WASH BURO I'M PT.

IN WASH, PT, NT WOKV.

*ANCHOR LEAD*

NEWS SAFETY RULES FROM THE F-A-A TODAY.  
PATRICK TERPSTRA TELLS US THEY FOCUS ON HELICOPTERS.

*TAKE PATRICK*

THE F-A-A HAS BEEN TRYING TO REDUCE HELICOPTER CRASHES OVER THE PAST 10 YEARS.

NEW RULES INCLUDE STRICTER PROCEDURES FOR FLYING IN BAD WEATHER AND AT NIGHT.

THE CHANGES TAKE EFFECT IN 60 DAYS AND APPLY TO AIR AMBULANCES AND OTHER HELICOPTERS.

THEY AGENCY SAYS THESE

15). SCOTUS GREENHOUSE GASES VOSOT

*/SCOTUS GREENHOUSE GASES*

*MANTELL - DC*

*SUPERS: WASHINGTON*

*SHANNON GOESSLING / SOUTHEASTERN LEGAL FOUNDATION*

*ANCHOR INTRO*

THE SUPREME COURT TODAY HEARD CHALLENGES TO THE E-P-A'S AUTHORITY TO REGULATE GREENHOUSE GASES.

*VO*

THE E-P-A ADDED GREENHOUSE GASES TO THE LIST OF POLLUTANTS IT CHECKS FOR WHEN AUTHORIZING NEW POWER PLANTS, CHEMICAL PLANTS, AND OIL REFINERIES.

BUT OPPONENTS SAY THAT GIVES THE EPA TOO MUCH REGULATORY POWER.

ONE OF THE PLAINTIFFS SAID SHE WAS PLEASED BY THE SUPREME COURT'S REACTION TO HER ATTORNEY'S ARGUMENTS.

*SOT: SCOTUS (framerate 29.97) 11;48;46;03*

he raised the concerns that southeastern legal foundation and its clients had with regard to abuse of the executive authority, separation of powers.

*VO*

THE OBAMA ADMINISTRATION MAINTAINS THE E-P-A HAS PERMISSION TO CONSIDER GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS BECAUSE THEY ENDANGER "PUBLIC HEALTH OR WELFARE."

16). SCOTUS BRISTOL BAY PRESSER VOSOT  
*/SCOTUS BRISTOL BAY PRESSER*  
*MANTELL - DC*

*SUPERS: WASHINGTON*

*BRETT VEERHUSEN / COMMERCIAL FISHERMAN*

*ANCHOR INTRO*

A SEATTLE-BASED FISHERMAN JOINED WITH ENVIRONMENTALISTS AND ALASKA NATIVE TRIBE MEMBERS IN WASHINGTON, D-C -- URGING THE E-P-A TO PROTECT BRISTOL BAY SALMON FISHING.

*VO*

THEY WANT THE E-P-A TO IMMEDIATELY TAKE ACTION TO STOP A PROPOSED GOLD AND COPPER MINE IN ALASKA.

UNDER THE CLEAN WATER ACT, THE EPA HAS AUTHORITY TO DENY A PERMIT TO THE PEBBLE MINE.

*Salmon int. DHC1087.new.01 (framerate 29.97)*

*Source Locators*

11;52;47;14 it will be a monster pit in probably the worst place imaginable. It's full of life. It's very porous, wet region that is seismically active

IN JANUARY THE EPA RELEASED A REPORT THAT SAYS THE MINE WOULD THREATEN SOCKEYE SALMON AND THE JOBS OF THOUSANDS OF NATIVE ALASKA TRIBE MEMBERS AND COMMERCIAL FISHERMEN.

BRISTOL BAY IS THE WORLD'S LARGEST SOCKEYE SALMON FISHERY.

*EXTRA SOT*

*BRETT VEERHUSEN / COMMERCIAL FISHERMAN*

*Salmon int. DHC1087.new.01 (framerate 29.97)*

*Source Locators*

11;53;09;19 *if you were to think about where might be the worst possible place to put a massive open pit gold and copper mine, Bristol Bay would probably be the worst place*

*BRIAN KRAFT / LODGE OWNER*

*Salmon Press conf. DHC1088.new.01 (framerate 29.97)*

*Source Locators*

12;31;04;23 *we've been hitting a brick wall time and time again. in fact even last year there were twelve bills put in play by the state administration to less salmon protection not strengthen it, not go the direction we should be going*

18). OHIO RNC VOSOT

/OHIO RNC

MANTELL + LEE - DC

*ANCHOR INTRO:*

COULD THE 20-16 REPUBLICAN NATIONAL CONVENTION BE HELD IN OHIO?

*TAKE VO*

TODAY OFFICIALS FROM CINCINNATI, CLEVELAND AND COLUMBUS WERE IN WASHINGTON.

THEY PITCHED THEIR CITIES TO THE NATIONAL REPUBLICAN LEADERS.

NO DECISION WILL BE MADE UNTIL LATER THIS YEAR.

COLUMBUS MAYOR MICHAEL COLEMAN TALKED TO OUR WASHINGTON BUREAU.

HE SAYS OHIO IS THE RIGHT CHOICE FOR THE G-O-P BECAUSE IT IS A SWING STATE.

*TAKE SOT:*

"09:53:35-09:53:42"

*TRT:07*

you can't win the white house without winning Ohio, and you can't win Ohio without first winning Columbus and central Ohio.

*CONTINUE VO:*

THE MAYOR SAYS IT WOULD COST TAXPAYERS 55-MILLION DOLLARS BUT WOULD BRING IN MORE THAN 200 MILLION DOLLARS TO THE CITY. COLUMBUS IS ALSO VYING FOR THE DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION.

*Extra Sound Bite:*

"09:59:03-09:59:20 *In 2012 the presidential and vice presidential candidates from both sides came to columbus 77 times... Just in columbus.*

19). OHIO RNC RADIO SCRIPT

*/OHIO RNC*

*MANTELL + LEE - DC*

*SUPERS: WASHINGTON*

*MAYOR MICHAEL COLEMAN / COLUMBUS, OHIO*

-----

*ANCHOR INTRO:*

OHIO CITIES WANT TO HOST THE 20-16 REPUBLICAN CONVENTION. PATRICK TERPSTRA IS IN WASHINGTON.

*WRAP*

OFFICIALS FROM CINCINNATI, CLEVELAND AND COLUMBUS PITCHED THEIR CITIES TO NATIONAL REPUBLICAN LEADERS. COLUMBUS MAYOR MICHAEL COLEMAN SAYS OHIO IS THE RIGHT CHOICE FOR THE G-O-P BECAUSE IT IS A SWING STATE.

*TAKE SOT:*

"09:53:35-09:53:42"

*TRT:07*

you can't win the white house without winning Ohio, and you can't win Ohio without first winning Columbus and central Ohio.

NO DECISION WILL BE MADE UNTIL LATER THIS YEAR. COLUMBUS IS ALSO VYING FOR THE DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION. IN WASH, PT, NT RADIO WHIO.

*Extra Sound Bite:*

"09:59:03-09:59:20 *In 2012 the presidential and vice presidential candidates from both sides came to columbus 77 times... Just in columbus.*

20). OBAMA BUDGET VOSOT



*/OBAMA BUDGET VOSOT  
MANTELL - DC*

*SUPERS: WASHINGTON  
(no super for president)*

THE WHITE HOUSE GAVE CONGRESS THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSED BUDGET FOR NEXT YEAR.

*TAKE VO*  
OUR WASHINGTON BUREAU WAS THERE AS THE SPENDING PLAN ARRIVED ON CAPITOL HILL.  
THE PRESIDENT WANTS MORE THAN 300 BILLION DOLLARS FOR TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS...  
A NATIONAL NETWORK OF 45 MANUFACTURING HUBS...  
AND TAX CREDITS FOR WORKERS WITHOUT CHILDREN.

*Obama Budget Remarks (framerate 29.97)  
Source Locators*

*11;43;46;04* we've got to decide if we're going to keep squeezing the middle class or if we're going to continue to the reduce deficits responsibly.

*CONTINUE VO*  
THE PRESIDENT'S PLAN IS ALREADY MEETING RESISTANCE ON CAPITOL HILL.  
HOUSE SPEAKER JOHN BOEHNER SAYS IT SPENDS, BORROWS AND TAXES TOO MUCH.

21). OBAMA BUDGET RADIO SCRIPT  
*/OBAMA BUDGET 1  
MANTELL - DC*

THE WHITE HOUSE GAVE CONGRESS THE PRESIDENT'S TODAY.  
OUR PATRICK TERPSTRA HAS DETAILS FROM CAPITOL HILL.

*WRAP*  
THE PRESIDENT WANTS MORE THAN 300 BILLION DOLLARS FOR TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS...  
A NATIONAL NETWORK OF 45 MANUFACTURING HUBS...  
AND NEW TAX CREDITS FOR WORKERS WITHOUT CHILDREN.

*Obama Budget Remarks (framerate 29.97)  
Source Locators*

11:43:46:04 we've got to decide if we're going to keep squeezing the middle class or if we're going to continue to the reduce deficits responsibly.

*CONTINUE VO*

ALREADY RESISTANCE ON CAPITOL HILL.  
HOUSE SPEAKER JOHN BOEHNER SAYS THE PLAN SPENDS, BORROWS AND TAXES TOO MUCH.  
IN WASH, PT, NT KRMG.  
IN WASH, PT, NT WOKV.

22). OBAMA BUDGET RADIO SCRIPT 2

*/OBAMA BUDGET 2*

*MANTELL - DC*

THE PRESIDENT UNVEILED HIS BUDGET PLAN.  
PATRICK TERPSTRA SAYS IT'S NOT LIKELY TO GO ANYWHERE.

*SPOT*

THE LAW REQUIRES THE WHITE HOUSE PRODUCE A BUDGET EACH YEAR.  
THIS ONE HAS NEW FUNDING FOR TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS... MORE TAX CREDITS FOR THE MIDDLE CLASS... AND MONEY FOR KIDS TO ATTEND PRESCHOOL.  
THE BUDGET PLAN LACKS SUPPORT ON CAPITOL HILL.  
REPUBLICANS SAY THE PRESIDENT'S PROJECTS ARE TOO EXPENSIVE.  
IN WASH, PT, NT WOKV.

23). HEALTH CARE UPDATE VOSOT

*/HEALTH CARE UPDATE*

*MANTELL - DC*

*SUPERS: WASHINGTON*

*SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIALS*

*ANCHOR INTRO*

THE OBAMA ADMINISTRATION THIS AFTERNOON ANNOUNCED IT WILL DELAY ANOTHER PART OF THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT.

*ROLL VO*

PEOPLE WHO HAVE INSURANCE POLICIES THAT DON'T COMPLY WITH THE NEW HEALTH CARE LAW WILL BE ABLE TO RENEW THOSE PLANS FOR TWO EXTRA YEARS, UNTIL OCTOBER 2016.  
BUT ONLY IF THEIR STATE ALLOWS THEM TO DO SO.  
THE CHANGES DO NOT APPLY TO NEW CUSTOMERS.  
SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIALS ESTIMATE THIS WILL AFFECT 5-HUNDRED THOUSAND PEOPLE.

THE ADMINISTRATION ALSO STREAMLINED REPORTING REQUIREMENTS FOR BUSINESSES WITH FEWER THAN 50 EMPLOYEES.

24). SENATE SEXUAL ASSAULT VOSOT  
*/SENATE SEXUAL ASSAULT*  
*MANTELL - DC*

*SUPERS: WASHINGTON*  
*SEN. JEANNE SHAHEEN / (D) NEW HAMPSHIRE*

*ANCHOR INTRO*  
THE SENATE TODAY BLOCKED A BILL THAT WOULD HAVE TAKEN AWAY THE POWER OF MILITARY COMMANDERS TO DECIDE WHETHER TO PROSECUTE SEXUAL ASSAULT CASES.

*TAKE VO*  
THE PROPOSAL BY SENATOR KIRSTEN GILLIBRAND OF NEW YORK WOULD HAVE SHIFTED INVESTIGATIONS TO INDEPENDENT PROSECUTORS. OPPONENTS ARGUED THAT WOULD THREATEN MILITARY COHESION. SENATORS PASSED A SLATE OF LESS CONTROVERSIAL MEASURES DESIGNED TO STRENGTHEN PROTECTIONS FOR MILITARY SEXUAL ASSAULT VICTIMS.

*ASC06131318 (framerate 29.97)*  
*Source Locators*

*13;14;37;29* i think it sends a very important message to our leaders inthem ilitary and those who would perpertrate crimes of sexual violence.

*ROLL VO*  
THE VOTE FOLLOWS MONTHS OF DEBATE ABOUT REFORMING MILITARY SEXUAL ASSAULT INVESTIGATIONS

*EXTRA SOT*  
*SUPERS: WASHINGTON*  
*SEN. JEANNE SHAHEEN / (D) NEW HAMPSHIRE*

*ASC06131318 (framerate 29.97)*  
*Source Locators*

*13;15;28;27* We can't allow sexual assault perpetrators to escape justice in any setting

25). SENATE SEXUAL ASSAULT RADIO SCRIPT  
*/SENATE SEXUAL ASSAULT*  
*MANTELL - DC*

THE SENATE TODAY BLOCKED A BILL THAT WOULD HAVE TAKEN AWAY THE POWER OF MILITARY COMMANDERS TO DECIDE WHETHER TO PROSECUTE SEXUAL ASSAULT CASES.

*WRAP*

THE PROPOSAL BY SENATOR KIRSTEN GILLIBRAND OF NEW YORK WOULD HAVE SHIFTED INVESTIGATIONS TO INDEPENDENT PROSECUTORS. SENATORS PASSED A SLATE OF LESS CONTROVERSIAL MEASURE DESIGNED TO STRENGTHEN PROTECTIONS FOR MILITARY SEXUAL ASSAULT VICTIMS.

*ASC06131318 (framerate 29.97)*

*Source Locators*

*13;14;37;29* i think it sends a very important message to our leaders in the military and those who would perpetrate crimes of sexual violence.

*ROLL VO*

THE VOTE FOLLOWS MONTHS OF DEBATE ABOUT REFORMING MILITARY SEXUAL ASSAULT INVESTIGATIONS

26). SENATE SEXUAL ASSAULT RADIO SCRIPTS 2

*/SENATE SEXUAL ASSAULT*

*MANTELL - DC*

THE SENATE TODAY BLOCKED A BILL TACKLING MILITARY SEXUAL ASSAULTS.

PATRICK TERPSTRA IS IN WASHINGTON.

*WRAP*

THE PROPOSAL BY SENATOR KIRSTEN GILLIBRAND OF NEW YORK WOULD HAVE SHIFTED INVESTIGATIONS TO INDEPENDENT PROSECUTORS. SENATORS PASSED A SLATE OF LESS CONTROVERSIAL MEASURE DESIGNED TO STRENGTHEN PROTECTIONS FOR MILITARY SEXUAL ASSAULT VICTIMS.

*ASC06131318 (framerate 29.97)*

*Source Locators*

*13;14;37;29* i think it sends a very important message to our leaders in the military and those who would perpetrate crimes of sexual violence.

SENATOR JEANNE SHAHEEN OF NEW HAMPSHIRE.

IN WASH, PT, NT KRMG.

IN WASH, PT, NT RADIO WHIO.

FROM THE NEWS 96-T WASHINGTON BUREAU I'M PT.

IN WASH, PT, NT WOKV.

27). SENATE SEXUAL ASSAULT RADIO SCRIPTS 3  
*/SENATE SEXUAL ASSAULT 3*  
*MANTELL - DC*

THE SENATE TODAY PASSED A BILL TO STRENGTHEN PROTECTIONS FOR  
MILITARY SEXUAL ASSAULT VICTIMS.  
PATRICK TERPSTRA REPORTS FROM WASHINGTON.

*WRAP*  
THE VOTE FOLLOWS MONTHS OF DEBATE ABOUT REFORMING MILITARY  
SEXUAL ASSAULT INVESTIGATIONS.  
SENATOR JEANNE SHAHEEN OF NEW HAMPSHIRE.

*ASC06131318 (framerate 29.97)*  
*Source Locators*

*13;14;37;29* i think it sends a very important message to our leaders in them military  
and those who would perpetrate crimes of sexual violence.

THE SENATE BLOCKED A MEASURE THAT WOULD HAVE SHIFTED  
INVESTIGATIONS TO INDEPENDENT PROSECUTORS.  
OPPONENTS SAY THAT MEASURE WOULD HAVE WEAKENED MILITARY  
COHESION.  
IN WASH, PT, NT WOKV.

28). PITT MAYOR VOSOT  
*/PITT MAYOR*  
*MANTELL - DC*

*SUPERS: WASHINGTON*  
*MAYOR BILL PEDUTO*

*ANCHOR INTRO*  
PITTSBURGH IS ONE OF 14 CITIES PARTNERING WITH THE U-S  
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION TO STRENGTHEN AFTER-SCHOOL  
PROGRAMS.

*TAKE VO*  
OUR WASHINGTON BUREAU TODAY CAUGHT UP WITH MAYOR BILL  
PEDUTO, IN WASHINGTON FOR THE ANNOUNCEMENT.  
PEDUTO SAYS THE PARTNERHSIP WILL HELP PITTSBURGH STRENGTHEN  
AFTER-SCHOOL ART AND SPORTS PROGRAMS.

*Peduto\_DC\_031014 (framerate 29.97)*  
*Source Locators*

01;01;26;28 for any mayor education is critical if you're trying to think about your future. the most dangerous time for any kid is the hours 3 to 7 pm.

*VO TAG*

PEDUTO SAYS THE ANNOUNCEMENT DOES NOT COME WITH BIG GRANT MONEY BUT SIGNALS BETTER COORDINATION WITH THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.

THE MAYOR SAYS HE ALSO WANTS TO KEEP DEVELOPING MORE EARLY EDUCATION AND COLLEGE ENROLLMENT PROGRAMS.

29). FEB ACA NUMBERS

*/FEB ACA NUMBERS*

*MANTELL - DC*

*SUPER: (NO LOCATOR - FILE VID)*

*ANCHOR INTRO*

WE HAVE NEW NUMBERS TONIGHT FOR HOW MANY PEOPLE ARE SIGNING UP FOR INSURANCE UNDER THE NEW HEALTH CARE LAW.

*TAKE VO*

MORE THAN 4-POINT-2 MILLION AMERICANS ENROLLED IN A PLAN UNDER THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT AS OF THE END OF LAST MONTH. THAT'S UP 29 PERCENT FROM THE 3-POINT-3 MILLION WHO WERE ENROLLED AT THE END OF JANUARY.

**(LOCAL NUMBER) HAVE ENROLLED HERE IN (STATE).**

AMERICANS HAVE UNTIL MARCH 31ST TO GET INSURED OR PAY A TAX PENALTY.

30). FEB ACA NUMBERS

*/FEB ACA NUMBERS*

*MANTELL - DC*

*SUPER: (NO LOCATOR - FILE VID)*

*ANCHOR INTRO*

WE HAVE NEW NUMBERS TONIGHT FOR HOW MANY PEOPLE ARE SIGNING UP FOR INSURANCE UNDER THE NEW HEALTH CARE LAW.

*ANCHOR VO*

MORE THAN 4-POINT-2 MILLION AMERICANS ENROLLED IN A PLAN UNDER THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT AS OF THE END OF LAST MONTH. THAT'S UP 29 PERCENT FROM THE 3-POINT-3 MILLION WHO WERE ENROLLED AT THE END OF JANUARY.

**(LOCAL NUMBER) HAVE ENROLLED HERE IN (STATE).**

AMERICANS HAVE UNTIL MARCH 31ST TO GET INSURED OR PAY A TAX PENALTY.

31). CHILD PORN ARRESTS  
*/CHILD PORN ARRESTS*  
*MANTELL - DC*

*SUPERS: WASHINGTON*  
*RAYMOND PARMER, JR./ HOMELAND SECURITY*

*ANCHOR INTRO*  
CHILDREN IN GEORGIA ARE AMONG HUNDREDS OF VICTIMS IN A WORLDWIDE CHILD PORN OPERATION REVEALED TODAY.

*ROLL VO*  
FEDERAL INVESTIGATORS REVEALED DETAILS TODAY OF ONE OF THE LARGEST CHILD EXPLOITATION CASES IN HISTORY. OFFICIALS SAY 14 SUSPECTS EXPLOITED 251 VICTIMS, INCLUDING 6 IN FLORIDA AND 4 IN GEORGIA. TWO VICTIMS WERE UNDER THREE YEARS OLD BUT MOST WERE 13 TO 15 YEAR-OLD BOYS.

*TAKE SOT*  
*child\_porn8.new.01 (framerate 29.97)*  
*Source Locators*

*11;43;50;20* They had created videos were they were posing as females and then they would entice the young men into doing various online things

*VO TAG*  
THE CHILD PORN RING HAD 27 THOUSAND MEMBERS AND IS STILL UNDER INVESTIGATION.  
THE GOVERNMENT HAS SHUT DOWN THE WEBSITE.

32). CHILD PORN ARRESTS  
*/CHILD PORN ARRESTS*  
*MANTELL - DC*

*SUPERS: WASHINGTON*  
*RAYMOND PARMER, JR./ HOMELAND SECURITY*

*ANCHOR INTRO*  
CHILDREN IN OHIO ARE AMONG HUNDREDS OF VICTIMS IN A WORLDWIDE CHILD PORN OPERATION REVEALED TODAY.

*ROLL VO*

FEDERAL INVESTIGATORS REVEALED DETAILS TODAY OF ONE OF THE LARGEST CHILD EXPLOITATION CASES IN HISTORY.

OFFICIALS SAY 14 SUSPECTS EXPLOITED 251 VICTIMS, INCLUDING 11 IN OHIO.

TWO VICTIMS WERE UNDER THREE YEARS OLD BUT MOST WERE 13 TO 15 YEAR-OLD BOYS.

*TAKE SOT*

*child\_porn8.new.01 (framerate 29.97)*

*Source Locators*

*11;43;50;20* They had created videos were they were posing as females and then they would entice the young men into doing various online things

*VO TAG*

THE CHILD PORN RING HAD 27 THOUSAND MEMBERS AND IS STILL UNDER INVESTIGATION.

33). UNUSED NASA VOSOT

*/UNUSED NASA*

*MANTELL - DC*

*SUPERS: LESLIE PAIGE / CITIZENS AGAINST GOVERNMENT WASTE*

*ANCHOR INTRO:*

A NEW REPORT UNCOVERED BY OUR WASHINGTON BUREAU FOUND NASA HAS \*THOUSANDS\* OF UNUSED SMARTPHONES AND TABLETS.

*TAKE VO:*

NASA'S INSPECTOR GENERAL DISCOVERED 23-HUNDRED MOBILE DEVICES LEFT UNTOUCHED FOR AT LEAST SEVEN SEVEN MONTHS AND PROBABLY LONGER.

14 PERCENT OF NASA'S MOBILE DEVICES HAVE NOT BEEN USED.

AND NASA CANNOT EVEN SAY HOW MANY DEVICES IT ACTUALLY HAS.

THE LIST INCLUDES SMARTPHONES... TABLETS... CELL PHONES... AND AIR CARDS.

*SOT*

*NASA Leslie Paige int. DHC1162.new.01 (framerate 29.97)*

*Source Locators*

*13;32;21;25 Leslie Paige, Citizens Against Government Waste*

This is not unusual. It's not even a surprise. Smart phones are only as smart as the people who are managing them.



NASA SPENT 700 THOUSAND DOLLARS ON THE UNUSED MOBILE DEVICES IN THE 7-MONTH PERIOD EXAMINED. THE SPACE AGENCY HAS PLEDGED TO FIX THE PROBLEM BY FEBRAURY 28TH, 2015.

34). UNUSED NASA PACKAGE  
/UNUSED NASA  
MANTELL - DC

*SUPERS: JUSTIN GRAY / WASHINGTON  
LESLIE PAIGE / CITIZENS AGAINST GOVERNMENT WASTE*

*ANCHOR LEAD:*

IF YOU NEED A NEW I-PHONE, YOU MAY WANT TO CALL NASA. A NEW REPORT UNCOVERED BY OUR WASHINGTON BUREAU FOUND \*THOUSANDS\* OF UNUSED SMARTPHONES AND TABLETS. JUSTIN GRAY IS LIVE IN WASHINGTON FOR US TONIGHT WITH WHAT HE FOUND OUT.

*\*\*\*JUSTIN LIVE\*\*\**

NASA'S INSPECTOR GENERAL DISCOVERED 23-HUNDRED MOBILE DEVICES UNTOUCHED FOR AT LEAST SEVEN MONTHS AND PROBABLY LONGER.

*\*\*\*ROLL PKG\*\*\**

SMARTPHONES... TABLETS... CELL PHONES... NASA'S AUDITOR SAYS ABOUT 14 PERCENT OF NASA'S MOBILE DEVICES HAVEN'T BEEN USED....AND THEY DON'T EVEN KNOW WHERE ALL OF THEM ARE.

*NASA Leslie Paige int. DHC1162.new.01 (framerate 29.97)  
Source Locators*

*13;32;21;25 Leslie Paige, Citizens Against Government Waste*

This is not unusual. It's not even a surprise. Smart phones are only as smart as the people who are managing them. OK?

THE REPORT SAYING...

*GFX*

..".the agency is unable to ensure that it is not paying for unused devices."

*BACK TO VO*

YOU THE TAXPAYER ARE ON THE HOOK....  
700 THOUSAND DOLLARS IN THE 7-MONTH PERIOD EXAMINED.  
AND NASA CAN'T EVEN SAY HOW MANY DEVICES IT ACTUALLY HAS.  
QUOTE,

*GFX*

"NASA lacks a complete and accurate inventory of Agency-issued mobile devices."

*BACK TO VO*

THE AUDITOR RECOMMENDS NASA DEVELOP A SYSTEM TO KEEP TRACK OF ITS DEVICES.

NASA HEADQUARTERS AGREED WITH THE FINDINGS, PLEDGING TO FIX THE PROBLEM BY FEBRAURY 28TH, 2015.

*NASA Leslie Paige int. DHC1162.new.01 (framerate 29.97)*

*Source Locators*

*13;33;07;10* The fact that you would have to tell people to manage their inventory of cell phones and create databases and actually track them is a little unusual and unfortunate. But it's not an isolated instance.

*BACK TO JUSTIN LIVE*

NASA HEADQUARTERS WOULDN'T COMMENT ON THIS AUDIT. THE INSPECTOR GENERAL'S OFFICE, SAYING THE FINDINGS SPEAK FOR THEMSELVES.

LIVE IN WASHINGTON, JUSTIN GRAY, CHANNEL 9 EYEWITNESS NEWS.

*ANCHOR TAG*

THE AUDIT ALSO RAISED CONCERNS ABOUT CYBER SECURITY RISKS WITH NASA'S MOBILE DEVICES.

35). UNUSED NASA VOSOT

*/UNUSED NASA*

*MANTELL - DC*

*ANCHOR INTRO:*

IF YOU NEED A NEW IPHONE, YOU MIGHT WANT TO TALK TO NASA. JUSTIN GRAY TELLS US NASA HAS \*THOUSANDS\* OF UNUSED SMARTPHONES AND TABLETS.

*TAKE VO:*

NASA'S INSPECTOR GENERAL DISCOVERED 23-HUNDRED MOBILE DEVICES LEFT UNTOUCHED FOR AT LEAST SEVEN SEVEN MONTHS AND PROBABLY LONGER.

14 PERCENT OF NASA'S MOBILE DEVICES HAVE NOT BEEN USED. AND NASA CANNOT EVEN SAY HOW MANY DEVICES IT ACTUALLY HAS. LESLIE PAIGE OF CITIZENS AGAINST GOVERNMENT WASTE...

*SOT*

*NASA Leslie Paige int. DHC1162.new.01 (framerate 29.97)*

*Source Locators*

13;32;21;25 *Leslie Paige, Citizens Against Government Waste*

This is not unusual. It's not even a surprise. Smart phones are only as smart as the people who are managing them.

*ANCHOR TAG:*

NASA SPENT 700 THOUSAND DOLLARS ON THE UNUSED MOBILE DEVICES  
IN THE 7-MONTH PERIOD EXAMINED.  
IN WASHINGTON, JG, NT KRMG.  
IN WASHINGTON, JG, NT WOKV.

36). UNUSED NASA RADIO SCRIPTS

*/UNUSED NASA  
MANTELL - DC*

*ANCHOR INTRO:*

OUR WASHINGTON BUREAU HAS UNCOVERED A NEW REPORT THAT SAYS  
NASA HAS \*THOUSANDS\* OF UNUSED SMARTPHONES AND TABLETS.  
JUSTIN GRAY HAS MORE.

*SPOT*

SMARTPHONES... TABLETS... CELL PHONES... AND AIR CARDS.  
NASA DOESN'T KNOW HOW MANY ELECTRONIC DEVICES IT ACTUALLY  
HAS.  
AND NASA'S INSPECTOR GENERAL DISCOVERED 23-HUNDRED MOBILE  
DEVICES LEFT UNTOUCHED FOR AT LEAST SEVEN MONTHS AND  
PROBABLY LONGER.  
14 PERCENT OF NASA'S MOBILE DEVICES HAVE NOT BEEN USED.  
NASA SPENT 700 THOUSAND DOLLARS ON THE UNUSED MOBILE DEVICES  
IN THE 7-MONTH PERIOD EXAMINED.  
THE SPACE AGENCY HAS PLEDGED TO FIX THE PROBLEM BY FEBRAURY  
28TH, 2015.  
IN WASHINGTON, JG, NT WOKV.

37). MCMORRIS RODGERS ETHICS VO

*/MCMORRIS RODGERS ETHICS VO  
MANTELL - DC*

*SUPERS: NONE -- FILE VIDEO*

*ANCHOR INTRO:*

A CONGRESSIONAL ETHICS COMMITTEE IS EXTENDING AN  
INVESTIGATION INTO WASHINGTON CONGRESSWOMAN MCMORRIS  
RODGERS.

*TAKE VO:*

THE VOTE WAS SIX TO ZERO -- UNANIMOUS.  
THE BOARD FOUND THERE WAS "SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE" THAT  
MCMORRIS RODGERS USED HER STAFF OFFICE FUNDS FOR CAMPAIGN  
ACTIVITIES.  
MCMORRIS RODGERS' ATTORNEY DENIED THE ALLEGATIONS, SAYING ALL  
PAYMENTS WERE FOR "BONA FIDE PERMISSIBLE SERVICES."  
THE ETHICS BOARD COULD HAVE DISMISSED THE COMPLAINT BUT  
INSTEAD VOTED TO PURSUE THE MATTER  
MCMORRIS RODGERS IS SERVING HER FIFTH TERM IN THE HOUSE.  
NO WORD ON WHEN THE HOUSE ETHICS COMMITTEE WILL CONCLUDE ITS  
INVESTIGATION.

38). MINIMUM WAGE WOMEN VOSOT

*/MINIMUM WAGE WOMEN*

*MANTELL - DC*

*SUPERS:*

*BETSEY STEVENSON / COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS*

*ANCHOR INTRO:*

THE WHITE HOUSE IS CALLING FOR THE MINIMUM WAGE FOR TIPPED  
WORKERS TO BE RAISED FOR THE FIRST TIME IN 20 YEARS.

*TAKE VO:*

THE ADMINISTRATION WANTS TO RAISE THE WAGE FROM TWO DOLLARS  
AND 13 CENTS AN HOUR TO FOUR DOLLARS AND NINETY CENTS AN HOUR  
BY 20-16.

THE WHITE HOUSE RELEASED A REPORT TODAY SAYING THE INCREASE  
WILL HELP WOMEN, IN PARTICULAR, SINCE THEY MAKE UP THE MAJORITY  
OF TIPPED WORKERS, SUCH AS RESTAURANT SERVERS AND HAIR  
STYLISTS.

*TAKE SOT:*

*BETSEY STEVENSON:*

*10;22;46;21* more than 1 in 10 workers tell us they are not getting the full minimum  
wage even with tips

*ANCHOR ON CAM:*

THE ADMINISTRATION IS DOWN PLAYING A CONGRESSIONAL REPORT  
THAT A PAY RAISE COULD COST 500-THOUSAND JOBS.  
ANY CHANGE WILL REQUIRE CONGRESSIONAL ACTION.

39) MINIMUM WAGE WOMEN RADIO SCRIPTS

*/MINIMUM WAGE WOMEN*  
*MANTELL - DC*

*ANCHOR INTRO:*

THE WHITE HOUSE TODAY CALLED FOR THE MINIMUM WAGE FOR TIPPED WORKERS TO BE RAISED FOR THE FIRST TIME IN 20 YEARS.  
JUSTIN GRAY REPORTS.

*JUSTIN*

THE ADMINISTRATION WANTS TO RAISE THE WAGE FROM TWO DOLLARS AND 13 CENTS AN HOUR TO FOUR DOLLARS AND NINETY CENTS AN HOUR BY 20-16.

THE INCREASE WOULD HELP WOMEN, IN PARTICULAR, SINCE THEY MAKE UP THE MAJORITY OF TIPPED WORKERS.

BETSEY STEVENSON FROM THE COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS:

*TAKE SOT*

*min wage intv jeff7981.new.01 (framerate 29.97)*

*Source Locators*

*10;22;55;21* tip workers workers tell us they are not getting the full minimum wage even when they're tips are included

*JUSTIN*

THE ADMINISTRATION IS DOWN PLAYING A CONGRESSIONAL REPORT THAT A PAY RAISE COULD COST 500-THOUSAND JOBS.  
IN WASHINGTON, JUSTIN GRAY, NEWS TALK KRMG

40). TORNADO BILL

*/TORNADO BILL*

*MANTELL - DC*

*SUPERS: (NO LOCATOR - FILE)*

*REP. JIM BRIDENSTINE / (R) OKLAHOMA*

*ANCHOR INTRO*

THE U-S HOUSE IS EXPECTED TO PASS A BILL TONIGHT SUPPORTERS SAY WOULD IMPROVE TORNADO FORECASTS.

*TAKE VO*

THE BILL WOULD REQUIRE THE GOVERNMENT TO UPGRADE WEATHER RADAR AND COMPUTER SYSTEMS.

SOME OF THAT TECHNOLOGY IS DECADES OLD.

THE BILL'S BACKERS SAY IT WOULD HELP FORECASTERS PREDICT TORNADOES MORE THAN AN HOUR BEFORE THEY HIT.

*SOT*

the weather forecasting improvement act is a first step in rebalancing noaa's priorities, moving new technology from the lab bench to the field.

*VO TAG*

CRITICS POINT OUT THE PLAN DOES NOT INCLUDE ANY NEW FUNDING. THE BILL'S SPONSOR SAYS IT WOULD SHIFT MONEY FROM CLIMATE CHANGE RESEARCH TO WEATHER FORECASTING.

41). TORNADO BILL RADIO SCRIPTS

*/TORNADO BILL*

*MANTELL - DC*

*ANCHOR INTRO*

THE U-S HOUSE IS EXPECTED TO PASS A BILL TONIGHT SUPPORTERS SAY WOULD IMPROVE TORNADO FORECASTS. PATRICK TERPSTRA REPORTS.

*WRAP*

THE BILL WOULD REQUIRE THE GOVERNMENT TO UPGRADE WEATHER RADAR AND COMPUTER SYSTEMS. OKLAHOMA CONGRESSMAN JIM BRIDENSTINE.

moving new technology from the lab bench to the field.

THE BILL'S BACKERS SAY IT WOULD HELP FORECASTERS PREDICT TORNADOES MORE THAN AN HOUR BEFORE THEY HIT. CRITICS POINT OUT THE PLAN DOES NOT INCLUDE ANY NEW FUNDING. IN WASH, PT, WSB. FROM THE NEWS 96-5 WASH BUREAU, I'M PT.

*Q: HOW DOES BRIDENSTINE EXPLAIN NOT INCLUDING NEW FUNDS WITH THIS BILL?*

SO BRIDENSTINE SAYS THIS BILL WOULD SHIFT MONEY FROM CLIMATE CHANGE RESEARCH TO WEATHER FORECASTING... FREEING UP MONEY. YOU CAN IMAGINE, THAT'S CONTROVERSIAL AND MAY DOOM THE BILL IN THE SENATE, CONTROLLED BY DEMOCRATS. IN WASH, PT, NT KRMG.

-----  
*ANCHOR INTRO*

BETTER FORECASTING FOR TORNADOES....THAT'S THE GOAL OF A BILL THE HOUSE IS EXPECTED TO PASS TONIGHT.

PATRICK TERPSTRA REPORTS

*WRAP*

CONGRESSMAN JIM BRIDENSTINE OF OKLAHOMA INTRODUCED THE BILL. IT WOULD REQUIRE THE GOVERNMENT TO UPGRADE WEATHER RADAR AND COMPUTER SYSTEMS.

BRIDENSTINE SAYS BETTER TORNADO FORECAST WOULD SAVE HIS STATE AND THE NATION LIVES AND MONEY.

TROUBLE IS, CRITICS SAY THE BILL DOESN'T INCREASE FUNDING FOR WEATHER RESEARCH.

BRIDENSTINE WANTS TO SHIFT FUNDS FROM CLIMATE CHANGE TO PAY FOR FORECASTING IMPROVEMENTS.

IN WASH, PT, NT WSB.

42). LOST CONTAINERS

*/LOST CONTAINERS*

*MANTELL - DC*

*SUPERS - NO SUPERS, GENERIC VIDEO*

*ANCHOR INTRO*

THEY WERE ON THE WAY TO STORES BUT ENDED UP ON THE BOTTOM OF THE SEA.

*TAKE VO*

A NEW FEDERAL REPORT (NOAA) ESTIMATES TEN THOUSAND CARGO CONTAINERS FALL OFF SHIPS EVERY YEAR.

THE CONTAINERS OFTEN FLOAT FOR A WHILE, ACTING AS MINI-ICEBERGS AND CREATING A NAVIGATIONAL HAZARD FOR SHIPS.

THEY LAST HUNDREDS OF YEARS UNDER WATER.

THE GOVERNMENT IS HOPING TO SOON STUDY THE IMPACT ON MARINE LIFE.

43). LOST CONTAINERS

*/LOST CONTAINERS*

*MANTELL - DC*

*ANCHOR INTRO*

THEY WERE ON THE WAY TO STORES BUT ENDED UP LOST AT SEA.

PATRICK TERPSTRA HAS A NEW STUDY OF WAYWARD CARGO.

*SPOT*

A NEW FEDERAL REPORT (NOAA) ESTIMATES TEN THOUSAND CARGO CONTAINERS FALL OFF SHIPS EVERY YEAR.

THE CONTAINERS OFTEN FLOAT FOR A WHILE, ACTING AS MINI-ICEBERGS AND CREATING A NAVIGATIONAL HAZARD FOR SHIPS. THEY LAST HUNDREDS OF YEARS UNDER WATER. THE GOVERNMENT IS HOPING TO SOON STUDY THE IMPACT ON MARINE LIFE.  
IN WASH, PT, NT WOKV.  
FROM THE NEWS 96-5 WASHINGTON BUREAU I'M PT.

*Q: THE NEW REPORT TALKED ABOUT HOW THESE BOXES TUMBLE INTO THE WATER...*

A: YES... BAD WEATHER CAN BE A FACTOR. BUT A LOT OF TIMES IT'S BECAUSE THOSE CONTAINERS ARE HEAVIER THAN THEY ARE SUPPOSED TO BE... OR THEY ARE NOT PROPERLY SECURED. AND... SOMETIMES THEY ARE STACKED TOO HIGH.  
IN WASH, PT, NT KRMG.

-----  
*ANCHOR INTRO*

A MAN-MADE HAZARD AT SEA.  
THOUSANDS OF CARGO SHIP CONTAINERS ARE FALLING OVERBOARD EVERY YEAR.  
PATRICK TERPSTRA REPORTS.

*SPOT*

A NEW FEDERAL REPORT (NOAA) ESTIMATES TEN THOUSAND CARGO CONTAINERS FALL OFF SHIPS EVERY YEAR. SOME OF THE CAUSES? CONTAINERS HEAVIER THAN THEIR DECLARED WEIGHT, AND OVERSTACKING. MANY OF THE CONTAINERS DON'T SINK RIGHT AWAY, CREATING A NAVIGATIONAL HAZARD FOR SHIPS. AND THEY LAST HUNDREDS OF YEARS ON THE BOTTOM OF THE OCEAN. THE GOVERNMENT IS HOPING TO SOON STUDY THE IMPACT ON MARINE LIFE.  
IN WASH, PT, NT WOKV.

44). GAS PRICE HEARINGS VOSOT  
*/GAS PRICE HEARINGS*  
*MANTELL-DC*

*SUPERS - WASHINGTON*

*RICHARD CHILDRESS, FORMER NASCAR DRIVER*



*ANCHOR INTRO*

A NASCAR TEAM OWNER IS ON CAPITOL HILL TALKING GAS PRICES.

*VO*

RICHARD CHILDRESS (CHILL-druss) TOLD A SENATE PANEL HIS TEAM IS USING A 15-PERCENT BLEND OF ETHANOL AND IS HAPPY WITH THE RESULTS.

HE'S URGING CONGRESS TO KEEP RULES IN PLACE REQUIRING A MINIMUM AMOUNT OF RENEWABLE FUEL IN GASOLINE BLENDS.

CHILDRESS SAYS ETHANOL IS BETTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT.

HE ALSO SAYS IT REDUCES DEPENDENCE ON FOREIGN OIL, AND KEEPS PRICES UNDER CONTROL AT THE PUMP.

*gas\_hearing\_int.new.01 (framerate 29.97)*

*Source Locators*

13;12;07;07 7 billion gallons we won't have to depend on for foreign oil. we can't be held hostage over this foreign oil.

*VO TAG*

HE SAYS NASCAR HAS DRIVEN OVER 5 MILLION MILES AT 95-HUNDRED R-P-M AND IS HAPPY WITH ETHANOL.

45). GAS PRICE HEARINGS RADIO SCRIPTS

*/GAS PRICE HEARINGS*

*MANTELL-DC*

*ANCHOR INTRO*

A NASCAR TEAM OWNER IS ON CAPITOL HILL TALKING GAS PRICES.  
PATRICK TERPSTRA REPORTS.

*PATRICK*

RICHARD CHILDRESS (CHILL-druss) TOLD A SENATE PANEL HIS TEAM IS USING A 15-PERCENT ETHANOL BLEND AND IS HAPPY WITH THE RESULTS.

HE'S URGING CONGRESS TO KEEP RULES IN PLACE REQUIRING RENEWABLE FUEL IN GASOLINE.

CHILDRESS SAYS ETHANOL IS BETTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT.

AND...

*gas\_hearing\_int.new.01 (framerate 29.97)*

*Source Locators*

13;12;07;07 it's seven billion gallons we won't have to depend on for foreign oil. we can't be held hostage over this foreign oil.

HE SAYS NASCAR HAS DRIVEN OVER 5 MILLION MILES USING ETHANOL  
IN WASH, PT, NT KRMG.  
FROM THE NEWS 96-5 WASH BUREAU I'M PT.  
IN WASH, PT, NT WOKV.

-----

*ANCHOR INTRO*

A FORMER NASCAR DRIVER HAS AN IDEA FOR KEEPING GAS PRICES  
UNDER CONTROL.  
PATRICK TEPRSTRA REPORTS FROM WASHINGTON.

*PATRICK*

RICHARD CHILDRESS TOLD CONGRESS HIS TEAM USES A 15 PERCENT  
ETHANOL BLEND IN ITS CARS.  
IF EVERY ONE IN THE U-S DID THAT, HE SAYS IT WOULD CUT DEPENDENCE  
ON FOREIGN OIL BY 7 BILLION GALLONS.  
AND IT'S GOOD FOR THE ENVIRONMENT.  
CHILDRESS WANTS CONGRESS TO KEEP THE REQUIREMENT FOR  
RENEWABLE FUEL IN GASOLINE BLENDS.  
HE SAYS NASCAR HAS DRIVEN OVER 5 MILLION MILES AT 95-HUNDRED R-  
P-M AND IS HAPPY WITH RESULTS.  
IN WASH, PT, WOKV.

46). GAS PRICE HEARINGS

*/A-10 PROTEST*

*ALEXANDRE AND MANTELL - DC*

*SUPERS -WASHINGTON*

*REP. JACK KINGSTON / (R) 1ST-DISTRICT*

*ANCHOR INTRO*

GEORGIA MEMBERS OF CONGRESS ARE AMONG THOSE SPEAKING OUT  
PHASING OUT A-TEN FIGHTER JETS STATIONED AT MOODY AIR FORCE  
BASE.

*TAKE VO*

OUR WASHINGTON BUREAU WAS THERE AS THEY SPOKE TODAY ON  
CAPITOL HILL.  
THEY SAY THE A-TEN HAS BEEN EFFECTIVE IN PROTECTING COMBAT  
TROOPS ON THE GROUND.  
LAWMAKERS SHOWED THE DIFFERENCE IN FIRE POWER BETWEEN THE A-  
TEN AND THE F-15 AND F-16.

*a10 clip2*

14;04;11;12 it has been used so many times in Afghanistan and in Iraq--not Korean War or WW2 or Vietnam, but recently and so I think in terms of what is going on in the world today it is far too early to retire.

THE AIR FORCE IS RETIRING THE A-TEN TO EVENTUALLY MAKE WAY FOR THE F-35 FIGHTER JET.  
RETIRING THE A-TEN COULD SAVE NEARLY 4-BILLION DOLLARS.

47). A-10 PROTEST VOSOT  
*/A-10 PROTEST*  
*ALEXANDRE AND MANTELL - DC*

*SUPERS -WASHINGTON*  
*REP. JACK KINGSTON / (R) 1ST-DISTRICT*

*ANCHOR INTRO*  
GEORGIA MEMBERS OF CONGRESS ARE AMONG THOSE SPEAKING AGAINST PHASING OUT A-TEN FIGHTER JETS STATIONED AT MOODY AIR FORCE BASE.

*TAKE VO*  
OUR WASHINGTON BUREAU WAS THERE AS THEY SPOKE TODAY ON CAPITOL HILL.  
THEY SAY THE A-TEN HAS BEEN EFFECTIVE IN PROTECTING COMBAT TROOPS ON THE GROUND.  
LAWMAKERS SHOWED THE DIFFERENCE IN FIRE POWER BETWEEN THE A-TEN AND THE F-15 AND F-16.

*a10 clip2*  
14;04;11;12 it has been used so many times in Afghanistan and in Iraq--not Korean War or WW2 or Vietnam, but recently.

THE AIR FORCE IS RETIRING THE A-TEN TO EVENTUALLY MAKE WAY FOR THE F-35 FIGHTER JET.  
RETIRING THE A-TEN COULD SAVE NEARLY 4-BILLION DOLLARS.

48. FRACKING QUAKES VOSOT  
*/FRACKING QUAKES*  
*MANTELL - DC*

*SUPERS -WASHINGTON*  
*LAUREN PAGEL / EARTHWORKS*

*ANCHOR INTRO*  
A REPORT BLAMING HYDRAULIC FRACTURING FOR EARTHQUAKES IN OHIO IS CREATING POLITICAL AFTERSHOCKS IN WASHINGTON.

*TAKE VO*

ENVIRONMENTAL GROUPS ARE ALREADY USING LAST WEEK'S FINDINGS BY THE STATE OF OHIO TO PUSH FOR A MORATORIUM ON FRACTURING. THAT'S THE PROCESS OF INJECTING FLUID INTO ROCK TO EXTRACT OIL AND GAS.

OUR WASHINGTON BUREAU SPOKE TO THE POLICY DIRECTOR FOR EARTHWORKS TODAY.

SHE SAYS POTENTIAL HARM FROM FRACTURING MUST BE STUDIED.

*Lauren Pagel Fracking interview.new.01 (framerate 29.97)*

*Source Locators*

14;16;15;05 We can't be using the American public as guinea pigs. This affects people and their property.

*VO TAG*

THE OIL AND GAS INDUSTRY ARGUES FRACTURING IS SAFE AND PROVIDES NEEDED ENERGY.

*extra sot*

*Lauren Pagel Fracking interview.new.01 (framerate 29.97)*

*Source Locators*

14;18;57;12 In our mind what's needed is a moratorium on oil and gas drilling, fracking and waste injection until all of the potential harms can be studied including earthquake issues.

49). FRACKING QUAKES RADIO SCRIPTS

*/FRACKING QUAKES*

*MANTELL - DC*

*SUPERS -WASHINGTON*

*LAUREN PAGEL / EARTHWORKS*

*ANCHOR INTRO*

A NEW REPORT CONNECTS HYDRAULIC FRACTURING AND EARTHQUAKES. PATRICK TERPSTRA HAS POLITICAL AFTERSHOCKS IN WASHINGTON.

*WRAP*

OHIO FOUND HYDRAULIC FRACTURING CAN CAUSE EARTHQUAKES. ENVIRONMENTAL GROUPS ARE ALREADY USING THE FINDINGS TO PUSH FOR A MORATORIUM ON FRACTURING, THE PROCESS OF INJECTING FLUID INTO ROCK TO EXTRACT OIL AND GAS.

LAUREN PAGEL IS THE POLICY DIRECTOR FOR EARTHWORKS.

*Lauren Pagel Fracking interview.new.01 (framerate 29.97)*  
*Source Locators*

14;16;15;05 We can't be using the American public as guinea pigs. This affects people and their property.

THE OIL AND GAS INDUSTRY ARGUES FRACTURING IS SAFE AND PROVIDES NEEDED ENERGY.  
FROM THE NEWS 96-5 WASH BUREAU I'M PT.  
IN WASH PT NT KRMG.

50). E-CIGS STUDY VOSOT  
*/E-CIGS STUDY*  
*MANTELL-DC*

*SUPER:*  
*MATTHEW MYERS / CAMPAIGN FOR TOBACCO-FREE KIDS*

*ANCHOR INTRO:*  
THE MAKERS OF ELECTRONIC CIGARETTES ARE MARKETING TO MINORS, ACCORDING TO A NEW SENATE REPORT.  
DEMOCRATS SAY THE FINDINGS ARE PROOF THE F-D-A NEEDS TO REGULATE E-CIGARETTES THE SAME WAY IT SUPERVISES TOBACCO SALES. E-CIGARETTES HEAT A NICOTINE SOLUTION AND PRODUCE A VAPOR THAT'S INHALED.  
LAWMAKERS ARE CONCERNED THE FLAVORS INCLUDE CHERRY, GRAPE AND COTTON CANDY.  
E-CIGARETTE RELATED CALLS TO POISON CENTERS ARE ALSO UP.

*TAKE SOT:*  
*MATTHEW MYERS / CAMPAIGN FOR TOBACCO-FREE KIDS*

*e-cig int.new.01 (framerate 29.97)*  
*Source Locators*

13;05;37;25 Tragically it's not a surprise at all that young people are being poisoned by liquid nicotine and e-cigarettes. Because there are absolutely no controls.

*VO TAG*  
E-CIGARETTE SUPPORTERS SAY THE DEVICES HELP PEOPLE QUIT TOBACCO CIGARETTES AND DON'T HAVE THE UNHEALTHY SMOKE.  
51) E-CIGS STUDY RADIO SCRIPTS  
*/E-CIGS STUDY*  
*MANTELL-DC*

*ANCHOR INTRO:*

MAKERS OF ELECTRONIC CIGARETTES ARE MARKETING TO MINORS.  
JUSTIN GRAY TELLS US THAT'S FROM A NEW SENATE STUDY.

*JUSTIN*

DEMOCRATS SAY THE STUDY IS PROOF THE F-D-A NEEDS TO REGULATE E-  
CIGARETTES LIKE TOBACCO.  
MATTHEW MYERS AT THE CAMPAIGN FOR TOBACCO FREE KIDS AGREES.

*TAKE SOT:*

*MATTHEW MYERS / CAMPAIGN FOR TOBACCO-FREE KIDS*

*e-cig int.new.01 (framerate 29.97)*

*Source Locators*

13;05;37;25 there are absolutely no controls.

*JUSTIN*

E-CIGARETTES HEAT A NICOTINE SOLUTION AND PRODUCE A VAPOR  
THAT'S INHALED.  
SUPPORTERS SAY THE DEVICES HELP PEOPLE QUIT TOBACCO CIGARETTES.  
JG NEWS TALK WOKV

-----  
*ANCHOR INTRO:*

*A NEW SENATE REPORT SAYS THE FDA SHOULD REGULATE E-CIGARETTES  
JUST LIKE TOBACCO.*

*JUSTIN GRAY REPORTS FROM WASHINGTON.*

*JUSTIN*

DEMOCRATS SAY E-CIGARETTE MANUFACTURERS ARE ADVERTISING TO  
MINORS...  
AND THEY ARE ATTRACTING PEOPLE UNDER 18 USING FLAVORS LIKE  
STRAWBERRY AND COTTON CANDY.  
E-CIGARETTES HEAT A NICOTINE SOLUTION AND PRODUCE A VAPOR  
THAT'S INHALED.  
DEMOCRATS WANT TO STOP TV AND RADIO ADVERTISING FOR E-  
CIGARETTES.  
SUPPORTERS SAY THE DEVICES HELP PEOPLE QUIT SMOKING.  
JG NEWS TALK WOKV

*/E-CIGS STUDY*

*MANTELL-DC*

*ANCHOR INTRO:*  
*MAKERS OF ELECTRONIC CIGARETTES ARE MARKETING TO MINORS.*  
*JUSTIN GRAY TELLS US THAT'S FROM A NEW SENATE STUDY.*

*JUSTIN*  
DEMOCRATS SAY THE STUDY IS PROOF THE F-D-A NEEDS TO REGULATE E-  
CIGARETTES LIKE TOBACCO.  
MATTHEW MYERS AT THE CAMPAIGN FOR TOBACCO FREE KIDS AGREES.

*TAKE SOT:*  
*MATTHEW MYERS / CAMPAIGN FOR TOBACCO-FREE KIDS*

*e-cig int.new.01 (framerate 29.97)*  
*Source Locators*

13;05;37;25 there are absolutely no controls.  
-----

*JUSTIN*  
E-CIGARETTES HEAT A NICOTINE SOLUTION AND PRODUCE A VAPOR  
THAT'S INHALED.  
SUPPORTERS SAY THE DEVICES HELP PEOPLE QUIT TOBACCO CIGARETTES.  
JG NEWS TALK KRMG

52). METCALF SUBSTATION PACKAGE  
*/METCALF SUBSTATION*  
*MANTELL - DC*

*SUPERS:*  
*WASHINGTON*  
*RET. MAJ. GEN. ROBERT NEWMAN / AIR FORCE*  
*MICHAEL DEL ROSSO / INFRASTRUCTURE EXPERT*  
*PETER VINCENT PRY / ELECTROMAGNETIC THREAT EXPERT*

*ANCHOR INTRO:*  
A YEAR HAS PASSED SINCE A MYSTERIOUS BARRAGE OF BULLETS  
STRUCK A BAY AREA POWER PLANT SUBSTATION.  
TODAY, EXPERTS HUDDLED IN WASHINGTON.  
(ANCHOR) TELLS US, THEY THINK THAT ATTACK SHOWS THE THREAT FROM  
A NEW KIND OF TERRORISM.

*PKG*  
ACROSS THE STREET FROM THE U-S CAPITOL... A DISCUSSION ABOUT AN  
ATTACK ON THE METCALF SUBSTATION.  
LAST YEAR... UNIDENTIFIED SNIPERS FIRED 150 BULLETS AT THE POWER  
PLANT FACILITY SOUTH OF SAN JOSE.

MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AT THE MEETING ORGANIZED BY THE CENTER FOR SECURITY POLICY SAY IT WAS A WAKE-UP CALL.

*SOT*

*MG Robert Newman, former Adjutant General of Virginia*

14;47;05;00 our grid, on which our first responders rely, is extremely vulnerable.

P-G AND-E KEPT POWER RUNNING DURING THE ATTACK.  
BUT SOME LOST PHONE SERVICE WHEN A-T-AND-T FIBER OPTIC CABLES WERE CUT.  
IT COULD'VE BEEN FAR WORSE, EXPERTS SAY.  
THEY SAY THE INCIDENT EXPOSED THE VULNERABILITY OF THE NATION'S POWER GRID.  
TERRORISTS WITH THE RIGHT TOOLS -- ABLE TO KNOCK OUT ELECTRICITY IN MAJOR CITIES... DISRUPTING ECONOMIES, FOOD SUPPLY AND MORE.

*SOT*

*Michael Del Rosso, former Chairman, IEEE Critical Infrastructure Committee*

15;03;21;22 it's not an improbable event, it's likely--it's inevitably going to occur. It's inexcusable not to do something.

PARTICIPANTS AT THE MEETING SAID THEY WANT CONGRESS TO HELP UTILITIES HARDEN POWER PLANTS AGAINST FUTURE ATTACKS... IT'S LIKELY TO TAKE FUNDING... MONEY THE INDUSTRY DOES NOT WANT TO SPEND.

*SOT*

*Peter Vincent Pry, former Staff Member, Congressional EMP Threat Commission*

14;56;52;14 these things are regarded by the industry when they look at the calculus of is it worth the cost, they don't want to go there

THESE EXPERTS SAY THE UNSOLVED ATTACK AT METCALF SHOWS... THE THREAT IS REAL.  
I'M (ANCHOR) REPORTING.

*ANCHOR TAG*

THE FBI SAYS THEY DO NOT SUSPECT TERRORISM WAS INVOLVED.  
PGE SAID LAST WEEK IT IS ISSUING A REWARD FOR INFORMATION ABOUT THE INCIDENT.



## Chapter Five: Analysis

### Theoretical Framework: Framing Theory

Framing is one of the three most important theories in academic studies of journalism and is related to the other two most prominent theories, agenda setting and priming (Entman, 2007.)

Framing theory considers the way that media select and present information to the public, at best partly for reasons of space constraints and practical considerations. Framing theory postulates that the news media strongly influence public's perceptions of events. By deciding how to present or frame "facts", the media helps set the tone for the overall public discourse.

Scheufele and Tewksbury (2007, 106) trace framing's theoretical roots to psychology and sociology, adding framing "is based on the assumption that how an issue is characterized in news reports can have an influence on how it is understood by audiences."

Entman (1993, 52) notes:

Framing essentially involves *selection and salience*. To frame is to *select some aspects of a perceived reality and make them more salient in a communicating text, in such a way as to promote a particular problem definition, casual interpretation, moral evaluation, and / or treatment recommendation* for the item described.

But Entman (1993, 164) acknowledges that biases can be at work behind this selection and presentation:

Scholars can shed new light on bias by examining linkages among the three concepts that have received such intense scholarly scrutiny. We can define framing as the process of culling a few elements of perceived reality and

assembling a narrative that highlights connections among them to promote a particular interpretation.

After showing how these three concepts--agenda setting, framing, and priming--fit together as tools of power, Entman (1993, 164) connects them to explicit definitions of news slant and the related but distinct phenomenon of bias. Properly defined and measured, slant and bias provide insight into how the media influence the distribution of power -- as Entman describes it: "who gets what, when, and how."

Capella and Jamison (1996, 71) also corroborate the subtle yet unmistakable influence framing can have on how the public views issues:

Studies that we have conducted over the past four years show that subtle changes in the way news stories are framed can affect consumers' responses, activating their cynicism when strategic or conflict-oriented frames are used. The studies directly implicate media framing of political news in activating, if not creating, cynicism about campaigns, policy, and governance and imply that cynicism about the news media may be an indirect consequence.

Dimitrova and Stromback (2008, 205) note that when the media and public or other parties are on the same page, the very fact that framing is even occurring may not be even noticed. "(F)raming is influenced by the national political context in which journalists operate. If there is agreement about an issue in the political environment, framing becomes invisible."

Certainly, the importance and centrality of framing has not escaped scholars. Pan and Kosicka (1993, 55) maintain framing theory heavily shapes the questions tackled by most studies today:

Much of the recent research in political communication deals with one or more of the following three questions. First, how do the news media "set the frame in which citizens discuss public events" (Tuchman, 1978, p. ix) and consequently "narrow the available political alternatives" (p. 156)? Second, how do politicians

and advocacy groups actively "court" the media to polish their images and frame debates over public policies (see Hertsgaard, 1988; Pertschuk & Schaetzel, 1989)? Third, how do audiences process news information actively and construct meanings using their preexisting cognitive representations (e.g., Graber, 1988; Livingstone, 1990)?

### **Democratic Peace Theory**

While an exhaustive discussion of ethics, politics, and war is beyond the scope of this paper, nonetheless, it would be fruitful and germane to consider the extent to which one powerful concept from political science, in particular--democratic peace theory--did or did not inform the coverage of Iraq War war anniversary. Democratic peace is a key theory for a deeper understanding of some of the basic political dynamics underlying the war, putting the relationship between democracies and dictatorships into a larger historical context.

Democratic Peace Theory is a notion that has gained wide acceptance among political scientists, and its acceptance seems to only get stronger with time, despite, or because of, the various challenges posed to it.

In brief, Democratic Peace Theory states that historically democracies rarely, if ever, go to war with each other--though democracies undeniably do fight--plenty--with non-democracies.

The study of international relations has produced few widely accepted generalizations. One of these, sometimes even asserted to be an empirical law (Levy 1988) is that democracies do not fight wars with one another. The empirical evidence for this is quite strong. (Bueno de Mesquita, 1999, 791)

Rummel (1994, 13) analyzed wars over a 175-year period in the 19th and 20th centuries, considering the type of government involved, and found strong empirical evidence for democratic peace. He found:

- 353 pairs of nations engaged in wars between 1816-1991.
- None was between two democracies.
- 155 pairs involved a democracy and a non-democracy.
- 198 involved two non-democracies fighting each other.
- The average length of war between states was 35 months, average battle deaths was 15,069.

But it is also important to also state what democratic peace does not claim, since the theory is often misrepresented or misunderstood in the literature. Despite the general tendency for peace among democracies, democratic peace does NOT deny that democracies can and do have disagreements, even strong ones, nor does it maintain that they cannot have conflicting self-interest or agendas.

To repeat, democratic peace is literally the claim that democracies tend to not go to war with each other. Often this is stated with the qualification that MATURE democracies rarely, if ever, go to war with each other.

Not surprisingly, much rides on how one defines what is and isn't a democracy. And both proponents and opponents have sometimes been accused by various studies of defining democracy in such a way to stack the deck in their favor or explain away seemingly uncomfortable anomalies.

Critics of democratic peace have tried to point to perceived battles fought between democracies at various points in history to undermine the concept partly or entirely. Rummel's evidence seems to suggest a strong correlation in modern times, but others have proposed a few supposed counterexamples to presumably blow the theory out of the water. For example: What about Athens and Syracuse in ancient times, some ask? (A

possible counter-response: scholars disagree about whether Syracuse was actually a democracy. The surviving evidence about the nature of Syracuse's government is not clear enough or comprehensive enough for us to decide conclusively one way or the other.) Others ask--what about Finland during World War II? (The typical counter-response is that Finland was fighting a separate war against Russia during World War II, not the West.)

Others attempt to split history into two periods, admitting the truth of democratic peace in the 20th century but denying its validity in ancient times. Russett (2006), for instance, while acknowledging democratic peace in modern times, disputes its existence in Ancient Greece, pointing in part to conflicts between Athens and Sparta. But his analysis of what constitutes a democracy seems strangely twisted. For one thing, he considers Ancient Sparta to be a democracy--even though most people, at best, would call Sparta an oligarchy, given its two kings, military ruling class, and the huge portion of the population that was enslaved as helots (outnumbering citizens by a wide margin.)

While not every advocate of democratic peace is prepared to admit the apparent exceptions, even if one does admit some counterexamples, it seems at most these would merely qualify democratic peace a bit. The theory would hold true for the most part, if not 100% of the time, but democratic peace would not be refuted. It would merely be a strong tendency, not an absolute rule.

Some scholars (Farber, 1997) have attempted to challenge democratic peace for other, conceptual reasons, casting doubt on its supposed explanations or causes. His point of view for attacking the theory is that apparently if the scholarly community can't

establish a coherent theoretical framework for why democratic peace exists, then it must not exist, no matter how much the evidence seems to back it up. (This seems somewhat akin to the notion that if a seven-foot tall man walks into the room, he isn't really seven feet tall unless you have a strong theory explaining why he is seven feet tall.)

Farber, furthermore, notes there were few democracies before 1914. He counts only four--Greece, the United States, Switzerland, and Norway. He feels it is impossible draw any meaningful conclusions from this small sample group. And yet this is to deny the very nature and importance of the early democracies. In fact, one might make the exact counter argument, that these first democracies were of tremendous importance in world history--perhaps the most important and compelling examples of all--given their rise against despite great odds and the whims of history.

But in the end, it is important to note that even those who question the causes of democratic peace nonetheless acknowledge the validity of the claim itself. Even a critical Rosato (2003, 585), for instance, who feels this peace "may not be caused by the democratic nature of those states," acknowledges "there are good reasons to believe that... there is certainly peace among democracies."

Indeed, the evidence has reached such an overwhelming tilt in favor of democratic peace that Dafoe (2010), examining the flaws of various studies attempting to debunk the theory, says democratic peace has survived so many challenges that it is time to put the matter to rest once and for all. It is time to accept the truth of democratic peace and henceforth consider all those who question it as being on extremely shaky ground. He asserts, "As the number of studies supporting the descriptive inference of democratic

peace continues to grow, the probability of a future study overturning this study becomes increasingly less likely (Dafoe, 2011, 206).” In legal parlance, we can issue a summary judgment against doubters from the get go.

My own contribution to the democratic peace theory would be this observation: It seems to me that one reason scholars are having a hard time understanding the underlying cause of democratic peace is that they are focusing on structural explanations or (pseudo-) mathematical explanations of the phenomenon not grounded in the basic psychology underlying the theory.

One could argue the main dynamic at work in democratic peace theory is this: democracy = good = friend; dictatorship = bad = enemy. It’s important to understand democratic theory at this most basic psychological level; this view tends to permeate all members and classes and structures in democracies--from the poor to the elites. President Ronald Reagan, summed up this point of view succinctly when he called the Soviet Union the “evil empire.” You cannot understand democratic peace merely by describing the phenomenon; you must understand the moral evaluation and judgment occurring in democratic society--how its population views other countries and governments on a moral level.

Scholars have attempted to take this ethical or moral element out of the discussion and then wonder why explanations based simply on structural explanations (for example, are democracies peaceful because they handle external struggles the same as they do internal struggles?) fall short. This basic demonization or fear of dictatorships exists in citizens in democracy for a good reason. If a democracy conquers another democracy,

there is little reason for the average person to fear his or her life would change more than after a change in leadership after a routine election. But if a dictatorship conquers a democracy, the average person has reason to fear basic freedoms may vanish overnight; it may be the end of the world as he or she knows it. Scholars who view democracies and tyrannies as merely different and discount or ignore the perceived moral supremacy of democracies, overlook the basic psychological explanation of why democracies do--and must--consider each other friends--and why democracies consider non-democracies to be enemies. Qualitative research may be premised on the notion of describing not evaluating, but unfortunately judgment is necessary in some cases.

Democratic peace is important in analyzing media's coverage of the Iraq War anniversary for two reasons: First, although some scholars cringe at the notion, nonetheless democratic peace may have direct bearing on the question of validity of the war; if democracies really don't fight each other, this would tend to support the official America justification of the war--that installing a democratic government in Iraq and Afghanistan would lead to long-term peace among nations in the region (notwithstanding current internal power struggles.) Spreading democracy spreads peace. Secondly, democratic peace sheds light on the underlying cause of the war itself. While historically democracies do not fight each other, it is indisputably true that democracies and non-democracies fight each other all the time.

Understanding this basic, historical tension between democracies and other forms of government can help journalists grasp at a more basic level what was driving the conflict, above and beyond the arguments used by both sides at the start of the war. If, as



it were, you understand the basic dynamics of what causes a divorce in general, you would have a deeper understanding of a particular divorce case than you would get by merely hearing both spouses give a “he said, she said” laundry list of various grievances. You realize there might be something larger going on that has an impact on all relationships (whether among people in the latter case or nations in the former.)

## **Literature Review**

### **Introduction.**

It is hard to rise above politics, especially in covering highly charged political matters such as foreign affairs and wars, but to the extent that reporters are able to do so, they expand the views and minds of their readers. The media has every right to be critical of the government and is under no obligation to serve up propaganda or campaign for war. But journalists should also seek out the truth beyond politics and groupthink (whether the pressure is coming from the government or the public.) Otherwise, one runs the risk of superficial reporting that merely preaches to the choir of the believers and alienates the dissenters, without really informing or challenging either.

Of course, even with the best of intentions, it is extremely hard to do ‘instant’ historical analysis of an event that has just concluded. The 10th anniversary of the start of the Iraq War in fact came just a year and a half after the end of the war and withdrawal of U.S. troops. Reporters were placed in the somewhat difficult position of attempting to predict the future long-term significance of the war with just a few years’ perspective under their belt. Historians, who usually have benefit of analyzing events (such as the

decline and fall of the Romans Empire) from a much longer timeframe, are faced with the opposite dilemma and must work against the tendency to read into events with hindsight and assume everything was predestined to be just as events turned out.

Perhaps the best reporters can do to overcome these limitations, and avoid a mere political analysis of current events, is to place events in a larger historical or worldwide context and to consider things in the more philosophical light of political science rather than the polarized left / right water cooler / Facebook politics in America.

The 10th anniversary of the start of the Iraq War offers an interesting case study to take a look at how well the media did in its news coverage of an extremely political, divisive event. The American public underwent a shift from being largely supportive of the war in the beginning to being much more critical at the war's end. It is a hypothesis of this study that the media probably also underwent a shift in its coverage of the war, and it probably ended up more critical than it began.

But because of the recent date of the anniversary of the war, few studies, if any, have analyzed the media's coverage of the 10th anniversary of the start of the war. However, plenty of studies have examined the media coverage of the war itself.

## **Methodology**

This study analyzes how four elite newspapers--two in the United States and two in the United Kingdom--reported on the 10th anniversary of the Iraq War. The reason papers in both the U.S. and U.K. were considered is the different overall national context and the effect this might have on newspaper war reporting. Both nations were direct

participants in the Iraq War. But public opinion about the war varied greatly between the two countries.

From the beginning of the conflict in 2003, the British public was less favorable toward the war than Americans. British pro-war sentiment peaked at 60% in the early years, but by 2007, 83% of those in the U.K. opposed the war, according to an Ipsos MORI polls (2013). However, as the war wore on, British opposition to the war declined a bit to 70% against. In the United States, Gallup (2014) polls show that at the beginning of the war, 75% of the American public supported the war. As in Britain, public support in the U.S. reached its low point in 2007 and 2008 (with 62 or 63% thinking intervention was a mistake and 36 percent thinking it wasn't.) By the 10th anniversary of the start of the war, that opposition had also softened, to 53% of Americans thinking the war was a mistake. Overall, then, British support over the years dropped from 60% to 30% in favor, and American support dropped from 75% to 42% in favor. In addition, the papers considered--The New York Times and The Wall Street Journal in America and The Times and The Guardian in the U.K.--are perceived to span a range of political positions. At least on the editorial pages, The Journal and The Times of London are on the more conservative side and The New York Times and The Guardian are on the more liberal side.

Because the 10th anniversary of the Iraq War occurred on a known date--March 19, 2013--I focused on this date as my central point. But newspapers did not limit their coverage of the anniversary to the exact date. In the weeks leading up to, and indeed even afterward, the newspapers still made references to the anniversary. So I searched for

articles appearing in a four-week period before and after the anniversary (March 5th - April 2, 2013)

This study focused on the media's coverage of the 10th anniversary of the start of the Iraq war--as opposed to, say, media coverage of the early years of the war--for two main reasons:

1. Others academic studies have already been done that tended to find that the media was "easier" on the official American government positions early in the war, when public opinion was in favor of the war. But by the war's end, the public's mood had also shifted--and the media became much more critical of the government. I could not find any studies focusing solely on the media's later coverage of the war, including the anniversary period, in particular.
2. The coverage of the anniversary of the war came after the official end of fighting by American troops, and the anniversary was seen by many as an opportunity to reflect on the war. The opportunity to wax philosophical is an opportunity to wax political, and I felt the more reflective coverage of the anniversary, freed from the "just the facts" mode of daily reporting, might allow any underlying biases to become apparent.

I decided to limit my textual analysis to news coverage, excluding editorials--because I was only interested in articles that were supposed to be "objective."

Originally I planned to search the Factiva database (which contains an archive of all four papers) for articles containing the words "Iraq War 10th anniversary." But the sample was fairly small and I was afraid I was missing something, so I widened the

search to simply look through the four newspapers for the term “Iraq War” during a four-week period before and after the anniversary.

I included some articles that only discussed the anniversary of the war incidentally (such as one about the tendency of war veterans to be violent criminals) since I felt the articles could provide insight into a possible slanted view of the war--to see how the war was framed when it was mentioned in passing and not the main focus of the story.

I also tried searching each paper’s websites directly using the same criteria, again to try to prevent my missing anything, but because of pay walls, I was really only able to make an effective search of the New York Times website directly, since the university had a subscription I could use.

Initially, I began analyzing articles by using word count software to see which words and phrases were the most common. Matthew Gentzkow of the University of Chicago Booth School of Business has done some interesting studies of liberal bias in the media using large databases covering many newspapers and searching for particular phrases identified as slanted. But because my sample size was quite a bit smaller, I didn’t ultimately I feel this approach was the most helpful or insightful, since the word count mostly showed how common prepositions are in the English language. Plus, because this was a qualitative study, not quantitative, I was interested in more complicated themes such as tone and framing, which a purely quantitative approach might not provide.

To spot check the online search, I pulled microfilm from the Library of Congress for three of the papers and went through paper issues of The Wall Street Journal (the only the library had hard copies of)--to make sure I didn’t miss any articles. I also found this

approach, besides giving me piece of mind about the effectiveness of the web search, allowed me to see first hand how much important the editors places on each article by its page and position thereon--something the web search made harder to grasp.

Based on the results of looking at the microfilm, I decided to re-do my online search, widening the search further to just use the terms “Iraq” for the two week period before and after the anniversary date. I knew I had missed an article in a few of the publications because I on the microfilm had seen articles in the Guardian and on The Wall Street Journal front page discussing a bombing on the anniversary date I knew the other papers would not have covered.) My first online search did not pull up The Wall Street Journal, The New York Times, and The Times articles about this bombing because their articles covering it did not include the term “war.” So I manually scanned the online list of all articles mentioning “Iraq” during the period in question and, with this one exception, did not discover any other articles to include.

The search revealed this many articles for each paper (in some cases the total included different versions of the same article):

- The New York Times--8
- The Wall Street Journal--4
- The Times of London--10
- The Guardian--30

(I excluded the Sunday Times; though it shares the name as the daily paper, a separate staff publishes it.)

I re-read the articles multiple times to develop a list of frames that seemed to be prevalent throughout. I also considered the ways the media did not frame the war anniversary, since it also shed light on the frames that were presented. The study also considered the extent to which the articles places the war in a larger global or historical context, and whether the articles considered important topics from political science that form the foundation for a serious discussion of war or forms of government.

The Guardian, by far, gave the most prominent coverage to the anniversary--running a three-part series "Iraq War: 10 Years On"--right on the front page--including about 62 articles and opinion pieces on the war. The vast majority of these articles were opinion pieces, not news pieces. The Guardian website did not make it especially easy to decide which it considered to be opinion and which it considered to be news. While the New York Times, for examples, labels some of its online articles as "opinion," the Guardian did not give any such clue at all in its online articles, leaving it up to the reader to judge for himself or herself which was which. (Considering how much difficulty I had in some cases placing a piece in a particular category, I imagine the average reader would have a harder time and might fail to make the distinction, at least online.)

I noticed that all four papers ran photo retrospectives on the war; unfortunately, these appeared to be mostly online and since the images were not included in the Factiva database, I could not analyze them. So I concentrated solely on written news coverage.

In addition, I generally did not include pieces that were only published on the paper's online blogs and not in the print edition, since most of these seemed to be opinion pieces.

## **Media Framing of the Early Years of the Iraq War**

Academics have not merely been critical of the Iraq War; they have been quick to cast a critical eye on the media's coverage of the Iraq War as well. There have been numerous studies examining news reports on the war, especially focusing on the early years.

Researchers often did a comparative analysis of how American media approached the war versus international media organizations, such as those in the United Kingdom, Canada, Germany, Sweden, Denmark, Japan, Arab nations, and others.

Most research, using content analysis, focused on whether or not the media was sufficiently critical of the war--or independent of official American sources--or instead just passed along the official line (from the American side.)

Perhaps one of the most profound studies examining media coverage of the Iraq War was that by Dimitrova and Stromback (2007), comparing U.S. and Swedish media coverage. The authors went beyond an easy political assessment and thus achieved a deeper understanding. The researchers did a qualitative content analysis of two elite newspapers in the U.S. (The New York Times and The Washington Post) and two prominent papers in Sweden, contrasting news reports with the attitude of political elites in each country. In all, the study examined 740 newspaper articles from the four papers in both countries during the official war period--March 20th to May 1, 2003 (when Bush declared the end of major military operations in Iraq.) The study found a strong connection between the tone of media coverage in each country and the beliefs of dominant political elites in each country. For example, during the early days of the war, when the U.S. public strongly backed military action, news coverage in the U.S. was less



critical of the American war effort and was deferential to official sources. In contrast, in Sweden the public and the main political parties were against the war from Day One. Needless to say, Swedish troops did not participate in the conflict. The analysis showed the news coverage in Sweden was more negative.

The study found a strong correlation between news coverage of the war and national political sentiment. If history is written by the winner, then journalism is written by the home team. But the study suggests that this slant is something that media in all nations are susceptible to. It wasn't just the American media; so is the media in Sweden and presumably other countries.

(On a side note, the study did not directly address the more political question, of course, of which nation's pro- or anti- war stance was the "correct one." While it may be tempting these days to see Sweden's criticism of the war as heroic, one might also consider the perils of assuming pacifism or an anti-war stance is in all cases morally superior to the decision to go to war... It is food for thought that Swedes today, as I heard firsthand on a trip this summer, are critical of their nation's infamous neutrality during World War II, when Sweden rolled out the red carpet for Nazis and allowed Sweden to be used as a base from which to attack Norway.)

Kristensen and Orsten (2003) considered the way the Danish media covered the Iraq War. Unlike Sweden, Denmark did send troops to Iraq. The study was unusual insofar as it was one of the few to consider the media coverage in one of the lesser players involved in the Iraq War; most studies concerning the media in the participant countries focused on the major players--the United States and United Kingdom.

Kristensen and Orsten did a content analysis of several thousand total articles and items from Danish newspapers, radio, and TV in two periods in March and April 2003. They considered the extent to which the articles relied on multiple viewpoints and sources and, in particular, whether any of those sources was “non-official.” The authors noted that the Danish media set out to do the right thing at the beginning of the war--“the Danish media tried to what they were supposed to do” (Kristensen and Orsten, 2003, 340). But as time went on, the effort lagged--and the independent, critical, alternative coverage became secondary and supplementary to covering the official line. That is, the execution of the coverage did not often live up to the professed goal. (Dimitrova might have found it interesting to note that this less critical phase seemed to coincide with a decision by the Danish opposition party to not criticize the war once it was underway, seeing such an action as unpatriotic. So in effect the Danish media coverage might be argued to be following the consensus of the nation’s political elites, as Dimitrova found to be the case in Sweden and the U.S.). Overall the study noted a sort of homogenization of the world’s news media, especially TV, in which it is difficult to differentiate the TV coverage of any one particular nation from another (in the Western world at least). It’s all starting to look the same.

Horten (2011) compared U.S. and German media coverage of the Vietnam War and the early years of the (second) Iraq War. Here again one sees how national political context can shape media coverage but in sometimes unexpected ways. “Unsurprisingly, media scholars have found that the media of combatant countries are usually less critical and more supportive of wars than those of non-combatants. (Horten, 2011, 32).” But in

the case of Vietnam, Germany's news media was actually more favorable toward the Vietnam War, and the America's media less favorable, in the early days. Horten attributes this to Germany experience during the Cold War with the Soviet Union. Germans were very distrustful of the spread of Communism and viewed Vietnam to be sort of an extension of the Soviet regime's influence. But as time went on, the attitude of the German media shifted, as a younger guard took over the nation's newsrooms, and the German media became more critical, eventually seeing America more as the aggressor and even going so far as to compare the America's aggression to the Nazi's.

When it came to the Iraq War, Horten notes the German media did not want to repeat its earlier mistakes in covering the Gulf War, which had been "dominated by the 'CNN Show' (Horten, 2011, 39)." While Germany did not send troops to Iraq, there was a great deal of interest in the war and it received extensive media coverage. Again, in a way that Dimitrova might appreciate, Horten asserts that because of the fact that Germany did not send troops to Iraq and because the German public opposed the war, it was much easier for the German media to be critical of the war. While German reporters were embedded with American troops, there was less of a tendency to rely on this embedded coverage. And there was a strong tendency to use footage and reports from a variety of sources, including Arab TV. The German newspapers also took on a watchdog role, devoting 15% of war coverage to a critique of the media, especially TV coverage. So at one point, when a German TV reporter embedded with American troops let slip the gaffe "we have better weapons" (referring to America's military), the German newspapers were all over it. Horten observes that a study of U.S., British, and German

TV news coverage of the war found the German media was far the most negative, while Britain was the best balanced, and America was the most pro-war. Horten concludes: “When a country is determined to go to war, its media find it difficult--if not impossible--to resist the call to arms (42).” He feels that other parts of the world received a more critical look at the Iraq War from their news organizations. He maintains American news media tends to be the most effective at taking a critical stance once an active political opposition framework has developed in the U.S. on a particular issue.

Still, while it might seem easy to conclude that foreign news coverage of the Iraq War was superior to American reporting because it was more critical, actually the coverage of each case was simply following the dominant political discourse in its respective region. Some British Middle Eastern scholars refer, for instance, to the “reporting style of Al-Jazeera as ‘contextualized objectivity.’ By this they mean that the network strives for fair and balances reporting, yet like all other global news channels, it is inextricably linked to the dominant political perspectives of its viewers and driven by competitive market forces within its region (Horten, 2011, 44).”

### **Media Framing of the 10th Anniversary of the Start of the Iraq War**

The “Dart Center for Journalism & Trauma” website at the Columbia Journalism School has examined how well newspapers cover war and other traumatic issues. The Dart Center concluded, “Newspapers generally do not provide context and statistical information,” with coverage focusing on the episodic (incidents) rather than thematic (big picture). In addition, “Many news stories feature provocative or salient aspects of an

event, ignoring overarching patterns or risk factors for particular events.” (Sarah Tiegreen and Elena Newman, 2008)

Dart’s comments on the lack of context provided by news coverage turned out to be an insightful observation illustrated throughout many of the frames used in the news coverage of the anniversary of the 10th anniversary of the start of the war. Gentzkow’s study (2010) showing, among other things, that news coverage tends to appear to be biased according to common opinions about a newspaper’s ideological position are, indeed, reflected in this study as well.

### **Frame 1: A Long War, Historically Significance Anniversary.**

One of the main frames used by all of the papers in the sample was the length of war and the related notion that the period was of deep historical significance in assessing its outcome. These themes were, of course, not limited to these papers, but the frames can definitely be found in varying degrees in all four of the papers.

The Guardian, as noted, gave the anniversary by far the most prominent coverage -- splashing a multi-part series, “The Iraq War: 10 years on” on its front pages over several days. The paper’s March 20 issue stressed an attack in Baghdad that “took place ten years to the day after President George W. Bush announced the start of the US-led invasion of Iraq to depose Saddam Hussein” (Beaumont, March 20, 2013). The New York Times, however, limited front page coverage on the date of the anniversary to a small block in the lower left hand corner (with full-page spreads deeper in the paper.) The Wall Street Journal and The Times didn’t note the anniversary at all on their respective front pages on the date of the anniversary, but The Journal did play a sizable front-page

story, below the fold, the day after the anniversary (March 20th). It reported an attack in Baghdad on the day of the anniversary itself. Although this study was restricted to examining news coverage of the anniversary, it is worth noting that all of the papers gave substantially more space to editorials discussing the war.

The New York Times adopted its own twist on the length of war frame. While stressing the deluge of coverage the anniversary was receiving, the Times added that the war something no one wanted currently in the U.S. government wanted to talk about:

The war that arrived a decade ago is still too painful and too controversial to discuss... So as historians, pundits, and former government officials in Washington and London produce a wave of reminiscences on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of the invasion of Iraq... Iraqis are more concerned with the present.” (Arango, March 19, 2013)

The New York Times reiterated the theme in an article on March 20<sup>th</sup> that began with a reference to President Obama’s public appearance on St. Patrick’s Day:

(O)n one topic, there was a conspiracy of silence: Republicans and Democrats agreed that they did not really want to talk about the **Iraq War**.

The 10-year anniversary of the American invasion came and went on Tuesday with barely a passing notice in a town once consumed by it. Neither party had much interest in revisiting what succeeded and failed, who was right and who was wrong....” (Baker, March 20, 2013)

But what The Times didn’t consider was whether we do, in fact, celebrate the beginnings of other wars. Do we, for instance, celebrate the beginning of World Wars I or II? The Civil War? Vietnam? Why, then, should we celebrate the beginning of the Iraq War?

(In the case of the Revolutionary War, we celebrate the Declaration of Independence on July 4, 1776; however the Battles of Lexington and Concord in April

1775 were the kickoff of actual fighting in the war. While July 4th is a major holiday in American, the April date is much less conspicuously marked.)

In addition, what the papers tended to call “the 10th anniversary of the Iraq War” was, of course, the anniversary of the start of the war--not the end of the war--a fact that the papers glossed over. As a matter of fact, though it does not sound as dramatic, the 10th anniversary of the start of the war was actually just fifteen months after American troops pulled out of the country.

Perhaps the newspapers general emphasis on the anniversary is not surprising given the public’s and the greeting card industry’s fondness for anniversaries and birthdays. But anniversaries are also manmade events that have more to do with reflecting our particular calendar rather than events in the real world.

The (separate) Sunday Times of London, however, did go beyond the frame of the date having great historical significance, including a comment from former Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz, who said, “We still don’t know how this is going to end...With the Korean War, it is amazing how different Korea looks after 60 years than it looked after 10 or even 30.” (Harnden, March 17, 2013).

The papers included in this study did not consider the fact that in the larger historical context, wars often look quite a bit different decades or centuries after they are fought than they do in the short term after the fighting. To cite some well-known examples from American history, America eventually became friends and even allies with former enemies Japan, Germany, Vietnam, South Korea and the United Kingdom--but in a timeframe that sometimes measured decades.

Moreover, the Iraq War was by no means the longest war in history, nor the longest war in which America has fought, though none of the papers went to the trouble of placing the war in any larger historical context. The period of official fighting of American troops in the Iraq War was eight years and nine months. The Vietnam War lasted ten years and two months. The Revolutionary War lasted eight years and five months. An earlier war in the region, the Iran-Iraq War lasted seven years and eleven months.

### **Frame 2: Weapons of Mass Destruction.**

Certainly in the popular imagination and editorial pages, the frame and slogan of “Weapons of Mass Destruction” came to almost exclusively define any discussion of the Iraq War during the anniversary period and, in particular, the cause of the war.

This frame also carried over to the news pages of the papers studied.

For instance, The Times “referred to the dodgy dossier” and “misuse of intelligence information by the Bush Administration.” (Taylor, March 14, 2013)

Two days before the anniversary, the Times of London carried a piece about a documentary about the Iraq War written by its defense correspondent saying, “The Blair and Bush government rejected intelligence refuting the existence of Iraqi weapons of mass destruction (WMD) and built the case for war on a defector whose information was regarded as suspicious, a documentary says” (Coghlan, March 18, 2013). The article quoted the filmmakers without any response from “the other side.”

The frame did not usually directly address the issue of whether intelligence information concerning weapons of mass destruction was simply mistaken or an



intentional lie--but context often suggested the latter. In addition, the frame suggested that weapons of mass destruction were the sole--or most important--criterion in evaluating the legitimacy of the war, overriding considerations of the nature of the Iraqi government, for example.

For example, the Times of London, in an interview with Dick Cheney noted, “Mr. Cheney holds the line on the most discredited intelligence: that Iraq was trying to buy uranium from Niger; a claim that appeared in the intelligence dossier on WMDs by Tony Blair’s Government.” (Taylor, March 14, 2013)

The Guardian went even further, beyond the framing solely on weapons of mass destruction, by raising the issue of a larger intelligence failure in an article entitled, “Iraq war was national disgrace, say former military chiefs.” In an interview with a former British Air Force official, The Guardian wrote, “Burridge pointed not so much to the Blair government’s discredited Iraqi weapons dossier, but to the failure to gather any useful information despite having been overflying Iraq at will since the first Gulf war more than 10 years earlier.” (Norton-Taylor and Watt, March 18, 2013)

The New York Times, unlike the British papers, did mention the possibility that the administration was merely mistaken, not lying, about WMDs, another not in an overly complimentary way:

Stephen J. Hadley recently described the cascade of misjudgments and inaccurate assumptions inside the Bush White House leading up to the war as a “failure of imagination.” His explanation of what went wrong is rife with lessons for two crises--one in Syria, another in Iran--that President Obama confronts as he lands in Israel on Wednesday morning.

Mr. Hadley told a small group gathered here to dissect the long-term lessons of the Iraq war that it never occurred to him or his boss, President George W. Bush,

to ask: “What if Saddam is doing all this deception because he actually got rid of the W.M.D. and he doesn’t want the Iranians to know?”

Instead, the White House and the intelligence agencies leapt to the conclusion that Saddam Hussein, the Iraqi leader who had pursued so many weapons of mass destruction in the past, must still be on the same quest” (Sanger, March 20, 2013).

Only The Wall Street Journal didn’t mention WMDs in its anniversary coverage, though it should be noted that The Journal did run editorials that supported the war.

Interestingly, causal frames such as “grab for oil,” which were also common in the popular imagination among critics of the war, did not occur as frequently (except in the Guardian which carried an article exploring the oil motive.)

Frames such as “payback for September 11th” were not emphasized in the news coverage.

### **Frame 3: Violence of War (Episodic not thematic). Disaster.**

In keeping with the observations of the Dart Center at Columbia, coverage of the war overwhelmingly focused on “violence of war”--indeed one might say “disaster and catastrophe” and “terror.”

The Wall Street Journal, in a March 15th article about a car bombing that killed 18 people, wrote the attack “brought fresh threats of terror to downtown Baghdad following the months of relative quiet.” But The Journal went on to note: “Many Iraqis believe the past decade of conflict has brought only violence and poverty,” citing a Gallup poll.

(Bradley and Nabhan, March 15, 2013)

The anniversary itself might have seemed to be an opportunity to explore more thematic coverage, but several car bombs that exploded on the day of the anniversary, drawing the media back to the episodic violence frame.

The Guardian trumpeted a headline “Iraq rocked by wave of explosions” and described Baghdad in the accompanying article as “convulsed by a deadly wave of explosions” (Beaumont, March 20, 2013)--perhaps suggesting something more along the line of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

The New York Times called “the attacks... a devastating reminder of the violence that regularly afflicts Iraq. And they somehow seemed more poignant coming on the eve of the 10th anniversary of the American-led invasion.” (Arango, March 20, 2013)

None of the articles questioned whether the attacks might have been planned to gather media attention.

And while frames such as “The Arab Spring” predominated in coverage of other events in the Middle East and Northern Africa, this frame did not occur in the Iraq anniversary coverage, which instead focused on violence. In contrast, in an academic study of “The Iraq War Ten Years On,” Louise Fawcett of Oxford maintained:

...(T)he war generated a series of changes that have had a central impact on the political evolution and international relations of the Middle East, though not in the manner anticipated by either its supporters or critics. The war and its consequences, which have become merged with developments surrounding the Arab Spring uprisings, which started at the end of 2010, have contributed over the long term to the acceleration of popular demands for the greater liberalization of politics, to shifts in the regional balance of power and to international realignments. Authoritarian regimes across the region have been increasingly challenged; there are new sectarian divides; Iran has been empowered by the demise of its old rival Saddam Hussein. (Fawcett, 2013).

Fawcett was not quoted by the major media in the coverage of the war

anniversary.

Nor did frames such as “rebuilding Iraq” or “regime change” or “democracy” receive emphasis during the anniversary period.

The Times, however, challenged the hopeless violence frame with the single most “positive” news story about the outcome of the war during the anniversary period headlined, “Ten years after Saddam, Iraqi Kurds have never had it so good.” The article begins:

Ask a Kurd in Erbil if the war to oust Saddam was a good idea and you will be laughed at. The answer is self-evident in this city’s glittering shopping malls, rampant development, double-digit economic growth, and a disposable income quite unimaginable a decade ago. (Loyd, March 15, 2013)

The Times of London article stands in stark comparison with the New York Times article the same day headlined “Iraqis’ Pain Never Abates as Attacks Kills Dozens.”

#### **Frame 4: Religion / Sectarian Factions.**

A related, overlapping yet different frame centered on religion and sectarian factions and fighting. With the official end of the fighting involving American troops, the news coverage during the anniversary period focused on sectarian faction and violence.

While the papers did sometimes attempt to delve into the underlying dynamics of the factional fighting, the implication was almost always that the United States was to blame for the factions and the sectarian violence as well as the casualties resulting from it. The articles did not refer to the fact that conflict between Sunni and Shia Muslims dates back to the year 632 AD and the death of the prophet Mohammed. Little attempt was made to put the Sunni / Shia conflict into historical context or refer to the fact that the religion has often been a basis of conflict throughout history.

The New York Times, for instance, wrote on March 19th:

The central legacy of the war, many experts say, is a political system midwifed by the United States in which the spoils of power are divided along sectarian and ethnic lines. As such, compromise--in the streets and in Parliament--has been nearly impossible. Today, the notion of a national identity that supersedes the sectarian seems a fantasy. (Arango, March 19, 2013)

And in the March 18th Guardian mentioned previously (“Iraq war was national disgrace, say former military chiefs....”) the paper quotes a former British military official saying:

The real failure was to plan properly for what happened. Whose fault was that? More, I suggest, the Americans’ than ours.’ He added: “Into the power vacuum created, al-Qaida and others moved and sowed the seeds of the disastrous next few years. (Norton-Taylor and Watt, March 18, 2013)

The Wall Street Journal wavered a bit between framing and not framing the U.S. as the chief culprit in the sectarian violence.

The Journal painted a bleak picture of U.S. intervention in Iraq in its March 15th article on a car bombing. But then on March 20th, The Journal gave some of the deepest background and context to the in-fighting among factions, without referring to the United States as cause, describing the car bombing incidents the previous day thus:

The coordinated nature of the attacks underscored renewed determination by Sunni insurgents, including those linked to al Qaeda, to exploit Iraq’s heightened sectarian polarization to bring down the current Shiite-led central government, Iraqi officials and analysts said and undo the political process that was ushered in after the U.S.-led invasion.

Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki, who is a Shiite, issued a statement late on Tuesday, blaming the bombings on unnamed regional states who want to reignite sectarian warfare in Iraq.” (Dagher, S. and Nabhan, A., March 20, 2013)

In Britain, The Times presented the most pro-war and pro-American assessment of the sectarian fighting, not only in the formerly mentioned article talking about how the Kurds have benefited from the removal of Saddam Hussein, but also in another article that questioned placing the blame for factional fighting on the U.S.:

Though a clear majority of Iraqis today enjoy a better quality of life-- including economic opportunities, relative freedom of speech and improved security--Baghdad and Sunni-dominated provinces in the west are still plagued by violence.

Despite the unpopularity of the invasion, many Iraqis acknowledge that the country's current problems are related more to its own internal dynamics than to the Americans and British. 'Blair and Bush handed us over a country with a constitution and process, and left under agreement,' Hoshyar Zebari, the Foreign Minister said last week.

For what has happened now we must blame ourselves. We must take the consequences of our own actions. (Loyd, March 20, 2013)

Even The Guardian, by far the biggest critic of the U.S. war, though it suggested the U.S. was the cause of the sectarian fighting, did acknowledge other forces were at work. On March 20th, the paper described the war "as the beginning of an occupation that led to events of the sectarian war that pitted Shia against Sunni in five years of brutal blood-letting and ethnic cleansing." (Beaumont, March 20, 2013)

But The Guardian went on to note in the same article, however:

While violence in Iraq has decreased in recent years since the end of the sectarian war in 2008, tensions have been rising again in the country, fanned by Sunni protests over equal rights and human rights abuses in northern and western provinces, in particular centred on the city of Falluja.

Analysts have blamed the slow response of the Shia-dominated Iraqi government to these protests for a resurgence in Al-Qaida in Iraq, which some claim has helped bring fresh recruits into the terrorist organization" (Beaumont, March 20, 2013).

Of course, religious factions have had a long history of attacking each other in the Middle East and Europe, but none of the articles made an effort to mention any of this historical context or provide any explanation of the religious disagreement. Many books have been written about the longstanding Shia / Sunni conflict in history; tensions between the groups existed centuries before the Iraq War.

**Frame 5: Extremely Costly and Deadly War, “Catastrophic Casualties and Cost.”**

Another major theme of the newspaper coverage during the anniversary concerned the large numbers of deaths and the great cost of the war. Even the two papers that tended to be less harsh in their reflection on the American role in the war--The Wall Street Journal and The Times of London--described the situation in bleak terms.

The Journal noted, “As the Iraqi death toll mounts, so does the war’s costs to the U.S. Government. The decadelong (sic) effort cost \$1.7 trillion... Fighting over the past 10 years has killed 134,000 Iraqi civilians.” (Bradley, M and Nabhan, A., March 15, 2013)

The London Times chimed in, saying (in an article about an anti-war documentary) the costs “challenged the rationale for a war that claimed the lives of more than 100,000 Iraqis and 4,000 Western troops, including 179 British servicemen.” (Coghlan, March 18, 2013)

But while all the papers trumpeted the “great cost of the wars” none of them actually went to the effort of comparing the Iraq War to other wars--offering a regional,

global, or historical context (perhaps because such comparisons tend to minimize the scale of the Iraq War?).

While some would say that human history has been nothing but one war after another, none of the articles noted dozens of wars in recent history that were deadlier, including World War I or II or Vietnam. Nor did any of the articles mention the fact that more American soldiers died in the American Revolutionary War than in the Iraq War, and more Iraqi civilians were killed in the nearly eight-year-long Iran-Iraq War two decades before the American-Iraq War.

In addition, the Iraqi civilians deaths were always described by all the newspapers in passive voice without giving an agent, tending to suggest the civilians were killed by American soldiers, without clarifying how many were killed by fighting among Sunni and Shia factions. (In addition, because the deaths on the American side were comparatively low, there was a tendency to focus on the deaths or casualties on the Iraq side to question effectiveness of the American effort. And most papers emphasized indirect costs of the war as direct costs in apparent attempt to inflate the cost of the war, even though all wars have had indirect costs.)

Interestingly, while historically war has been framed as a stronger side defeating a weaker side and the victory has generally been considered greater based on the amount of death and destruction inflicted on the losing side, in the Iraq War, the media framed any negative consequences for Iraq as signs of defeat or loss by America. The media framed the purpose of war to be building up peace and security in your enemy, not defeating an opponent (something that Machiavelli might find rather interesting.)



This study has repeatedly noted the failure of some of the world's leading newspapers to put the war into any larger context global or historical perspective. It does not intend to repeat the same mistake. In the next section we'll see how the cost and fatalities in the Iraq War compare with other wars in U.S. history and the region.

## **Conclusion**

Going into this study I felt certain newspaper editorials were clearly against the Iraq War during the period of the war anniversary. I wasn't completely sure whether the anti-war rhetoric would influence news coverage, though I suspected it would influence the coverage some.

What I found was that while all of the papers could be critical of the war, there was a definite spectrum (aligned with Gentzkow's study showing that newspaper coverage does, in fact, followed the paper's perceived bias). The Times of London and The Wall Street Journal were willing to consider some positive frames of the war, whereas the New York Times tended to only consider the negative--and the most negative of all was The Guardian. National context and public opinion did seem to play a part insofar as the most critical paper, The Guardian, was located in the U.K., where, as noted, anti-war sentiment had always been stronger. But The Times of London was willing to consider more positive aspects of the war than the New York Times, so political viewpoint also seemed to play a part in the coverage. Not surprisingly the most conservative American paper in the study, The Wall Street Journal, had a more positive outlook on the war than the most liberal British newspaper, The Guardian. (If I had

looked at Fox, The New York Times, and Al Jazeera, as Gentzkow had, the results probably would have been even more glaring.)

What was interesting was not just what the papers said, but what they didn't say I do not begrudge the media the role of being critical of the American government, but clearly in the news coverage of the Iraq War anniversary there was less criticism and reflection on the evils and excesses of Saddam Hussein. There was no consideration of what might have happened had Saddam had stayed in power (considering his track record of invading his neighbors), and no consideration of whether the Iraq War was a possible catalyst of the Arab Spring. And more disturbingly there was a sort of moral relativism about the merits of tyranny versus democracy. One was merely different than the other, not better.

I was surprised, though, by just how little larger, historical context any of the papers provided. The Dart Center hit the nail on the head. Perhaps because there is such a focus on anecdotes in the media these days--the emotional over the intellectual--the anecdotal over the statistical--that it seemed to simply not occur to the editors to include this sort of coverage. I would have expected at least one of the papers would have done a probing news analysis story considering varying points of view examining "Was the war worth it?" or "What is the outcome of the war?" I also thought there might be some sort of more philosophical piece examining, "Was the Iraq War a just war?" But no such reflective pieces were to be found.

Not only did all of the papers fail to put the war into any larger global or historical context, but the news "analysis" coverage did not seem at informed in any way by

important concepts from political science, such as democratic peace theory. While philosophers in Western Civilization have spent centuries theorizing over right and wrong, tyranny versus democracy and other grand notions, these ideas were conspicuously absent from the news coverage of the 10th anniversary of the start of the Iraq War. While I was not expecting a philosophy dissertation, I did expect at least some sort of reference or debate about the issues surrounding the morality of war, or lack thereof, as part of the anniversary coverage. This was not to be found. Indeed, in all of the papers, any sort of probing reflection about the merits of the Iraq War was largely confined to highly political pontificating on the editorial page.

To the extent that the media that can rise above simplistic political coverage of complex events like war by putting circumstances into the larger historical and global context--and also by considering the war from the more sophisticated or philosophical framework of political science--reporting can elevate and enlighten the public rather than merely reciting the perceived wisdom of water cooler discourse.

Why should the media bother to do so? Is it worth the time or the trouble to probe more deeply?

As Mark Twain once said, "It ain't what you don't know that hurts you. It's what you know that ain't so." History proves time and time again the pitfalls of instant historical analysis--something journalists should keep in mind when assessing wars.

Few wars have been more controversial or notorious in American history than Vietnam, which may be the nation's one universally agreed foreign relations disaster. Nonetheless, the outcome of this disaster 40 years later is that public opinion polls show

Vietnam has the most positive outlook on America of any nation in Asia and there is currently a rush by McDonald's and Starbucks to open a franchise on every block in the country.

Indeed, when visiting Japan, if you wish to see where America dropped nuclear weapons on Hiroshima and Nagasaki nearly 70 years ago, you will be comforted to know that not far away from ground zero you will be able buy a cup of Starbucks coffee and a Big Mac.

History has the last laugh when it comes to assessing the long-term significance of any given war.

There are various ways further research could expand upon this study, such as: 1) evaluating a larger sample of newspapers, both American and international, and 2) exploring the differences between editorial and news coverage during the anniversary period. While it would be a larger undertaking, examining online news stories from broadcast networks, such as Fox and Al Jazeera, would provide an eye-opening perspective into the subject of possible media bias. In addition, it would be interesting to interview the editors of some of the leading newspapers or media organizations (including those studied herein as well as others) to ask them why they chose to run the news articles they did and also why they seemed to put more emphasis on editorials than news analysis.

## References

- Arango, T. (2013, March 19). "10 Years Later, an Anniversary Many Iraqis Would Prefer to Ignore." *New York Times*, p. A4
- Arango, T. (2013, March 20). "Iraqis' Pain Never Abates as Attacks Kill Dozens." *New York Times*, p. A10.
- Baker, P. (2013, March 20). "Iraq War's 10th Anniversary is Barely Noted in Washington." *New York Times*, p. A10.
- Beaumont, P. (2013, March 20). "10 years after the war began, Baghdad is rocked again by deadly bomb blasts: At least 65 killed and 240 hurt in series of explosions Blasts mainly target Shia districts of Iraqi capital." *The Guardian*, p. 3.
- Bradley, A. and Nabhan, A. (2013, March 15). "Attackers Kill 18 in Coordinated Baghdad Assault." *The Wall Street Journal*, p. A6.
- Camaj, Lindita. 2010. "Media framing through stages of a political discourse: International news agencies' coverage of Kosovo's status negotiations." *International Communication Gazette* 72: 635-653.
- Cappella, Joseph N., and Kathleen Hall Jamieson. 1996. "News Frames, Political Cynicism, and Media Cynicism." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences* 546 (July): 71-84.
- Coghlan, T. (2013, March 18). "Iraq war 'based on total fiction', documentary says." *The Times* (London), p. 14.
- Dafoe, Allan. 2011. "Statistical Critiques of the Democratic Peace." *American Journal of Political Science* 55(2): 247-262.
- Dagher, S. and Nabhan, A. (2013, March 20). "World News: Bombs Jolt Iraq on Anniversary of 2003 Invasion." *The Wall Street Journal*, p. A9.
- Dimitrova, Daniela V., and Jesper Stromback. 2008. "Foreign policy and the framing of the 2003 Iraq War in elite Swedish and US newspapers." *Media, Conflict & War* 1 (2): 203-220.
- Entman, Robert M. 2007. "Framing Bias: Media in the Distribution of Power." *Journal of Communication* 57: 163-173.

- Entman, Robert M. 1993. "Framing: Towards Clarification of a Fractured Paradigm." *Journal of Communication*. 43(4): 51-58.
- Farber, Henry S., and Joanne Gowa. 1997. "Common Interests or Common Politics? Reinterpreting the Democratic Peace." *Journal of Politics* 59(2): 393-417.
- Fawcett, Louise. 2013. "The Iraq War ten years on: assessing the fallout." *International Affairs* 89(2): 325-343.
- Gallup Poll. Iraq. (2014, February 14). Retrieved May 3, 2014, from <http://www.gallup.com/poll/1633/iraq.aspx>
- Gartzke, Erik. 1998. "Kant We All Just Get Along? Opportunity, Willingness, and the Origins of the Democratic Peace." *American Journal of Political Science* 42(1): 1-27.
- Gentzkow, Matthew and Jesse M. Shapiro. 2010. "What Drives Media Slant? Evidence from U.S. Daily Newspapers." *Econometrica*. 78 (1): 35-71.
- Harnden, T. (2013, March 17). *Pentagon chief Wolfowitz admits US bungled in Iraq | The Sunday Times*. Retrieved May 6, 2014, from [http://www.thesundaytimes.co.uk/sto/news/world\\_news/Americas/article1230851.ece](http://www.thesundaytimes.co.uk/sto/news/world_news/Americas/article1230851.ece)
- Sanger, D. E. (2013, March 20). *Iraq War Offers Lessons for Syria and Iran - NYTimes.com*. Retrieved May 6, 2014, from <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/03/20/world/middleeast/iraq-war-offers-lessons-for-syria-and-iran.html>
- Hayes, Danny, and Matt Guardino. 2010. "Whose Views Made the News? Media Coverage and the March to War in Iraq." *Political Communication* 27(1): 59-87.
- Horten, Gerd. 2011. "The Mediatization of War: A Comparison of the American and German Media Coverage of the Vietnam and Iraq Wars." *American Journalism* 28 (4): 29-53.
- Ipsos MORI / King's College London. (19 March 2013). Retrieved May 3, 2014, from <http://www.ipsos-mori.com/researchpublications/researcharchive/3146/Iraq-war-damaged-Britains-reputation-in-the-world.aspx>
- Kristensen, Nete Norgaard, and Mark Olsen. 2007. "Danish media at war: The Danish media coverage of the invasion of Iraq in 2003." *Journalism* (8) 323-343.

- Lacina, Bethany, and Nils Petter Gleditsch. 2012. "The Waning of War is Real: A Response to Gohdes and Price." *Journal of Conflict Resolution*. 57(6): 1109-1127.
- Levy, Jack S. 1994. "The Democratic Peace Hypothesis: From Description to Explanation." *Mershon International Studies Review* 38: 352-354.
- Loyd, A. (2013, March 20). "Bombers kill 65 on anniversary as Blair defends Iraq decision." *The Times* (London), p. 29.
- Loyd, A. (2013, March 15). "Ten years after Saddam, Iraqi Kurds have never had it so good." *The Times* (London), p. 43.
- Norton-Taylor, R. and Watt N. (2013, March 18). "Iraq war was national disgrace, say former military chiefs: Rumsfeld, Bremer come in for particular criticism Alexander: war caused collapse in public trust." *The Guardian*, p. 8.
- Bueno de Mesquita, Bruce, James D. Morrow, Randolph M. Siverson, and Alastair Smith. 1999. "An Institutional Explanation of the Democratic Peace." *The American Political Science Review* 93(4): 791-807.
- Obermeyer, Ziad, and Christopher J L Murray and Emmanuela Gakidou. 2008. "Fifty years of violent war deaths from Vietnam to Bosnia: analysis of data from world health survey programme." *BMJ* 336: 1482-6.
- Pan, Zhongdang, and Gerald M. Kosicki. 1993. "Framing Analysis: An Approach to News Discourse." *Political Communication* 10: 55-75.
- Rosato, Sebastian. 2003. "The Flawed Logic of Democratic Peace Theory." *The American Political Science Review* 97(4): 585-602.
- Rummel, R.J. 1997. *Power Kills: Democracy as a Method of Nonviolence*. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.
- Russett, Bruce. 2006. "Thucydides, Ancient Greece, and the Democratic Peace." *Journal of Military Ethics* 5(4): 254-269.
- Sanger, D. E. (2013, March 20). *Iraq War Offers Lessons for Syria and Iran - NYTimes.com*. Retrieved May 6, 2014, from <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/03/20/world/middleeast/iraq-war-offers-lessons-for-syria-and-iran.html>

- Sara Tiegreen and Elana Newman. (Apr 1, 2008). Dart Center for Journalism and Trauma. In How News is "Framed." Retrieved Apr 29, 2014, from <http://dartcenter.org/content/how-news-is-framed#.U18yeMdXjUU>.
- Scheufele, Dietram A., and David Tewksbury. 2007. "Framing, Agenda Setting, and Priming: The Evolution of Three Media Effects Models." *Journal of Communication* 57: 9-20.
- Scheufele, Dietram A. 1999. "Framing as a Theory of Media Effects." *Journal of Communication* Winter: 103-122.
- Taylor, D. (2013, March 14). "Iraq? I'd do it all again in a minute, insists Dick Cheney." *The Times* (London), p. 22.
- Thompson, William R., and Richard Tucker. 1997. "A Tale of Two Democratic Peace Critiques." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 41(3): 428-54.
- Tomz, Michael, and Jessica Weeks. 2010. "An Experimental Investigation of the Democratic Peace." Presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association.



## **Appendix A: Original Proposal**

### **Introduction**

I am excited about undertaking my master's project. It is the culmination of the graduate program and my own interests. It's a chance for me to explore in depth a topic that I have a strong interest in--the media's coverage of the 10th anniversary of the Iraq War. And, of course, it's a chance to venture into the work world of journalism and attempt to help contribute to journalism of the highest standards.

While I have chosen to pursue a professional project rather than a Master's thesis, I like the fact that my project nonetheless tackles some serious philosophical issues of war and peace, democracy and freedom. The project gives me the opportunity to not only consider the theoretical side of things but also to see how in practice how the news media handles coverage of highly political issues on a daily basis; I will be working in a the news room of a major media organization observing how those decisions are made firsthand.

Analyzing the Iraq War anniversary coverage is an opportunity to determine how well the media puts its money where its mouth is. Journalists have an obligation to report the truth, even when it conflicts with their own political beliefs. It's what they owe themselves and their readers. Of course, American journalists always claim to uphold this standard. That all sounds well and good in theory, but how well does this goal work out in practice? An analysis of the media reports on the 10th anniversary of the start of the Iraq War provides an excellent case study for assessing this claim of neutrality.

Because views on the war were highly-charged and political, an examination of the anniversary coverage should also provide insight more generally into how the media covers emotional and political issues like war--matters in which, even with the best of intentions, objectivity can be strained. These insights may provide some practical suggestions for helping journalists 'get it right' when dealing with complex, political issues.

### **Professional Skills Component**

I am planning to intern at a major news organization, Cox Media Group, in Washington, D.C. for spring semester 2014. I have been accepted into the Washington program and received a scholarship. I applied for several broadcast internships and accepted one for Cox Media's centralized Washington Bureau, which handles reporting for a dozen of its TV stations and various newspapers. I will be working for the broadcast group.

There is a direct connection between the professional skills component of my project and the analytical component. I believe that working in a major media organization in DC will give me a better understanding of the way important theoretical concepts of journalism, such as framing and agenda setting, work in practice. Interning in DC would give me a behind the scenes look at how producers, editors, and reporters make decisions in the real world on a daily basis. The insights learned from the the analytical and professional skills component about how journalists frame the news, especially complex political issues, should not only make me a better reporter but, as mentioned, could provide food for thought for others as well.

At Cox I will be reporting to Senior Producer Patrick Terpstra. Cox wanted someone with a background and interest in data journalism, someone who could analyze databases for them. I have taken computer-assisted reporting and used to be a database developer in my previous IT job, so this position is a perfect fit for my interests. I will also have the chance to interview members of Congress who represent the home districts of Cox's TV stations (San Francisco, Atlanta, and elsewhere.) I will also help with field reporting. The position will require a lot of work but also it is a great opportunity to learn as well. Plus, I have the ability to pitch story ideas and, indeed, I already have several I plan to pitch.

My work schedule calls for at least 32 hours a week, Monday through Thursday, beginning January 17th. I will keep Friday free for the seminar with Barbara Cochran.

I plan to include some tangible aspects of my work for Cox in my project, perhaps web scripts of the final product or links to videos, etc. that I helped produce. I will also keep a weekly log of my activities for the network.

I believe that my educational and work background have strongly prepared me for this opportunity. My undergraduate liberal arts education at the University of Chicago gave me a strong foundation in critical judgment and thinking that I believe will help me successfully complete the professional and analytical components of the Master's project. And I believe my experience so far with three semesters in the broadcast track at a top graduate journalism program have honed my writing, video editing ability, and analytical skills. I'm eager to take on reporting in an established media organization, which I would

like to believe should help pave a path for my future career success and my goal of hosting a broadcast talk show or reporting for a news magazine program.

On top of my educational background, I also have already had plenty of professional experience. I had a successful corporate career for nearly a decade at a major Fortune 500 year before I began graduate school. This was an education itself the politics and dynamics of working in a large organization.

I've also had plenty of real world experience working in journalistic endeavors. Before school I also produced and hosted more than three hundred episodes of an internet talk show as well as dozens of travel videos, movie reviews, and some news pieces. In addition, in graduate school I have reported and anchored for KOMU, and also reported for KBIA and the Missouri Business Alert.

## **Theoretical Framework**

### **Analytical Component.**

As noted, for the analysis component of my project I plan to examine major media organizations' coverage of the 10th anniversary of the start of the Iraq War. In particular, the study will compare how four elite newspapers--two in the U.S. and two in the United Kingdom--framed news coverage of the anniversary and consider the extent to which important concepts from political science, such as democratic peace theory, informed news and analysis coverage of the war anniversary. The papers American papers I will focus on are The New York Times and The Wall Street Journal, the British ones are The Times and The Guardian. The Guardian did an extensive series on the 10th anniversary.

Some would say that human history is nothing but one war after another, and coverage of war presents certain challenges for journalists--reporting on an event that most would consider, at best, to be a necessary evil. Even with the best of intentions, can journalists ever be completely objective? How can reporters, whether at the level of a mundane factual level or the at the loftier moral level, determine who is right and who is wrong--without regard for, or deference to, their own national background or "home team"? Easy or "obvious" answers may not be the correct ones. Is such objectivity even desirable if the opposing side in a war is a dictator whose victory would spell the end of free journalism and free speech? If the role of media is to educate citizens and shed light on government, does the media have a role to play in advocating democracy and free speech over dictatorship and repression? Should the media still sit on the fence even if a loss in a war could hurt societal freedoms? Or, is it ok and 'natural' for reporters to side with the home team, as TV stations, radio stations, and newspapers might do when covering sporting events? And moreover, even if objectivity is the goal, what are some practical steps reporters and producers can take to try to keep their own personal biases out of the coverage?

The Iraq War anniversary presents ample opportunity to study media coverage of a highly divided political issue. There has been much study of the of the media's coverage of the Iraq War while the conflict was in progress, especially comparing the American and foreign media's coverage of the early years of the war. These studies often find media in other countries were more critical of the war, at least in the early days. But there has been little research (if any) about the media's coverage of the 10th anniversary

of the start of the Iraq War--perhaps not surprising since the event only happened earlier this year on March 19th.

It is the goal of this study to help fill that gap.

Media coverage of the war when it was happening provided all sorts of logistical and practical issues--from security to challenges of obtaining information in the field and finding multiple, reliable sources. The anniversary of the war, however, invited an opportunity to speculate on the significance of the war free from many of those constraints. And unlike reporting on daily events on the battlefield, which tended to limit reporting to the facts of "what happened" and "giving both sides," reporters were free to roam much wider when assessing the war. The opportunity to wax philosophical is also an opportunity to wax political and the less restrained, "deeper" analysis--coming closer to commentary--presents a scenario in which reporters must be especially vigilant to any tendency to slant the news and frame it in particular ways that fit the reporter's politics.

In most wars, and certainly in the Iraq War, it takes two to tango. There was a long, complicated history involving the U.S., the West in general, Iraq, Saddam Hussein, and its neighbors. Therefore, if news coverage of the Iraq War anniversary was not biased, one might expect a robust, wide-ranging, no holds barred critique of the pros and cons of the actions and transgressions of both sides. In contrast, if coverage of the Iraq War anniversary was biased, one might suspect that actions of one side or the other were critiqued more soundly by the media. In addition, since the outcome of the war is not set in stone, and one presumes no one can predict the future with complete accuracy, then one assumes in balanced reporting multiple outcomes of the war might be considered. On

the other hand if the media coverage were biased, only single views--rather than multiple, alternative views--about the success or failure (or even, more neutrally, the results)--of the war may have been considered. Alternative views may have been downplayed or ignored.

The media's approach to coverage of the war anniversary can be examined by studying the terms and themes used to describe the war's outcome, whether reporters placed the war in any sort of larger historical context, and considering the extent to which the coverage was informed by ideas about war and government from political science, such as democratic peace theory.

It goes without saying that notions of war and peace, freedom, ethics, and government are issues that have been considered by writers and philosophers for thousands of years.

It is not the goal of this study to insist that the media's coverage or analysis of the Iraq War must resemble a philosophy dissertation. But while an analysis of the war anniversary need not reach the level of sophistication of a treatise on government or politics, nonetheless one might expect that news coverage discussing such important societal issues might draw on the larger historical and philosophical canon of literature that has developed over centuries. Certainly the founders of this country relied heavily on fundamental concepts from the history of political science when writing our nation's constitution and founding documents, such as the Declaration of Independence. Perhaps it is not unreasonable to assume the media might also have some familiarity with these

ideas as well and rely on a richer framework for analyzing the outcome of the war rather than merely relying on the water cooler political discussions of the day.

### **Framing Theory**

Framing is one of the three most important theories in academic studies of journalism and is related to the other two most prominent theories, agenda setting and priming (Entman, 2007).

Framing theory considers the way that media select and present information to the public, at best partly for reasons of space constraints and practical considerations.

Framing theory postulates that the news media strongly influence public's perceptions of events. By deciding how to present or frame "facts", the media helps set the tone for the overall public discourse.

Scheufele and Tewksbury (2007, 106) trace framing's theoretical roots to psychology and sociology, adding framing "is based on the assumption that how an issue is characterized in news reports can have an influence on how it is understood by audiences."

Entman (1993, 52) notes:

*Framing essentially involves selection and salience. To frame is to select some aspects of a perceived reality and make them more salient in a communicating text, in such a way as to promote a particular problem definition, casual interpretation, moral evaluation, and / or treatment recommendation for the item described.*

But Entman (1993, 164) acknowledges that biases can be at work behind this selection and presentation:

Scholars can shed new light on bias by examining linkages among the three concepts that have received such intense scholarly scrutiny. We can define



framing as the process of culling a few elements of perceived reality and assembling a narrative that highlights connections among them to promote a particular interpretation.

After showing how these three concepts--agenda setting, framing, and priming--fit together as tools of power, Entman (1993, 164) connects them to explicit definitions of news slant and the related but distinct phenomenon of bias. Properly defined and measured, slant and bias provide insight into how the media influence the distribution of power -- as Entman describes it: "who gets what, when, and how."

Capella and Jamison (1996, 71) also corroborate the subtle yet unmistakable influence framing can have on how the public views issues:

Studies that we have conducted over the past four years show that subtle changes in the way news stories are framed can affect consumers' responses, activating their cynicism when strategic or conflict-oriented frames are used. The studies directly implicate media framing of political news in activating, if not creating, cynicism about campaigns, policy, and governance and imply that cynicism about the news media may be an indirect consequence.

Dimitrova and Stromback (2008, 205) note that when the media and public or other parties are on the same page, the very fact that framing is even occurring may not be even noticed. .."(F)raming is influenced by the national political context in which journalists operate. If there is agreement about an issue in the political environment, framing becomes invisible."

Certainly, the importance and centrality of framing has not escaped scholars. Pan and Kosicka (1993, 55) maintain framing theory heavily shapes the questions tackled by most studies today:

Much of the recent research in political communication deals with one or more of the following three questions. First, how do the news media "set the frame in which citizens discuss public events" (Tuchman, 1978, p. ix) and

consequently "narrow the available political alternatives" (p. 156)? Second, how do politicians and advocacy groups actively "court" the media to polish their images and frame debates over public policies (see Hertsgaard, 1988; Pertschuk & Schaetzel, 1989)? Third, how do audiences process news information actively and construct meanings using their preexisting cognitive representations (e.g., Graber, 1988; Livingstone, 1990)?

### **Democratic Peace Theory**

While an exhaustive discussion of ethics, politics, and war is beyond the scope of this paper, nonetheless, it would be fruitful and germane to consider the extent to which one powerful concept from political science, in particular--democratic peace theory--did or did not inform the coverage of Iraq War war anniversary. Democratic peace is a key theory for a deeper understanding of some of the basic political dynamics underlying the war, putting the relationship between democracies and dictatorships into a larger historical context.

Democratic Peace Theory is a notion that has gained wide acceptance among political scientists, and its acceptance seems to only get stronger with time, despite, or because of, the various challenges posed to it.

In brief, Democratic Peace Theory states that historically democracies rarely, if ever, go to war with each other--though democracies undeniably do fight--plenty--with non-democracies.

The study of international relations has produced few widely accepted generalizations. One of these, sometimes even asserted to be an empirical law (Levy 1988) is that democracies do not fight wars with one another. The empirical evidence for this is quite strong. (Bueno de Mesquita, 1999, 791)

Rummel (1994, 13) analyzed wars over a 175-year period in the 19th and 20th centuries, considering the type of government involved, and found strong empirical evidence for democratic peace. He found:

- 353 pairs of nations engaged in wars between 1816-1991.
- None was between two democracies.
- 155 pairs involved a democracy and a non-democracy.
- 198 involved two non-democracies fighting each other.
- The average length of war between states was 35 months, average battle deaths was 15,069.

But it is also important to also state what democratic peace does not claim, since the theory is often misrepresented or misunderstood in the literature. Despite the general tendency for peace among democracies, democratic peace does NOT deny that democracies can and do have disagreements, even strong ones, nor does it maintain that they cannot have conflicting self-interest or agendas.

To repeat, democratic peace is literally the claim that democracies tend to not go to war with each other. Often this is stated with the qualification that MATURE democracies rarely, if ever, go to war with each other.

Not surprisingly, much rides on how one defines what is and isn't a democracy. And both proponents and opponents have sometimes been accused by various studies of defining democracy in such a way to stack the deck in their favor or explain away seemingly uncomfortable anomalies.

Critics of democratic peace have tried to point to perceived battles fought between democracies at various points in history to undermine the concept partly or entirely.

Rummel's evidence seems to suggest a strong correlation in modern times, but others have proposed a few supposed counterexamples to presumably blow the theory out of the water. For example: What about Athens and Syracuse in ancient times, some ask? (A possible counter-response: scholars disagree about whether Syracuse was actually a democracy. The surviving evidence about the nature of Syracuse's government is not clear enough or comprehensive enough for us to decide conclusively one way or the other.) Others ask--what about Finland during World War II? (The typical counter-response is that Finland was fighting a separate war against Russia during World War II, not the West.)

Others attempt to split history into two periods, admitting the truth of democratic peace in the 20th century but denying its validity in ancient times. Russett (2006), for instance, while acknowledging democratic peace in modern times, disputes its existence in Ancient Greece, pointing in part to conflicts between Athens and Sparta. But his analysis of what constitutes a democracy seems strangely twisted. For one thing, he considers Ancient Sparta to be a democracy--even though most people, at best, would call Sparta an oligarchy--given its two kings, military ruling class, and the huge portion of the population that was enslaved as helots (outnumbering citizens by a wide margin.)

While not every advocate of democratic peace is prepared to admit the apparent exceptions, even if one does admit some counterexamples, it seems at most these would merely qualify democratic peace a bit. The theory would hold true for the most part, if not 100% of the time, but democratic peace would not be refuted. It would merely be a strong tendency, not an absolute rule.

Some scholars (Farber, 1997) have attempted to challenge democratic peace for other, conceptual reasons--casting doubt on its supposed explanations or causes. His point of view for attacking the theory is that apparently if the scholars community can't establish a coherent theoretical framework for why democratic peace exists, then it must not exist--no matter how much the evidence seems to back it up. (This seems somewhat akin to the notion that if a seven-foot tall man walks into the room, he isn't really seven feet tall unless you have a strong theory explaining why he is seven feet tall.)

Farber, furthermore, notes there were few democracies in history before 1914. He counts only four--Greece, the United States, Switzerland, and Norway. He feels it is impossible draw any meaningful conclusions from this small sample group. And yet this is to deny the very nature and importance of the early democracies. In fact, one might make the exact counter argument, that these first democracies were of tremendous importance in world history--perhaps the most important and compelling examples of all--given their rise against despite great odds and the whims of history.

But in the end, it is important to note that even those who question the causes of democratic peace, nonetheless acknowledge the validity of the claim itself. Even a critical Rosato (2003, 585), for instance, who feels this peace "may not be caused by the democratic nature of those states," acknowledges "there are good reasons to believe that... there is certainly peace among democracies."

Indeed, the evidence has reached such an overwhelming tilt in favor of democratic peace that Dafoe (2010), examining the flaws of various studies attempting to debunk the theory, says democratic peace has survived so many challenges that it is time

to put the matter to rest once and for all. It is time to accept the truth of democratic peace and henceforth consider all those who question it as being on extremely shaky ground. He asserts, “As the number of studies supporting the descriptive inference of democratic peace continues to grow, the probability of a future study overturning this study becomes increasingly less likely (Dafoe, 2011, 206).” In legal parlance, we can issue a summary judgment against doubters from the get go.

My own contribution to the democratic peace theory would be this observation: It seems to me that one reason scholars are having a hard time understanding the underlying cause of democratic peace is that they are focusing on structural explanations or (pseudo-)mathematical explanations of the phenomenon not grounded in the basic psychology underlying the theory.

I would argue the main dynamic at work in democratic peace theory is this: democracy = good = friend; dictatorship = bad = enemy. It’s important to understand democratic theory at this most basic psychological level; this view tends to permeate all members and classes and structures in democracies--from the poor to the elites. This point of view was summed up succinctly by President Reagan, for instance, when he called the Soviet Union the “evil empire.” You cannot understand democratic peace merely by describing the phenomenon; you must understand the moral evaluation and judgment occurring in democratic society--how its population views other countries and governments on a moral level.

Scholars have attempted to take this ethical or moral element out of the discussion and then wonder why explanations based simply on structural explanations (for example,

are democracies peaceful because they handle external struggles the same as they do internal struggles?) fall short. This basic demonization or fear of dictatorships exists in citizens in democracy for a good reason. If a democracy conquers another democracy, there is little reason for the average person to fear his or her life would change more than after a change in leadership after a routine election. But if a dictatorship conquers a democracy, the average person has reason to fear basic freedoms may vanish overnight; it may be the end of the world as he or she knows it. Scholars who view democracies and tyrannies as merely different and discount or ignore the perceived moral supremacy of democracies, overlook the basic psychological explanation of why democracies do--and must--consider each other friends--and why democracies consider non-democracies to be enemies. Qualitative research may be premised on the notion of describing not evaluating, but unfortunately judgment is necessary in some cases.

Democratic peace is important in analyzing media's coverage of the Iraq War anniversary for two reasons: First, although some scholars cringe at the notion, nonetheless democratic peace may have direct bearing on the question of validity of the war; if democracies really don't fight each other, this would tend to support the official America justification of the war--that installing a democratic government in Iraq and Afghanistan would lead to long-term peace among nations in the region (notwithstanding current internal power struggles.) Spreading democracy spreads peace. Secondly, democratic peace sheds light on the underlying cause of the war itself. While historically democracies do not fight each other, it is indisputably true that democracies and non-democracies fight each other all the time. Understanding this basic, historical tension

between democracies and other forms of government can help journalists grasp at a more basic level what was driving the conflict, above and beyond the arguments used by both sides at the start of the war. If, as it were, you understand the basic dynamics of what causes a divorce in general, you would have a deeper understanding of a particular divorce case than you would get by merely hearing both spouses give a “he said, she said” laundry list of various grievances. You realize there might be something larger going on that has an impact on all relationships (whether among people in the latter case or nations in the former.)

## **Method**

### **Content analysis.**

To research the way the media’s coverage of the 10th anniversary of the start of the Iraq War, this study would undertake a qualitative content analysis of news reports about anniversary by four elite newspapers--two in the U.S. and two in the United Kingdom.

A variety of methods could be used to examine anniversary coverage, including interviews with journalists, but nonetheless content analysis best gets to the heart of the matter of in regard to media framing--since it takes a look at what is actually selected and presented to the public. The proof is in the pudding.

### **Sample Selection.**

The study will examine the news coverage of four elite newspapers (two British, two American)--the New York Times, Wall Street Journal, The Guardian, and Times.



The selection of papers from two different countries provides a wider perspective than just focusing on American newspapers alone, and the difference in the editorial perspective of the chosen papers also provides a chance to see whether news coverage has been influenced by the papers' more overt editorial slant.

Finding articles to examine does not present a particular challenge, since the anniversary occurred on a known date--March 19, 2013. Because of the high-profile of the war and strong opinions on it, the anniversary was covered by perhaps every major news organization in the world. Everyone had their take on it. To ensure the widest catch of article possible, I would also search for anniversary reports two weeks before and after the anniversary date itself.

I would focus on news reports of the event, not editorials, since much of the commentary and analysis pieces on anniversary were written by experienced foreign affairs reporters or bureau chiefs who covered either the Iraq War itself or international politics on a regular basis.

In addition, as an initial search and to ensure the widest possible catch, I cast a wide net performing a Google search, using the terms "Iraq war anniversary" to get a general overview of articles covering the war. In addition, I also went to the websites of the papers and searched their site for articles using the key words "Iraq War Anniversary."

Stories that focused on coverage of the war itself, especially early on, were considered for background on the war, but were not actually included in the sample since the study deals solely with media coverage of the 10th anniversary of the start of the war.

### **Coding Procedure.**

I will read each article twice coding for a variety of variables. In particular, each article will be coded for overall tone favorable or critical of the war. In addition, I will also count the number of times certain key words and themes appear in each story, keeping separate tallies for those that appear in headlines and the body of the article. A single coder will be used for consistency purposes.

The number of times the following terms occur in headlines (and subheadlines) as well as the body of articles will be separately counted:

- Weapons of mass destruction.
- Lie(s).
- Disaster or disastrous.
- Vietnam.
- Arab Spring.
- Democracy.
- Dictator.
- Tyranny.
- Deaths.
- Genocide.
- Saddam Hussein.
- George Bush.
- Democratic peace (theory).
- Victims.
- Peace.

- Insurgents.
- Suicide bombings.

Fortunately, the use of software such as wordcounter.net makes this sort of word count easy--in fact the computer will do much of the dirty work for you. This automation also makes sure you don't overlook key terms that are widely used but may not have been on your original "watch" list.

In addition, I will examine each article for it had to say about the following themes and ways of analyzing the war:

- Were multiple or single possible outcomes of the war considered? Which?
- What terms were used to describe them?
- Were concepts concerning war or democracy from political sciences considered?
- Which?
- Were historical or global references made to other wars and if so, which?
- Were death and damage figures and outcomes put into historical contexts?
- Were cost estimates put into historical or global context (i.e, compared with other wars)?
- What was perceived to be the direct cause of the war and who was the instigator?
- Were civilian or military casualties on either side mentioned?
- The role the war played in the Arab Spring, if any
- Civil unrest after the war and how it relates to the validity or outcome of the war
- Overall was the war worth it?

In short, I will be looking at ways in which the article framed certain key ideas and themes and whether or not the articles placed important aspects and outcomes of the war into historical and global perspective. In particular I will be paying attention to the extent to which articles and commentary referred to important theories of political science, such as Democratic Peace Theory, when discussing the outcome of the war.

In particular, I will consider the way of framing three themes:

- Democracy.
- Religion.
- History.

By examining the coverage of the war anniversary using this framework, it should be possible to see whether there was an overall tendency for the news organizations to cover the event in a particular way, and if that coverage seemed biased in a particular direction.

### **Literature Review**

It is hard to rise above politics, especially in covering highly charged political matters such as foreign affairs and wars, but to the extent that reporters are able to do so, they expand the views and minds of their readers. The media has every right to be critical of the government and is under no obligation to serve up propaganda or campaign for war. But journalists should also seek out the truth beyond politics and groupthink (whether the pressure is coming from the government or the public.) Otherwise, one runs the risk of superficial reporting that merely preaches to the choir of the believers and alienates the dissenters, without really informing or challenging either.

Of course, even with the best of intentions, it is extremely hard to do ‘instant’ historical analysis of an event that has just concluded. The 10th anniversary of the start of the Iraq War in fact came just a year and a half after the end of the war and withdrawal of U.S. troops. Reporters were placed in the somewhat difficult position of attempting to predict the future long term significance of the war with just a few year’s perspective under their belt. Historians, who usually have benefit of analyzing events (such as the decline and fall of the Romans Empire) from a much longer timeframe, are faced with the opposite dilemma and must work against the tendency to read into events with hindsight and assume everything was predestined to be just as events turned out.

Perhaps the best reporters can do to overcome these limitations, and avoid a mere political analysis of current events, is to place events in a larger historical or worldwide context and to consider things in the more philosophical light of political science rather than the polarized left / right water cooler / FaceBook politics in America.

The 10th anniversary of the start of the Iraq War offers an interesting case study to take a look at how well the media did in its news coverage of a extremely political, divisive event. The American public underwent a shift from being largely supportive of the war in the beginning to being much more critical at the war’s end. It is a hypothesis of this study that the media probably also underwent a shift in its coverage of the war, and it probably ended up more critical than it began.

But because of the recent date of the anniversary of the war, few studies, if any, have analyzed the media’s coverage of the 10th anniversary of the start of the war. However, plenty of studies have examined the media coverage of the war itself.

### **Framing the Iraq War: Media Coverage.**

Academics have been not merely critical of the Iraq War, they have been quick to cast a critical eye on the media's coverage of the Iraq War as well. There have been any number of studies examining news reports on the war, especially focusing on the early years.

Researchers often did a comparative analysis of how American media approached the war versus international media organizations, such as those in the United Kingdom, Canada, Germany, Sweden, Denmark, Japan, Arab nations, and others.

Most research, using content analysis, focused on whether or not the media was sufficiently critical of the war--or independent of official American sources--or instead just passed along the official line (from the American side.)

Perhaps one of the most profound studies examining media coverage of the Iraq War was that by Dimitrova and Stromback (2007), comparing the U.S. and Swedish media coverage. The authors went beyond an easy political assessment and thus achieved a deeper understanding. The researchers did a qualitative content analysis of two elite newspapers in the U.S. (The New York Times and The Washington Post) and two prominent papers in Sweden, contrasting news reports with the attitude of political elites in each country. In all, the study examined 740 newspaper articles from the four papers in both countries during the official war period--March 20th to May 1, 2003 (when Bush declared the end of major military operations in Iraq.) The study found a strong connection between the tone of media coverage in each country and the beliefs of dominant political elites in each country. For example, during the early days of the war,

when the U.S. public strongly backed military action, news coverage in the U.S. was less critical of the American war effort and was deferential to official sources. In contrast, in Sweden the public and the main political parties were against the war from Day One. Needless to say, Swedish troops did not participate in the conflict. The analysis showed the news coverage in Sweden was more negative.

The study found a strong correlation between news coverage of the war and national political sentiment. If history is written by the winners, journalism is written by the hometeam. But the study suggests that this slant is something that media in all nations are susceptible to. It wasn't just the American media; so is the media in Sweden and presumably other countries.

(On a side note, the study did not directly address the more political question, of course, of which nation's pro- or anti- war stance was the "correct one." While it may be tempting these days to see Sweden's criticism of the war as heroic, one might also consider the perils of assuming pacifism or an anti-war stance is in all cases morally superior to the decision to go to war... It is food for thought that Swedes today, as I heard firsthand on a trip this summer, are critical of their nation's infamous neutrality during World War II, when Sweden rolled out the red carpet for Nazis and allowed Sweden to be used as a base from which to attack Norway.)

Kristensen and Orsten (2003) considered the way the Danish media covered the Iraq War. Unlike Sweden, Denmark did send troops to Iraq. The study was unusual insofar as it was one of the few to consider the media coverage in one of the lesser players

involved in the Iraq War; most studies concerning the media in the participant countries focused on the major players--the United States and United Kingdom.

Kristensen and Orsten did a content analysis of several thousand total articles and items from Danish newspapers, radio, and TV in two periods in March and April 2003. They considered the extent to which the articles relied on multiple viewpoints and sources and, in particular, whether any of those sources was “non-official.” The authors noted that the Danish media set out to do the right thing at the beginning of the war--“the Danish media tried to what they were supposed to do” (Kristensen and Orsten, 2003, 340). But as time went on, the effort lagged--and the independent, critical, alternative coverage became secondary and supplementary to covering the official line. That is, the execution of the coverage did not often live up to the professed goal.(Dimitrova might have found it interesting to note that this less critical phase seemed to coincide with a decision by the Danish opposition party to not criticize the war once it was underway, seeing such an action as unpatriotic. So in effect the Danish media coverage might be argued to be following the consensus of the nation’s political elites, as Dimitrova found to be the case in Sweden and the U.S.). Overall the study noted a sort of homogenization of the world’s news media, especially TV, in which it is difficult to differentiate the TV coverage of any one particular nation from another (in the Western world at least). It’s all starting to look the same.

Horten (2011) compared U.S. and German media coverage of the Vietnam War and the early years of the (second) Iraq War. Here again one sees how national political context can shape media coverage but in sometimes unexpected ways. “Unsurprisingly,



media scholars have found that the media of combatant countries are usually less critical and more supportive of wars than those of non-combatants.” (Horten, 2011, 32) But in the case of Vietnam, Germany’s news media was actually more favorable toward the Vietnam War, and the America’s media less favorable, in the early days. Horten attributes this to Germany experience during the Cold War with the Soviet Union. Germans were very distrustful of the spread of Communism and viewed Vietnam to be sort of an extension of the Soviet regime’s influence. But as time went on, the attitude of the German media shifted, as a younger guard took over the nation’s newsrooms, and the German media became more critical, eventually seeing America more as the aggressor and even going so far as to compare the America’s aggression to the Nazi’s.

When it came to the Iraq War, Horten notes the German media did not want to repeat its earlier mistakes in covering the Gulf War, which had been “dominated by the ‘CNN Show’.” (Horten, 2011, 39) While Germany did not send troops to Iraq, there was a great deal of interest in the war and it received extensive media coverage. Again, in a way that Dimitrova might appreciate, Horten asserts that because of the fact that Germany did not send troops to Iraq and because the German public opposed the war, it was much easier for the German media to be critical of the war. While German reporters were embedded with American troops, there was less of a tendency to rely on this embedded coverage. And there was a strong tendency to use footage and reports from a variety of sources, including Arab TV. The German newspapers also took on a watchdog role, devoting 15% of war coverage to a critique of the media, especially TV coverage. So at one point, when a German TV reporter embedded with American troops

let slip the gaffe “we have better weapons” (referring to America’s military), the German newspapers were all over it. Horten observes that a study of U.S., British, and German TV news coverage of the war found the German media was far the most negative, while Britain was the best balanced, and America was the most pro-war. Horten concludes: “When a country is determined to go to war, its media find it difficult--if not impossible--to resist the call to arms (42).” He feels that other parts of the world received a more critical look at the Iraq War from their news organizations. He maintains American news media tends to be the most effective at taking a critical stance once an active political opposition framework has developed in the U.S. on a particular issue.

Still, while it might seem easy to conclude that foreign news coverage of the Iraq War was superior to American reporting because it was more critical, actually the coverage of each case was simply following the dominant political discourse in its respective region. Some British Middle Eastern scholars refer, for instance, to the “reporting style of Al-Jazeera as ‘contextualized objectivity.’ By this they mean that the network strives for fair and balanced reporting, yet like all other global news channels, it is inextricably linked to the dominant political perspectives of its viewers and driven by competitive market forces within its region.” (Horten, 2011, 44)

### **Conclusion.**

Studies of media coverage of the Iraq War illustrate the extent to which the national political contexts can color a particular nation’s war coverage. But thus far there have not been many studies considering the media’s coverage of the anniversary of the war, when coverage became divorced from the logistical challenges of field reporting. An

examination of this coverage can add to our understand of media's coverage of difficult, political issues like war. And it might even provide food for thought about how the media can do a better job.

To the extent that the media that can rise above simplistic political coverage of complex events like war by putting circumstances into the larger historical and global context--and also by considering the war from the more sophisticated or philosophical framework of political science--reporting can elevate and enlighten the public rather than merely reciting the perceived wisdom of water cooler discourse.

Why should the media bother to do so? Is it worth the time or the trouble to probe more deeply?

As Mark Twain once said, "It ain't what you don't know that hurts you. It's what you know that ain't so." History proves time and time again the pitfalls of instant historical analysis--something journalists should keep in mind when assessing wars.

Few wars have been more controversial or notorious in American history than Vietnam, which may be the nation's one universally agreed foreign relations disaster. Nonetheless, the outcome of this disaster 40 years later is that public opinion polls show Vietnam has the most positive outlook on America of any nation in Asia and there is currently a rush by McDonald's and Starbucks to open a franchise on every block in the country.

Indeed, when visiting Japan, if you wish to see where America dropped nuclear weapons on Hiroshima and Nagasaki nearly 70 years ago, you will be comforted to know

that not far away from ground zero you will be able buy a cup of Starbucks coffee and a Big Mac.

History has the last laugh when it comes to assessing the long-term significance of any given war.

## **Publication Possibilities**

Possible places to publish the analysis component of the professional project:

*American Journalism Review, Journalism Quarterly, Columbia Journalism Review, Political Communication, and American Journal of Political Science*

## Sample Articles

<http://www.theguardian.com/world/series/iraq-war-10-years-on>

[http://www.nytimes.com/2013/03/20/world/iraq-wars-10th-anniversary-is-barely-noted-in-washington.html?\\_r=0](http://www.nytimes.com/2013/03/20/world/iraq-wars-10th-anniversary-is-barely-noted-in-washington.html?_r=0)

## References

- Bueno de Mesquita, Bruce, James D. Morrow, Randolph M. Siverson, and Alastair Smith. 1999. "An Institutional Explanation of the Democratic Peace." *The American Political Science Review* 93(4): 791–807.
- Camaj, Lindita. 2010. "Media framing through stages of a political discourse: International news agencies' coverage of Kosovo's status negotiations." *International Communication Gazette* 72: 635-653.
- Cappella, Joseph N., and Kathleen Hall Jamieson. 1996. "News Frames, Political Cynicism, and Media Cynicism." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences* 546 (July): 71-84.
- Dafoe, Allan. 2011. "Statistical Critiques of the Democratic Peace." *American Journal of Political Science* 55(2): 247-262.
- Dimitrova, Daniela V., and Jesper Stromback. 2008. "Foreign policy and the framing of the 2003 Iraq War in elite Swedish and US newspapers." *Media, Conflict & War* 1(2): 203-220.
- Entman, Robert M. 2007. "Framing Bias: Media in the Distribution of Power." *Journal of Communication* 57: 163-173.
- Entman, Robert M. 1993. "Framing: Towards Clarification of a Fractured Paradigm." *Journal of Communication*. 43(4): 51-58.
- Farber, Henry S., and Joanne Gowa. 1997. "Interests or Common Polities? Reinterpreting the Democratic Peace." *Journal of Politics* 59(2): 393–417.
- Gartzke, Erik. 1998. "Kant We All Just Get Along? Opportunity, Willingness, and the Origins of the Democratic Peace." *American Journal of Political Science* 42(1): 1–27.
- Hayes, Danny, and Matt Guardino. 2010. "Whose Views Made the News? Media Coverage and the March to War in Iraq." *Political Communication* 27(1): 59-87.
- Horten, Gerd. 2011. "The Mediatization of War: A Comparison of the American and German Media Coverage of the Vietnam and Iraq Wars." *American Journalism* 28 (4): 29-53.

- Kristensen, Nete Norgaard, and Mark Olsen. 2007. "Danish media at war: The Danish media coverage of the invasion of Iraq in 2003." *Journalism* (8)323-343.
- Levy, Jack S. 1994. "The Democratic Peace Hypothesis: From Description to Explanation." *Mershon International Studies Review* 38: 352-354
- Pan, Zhongdang, and Gerald M. Kosicki. 1993. "Framing Analysis: An Approach to News Discourse." *Political Communication* 10: 55-75.
- Rosato, Sebastian. 2003. "The Flawed Logic of Democratic Peace Theory." *The American Political Science Review* 97(4): 585-602.
- Rummel, R.J. 1997. *Power Kills: Democracy as a Method of Nonviolence*. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.
- Russett, Bruce. 2006. "Thucydides, Ancient Greece, and the Democratic Peace." *Journal of Military Ethics* 5(4): 254-269.
- Scheufele, Dietram A., and David Tewksbury. 2007. "Framing, Agenda Setting, and Priming: The Evolution of Three Media Effects Models." *Journal of Communication* 57: 9-20.
- Scheufele, Dietram A. 1999. "Framing as a Theory of Media Effects." *Journal of Communication* Winter: 103-122.
- Thompson, William R., and Richard Tucker. 1997. "A Tale of Two Democratic Peace Critiques." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 41(3): 428-54.
- Tomz, Michael, and Jessica Weeks. 2010. "An Experimental Investigation of the Democratic Peace." Presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association.



## **Appendix B: Changes to Original Proposal**

After discussing the original proposal with my faculty committee, they suggested some changes:

- 1) Limiting the textual analysis to news articles and excluding editorials
- 2) Limiting the papers considered to two in the U.S. (The New York Times and the Wall Street Journal) and two in the U.K. (The Times of London and The Guardian)
- 3) Considering 5 or so frames along the lines of religion, history, form of government, etc.