

Summer 2012

Asahi Shimbun and The New York Times: Framing Pearl Harbor and the 9/11 Attacks

Maiko Kunii
San Jose State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses

Recommended Citation

Kunii, Maiko, "Asahi Shimbun and The New York Times: Framing Pearl Harbor and the 9/11 Attacks" (2012). *Master's Theses*. 4197.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31979/etd.y2gb-agu6>
https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses/4197

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Master's Theses and Graduate Research at SJSU ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of SJSU ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@sjsu.edu.

ASAHI SHIMBUN AND THE NEW YORK TIMES: FRAMING PEARL HARBOR
AND THE 9/11 ATTACKS

A Thesis

Presented to

The Faculty of the School of Journalism and Mass Communications

San Jose State University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Science

by

Maiko Kunii

August 2012

© 2012

Maiko Kunii

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

ASAHI SHIMBUN AND THE NEW YORK TIMES: FRAMING PEARL HARBOR
AND THE 9/11 ATTACKS

by

Maiko Kunii

APPROVED FOR THE SCHOOL OF JOURNALISM AND MASS
COMMUNICATIONS

SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY

August 2012

Dr. Diana Stover	School of Journalism and Mass Communications
Dr. Yoshimitsu Shimazu	Department of World Languages & Literature
Dr. William Tillinghast	School of Journalism and Mass Communications

ABSTRACT

ASAHI SHIMBUN AND THE NEW YORK TIMES: FRAMING PEARL HARBOR AND THE 9/11 ATTACKS

by Maiko Kunii

The researcher analyzed visual frames in the photo coverage in the *New York Times* and the Japanese newspaper, *Asahi Shimbun*, following the Pearl Harbor attack in 1941 and the 9/11 attacks in 2001. In 1941-1942, although the humanization set of frames was the dominant frame in the *New York Times*, the set of military frames was dominant in *Asahi Shimbun*. The *New York Times* emphasized American civilians as well as the American and U.S. allied soldiers' involvement in the war. In contrast, photos in *Asahi Shimbun* portrayed the patriotism of the Japanese military and the international human dimension in Asia. Its photo coverage emphasized victories by the Japanese military. In both publications in 2001, the violence of terrorism set of frames, which focused on the aftermath of the 9/11 attacks and the victims, was the dominant frame. The researcher found significant differences in the way *Asahi Shimbun* and the *New York Times* framed the Pearl Harbor and the 9/11 attacks. In 1941, there were significant differences between the newspapers in six of the seven major frames that emerged in the coverage—military, humanization, international human dimension, politics, violence of war, and portrayal of opponents. In contrast, in 2001, when Japan and the United States were engaged in peaceful cooperation, the frames were more convergent. Significant differences were found between the newspapers in three out of six of the major frames—violence of terrorism, portrayal of opponents, and anti-war/anti-U.S.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I sincerely appreciate my father, Takaaki Kunii, for his financial support and continued trust through my academic pursuits. I am also grateful to my dear friends, Wan Cheol Yun and Sarah Kang, who encouraged and helped me complete this thesis.

Finally, I would like to express my sincerest gratitude to Dr. Diana Stover, Dr. William Tillinghast, and Dr. Yoshimitsu Shimazu for all their hard work and considerate support, especially Dr. Stover who has provided me all the necessary guidance to conduct this research. I could have never completed this thesis without her assistance.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction	1
Purpose of the Study	1
II. Review of the Literature.....	6
Media Frames.....	6
Visual Media Frame.....	10
Composition.....	13
Size.....	14
Proximity.....	14
Placement.....	15
Camera Angle.....	15
Photo Caption.....	16
Framing September 11.....	16
Framing Pearl Harbor	19
Photojournalism in the United States	20
Photojournalism in Japan	21
Historical Context of Pearl Harbor and September 11, 2001Attacks.....	23
Japanese immigration.....	23
War in the Pacific and Europe	25
September 11th Terrorist Attacks.....	28
Overview.....	30
Research Questions	31

III. Method	32
Newspapers Analyzed.....	33
<i>Asahi Shimbun</i>	33
<i>The New York Times</i>	33
Data Collection.....	34
Measures.....	36
Frame Definitions.....	36
Composition.....	41
Analysis.....	42
IV. Results.....	44
Overview: Descriptive Analysis of Frames in the Pearl Harbor Period	45
Military Frames in the Pearl Harbor Period	47
Humanization Frames in the Pearl Harbor Period.....	52
International Human Dimension Frames in the Pearl Harbor Period	55
Politics Frames in the Pearl Harbor Period.....	56
Violence of War Frames in the Pearl Harbor Period.....	57
Portrayal of Opponents' Military Frames in the Pearl Harbor Period...	62
Portrayal of Opponents Frames in the Pearl Harbor Period.....	63
Minor Frames in the Pearl Harbor Period.....	69
Overview: Descriptive Analysis of the 9/11 Frames.....	71
Violence of Terrorism Frames in 2001	71

Humanization Frames in 2001.....	79
Military and Firefighters Frames in 2001.....	82
Politics Frames in 2001.....	83
Portrayal of Opponents Frames in 2001.....	84
Anti-War and Anti-U.S. Frames in 2001.....	87
Media Self-Reference Frames in 2001.....	89
Other Frames in 2001.....	90
Research Questions.....	91
Overview.....	91
Research Question 1.....	98
Research Question 2.....	101
Research Question 3.....	102
Research Question 4.....	104
Compositional Elements.....	105
Camera Angle in 1941 and 2001.....	105
Proximity in 1941 and 2001.....	106
Size of Picture in 1941 and 2001.....	106
Placement of Picture in 1941 and 2001.....	107
V. Conclusion.....	112
Discussion.....	113
Significant Differences between <i>Asahi Shimbun</i> and the <i>New York Times</i>	117

Contributions to the Literature.....	117
VI. References.....	120
VII. Appendix A, Codebook.....	126

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Frames in *Asahi Shimbun* and the *New York Times* in 1941-1942..... 46

Table 2: Major Frames in *Asahi Shimbun* and the *New York Times* in 1941-1942... 48

Table 3: Frames in *Asahi Shimbun* and the *New York Times* in 2001..... 73

Table 4: Major Frames in *Asahi Shimbun* and the *New York Times* in 2001..... 75

Table 5: Means for Frames in *Asahi Shimbun* and the *New York Times* in 1941-1942
and 2001.....93

Table 6: Two-Tailed t-test for Frames in *Asahi Shimbun* and the *New York Times* in
1941-1942..... 94

Table 7: Two-Tailed t-test for Frames in *Asahi Shimbun* and the *New York Times* in
2001..... 95

Table 8: Camera Angles in Photos in *Asahi Shimbun* and the *New York Times*..... 96

Table 9: Proximity of Subject to Viewer in Photos in *Asahi Shimbun* and the *New
York Times*.....96

Table10: Size of Photos in *Asahi Shimbun* and the *New York Times*..... 97

Table 11: Placement of Photos in *Asahi Shimbun* and the *New York Times*..... 97

Chapter I

Introduction

This study compared how the visual coverage in two prestige newspapers in Japan and the United States framed the attack on Pearl Harbor and the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks for their readers. This framing study provides an analysis of the similarities and the differences between the news photo coverage in *Asahi Shimbun* and the *New York Times* for the two time periods.

Purpose of the Study

News photographs in *Asahi Shimbun* and the *New York Times* during the time periods following the bombing of Pearl Harbor in 1941 and the attacks of September 11, 2001, were analyzed to determine what visual frames were used and what visual frames dominated the coverage in each newspaper. The study was designed to determine whether the frames in the photo news coverage differed by newspaper and by time period.

Newspapers were chosen for this study because they are still the most reliable source of information, according to Hoffman & Wallach (2007). They noted that “the quality of newspaper reporting is the highest, as compared to other media outlets” (p. 616). The pair emphasized the importance of newspapers, noting that “newspapers advertised news” (p. 622). The placement of an article on the front page of a newspaper makes the news important.

It is possible that readers who are not exposed to reporting about war protests and war victims may become more inclined to support war efforts (Dimitrova & Strömbäck, 2005). Fortunato (2005) also noted that, “for stories in which people have no personal

experience for comparison, people might be more willing to accept the perspective offered by the media” (p. 56).

This study makes a contribution to global mass communication and to visual communications in areas in which there have been gaps in the literature regarding the study of framing. It also provides a deeper understanding of how the two newspapers framed the two attacks—in 1941 when the countries became wartime enemies and in 2001, a time of peaceful cooperation. As Dimitrova and Strömbäck (2005) noted, there have not been enough studies comparing how the media cover news differently in individual countries. They added that, “while ‘truth’ is an abstract concept subject to much debate by academics all over the world, it is important to examine how war reality was constructed for different national audiences” (p. 412).

It is important to know how the media have framed unexpected past international crises, especially since studies have shown that, when the media cover ordinary expected content, it is more rational and well filtered. However, for an unexpected event, such as a surprise attack or a terrorist attack, media reporting may be emotional and nationalistic.

Brennen and Duffy (2003) noted a similarity in the coverage of the “other” in U.S. media coverage of the events of Pearl Harbor and 9/11. The authors noted that media in the United States used the Pearl Harbor attack as the most common analogy for the September 11 attacks. In the 1941 attack on Pearl Harbor, the authors found that the *New York Times* did not distinguish between Japanese nationals and Japanese-Americans, most of whom lived on the West Coast. Brennen and Duffy (2003) wrote that, during the first six weeks following September 11, 2001, the *New York Times* reported “growing fear

among Arab and Muslim-Americans that they will become targets of American bigotry” (p. 9) and that “ultimately, the coverage of Japanese-Americans as well as Muslim and Arab-Americans is framed to evoke a pervading sense of fear about the Other” (p.13).

How media frame a terrorist or a military attack is important because the manner in which the media frame the event may directly affect public opinion. For example, the absence of anti-war voices or one-sided emotional frames may lead to nationalistic coverage or what Gans (1979, 1980) referred to as ethnocentrism. According to Kellner (2003), most of the media actively emphasized the fear of terror with the 9/11 attacks. After the United States invaded Afghanistan, Kellner noted that CNN president Walter Isaacson commented that “it seems perverse to focus too much on the casualties or hardship on Afghanistan” and sent a message to CNN commentators that “when they mention casualties, they should also remind the viewers of the horrors of the 9/11 attacks” (p. 66). Lule (2002), in a study of editorials in the *New York Times* after September 11, noted that “the paper responded with an intensity of coverage seen perhaps only in wartime” (p. 277).

The definition of newsworthy is the key to understanding why the media rarely covered anti-war and alternative choices such as peaceful negotiation: “During the Vietnam War, news about the possibility of peace negotiation was occasionally dropped from the story list” because it was an inconclusive argument (Gans, 1980, p. 162). Also, Brennen and Duffy (2003) concluded that there was a similarity of coverage of the Pearl Harbor and 9/11 events because, in both cases, dissenting or oppositional opinion was ignored. For example, when Bill Maher, host of ABC television’s *Politically Incorrect*,

implied that the United States' attitude was cowardly because the U.S. military chose to use cruise missiles rather than ground troops, White House Press Secretary Ari Fleischer sent a warning message to the press to "watch what they say, watch what they do" (Kellner, 2003, p. 68). Journalists were intimidated and deterred from their role as impartial observers.

Kellner (2003) stated that after 9/11, the media actively supported the Bush administration, and that they rallied around the president as he prepared the nation for war. During this period, the media actively contributed to the formation of public opinion. Chomsky (2006) attributed "the government-media campaign to convince Americans that Saddam Hussein was an imminent threat to their survival, driving them completely off the spectrum of world opinion" (p. 248) to American's initial support for the war. As Schwalbe, Silcock, and Keith (2008) noted regarding the media's coverage of the war in Iraq: "Although scholarly analysis of coverage of the Iraq war was still developing in 2008 as the U.S. occupation entered its sixth year, research has revealed that the U.S. news media tended to buttress the government's viewpoint during the invasion, as they did early in other conflicts" (p. 449).

If the American people had been exposed to a more impartial frame, a more balanced media frame, the high approval rate for the Bush administration's handling of 9/11 and the aftermath might not have occurred. The Program on International Policy Attitude (PIPA) found that in the 2004 election: "74 percent of the public felt that the United States should not have gone to war if Iraq did not have weapons of mass destruction or was not providing support to Al Qaeda" (p. 232).

After the Bush administration conceded that Iraq did not have weapons of mass destruction, the *Washington Post* and the *New York Times* admitted that “they had too readily and uncritically published accounts of alleged Iraqi weapons programs fed to them by the Bush administration” (Kellner, 2005, p. 63). In times of crisis, the news almost always contains unintended bias: “When information is supplied to news media by sources, then it arrives with a built-in frame that suits the purpose of the source and is unlikely to be purely objective” (McQuail, 2005, p. 379).

Chapter II

Review of the Literature

This chapter provides an explanation of the framing literature, including framing theory and studies on textual and visual frames. It also provides a review of studies on the coverage of the Pearl Harbor and 9/11 attacks and their aftermath as well as the historical context for those events. In addition, the chapter provides a list of the research questions and briefly summarizes the research method.

Media Frames

Individuals need to create definitions of their situations to communicate within social realities. Because there are many approaches that could be used to describe an event or a subject, the media need common definitions of reality. Framing helps to create social realities that allow people in to communicate with others. In other words, framing socially constructs situations. Faludi (1995) noted that “the complementary process of naming and framing socially constructs the situation” (p. 94).

Goffman (1994) defined a frame as the definition of situations that are connected with the social system and the public. He noted that the “definitions of a situation are built up in accordance with principals of organization which govern events—at least social ones—and our subjective involvement in them” (p. 10). Faludi (1995) noted that “knowledge is not a mirror image of reality” (p. 94). Within a political context, this implies that social realities, which are mainly constructed by politicians, elites in society, and the media, do not reflect exact realities. Entman (2001) noted that frames provide a practical tool to communicate with the public. He described framing as the process of

journalistic culling of “a few elements of perceived reality and assembling a narrative that highlights connections among them to promote a particular interpretation” (p. 164).

According to Fortunato (2005), the media frame is what is presented to the public. He noted that “the audience does not see the alternative frames that were not selected in the presentation of the issue, at least at that time, through that medium” (p. 54).

Schwalbe (2006) also noted that the media frame is “how the media present the news” (p. 268). Framing exists to help readers and journalists to quickly identify and classify information. Entman (1993) explained:

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, causal interpretation, moral evaluation, and/or treatment recommendation* for the item described. (p. 52)

Framing is choosing a specific part of some information, and making it more noticeable, meaningful, or memorable to the audience than other information. Schwalbe (2006) noted that “by framing an event in one way rather than another, the media can influence the way people think about it and, later, remember it” (p. 269).

Also, the audience is expecting certain frames to be part of the news (Fortunato, 2005). Framing makes news events understandable, but it also may lead to oversimplification and generalization of the news. Scheufele (2000) stated that “framing influences how audiences think about issues, not by making aspects of the issue more salient, but by invoking interpretive schemas that influence the interpretation of incoming information” (p. 309). He also noted that framing is based on subtle nuances of words; therefore, one frame may not be identified as a specific frame. The important key is

frequency, placement, and the amount of time or space (Fortunato, 2005). Much of the power of framing comes from its ability to define the terms of a debate without the audience realizing its influence (Tankard, 2003).

Entman (2003) explained how frames are shaped through the social system. He labeled the process “the cascading flow of influence,” which starts from the administration, nonadministration elites, the media, news frames, and the public. In this system, individuals in higher positions have more independent ability to control frames. The administration influences media content, which, in turn, can affect public opinion. Frame parity means that the media present multiple perspectives of an event, which contain both positive and negative sides. Frame dominant and frame contestation mean that the media present more partial and unbalanced perspectives of an event than frame parity. Entman (1993) noted that, “from a framing perspective, dominant meaning consists of the problem, causal, evaluative, and treatment interpretations with the highest probability of being noticed, processed, and accepted by the most people” (p. 56). The dominant frame is the most memorable, noticeable, and acceptable for the majority of the public. Research has found that frame parity news, which contains counterframes, may provide a better understanding for audiences. However, the media provide more frame dominant and frame contestation news, which are occupied by particular frames more than other information.

Entman (2003) noted other characteristics of news frames using the cultural congruence model. The model showed that when a stimulus is culturally congruent, the response is habitual, and when a stimulus is culturally incongruent, the response is likely

to be blocked. Culturally congruent means that each component of the social system, or the social system as a whole can reach an agreement regarding a specific issue. When the social systems agrees with the definition or understanding, the response, which includes the media frame, is a conventional and conservative one. Conversely, if the social system can not reach cultural congruence, the media frame is likely unnoticeable and less important to the society. These steps occur at each level of the social system. If an element of an incident was highly incongruent with the social system, the public might not notice the frames.

For example, U.S.-based media reported two incidents by choosing different media frames: a Soviet fighter plane shot down a Korean Air Lines (KAL) plane on September 1, 1982, and a U.S. Navy ship shot down Iran Air flight on July 3, 1988. Both incidents were sudden and unexpected. The airplanes carried 269 and 290 civilians, respectively, and all died. In both cases, military officials identified both KAL and Iran Air as possible hostile targets to justify their decisions to shoot the planes down. Entman's study showed that the U.S. media discussed the KAL incident more frequently with detailed and humanized messages that described the passengers as innocent human beings and loved ones. However, the media discussed the Iran Air incident less frequently and generally did not write about the human aspects of the disaster. Entman noted:

The frame does not eliminate all inconsistent information; texts inevitably contain some incongruent data. But through repetition, placement, and reinforcing association with each other, the words and images that comprise the frame render one basic interpretation more readily discernable, comprehensive, and memorable than others. (1991, p. 7)

In this case, portraying the U.S. Navy as an attacker was culturally incongruent for the president and his administration, non-administration elites, the media, and the public, so the news frame was blocked. The media reported the Iran Air incident less frequently as a tragedy because the tragedy frame was congruent for the social system. However, portraying a Soviet fighter as an attacker was congruent for the administration, non-administration elites, the media, and the public, so habitual responses were established, such as the frame of an “evil” nation. By choosing the words, images, frequency, and placement, the U.S. media created a dominant frame of the Korean Air Lines incident as an attack, and the Iran Air incident as a tragedy.

Visual Media Frames

Lister (2007) stated that digital photography has dramatically increased the number of available news photos. Following the Gulf War, embedded photojournalists produced numerous images of war (Best, 2004; Schwalbe, Silcock, & Keith, 2008). Schwalbe et al. (2008) noted that “one of the most vivid ways journalism reports war to the world is through images” (p. 448), explaining that framing occurs in visual news reports just as it does in the verbal news reports of broadcast journalists. Schwalbe (2006) explained that visual framing begins with the choice of events then involves how to photograph the event (the angle, perspective, assumptions, and cropping) and finally the selection of pictures and their sizing and placement.

During the Iraq War, “the news media could *select* to show the American perspective rather than the Iraqi perspective, *emphasize* victory and heroism instead of loss and failures, *elaborate* frames of freedom rather than destruction, and *exclude*

images of the injured and dead” (Schwalbe, 2006, p. 269). Visual frames are more limited than words because each news story typically has only one picture associated with each article in a newspaper. Therefore, visual frames may cause oversimplification and generalization of the news. Schwalbe (2006) noted that framing is a selective process that “telescope[s] event[s] into a few images that stand for the whole” (p. 266). Waldman and Devitt (1998) noted that “photos are meant to illustrate stories” (p. 310). Therefore, news photography always needs a story.

Dauber (2001) noted that “despite the power images have to shape perceptions, images do not stand alone” (p. 657). Messaris (1992) stated that photography may mislead the audience rather than inform them because photographs need to record a very specific segment of reality. A photo accompanied by a story may mislead audiences; moreover, a stand-alone image may also mislead audiences. Messaris noted that “visuals are being used to encourage an inference which could be considered false if it were put in the form of an explicit verbal claim” (p. 191). Visual images are more likely to be combined with other unrelated images to create specific frames. Messaris explained that cigarette ads often combine both images of a healthy environment and smoking. Such ads are only effective “in which visual syntax is used as a vehicle for implying meanings that would be less acceptable if formulated explicitly in words” (p. 75). In many cases, visual framing can deliver the nuance of a message to audiences more effectively than verbal framing.

Visual framing may have negative effects such as oversimplification and the overgeneralization of the news. Since journalists work under the pressure of deadlines

and cost efficiency, they often do not have time to reconsider news content. Shahira (2004) noted that this economic pressure often leads to oversimplification and decontextualization, especially international news photographs. When choosing images that document violence or tragedy, news editors must consider government censorship, privacy of the subject, and the tolerance of readers (Keith, 2006). Schwalbe (2006) noted that, when photojournalists and photo editors chose news photos taken in Afghanistan, they considered political sensitivity to be an important factor. Also Ross and Bantimaroudis (2006) noted that the political environment can result in the reframing of events. Cobb and Boettcher (2008) stated people can only perceive reality subjectively and that their perceptions may be influenced by the political elite.

Research has shown that news photography has a great ability to influence people. Messaris (1998) noted that visual literacy enriches individuals' cognition and creativity. Also, a study by Sundar (2000) showed that people can recall and recognize stories with pictures at a higher rate than stories with text only. Mendelson and Thorson (2004) noted that relevant and redundant photos with text increased understanding of the text. They also noted that news photos and headlines are "points of entry" into newspapers. Readers initially pay attention to news photos and headlines on newspaper pages, and the news photos sometimes have a larger impact than the article itself. A study by Pfau et al. (2006) found that women respond more emotionally than men do to news photographs of war.

Dauber (2001) noted that when 18 American servicemen were killed in Mogadishu, President Clinton announced the withdrawal of the United States from

Somalia. At the time, media images of American bodies elicited a strong public reaction. According to Dauber, it was the photos of the dead Americans that had a considerable impact on public opinion and “not the deaths themselves” (p. 676). Keith (2006) noted that some news photos can influence public opinion and government policy. In 2004, after the media released the Abu Ghraib photos, the Bush administration’s support for the Iraq War declined.

Composition

The composition of news photographs is important because some compositional elements can keep viewers’ attention longer. Consequently, readers may gain a better understanding of the subject of the news photograph (Horton, 2001). Photojournalists try to bring new perspectives by using high and low angles. Simply shooting a subject from a high or low angle can provide a refreshing look at a subject (Kobre, 2000). However, photojournalists’ efforts to seek the most interesting or unique composition may confuse viewers because the resulting picture may not contain essential information (Horton, 2001). For example, shooting a subject from an extremely low angle, rather than providing a new perspective, may not be effective because it may draw the reader’s attention away from the subject and toward the sky in the background. The difference between news photography and art photography is whether the photograph tells the story. News photography has to communicate with readers through the visual information (Horton, 2001).

The following four elements of a photo can change the impact of news: (1) Size (Coleman, 2006; Garcia & Stark, 1991; Schwalbe et al., 2008), (2) proximity (Messaris,

1992), (3) placement (Hoffman & Wallach, 2007), and (4) camera angle (Hoffman & Wallach, 2007; Waldman & Devitt, 1998; Messaris, 1998; Best, 2004).

Size. More specifically, Wanta (1988) and Coleman (2006) noted that dominant news pictures, the largest photos on a newspaper page, increase the perception of the salience of an issue more than smaller photographs. They noted that people remember a story with large pictures better than small pictures in newspapers. One study concluded that larger pictures gain more viewers' attention than smaller pictures. Research has shown that newspaper subscribers read only 12% of stories that do not have photos but that 42% read stories with a one-column picture and 55% read stories with a two-column picture. This readership figure rose to 70% for a picture that was four columns wide (Kobre, 2000). Moreover, larger pictures enhanced readers' abilities to recall and understand the stories.

Proximity. According to Messaris (1992), proximity is one of the most important visual factors. When people see proximate photographs, they may be influenced so much by the photo that it interacts with their perception of an event. A tighter shot is used to emphasize an action and increase the viewers' involvement with the images. Kobre (2000) noted that, "the scope of the shot depends on the size of the event" (p. 13). If an event happens in a room, a long shot of the room provides an overall view for viewers. For other cases, long shots of a street, a neighborhood, or a whole city provide all the information that is needed in stories. Generally, long shots are taken from a high angle point. According to Kobre (2000), a mid-range shot should deliver a story in one photograph. A mid-range shot is close enough to show the subject's actions, yet far

enough away to show their relationships with others and the environment. Kobre noted: “The medium shot is the story’s summary” (2000, p. 13). Also, Von Buseck noted that the medium shot “generally made the viewer feel part of the action without being very close” (p. 50). Kobre wrote that “a close-up should isolate one element and emphasize it” (2000, p. 13).

Placement. Hoffman and Wallach (2007) said that placement in newspapers can change the importance of an issue. They noted that “the importance of an event can change dramatically simply by what section the story is in” as well as “where” it is in a particular section (p. 619). As with the most catchy advertisements, the most noticeable news, such as the news on the front page or accompanied by a large photograph, may have more influence upon readers.

Camera angle. Messaris (1998) noted that a low angle picture appears more imposing. He previously observed (1992) that taking a photo from a low angle makes subjects appear more powerful and authentic than they really are. Conversely, using high angles make the subject appear less powerful. These are typical camera techniques that are used in political advertisements. Showing the image of a political figure taken from a lower angle may lead to creating the image of a more powerful politician as opposed to a high angle photograph. However, these perceptions of powerful and less powerful may be changed by the subjects and the audiences. Messaris (1998) noted that “the effect of any particular compositional device can vary significantly depending on the type of content to which is it applied and the type of audience at which it is aimed” (p. 184).

Photo caption. In addition, pictures can only partially deliver information. Without explanation, viewers cannot fully understand the event in the picture. Moreover, when a photograph is ambiguous, a photo caption might change the viewers' interpretations completely. As Kobre wrote, "pictures transmit the message immediately, but words shape and give focus to that message" (2000, p. 211). Kobre (2000) noted that a good photo caption contains the five Ws and some extra information, such as how the picture was taken or who provided the picture. The five Ws are who where, what, when, and, why.

Framing September 11

After the 9/11 attacks, the event was immediately framed by the new coverage. At the onset, news reports described the event as a tragedy. Later, the event was described as a decisive moment. Kellner (2002) stated that the media used the word "war" before the government declared war: "media frames shifted from 'America under Attack' to 'America Strikes Back' and 'America's New War'—even before any military action was undertaken, as if the media frames were to conjure the military response that eventually followed" (p. 149). Ruigrok and Atteveldt (2007) noted that the "war on terror" frame was accepted without any arguments (p. 74). According to Entman (2003), President George W. Bush used the term "act of war" the morning following the 9/11 attacks. The Bush administration provided a simple and emotional frame for 9/11. Entman wrote that, for the Bush administration, framing the terrorist attack as a "war" was an essential element aimed at altering public opinion before declaring war, noting that "it was vital to convey an unambiguous and emotional frame to the public" (p. 416).

Callahan, Dubnick, and Olshfski (2006) noted that the United States declared war without an established “war narrative.” Unlike other wars, the United States declared war on terror without political, material, or psychological preparations (p. 554). Even journalists reported the events quite differently than they normally would have done. According to Li (2007), during the first five hours of television coverage of the 9/11 attacks, journalists altered their daily routines. Li also noted that “media frames of crisis in television coverage are dynamic rather than static” (p. 683). Lule stated that in its editorials, the *New York Times* “[tried] to make sense of almost senseless events” (p. 277). After 9/11, the *New York Times* shaped a myth that “the terrorist attacks were a stunning assault on social order. Within hours, the *New York Times* had taken up the process of answering that assault” (p. 287). During the month from September 12 to October 12, 2001, the *New York Times* wrote that the world was changed, and wrote stories on how the tragic deaths “transform victims into heroes and death into sacrifice” (Lule, 2002, p. 283). Moreover, the paper treated President George W. Bush and New York Mayor Rudy Giuliani as heroes, despite the fact that the previous edition of paper derided them. Gans (1980) noted that, if it is necessary, news even helps to create leaders. In the United States, 9/11 stories were “framed, angled, geared and worded to suit the emotional and cognitive framework of audiences at home” (Ruigrok & Atteveldt, 2000, p. 74).

During the days after 9/11, the media rapidly changed media frames about the attacks. A study by Edy and Meirick (2001) showed that during October 2001, U.S. media framed the events of September 11 as a war and as a crime, and both frames influenced the audience. As a result, “audiences combine framing elements in

unexpected ways that impact their support for politics” (p. 120).

As previously noted, the Entman (2007) study showed that the administration and nonadministration elites had the power to frame events and influence the media and public opinion. Immediately after the 9/11 attacks, news was framed by the administration. The Schildkraut (2002) 9/11 study noted that “majority opinion lags behind movement in elite discourse and actions” (p. 518). Schwalbe et al. (2008) stated that the U.S. media adoption of the Bush administration’s perspective right after September 11 occurred because the media had a “reliance on framing that emphasized conflict rather than the individual costs of war” (p. 450). Gans (1980) stated that American news has always emphasized social disorder stories: “Social disorder news deals with activities that disturb the public peace and may involve violence or the threat of violence against life or physical property” (p. 53). Lule (2002) noted that, “as modern myth, news proclaims and promotes social order” (p. 283). The president of the United States “is viewed as the ultimate protector of order . . . He sets an example that might be followed by others . . . he is the person who states and represents the national values and he is the agent of the national will” (Gans, 1979, p. 63). Schwalbe et al. (2008) noted that there were patriotic frames in news photography, which were related to the events of 9/11. They noted that “a patriotic tone was present in visual as well as textual coverage” (p. 450). They also noted that, as in previous periods of war, it was typical for the frame to shift gradually from a patriotic mode to a critical mode.

Framing Pearl Harbor

Before Pearl Harbor, the *New York Times* offered positive descriptions of Japanese Ambassador Nomura and reported the war situation in Europe and Asia in a calm and neutral tone (Yoshimoto, 1994). However, after government officials warned about Japanese espionage, the *New York Times* shifted its tone dramatically against Japanese-Americans. The media had previously been fair and objective in its news reports, but after the Pearl Harbor attack, they did not adhere to those values of American journalism. Brennen and Duffy (2003) noted that “the illusion of fairness in coverage became increasingly vitriolic and inflammatory” (p. 5). Yoshimoto’s (1994) study noted that after Pearl Harbor, a December 8, 1941, editorial in the *New York Times* described Japan as the enemy, using phrases such as “treacherous friend” and “madmen of Japan” (p. 85).

Meanwhile in Japan, on December 9, 1941, *Asahi Shimbun* reported the Japanese declaration of the war against the United States as an Imperial Order, and most Japanese literally perceived the declaration of war as an Imperial Order. According to Yoshimoto (1994), *Asahi Shimbun* reported that, although Japan worked hard to avoid a war with the United States, the Western-dominated world system ruined the effort. After Pearl Harbor, *Asahi Shimbun*, which published reports with many quotations from official communiqués, failed to adhere to journalistic objectivity. *Asahi Shimbun* persuaded the public that the decision to go to war was an Imperial Order, and the paper was inclined to perpetuate the government’s propaganda rather than publish investigative reports. Yoshimoto noted that “*Asahi Shimbun* started to describe the Japanese military victories and losses in a patriotic, glorious, and eloquent tone” (p. 83).

Both newspapers rationalized their country's war efforts; *Asahi Shimbun* wrote about the Imperial Order, and the *New York Times* wrote about the danger to democracy and to the nation. Both newspapers framed their own nation as "us," and "our," while referring to the opponent nation as "they" and "their" (Yoshimoto, p. 87). As with the 9/11 news reports, neither newspaper discussed why the war was necessary (Yoshimoto).

Photojournalism in the United States

The first newspaper with photographs was published in 1880 in the United States when the *Daily Graphic* covered a story with a halftone picture (Geraci, 1984). As technology has advanced, photojournalists have produced better quality photographs and the capability to shoot a variety of situations: "Photographers today do more than just record the news. They have become visual interpreters by using their cameras and lenses, sensitivity to light, and keen observational skills to bring readers a feeling of what an event was really like" (Kobre, 2000, p. 332). Joseph Pulitzer began to publish the *New York World* in 1883. He once used fewer pictures in the newspaper, including drawings and illustrations, because he thought they would lower the dignity of the newspaper. However, the reduction of pictures led to a fall in the paper's circulation. As a result, Pulitzer began to increase the use of pictures in his newspaper, and other newspapers followed his lead. News photography has become an essential part of newspapers today (Kobre, 2000).

In 1914, the *New York Times* began publishing *Mid-Week Pictorial War Extra* and the first Sunday rotogravure section. Despite severe censorship, these sections revealed the trench warfare of World War I in Europe (Kobre, 1980). Photographers were

forbidden access to the battlefield; therefore, many photographs that covered the war in the *New York Times* were taken by soldiers who were also amateur photographers (Kobre, 2000).

During the entire 19 months of American involvement in World War I, the U.S. government prohibited publishing any photographs of dead American soldiers. A similar prohibition was imposed during the first 21 months of American involvement in World War II. However, during WWII, photojournalists could accompany soldiers and shoot pictures freely. Embedded journalists, who traveled with the military all the time, photographed scenes of what soldiers really saw during wartime. However, all photographs showing American casualties were strictly censored, and the American public did not have the chance to know the reality of war. The American government was concerned that showing American casualties might change public opinion. The American government worried that if the public saw American casualties, “they would press for a compromise settlement with Germany and Japan” (Kobre, 2000, p. 356). According to Kobre, after the American leaders were convinced that public complacency was brought on by Allied victories, they released some photographs depicting the war’s brutality.

Photojournalism in Japan

In Japan, embedded journalists were allowed to cover the Sino-Japanese War, which occurred between 1894 and 1895. This practice continued in the 20th century, with *Asahi Shimbun* providing extensive coverage of the Sino-Japanese War (1937-1945) and the Pacific War (1941-1945). During these two wars an estimated 300 Japanese journalists died on the battlefield (Asahi Shimbun Association, 2008).

When the Manchurian incident occurred in China on September 18, 1931, the staff from *Asahi Shimbun* flew to Seoul, Korea and issued a special edition of the newspaper in Tokyo and Osaka on September 20. At the time, *Asahi Shimbun* owned 15 airplanes that it used for covering stories (Asahi Shimbun Association, 2008).

A picture in America's *Life* magazine inspired a Japanese photojournalist, Natori Younosuke, who took propaganda pictures for Japanese magazines aimed at improving the image of the Japanese military. The *Life* picture showed a crying baby in Shanghai Station, which the Japanese military had destroyed when it was at war with China. After the picture was widely published on October 4, 1937, it spread the image of a cruel Japanese military. Subsequently, the picture was revealed to have been manipulated (Asahi Shimbun Association, 2008). A Japanese propaganda magazine, *FRONT*, which was published in 1941, displayed composite and modified pictures that added extra tanks and airplanes in an effort to portray the strength of the Japanese military (Asahi Shimbun Association, 2008).

On May 17, 1940 the Japanese government established a committee for regulating paper supplies to newspapers and magazines. As a result, the government even more strongly controlled freedom of speech through the restriction of newsprint (Asahi Shimbun Association, 2008).

The Japanese government imposed strict censorship on the press during World War II. Japanese censors did not allow the news media to show Japanese injuries and casualties or other pictures that weakened the motivation to fight. Some journalists who wrote stories that the censors didn't like were physically tortured for three-month periods

or imprisoned for a year without being allowed to take showers (Asahi Shimbun Association, 2008).

As a result of intense pressure from the government, *Asahi Shimbun* became almost like the public relations arm of the Japanese military. After December 8, 1941, war news occupied most of the space in *Asahi Shimbun*. The entrance of Asahi Newspaper Company exhibited slogans such as “Advance, One Hundred Million, with Raging Morale,” and “Slaughter Them! America and Britain, They’re Our Enemies” (Asahi Shimbun Association, 2008, p. 60).

Historical Context of Pearl Harbor and September 11, 2001 Attacks

Japanese immigration. Japan’s long feudal period ended on March 31, 1854, after negotiations with the United States resulted in the two nations signing the Treaty of Kanagawa. The Japanese Government began issuing passports for foreign travel in 1866. In 1880, a total of 35 passports for the United States were issued, and the number was continued until the exclusion act in 1924 (Wilson & Hosokawa, 1980). Applying for those passports were students, businessmen, fishermen, farmers, craftsmen, and laborers, among others (Wilson & Hosokawa, 1980). The authors noted:

The cumulative total of Japanese immigrants to mainland America through 1919 was 237,121; those who either returned to Japan or died numbered 155,783, showing a net gain of only 81,338. However, the 1920 census shows 110,010 ‘Japanese’ in the U.S. mainland. The difference is accounted for by 29,672 Nisei who were American citizens by birth. But the majority of the 110,010 were concentrated in California, and this meant high visibility which magnified their problem and focused the discrimination against them. (p. 57)

In 1909, the Immigration Commission estimated that half of all Japanese in the United States—about 39,500—were engaged in farming (Wilson & Hosokawa, 1980).

Although Japanese immigration was useful for some Americans, Japanese immigrants experienced discrimination. Japanese farmers competed with Caucasian farmers for benefits; moreover, the outbreak of the Russo-Japanese War in 1904 and Japan's subsequent victory caused anxiety among some Americans. On March 10, 1905, the San Francisco Labor Council, which met to discuss Japanese immigration, stated the following:

We have been accustomed to regard the Japanese as an inferior race, but now suddenly arouse to our danger . . . We have suddenly awakened to the fact that they are gaining a foothold in every skilled industry in our country . . . We are here today to prevent that very competition. (Wilson & Hosokawa, 1980, p. 123)

On October 11, 1906, the San Francisco School Board ordered all Japanese and Korean children in the public schools transferred to segregated schools in Chinatown, a decision that was criticized by President Theodore Roosevelt: "In a message to Congress on December 3, 1906, Roosevelt characterized the San Francisco school board action as 'wicked absurdity'" (Wilson & Hosokawa, 1980, p. 123). On March 13, 1907, the San Francisco school board withdrew the order. In 1910, 27 anti-Japanese proposals were introduced in the California Legislature. Wilson and Hosokawa wrote that the Alien Land Measure was passed in 1913: "Although the Japanese were not named, the law was aimed at 'all aliens other than those eligible for citizenship.' It prohibited further purchase of agricultural land by Japanese aliens" (p. 64).

The high concentration of Japanese and Japanese-Americans on the West Coast as well as segregation and discrimination against those of Japanese ancestry occurred prior to the Pearl Harbor attack. Wilson and Hosokawa (1980) noted that a majority of the white population on the West Coast believed that "Anglo-Saxon and Teutonic culture

must be supreme in the development of American culture” (p. 123).

After the Pearl Harbor attack on December 8, 1941, the funds of Japanese immigrants were frozen. Japanese-Americans were denounced as enemy spies. During the first few weeks after Pearl Harbor, hostility toward Japanese-Americans was mild to moderate. Eventually, a chorus of hate was generated, and authorities were subject to intense political pressures. The federal government did little to discourage this hostility (Wilson & Hosokawa, 1980, p. 192). Schildkraut (2002) noted that during the World War II-era, news editors preferred to call Japanese-Americans “descendants of enemy aliens” (p. 522). Two months later, on February 19, 1942, President Roosevelt signed Executive Order 9066, ordering everyone of Japanese ancestry to leave the West Coast.

War in the Pacific and Europe. By the end of 1938, Japan dominated almost all of China’s major cities, and that threatened European and American economic interests in China (Lyons, 1999). In the summer of 1940, the fall of France to the Nazis and the German threat to Great Britain led to growing support for the British among Americans. According to Lyons, although supporting Britain increased the risk of the United States going to war, 70% of Americans favored supporting Britain.

After Japan, Germany, and Italy became allies on September 27, 1940, the United States and Britain closely cooperated against the Japanese military (Hatano, 1988). Through the alliance, both Japan and Germany wanted to contain British military action. However, Germany also wanted Japan to contain the U.S. military and to prevent the United States from joining the war in Europe (Hatano, 1988). The Japanese military argued that Japan should not antagonize the United States (Hatano, 1988).

In June of 1941, the U.S. government froze German and Italian assets in the United States, and on July 28, 1941, Japan's military advanced to French South Indonesia. In retaliation against Japan, the United States, Britain, and the Netherlands froze Japanese assets in the United States. Then the United States enforced an embargo against Japan on the export of oil. The embargo was much more severe than the 1940s embargo of fuel, iron, and scrap steel. From the viewpoint of the Japanese military, the movement of its army from north to south in Indonesia was a defensive action against the United States, Britain, and the Netherlands, which had placed pressure on the Japanese economy. Hatano (1988) wrote that the action was not taken based on the will to declare war.

As a consequence, the fuel embargo forced Japan into a corner. Drea (1998) noted that the fuel embargo was a major problem for Japan, and "because the Imperial Navy would run out of oil in eighteen months, Japan had to make decisions on war or peace quickly" (p. 179). In September of 1941, President Roosevelt stated that, if the U.S. military discovered a German or Italian warship in the vicinity of a U.S. armed convoy to Britain, the U.S. military would take action (Hatano, 1988). When the tension in the Atlantic increased, the United States wanted to avert a conflict with Japan. The United States expected that the economic sanctions would lead Japan to surrender (Hatano, 1988). To avoid going to war against the United States, Japan proposed that, if the United States lifted the fuel embargo, Japan would move its military from south Indonesia to north Indonesia. Although the United States and the Netherlands agreed with the plan; China and Britain disagreed. China demanded that Japan withdraw its military from all parts of China (Hatano, 1988).

At that point, the Japanese military advanced into South Vietnam, and the United States immediately stopped exporting fuel to Japan (Asahi Shimbun Association, 2008). Britain and the Netherlands took similar action. Those acts negatively affected Japanese military operations because Japan relied on 88% of its oil supply from other countries. After several attempts at a peaceful solution between Japan and the United States, negotiations collapsed. The Roosevelt administration expected a declaration of war from Japan after it received its final message from Japan. Lyons noted that President Roosevelt and officials in his administration “became convinced that war was virtually inevitable when they read a particularly ominous message that pinpointed November 29th as the final deadline for negotiations and added that thereafter, ‘things are automatically going to happen’” (Lyons, 1999, p. 145).

On the morning of December 7, 1941, the Japanese launched an attack on the U.S. Navy base in Pearl Harbor, Hawaii. Japanese aircraft, including torpedo bombers, sank the battleship Arizona, three destroyers, and four small vessels and damaged the battleship Oklahoma and three light cruisers. They also destroyed 160 aircraft and damaged 128 additional aircraft. More than 2,400 Americans were killed. Japan lost 29 aircraft and 185 Japanese were killed or wounded (Borch, 2003; Lyons, 1999). On December 8, 1941, President Roosevelt declared war against Japan, and Congress unanimously responded and agreed (Lyons, 1999). On December 11, 1941, Germany and Italy joined Japan in declaring war against the United States. When Japan declared war against the United States and Britain, the Japanese people felt temporary relief because they expected it might change the gloomy economic situation they faced if the United

States and Britain were expelled from East Asia (Hatano, 1988).

September 11th terrorist attacks. Early in the morning of September 11, 2001, terrorists hijacked four commercial airliners in the United States. The two airliners originating in Boston crashed into the North and South Towers of the World Trade Center in Manhattan at 8:46 a.m. and 9:03 a.m. respectively. The third airplane from Washington, DC smashed into the west side of the Pentagon at 9:37 a.m. The fourth aircraft from Newark crashed into the ground near Shanksville, PA, at 10:10 a.m. In New York, the South Tower collapsed at 9:59 a.m. and the North Tower at 10:28 a.m., killing more than 2,823 people. The airplane crash in Pennsylvania killed all people on board, including 7 crew members, 33 passengers, and 4 hijackers. The Pentagon attack killed 189 civilians and military personnel. Within weeks of the attacks, the United States and coalition countries, especially Britain, began a military response against the Taliban regime in Afghanistan where Osama bin Laden was harbored. On October 7, 2001, U.S and British forces launched air raids against Afghanistan, targeting Taliban and Al-Qaeda camps (Borch, 2003; Goldberg, Papadopoulos, Putney, Berlage, & Welch, 2007).

Naber (2008) wrote that the definition of Arab is contested—not all Arabs speak Arabic, and not all Arabs are Muslims. Naber observed that “Arab countries include a diversity of linguistic, ethnic, and religious groups” (p. 6). Consequently, Arab Americans and Muslims in the United States are from a variety of backgrounds. Arab immigration commenced in the late 1880s, with immigrants coming mainly from Greater Syria, Mount Lebanon, and Palestine (Naber, 2008). After World War II, the United States expanded its economic interests and interventions in the Middle East. These

conflicts also shaped the public's perceptions about Arabs and Muslims in the United States. Naber noted that "the United States increasingly deployed the assumption that all Arabs are Muslim and that Islam is an inherently backward and uncivilized religion" (p. 32). The following events led to the deterioration of the image of people from the Middle East in the U.S. media and the relationship between the United States and the Arab World: (1) the 1970s oil embargo; (2) the 1979 revolution in Iran; (3) the U.S. intervention in Lebanon in 1982; (4) the 1986 bombing of Libya by the United States; (5) the 1990 Gulf War; (6) the 1998 bombing of Sudan and Afghanistan by the United States; and (7) ongoing support of Israel and the attack on Iraq (p. 34).

In contrast to Pearl Harbor, after September 11 and within two weeks of the attacks, the *New York Times* began reporting instances of tolerance and understanding, suggesting that the country's business and political leaders understood the need for acceptance of all Americans (Brennen & Duffy, 2003). After 9/11, the media reported tolerance and understanding. In 1942, Japanese-Americans were not a large percentage of the U.S. population; there were 120,000 Japanese-Americans interned and two-thirds were American citizens (Schidkraut, 2002). However, according to the 2000 census, 1 million Americans are of Arab decent, and 10 million people described themselves as Asian-Americans (Brennen & Duffy, 2003). Another difference is that "today's editorials refer to the United States as a nation of immigrants, celebrate diversity, and highlight the evolving ethnic nature of American identity" (Schidkraut, 2002, p. 524). Only four days after the 9/11 attacks, members of Congress introduced a resolution that censured bias and violence against Arab-Americans and Muslims residing in the United States. The

U.S. media did not frame Afghanistan as the enemy. Schildkraut noted that “the Afghan people are constantly portrayed as victims of Taliban regime” (p. 522).

Overview

As previously discussed, the frames used to portray an event create specific perceptions in the reader’s mind. When a nation faces the danger of war, people rely on the news for making sense of the event. Scheufele (2000) stated that framing influences how audiences think about issues, and Tankard (2003) stated that the power of framing comes from its ability to define the terms of a debate without people realizing the frames. Therefore, the most common frame in the media is the most influential to audiences. Fortunato (2005) mentioned frequency as an important factor in framing. Although visual news helps the reader to understand stories, news photos also narrow the reader’s view.

During the period following the 9/11 attacks, Americans were presented with different media frames regarding other countries. Moreover, the lack of an alternative choice in the media frame, such as peaceful negotiation, is almost a universal phenomenon before a country starts a war. Therefore, what frames and how frequently the frames appear in the media may provide considerable perspective about how media frames work during a crisis. Comparing the frames in prestige newspapers in two nations may provide a clearer understanding about media frames in both countries. This study analyzed how the media framed Pearl Harbor and 9/11 attacks and how often the media used the same frames. Because this study examined pictures and photo captions, the following visual elements were also measured: (1) camera angle, (2) proximity, (3)

image size, and (4) placement of news photos.

Research Questions. By examining news photography of the bombing of Pearl Harbor and the 9/11 terrorist attacks, produced by *Asahi Shimbun* and the *New York Times*, this study was designed to answer the following questions:

RQ1: What frames were used to report the events of Pearl Harbor in the *New York Times* and *Asahi Shimbun*?

RQ2: What were the dominant frames in each newspaper immediately after the bombing of Pearl Harbor?

RQ3: What frames were used to report the events of 9/11 in the *New York Times* and *Asahi Shimbun*?

RQ4: What were the dominant frames in each newspaper immediately after the 9/11 attack?

Chapter III

Method

This study compared and contrasted how prestige newspapers in Japan and the United States used news photos to portray the bombing of Pearl Harbor and its aftermath and the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks that led to the War in Afghanistan. The purpose of this study was to determine what media frames were dominant and how the frames were used.

The method was a framing analysis of the Japanese newspaper, *Asahi Shimbun*, and the *New York Times*. The newspapers were selected because both are regarded as reputable national newspapers that have a large number of readers. The study provided an analysis of photographs and accompanying photo captions in both newspapers during the time period following the events of Pearl Harbor and 9/11. It identified and analyzed what frames the newspapers applied to those events and compared and contrasted the frames by newspaper and by time period. The researcher identified 27 media frames that were used to code the photos: (1) overall military, (2) personal face of military, (3) allies' military, (4) personal face of allies' military, (5) violence/destruction, (6) patriotic symbols, (7) political, (8) allies' political, (9) human dimension, (10) international human dimension, (11) anti-war, (12) loss, (13) mug shots of loss, (14) enemy symbols, (15) military of opponents, (16) military of allies' opponents, (17) personal face of opponents' military, (18) prisoners of war, (19) victims/casualties, (20) media self-reference, (21) landscape, (22) other, (23) Arabs and Muslims, (24) anti-U.S., (25) U.S. firefighters, (26) security, and (27) terrorist. Four visual compositional elements were

also measured: (1) camera angle, (2) proximity, (3) image size, and (4) placement of news photos.

A quantitative framing analysis was conducted to determine what frames dominated the visual coverage and what compositional elements were used during the Pearl Harbor period and the period immediately following the 9/11 attacks. As Von Buseck (2007) noted, because of its unobtrusive nature, a quantitative framing analysis is the most reliable method for examining how newspapers frame events. The framing analysis also included a qualitative component. Extensive notes were taken on the content and distinguishing features, if any, of each news photo and photo caption.

Newspapers Analyzed

Asahi Shimbun. Historically, Japan has been credited with having “Asia’s most progressive and elaborate press system” (Merrill, Bryan, & Alisky, 1964, p. 191). The authors noted that the basic philosophy, commercial competition, and mechanical techniques were similar to the U.S. press system. The Asahi Shimbun Company owns *Asahi Shimbun*, founded and published since 1879. The newspaper has long been one of the three major newspapers in Japan, and, after the World War II period, has been considered to be an accurate, good quality, and prestigious newspaper. Like the *New York Times*, *Asahi Shimbun* is an elite newspaper that provides both national and international news to upper and upper-middle class readers. In 2001, the Japan Audit Bureau of Circulations reported that *Asahi Shimbun* had a circulation of 7.9 million.

The New York Times. The *New York Times*, founded and published since 1851, is owned by the New York Times Company. The *Times* is a prestige paper that has long

been known for its international coverage. In 1941, Otto D. Tolischus, the *New York Times* reporter who won the 1940 Pulitzer Prize, was arrested in Japan just after the attack on Pearl Harbor. A Japanese prisoner of war, Tolischus was tortured and accused of espionage. He was released in 1942.

At present, the *New York Times* has 26 foreign news bureaus, including a United Nations bureau based in New York City. The newspaper has won 106 Pulitzer Prizes, 78 of which were awarded prior to 2001 and 28 of which were awarded from 2001-2011. It won two Pulitzer Prizes for its 9/11 coverage—one for its photographic coverage of the attacks and one for its comprehensive coverage of the aftermath of the attacks, the war in Afghanistan, and America's campaign against terrorism through the special section “A Nation Challenged.” In 2001, the *New York Times* had a weekday circulation of 1.15 million and a Sunday circulation of 1.69 million.

Data Collection

This study analyzed the two newspapers, focusing on photographs and captions that related to the bombing of Pearl Harbor and the 9/11 terrorist attacks. The author obtained and examined 934 news photographs from *Asahi Shimbun*, published between December 9, 1941 and March 31, 1942, and 1,062 news photographs from the *New York Times*, published during the period from December 8, 1941 to March 31, 1942. In addition, the author obtained and examined 274 news photographs from *Asahi Shimbun*, published from September 12, 2001 to October 6, 2001, and 1,013 news photographs from the *New York Times*, published from September 12, 2001 to October 7, 2001. The

second time period, which was just short of one-month after the 9/11 terrorist attacks, ended just prior to the invasion of Afghanistan.

This study analyzed only news photos of the two events to determine what frames were present. It excluded other war-related images, such as satellite live shots, maps, graphics, and cartoons. As Dauber (2001) noted, news photos have power, but a single photo does not tell a full story; therefore, this study also considered photo captions. The average number of pages in *Asahi Shimbun* in 1941 and 1942 was four pages in the morning edition and two pages in the evening edition. The average number of pages in *Asahi Shimbun* in 2001 was 40 pages for the morning edition and 15 pages for the evening edition. In 1941, the weekday edition of the *New York Times* had 50 pages. It had the following sections: books, amusements, sports, business, stock exchange, financial, apartments, help wanted, weather reports, obituaries, society, and churches. In 2001, the weekday edition of the *New York Times* averaged 95 pages. Its sections included business, sports, arts, metro, weekend, automobile, world business, and science times. As well as other specialized sections, after September 18, the *New York Times* changed section 2(B), Business, to a new section called “A Nation Challenged.” It provided additional text and visual information related only 9/11.

The study excluded the week in review section, the picture section, and the *New York Times* Magazine section in the Sunday edition of the *New York Times*. Both the week in review and Magazine sections contained numerous news photos. However, they were excluded from the analysis because there were not any comparable sections in *Asahi Simbun*. The author obtained hard-copy editions of *Asahi Simbun* from the Japanese

National Library in Tokyo. For the *New York Times*, the researcher examined microfilm and the paper's online database, both of which were available through the San Jose State University Library.

Measures

Measures for 27 frames were developed for this framing analysis of photographic content from *Asahi Simbun* and the *New York Times* in 1941-1942 and 2001. The content-based measures were used to code the subject matter of each photograph. In cases in which the subject matter fit more than one framing category, every subject was coded. As a result, some of photographs were categorized under several frames.

The photo captions for each image were used to aid the researcher in determining what frame as frames were present.

Frame Definitions. The 27 framing measures used in this study were based on frames found in previous research on wars and conflict (Von Buseck, 2008; Dimitrova & Strömbäck, 2005; Schwalbe, 2006; Schwalbe et al., 2008) as well as on new frames that were identified in a pretest. The pretest of content similar to the stories in both newspapers in the two time periods was conducted to determine whether additional frames could be identified that were specific to the two events or to the newspapers. The definitions of the framing measures used in the study of *Asahi Shimbun* and the *New York Times* in 1941 and 2001 are as follows:

- 1. Overall Military**—This frame focused on the U.S., Japanese, and Muslim and Middle Eastern military operations and machines of war, such as weaponry, troops, arsenals, aircraft, battleships, and soldiers whose faces are not identified

2. Personal Face of Military Frame—This frame focused on the humanization of the military by showing the faces of soldiers. According to Schwalbe et al., images of soldiers that depict individuals' faces fall into the human interest frame. The author of this study adhered to the example from Schwalbe et al.'s study: "wide shots of tanks moving across the desert were coded as conflict images, while tight shots of individual soldiers with weapons fell into the human interest category" (2008, p. 454).

3. Allies' Military Frame—This frame focused on the militaries of the allies of the United States and Japan—their machines of war, such as weaponry, troops, arsenals, aircraft, battleships, and soldiers whose faces are not identified.

4. Personal Face of Allies' Military Frame—This frame focused on the humanization of militaries of the allies by showing the faces of allied soldiers.

5. Violence and Destruction Frame—This frame focused on the aftermath caused by the bombing of Pearl Harbor and the terrorist attacks, such as bombings, destroyed buildings, destroyed aircraft, and sunken destroyers.

6. Patriotic Symbols Frame—This frame focused on the symbols of patriotism such as national flags, the Emperor of Japan, and Japanese Shinto Shrines. The Japanese Emperor was considered to be a God.

7. Political Frame—This frame focused on political figures, including politicians, government officials, and religious leaders who had significant influence on policies during World War II and on the policies of Al Qaeda, the Taliban, and the Muslim world.

8. Allies' Political Frame—This frame focused on political figures, including politicians, government officials, and religious leaders in allied countries.

9. Human Dimension Frame— This frame focused on U.S. citizens who were affected by World War II and the 9/11 attacks. It included photos that showed the plight of Japanese citizens who were affected by World War II. It also showed civilians in Muslim and Middle Eastern countries, especially Afghan refugees. This frame emphasized the reactions of private citizens.

It excluded military officers, politicians, firefighters, the injured, and anti-war or anti-U.S. demonstrators.

10. International Human Dimension Frame—This frame focused on civilians all over the world who were directly or indirectly affected by the Pearl Harbor attack, such as Axis nations, Asian countries, and the U.S. allied countries. It focused on civilians who were directly or indirectly affected by the 9/11 attacks in the world. This frame also emphasized the reactions of private citizens.

11. Anti-War Frame—This frame focused on protesters who were against the invasion of Afghanistan and war, either in the United States, Japan, or abroad.

12. Loss Frame—This frame emphasized loss and grief, such as images of families who lost loved ones during combat, missions, or the 9/11 attacks, and other images related to funerals and memorial services. This frame also included orphans because showing orphans implied that their parents had died.

13. Mug Shots of Loss Frame—This frame focused on loss through mug shots (head and shoulder shots), such as pictures of soldiers who died during the war

and terrorists who died during the 9/11 attacks.

14. Enemy Symbols Frame—This frame focused on symbols of enemies, and machines of war of enemies, which Japanese, American, or other allied militaries left on the battlefield. For example, this frame showed some fragments of machines of war, national flags, and mementos of opponent nations. It included Japanese swords, German helmets, and fragmented British airplanes.

15. Military of Opponents Frame—This frame focused on the military opponents of Americans and Japanese.

16. Military of Allies' Opponents—This frame focused on the military of the allies' opponents of Americans and Japanese—their machines of war, such as weaponry, troops, arsenals, aircraft, battleships, and soldiers whose faces are not identified.

17. Personal face of Opponents' Military Frame—This frame focused on the humanization of the military of opponents by showing the faces of the soldiers fighting against Americans and Japanese.

18. Prisoners of War—This frame focused on prisoners of war, showing soldiers who surrendered to the Japanese or to the U.S. military.

19. Victims and Casualties Frame—This frame focused on the victims of the 9/11 attacks and the casualties of war. This frame included only victims who were injured or dead.

20. Media Self-Reference Frame—This frame focused on pictures of journalists who were covering the war or the 9/11 attacks.

21. Landscape Frame—This frame showed landscapes of nations primarily in aerial photos where the Japanese military invaded or where U.S. military fought. The main purpose of these pictures was to show areas where military action took place. This frame was not combined with any of the other frames.

22. Other—The other category included images that did not fit into any of the previously defined categories.

The frames defined below were used only for the *New York Times* and *Asahi Shimbun* in 2001.

23. Arabs and Muslims Frame—This frame focused on racial or regional problems that occurred among Arab-Americans and Muslim-Americans after the 9/11 attacks in the United States. This frame also emphasized American human dimensions.

24. Anti-U.S. Frame—This frame focused on anti-U.S. movements either in the United States, Japan, or abroad.

25. U.S. Firefighters Frame—This frame focused on firefighters and emergency workers who were on the scene on the day of and following September 11.

26. Security Frame—This frame focused on airport security and other security measures after the 9/11 attacks.

27. Terrorist Frame—This frame focused on images of perceived enemies, such as photographs of Osama bin Laden and the individuals who carried out the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon.

Composition. This study also examined the compositional elements used to construct the photography. Compositional elements such as proximity, size, placement, and camera angles of photos were also measured (Coleman, 2006; Hoffman & Wallach, 2007).

The proximity of photography was measured by long, mid-range, and close-up shots. The implied distance between the subject and the viewer determines proximity. When a picture is taken from a long distance away that shows a complete image, viewers are given a context for the people or objects in the photo. A long shot provides readers with information about a scene as a whole. A mid-range shot shows subjects as well as a background. A close-up shot shows details of a subject or an object. According to Von Buseck (2007), “If the viewer felt closer than what would be considered a comfortable physical distance from a person”, then the photograph was regarded as a close-up shot.

Coleman (2006) and Wanta (1988) noted that a large news picture increases the viewers’ awareness of news more than a small picture. Also, viewers remember news with large pictures more often than news with small pictures. In this study, when a picture covered more than 40% of the page, it was coded as a dominant photo. When a picture covered from 7 to 40% of a page, it was coded as a semi-dominant photo. When a picture covered less than 7% of a page of a newspaper, it was coded as a small photo.

The layout of pictures in a newspaper is very important. Simply changing the placement of a news photograph can make a difference in the viewers’ perception of the importance of an issue. In this study, when a picture was published on the front page of either the morning or the evening edition of a newspaper, it was coded as a front-page

photo. When a picture was published in the front section(s) or front half of either the morning or the evening edition of a newspaper, it was categorized as a front-half photo and, when it was published in the back section(s) or back half of the newspaper, it was categorized as a back-half photo.

When a picture was taken from an obviously lower point than a subject, it was coded as a low-angle photo. When a picture was taken from an obviously higher point than a subject, it was coded as a high-angle photo. High-angle pictures included aerial photographs. When a subject of a picture was taken from almost the same, slightly lower, or slightly higher point, it was categorized as an equal-angle photo. Messaris (1992) noted that using a high-angle shot makes a subject less powerful but that using a low-angle shot makes a subject more powerful.

Analysis

The researcher was the primary coder. To determine intercoder reliability, the researcher trained a second coder. The second coder examined 10% of the total sample for both newspapers for both time periods. Scott's pi was used to determine intercoder reliability. The formula is as follows:

$$\text{pi} = \frac{\% \text{ observed agreement} - \% \text{ expected agreement}}{1 - \% \text{ expected agreement}}$$

The overall reliability was .92 across all categories. Three of the variables measured had a perfect Scott's pi of 1, and the other six ranged from .78 to .98. All variables measured had an acceptable level of intercoder reliability. The intercoder reliability for each variable is listed in Appendix A. The researcher analyzed the data using SPSS, a statistical software program. Independent sample *t*-tests analyses were

used to test for statistical differences.

Chapter IV

Results

The primary objective of this study was to determine what frames were used and what frames were dominant in the photographic coverage in *Asahi Shimbun* and the *New York Times* of the bombing of Pearl Harbor and its aftermath and the 9/11 terrorist attacks. This study also considered compositional elements of the news photographs. By examining the news photographs, this study explored how *Asahi Shimbun* and the *New York Times* framed the attack on Pearl Harbor and the first few months of World War II and the 9/11 terrorist attacks.

The author obtained and examined 934 news photographs from *Asahi Shimbun*, published between December 9, 1941, and March 31, 1942, and 1,062 news photographs from the *New York Times*, published between December 8, 1941, and March 31, 1942. In addition, the author obtained and examined 1,013 news photographs from the *New York Times*, published between September 12, 2001, and October 7, 2001, and 274 news photographs from *Asahi Shimbun*, published between September 12, 2001, and October 6, 2001.

The study identified 27 different frames in *Asahi Shimbun* and the *New York Times* of which 5 were applicable only to the 9/11 time period. Appendix A includes a listing and description of each of the frames.

The study found 1,200 different frames in the 934 news photographs that *Asahi Shimbun* published during the Pearl Harbor time period. Slightly more than two-thirds (658) of the photos were one-dimensional in that they had only one frame, 258 photos

had two separate frames, and 18 photos had three separate frames.

Similarly, most of the 1,062 news photos published in *The New York Times* during the Pearl Harbor time period had only one frame. The paper published 874 photos that had a single frame, 181 photos that had two separate frames, and 3 photos that had three separate frames. The total number of frames in the photo coverage in the *New York Times* was 1,257.

Overview: Descriptive Analysis of Frames in the Pearl Harbor Period

This section provides a descriptive analysis of the visual framing in the two newspapers during the Pearl Harbor period in late 1941 and early 1942. Table 1 shows the results for all the frames that appeared in *Asahi Shimbun* and the *New York Times*.

Table 1
Frames in Asahi Shimbun and the New York Times in 1941-1942

Frames	<i>Asahi</i> (n = 934)	%	<i>Times</i> (n = 1,062)	%
<u>Military</u>				
Overall Military	323	34.6	178	16.8
Allies' Military	6	0.6	48	4.5
Patriotic Symbols	109	11.7	17	1.6
<u>Humanization</u>				
Human Dimension	87	9.3	206	19.4
Human Dimension/Japanese Americans	0	0.0	7	0.7
Personal Face of Military	120	12.8	149	14.0
Personal Face of Allies' Military	6	0.6	72	6.8
<u>International Human Dimension</u>				
Asia	46	4.9	10	0.9
Allies	3	0.3	66	6.2
Other Countries	0	0.0	4	0.4
<u>Politics</u>				
Political	42	4.5	56	5.3
Allies' Political	23	2.5	41	3.9
<u>Violence of War</u>				
Violence/Destruction	129	13.8	128	12.0
Loss	32	3.4	12	1.1
Mug Shots of Loss	50	5.4	20	1.9
Victims/Casualties	0	0.0	14	1.3
<u>Portrayal of Opponents' Military</u>				
Military of Opponents	43	4.6	22	2.1
Military of Allies' Opponents	44	4.7	5	0.5
Enemy Symbols	51	5.5	36	3.4
<u>Portrayal of Opponents</u>				
Personal Face of Opponents' Military	3	0.3	4	0.4
Prisoners of War	20	2.1	5	0.5
Political	0	0.0	8	0.8
Allies' Political	3	0.3	6	0.6
Human Dimension	1	0.1	2	0.2
International Human Dimension	2	0.2	3	0.3
Loss	1	0.1	1	0.1
Mug Shots of Loss	0	0.0	1	0.1
Victims/Casualties	0	0.0	2	0.2
Landscape	74	7.9	62	5.8
Anti-War	0	0.0	1	0.1
Media Self-Reference	0	0.0	4	0.4
Other	15	1.6	62	5.9

Note. Percentages in the major frames in the table add to more than 100% because some pictures contained more than one frame.

For the analysis, as shown in Table 2, the researcher combined the individual frames into seven major sets of frames. The remaining frames were excluded from the quantitative analysis, but are briefly discussed in this chapter.

Military Frames in the Pearl Harbor Period. The military set of frames was the most dominant set of frames in the photo coverage in *Asahi Shimbun* during the Pearl Harbor period, and the second dominant set of frames in the *New York Times*. As shown in Table 2, military frames—overall military, the allies’ military, and patriotic symbols frames—were found in 438 news photographs or 46.9% of all of the pictures in *Asahi Shimbun*. The military set of frames numbered 243 in the *New York Times*, accounting for 22.9% of all of its photos.

A military subframe that was prominent in *Asahi Shimbun*’s photo coverage in 1941 and early 1942 was the overall military frame of Japan. There were 323 pictures (34.6% of its total) of the Japanese military that showed military operations and machines of war, such as weaponry, troops, aircraft, battleships, and soldiers whose faces were not identified. Many of the photographs of the Japanese military showed the backs of Japanese soldiers. Some of the pictures were taken just one foot behind soldiers by embedded photojournalists. A common generalized picture in *Asahi Shimbun* was an image of Japanese soldiers in tanks or other vehicles on the move somewhere in Asia, which emphasized the progression of the Japanese military throughout Asia.

Also, when *Asahi Shimbun* showed Japanese military aircraft, with the Japanese national flag on the side of planes or Japanese battleships, it often did so to emphasize the strength of the Japanese military.

Table 2
Major Frames in Asahi Shimbun and the New York Times in 1941-1942

Frames	<i>Asahi</i>		<i>Times</i>	
	(<i>n</i> = 934)	%	(<i>n</i> = 1,062)	%
<u>Military</u>	438	46.9	243	22.9
Overall Military	323	34.6	178	16.8
Allies' Military	6	0.6	48	4.5
Patriotic Symbols	109	11.7	17	1.6
<u>Humanization</u>	213	22.7	434	40.9
Human Dimension	87	9.3	206	19.4
Human Dimension/Japanese Americans	0	0.0	7	0.7
Personal Face of Military	120	12.8	149	14.0
Personal Face of Allies' Military	6	0.6	72	6.8
<u>International Human Dimension</u>	49	5.2	80	7.5
Asia	46	4.9	10	0.9
Allies	3	0.3	66	6.2
Other Countries	0		4	0.4
<u>Politics</u>	65	7.0	97	9.2
Political	42	4.5	56	5.3
Allies' Political	23	2.5	41	3.9
<u>Violence of War</u>	211	22.6	174	16.3
Violence/Destruction	129	13.8	128	12.0
Loss	32	3.4	12	1.1
Mug Shots of Loss	50	5.4	20	1.9
Victims/Casualties	0	0.0	14	1.3
<u>Portrayal of Opponents' Military</u>	138	14.8	63	6.0
Military of Opponents	43	4.6	22	2.1
Military of Allies' Opponents	44	4.7	5	0.5
Enemy Symbols	51	5.5	36	3.4
<u>Portrayal of Opponents</u>	30	3.1	32	3.2
Personal Face of Opponents' Military	3	0.3	4	0.4
Prisoners of War	20	2.1	5	0.5
Politicians	3	0.3	14	1.4
Soldiers/Civilians Loss ^a	4	0.4	9	0.9

Note. Percentages in the major frames in the table add to more than 100% because some pictures contained more than one frame.

^aSoldiers/Civilians Loss frame consisted of Human Dimension, International Human Dimension, Loss, Mug Shots of Loss, and Victims/Casualties related to opponent countries.

Photo captions in *Asahi Shimbun* often referred to the Japanese Air Force as eagles. In contrast, the U.S. and British militaries were called cowards. Pictures of the Japanese military often were long shots of battleships or airplanes with accompanying explanatory captions about their high performance.

Asahi Shimbun had six frames (0.6% of its total) in the allies' military frame. These images were of the Thai military, which cooperated with the Japanese military in Asia after Thailand was pressed into an alliance with Japan on December 21, 1941. On January 25, *Asahi Shimbun* published two pictures of Thai tanks and cow-drawn carriage troops, with the photo caption that read: "The Thailand military cooperated in a Burma operation."

Asahi Shimbun had 109 photographs (11.7% of its total) that were related to patriotic symbols of Japan. These news photographs showed patriotic symbols, such as the Japanese national flag, the Emperor of Japan, Japanese royal families, and Japanese Shinto shrines. Before World War II, Japan was a constitutional monarchy with the Japanese Emperor as its head. He was superior to the Japanese Prime Minister, the highest ranking Japanese Supreme Court justice, and the head of the Japanese military. During World War II, the Emperor was the supreme commander of the Japanese military. Drea (1998) noted: "By reviewing troops, attending ceremonies, and seeing off departing servicemen, he not only symbolized the legitimacy of Japan's war but also lent imperial sanction to the conflict" (p. 175). On December 9, 1941, the headline on the front page read: "Japan declares war against the U.S. and Britain" with an imperial edict on the same page. At the time, the imperial edict was a significant message to Japanese citizens.

Typical ways of showing patriotism in *Asahi Shimbun* were to use the royal families, the Japanese national flag, and Japanese civilians gathered in front of the Emperor's palace. Also, *Asahi Shimbun* often combined the patriotic symbols frame and the human dimension frames of Japan. On February 16, 1942, *Asahi Shimbun* reported the surrender of Singapore. The newspaper applauded the military for obtaining an important base in Asia. In the days that followed, *Asahi Shimbun* showed Japanese citizens celebrating the victory. These pictures often were combined with Japanese national flags and Japanese human dimensions.

Although the set of military frames dominated *Asahi Shimbun* in 1941 and 1942, the same set of frames was the second set of dominant frames in the *New York Times* published in 1941 and 1942. In the *New York Times*, the set of military frames had 243 news photographs (22.9% of its total) that contained 178 photographs (16.8% of its total) photographs of the overall military frame. The *New York Times* also showed U.S. military operations and machines of war, such as weaponry, troops, aircraft, and battleships. However, unlike *Asahi Shimbun*, which had many pictures of the Japanese soldiers' faces that were not clear, most of the photos of soldiers in the *New York Times* that were mid-range shots showed their faces. Since their faces were visible, these photos were categorized under the personal face of military frame rather than under the military frame.

Many of the Japanese soldiers' faces in *Asahi Shimbun* were not recognizable because they were taken from behind, from a long distance away, or with helmets or dark shadows covering their faces. The fact that Japanese soldiers' faces were not

recognizable in photos may explain why the overall military in *Asahi Shimbun* (323) is higher than the overall military in the *New York Times* (178).

Similar to the pictures in *Asahi Shimbun*, the *New York Times* also published long shots, in which whole images of the U.S. or allied battleships or airplanes with accompanying explanatory captions about their high performance.

The *New York Times* had 48 photographs (4.5% of its total) that were related to the militaries of U.S. allies. Allies of the United States that appeared in the *New York Times* were the following countries: Britain, France, the Netherlands, the Soviet Union, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Iceland, Norway, Mexico, Brazil, Cuba, and the Philippines. These pictures emphasized the strong ties with the allies, especially with Britain.

Asahi Shimbun published 109 photographs that depicted Japanese patriotic symbols. In comparison, the *New York Times* had only 17 photographs (1.6% of its total) depicting American patriotic symbols, all of which were of the American flag. These photos often appeared with American machines of war, American military officers, and American or allies' political figures. A possible explanation for the lack of patriotic coverage in the *New York Times* might be because this study excluded the picture section in the *New York Times* and the *New York Times Magazine*, which is only published on Sunday. Both published many visual images of the war, and most were graphic and contained clear messages.

Overall, the *New York Times* ran fewer pictures of the country's military and its patriotic symbols and more pictures of the militaries of its allies than *Asahi Shimbun* did.

In other words, *Asahi Shimbun* emphasized Japanese military and Japanese patriotic symbols but put less emphasis on its alliance with Germany and Italy.

Humanization Frames in the Pearl Harbor Period. The set of humanization frames led to a perspective of the personal side of war rather than political or international complications.

Asahi Shimbun published 213 pictures (22.7% of its total) related to the set of Japanese humanization frames. That included the human dimension frame, the personal face of military frame, and the personal face of the militaries of Japanese allies. The humanization frames were virtually tied with the violence of war frames (211 photos or 22.6% of its total) as the second most dominant set of frames in *Asahi Shimbun*. The human dimension frame of Japan had 87 photographs (9.3% of its total) that showed Japanese civilians' support for and contribution to the war and wartime defense. Japanese civilians were often photographed when they were raising both hands—Banzai—which is a pose indicating support for the Emperor or the war effort.

As shown in Table 2, the study showed that 120 or 12.8% of the paper's total number of Pearl Harbor-related photographs depicted the personal face of the Japanese military. The personal face frame was often combined with the international human dimension of Asia frame, and typically the frames depicted Japanese soldiers' kindness and intimacy with locals in Asian countries where Japan had troops. Embedded photojournalists who traveled with the Japanese military captured the daily lives of Japanese soldiers, such as talking with locals, eating unfamiliar food, or bathing outside in various countries in Asia.

Asahi Shimbun published only 6 pictures (.6% of its total) that showed the personal face of Japan's military allies. Thai and German soldiers were the subjects in this frame. On January 3, 1942, *Asahi Shimbun* published a picture of Thailand's infantry units with a photo caption that read: "The march of the debonair Thailand infantry units." On January 28, 1942, *Asahi Shimbun* ran a small picture of German soldiers who tried to escape from a prison in Britain. The article explained that, although they pretended to be Dutch soldiers, the escape attempt failed. Unlike the *New York Times*, when *Asahi Shimbun* depicted the German military, it did not always emphasize the cooperation and strong relationship with the Japanese military.

The humanization frames—the American human dimension, the personal face of the military, and the personal face of the allies' military—were the dominant set of frames in the *New York Times*' photo coverage of Pearl Harbor and the beginning of World War II, with the 434 humanized photos accounting for almost 41% of its total photo coverage. As noted earlier, this finding shown in Table 2 was in contrast to the dominant set of frames found in *Asahi Shimbun*, which was the military set of frames.

The *New York Times* ran 206 photographs (19.4% of its total) that portrayed the human dimension in the United States. American civilians were featured in wartime defense news. Photos on wartime defense instructed readers on how to protect themselves during air raids and how to save food. Photos showed the contributions of women who worked for the Red Cross and factory workers who made military products. Pictures of star athletes who were recruited by the military were also typical of the American human dimension frame. Most of the time, the pictures showed smiling

athletes shaking hands with military officers. The *New York Times* often depicted the human dimension frame by showing survivors, whose ships had been attacked. When the *New York Times* reported on the American human dimension of military news, it occasionally carried a series of four to six pictures on the same page. It should be noted here that research has shown that the publication of a series of newspaper photos about an event might increase reader understanding of the event.

The *New York Times* published seven photographs related to Japanese-Americans. After the bombing of Pearl Harbor, the *New York Times* ran photos showing Japanese and Japanese-Americans in the United States, such as Japanese-Americans who were sent to internment camps. For example, on December 10, 1941, the *New York Times* showed Japanese-Americans who were sent to internment camps. The pictures showed American sailors surrounding Japanese-Americans. The photo caption read: "ROUND-UP OF ALIENS IN THE UNITED STATES AND ENGLAND." However, at the same time, the *New York Times* was referring to Japanese-Americans as aliens, it also reported events that might have led to tolerance and understanding of Japanese-Americans in the United States. On December 15, 1941, a picture showed the First Lady greeting Japanese-Americans; both had smiles on their faces. The photo's main caption read: "MRS. ROOSEVELT GREETING AMERICAN-BORN JAPANESE" with a subhead that read: "At Tacoma on Saturday when she warned against uncalled-for suspicion of them." On March 24, 1942, a picture showed Japanese descendants with smiles on their faces who were going to internment camps by train. The photo caption read "CONCENTRATION CAMP SPECIAL." In the article, a Japanese-American man commented that he did not

expect such fine treatment at the internment camp.

The *New York Times* ran 149 photographs (14% of its total) related to the personal face of the U.S. military and 72 photographs (6.8% of its total) related to the personal face of U.S. allies. Similar to the pictures in *Asahi Shimbun*, the photos showed the daily life of soldiers. Embedded photojournalists featured the daily routines of soldiers and life in the military. U.S. soldiers often appeared with allied soldiers, such as American soldiers with British or Irish soldiers, or American and British generals discussing joint military missions. One picture emphasized Japanese-American soldiers' contribution to the United States. On January 22, 1942, the *New York Times* showed Japanese-American soldiers' faces during a military mission. The photo caption read: "AMERICANS OF JAPANESE DESCENT IN U.S. ARMY."

The following countries appeared in the *New York Times* as the personal face of U.S. allies: Canada, Britain, France, the Netherlands, Mexico, Brazil, Australia, and the Soviet Union. On February 5, 1942, the *New York Times* showed Latin-American aviators standing on a huge map of Central and South America. The picture visually explained the alliance of the United States with Central and South American countries.

International Human Dimension Frames in the Pearl Harbor Period. As shown in Table 2, the international human dimension frame accounted for only 5.2% (49 photos) of the Pearl Harbor-related photos in *Asahi Shimbun*, including 46 pictures from Asia and 3 pictures from countries allied with Japan. The international human dimension frame showed the following places: Burma, Malaysia (Johore), the Philippines (Manila), the Netherlands Indies (Borneo, Sumatra, Bali), Vietnam, Thailand, Germany, England,

British Empire (Hong Kong), the United States, Papua, and British New Guinea.

As noted above, local Asians appeared with Japanese soldiers in friendly settings. In the *New York Times*, 80 or 7.5% of its total photographs portrayed an international human dimension. Most of the pictures that were part of this frame (66 or 6.2% of all of its Pearl Harbor photos) portrayed the human dimension in countries allied with the United States. The countries were: the Soviet Union, Australia, China, Britain, Brazil, Ireland, Panama, the Netherlands, Argentina, the Philippines, Finland, Romania, Switzerland, Paraguay, Burma, and the Netherlands Indies. The pictures often captured civilians' wartime hardship or war effort. For example, the *New York Times* showed volunteers in Swaziland preparing glasses for prisoners of war on January 4, 1942. A February 4, 1942, picture showed a British woman donating her wedding ring to the military. Some pictures highlighted some events that might have played into anti-Japanese sentiment. In a January 16, 1942 photo, the *New York Times* showed people in Argentina playing a game—throwing a ball at a picture of the Japanese Emperor's face. On February 8, 1942, the front page of the *New York Times* showed a picture of Burmese who had lost their homes in a Japanese air raid.

Politics Frames in the Pearl Harbor Period. Only 65 or 7% of the total frames in *Asahi Shimbun* concerned politics. As shown in Table 2, the politics frame included 42 photos (4.5% of its total) of Japanese politicians and 23 photos (2.5% of its total) of politicians from countries allied with Japan. Most images of Japanese political figures were of Hideki Tojo, who was Prime Minister of Japan at the time. On February 1, 1942, the paper ran a picture of Hitler delivering a speech before an audience in Berlin. The

photo caption read: Fuehrer Hitler praised the Japanese imperial military. On March 17, 1942, a picture showed Japanese Prime Minister Tojo with the Manchurian ambassador. This photo emphasized the amicable relationship between Japan and what was then known as Manchuria, an area in northeastern China that bordered Russia and that had been taken over by Japan.

The political frame in the *New York Times* included 97 photographs (9.2% of its total). As shown in Table 2, about two-thirds of the photos were in the American political frame, with the remainder in the allies' political frame.

The *New York Times* often published photos of President Franklin D. Roosevelt and British Prime Minister Winston Churchill. Politicians in the allied political subframe that appeared in the *New York Times* included politicians from the following countries: the Netherlands, Britain, the Soviet Union, Poland, Mexico, Yugoslavia, and Canada.

Violence of War Frames in the Pearl Harbor Period. The set of violence of war frames included four frames—violence/destruction, loss, mug shots of loss, and victims/casualties of war frames. As shown in Table 2, in *Asahi Shimbun*, the set of violence of war frames was comprised of 211 pictures (22.6% of its total). Of the 129 photos published by *Asahi Shimbun*, 116 depicted violence or destruction in Asia. Only 10 pictures showed the damage to Pearl Harbor. On January 1, 1942, the newspaper ran very large pictures of the bombing of Pearl Harbor on the front page and the third page. Most of the pictures were aerial shots of the bombing of Pearl Harbor, showing the destruction to the U.S. fleet and military installations and the fires caused by the explosions. This was the first time *Asahi Shimbun* ran pictures of the bombing of Pearl

Harbor. The paper also ran several long-range aerial photos of warships and planes as well as non-military ships/boats, some of which were damaged and some of which were not damaged, to illustrate how successful the attack had been. These illustrative photos fit into four frames—military, violence of war, portrayal of opponents' military, and other frames. Since photos of non-military ships and boats did not fit into the military and the portrayal of opponents' military, they were categorized in either the violence/destruction frame or the other.

On March 31, 1942, *Asahi Shimbun* published a series of pictures showing the last moments of the sinking of a British warship. The five pictures showed the damaged British ship from different angles until the ship was shown sinking beneath the waves.

The loss frame had 32 photographs related to the loss and grief of Japanese, such as Japanese family members who lost loved ones or Japanese funerals. On January 4, 1942, the paper ran a picture that showed a Japanese pilot who died in the Pearl Harbor attack and, on the same page, it ran a photo of his wife and child. He had a smile on his face and stood in front of a Japanese fighter plane. The photo caption read: "Meet a heroic death in action" and "a great achievement of Kamikaze in the world." Kamikaze, which means "divine wind," symbolized the power of the Japanese Air Force. On March 16, 1942, the newspaper ran a photo of a woman who lost her son on the battlefield and referred to her as "the mother of a martial god." This kind of praise for dead soldiers and their families was often found in *Asahi Shimbun*. By the end of March, *Asahi Shimbun* was frequently publishing pictures of war orphans. *Asahi Shimbun* emphasized their self-sacrificing attitudes and their loyalty to Japan.

Asahi Shimbun published 50 mug shots of loss. This loss frame, which consisted of mug shots or small head and shoulder shots, included only mug shots of Japanese who died on the battlefield. Most were soldiers, but one of the pictures was of an embedded journalist who died on the battlefield. On March 11, 1942, *Asahi Shimbun* ran nine mug shots of dead soldiers that accompanied articles that discussed their characters and their careers. The same page had complimentary commentary about their achievements and a picture of a soldier's house with his parents' mug shots. The photo caption read: "The flowers of Pearl Harbor; reports of when nine martial gods were alive." It is important to note that *Asahi Shimbun* did not publish a single picture showing Japanese injuries and casualties.

In the *New York Times*, as shown in Table 2, the set of violence of war frames had 174 photographs (16.3% of its total). The *New York Times* published 128 photos that fit into the violence and destruction frame: 50 pictures taken in the United States or near its coastal waters, 44 pictures taken in Asia, and 27 taken in Europe or in the Atlantic Ocean. In addition to the United States, the violence of war frame included the following places: Malaysia (Penang), British Empire (Hong Kong), Burma (Rangoon), and the Philippines (Manila), the Soviet Union, Brazil, Paraguay, the Netherlands Indies, and Australia.

On December 17, 1941, the *New York Times* published photos of the bombing of Pearl Harbor. The front page showed the U.S. Army planes in flames. The photo caption read: "U.S. ARMY PLANES AFIRE AS JAPANESE RAIDED HAWAII." On the same day, photos on other pages showed the overview and aftermath of Pearl Harbor, a Japanese airplane that had crashed, American nurses, and victims in Hawaii. The caption

read: “FIRST PICTURES OF DAMAGE IN HAWAII IN FIRST AERIAL ATTACK ON U.S. TERRITORY.” The *New York Times* also ran a series of pictures showing the aftermath of Pearl Harbor on February 1, 1942. The coverage showed the sinking of the U.S battleship, the Arizona, with the photo caption of “PEARL HARBOR REMINDER.”

The frame also contained explanatory pictures of warships that were destroyed by the Japanese military. Unlike *Asahi Shimbun*, which frequently displayed photos of U.S. or British warships attacked by the Japanese military, the *New York Times* published only seven pictures that identified the warships that the U.S. military destroyed.

There were very few photos in the loss frame in the *New York Times*. The 12 photos in this frame depicted members of the military who gave their lives, funeral scenes, or American family members who lost loved ones. On December 25, 1941, the *New York Times* ran a picture of a group of five young American pilots who were killed in action at Pearl Harbor while shooting at Japanese bombers. The photo caption read: “LAST FLIGHT FOR SEVEN JAPANESE PLANES OVER HAWAII.” On January 30, 1942, a picture showed a couple who lost their son looking at pictures of him. The photo caption read: “NAME OF THEIR SON WRITTEN HIGH AMONG NATIONS HEROES” and “first Congressional Medal of Honor of the war has been awarded posthumously.” Another picture was of parents accepting a medal on behalf of their son who died in battle.

The *New York Times* ran only 20 mug shots of dead servicemen. Most of the photos in the mug shots of loss frame were accompanied by articles and photo captions that provided information about their careers, how they died, and their families. Most

pictures in the mug shots of loss frame emphasized heroic achievements and the grief of loss.

The *New York Times* published mug shots, such as a picture of a rear admiral accompanied by the headline, “KILLED IN HAWAII,” on December 11, 1941, and three pictures of soldiers with the headline, “U.S. FLIERS CITED FOR BRAVELY IN ACTION IN PACIFIC,” on December 13, 1941. On December 30, 1941, the *New York Times* showed mug shots of a soldier who died and his wife; the two pictures appeared next to each other. The photo caption read: “Flier, Shot Down, Resumed Battle In Another Plane as Wife Watched.”

When *Asahi Shimbun* and the *New York Times* presented mug shots of people who were alive, they used the pictures in a similar way. Mug shots were used with stories about military commanders of the country’s military as well as military commanders of their opponents, and soldiers who were decorated or who had done a meritorious deed.

Although *Asahi Shimbun* did not run any pictures showing Japanese injuries and casualties, the *New York Times* did have a few photos in the victims and casualties frame. The 14 images in this frame were not graphic, but injuries and casualties were visually obvious in the newspaper. On January 1, 1942, the *New York Times* ran a series of pictures of victims of the bombing of Pearl Harbor. The main photo caption read: “AMERICAN WOUNDED AND EVACUEES RETURN HOME FROM THE BATTLEGROUND OF HAWAII.” The pictures were of wounded soldiers on beds, a woman wearing a bandage around her arm, American nurses, and wounded British soldiers. On February 3, 1942, one of the pictures of the aftermath of Pearl Harbor

showed U.S. casualties. The long-shot photo showed some people in a damaged car. The photo caption read: “A pleasure car riddled by shrapnel. Three occupants were killed.” On January 2, 1942, the *New York Times* published a picture of a victim of the Nazis. The picture was taken over the shoulders of Nazis and showed a hostage who stood in front of a pole. The photo caption read: “THE NAZIS PREPARE TO EXECUTE A 15-YEAR-OLD HOSTAGE” and “A young sailor, picked up in Brittany, is tied to a post just before facing a firing squad in occupied France.”

Portrayal of Opponents’ Military Frames in the Pearl Harbor Period. In *Asahi Shimbun*, the set of portrayal of the opponents’ military frames—the military of opponents, military of allies’ opponents, and enemy symbols—had 138 pictures (14.8% of its total). As shown in Table 2, the frames included 43 pictures in the military of opponents frame, 44 pictures of the military of allies’ opponents frame, and 51 pictures in the enemy symbols frame. As noted in the discussion on the violence of war frame, *Asahi Shimbun* often published pictures of U.S. or British warships that were attacked or destroyed by the Japanese military. In most cases, the newspaper showed only pictures that were taken before the warships were attacked.

The enemy symbols frame occasionally included Japanese soldiers. The pictures showed Japanese soldiers with enemy symbols, such as fragments of U.S. aircraft or British tanks left in Asia. On March 21, 1942, *Asahi Shimbun* showed the Japanese military marching into Hong Kong and removing the statue of the British king from its pedestal. The photo caption read: “the symbol of the decline of Britain.”

As shown in Table 2, the *New York Times* had 63 (6% of its total photos) in the

portrayal of opponents' military frame. Of these, 22 pictures were in the military of opponents frame, five pictures were in the military of allies' opponents frame, and 36 pictures were in the enemy symbols frame. On February 11, 1942, the *New York Times* showed Nazi troops marching in a street in Norway. The photo caption read: "THE CAMERA RECORDS NORWEGIANS IN THE ACT OF DEFYING THE NAZIS." The article explained that, when the German command came to a city near Oslo, only a few of Norwegians responded, and most of them turned their backs on the invaders.

Similar to *Asahi Shimbun*, the *New York Times* also ran photographs showing American soldiers with symbols of the enemy, such as the American soldiers holding German helmets or standing in front of Japanese tanks left behind in Asia. On December 11, 1941, the *New York Times* showed a cherry blossom tree, a gift from Japan that had been intentionally sawed. On December 28, 1941, the *New York Times* published a photo of the emergency rations of the Japanese military. The photo caption explained that the rations were found in a disabled Japanese airplane that was used in the bombing of Pearl Harbor. On March 24, 1942, a picture on the front page of the *New York Times* showed a colonel presenting a Japanese sword to President Roosevelt. The photo caption explained that the sword was taken from a dead Japanese soldier.

Portrayal of Opponents Frames in the Pearl Harbor period. As shown in Table 2, *Asahi Shimbun* published only 30 pictures that related to the United States and its allies, and the *New York Times*, similarly, published only 32 photos that related to Japan and its allies. This set of frames, which included the personal face of opponents' military frame, the prisoner of war frame, the politicians frame, and the soldiers/civilians

loss frame, provided a humanized depiction of the Japanese and their allies in the *New York Times* and the Americans and their allies in *Asahi Shimbun*. The soldiers/civilians loss frame primarily depicted the human dimension and loss related to the opponent's country.

Asahi Shimbun ran 5 pictures of American prisoners of war and 15 pictures of British and Australian prisoners of War. Most of these pictures clearly showed the faces of the prisoners. *Asahi Shimbun* published pictures that appeared to show the Japanese military treating prisoners of war well. On January 19, 1942, a photograph showed American prisoners of war on Wake Island who were smiling as they stood with Japanese soldiers. The photo caption read: "American prisoners of war were pleased by Japanese invitation." On February 20, 1942, *Asahi Shimbun* reported that the Japanese military conquered Singapore, and the front page showed a picture of British prisoners of war carrying a white flag and the Union Jack. The photo caption read: "The British commander surrendered to Japan." On March 25, 1942, *Asahi Shimbun* showed American prisoners of war speaking into microphones to make recordings to send to their families. The photo caption read: "Voice messages to home country. I am happy in Japan." The article also reported what Americans said, such as they appreciated the Japanese, they missed their families, and they bore a grudge against the U.S. commanders who caused the war.

Asahi Shimbun published only three pictures in the politicians' frame, which were pictures of British political figures. On December 12, 1942, a picture showed British Prime Minister Winston Churchill walking on a British warship, the Prince of Wales. The

photo caption read: “Now, the pride of Britain sank to the bottom of the ocean.” The picture was small and was run on the second page of the evening edition. On February 20, 1942, *Asahi Shimbun* showed a semi-dominant picture of the Japanese Lieutenant General and the British commander meeting at the same table. The photo caption read: “The remarkable triumph, the surrender of Singapore” and “The British commander accepted unconditional surrender.” On March 19, 1942, *Asahi Shimbun* reported that Japan and the Netherlands concluded a cease-fire agreement in the Netherlands Indies. A picture showed Japanese and Dutch commanders were shown standing and facing the camera.

As shown in Table 2, *Asahi Shimbun* ran only four pictures in the soldiers and civilians loss frame. On February 8, 1942, a picture showed Japanese soldiers saluting in front of the graves of British soldiers in Asia. The photo caption read: “The Japanese soldiers made crosses for the graves and saluted the British soldiers who died in action.” The paper ran only one photo depicting American loss—a picture of a U.S. soldier.

As noted earlier, *The New York Times* also did not run many pictures—only 32—that portrayed its opponents. It published four pictures of the personal face of the opponents’ military frame. On December 29, 1941, the paper ran a Japanese soldier’s picture. It clearly showed the face of a Japanese soldier who was wearing a flight uniform and saluting. The photo caption read: “Geared for action.” On March 21, 1942, the *New York Times* had two pictures that were almost the same as the ones *Asahi Shimbun* published on February 20, 1942. The pictures showed British soldiers carrying a white flag and the Union Jack, and a conference scene with the Japanese Lieutenant

General and the British commander at the same table after the British Army surrendered to Japan in Singapore. The pictures were small and were taken at slightly different angles than those published in *Asahi Shimbun*. The photo caption read: “JAPANESE PICTURE OF THE SURRENDER OF SINGAPORE” and “Escorted by a Japanese officer, the British delegation heads for the headquarters of Lieut. Gen. Tomoyuki Yamashita to discuss the terms.” The caption also explained that the pictures, which were approved by the Japanese censor, were sent out of Tokyo and were made available through a neutral nation to Associated Press Radiophoto. *Asahi Shimbun* noted that the pictures were taken by their embedded journalists. This is the only instance during the Pearl Harbor period in which the researcher found that the *New York Times* and *Asahi Shimbun* published pictures that were provided by the same source.

The *New York Times* published five pictures in the prisoner of war frame. The prisoners of war were Germans and Italians. On January 22, 1942, the *New York Times* showed German prisoners of war who were crouched down on the ground with their heads bowed. The photo caption read: “Axis prisoners at a clearing center in the desert.” On February 19, 1942, the *New York Times* ran a picture of German prisoners. The picture clearly showed their solemn faces, and the photo caption read: “NAZI PRISONERS IN RUSSIA MAKE APPEAL FOR PEACE.” On February 25, 1942, the *New York Times* ran a picture of an archbishop visiting a prison camp for Italians and Germans located in the Middle East. The picture showed a German prisoner dressed in a German military uniform bowing to the archbishop.

The politicians frame had eight pictures of Japanese politicians and government

officers and six pictures of politicians whose countries were allies with Japan. On December 8, 1941, the *New York Times* published pictures showing the rush of Japanese consuls to dispose of some documents, and pictures of the consuls leaving the United States. The photo caption read: "Bonfire in Washington: Japanese lose no time in burning State papers on the ground of their embassy." On December 8, 1942, the *New York Times* ran a series of pictures under the headline: "The New War in the Pacific: Japanese and Chinese Reactions," which showed a Japanese consul in front of a bonfire. On the same page, the *New York Times* showed a picture of Chinese giving thumbs up in front of the building where the Japanese consulate was housed. On December 9, 1941, the *New York Times* showed a surprised Japanese consulate aide who was dressed in a tank top and surrounded by scattered papers. The photo caption read: "A consulate aide, lightly clad, is caught in the act of removing papers from a cabinet in his office at Chicago. Confidential papers by the consulate previously had been burned." And, on December 20, 1941, a picture of Nazi diplomats was published on the front page of the *New York Times*. The photo caption read: "Nazi Diplomats Are Sent To West Virginia Resort." The Nazi diplomat and his wife wore travel attire. On January 15, 1942, the *New York Times* showed a Nazi who was holding books to hide his face. The photo caption read: "NAZI SABOTEURS ON WAY TO FEDERAL PRISON." In the *New York Times* on January 20, 1942, a picture showed a Nazi minister and his wife both smiling with the photo caption: "A GERMAN EXODUS FROM MEXICO." The photo caption explained that the Nazi minister and his wife were going to White Sulphur Springs, WV, where they would be interned while awaiting repatriation. On February 7,

1942, the *New York Times* published a picture of a group of German, Italian, and Japanese political figures. The picture clearly showed their faces, and three of them looked concerned. The photo caption read: “A PARTNERSHIP BROKEN UP BY GOVERNMENT OF BOLIVIA” and explained that the Japanese ambassador, who was expelled immediately from Bolivia, was seen by the Italian Minister and the German envoy, who were also ordered to leave the country shortly.

The *New York Times* ran nine pictures related to the soldiers and civilians loss frame. On December 13, 1941, a *New York Times* photo showed Japanese civilians who were practicing civil defense techniques in Tokyo. The photo caption read: “Civil defense workers teaching women and children how to extinguish street fires during a recent test.” On January 31, 1941, the *New York Times* ran a picture taken from behind the body of a Japanese soldier who had fallen face down. The photo caption explained that the picture taken in the Malaysian jungle showed disabled Japanese tanks and the body of a Japanese soldier. On February 24, 1942, the *New York Times* reported on the military action of U.S. allies in Libya, and one of the pictures showed New Zealand soldiers kneeling down beside German soldiers who were lying on the ground. The photo caption read: “New Zealanders brave enemy fire to go to the rescue of two wounded Germans.”

Similar to the picture in *Asahi Shimbun*, on December 24, 1941, the *New York Times* published a picture of the burial of a Japanese soldier who died at Pearl Harbor. The picture showed American soldiers around a coffin. The photo caption read: “A Japanese flying officer who crashed during the attack is buried with military honors.” On

February 26, 1942, the *New York Times* published a mug shot of a Japanese commander who died on the battlefield. The photo caption read: “Admiral Shibuya Killed In Action Off Borneo.”

Minor Frames in the Pearl Harbor Period. As discussed above, the results showed that seven sets of major frames emerged—military, humanization, international human dimension, politics, violence of war, portrayal of opponents’ military, and portrayal of opponents. In addition to these major frames, four minor frames were found—landscape, anti-war, media self-reference, and other frames.

In *Asahi Shimbun*, the landscape frame had 74 pictures. Most of the landscape pictures were aerial photographs used to illustrate where the Japanese military had advanced in Asia. The landscape frame showed pictures taken in a number of countries, including China (Beijing), British Empire (Singapore, Hong Kong), Thailand, the Philippines (Manila), Malaysia (Johor Bahru), the Netherlands Indies (Celebes, Borneo, Java, Timor), Vietnam, Papua, British New Guinea, Burma (Rangoon), and the United States (Wake island).

The *New York Times* was similar to *Asahi Shimbun* in its use of landscape aerial photographs. Most were used to show where the American military was and where the Japanese military attacked. Landscape photographs that were published included the following: the Netherlands Indies (Celebes, Borneo, Sumatra, Tarakan island), the Philippines (Luzon), the United States (Guam), British Empire (Malta), Malaysia, Marshall islands (Wotje atoll), Kiribati (Gilbert islands), Dutch West Indies, and Burma (Rangoon).

The study found that during the Pearl Harbor period, *Asahi Shimbun* never ran photos about the newspaper or its journalists or anti-war photos that questioned Japan's decision to go to war or its conduct of the war, and that the *New York Times* rarely ran photos that fit into the media self-reference and anti-war frames. The *New York Times* ran four pictures depicting journalists who were covering the news. On January 30, 1942, the *New York Times* published a picture of an Associated Press war correspondent. The photo caption explained that he traveled about 100,000 miles with the British Navy.

After Congress voted to go to war with Japan, the *New York Times* did not run any photos of anti-war activity. The one anti-war picture that it did run related to a "no" vote in Congress to declaring war against Japan. On December 9, 1941, the *New York Times* showed Louise Rankin, who was a U.S. Representative from Montana, talking with a man at the door of a telephone booth. The photo caption read: "REPEATS HER ANTI-WAR VOTE" and "HOUSE VOTES WAR; MISS RANKIN 'NAY'." The article reported that the U.S. House of Representatives adopted a resolution declaring war against Japan. The resolution was carried by 388 votes just 40 minutes after it was offered.

The *New York Times* ran a story and photo on February 17, 1942, on the Japanese victory in Sumatra. The photo caption read: "JAPANESE WIN HOLD ON SUMATRA" and accompanied an aerial landscape picture of the Netherlands Indies. *Asahi Shimbun*, which was severely censored during World War II, never reported victories of the United States and its allies.

It should be noted that only 8 of the photos in the *New York Times* provided a

visual representation of the government's decision to send Japanese and Japanese-Americans living in the United States to internment camps. One photo, among the 62 photos in the other category, showed an internment camp that was under construction. Seven photos under Humanization frame showed Japanese and Japanese-Americans who were going to be confined in internment camps (See Table 1).

Overview: Descriptive Analysis of the 9/11 Frames

This section provides a descriptive analysis of the visual framing in the two newspapers in a 3 1/2 –week period after the 9/11 attacks. Table 3 shows the results for the all frames that appeared in *Asahi Shimbun* and the *New York Times*. Appendix A provides a list and description of the frames. As shown in Table 4, the researcher combined the individual frames into six major sets of frames. The remaining frames were excluded from the quantitative analysis, but are briefly discussed in this chapter.

The study found that most of the 1,013 news photos published in the *New York Times* in the 9/11 time period had only one frame. The paper published 898 photos that had a single frame, 109 photos that had two separate frames, and 6 photos that had three separate frames. The total number of frames in the photo coverage in the *New York Times* was 1,134.

The 274 news photos published in *Asahi Shimbun* had 274 frames. Similar to the *New York Times*, most of the photos (232) depicted only one frame, 39 photos had 2 frames, and 3 photos had 3 frames.

Violence of Terrorism Frames in 2001. In the analysis of the photo coverage during the period immediately after 9/11, the violence of terrorism set of frames (the

violence of war set of frames during the Pearl Harbor period) dominated the coverage in both newspapers. The framing by the *New York Times* reflected the paper's heavy reliance on photos depicting the violence of terrorism—mug shots of loss, loss, victims/casualties, violence/destruction, and security.

As shown in Table 4, more than half of the photos (522) published in the *New York Times* during the 9/11 period had violence of terrorism frames. Although it published far fewer 9/11 pictures than the *New York Times*, the violence of terrorism frames were also the dominant set of frames in *Asahi Shimbun*. The paper's 85 photos in this frame accounted for 31% of all of its 9/11 pictures that were published.

Table 3
Frames in Asahi Shimbun and the New York Times in 2001

Frames	<i>Times</i> (<i>n</i> = 1,013)	%	<i>Asahi</i> (<i>n</i> = 274)	%
<u>Violence of Terrorism</u>				
Mug Shots of Loss	265	26.2	0	0.0
U.S. Loss	99	9.8	20	7.3
International Loss	5	0.5	4	1.4
Victims/Casualties	11	1.1	9	3.3
Violence/Destruction	71	7.0	41	15.0
Security				
Japan	0	0.0	6	2.2
United States	71	7.0	11	4.0
Muslim Countries	3	0.3	0	0.0
International	6	0.6	0	0.0
<u>Humanization</u>				
Human Dimension				
Japan	0	0.0	5	1.8
United States	110	10.9	34	12.4
Arabs & Muslims in the U.S.	23	2.3	0	0.0
Personal Face of Military				
Japan	0	0.0	1	0.4
United States	15	1.5	3	1.1
Muslim Countries	6	0.6	3	1.1
Personal Face of Allies' Military	1	0.1	0	0.0
<u>Military/Firefighters</u>				
Patriotic Symbols	54	5.3	16	5.8
U.S. Firefighters	49	4.8	15	5.5
Overall U.S. Military				
Japan	0	0	4	1.5
United States	16	1.6	10	3.6
Muslim Countries	6	0.6	3	1.1
<u>Politics</u>				
Political				
Japan	0	0.0	5	1.8
United States	90	8.9	17	6.2
Allies	21	2.1	5	1.8

(Table 3—Continued on page 73)

(Table 3—Continued from page 72)

Frames	<i>Times</i> (<i>n</i> = 1,013)		<i>Asahi</i> (<i>n</i> = 274)	
		%		%
<u>Portrayal of Opponents</u>				
Human Dimension	52	5.1	23	8.4
Mug Shots of Loss	50	4.9	22	8.1
Terrorist	22	2.2	22	8.0
Political	15	1.5	4	1.5
Enemy Symbols	8	0.8	1	0.4
Loss	5	0.5	1	0.4
<u>Anti-War</u>				
United States	11	1.1	6	2.2
Japan	0	0.0	3	1.1
Muslim countries	2	0.2	2	0.7
International	0	0.0	2	0.7
<u>Anti-U.S.</u>				
Muslim Countries	11	1.1	8	2.9
International	3	0.3	0	
<u>International Human Dimension</u>	3	0.3	3	1.1
<u>Media Self-Reference</u>				
United States	6	0.6	3	1.1
Muslim Countries	0	0.0	1	0.4
<u>Landscape</u>				
United States	3	0.3	1	0.4
Muslim Countries	4	0.4	1	0.4
<u>Other</u>				
United States	12	1.2	2	0.7
Muslim Countries	0	0	2	0.7

Note. Percentages in the major frames in the table add to more than 100% because some pictures contained more than one frame.

Table 4
Major Frames in Asahi Shimbun and the New York Times in 2001

Frames	<i>Times</i> (n = 1,013)		<i>Asahi</i> (n = 274)	
		%		%
<u>Violence of Terrorism</u>	522	51.6	85	31.0
Mug Shots of Loss	265	26.2	0	0.0
U.S. Loss	99	9.8	20	7.3
International Loss	5	0.5	4	1.4
Victims/Casualties	11	1.1	9	3.3
Violence/Destruction	71	7.0	41	15.0
U.S. Security	71	7.0	11	4.0
<u>Humanization</u>	149	14.8	37	13.5
U.S. Human Dimension	110	10.9	34	12.4
Arabs & Muslims in the U.S.	23	2.3	0	0.0
Personal Face of Military	15	1.5	3	1.1
Personal Face of Allies' Military	1	0.1	0	0.0
<u>Military/Firefighters</u>	119	11.7	41	14.9
Patriotic Symbols	54	5.3	16	5.8
U.S. Firefighters	49	4.8	15	5.5
Overall U.S. Military	16	1.6	10	3.6
<u>Politics</u>	111	11.0	22	8.0
U.S. Political	90	8.9	17	6.2
Allies' Political	21	2.1	5	1.8
<u>Portrayal of Opponents</u>	152	15.0	73	26.8
Human Dimension	52	5.1	23	8.4
Mug Shots of Loss	50	4.9	22	8.1
Terrorist	22	2.2	22	8.0
Political	15	1.5	4	1.5
Enemy Symbols	8	0.8	1	0.4
Loss	5	0.5	1	0.4
<u>Anti-War/Anti-U.S.</u>	27	2.7	21	7.6
United States	11	1.1	6	2.2
Japan	0	0	3	1.1
Muslim Countries	13	1.3	10	3.6
International	3	0.3	2	0.7

Note. Percentages in the major frames in the table add to more than 100% because some pictures contained more than one frame.

In the *New York Times*, as shown in Table 4, the three loss frames comprised the majority of frames in the violence of terrorism set of frames, accounting for 36.5% of all of its 9/11 frames.

A week after the terrorist attacks, on September 18, 2001, the *New York Times* created a new section called “A Nation Challenged.” It provided additional text and visual information on the 9/11 attacks. A page at the end of this section contained mug shots of loss pictures that accompanied biographical sketches of the victims. Although they didn’t occupy the largest number of column inches devoted to 9/11 photos, the largest number of photos in the *New York Times* immediately after the terrorist attacks were the small mug shots of the victims. There were 265 of these small pictures, which accounted for 26.2% of the photos that the paper published in the 9/11 period. In addition, there were 99 other photos (9.8% of the total) related to the grief and loss of Americans, primarily New Yorkers, as well as 4 photos that were classified in the international loss category.

The most frequent images in the loss frame were scenes of funerals, memorial events, and posters of missing people. Funeral scenes often showed caskets, American flags, military officers, and family members of the deceased. Photographs of the loss frame focused on those attending the services.

On September 15, 2001, the *New York Times* displayed a series of pictures showing people praying in the United States, Taiwan, Kenya, and India. One depicted a firefighter in Taiwan who was holding a candle, with a photo caption that read: “More than 100 firefighters held a solemn candlelight vigil.” On September 23, 2001, the *New*

York Times published a picture of people from different religions, including Christianity, Islam, and Judaism, praying together. In a rare exception to its policy of not showing bodies or horrific images, on September 12, 2001, the *New York Times* ran a picture with a caption that read: “A person falls headfirst after jumping from the north tower of the World Trade Center.”

The victims and casualties frame in the *New York Times* had 11 photographs, most of which showed survivors receiving medical treatment on the street or while being transported to hospitals. On October 2, 2001, a picture depicted firefighters carrying flag-draped bodies recovered from the wreckage of the World Trade Center.

As Table 3 shows, 7% of the *New York Times*' photos were in the violence and destruction frame. Most depicted the aftermath of terror such as destruction of the World Trade Center in New York with clouds of fumes, the ground strewn with rubble and ashes. The most frequent images were of the World Trade Center after it was attacked, and many images were combined with images of rescue workers and firefighters. On September 12, 2001, the *New York Times* published a huge, front-page picture of the World Trade Center wreathed in smoke with a headline that read, “U.S. ATTACKED.”

The U.S. security frame (71 pictures) represented 7% of the total 9/11 photos in the *New York Times*. After 9/11, the *New York Times* gradually increased the number of news photos documenting the stricter security measures that were taken in the United States. Most images portrayed airport guards, passengers, airports, and airplanes in the United States.

As noted earlier, the set of violence of terrorism frames was also the dominant set

of 9/11 frames in *Asahi Shimbun*. This set of frames included 85 photographs (31% of its total). *Asahi Shimbun* had 41 photographs (15% of its total) in the violence and destruction frame. On September 12, 2001, *Asahi Shimbun* published a picture of the burning World Trade Center on the front page of its morning edition under the headline: “Terrorist Attacks on the Center of the United States.” Photographs on inside pages showed the Pentagon burning in Washington, DC and plumes of smoke in New York City. On September 12, 2001, the evening edition of *Asahi Shimbun* displayed a full-page picture of the World Trade Center with clouds of smoke. The very large headline read: “An Outrage, A Nightmare, Mercilessness.” Similar to the *New York Times*, most of the pictures in the violence and destruction frame were scenes of destruction of the World Trade Center following the attack.

As Table 3 shows, *Asahi Shimbun* published 20 photographs (7.3% of its total) that were categorized in the loss frame. On September 14, 2001, the front page of *Asahi Shimbun* showed Americans holding candles, mourning all the people who died in the terrorist attacks. *Asahi Shimbun* had 4 pictures in the loss frame that showed images photographed outside of the United States. On September 12, 2001, *Asahi Shimbun* depicted a Russian expressing his condolences in front of the American Embassy in Russia, and on September 20, 2001, *Asahi Shimbun* showed traders at the Hong Kong stock exchange praying for victims of the 9/11 attacks.

Asahi Shimbun showed 9 poignant images that depicted victims and casualties. On September 12, 2001, *Asahi Shimbun* ran a semi-dominant sized picture showing a woman sitting on the sidewalk. Her head was bleeding and her clothes were covered

with ashes. The photo caption and headline read: “Hope Be Safe” and “I want to fly to you if I can.” The photos of the tragedy in New York City showed a deep sympathy for the suffering of Americans.

As noted earlier, this study did not consider news sources. However, *Asahi Shimbun* used many pictures provided by Reuters and The Associated Press, two news agencies that also provided the *New York Times* with some of its photos. In 2001, some of the photos were similar or identical in both newspapers. For example, on September 12, 2001, *Asahi Shimbun* and the *New York Times* published the same picture of a victim being carried away by four emergency workers.

Asahi Shimbun ran 11 pictures in the U.S. security frame. These images depicted airport security and other security measures. In addition, *Asahi Shimbun* also ran 6 pictures related to the security frame in Japan. For example, it reported that the United States doubled its security measures at its bases in Japan.

Humanization Frames in 2001. The *New York Times* published 149 photos (14.8% of its total) in the humanization set of frames. As shown in Table 4, 110 pictures (10.9% of its total) were in the U.S. human dimension frame, which was focused on the emotional distress and hardships of Americans after the attack. In the beginning, the emotional distress was obvious in news photographs. The *New York Times* depicted people crying, searching for missing people, bowing their heads, or gazing anxiously at the destruction of the World Trade Center. As time went on, the *New York Times* focused more on the suffering of people who lost their families, lost their jobs, or had to move to unfamiliar places. The *New York Times* published some photos of American aid workers

who fled from Afghanistan fearing attacks by the United States.

There were 23 pictures (2.3% of the paper's total) in the U.S. Arabs and Muslims frame. This frame focused on the difficulties of Arabs and Muslims who lived in the United States, such as the discrimination they faced because of their ethnicity and religion. For example, on September 13, 2001, the *New York Times* showed a portrait of a woman wearing a hijab, with a photo caption that read: "I'm Arab, but if the Arabs did it, then I'm ashamed. But if some Arabs did it, you can't say all Arabs are bad." Similar to a portrait of Japanese-Americans in the coverage of the *New York Times* during the Pearl Harbor period, the *New York Times*, on September 18, 2001, published a photograph depicting President Bush and a representative of the Muslim American Society at the Islamic Center of Washington. The photo caption read: "Support for Arabs and Muslims in U.S." and "Mr. Bush denounced domestic attacks on Middle Eastern people." On the same day, the *New York Times* showed a picture of an owner of an Afghan restaurant in California holding a photograph of Osama bin Laden that was crossed out. The owner commented that he opposed Osama bin Laden.

In the latter part of September, 2001, the *New York Times* began publishing photos in another humanization frame, the personal face of military. This frame depicted American soldiers and their families, and often focused on soldiers' painful separation from their families, especially their wives and children. A picture, which ran October 7, 2001, on the front page of the *New York Times* showed a picture of a family: mother and father in camouflage uniform holding their children; the photo caption read: "Reservists Heed Call to Duty, And Kids Are Left Behind." The personal face of the military frame

had 15 pictures. However, at this point in time, the personal face of the allies' military frame had only one picture.

As shown in Table 3, the *New York Times* published 6 photos of the Northern Alliance and Anti-Taliban forces beginning in late September, accounting for 6 (0.6%) pictures in the military frame (Muslim countries subframe), and 6 (0.6%) pictures in the personal face of military frame. These frames, which were excluded from the quantitative analysis because of their small n's, indirectly emphasized the strength of the U.S. allies military and laying siege to the Taliban.

As shown in Table 4, the humanization set of frames accounted for 37 or 13.5% of the total 9/11 photos in *Asahi Shimbun*. Of these, 34 pictures related to the U.S. human dimension frame. Photos in the frame depicted Americans crying, donating blood, and being evacuated from the World Trade Center. The Arab and Muslim frame was not present in *Asahi Shimbun*. The personal face of the military frame had only 3 pictures. Pictures in this frame showed American military officers who worked on U.S. bases in Japan, and emphasized their concern about the U.S. decision to go to war. Photo captions were: "Submitting to military order" and "Tattooing in order to identify after death." One picture showed U.S. military officers who had tattooed their bodies so that it would be easier to identify them if they died during combat. As shown in Table 3, *Asahi Shimbun* also published 3 pictures of the Northern Alliance and Pakistan militaries (Muslim countries subframe), representing 1.1% of the total in the paper's overall U.S. military frame and 3 pictures of soldiers from Muslim and Middle Eastern countries in the personal face of the allies' military frame (1.1% of its total in this frame). These were

also excluded from the quantitative analysis because of the small n's.

Military and Firefighters Frames in 2001. The *New York Times*, as shown in Table 4, published 119 pictures (11.7% of its total) in the military and firefighters set of frames. The set was comprised of 54 pictures in the patriotic symbols frame, 49 pictures of firefighters frame, and 16 pictures in the overall U.S. military frame. The patriotic symbols frame, such as American flags, was found in photos of political figures and in pictures depicting memorial events for people who died in the September 11 attack. When the *New York Times* created its new section, "A Nation Challenged," the first page of the section showed a picture of baseball players holding an enormous American flag on a baseball field. Firefighters, emergency workers, and rescue workers were portrayed as heroes in the *New York Times*. At first, the *New York Times* reported their hard work and dedication and, then later, their distress and weariness. The overall military frame focused on what the U.S. military was doing to prepare for war.

As shown in Table 4, *Asahi Shimbun* published 41 (14.9% of its total) pictures in the military and firefighters set of frames, about one third as many military/firefighters frames as in the *New York Times*. However, the percentage for the military/firefighters set of frames in *Asahi Shimbun* was actually higher than that in the *New York Times*. *Asahi Shimbun* published 16 pictures in the patriotic symbols frame, 15 in the firefighters frame, and 10 in the overall military frame. Similar to the photos in the *New York Times*, some of these pictures had more than one frame. For example, in some pictures, *Asahi Shimbun* paired the patriotic symbols frame with the U.S. political frame or the loss frame with pictures that showed American flags draped over caskets or President Bush

next to the American flag. The military/firefighters set of frames was often combined with the violence of terrorism set of frames, especially the violence/destruction frame, in pictures that showed firefighters working in the rubble of the World Trade Center.

Most pictures in the overall military frame portrayed the U.S. military deployed in Japan, such as on aircraft carriers and warships. After the 9/11 attacks, *Asahi Shimbun* was concerned with whether the United States would go to war. The paper ran stories on the controversial arguments concerning whether Japan should support U. S. military action since Japan had enacted a war-renouncing constitution after World War II.

Politics Frames in 2001. As shown in Table 4, in the first 3 ½ weeks after the 9/11 attacks, the *New York Times* published 111 photos (11% of its total) in the politics frame. Of these, 90 were related to the U.S. political frame and 21 were related to the U. S. allies' political frame. The most frequent political figure to appear in the photo coverage in the *New York Times* was President George W. Bush. President Bush appeared with firefighters and with New York Mayor Rudolph W. Giuliani in front of the rubble of the Twin Towers. He also he appeared with members of his administration, frequently with an American flag prominently displayed. The paper also ran pictures of officials in the Bush administration that focused on Dick Cheney, Colin Powell, Donald Rumsfeld, and Paul Wolfowitz.

The allies' political frames focused on the leaders of the “coalition of the willing.” This frame showed President Bush with leaders of the countries that joined the coalition, such as President Vladimir V. Putin of Russia, Prime Minister Junichiro Koizumu of Japan, President Jacques Chirac of France, President Megawati Sukarnoputri of

Indonesia, President Islam Karimov of Uzbekistan, and King Abdullah II of Jordan. Photos of British Prime Minister Tony Blair appeared often. Portraits of President Bush appeared on the *New York Times* with definitive statements. For example, on September 20, 2001, the headline was: “BUSH ORDERED HEAVY BOMBERS NEAR AFGANS; DEMANDS BIN LADEN NOW, NOT NEGOTIATION,” and the next day, the headline accompanying a picture of President Bush was “BUSH PLEDGES’ ATTACK ON AFGANISTAN UNLESS IT SURRENDERS BIN LADEN NOW.”

In *Asahi Shimbun*, as shown in Table 4, the politics frame contained 22 photos (8% of its total) of which 17 were of American political figures and 5 were of allied political figures. Most of the pictures were of President Bush and British Prime Minister Tony Blair. On September 13, 2001, on the front page, *Asahi Shimbun* ran a picture of President Bush and Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld standing in front of the wreckage at the Pentagon. In addition, as shown in Table 3, the paper’s photo coverage included five pictures of Japanese political figures.

Portrayal of Opponents Frames in 2001. In the *New York Times*, the set of frames portraying American opponents depicted images related to terrorists, the hijack suspects, Al-Qaeda, the Taliban, Afghanistan, and several Middle Eastern countries and Muslim nations. The frame had 152 pictures (15% of its total). As shown in Table 4, in this set of frames, a majority of the photos fell into two frames—the human dimension with 52 pictures and the mug shots of loss frame with 50 small photos. Although the total number of photos in the portrayal of opponents set of frames in the *New York Times* was twice as many as in *Asahi Shimbun*, the percentage was actually about half that of the

same set in *Asahi Shimbun*.

Most of the human dimension pictures were from Afghanistan, Tajikistan, Palestine, and Pakistan. The majority of pictures depicted the hardships of Afghans such as drought and the fear of an attack by the United States as well as historic photos of the invasion of Afghanistan by the Soviet Union. One article explained that, although they fled from Afghanistan, their neighbors, such as Pakistan, did not welcome them. On September 12, 2001, the *New York Times* ran a picture of children smiling cheerfully. The photo caption said that there was a celebration at a Palestinian refugee camp after the September 11 attack. On September 13, 2001, the *New York Times* displayed a picture of two Afghan children holding each other's hands and walking among parched ruins. The photo caption read: "The Taliban begged America yesterday not to attack a people who 'have suffered so much.'" On September 17, 2001, the *New York Times* showed pictures of Afghan refugees who fled from the threat of war and abandoned their homes, and on September 30, 2001, the *New York Times* published a photo of an Afghan family who had escaped from their country. The headline read: "Refugees From Afghanistan Flee Out of Fear and Find Despair." The father commented: "We don't fear the Taliban" and "We came here because war is coming." The following pages showed a series of pictures of Afghan refugees. On September 19, 2001, the *New York Times* ran a picture depicting the father of a hijacking suspect with the headline: "Father Denies 'Gentle Son' Could Hijack Any Jetliner."

Unlike the mug shots of loss frame in the violence of terrorism set of frames that expressed loss and grief by the publication of small pictures of the 9/11 victims, this frame

was of mug shots of the suspects who carried out the suicide mission. On September 15, 2001, the *New York Times* published the pictures of all suspects, on the same page.

The enemy symbols frame and the terrorist frames were primarily images related to the terrorists who committed the 9/11 attacks. In the *New York Times*, the enemy symbols frame often was of houses or buildings where the suspects concealed themselves and where they received flight training. The terrorist frame showed images of suspects who were captured by airport surveillance cameras. This frame also frequently displayed pictures of Osama bin Laden and Taliban members. In the political frame, the *New York Times* had 15 photos. For example, it ran a picture of the Taliban foreign minister under the headline: “Condemning Attacks, Taliban Says Bin Laden Not Involved.”

Although *Asahi Shimbun* published fewer pictures (73) in the portrayal of opponents set of frames than the *New York Times* (152), the percentage of its total 9/11 photos that it published in this frame (26.8%) was higher than the percentage of the photos published by the *New York Times* in this set of frames (15%). The 3 frames in this set that had the most photos in *Asahi Shimbun* were the human dimension frame with 23 photos, mug shots of loss frame with 22 pictures, and the terrorist frame, which also had 22 photos.

Asahi Shimbun also depicted the hardships of Afghans refugees in the human dimension frame. On September 12, *Asahi Shimbun* displayed a picture of a Palestinian under a picture of a Russian who was praying. The picture depicted a male Palestinian holding a rifle, giving the peace sign. The caption explained that some Palestinians rejoiced at the news of 9/11 attacks. On September 23, *Asahi Shimbun* depicted a crying

mother with her son in Kabul, Afghanistan. The photo caption explained that humanitarian aid agencies withdrew from Afghanistan, the Afghan border was closed, and medical supplies were severely depleted. On September 30, *Asahi Shimbun* displayed a family of Afghan refugees standing in front of their temporary residence tent; the title read “Exhausted, No aid” and “Accompanying 5 year old child, walking through all day and night.” On October 3, *Asahi Shimbun* showed picture of girls in Afghanistan; the title read “severe life under Taliban-dominated society, girls studied at a hidden school.”

Similar to the *New York Times*, *Asahi Shimbun* displayed suspects of the terrorist attacks, Osama bin Laden, and Taliban members in the terrorist frame and the mug shots of loss frame. Those pictures primarily depicted images of terrorists who attacked the World Trade Center and Pentagon.

In the political frame, *Asahi Shimbun* had 4 pictures (1.5% of its total). The Taliban Foreign Minister appeared in *Asahi Shimbun* occasionally. On October 3, *Asahi Shimbun* displayed a picture of the Ambassador of the Taliban Administration in Pakistan with photo captions “Conversation is the only solution” and “The U.S. government refused to negotiate with Taliban.”

Both publications reported about the devastating situation in Afghanistan and the plight of Afghan refugees. However, *Asahi Shimbun* displayed the human dimension frames 3.3% more frequently than did the *New York Times*.

Anti-War and Anti-U.S. Frames in 2001. The *New York Times* published 13 anti-war photographs (1.3% of its total). Eleven of the photos depicted anti-war

movements in the United States, and two depicted events in the Middle East. Also, the *New York Times* published 14 pictures (1.4% of its total) that were in the anti-U.S. frame; most of these were photographed in Pakistan and Indonesia.

On September 21, the *New York Times* ran photos of a peace demonstration at Harvard University with a photo caption that explained that mass demonstrations were held on 146 campuses in 36 states. On September 24, the *New York Times* showed a picture of Pope John Paul II in Kazakhstan. The photo caption read “Pope in Central Asia Speaks Out Against Any Overzealous Military Response by the U.S.” On September 26, the *New York Times* depicted Pakistani women protesters who held their children and placards reading “NO TO WAR” with a photo caption explaining that thousands of Afghan refugees in Pakistan had been rounded up and deported.

The images of anti-U.S. demonstrations in the *New York Times* often displayed signs of Osama bin Laden. On September 28, the *New York Times* displayed Indonesian protesters holding a sign of President Bush with “Bush Dog” on the board. Also, the next day, the *New York Times* reported on an anti-U.S. demonstration in Indonesia; the photo caption explained that Indonesian protesters gathered “as appeals for Muslim solidarity fire passions to defend Afghanistan.” On September 17, the *New York Times* described a crowd of people in Pakistan who denounced their government’s cooperation with American anti-terrorism efforts. On October 6, the *New York Times* showed a picture of a child, an anti-US protester who was lifting a toy pistol in his hand.

Asahi Shimbun had 13 pictures of protests (4.7% of its total), which depicted the anti-war frame; three were in Japan, six were in the United States, two were in Muslim

and Middle Eastern countries, and two were in other countries. Also, *Asahi Shimbun* showed 8 pictures (2.9% of its total) related to the anti-US frame; all were taken in Muslim and Middle Eastern countries.

On September 16, *Asahi Shimbun* reported that Barbara Lee, a member of the U.S. House of Representatives for California, voted against a resolution approving military action; her portrait accompanied the article. She commented that someone has to be rational, and that the meaning of the resolution should be carefully considered. The resolution was carried by 420 votes, and she was the only one to vote against it. On the same page, *Asahi Shimbun* noted that the Bush administration's approval rating increased to 86% in the United States, and that this was the same as the George H. W. Bush administration's approval rating during the Gulf War. On September 18, *Asahi Shimbun* published a picture in the anti-war frame, which depicted a woman in India hitting a portrait of Osama bin Laden with her shoes.

Although *Asahi Shimbun* published fewer anti-war and anti-U.S. photos (21 pictures or 7.6% of its total) than the *New York Times* (27 pictures or 2.7% of its total coverage), in terms of percentages, *Asahi Shimbun*'s photo coverage in these two frames were about 3 times (2.8 times) higher than the two frames in the *New York Times*.

Media Self-Reference Frame in 2001. The *New York Times* had 6 photographs (0.6% of its total) depicting American media. Some pictures showed the inside of the *Wall Street Journal* that had to move its office from lower Manhattan as the result of the attack. On October 1, the *New York Times* covered news describing how the media were preparing to cover the war.

On September 22, *Asahi Shimbun* reported that after President Bush mentioned “war” in the afternoon of September 12, major U.S. newspapers began to use the word. *Asahi Shimbun* reported that the American newspapers were preoccupied with writing about war, and the patriotic mood made it hard to discuss peaceful negotiations. On September 21, *Asahi Shimbun* displayed a picture of Dan Rather, the CBS television anchor, with a photo caption that read “something wrong with American media” and “‘compulsion’ to feel sorrow.” The photo of Dan Rather was accompanied with a short article that reported that American news media, which were focused on the terrorist attacks and news related to the attacks, appeared to compel mourning and the inevitable outbreak of war. An *Asahi* reporter suggested that American media were not balanced. On September 29, *Asahi Shimbun* reported on a U.S. organization that surveyed 1,200 Americans just after the attack; 63% said that they could not stop watching television. The caption read “News Addiction among Viewers.” The *New York Times* depicted journalists’ hardships and preparations for war, and, in contrast, *Asahi Shimbun* depicted American media that were inclined toward war.

Other Frames in 2001. *Asahi Shimbun* ran 2 photos and the *New York Times* ran 12 photos that did not fit into any of the major frame categories. For example, on September 30, *Asahi Shimbun* published a picture depicting people transporting emergency aid to Afghanistan, which was in bags with USA logos. The caption read: “The United States completed preparation for a military attack against Afghanistan.” The article explained that, to help Afghan civilians, while preparing to attack Afghanistan, the United States sent some aid supplies to the country.

Research Questions

Overview. This study identified the frames that were present in the coverage in the *New York Times* and *Asahi Shimbun* during the Pearl Harbor period in 1941 and the 9/11 period in 2001. Two-tailed *t*-tests were conducted to determine whether there was a statistically significant difference between the frames found in the *New York Times* and *Asahi Shimbun* in 1941 and in 2001. The means for the frames are shown in Table 5. Table 6 and Table 7 show the results of two-tailed *t*-tests after combining the major sets of frames found in the *New York Times* and *Asahi Shimbun* in 1941 and 2001.

In 1941, the *New York Times* and *Asahi Shimbun* framed the coverage for their readers by publishing photos that focused on seven major sets of frames—military, humanization, international human dimension, politics, violence of war, portrayal of opponents' military, and portrayal of opponents frames. The results showed that the set of humanization frames was the dominant set of frames in the photography coverage in the *New York Times*, and the set of military frames was the dominant set of frames in *Asahi Shimbun*. However, although the dominant frames were different, both papers devoted more than half of their photography coverage to publication of pictures depicting the military and the human side of the war in each of their countries.

As shown in Table 6, the emphasis that the two newspapers put on its photo coverage for 6 of the 7 major sets of frames was significantly different. However, it must be noted here that the violence of war set of frames was significantly different in the two newspapers primarily because the photo coverage that constituted most of the photo coverage in the set, the subframe of violence/destruction, was significantly different.

Also, although the portrayal of opponents set of frames was significantly different in the two papers, the personal face of the opponent's military subframe was not significantly different.

Table 5
Means for frames in Asahi Shinbun and the New York Times in 1941-1942 and 2001

Frames	Asahi 1941			Times 1941			Asahi 2001			Times in 2001		
	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N
Military	.47	.562	438	.62	1.189	243	.38	1.046	41	.27	.859	119
Overall Military	.35	.476	323	.50	1.118	178	.15	.751	10	.60	.499	16
Allies' Military	.01	.080	6	.09	.414	48	—	—	—	—	—	—
Patriotic Symbols	.12	.321	109	.03	.250	17	.18	.738	16	.16	.674	54
Firefighters	—	—	—	—	—	—	.05	.228	15	.05	.215	49
Humanization	.23	.435	213	1.13	1.528	434	.54	1.412	37	.50	1.366	149
Human Dimension	.09	.291	87	.58	1.184	206	.50	1.321	34	.43	1.245	110
Personal Face of Military/Allies' Military	.13	.347	126	.54	1.154	221	.04	.383	3	.06	.465	16
International Human Dimension	.06	.243	49	.21	.763	80	.05	.521	3	.01	.272	3
Politics	.07	.275	65	.23	.813	97	.32	1.286	22	.44	1.394	111
Political	.04	.207	42	.16	.669	56	.25	.967	17	.36	1.139	90
Allies' Political	.02	.155	23	.08	.384	41	.07	.536	5	.08	.570	21
Violence of War/Terrorism	.26	.585	211	.47	1.207	174	1.33	2.037	86	2.03	2.082	522
Violence/Destruction	.18	.542	129	.34	1.084	128	.75	1.787	41	.35	1.277	71
Loss	.03	.182	32	.03	.318	12	.35	1.158	24	.42	1.251	104
Mug Shots of Loss	.05	.225	50	.06	.407	20	.00	.000	0	1.05	1.759	265
Victims/Casualties	.00	.000	0	.04	.341	14	.13	.714	9	.04	.415	11
Security	—	—	—	—	—	—	.10	.416	11	.17	.610	71
Portrayal of Opponents' Military	.15	.354	138	.17	.684	63	—	—	—	—	—	—
Military of Opponents	.05	.210	43	.06	.426	22	—	—	—	—	—	—
Military of Allies' Opponents	.05	.212	44	.01	.137	5	—	—	—	—	—	—
Enemy Symbols	.05	.227	51	.10	.541	36	—	—	—	—	—	—
Portrayal of Opponents	.09	.553	30	.04	.229	32	.23	.466	73	.16	.465	152
Personal Face of Opponent's Military	.00	.057	3	.01	.122	4	—	—	—	—	—	—
Prisoners of War	.08	.548	20	.01	.183	5	—	—	—	—	—	—
Enemy Symbols/Terrorist	—	—	—	—	—	—	.08	.333	23	.05	.360	30
Loss/Mug/Political/Human	.15	.361	7	.11	.311	23	.01	.086	50	.02	.144	122
Anti-War/Anti-U.S.	—	—	—	—	—	—	.28	1.058	21	0.10	.600	27
Anti-War	—	—	—	—	—	—	.20	.948	13	.05	.470	13
Anti-U.S.	—	—	—	—	—	—	.09	.506	8	.04	.379	14

Table 6*Two-tailed t-test for Frames in Asashi Shimbun and the New York Times in 1941-1942*

Frames	df	t	p
<u>Military</u>	1566.716	-3.578	<.001
Overall Military	1483.750	-3.904	<.001
Allies' Military	1158.507	-6.052	<.001
Patriotic Symbols	1754.214	6.634	<.001
<u>Humanization</u>	1262.747	-17.451	<.001
Human Dimension	1213.980	-12.202	<.001
Personal Face of Military/Allies' Military	1315.010	-10.428	<.001
<u>International Human Dimension</u>	1310.461	-5.910	<.001
<u>Politics</u>	1339.571	-5.889	<.001
Political	1297.974	-4.924	<.001
Allies' Political	1445.689	-4.068	<.001
<u>Violence of War</u>	1588.440	-4.816	<.001
Violence/Destruction	1614.857	-4.257	<.001
Loss	1740.300	-.030	.974
Mug Shots of Loss	1708.405	-.173	.863
Victims/Casualties	1068.000	-3.519	<.001
<u>Portrayal of Opponents' Military</u>	1684.980	-.883	.337
Military of Opponents	1601.207	-1.023	.306
Military of Allies' Opponents	1553.520	4.795	<.001
Enemy Symbols	1473.763	-2.439	.015
<u>Portrayal of Opponents</u>	1216.756	2.880	.004
Personal Face of Opponent's Military	1550.306	-.981	.327
Prisoners of War	1034.715	4.098	<.001
Other Portrayals ^a	1821.216	-2.543	.011

^aOther Portrayals consist of Political, Allies' Political, Human Dimension, International Human Dimension, Loss, Mug Shots of Loss, and Victims/Casualties.

Table 7*Two-tailed t-test for Frames in Asahi Shimbun and the New York Times in 2001*

Frames	<i>df</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
<u>Violence of Terrorism</u>	439.535	-4.971	<.001
Violence/Destruction	351.844	4.169	<.001
Loss/Mug/Victims	815.584	-8.384	<.001
U.S. Security	626.775	-1.804	.071
<u>Humanization</u>	421.403	.466	.642
U.S. Human Dimension	413.493	.722	.471
Personal Face of Military/Allies' Military	623.169	-.657	.511
<u>Military/Firefighters</u>	378.205	1.82	.069
Overall Military	340.689	2.163	.031
Patriotic Symbols	404.456	.481	.630
U.S. Firefighters	413.320	.430	.667
<u>Politics</u>	461.304	-1.254	.210
Political	497.436	-1.426	.154
Allies' Political	453.970	-.259	.796
<u>Portrayal of Opponents</u>	523.168	2.667	.008
Enemy Symbols/Terrorist	559.668	1.456	.146
Other Portrayals ^a	469.711	2.244	.025
<u>Anti-War/Anti-U.S.</u>	321.734	2.805	<.001
Anti-War	310.063	3.497	<.001
Anti-U.S.	359.678	1.55	.121

^aOther Portrayals consist of Loss, Mug Shots of Loss, Political, and Human Dimension.

Table 8
Camera Angles in Photos in Asahi Shimbun and the New York Times

		<i>Asahi 1941</i>	<i>Times 1941</i>	<i>Asahi 2001</i>	<i>Times 2001</i>
Camera Angle		(n = 934)	(n = 1,062)	(n = 274)	(n = 1,013)
		%	%	%	%
Low	(n = 16)	1.1	0.5	0.0	0.1
Equal	(n = 3103)	89.1	94.3	97.4	99.0
High	(n = 164)	9.9	5.3	2.6	0.9

Table 9
Proximity of Subject to Viewer in Photos in Asahi Shimbun and the New York Times

		<i>Asahi 1941</i>	<i>Times 1941</i>	<i>Asahi 2001</i>	<i>Times 2001</i>
Proximity		(n = 934)	(n = 1,062)	(n = 274)	(n = 1,013)
		%	%	%	%
Long	(n = 1912)	77.3	62.5	50.7	38.2
Mid-range	(n = 1316)	21.6	37	46.7	58.5
Close-up	(n = 55)	1.1	0.5	2.6	3.3

Table 10
Size of Photos in Asahi Shimbun and the New York Times

Size of Photo		<i>Asahi 1941</i>	<i>Times 1941</i>	<i>Asahi 2001</i>	<i>Times 2001</i>
		(<i>n</i> = 934) %	(<i>n</i> = 1,062) %	(<i>n</i> = 274) %	(<i>n</i> = 1,013) %
Dominant	(<i>n</i> = 5)	0.0	0.0	1.5	0.1
Semi-Dominant	(<i>n</i> = 1009)	26.8	21.9	18.2	47.0
Small	(<i>n</i> = 2269)	73.2	78.1	80.3	52.9

Table 11
Placement of Photos in Asahi Shimbun and the New York Times

Placement of Picture		<i>Asahi 1941</i>	<i>Times 1941</i>	<i>Asahi 2001</i>	<i>Times 2001</i>
		(<i>n</i> = 934) %	(<i>n</i> = 1,062) %	(<i>n</i> = 274) %	(<i>n</i> = 1,013) %
Front	(<i>n</i> = 429)	32.0	4.9	10.9	4.7
Front Half	(<i>n</i> = 2189)	29.9	79.8	59.1	88.9
Back Half	(<i>n</i> = 665)	38.1	15.3	29.9	6.3

It was found that the *New York Times* and *Asahi Shimbun* published in 2001 focused on 6 sets of frames—violence of terrorism, humanization, military/firefighters, politics, portrayal of opponents, and anti-war/anti-U.S., which were very similar to the set of Pearl Harbor frames found in the coverage 70 years earlier. The set of violence of terrorism frames was the dominant set of frames in both the *New York Times* and *Asahi Shimbun*.

As shown in Table 7, the set of violence of terrorism frames and the anti-war/anti-U.S. frame were significantly different in the two newspapers. Table 7 shows that 2 of the 3 frames in this set were significantly different.

Although other frames were identified, such as the landscape frame, the media self-reference frame, the other frame, and some frames from the set of portrayal of opponents' frames, these minor frames were not included because they did not provide enough photographic data for a quantitative analysis.

Research Question 1. What frames were used to report the events of Pearl Harbor in the *New York Times* and *Asahi Shimbun*?

The previous sections provided descriptions of the visual frames used by the *New York Times* and *Asahi Shimbun*. The results showed that seven sets of frames emerged from the photographic content of the *New York Times* and *Asahi Shimbun* published in 1941 and 1942. The seven sets of frames were military, humanization, international human dimension, politics, violence of war, portrayal of opponents' military, and portrayal of opponents. The dominant set of frames in the *New York Times* was the set of humanization frames, followed by the set of military frames in second place. In the

photo coverage of *Asahi Shimbun*, the set of military frames was dominant, and the set of humanization frames and the set of violence of war frames were virtually tied for second place.

As shown in Table 6, the photo coverage in the two newspapers that made up six major sets of frames—military, humanization, international human dimension, politics, violence of war, and portrayal of opponents—was significantly different ($p < .001$ for the first five sets and $p < .004$ for the last set). Table 6 also shows that all of the individual subframes in the military, humanization, international human dimension, and the politics set of frames in the two newspapers were highly significant ($p < .001$).

Overall, in its Pearl Harbor coverage, the *New York Times* framed the war in terms of the human dimension, both at home and abroad, with a secondary emphasis on the military and violence of war frames. Photographs of the human dimension frame and the personal face of military frame in the *New York Times* depicted American civilians and the U.S. soldiers' involvement in war. As research has shown, humanization of war tends to increase comprehension and empathy with the war effort on the part of the public.

In contrast, *Asahi Shimbun* framed the war in terms of the Japanese military, especially Japanese patriotic symbols. Rather than depicting the personal side of the war, *Asahi Shimbun* framed the war in terms of patriotism by publishing images of patriotic supporters of the war in the human dimension frame and depicting the personal face of military frame of Japanese in a patriotic way. *Asahi Shimbun* often emphasized the military's conquests by presenting Japanese soldiers with enemy symbols such as fragments of U.S. aircraft or British tanks left in Asia. The *New York Times* showed more

images of the allies' face of military frame and the allies' military frames than did *Asahi Shimbun*. Those pictures emphasized strong relationships with allies of the United States. However, *Asahi Shimbun* did not emphasize the relationship with Japanese allies as much as the *New York Times* did. Rather than emphasizing the relationship with allies, *Asahi Shimbun* depicted the friendly relationships with local Asians and Japanese soldiers. When the *New York Times* depicted the international human dimension frame, it also stressed the human dimension in countries allied with the United States.

The *New York Times* predominantly concentrated on American allies in the photographic coverage of the allies' military frame, the personal face of military frame, the international human dimension frame, and the politics frame.

When *Asahi Shimbun* published photos in the violence/destruction frame, most images depicted Asia. These images included both areas where Japanese and the U.S. or British militaries attacked. *Asahi Shimbun* published only 10 photographs of the destruction of Pearl Harbor. In comparison, the *New York Times* depicted scenes in Asia almost as often as the United States, and also depicted the aftermath of war in Europe. Most images showed where the Japanese attacked and where the United States was victimized, especially at Pearl Harbor. Similar to the *New York Times*' depictions in the violence/destruction frame, the victims/casualties frame presented victims who suffered because of the Japanese military.

Asahi Shimbun published photos in the military of opponents frame and the military of allies' opponents frame almost equally; it ran pictures of battleships or airplanes that belonged to American, British, and other allied military.

Asahi Shimbun depicted the prisoner of war frame more often than the *New York Times*. *Asahi Shimbun* described prisoners of war as surrendering “prisoners” but, at the same time, it also depicted the Japanese military treating them well. This was similar to how the *New York Times* reported about Japanese-Americans in the United States. Although the *New York Times* provided photo coverage of internment camps and aliens, it also ran photos demonstrating Americans’ considerate attitudes toward Japanese-Americans and Japanese-Americans’ contributions to America. Yamamoto’s (1973), who examined stories in the *San Francisco Chronicle*, the *San Jose Mercury Herald*, the *Sacramento Bee*, and the *New York Times* that were published between December 8, 1941 and March 31, 1942, also noted that the newspapers mentioned the loyalty of Japanese-Americans in the immediate post-Pearl Harbor period. However, the newspaper stories became more negative as they referred to the arrests of Japanese-Americans.

Research Question 2. What were the dominant frames in each newspaper immediately after the bombing of Pearl Harbor?

As shown in Table 1 and Table 2, the set of humanization frames dominated the photographic coverage of the *New York Times* in 1941. The *New York Times* published 434 (40.9%) photographs related to the set of humanization frames. However, the set of military frames was the dominant set of frames with 438 (46.9%) photographs in *Asahi Shimbun*. The set of humanization frames was the second dominant set of frames with 213 (22.7%) pictures. As well as the set of humanization frames, the set of violence of war frames with 221 (22.6%) pictures, was the second dominant set of frames in *Asahi Shimbun*.

Research Question 3. What frames were used to report the events of 9/11 in the *New York Times* and *Asahi Shimbun*?

The results showed that six sets of frames emerged from the photographic contents of the *New York Times* and *Asahi Shimbun* published in 2001. The six sets of frames were—violence of terrorism, humanization, military/firefighters, politics, portrayal of opponents, anti-war/anti-US. In both publications, the dominant set of frames was the set of violence of terrorism frames. In 2001, there were significant differences in the way the *New York Times* and *Asahi Shimbun* framed the photo coverage in three of the six major sets of frames. Table 7 shows that the set of violence of terrorism, portrayal of opponents, and the anti-war/anti-US frame were significantly different. However, it should be noted that not all of the subframes in the three major sets of frames were significant. The researcher found statistical differences in the following subframes: violence/destruction frame ($p = < .001$), the mug shots of loss frame ($p = < .001$), the overall military frame ($p = .031$), other portrayals frame ($p = < .001$), and the anti-war frame ($p = < .001$).

The *New York Times* showed 71 (7%) pictures related to the violence/destruction frame, and *Asahi Shimbun* had 41 (15%) photographs of the violence/destruction frame. Those images similarly depicted the aftermath of terror, such as the destruction of the World Trade Center. The *New York Times* very frequently showed pictures of the mug shots of loss frame (26.2%). The mug shots of people who died accompanied their biographies and anecdotes about their lives. In a new section called “A Nation Challenged,” the *New York Times* published mug shots of people who died in the 9/11

attacks. In contrast to the *New York Times*, *Asahi Shimbun* did not display a picture in the mug shots of loss frame. This difference might be because the 9/11 stories and pictures were local news in the *New York Times* but international news in *Asahi Shimbun*. The *New York Times* provided the role of a local newspaper while *Asahi Shimbun* did not.

The victims/casualties frame had 11 (1.1%) photographs in the *New York Times*, and *Asahi Shimbun* showed 9 (3.3%) images in the victims/casualties frame. Although the *New York Times* displayed a considerable number of pictures of the mug shots of loss in a short period of time, the percentage of the victims/casualties frame was about one third that of *Asahi Shimbun*. A possible explanation for the small percentage of the victims/casualties frame in the *New York Times* might be that the newspaper deliberately refrained from depicting graphic images of Americans who were injured or died; meanwhile *Asahi Shimbun* tried to exhibit the realistic images of tragedy in New York City.

The *New York Times* published 16 (1.6%) pictures in the overall military frame, and those images emphasized the U.S. military's preparations for an attack against Afghanistan. *Asahi Shimbun* showed 10 (3.6%) pictures related to the overall military. Japan has American military bases; therefore, *Asahi Shimbun* covered news about the movements of the U.S. military in Japan.

The *New York Times* had 22 (2.2%) pictures in the terrorist frame, and *Asahi Shimbun* had 22 (8%) pictures in the terrorist frame. Most images showed portraits of Osama bin Laden, and a few showed Taliban soldiers and the hijack suspects. *Asahi Shimbun* displayed photographs of terrorists more often than the *New York Times*.

The *New York Times* displayed 13 (1.3%) photographs related to the anti-war frame. Eleven of them depicted anti-war movements in the United States, and two of them depicted events in Muslim and Middle Eastern countries. *Asahi Shimbun* had 13 (4.7%) pictures that depicted the anti-war frame; three of them showed anti-war protests in Japan, six of them in the United States, two of them in Muslim and Middle Eastern countries, and two of them in other countries. The results showed that *Asahi Shimbun* depicted anti-war news more frequently than the *New York Times* did.

According to Table 4, *Asahi Shimbun* displayed 73 (26.8%) photographs of the set of portrayal of opponents; this percentage was twice as high as the percentage of the set of humanization frames (13.5%), which depicted the American human dimension. In contrast, the *New York Times* showed 152 (15%) pictures related to the set of portrayal of opponents, and this number was nearly the same as the set of humanization frames of Americans (14.8%). The set of portrayal of opponents included 22 terrorist images and 50 mug shots of the hijack suspects from the coverage by the *New York Times*. In short, the *New York Times* focused on Americans' suffering and loss rather than depicting images of Afghanistan that might increase the understanding about the opponent among American readers.

Research Question 4. What were the dominant frames in each newspaper immediately after the 9/11 attack?

As shown in Table 3 and Table 4, the set of violence of terrorism dominated the news photography in both the *New York Times* and *Asahi Shimbun* in 2001. The *New York Times* displayed 522 (51.6%) photographs related to the set of violence of terrorism

frames; *Asahi Shimbun* portrayed 85 (31%).

Compositional Elements

This study also examined the compositional elements used to construct the news photographs in the *New York Times* and *Asahi Shimbun* published in 1941 and 2001. Tables 8 to 11 show the percentages of the compositional elements of the photos published in both of the newspapers in the two time periods. As shown in Tables 8, 9, and 10, the majority of images in 1941 in both publications had equal camera angles, long proximity of subjects to viewers, and small picture sizes. The majority of images published in both papers in 2001 also contained equal camera angles. However, the photos published in the *New York Times* and *Asahi Shimbun* in 2001 were almost equally divided between long and mid-range proximity as well as being larger than the photos published in 1941 and 1942.

Camera Angle in 1941 and 2001. In the coverage by *Asahi Shimbun* in 1941 and 1942, there were 832 pictures taken from equal angles, and they accounted for 89.1% of the total number of pictures. High angle pictures were 9.9% of the total, and most of them were aerial photographs. Low angle pictures were 1.1% of the total number of pictures. In the coverage by the *New York Times* in 1941 and 1942, there were 1,001 pictures taken from equal angles, and they accounted for 94.3% of the total number of pictures. High angle pictures were 5.3% of the total, and most of them were aerial photographs. Low angle pictures were 0.5% of the total number of pictures. High angle photographs were often of large numbers of soldiers, prisoners of war, and weaponry.

In the 2001 photo coverage in *Asahi Shimbun*, there were 267 pictures taken from

equal angles, and they accounted for 97.4% of the total number of pictures. High angle pictures were 2.6% of the total, and there was no picture taken from a low angle. In the coverage in the *New York Times* in 2001, there were 1,003 pictures taken from equal angles, and they accounted for 99% of the total number of pictures. High angle pictures were 0.9% of the total, and most of them were aerial photographs. Low angle pictures were 0.1% of the total number of pictures.

Proximity in 1941 and 2001. There were 722 pictures taken from a long distance in *Asahi Shimbun* in 1941, and they accounted for 77.3% of the total number of pictures. Middle distance shots were 21.6% of the total pictures, and close distance shots were 1.1% of the total. There were 664 pictures captured from a long distance, and they accounted for 62.5% of the total number of pictures in the *New York Times* published in 1941. Middle distance shots were 37% of the total pictures, and close distance shots were 0.5% of the total

In the coverage of *Asahi Shimbun* in 2001, there were 50.7% pictures taken from a long distance, 46.7% pictures taken from a middle distance, and 2.6% pictures taken from a close distance. In the *New York Times* in 1941, there were 38.2% pictures taken from a long distance, 58.5% pictures taken from a middle distance, and 3.3% pictures taken from a close distance.

Size of Picture in 1941 and 2001. It should be noted here that, since *Asahi Shimbun* published an average of only 6 pages each day, this study excluded the *New York Times* Magazine sections and the picture section of the *New York Times*; in these sections, many large photographs were published. However, because of the shortage of

newsprint in Japan, *Asahi Shimbun* did not have the space to publish comparable sections. It published an average of only four pages in the morning edition and two pages in the evening edition. Both editions were included in the study.

In *Asahi Shimbun*, there were 684 small size pictures, and they accounted for 73.2% of the total number of photographs in 1941. There were 26.8% semi-dominant pictures, but there were no dominant photographs in the 1941 photographic coverage in *Asahi Shimbun*. *Asahi Shimbun* showed semi-dominant pictures of the bombing of Pearl Harbor and the surrender of Singapore. In the coverage in the *New York Times*, there were 829 small pictures, and they accounted for 78.1% of the total number of photographs. Semi-dominant photographs were 21.9% of the total, and there was no dominant-sized photo.

In *Asahi Shimbun* in 2001, there were 220 small pictures, and they accounted for 80.3% of the total number of photographs. Semi-dominant photographs were 18.2% of the total, and only 1.5% was dominant photos. On September 12, *Asahi Shimbun* displayed full-page dominant photographs in both its morning and evening editions; the pictures were categorized in three frames—violence of terrorism, American human dimension, and victims/casualties in the United States. In the coverage in the *New York Times* in 2001, there were 536 (52.9%) small pictures and 476 (47%) semi-dominant pictures. There was only one dominant photo.

Placement of Picture in 1941 and 2001. In the visual coverage of *Asahi Shimbun* in 1941, the placement of photographs was almost equally distributed in the paper: the front page had 32%, the front half of the paper had 29.9%, and the back half of

the paper had 38.1%. In the visual coverage in the *New York Times* in 1941, the photographs were distributed as follows: the front page had 4.9%, the front half of the paper had 79.8%, and the back half of the paper had 15.3%.

In 2001, the photographs in *Asahi Shimbun* were distributed in different sections of the publication: the front page had 10.9%, the front half of the paper had 59.1%, and the back half of the paper had 29.9%. The visual coverage by the *New York Times* in 2001 was distributed as follows: the front page had 4.7%, the front half of the paper had 88.9%, and the back half of the paper had 6.3%.

In summary, in 1941 *Asahi Shimbun* exhibited twice as many high angle pictures mostly aerial photographs, as those in the *New York Times*. These pictures primarily depicted landscapes in Asia and the aftermath of Pearl Harbor. In 1941 the number of pictures taken from a middle distance from subjects was twice as many in the *New York Times* as in *Asahi Shimbun*. When the *New York Times* depicted the human dimension frame, the personal face of military frame, and the personal face of the allies' military, many pictures clearly showed the faces of American soldiers and U.S. allies' soldiers. In contrast, in *Asahi Shimbun* photographs of Japanese soldiers were from a long proximity; these pictures delivered blurred images of Japanese soldiers.

In 1941 and 1942 photos in *Asahi Shimbun* were mostly long shot-pictures. However, some crucial events, such as the bombing of Pearl Harbor and the surrender of Singapore, were reported with semi-dominant photographs. As in 1941, in 2001 the majority of pictures in *Asahi Shimbun* and the *New York Times* were taken from equal angles. Both publications depicted news events with long and middle shots, but the *New*

York Times used middle and close shots more often than *Asahi Shimbun*. Also, the *New York Times* published large pictures more often than *Asahi Shimbun*. The percentage of semi-dominant pictures in the *New York Times* was about 2.5 times higher than in *Asahi Shimbun*. The *New York Times* presented the majority of news photographs related to the 9/11 attacks (93.6% of its total) on its front pages and in the first half of the paper, which included a special section, “A Nation Challenged.” In comparison, in *Asahi Shimbun* the percentage of 9/11 photos on its front pages or in the front half of the paper was 70%.

In 1941 *Asahi Shimbun* published more high angle-photographs than it did in 2001. In its 1941 photo coverage, most of the pictures in *Asahi Shimbun* were long shots (77.3%). However, in 2001 long shots (50.7%) and middle distance shots (46.7%) were almost equal in the paper. In 1941, *Asahi Shimbun* ran 8.6% more semi-dominant pictures than it did in 2001. In 1941 in *Asahi Shimbun* news photographs related to World War II were spread equally on its front page and on the front and back halves of the paper. In contrast, in 2001 a majority of the photos were displayed in the front half of the paper (59.1%), with 29.9% published in the back half of the paper.

In both 1941 and 2001, the majority of photographs in the *New York Times* were taken from equal angles. In 2001, the *New York Times* published fewer high angle photographs than it did in 1941. The percentages of middle and long shots were reversed. In 2001, the *New York Times* published more middle shots and fewer long shots than it did in 1941. Although the majority of pictures in the *New York Times* in 1941 were small, the paper published an almost equal number of small and semi-dominant pictures in 2001. Placement of pictures was similar in 1941 and 2001 in the *New York Times*. When

the *New York Times* reported on World War II and the 9/11 attacks, the newspaper published most of the news photographs in the front page or in the front half of the paper. However, in 1941 the *New York Times* displayed more pictures in the back half of the paper than it did in 2001. Those pictures were related to recruited athletes in the sports section and economic news related to World War II.

In 1941 *Asahi Shimbun* published more high angle photographs than it did in 2001. In 2001, most of the pictures in the paper were long shots (77.3%). However, in 2001, long (50.7%) and middle (46.7%) distance shots appeared almost equally. In 1941, *Asahi Shimbun* had 8.6% more semi-dominant pictures than it did in 2001. In *Asahi Shimbun*, news photographs related to WWII were spread evenly on its front page and on its front and back halves of the paper. In contrast, in 2001 a majority of its photos were published in the front half (59.1%) of the paper; 29.9% were run on the back half of the paper.

In conclusion, most of the pictures in both papers were taken from equal angles, meaning that were photographed from eye-level. This provides the reader with photos that are more objective. According to Messaris (1992), using high-angle shots make a subject less powerful; however, using low-angle shots make a subject more powerful. In this study, few subjects were taken from extremely low or high angles, except the aerial photographs of landscapes. Showing a landscape from a high angle might not notably affect readers' perception of reality. Messaris also noted that "the effects of any particular compositional device can vary significantly depending on the type of content to which it is applied and the type of audience at which it is aimed" (1992, p. 184).

In comparing the coverage of both publications, the results of proximity suggested that the distance between subjects and viewers became shorter than it had been in the past. Both newspapers depicted subjects closer in 2001 than they did in 1941. There were no large differences in the size of pictures in *Asahi Shimbun* in 1941 and 2001. However, in 2001 the *New York Times* ran larger photos of the 9/11 attacks and its aftermath than it did in its World War II coverage. Coleman (2006) and Wanta (1988) noted that large news pictures are more likely to increase the viewers' awareness of news than small picture do.

Chapter V

Conclusion

News photography has a propensity to influence readers' perceptions and understanding of events (Schwalbe, 2006). Therefore, it is important to examine visual frames, particularly dominant frames that emerge during critical events. It is important to know how the media have framed unexpected international crises, especially since studies have shown that, when the media cover an unexpected event, such as a terrorist attack or surprise attack, media reporting may be emotional and nationalistic.

The researcher examined visual frames that were present in the news photography of the bombing of Pearl Harbor and the 9/11 terrorist attacks in *Asahi Shimbun* and the *New York Times*. The researcher analyzed what the dominant media frames were and how the frames were used. Compositional elements of the photographic coverage were also examined. The researcher conducted a quantitative and qualitative framing analysis of the photographs, headlines, and photo captions on a sample of two newspapers of two critical events that occurred 60 years apart.

The author obtained and examined 934 news photographs from *Asahi Shimbun*, published between December 9, 1941 and March 31, 1942, and 1,062 news photographs from the *New York Times*, published between December 8, 1941 and March 31, 1942. The author also obtained and examined 274 news photographs from *Asahi Shimbun*, published between September 12, 2001 and October 6, 2001, and 1,013 news photographs from the *New York Times*, published between September 12, 2001, and October 7, 2001.

Discussion

This study provided an international perspective on how the *New York Times* and *Asahi Shimbun* framed their photo coverage of the bombing of Pearl Harbor and the 9/11 terrorist attacks. Major findings of the study were that in 1941 the visual frames in *Asahi Shimbun* were primarily frames that depicted Japan's military power, the Japanese human dimension, and Asian locals. In a study of *Asahi Shimbun's* coverage by Haruhara (1977), from December 8-14 in 1941 and from March 8-14 in 1942, international news, national defense news, and war news occupied nearly half of the newspaper.

The researcher found that a large majority of pictures in *Asahi Shimbun* in 1941 described the war in a patriotic tone, especially when *Asahi Shimbun* depicted loss or the Japanese human dimension; these pictures emphasized patriotism—Japanese civilians' support for the war and their contributions and sacrifices. When *Asahi Shimbun* depicted the portrayal of opponents' military frame or the violence/destruction frame, these frames emphasized the achievements and victories of the Japanese military. As in Yoshimoto's (1994) propaganda study of *Asahi Shimbun* during World War II, this study found that, from a visual perception, the paper's photo coverage also tended to perpetuate government propaganda rather than provide objective visual coverage. In 1941, *Asahi Shimbun* provided an Asian-centered perspective of the war for its readers. In comparison, the frames in the *New York Times* in 1941 focused on the American human dimension and the human dimension of U.S. allies.

In a rhetorical study, Brennen and Duffy (2003) noted that the *New York Times* used the Pearl Harbor attack as the most common analogy for the 9/11 attacks. The

authors found that the *New York Times* used similar rhetorical strategies against Japanese-Americans after the Pearl Harbor attack and Muslims and Arab-Americans after the 9/11 attacks. According to Brennen and Duffy, after September 11, the *New York Times* began reporting instances of tolerance and understanding for Arabs and Muslims.

This researcher also found similarities in the depictions of Japanese-Americans (0.7%) and Arabs and Muslims (2.3%) in the photographic coverage in the *New York Times* in 1941 and 2001. In 1941 and 2001, respectively, photos and captions in the paper depicted Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt and President George W. Bush in a way that suggested the need for Americans to accept Japanese-Americans and Muslims and Arab-Americans. Both Japanese-Americans and Arabs and Muslims faced similar situations; they publicly became the target of Americans' denouncements. Although photos and captions in the *New York Times* depicted the loyalty and patriotism of Japanese-Americans right after the attack on Pearl Harbor, they were consistently portrayed as aliens and descendants of the enemy. In contrast, in 2001 news and photo coverage in the *New York Times* made the point that Muslims and Arab-Americans should not be viewed as terrorists and should not be subjected to abuse.

This researcher also found that the way the *New York Times* portrayed Japanese-Americans was similar to how *Asahi Shimbun* portrayed prisoners of war. Although the *New York Times* viewed Japanese-Americans as aliens, it also emphasized that they were treated well in internment camps; its photo coverage also provided information on how Japanese-Americans contributed to the war effort. In 1941, *Asahi Shimbun* ran photos to

show that British and U.S. prisoners of war were treated well and that the soldiers were happy.

A major finding of the study was that in 2001 both *Asahi Shimbun* and the *New York Times* focused on the set of violence of terrorism frames. The *New York Times* devoted half of its visual coverage to the set of violence of terrorism frames, which included 265 mug shot pictures of people who died in the attack on the World Trade Center.

Schwalbe (2006) noted that framing is a selective process of telescoping events into a few images that represent the event. After the 9/11 attacks, photographs that focused on the destruction and the victims instantly framed the event as a tragedy. And, after President Bush mentioned “war” on September 12, the media also started to refer to war frequently. As Ruigrok and Atteveldt (2007) noted, the “war on terror” frame was accepted without any arguments immediately after the attack. The large volume of photos of the attack and its aftermath might have precluded opportunities for peaceful negotiations with Afghanistan and the Taliban.

The set of violence of terrorism and the set of humanization frames, both of which depicted the suffering of Americans, accounted for 66.4% of the total photographic coverage in the *New York Times*. Similarly, Griffin (2004) found that the aftermath of the 9/11 attacks dominated the coverage in American news magazines—*Time*, *Newsweek*, and *US News & World Report*—from September 11 until the end of October of 2001.

According to Schildkraut (2002), before the invasion of Afghanistan, the U.S. media did not frame Afghanistan as an enemy; civilians in Afghanistan were portrayed as

victims of the Taliban. In this study, photos in both newspapers depicted Afghan refugees and their suffering. The *New York Times* devoted 15% of its visual coverage to the portrayal of opponents' frame, which included photos of the 9/11 terrorists and Afghan refugees. In contrast, *Asahi Shimbun* devoted 26.8% of its coverage to the portrayal of opponents' frame. In the *New York Times*, the visual coverage in the set of American humanization frame and the set of portrayal of opponents' frames was about equal. In contrast, in *Asahi Shimbun* the photos in the set of portrayal of opponents' frames were twice as many as the photos in the set of American humanization frame. By portraying the Taliban and Afghan refugees, *Asahi Shimbun* provided images that gave an international context to the conflict. In contrast, the *New York Times* focused on Americans' suffering and loss rather than depicting images of Afghanistan that might have increased the understanding of American readers of the Taliban and the plight of Afghan civilians.

During decisive moments, the newspapers frequently portrayed the President or the Prime Minister of their own nations. President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Hideki Tojo and President Bush were the political figures who appeared most frequently in the photo coverage of the *New York Times* and *Asahi Shimbun* in 1941 and 2001.

Gans (1979) noted that the heads of nations represent national values and serve as the agents of a nation's will. Similar to Griffin's study of the photo coverage in U.S. news-magazines published in 1991, 2001, and 2003, photographic images in the *New York Times* in 2001 depicted President Bush as a strong and confident leader. Moreover, the paper treated President George W. Bush and New York Mayor Rudy Giuliani as

heroes, despite the fact that the previous edition of the paper derided them (Li, 2007).

Significant Differences Between *Asahi Shimbun* and the *New York Times*

The researcher found significant differences in the way *Asahi Shimbun* and the *New York Times* framed the attack on Pearl Harbor and the 9/11 attacks. In 1941, there were significant differences between the newspapers in 6 of the 7 major frames that emerged from the coverage—the military, humanization, international human dimension, politics, violence of war, and portrayal of opponents frame. In contrast, in 2001, when the relationship between Japan and the United States was one of peaceful cooperation, the frames were more convergent. Significant differences were found between the two newspapers in 3 out of 6 of the major frames—violence of terrorism, portrayal of opponents, and anti-war/anti-U.S.

Contributions to the Literature

The study made a contribution to global mass communication as well as to visual communications in areas in which there have been gaps in the literature. Dimitrova and Strömbäck (2005) noted that there have not been enough comparative studies that have examined the news coverage of the same events in different countries. In particular, they stressed that, “while ‘truth’ is an abstract concept subject to much debate by academics all over the world, it is important to examine how war reality was constructed for different national audiences” (p. 412). This framing study will help to fill this gap in mass communication research since it provides data on how the “war reality” was constructed visually for Japanese and American audiences during the Pearl Harbor period and during 9/11 and its aftermath. It also provides empirical evidence of how the two

newspapers framed the two attacks—in 1941 when the countries were wartime enemies and in 2001, when they were engaged in peaceful cooperation.

The news media have compared the 9/11 attacks to the attack on Pearl Harbor. There have been only two other studies reported in the literature that analyzed the two attacks. The Borch (2003) study, which was published in *The Journal of Military History*, was primarily devoted to discussing military issues, such as intelligence failures and the lack of preparedness for attacks on American soil. The study by Brennan and Duffy (2003) was a rhetorical study that was focused on the coverage of the ‘other’ in the *New York Times*—Japanese nationals and Japanese-Americans in 1941 and Arab and Muslim-Americans in 2001. It should be noted here that this study is the first mass communication study to compare the Pearl Harbor attack and the 9/11 attacks in Japanese and American newspapers.

It is important to know how the media have framed unexpected international crises, especially since studies have shown that, when the media cover ordinary expected content, it is more rational and well-filtered. However, for an unexpected event, such as a terrorist attack or surprise attack, media reporting may be emotional and nationalistic. For example, Kellner (2003) noted that, after 9/11, the media rallied around the President as he prepared the nation for war. As Gans (1979) explained, the clearest expression of ethnocentrism, which the researcher found was present in photographic reports in the *New York Times* in 1941 and 2001 and in *Asahi Shimbun* in 1941, appears in wartime in all countries. The photos in both publications depicted patriotism such as mug shots or portraits of people who died in battle with captions noting the sacrifices they made for

their countries, heroic political leaders, soldiers' contributions to their nations, and national flags.

In the case of the *New York Times*, the results of this study differ from previous framing studies of recent conflicts that focused on military power and deemphasized the human cost of war and coalition countries (Griffin, 2004; Griffin & Lee, 1995; Schwalbe, et al., 2008). In contrast, during the Pearl Harbor period, the dominant frame in the *New York Times* was the human dimension set of frames, which focused on the human side of the war rather than on military strength. Similar to Gans's 1979 study on Vietnam War news, this study also found that the possibility of peace negotiation was omitted in news photos in the *New York Times* in both 1941 and 2001.

References

- Asahi Shimbun Association (2008). *Shimbun to sensou [Newspaper and war]*. Tokyo: Asahi Shimbun Syuppan.
- Best, Kirsty (2004, November) Imagery, dialogue and affect: Visual communication technologies and the ethics of security and war. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, New York City, NY. Retrieved on March 28, 2009 from http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p14557_index.html
- Boettcher, William A., III & Cobb, Michael D. (2006). Echoes of Vietnam?: Casualty framing and public perceptions of success and failure in Iraq. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 50, 831–854.
- Borch, Fred L. (2003). Comparing Pearl Harbor and “9/11”: Intelligence failure? American unpreparedness? Military responsibility? *The Journal of Military History*, 67, 845-860.
- Brennen, Bonnie & Duffy, Margaret (2003). If a problem cannot be solved, enlarge it: An ideological critique of the ‘other’ in Pearl Harbor and September 11. *Journalism Studies*, 4, 3–14.
- Callahan, Kathe; Dubnick, Melvin J.; & Olshfski, Dorothy (2006). War narratives: Framing our understanding of the war on terror. *Public Administration Review*, 66, 554–568.
- Coleman, Renita (2006). The effects of visuals on ethical reasoning: What’s a photograph worth to journalists making moral decisions? *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 83, 835–850.
- Chomsky, Norm (2006). *Failed states*. New York: Henry Holt.
- Dauber, Cori E. (2001). The shots seen 'round the world': The impact of the images of Mogadishu on American military operations. *Rhetoric & Public Affairs*, 4, 653–687.
- Dimitrova, Daniela V. & Strömbäck, Jesper (2005). Mission accomplished? Framing of the Iraq War in the elite newspapers in Sweden and the United States. *International Communication Gazette*, 67, 399–417.

- Edy, Jill A. & Meirick, Patrick C. (2007). Wanted dead or alive: Media frames, frame adoption, and support for the war in Afghanistan. *Journal of Communication*, 57, 119–141.
- Entman, Robert M. (1991). Framing U.S. coverage of international news: Contrasts in narratives of the KAL and Iran Air incidents. *Journal of Communication*, 41(4), 6–10.
- Entman, Robert M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43(4), 51–58.
- Entman, Robert M. (2003). Cascading activation: Contesting the White House's frame after 9/11. *Political Communications*, 20, 415–432.
- Entman, Robert M. (2007). Framing bias: Media in the distribution of power. *Journalism and Communication*, 57, 163–173.
- Fahmy, Shahira (2004). Picturing Afghan women: A content analysis of AP wire photographs during the Taliban regime and after the fall of the Taliban regime. *International Communication Gazette*, 66(2), 91–112.
- Fahmy, Shahira (2006). Attitudes & perceptions: Visual coverage of 9/11 & the Afgan War. *Visual Communication Quarterly*, 12, 146-163.
- Faludi, Andreas (1996). Framing with images. *Environment and planning*, 23(1), 93–108.
- Fortunato, John A. (2005). *Making media content: The influence of constituency groups on mass media*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Gans, Herbert J. (1979). *Deciding what's news*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Gans, Herbert J. (1980, January). The message behind the news. *Columbia Journalism Review*, 40–45.
- Garcia, Mario P. & Stark, Pegie (1991). *Eyes on the news*. St. Petersburg, FL: Poynter Institute.
- Gartner, Scott Sigmund (2004). Making the international local: The terrorist attack on the USS Cole, local casualties and media coverage. *Political Science Communication*, 21, 139-159.

- Geraci, Philip C. (1984). *Photojournalism: New images in visual communication* (3rd ed.). Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.
- Goldberg, Alfred; Papadopoulos, Sarandis; Putney, Diane; Berlage, Nancy; & Welch, Rebecca (2007). *Pentagon 9/11*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Goffman, Erving (1974). *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*. New York: Harper Torchbooks.
- Griffin, Michael (2004). Picturing America's war on terrorism in Afghanistan and Iraq: Photographic motifs as news frames. *Journalism*, 5(4), 381-402.
- Griffin, Michael & Lee, Jongsoo (1995). Picturing the Gulf War: Constructing an image of war in *Time*, *Newsweek*, and *U.S. News & World Report*. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 72(4), 813-825.
- Haruhara, Akihiko (1977). *Senji houdouno jittai [The realities of war reports]*. Tokyo: Jochi University.
- Hatano, Sumio (1988). "Daitoua sensou no jidai": Nittcyu sensou kara nichibei sensou e ["The era of the Great East Asia War": From the Sino-Japanese war to U.S.-Japanese war]. Tokyo: Asahi Syuppan.
- Hoffman, August John & Wallach, Julie (2007). The effects of media bias. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 37, 616-630.
- Horton, Brian (2001). *Guide to photojournalism* (2nd ed.). New York: The Associated Press.
- Jamal, Amaney & Naber, Nadine (Eds.). (2008). *Race and Arab Americans before and after 9/11: From invisible citizens to visible subjects*. New York: Syracuse University Press.
- Keith, Susan (2006). Images in ethics codes in an era of violence and tragedy. *Journal of Mass Media Ethics*, 21(4), 245-264.
- Kellner, Douglas (1990). *Television and the crisis of democracy*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Kellner, Douglas (2002). September 11, the media, and war fever. *Television & New Media*, 3(2), 143-151.

- Kellner, Douglas (2003). *From 9/11 to terror war*. MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Kellner, Douglas (2005). *Media spectacle and the crisis of democracy*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.
- Kobre, Kenneth (1980). *Photo journalism: The professionals' approach*. New York: Curtin & London.
- Kobre, Kenneth (2000). *Photo journalism: The professionals' approach* (4th ed.). Woburn, MA: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Li, Xigen (2007). Stage of a crisis and media fames and functions: U.S. television coverage of the 9/11 incident during the first 24 hours. *Journalism of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 51(4), 670–687.
- Lister, Martin (2007). A sack in the sand: Photography in the age of information. *Convergence: the International Journal of Research into New Media Technologies*, 13(3), 251–274.
- Lule, Jack (2002). Myth and terror on the editorial page: The *New York Times* responds to September 11, 2001. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 79(2), 275–293.
- Lyons, Michael J. (1999). *World War II: A short history* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- McCombs, Maxwell & Ghanem, Salma I. (2003). Framing public life: A bridging model for media research. In Stephen D. Reese, Oscar H. Gandy, Jr., & August E. Grant (Eds.), *Framing public life* (pp. 67–82). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- McQuail, Denis (2005). *McQuail's mass communication theory* (5th ed.). London: Sage.
- Mendelson, Andrew L. & Thorson, Esther (2004). How verbalizers and visualizers process the newspaper environment. *Journal of Communication*, 54, 474–491.
- Merrill, John C.; Bryan, Carter R.; & Alisky, Marvin (1946). *The foreign press*. Louisiana State University Press.
- Messaris, Paul (1992). Visual 'manipulation': Visual means of affecting responses to images. *Communication*, 13, 181–195.
- Messaris, Paul (1998). Visual aspects of media literacy. *Journal of Communication*,

- 48(1), 70–80.
- Pfau, Michael; Haigh, Michel; Fifrick, Andeelynn; Holl, Douglas; Tedesco, Allison; Cope, Jay, et al. (2006). The effects of print news photographs of the casualties of war. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 83, 150-168.
- Ross, Susan Dente & Bantimaroudis, Philemon (2006). Frame shift and catastrophic events: The attacks of September 11, 2001, and *New York Times*'s portrayals of Arafat and Sharon. *Mass Communication & Society*, 9, 85–101.
- Ruigrok, Nel & Atteveldt, Wouter van (2007). Global angling with a local angle: How U.S., British, and Dutch newspapers frame global and local terrorist attacks. *The Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics*, 12(1), 68–90.
- Sundar, S. Shyam (2000). Multimedia effects on processing and perception of online news: A study of picture, audio, and video downloads. *Journalism and Communication Quarterly*, 77, 480–499.
- Scheufele, Dietram A. (2000). Agenda-setting, priming and framing revised: Another look at cognitive effect of political communication. *Mass communication & Society*, 3, 297–316.
- Schildkraut, Deborah J. (2002). The more things changed . . . American identity and mass and elite response to 9/11. *Political Psychology*, 23, 511–535.
- Schwalbe, Carol B. (2006). Remembering our shared past: Visually framing the Iraq War on U.S. news websites. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 12, 264–289. Retrieved October 16, 2007 from <http://jcmc.indiana.edu/vol12/issue1/schwalbe.html>
- Schwalbe, Carol B.; Silcock, B. William; & Keith, Susan (2008). Visual framing of the early weeks of the U.S.-led invasion of Iraq: Applying the master war narrative to electronic and print images. *Journal of Broadcast and Electronic Media*, 52, 448–465.
- Schwartz, Dona (1992). To tell the truth: Codes of objectivity in photojournalism. *Communication*, 13, 95-109.
- Thorn, William J. & Pfeil, Mary Pat (1987). *Newspaper circulation: Marketing the news*. New York: Longman.
- Von Buseck, Diana (2007). A content analysis examining the framing of the invasion of Iraq in photographs. Unpublished master's thesis. San José State

- University, San José, CA.
- Waldman, Paul & Devitt, James (1998). Newspaper photographs and the 1996 presidential election: The question of bias. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 75(2), 302–311.
- Wanta, Wayne (1988). The effects of dominant photographs: An agenda-setting experiment. *Journalism Quarterly*, 65, 107–111.
- Wilson, Robert. A. & Hosokawa, Bill (1980). *East to America: A history of the Japanese in the United States*. New York: William Morrow.
- Yamamoto, Margaret M. (1973). Newspaper treatment of the Japanese in America December 8, 1941 to March 31, 1942. Unpublished master's thesis. San José State University, San José, CA.
- Yoshimoto, Hideko (1994). Media treatment of World War II in Japan and the United States, 1931-1945: A propaganda theory approach. Unpublished master's thesis. San José State University, San José, CA.

APPENDIX A
Codebook

1. Image number (Scott's pi reliability coefficient = 100%)

Each image will be sequentially numbered as follows:

- (a) Images published in the *New York Times* after December 7, 1941 will be numbered from 1 to n.
- (b) Images published in *Asahi Shimbun* after December 7, 1941 will be numbered from 2001 to n.
- (c) Images published in the *New York Times* after September 11, 2001 will be numbered from 4001 to n.
- (d) Images published in *Asahi himbun* after September 11, 2001 will be numbered from 6001 to n.

2. Newspaper publishing the image and the year published (Scott's pi reliability coefficient = 100%)

Category	Code
The <i>New York Times</i> in 1941	1
<i>Asahi Shimbun</i> in 1941	2
The <i>New York Times</i> in 2001	3
<i>Asahi Shimbun</i> in 2001	4

3. Date of publication (Scott's pi reliability coefficient = 100%)
Month, date, and year the images were printed will be stated in that order.

4. Frames Definitions for the *New York Times* and *Asahi Shimbun* (Scott's pi reliability coefficient = 85%)

Category	Code	Definition
Overall Military Frame	1	This frame focused on the U.S., Japanese, and Muslim and Middle Eastern military operations and machines of war, such as weaponry, troops, arsenals, aircraft, battle ships, and soldiers whose faces are not identified. According to Schwalbe, et al. (2008), photography documenting military superiority is a typical frame found in studies of war coverage.
Personal Face of Military Frame	2	This frame focused on humanization of militaries by showing personal faces of soldiers. According to Schwalbe, et al., images of soldiers that depict individuals' faces fall into the human interest frame. This study subcategorized the human interest frame into more descriptive frames, such as the human dimension frame, the international human dimension frame, and the personal face of military frame.
Allies' Military Frame	3	This frame focused on allied militaries of the U.S., Japan, Muslim and Middle East and machines of war, such as weaponry, troops, arsenals, aircraft, battle ships, and soldiers whose faces are not identified. For convenience, this study applied the term of Ally to Axis nations: Germany and Italy. Also, the term of Ally applied to the coalition countries of the United States in 2001.
Personal Face of Allies' Military Frame	4	This frame focused on humanization of allies' military by showing personal faces of soldiers.

Violence/Destruction Frame	5	This frame focused on the aftermath caused by terrorist attacks and war, such as bombings, destroyed buildings, destroyed aircraft, and sunken destroyers. If newspapers showed an undamaged war ship with a photo caption that said the ship was sunk by the enemy, the researcher categorized the picture into both the violence/destruction frame and the military frame. If it was a civilian ship, the researcher categorized it into both the violence/destruction frame and the other frame.
Patriotic Symbols Frame	6	This frame focused on the symbols of patriotism such as national flags, the Emperor of Japan, and Japanese Shinto shrines. Before World War II the Japanese Emperor existed as a God.
Political Frame	7	This frame focused on political figures, including politicians, government officials, and religious leaders who have significant influence in and upon the policies of Al Qaeda, the Taliban, and the Muslim world.
Allies' Political Frame	8	This frame focused on political figures, including politicians, government officials, and religious leaders in allied countries.
Human Dimension Frame	9	This frame focused on the U.S. citizens who were affected by the 9/11 attacks and World War II. Also, This frame emphasized Japanese citizens, who were affected by the World War II. This frame focused on civilians in Muslim and Middle Eastern countries, especially Afghan refugees.

International Human Dimension Frame	10	This frame focused on civilians all over the world who were directly or indirectly connected with the 9/11 attacks. This frame also focused on civilians who were directly or indirectly connected with the Pearl Harbor attack, such as Axis nations, Asian countries, and the U.S. Allied countries.
Anti-War Frame	11	This frame focused on protesters who were against the invasion of Afghanistan and war, either in the United States, Japan, or abroad. If photo captions mentioned anti-war, the pictures are categorized under this frame, even though the newspaper only showed a portrait.
Loss Frame	12	This frame emphasized loss and grief through pictures, such as images of families who lost loved ones during the mission, and other images related to funerals and memorial services. The frame included orphans because showing orphans implied their families had died.
Mug shots of Loss Frame	13	This frame focused on loss through mug shot pictures, such as portraits of soldiers who died during war and terrorists who committed the 9/11 attacks. This frame only included mug shot pictures, which occupied about less than 1% of a newspaper page.
Enemy Symbols Frame	14	This frame focused on symbols of enemies, and machines of war, which U.S., Japanese, or other allies' armies left on the battlefield. This frame showed some fragments of machines of war, national flags of opponent nations, and mementos.

Military of Opponents Frame	15	This frame focused on military opponents and their machines of war. The frame included the images of enemies, such as Japanese Navy that carried out the attack on Pearl Harbor.
Military of Allies' Opponents Frame	16	This frame focused on allied military opponents against the U.S., Japanese, Muslim and Middle Eastern, and their machines of war.
Personal Face of Opponents' Military Frame	17	This frame focused on the personal faces of military opponents' soldiers. The frame included the faces of opponents' soldiers, such as photos of Japanese soldiers in the American media.
Prisoners of War Frame	18	This frame focused on prisoners of war, showing soldiers that surrender to the U.S., or Japanese military.
Victims/Casualties Frame	19	This frame focused on the casualties of war and the victims of the 9/11 attacks. The frame included only photos of victims who were injured or dead.
Media Self-Reference Frame	20	This frame focused on photos of journalists who covered World War II or the 9/11 attacks.
Landscape Frame	21	This frame showed only the landscapes of nations where the Japanese military invaded or where the U.S. military was fighting. The purpose of landscape pictures was to provide readers with a visual overview of where military action was taking place.
Other	22	The other category consisted of images that did not fit in the 21 previously defined categories.

Frames below were used only for *Asahi* and the *New York Times* in 2001.

Arabs and Muslims Frame	23	This frame focused on racial or regional problems that occurred among Arabs and Muslims after the 9/11 event in the United States. This frame also emphasized human interest.
Anti-U.S. Frame	24	This frame focused on anti-U.S. movements either in the United States, Japan, or abroad.
U.S. Firefighters Frame	25	This frame focused on firefighters and emergency workers who worked after the aftermath of September 11.
Security Frame	26	This frame focused on airport security and other security measures taken in the United States, Japan, and other countries after the 9/11 attacks.
Terrorist Frame	27	This frame focuses on images of perceived enemies, such as photographs of Osama bin Laden and the individuals who carried out the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon.

Additional Information on the Frames

The human dimension frames and the international human dimension frame were categorized by subjects' nationalities not by where the picture was taken. For example, if a photo caption said civilians in Myanmar, the picture was categorized in the international human dimension in Asia. If a photo showed a U.S. general's wife in Asia, the picture would be categorized into the human dimension frame of the United States. China was an ally of the United States; however, during 1941 to 1942, Manchuria was under the occupation of Japanese government; therefore, the researcher categorized Manchurian political figures under the allies' political frame of Japan.

5. Variables for the *New York Times* and *Asahi Shimbun* (Scott's pi reliability coefficient = 95%)

Variables	Definition
1	Japan in 1941
2	Japan in 2001
3	America in 1941
4	America in 2001
5	Muslim and Middle East in 2001

6. Camera angle (Scott's pi reliability coefficient = 92%)

Category	Code
Low angle	1
Equal angle	2
High angle	3

7. Proximity of subject to photographer (Scott's pi reliability coefficient = 78%)

Category	Code
Long shot	1
Mid-range shot	2
Close-up shot	3

8. Size of the image (Scott's pi reliability coefficient = 84%)

If the published size of the image was over 40 percent of a page, it was sorted into dominant. If a picture occupied anywhere from 7 to 40 percent of a page, it was sorted into semi-dominant. If a picture covered less than 7 percent of a page of newspaper space, it was sorted into small.

Category	Code	Definition
Dominant	1	Image size is between 40% and 100% of the page
Semi-dominant	2	Image size is between 7% and 40% of the page
Small	3	Image size is less than 7% of the page

9. Placement of the image (Scott's pi reliability coefficient = 98%)

Category	Code
Front	1
Front half of publication	2
Back half of publication	3