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CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

In the wake of the horrific attacks on the Pentagon and the World Trade Center that occurred on September 11, 2001, many people in American society tried to put the events into perspective. As a result of this process, in a search to process the reality of the situation, Americans tried to link the attacks in a historical background, and the mainstream producers of mediated news narratives, the means of ideological and social production, were there to assist in this socio-cognitional process. Due to the nature of the events (i.e., an attack on America), comparisons to Pearl Harbor were natural; they appeared in the mainstream American news media almost immediately. As an example, observe the following mass mediated exchange that occurred between CNN’s Aaron Brown and former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger in the hours shortly following the attacks:

BROWN: And Mr. Secretary, we heard -- and I am not sure you were able to -- but a few moments ago, Chris Dodd, Senator Dodd of Connecticut, compared this to the attack on Pearl Harbor. Can you give me any historical context for what has taken place today, or are we a bit too close to it all to understand it yet?

KISSINGER: Well, the attack was -- I guess it was -- it was certainly the first attack from across the seas on the territory of the United States, but it was not yet the mainland. And I agree with Senator Dodd, this is
comparable to an attack like Pearl Harbor, and we must have the same response. And the people who did it must have the same end as the people who attacked Pearl Harbor (2001).

This mediated equation of the two events continued to manifest itself in other media outlets in the days and months following the events. An article appeared in *National Review Online* entitled, “Dates of Infamy: December 7 and September 11” (Hanson 2001). The comparison made in this article of the two events suggest that just as those behind the attack on Pearl Harbor met their end at the hands of the American military, so too would it be for those who perpetrated the September 11 attacks.

There were indeed a number of similarities between the two events, but these are few when compared to the differences. It is the differences that are of primary concern to this project. It was the observation of how these events are dissimilar that makes this study necessary. This study seeks to draw attention not only to how both of the events were presented in the *New York Times*, but also how this particular news source, specifically in relation to its content, has changed in the intervening time between each historic event. I believe that is necessary to conduct this comparison in order to accumulate knowledge of the way in which the *New York Times* responded to each event, in order to gain perspective in relation to how the American public responded to the mass mediated news narratives following and supported the official responses to each of the historic moments.
The visual illustrations that follow draw attention to not only the differences between both events, but also the degree to which American culture has changed in the sixty year period between them. Observe the following:

**Figure 1.1: Keep America Rolling---Then**

![Keep America Rolling advertisement](image)

(Bird and Rubenstein 1995:35)

which suggests that material sacrifice is the way for the American civilian to do their part in aiding the war effort, and being exposed to the following advertisement from an advertising campaign executed by the General Motors corporation.
The explicit message of the General Motors’ “Keep America Rolling” campaign was simple: If you are a civilian, and wish to do your part in the “War on Terror,” you can, to quote the advertisement, “step in and help” by buying a new GM car or truck. The advertisement appeared in the October 15, 2001 edition of the New York Times. This was quite contradictory and dissimilar to the message of thrift during World War II.

The differences in these two examples of mediated advertising messages illustrate graphically, the extent to which American culture has changed, and hence the role the average American citizen was asked to play via the mass mediated realities of the respective time periods. In the period of American socio-cultural-political-economic-military (cultural and institutional) reality following the official beginning of U.S. involvement in World War II, the message mediated to the American public was one of
patriotism, thrift, and sacrifice. Americans were asked to produce and save rather than consume. Rationing and sacrifice were a reality of the American cultural experience as a result of the U.S. involvement in the Second World War. Not only were the American public asked to do their part by being frugal and conservative in regards to their use of resources, but they were mandated to do so through legislation that was passed to ensure that they did so. Staples and food products were rationed, as were such items as rubber and fabric. This greatly affected the availability of many consumer goods. At the time, being American meant being frugal. This message is quite different than the one mediated to the citizenry in the wake of the September 11 terrorist attacks.

Spector and Kitsuse have defined a “claims-maker” as anyone actively involved in an interactive process in which that individual makes a demand to another group that something should or ought to be done (2001:78). President George W. Bush, one of the primary claims-makers involved in the principle production of narrative constructs surrounding the framing of the events and aftermath, gives another example of this consumption message when he made the following remarks to Airline employees during a speech at O'Hare International Airport:

Get on board. Do your business around the country. Fly and enjoy America's great destination spots. Get down to Disney World in Florida. Take your families and enjoy life, the way we want it to be enjoyed. (www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010927, 2001)
When the above statement and its message of unjustified travel with a corporate destination is compared to the following World War II poster, the differences between the two periods in American history and American consciousness become apparent:

**Figure 1.3: Travel During World War II**

(Bird and Rubenstein, 1995:35)

The explicit difference between the two mediated constructions is related to what is considered to be American duty during each period. The acknowledgement of this difference realizes the difference of the American predicament between each period. America was not, in the aftermath of Pearl Harbor, in the same position militarily, economically, or culturally, than it was in the wake of the September 11 attacks. The current message is one of consumption as duty, rather than of frugality and sacrifice.

Although both events resulted in thousands of American deaths, Pearl Harbor and September 11th are further different in a number of ways, as were the situations preceding
the events. The attack on Pearl Harbor was directed at a military installation in what at
the time was an island holding of the United States. The primary targets were military
hardware and military personnel. In total, 2403 Americans died as a result of the attacks
with many wounded. In addition to the casualties, five ships were destroyed, and the
others in the area were heavily damaged. Nearly 200 aircraft were destroyed and another
159 were damaged. The attacks had greatly limited the ability of the American military
to respond to the battles then going on in the adjacent area. (Folly, 2002:29)

Approximately 3047 people died as a result of the terrorist attacks on September
11\textsuperscript{th} (Uniform Crime Index, 2001). In addition to the loss of life, the economic impacts
were far reaching. The targets were quite different. Symbols were attacked, symbols of
American military and economic might. These symbols were not attacked with military
aircraft of a sovereign nation, but commercial ones. The methods and magnitude of the
attacks are unprecedented.

The state of world affairs that existing preceding both events is another point of
dissimilarity. The world had been ripped by the ravages of war in the years prior to Pearl
Harbor, which drew the United States directly into the conflict. According to a
chronology of World War II provided by Martin Folly, prior to December 7, 1941, in
Europe, Hitler’s armies had already invaded or otherwise taken Austria, Czechoslovakia,
Poland, Greece, Holland, Belgium, Yugoslavia, Belgium, France, and the USSR. The
German blitzkrieg had brutalized Britain. Britain, France, New Zealand, and Canada had
already declared war on Germany. The USSR had invaded Poland and Finland. In Asia
and the Pacific, Japan was already agressing towards its’ neighbors. Prior to attacking
Pearl Harbor, the Japanese had taken the Chinese cities of Beijing and Shangai, forced the closing of the Burma Road, and occupied Northern Indo-China.

The United States had already been involved in the conflict militarily, politically, and economically. Prior to Pearl Harbor, the United States had responded to the various conflicts economically by freezing German, Japanese, and Italian assets and placing an oil embargo against the Axis states as well as banning the sale of steel and scrap iron to Japan. Vessels of the U.S. Navy had come under attack by German and Japanese forces. The United States depth charged and sank a German U-boat off the coast of Iceland in the spring of 1941 (2002:xi-xv).

The picture of the world, to all concerned, looked a lot different in the timespan before Pearl Harbor than it does in the days before September 11, 2001. Most of the world beyond the borders of the continental United States were dealing with the realities of war. This was not the case in the latter of the two periods. The American public was aware of terrorist activity, but nothing of this scale or magnitude. In the years prior to the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, there were isolated acts of domestic terrorism. Many things were happening in the world that foreshadowed future events and military engagements.

In the aftermath of September 11, we can see that the very nature and magnitude of domestic terrorism (acts that occur within its borders) has changed. The method used, as well as the number of lives lost as a result of the September 11 attacks are unprecedented.

To illustrate the change in shape of the terrorist threat on U.S. soil, the FBI’s official report on terrorism, published in 1998 proves to be a useful resource. According
to this report, during 1998, there were 5 terrorist incidents and 12 terrorist preventions in the United States during 1998. Of the five acts of terrorism that reached fruition, only one death resulted (that of a police officer at an abortion clinic). Of the 17 total attacks either planned or carried out on U.S. soil in 1998, 3 of the 5 that were successful took place in Puerto Rico, not within the confines of the continental U.S. (Terrorism in the United States 1998 Counterterrorism Threat Assessment and Warning Unit National Security Division, 23).

If we look at the official statistics related to terrorism in the United States through the 1990s, we see that the loss of human life as a result of the September 11 attacks is completely unprecedented. The first World Trade Center bombing, which occurred in the winter of 1993, resulted in over 1000 injuries, but only 6 deaths. There were no terrorist incidents reported at all in 1994. In the spring of 1995, the Murrah Federal Building was bombed, resulting in 168 deaths and 642 injuries, by far the most deadly terrorist event to take place on American soil prior to September 11. The other fatal terrorist event that occurred within the confines of the continental U.S. during the 1990s was carried out at Centennial Olympic Park in Atlanta, Georgia during the Summer Olympics; it resulted in 112 injuries and 2 deaths (Terrorism in the United States 1998 Counterterrorism Threat Assessment and Warning Unit National Security Division, 34).

In sum, of the three terrorist events that occurred on American soil during the 1990s, two of them were carried out not by foreign invaders, but rather by native born American citizens who had served in the United States military. The individuals tried and convicted for the Oklahoma City bombing, Timothy McVeigh and Terry Nichols,
both served in the United States Army. The chief suspect in the Olympic bombings, Eric Rudolph, also served in the U.S. Army.

Pearl Harbor and September 11th appear to be quite different, regardless of the comparisons made by voices in the American media. These voices in the American news media, and the messages put forth by them have had a profound impact on how the public perceives the events. My intent here is to examine the messages put out to the American public via news media outlets and the possibilities of these messages as agents of reality construction.

The importance of the news media as an agent in the construction of reality has been examined in much of the sociological literature related to the creation of social problems from the social constructionist perspective.

This study attempted to answer the questions related to the similarities and differences between Pearl Harbor and September 11, 2001 by looking at a media source that existed during both times by examining the focus of various narratives available to the U.S. public following each event in mainstream media sources. Was the focus of the articles military, economic, or other?

It was the difference between the mediated messages received by the American public during both periods, and the apparent difference between them economically that led me to question how these differences were reflected in the media.

It is my intent to examine the similarities and differences in the messages put forth by the media, in the periods shortly following each event. The goal of such an examination is to arrive at an understanding as to how public support might be constructed, and dissent deconstructed or otherwise undermined.
A question that needs to be answered is why it is of importance to look at the mass media, and the messages put forth by them, particularly those messages which we see manifest themselves in print? The mass media has become a major means of communication in our modern society. It is our ability to communicate that makes us social. The most pervasive and wide-reaching narratives with which we are confronted in our current reality are those which are perpetuated by the mass media. It is for this reason that it is necessary to look at the messages which we may or may not be given via the mass media. An examination of these messages is necessary in order for us to understand our current state of being, both what we believe to be true and what we do not. The mediated message, as a social construct, can be viewed as the common thread that ties us together as a society. The mass media, and the messages they put forth, form a critical link between the institutional structures that exist within our society as well as the individuals who exist within those structures. The mass media is instrumental in establishing our social consciousness. It is for the reasons mentioned above that I undertook this study.
CHAPTER TWO

Literature Review

In his book, *The Faultline of Consciousness*, David Maines states that his goal in the work is to “attempt to show how acts of telling are intimately connected to cultural and contextual frames of legitimacy, and then how narrative structures (as opposed to the structures of the narrative) may be connected to social institutions” (2001:xvii). The method by which Maines attempts to go about reaching the aforementioned goal is by means of narrative analysis, which deals in part with uncovering the way in which the content of story functions. Maines says of narrative analysis that it “has the obvious strength of allowing an analyst to show sensitivity to detail, process, conjuncture, and causal complexity” (2001:166).

Maines relates an excerpt from a letter which Herbert Blumer wrote to Robert Park in the winter of 1939 which is as follows: “The central problem of social science, which ostensibly is trying to understand human behavior, is the problem of communication.” Maines goes on to conclude, “Blumer understood that human conduct, including its collective and structural phases, is communicative in its fundamental nature” (2001:163). Given this, it is clear that in order to understand the processes by which we interact, it is of fundamental importance to look at the way in which we communicate, and how these communicative processes influence our interactions as well as the structures within which these interactions take place.

Gerald Cromer and Robin Wagner-Pacifici, suggest of narratives that they can “be said to be both retrospective, in the sense of explaining past actions, and prospective, in the sense of justifying future social arrangements that derive from these actions”
They go on to say, that in regards to narratives of violent acts, that they have “this doubled quality, in an often exaggerated manner” (2001:167). In discussing narrative analysis as a research tool, Cromer and Wagner-Pacifici, identify its neglect to look at violence in general, but more specifically acts of violence that are perpetuated by the state. They put forth the fact that it has been a recent development that:

...scholars have begun to look at the ways in which those in power use narratives to explain and legitimate wars and atrocities of one kind or another. Such developments look at the origins of sociological preoccupation with the state itself, drawing into their sweep Weber’s dark but disciplined characterization of the state as a ‘monopoly of the legitimate use of physical force within a given territory’ (Weber 1946) (2001:165).

In relation to a news narrative, that is a narrative account that is created and transmitted via mass mediated news sources and outlets, Gaye Tuchman offers a glimpse into the logic behind viewing the mass media as an agent of socialization in American society. She says of news that it is

...a window to the world. Through its frame, Americans learn of themselves and others, of their own institutions, leaders, and life styles, and those of other nations and their peoples (1978:1).

Tuchman further attempts to distinguish the news narrative as being intrinsically different from other narrative forms. She says of these news narratives, and of the particular style in which they are written that:

...the language of news prose contains a special relationship to the everyday world, like any other language, it both frames and accomplishes discourse. It is perception and it guides perception, it reconstitutes the everyday world (107).
In saying of news that it “reconstitutes the everyday world,” Tuchman points to the necessity of looking at the news not simply as a product of material culture, but a producer of nonmaterial culture, of thoughts, ideas, and ideologies as well.

In conceiving of news as ideological, Tuchman suggests that all knowledge is situationally determined, that it is dependent on both the cultural and historical contexts in which it exists. In making this understanding lucid, Tuchman cites the following quotation from Dorothy E. Smith:

> It must be stressed that knowing is always a relation between knower and known. The knower cannot therefore be collapsed into the known. To know is always to know on some terms and the paradox of knowing is that we discover in its object the lineaments of what we already know. There is no other way to know than humanly and therefore the knower is situated historically and culturally. This is the fundamental human condition of knowing. The very concept of knowledge itself...is historically and culturally given. If to be situated as such entails ideology (indeed, if to be human entails ideology), then knowledge [and science as knowledge] is fundamentally ideological [1972:2] (179).

Tuchman finishes her point; in arguing that news narratives are like knowledge in that such narratives function to impose “a frame for defining and constructing social reality” (180). The examination of news narratives, and their functions, falls squarely within the symbolic interactionist perspective in sociological theory and practice.

In his book, *The Culture of Terrorism*, Noam Chomsky, discusses how the media in the United States, does construct narratives in such a way that they can maintain the agenda of the government in relation to certain issues. He illustrates the fact that, when Congress was to vote on contra aid in 1986:
The two major newspapers—The New York Times and The Washington Post—devoted to this matter no less than 85 opinion pieces by regular columnists and invited contributors. All 85 were critical of the Sandinistas, the overwhelming majority bitterly hostile; thus total conformity was maintained on a central issue. In 85 columns, there was not a single phrase noting that in sharp contrast to our loyal allies and clients, the Sandinista government, whatever its sins, does not slaughter its own population; the irrelevance of this evidently insignificant fact is just another indication of the ease with which we tolerate horrendous atrocities committed by ‘our side’ (1988:204).

This forces us to ask the question: “Is the American media possibly biased?”

Arthur Asa Berger, in observing the social nature of knowledge, suggests that:

...though consciousness is socially produced, it is always filtered through the minds of real, live, active men, and women and is not something that works automatically. There is always the possibility of individuals’ gaining an understanding of their situation and doing something about it...We have, now, our first important insight---namely, that ‘our’ ideas are not entirely our own, that knowledge is social (1988:39).

Berger lists some questions that he views as being important to ask when undertaking an analysis of narratives that appear in the media, which are as follows:

1. What social, political, and economic arrangements characterize the society in which the media are being analyzed?
2. Who owns, controls, and operates the media?
3. What roles do the various media play in the society where the media are being analyzed? And what are the functions of the various popular art forms carried by the media?
4. What ideas, values, notions, concepts, beliefs, and so on are spread by the media, and what ideas, values, and so on are neglected by the media? Why?
5. How are writers, artists, actors, and other creative people affected by the patterns of ownership and control of the media? (39).
Berger notes that the mass media, as an institution, is necessary to focus on in order to understand how social consciousness is established, formed, and later manipulated within the social context in which they exist. Berger concludes in saying that “…the mass media and popular culture constitute a crucial link between the institutions and society (and the superstructure in general) and individual consciousness” (43).

Edward Herman and Noam Chomsky, following Berger, say of the mass media outlets that exist in a democratic society, such as the United States, that they:

…serve as a system for communicating messages and symbols to the general populace. It is their function to amuse, entertain, and inform, and to inculcate individuals with the values, beliefs, and codes of behavior that will integrate them into the institutional structures of the larger society (1988:1-35).

In his critique of Herman and Chomsky’s conception of the function of the mass media in democratic societies, Jeffrey Klaehn asserts the following:

Mass media play an especially important role in democratic societies. They are presupposed to act as intermediary vehicles that reflect public opinion, respond to public concerns and make the electorate cognizant of state policies, important events and viewpoints. The fundamental principles of democracy depend upon the notion of a reasonably informed electorate (2002:147).

Following the above assertion, we see that the mass media in American society are not charged with simply disseminating information and entertaining us, but must meet the informational needs of the populous in order to insure that democracy can flourish. To fully exercise our responsibility of active participation in the decision-making process, we are dependent upon the information that lies within mediated news narratives.
Herbert Gans draws our attention to the influence of the mass media, on Italian-American immigrants living in the West End of Boston in particular, in his book *Urban Villagers*. He makes the observation that “…of all the ideas which come from the outside world, the most avidly received are those transmitted by the mass media” (1962:187). Given that the mass media is the most far-reaching vehicle for the transmission of ideas and values in this country, this comes as no surprise.

As a discipline, sociology offers us many conceptual and theoretical leads by which to examine written communication which we find, or do not find in the mass media. Among some of the theorists in the discipline who deal with communication and its role in the formation of collective consciousness are as follows: Karl Marx, Erving Goffman, and Georg Simmel.

Marx puts forth the idea of how cultural elites, or the ruling class within a given culture, operate not only in regards to their use and control of the means of ideological production, here the media, but also how it shapes the collective consciousness within the social context. This idea is illustrated in the following excerpt from his work *The German Ideology*:

The ideas of the ruling class are, in every age, the ruling class which is the dominant material force in society is at the same time its dominant intellectual force. The class which has the means of material production at its disposal, has control at the same time over the means of production, so that in consequence the ideas of those who lack the means of mental production are, in general, subject to it. The dominant ideas are nothing more than the ideal expression of the dominant material relationships, the dominant material relationships grasped as ideas, and thus of the relationships which make one class the ruling one; they are consequentially the ideas of its dominance. The individuals composing the ruling class possess among other
things consciousness, and therefore think. Insofar, therefore, as they rule as a class and determine the whole extent of an epoch, it is self-evident that they do in their whole range and thus, among other things, rule as thinkers, as producers of ideas, and regulate the production and distribution of the ideas of their age. Consequently their ideas are the ruling ideas of their age (1973:78)

Erving Goffman, in his work *Frame Analysis*, suggests that the events that make the news are only the “extraordinary ones.” Goffman goes on to suggest that the media, or those individuals or groups who control the mechanism can from time to time engage in what he terms as “fabrication.” To Goffman, fabrication refers to the “intentional effort of one or more individuals to manage activity so that a party of one or more others will be induced to have a false belief about what it is that is going on” in relation to a particular matter or event. He identifies the individuals or groups who construct such machinations as “operatives, fabricators, or deceivers.” Goffman termed the individuals or groups who are taken in as being “contained,” referring to the fact that they are restricted within the confines of the fabrication (1974:85).

Following Goffman’s concept of framing or fabrication, Robert Entman speaks of it in relation to the mediated news narratives. To Entman, news frames are complex, in that they exist at more than one level. It is these frames that shape and guide the way in which we perceive, interpret, and act upon the information contained within news narratives. Entman put it this way:

- News frames exist at two levels: as mentally stored principles for information processing and as characteristics of the news text. Examples of frames as internalized guides are the cold war frame imposed on international affairs and the horse race frame imposed on election
News frames are constructed. It is through these constructs that we come to define what is real. Once the frame has been constructed and set, it will act as a template through which we perceive and experience reality. The news frame sets and confines our perception and digestion of the contents contained within the news narratives that are transmitted to us via the mass media.

Why study the messages put forth in writing? Why study written communication? In regards to written communication, which he refers to as “the sociology of the letter,” Georg Simmel asserts that writing “…represent a very peculiar constellation even under the category of secrecy. In the first place, writing is opposed to all secrecy” (1955:352). In saying of writing, that it is “opposed to all secrecy,” Simmel makes an important point. Due to its very nature, the written word is not secret. The question is: “How do we determine that that which is written is true?” We have all heard the expression “don’t believe everything you read,” but why is it that we will believe some things that we read? How is it that we tell the difference? The difference I believe lies in the source of the written information. Lies do indeed have a function, but only when they are no longer secrets.

Simmel adds, in relation to secrecy and written communication, the following:

In being written down, the intellectual content receives an objective form, an existence that, in principle, is timeless, a successively and simultaneously unlimited reproducibility in the consciousness of individuals (352).

To conclude the above idea, Simmel says of writing that it thus “…possesses an objective existence which renounces all guarantees of remaining secret” (312). According to
Simmel then that which is written is by its very nature not secret for that which is written renounces secrecy. We can conclude then, that that which is not written is intended to remain secret, and as a result remains outside of our perception, and hence outside of our reality. Simmel goes on to say that:

Primitive man, who lives in a small group, who satisfies his needs through his own production or through direct cooperation, who limits his intellectual interests to his own experiences or to unilinear tradition, surveys and controls the material of his life more easily and completely than does the man of higher culture (312).

As a result of mass media, we are unlike primitive man, who “limits his intellectual interests to his own experiences” and “controls the material of his life more easily”. We need to ask then: Who controls the material of our life? Who controls the material of our experiences? Simmel goes on to say of primitive man:

…the practice of his life is guided in the main by those few facts and circumstances of which his narrow angle of vision permit him to gain directly a correct view. In a richer and larger cultural life, however, existence rests on a thousand premises which…the individual must take on faith. Our modern life is based to a much larger extent than is usually realized upon the faith in the honesty of the other (313).

Can we assume then, that the life of modern man is guided in a similar way? Can we assume then, that the circumstances which we experience, being much larger in number, give us anything more than a similar “narrow” angle of vision? According to Simmel, our “modern life is based to a much larger extent than is usually realized upon faith in the honesty of the other” (313). Although the media outlets which we have access to are extensive in number, the sources behind them are not. Such entities as media
conglomerates and wire services exist which put out many of the ideas that to which we have access.

These media conglomerates, being huge corporations, are extremely influential in regards to what “truths” or “lies” get out; and in many cases, we will see the same story over and over again via various outlets, at most times not realizing that these outlets are owned by the same parent companies. The media corporations are the means of ideological production in our current society. We hear a story from what appears to be a great number of sources, when in fact it is not. The story has become nothing more than product, a good to be sold. The audience is the product. In relation to this, Noam Chomsky writes:

Whether they’re called “liberal” or “conservative”, the major media are large corporations, owned by and interlinked by even larger conglomerates. Like other corporations, they sell a product to a market. The market is advertisers---that is, other businesses. Not surprisingly, the picture of the world presented reflects the narrow and biased interests and values of the sellers, the buyers, and the product (1988:93).

The media in our modern American society have become powerful and influential to such an extent that the individual “does not trust his own experience…until it is confirmed by…the media” (Mills, 1956:312). We tend to base our conceptions of reality on the stories which are perpetuated in the media. Beliefs are built in a similar fashion: we see one thing occur the same way time after time, after a while we start to believe that it is just how things are. We base our beliefs on these conceptions. In relation to this, Simmel writes:

We base our gravest decisions on a complex system of conceptions, most of which presuppose the confidence that
we will not be betrayed. Under modern conditions, the lie, therefore, becomes something much more devastating than it was earlier, something which questions the very foundations of our life (1955:313).

Although my specific topic has not been researched, there have been various papers written and studies conducted related to mass media news coverage of conflicts and disasters. These past endeavors provide insight and guidance as to how this current study was conducted.

Many articles have been written related to censorship imposed upon journalists during times of conflict, particularly conflicts in which the American military has been directly involved. Blanchard has focused on the extent to which the right to free expression on the part of American journalists has historically been suppressed during times of war (2001:5). The Persian Gulf War, which began in late 1990, and the degree to which the American media was denied access to or otherwise was restricted from covering the operations and activities of the United States military over the course of the conflict, brought up many concerns regarding censorship among journalists in particular and Americans in general (6). Blanchard suggests that this high degree of restricted access and censorship of journalists by the first Bush Administration amounted to active control of the flow of information, and manipulation of the democratic process. In addition to this restricted access, as the result of governmental controls, Blanchard writes:

Other restrictions were in place as well---all due, said journalists and their supporters with varying degrees of intensity to: the military’s desire to get even with the press for besmirching the military’s reputation in Vietnam; the administration’s goal of keeping American citizens unable to make informed decisions about whether the nation should be involved in the war in the first place; and the administration’s desire to hide the nation’s true motives for going to war (6).
The ultimate outcome of such restriction of journalists, and in turn manipulation of the media, by controlling the information which they are privy to, is the suppression of dissent through undermining the democratic process.

War coverage has been an issue of focus for a number journalism and communications scholars, particularly since the Vietnam War. Patterson conducted a comparative study between media coverage of the Vietnam and Persian Gulf wars. The study was conducted to investigate “the suggestion that had Gulf war rules been in place during the war in Vietnam, reporting about Vietnam would have been different” (1995:20). In conducting the study, Patterson compared television coverage of American military operations on the three major television network news sources ---NBC, ABC, and CBS---within the five year period between Augusts of 1968 and 1973. The goal of the research was to see if the ground rules established, which dictated what journalists could and could not report during the Gulf War of 1991 had been applicable to journalists covering the Vietnam conflict, would impact the coverage in any way. The answer to the question: “Had the 12 rules (of reporting during the Persian Gulf War) been in place during Vietnam, would television coverage of that war have been any different?” (28), the answer that Patterson arrives at is “probably not” (28). This leads us to the possible conclusion that it was not the media coverage that led to the ultimate lack of victory with which the American military leadership was forced to deal at the end of its involvement in Vietnam, but quite possibly the military leadership itself. The media was used as a scapegoat.

McLeod, Eveland, and Signorielli (1994) examined the role that the American news media play in the construction of ideological reality during times of war. They say
of the media that they “play an intermediary role in the conflict process,” and that the media “are a primary conduit for information that produces rallying effects” (22). Rallying effects are the extent to which the civilian population. Methodologically, their study sought to gather data on the degree to which the American public relied on the mass media for their information regarding the Persian Gulf War (24). The media sources examined, the sources from which the public got their information regarding the Persian Gulf War, were television, newspaper, and radio news outlets. One of the variables measured in the study was that of confidence the respondents reported having in Congress, the president, military, television, and newspapers during the course of the conflict. According to the results, respondents reported having more confidence in each of the above variables while an external conflict was progressing, while after the conflict had passed, the level of public confidence in each variable dissipated (25). In all cases examined, the extent to which the populous rallies behind its leaders and institutions is greatest at the onset of war. McLeod et al. found that the type of information that the public receives from mainstream American media sources during times of conflict tend to be very homogeneous, which in turn reinforces the high degree to which people rally around the flag; of this they say that in time of war, the public receives “a relatively consonant view of the war from the mainstream media, thus reinforcing rally effects” (29). Given that the media has been shown to function in such a way as to benefit the status quo in time of external conflict, it would not be surprising to find these media outlets, and the message they put forth to be consciously manipulated by those in power.

German (1991) examined the way in which historical comparisons can be utilized by governmental claims-makers to convince the American public of the necessity for
war. This framing of events or figures by way of historical comparison has become necessary to be utilized to convince the public, which tends to favor the use of economic sanctions over military intervention, to support war as a viable option in resolving conflict (292). Citing examples found in the rhetoric employed by President George H. W. Bush prior to the first Persian Gulf War, German illustrates the extent to which historical analogy was relied upon to justify the war the American public initially thought was unnecessary. The use of historical analogy is seen as having great emotional impact on the receivers of such mediated narratives, which eventually “advances support for military rather than economic action” (295). Discussing the early speeches in which Bush argued the case for war to the American people, German says the following:

Throughout the early speech narratives of Saddam’s cruelties make him the counterpart of Adolf Hitler, further justifying US intervention. While the US waits, atrocities mount. Bush says, ‘Babies have been torn from their incubators; children shot in front of their parents (296).

Given that the events of December 7, 1941 have been widely compared by claims-makers in the mainstream American news media to the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, it as if the stage has been set for the same types of historical analogies as seen in the months prior to American military campaign against Saddam Hussein in the first Gulf War. The frame has been constructed in such a manner as to justify further analogies which will in turn be used to justify a wide scale military intervention in the new war on terror.

The ideas laid out above provide us with a useful framework with which to examine the various information which we have at our fingertips, particularly that which is made accessible to us via media outlets that are so pervasive in modern American society.
The social constructionist perspective informs the current study by pointing out that social reality is a construction which is facilitated by the communication of information, particularly that information that we receive contained within news narratives. As Tuchman (1978) pointed out, it is by means of these news narratives that we, as Americans, learn not only where we are situated in the social structure, but also how we come to where we stand in relation to the rest of the world. For Berger (1998), in his own observation of the degree to which knowledge, and therefore consciousness is a social construct, suggests that this knowledge is filtered and processed not passively, but actively. The information human beings receive is not passively absorbed, but rather it is actively processed and interpreted by them within the particular ideological and institutional context in which they are living. It is this cultural context that shapes the way in which knowledge is not only produced, but also how it is processed, and consciousness manufactured.

Similarly, Marx, Goffman, Simmel, and Chomsky focus on the ideological nature of constructed consciousness. Marx (1973) drew attention to the fact that those individuals and groups in society who control the means of material production also control the means of ideological production. Goffman identified those individuals who have the power to produce ideology, and hence consciousness as “fabricators” (1974:85). Along the same lines, Simmel (1955) suggests that our consciousness is no longer limited by that which we experience directly. Our consciousness now is largely shaped by the indirect contact we have with mediated messages in general, and new narratives in particular. Chomsky (1988) draws our attention to the nature of the modern American media system, pointing out the fact that they are large corporate entities. These large
media conglomerates are further interconnected to other large corporations. To Chomsky, the narratives which these organizations mediate or otherwise transmit reflect not the interests of the public, but rather the corporate interests. To Chomsky there exists the great potential that this institutional arrangement can serve to undermine the democratic process.

Due to the pervasiveness of the information that is brought to our attention via the mass media, I believe that it is important to examine not only the various stories and their sources, but how these stories, and the ideas put forth by them, function for those who put them out, and in turn how they function within our society, within the context in which they exist and have meaning. Since those elite groups wielding power in society that control the means of material production also control the means of ideological, and hence reality production, it is of importance to examine the potential ways that such produced reality might function to their benefit rather than to the benefit of the general populous. Given the central role that information plays in a democratic system, the examination of the means by which the general populous receives such information, and the messages put forth by those means is critical in order to ensure that democracy functions for the people, which is of crucial importance during times in which the national interest has been threatened.
CHAPTER THREE

Method

The aim of this study was to provide a clearer picture of what appeared in the *New York Times* in the two month period following the attacks on Pearl Harbor and the attacks on the Pentagon and World Trade Center that took place on September 11, 2001. This aim was fulfilled by means of both quantitative and qualitative methods. Content analyses were performed on both the primary news articles as well as the OP/ED/Letters pieces within the sample period. As an indirect result of conducting the content analyses, qualitative observations were made related to the degree to which advertisement placement, content, and structure of the *New York Times* has changed between the two time periods.

As media outlet, The *New York Times* is considered to belong to the top tier of all media organizations in the United States as a result of its wealth and hence, influences (Herman and Chomsky, 1988:1-35). According to Lee and Solomon, along with the *Washington Post*, the *New York Times* has a tremendous impact on American political reality, more so than any other published news source, to the extent that they influence the agenda of the major television news outlets (1990:20). The *New York Times* was chosen as the media source to be examined because, a) it existed during both periods, b) it was one of the most widely circulating daily periodicals during both periods, and c) it was considered during both periods to be the elite paper of record that influenced the agenda of other media outlets in the United States. This seemed to be the most appropriate source by which to perform the historical comparison but, being appropriate does not equate with a lack of limitations. The primary limitation of the *New York Times*
as a data source is the fact that whereas the Pearl Harbor attack was distant news for the paper, the attacks on the World Trade Center were local. There is the stark possibility that the narrative reality constructed in the source from that sample could be somehow skewed in relation to the content and focus of the content.

Samples were constructed from the eight-week time periods immediately following the attack on Pearl Harbor (1941-1942) and the attacks of September 11 (2001). A complete two-week period (14 days) was constructed by means of random selection from each eight-week period.

Guido Stempel clearly established that two constructed weeks sample from a daily periodical is sufficient for representing a year’s content (1952:333). Stempel’s study was replicated by Lacy, Robinson, and Riffe who suggest that “someone interested in studying weekly newspaper content should either randomly select fourteen issues from a year, or pick twelve issues, one from each month” (1998:99). I am only interested in generating a representative sample of two months. The sample size is appropriate.

The two month period following each event was chosen due to the fact that it is during this period of time that the dominant narratives that help citizens realistically define a situation emerge. Robert Schrag discusses this in relation to the “first stories” that we hear as children, as part the process by which we are socialized and come to understand reality and subjective truth. Schrag writes:

First stories are, obviously, the stories told to children. They take many forms, e.g., traditional oral story-telling, books, songs, television, and movies, all of which share a common, important, characteristic: in the absence of prior stories of authoritative instructions to the contrary, first stories are given a waiver on the fidelity test. Instead, if deemed probable, they pass easily into the realm of truth
and become part of the standard for subsequent judgments of narrative fidelity. Hence, first stories become very important stories, stories worthy of serious consideration and investigation (1991:314).

Given that socialization is a lifelong process, it seems reasonable to apply this to the first stories related to specific events that we hear as adults as well. Schrag’s statement provides justification not only for the sample, but for this study as well.

Once the sample was constructed two separate content analyses were conducted as well as a more qualitative examination of the New York Times in relation to general structure, advertising placement, and advertising content. One looked at the focus of the articles in the primary or first section of the New York Times, the other coded for the focus of pieces occurring in the OP/ED and Letters sections of the paper. The same constructed samples were used for each analysis. In each case, all articles that appeared in the sample were coded. The reasoning being that what was lost in efficiency would be gained in accuracy and the degree to which the samples are representative of the section from which they were pulled.

In the content analysis of the primary new articles, only those articles appearing in this first section of the paper were analyzed. A coding sheet and instructions were developed for the purpose of this study (see Appendices A and B). The following information was culled from the primary news section via application of the coding sheet. Each article was coded for the following categories:

1. **Article title.**

2. **Date.**
3. **Section in which the story begins**: In this case, the answer was always one. When I initially constructed the coding sheet, I did so acknowledging the possibility that I might need to apply to other parts of the paper.

4. **Page on which the story begins**: The page on which the story begins will give an idea as to the importance of the story. The further towards the back of the section an article first appears, the less relevant it is in the news of the day.

5. **Length in paragraphs**: The length in paragraphs will give an idea as to the importance or dominance of a particular story.

6. **Type of story (focus)**: The type of story is the main focus or subject of the story.

   The following were available as types or foci:

   1) **Military**: This story type or focus area was applied if the story primarily dealt with any of the following related subject matter: war, army, navy, marines, battles, the Pentagon, terrorist attacks, military personnel, military aircraft, air raids, terror alerts, enlistment, black outs, Nazis, Japanese, Taliban, al Qaeda, Osama bin Laden, Hitler, Tojo, bombs, torpedoes, espionage, terrorism, security, etc. (see Appendix C for examples of stories coded as being military in focus).

   2) **Economic**: This type of story or focus area was applied if the story primarily dealt with any of the following related subject matter: thrift, sacrifice, rations (of grain, sugar, rubber, etc.), the Labor Board, war bonds, war stamps, Wall Street, the New York Stock Exchange, job losses, jobs created, work hours, factory production, consumer activity, and so forth (see Appendix D for examples of stories coded as being economic in focus).
3) **Other:** This type of story or focus area was applied if the story primarily dealt with subject matter which was unrelated to the other two focus categories. Example of such articles dealt with the following: traffic accidents, child paralysis, race relations, the elderly, health care, medicine, speed limit changes, television programs, celebrities, radio, theatre, movies, travel, automobiles, elections, and crime (see Appendix E for examples of stories coded as being other in focus).

In order to determine intercoder reliability, the author as well as two other sociology graduate students applied the coding sheet to the same two articles from four issues of the *New York Times* which were randomly selected from the constructed sample. Intercoder reliability for this study ranged from a low of 86.8% to a high of 100% for all categories on the coding sheet, yielding an overall intercoder reliability of 95.05% based on the percentage of the agreement (see Appendix F for reliability report). Level of significance for this study was set at .05. The author coded all articles in the sample of 2005 articles.

In the second content analysis, that of the OP/ED pieces and Letters only those articles appearing in this section of the paper were analyzed. A coding sheet and instructions were developed for the purpose of this study (see Appendices G and H). The following information was culled from the OP/ED and Letters section via application of the coding sheet. Each article was coded for the following categories:

1. **Title of piece.**
2. **Date.**
3. **Length in paragraphs**: The length in paragraph will give an idea as to the importance or dominance of a particular story.

4. **Source of piece**: The source of the piece: editorial, opinion letter, article (by staff writer).

5. **Type of piece**: The type of story is the main focus or subject of the story. The following were available as types or foci:

1) **Military**: This story type or focus area was applied if the story primarily dealt with any of the following related subject matter: war, army, navy, marines, battles, the Pentagon, terrorist attacks, military personnel, military aircraft, air raids, terror alerts, enlistment, black outs, Nazis, Japanese, Taliban, al Qaeda, Osama bin Laden, Hitler, Tojo, bombs, torpedoes, espionage, terrorism, security, etc..

2) **Economic**: This type of story or focus area was applied if the story primarily dealt with any of the following related subject matter: thrift, sacrifice, rations (of grain, sugar, rubber, etc.), the Labor Board, war bonds, war stamps, Wall Street, the New York Stock Exchange, job losses, jobs created, work hours, factory production, consumer activity, and so forth.

3) **Other**: This type of story or focus area was applied if the story primarily dealt with subject matter which was unrelated to the other two focus categories. Example of such articles dealt with the following: traffic accidents, child paralysis, race relations, the elderly, health care, medicine, speed limit changes, television programs, celebrities, radio, theatre, movies, travel, automobiles, elections, and crime.
In order to determine intercoder reliability, the author as well as two other sociology graduate students applied the coding sheet to the same two pieces from four issues of the *New York Times* which were randomly selected from the constructed sample. Intercoder reliability for this study ranged from a low of 91.75% to a high of 100% for all categories on the coding sheet, yielding an overall intercoder reliability of 96.90% based on the percentage of the agreement (see Appendix I for reliability report). Level of significance for this study was set at .05. The author coded all pieces in the sample of 507 pieces.

The data gleaned from the content analyses was analyzed using SPSS, a computer-based data analysis program. SPSS was used to compute cross tabulations and frequency distributions.

**Qualitative Analysis**

A further analysis was made of the *New York Times* in the periods studied. This qualitative analysis looked at advertisement placement, and content, as well as an examination of the sources of the dominant narratives surrounding the most robust differences between the coverage of each period and those individuals who have the voice and power to produce these narrative constructions linked to the stark differences in the content analysis findings.

In my view it was necessary to transcend the constructed samples in order to aid in obtaining a clear means for comparison between the two periods studied. I examined the December 7, 1941 and September 11, 2001 in addition to December 8, 1941 and September 12, 2001; the days before and after coverage of each event. The goal was that
this would assist in grounding the events in the social climate that existed prior to each event in history as reflected in the *New York Times*. 

I conclude with an analysis of various claims and statements those individuals I have identified as claims-makers have made in regards to the events of September 11, the reasons for the attacks, and the threat of terrorism. Rather than using the *New York Times* as a source, I have chosen to use excerpts from speeches and press releases accessed from the archives of the United States Department of State.
CHAPTER FOUR

Data Analysis and Results

The results of this study illustrate not only that Pearl Harbor and the September 11 attacks, as well as the two months following them; have more differences than similarities as they were reflected in the *New York Times* window. These dissimilarities are not just reflected in the foci of the primary news articles, OP/ED pieces, and letters, but also in relation to the placement and content of advertisements.

**Primary News Articles**

A total of 2005 articles were analyzed in the news section of the *New York Times* for both periods. The primary news section is that section which starts with the front page and includes such things as national, international, and other news. The primary news section is the very first section of the paper, which generally ends with the obituaries or editorial section. The number of articles which were coded as having a military focus during the WWII sample was 976, compared to 271 articles of the same focus for the issues covered after September 11. The total number of articles having a military focus found in both samples was 1247. In regards to stories having an economic focus, 55 were found from the post Pearl Harbor period, compared to 71 from the post September 11 period, for a total of 126 articles having an economic focus. The total number of articles that appeared within the post Pearl Harbor sample was 1435, as opposed to 570 total articles appearing in the post 9-11 sample. The combined total for both sample periods was 2005. The distribution is statistically significant. See Table 1.
Table 1
Post Pearl Harbor and September 11, 2001 Coverage---New York Times

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Area</th>
<th>1941-1942</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Military Focus</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>1247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Focus</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Focus</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1435</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degrees of freedom: 2
Chi-square = 93.9227
$p$ is less than or equal to 0.001.

Within the 2005 articles that were coded for this study, there were a total of 26343 paragraphs. Within the total sample appeared 15653 paragraphs that were coded as having a military focus. The total number of paragraphs from the sample that were coded as having an economic focus was 1978. The total number of paragraphs coded as other in focus was 8712. The distribution is statistically significant. See Table 2 below which includes the collapsed categories showing the paragraphs appearing within each of the three focus areas in four-week periods.

Table 2
Paragraphs per Focus Area per Period---New York Times

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Area</th>
<th>12/07/41-01/05/42</th>
<th>01/06/42-02/05/42</th>
<th>09/12/01-10/09/01</th>
<th>10/10/01-11/06/01</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>3515</td>
<td>6506</td>
<td>4025</td>
<td>1607</td>
<td>15653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>1404</td>
<td>1404</td>
<td>5498</td>
<td>8712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4262</td>
<td>8144</td>
<td>6275</td>
<td>7662</td>
<td>26343</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degrees of freedom: 6
Chi-square = 8434.0761
$p$ is less than or equal to 0.001.
When we examine the paragraphs within each article focus area per each time period sampled, the following can be observed: we can see that the percentage of paragraphs coded as being military in focus has decreased by 40% from the 1941-1942 sample to that from the post September 11 period. In regards to paragraphs coded as having an economic focus, we see that the percentage of articles coded as such for the post September 11 sample is twice that found in the 1941-1942 sample. The percentage of articles coded as other has tripled when we compare the 1941-1942 sample to that of 2001. Tables 3 and 4 illustrate the percentage of the total content of each sample, based on the total number of paragraphs coded for each of the three focus areas.

Table 3
Paragraphs per Article Focus and Percentage of Content 1941-1942

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Paragraphs</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>3515 + 6506</td>
<td>10021</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>341 + 234</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>406 + 1404</td>
<td>1810</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4262 + 8144</td>
<td>12406</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4
Paragraphs per Article Focus and Percentage of Content 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Paragraphs</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>4025 + 1607</td>
<td>5632</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>846 + 557</td>
<td>1403</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1404 + 5498</td>
<td>6902</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6275 + 7662</td>
<td>13937</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When we collapse the time period categories for the percentage of paragraphs devoted to each of the three focus areas in each sample, we find the following: a decrease in the amount of paragraphs having a military focus, an increase in the number of paragraphs coded as being economic in focus, and an increase in the number of paragraphs in the focus category of other. See Table 5.

Table 5
Percentage of Paragraphs Devoted to Each Focus Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Area</th>
<th>1941-1942</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Military Focus</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Focus</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Focus</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Focus</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When we examine the percentages of paragraphs devoted to each focus area for each constructed period designated on Table 6 we see some interesting changes both between and within the sample categories.
Table 6
Percentage of Paragraphs Devoted to Each Focus Area---Dates Collapsed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Paragraph Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/08/1941-01/05/1942</td>
<td>3503</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Focus</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Focus</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Focus</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4262</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/06/1942-02/05/1942</td>
<td>6506</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Focus</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Focus</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Focus</td>
<td>1404</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8144</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/12/2001-10/09/2001</td>
<td>4025</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Focus</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Focus</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Focus</td>
<td>1404</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6275</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/10/2001-11/06/2001</td>
<td>1607</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Focus</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Focus</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Focus</td>
<td>5498</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7662</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We see very little change in regards to the proportion of the paper which is made up of the 3 coding categories for the period from 12/08/1942 to 01/05/1942 and the period from 01/06/1942 to 02/05/1942. What we do see, however, is a near doubling of the total number of paragraphs from the first 28-day period following Pearl Harbor to the second.

When we examine the percentage of paragraphs within coding categories for the samples pulled from the post September 11 period, we see more dramatic changes in the content of the primary news section of the New York Times as opposed to those content shifts which were detected in the post Pearl Harbor period. The findings are as follows:

We see a significant drop in stories having a military focus from the 09/12/2001 to
10/09/2001 sample and the 10/10/2001 to 11/06/2001 sample. The number of paragraphs in articles having a military focus drops from 64% to 21%, a decrease of more than 40%. The articles coded as having a military focus in the corresponding samples from 1941-1942 stayed high in number, with no significant change. We see a significant drop in the percentage of paragraphs with an economic focus, the percentage drops from 13.5% to 7%. In regards to the other category, we see a rather dramatic increase in the percentage of section content that it comprises from 22.5% to 72%.

**OP/ED/Letters Pieces**

Within the 507 pieces that appeared in the OP/ED, Letters, and Editorial sections coded for this study, there were a total of 8391 paragraphs. Within the total sample, 4769 paragraphs were coded as having a military focus. The total number of paragraphs from the sample that were coded as having an economic focus was 1025. The total number of paragraphs coded as other in focus was 2597. See table 7 below which includes the collapsed categories showing the paragraphs appearing within each of the three focus areas in four-week periods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>12/07/41-01/05/42</th>
<th>01/06/42-02/05/42</th>
<th>09/12/01-10/09/01</th>
<th>10/10/01-11/06/01</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>1328</td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>1391</td>
<td>4769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>1025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>1596</td>
<td>2597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>478</strong></td>
<td><strong>1955</strong></td>
<td><strong>2707</strong></td>
<td><strong>3249</strong></td>
<td><strong>8391</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degrees of freedom: 6
Chi-square = 1662.9433

\( p \) is less than or equal to 0.001.
When we examine the paragraphs within each focus area the following can be observed: we can see that the percentage of paragraphs coded as being military in focus has increased by only 1% from the 1941-1942 sample to that from the post September 11 periods. In regards to paragraphs coded as having an economic focus, we see that the percentage of pieces coded as such for the post September 11 sample is one fifth that found in the 1941-1942 sample. The percentage of pieces coded as other has more than doubled when we compare the 1941-1942 sample to that of 2001. Tables 8 and 9 illustrate the percentage of the total content of each sample, based on the total number of paragraphs coded for each of the three focus areas.

Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Paragraphs per Piece</th>
<th>Total Content</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>195 + 1328</td>
<td>1523</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>162 + 501</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>121 + 126</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Paragraphs per Piece</th>
<th>Total Content</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>1855 + 1391</td>
<td>3246</td>
<td>55.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>98 + 262</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>754+ 1596</td>
<td>2350</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When we examine the percentage of paragraphs devoted to each focus area for each constructed period designated on Table 10, we see some interesting changes both between and within the sample categories, as well as some things that do not change.
Table 10
Percentage of Paragraphs Devoted to Each Focus Area---Dates Collapsed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Paragraph Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>12/08/941-01/05/1942</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Focus</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Focus</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Focus</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>01/06/1941-02/05/1942</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Focus</td>
<td>1328</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Focus</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Focus</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>09/12/2001-10/09/2001</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Focus</td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Focus</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Focus</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2707</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10/10/2001-11/06/2001</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Focus</td>
<td>1391</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Focus</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Focus</td>
<td>1596</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3249</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We see the following changes between the two constructed weeks within the
12/08/1941-01/05/1942 and 01/06/2001-02/05/2001 samples: We see an increase of 27% in the total number of paragraphs coded as having a military focus from the first 28-day period following Pearl Harbor to the second. In regards to the total number of paragraphs coded as having an economic focus, we see a slight decrease of 8% from 34% to 26% from the first 28-day period following the attack on Pearl Harbor to the second. From the first 28-day period following Pearl Harbor, we see a drop off from 25% in the 12/08/41-01/05/42 sample to 6% in the 01/06/42-02/05/42 sample in pieces coded as being other in focus.
When we examine the percentage of paragraphs within coding categories for the samples pulled from the post September 11 period, we see similar shifts in the amount of paragraphs devoted to each type of focus. The findings are as follows: We see a drop in pieces having a military focus from the 09/12/01-10/09/01 sample and the 10/10/01-11/06/01 sample. The percentage of paragraphs in pieces having a military focus drops from 68% to 43%, a decrease of 25%. The articles having a military focus in the corresponding samples from 1941-1942 is almost an exact reverse, or literal mirror image of this---from 41% in the 12/08/41-01/05/42 sample to 68% in the 01/06/42-02/05/42 sample, a total increase of 27%. In regards to those pieces coded as being economic in focus, we see a slight increase from 4% to 8% between the 09/12/01-10/09/01 sample and the 10/10/01-11/06/01 sample. When we examine the change that occurred in articles coded as being other in focus, we see an increase of 21% between the 09/12/01-10/09/01 sample and the 10/10/01-11/06/01 sample, from 28% to 49%.

**Qualitative Observations**

In the process of applying the coding sheets to the articles and pieces, it was possible for me to observe the other content of the paper, not just that which I was coding. I was able to see a shift not only in the content, but also in the very structure of the *New York Times*. For example, in the 2001 sample, full-page advertisements appear closer to the front of the paper than they did in the 1941-1942 sample. Another shift was in the way that the paper was organized.

When I looked at the day of each of the two catastrophic events (which included no coverage of the events) in our history, I saw that in relation to where advertisements appear in each, they are very similar. In the first section (A) of the *New York Times* from
September 11, 2001, the first advertisement appeared on the second page, with the first full-page advertisement appearing on page five. This first full-page advertisement was for the retailer Lords and Taylor. In the first section there were a total of 24 pages, 9 of which were full-page advertisements. In the remaining 15 pages, many half-page and smaller advertisements appeared. Fully more than half- of the content of sections A was composed of advertisements. When I looked at the first section of the *New York Times* from December 7, 1941, I saw that the first full-page advertisement appeared on page 3, this ad was for the retailer Franklin Simon. In the first section there were 53 full page advertisements in 80 pages. In the remaining pages many half-page and smaller advertisements appeared. About two-thirds of the total content in the first section was devoted to ads, most of which were priming American consumers of the day for the Christmas shopping season.

When I examined the first day of news coverage, December 8, 1941 and September 12, 2001, relating to each of the two events, I saw some differences in regard to the placement of advertisements as well the amount of advertising content in each edition. In each edition, we see that the advertisements do not appear as close to the first page as they did in the days prior to the attacks. In the *New York Times* of September 12, 2001, only one advertisement appeared in the 28 pages of the first section. This single advertisement was a full-page advertisement for Verizon wireless. (Keep in mind the critical role that cellular phones played in the rescue efforts, as well as the calls that were made from the doomed souls trapped on the upper floors of the WTC and the calls from the passengers on the fourth plane that crashed into a Pennsylvania field.). In the issue of
Examining the coverage that appeared in the *New York Times* in the days during which each attack occurred gives an idea as to what the world looked like, at least through the eyes of the paper, prior to the events.

When I looked at the total content of the December 7, 1941 issue of the *New York Times*, it became quite apparent that much conflict was going on between many countries, before the war had reached American soil. The world prior to direct American involvement in World War II was one torn by conflict and conquest (see Appendix J). Some of the headlines of the day were as follows: “Roosevelt Appeals to Hirohito after New Threat in Indo-China; Germans Trapped at Tagnrog.” “British Cruiser Seeks Raider; Atlantic Victim Third in Week,” “Navy is Superior to Any Says Knox,” “King of Belgians is Married Again,” “Joint Plans Made to Thwart Japan.” The majority of the front page coverage dealt with war developments. This was not the case prior to September 11, 2001.

The top stories on the front page illustrate another way in which the two periods in American history are very different, and in turn, the grounding of the events, the degree to which each attack was a surprise. Based on the headlines from the September 11, 2001 coverage in the *New York Times*, the attacks on the Pentagon and World Trade Center were not seen in advance (see Appendix K). Some examples of what had been deemed worthy of front page coverage the day of the attacks were such items as: “Scientists Urge Bigger Supply of Stem Cells,” “Key Leaders Talk of Possible Deals to Revive Economy,” “In a Nation of Early Risers, Morning TV is a Hot Market,” and
“School Dress Codes vs. a Sea of Bare Flesh.” The content here is a bit lighter than that that appeared on the comparable date.

In addition to the differences in regard to advertisement placement, there were differences in the manner in which the enemy was photographically represented. In the first day of coverage following the Pearl Harbor attack, the *New York Times* ran a photograph of a group of Chinese (Asian) men, allegedly in front of the Manhattan building that houses the Japanese Consulate. The well dressed men are shown giving the “thumbs-up,” apparently as a show of their support for the fact that the Japanese had finally attacked the United States. This seems odd, especially in light of the fact that Japan and China have a long history of violent conflict with one another. The message that this photograph conveys is simple: See what the enemy looks like?

**Figure 4.1: The Enemy --- Then**

When the above image is compared to the photographic representation of the “enemy” of the post September 11 period, the differences are striking. In the first day of coverage following the September 11 attacks, the *New York Times* ran a photograph taken
at the Shatila Palestinian refugee camp near Beirut, Lebanon. The group of revelers in this photograph appears much less reserved than those men in the photograph described above. They are shown filling the street, smiling, and waving flags, jubilant as a result of the new turn on events in the United States.

Figure 4.2: The Enemy ---Now

Another difference is they are mostly children; the new enemy of America can be children.

When I examined the subsequent days of the two periods sampled in the *New York Times*, I was able to see that ad content got back to normal more quickly in the post-Pearl Harbor period than it did in the Post-September 11th period. The days immediately following September 11th looked very different in regards to ad content in the first section. In the first section of the 09/13/2001 edition, for example, it was seen that there was only one full-page advertisement in the 24 pages that made up this section; this advertisement was for the Anheuser-Busch brewing company. We see all advertisements disappear in the first section of the *New York Times* from September 14, through
September 17, 2001. It is in the September 18, 2001 issue that the advertisements come back. The first full-page advertisement appears on page 5, an advertisement for Bloomingdale’s. In this same issue, we see 16 full-page ads appear in the first section of the paper, which consists of 31 pages. When we figure in the space taken up by all of the full-page advertisements as well as the half-page and smaller advertisements, we see that nearly three-fourths of the total space is taken up by advertisements.

The way in which the paper was laid out during the days following the attack on Pearl Harbor did not change from how it appeared prior to the event. The lay-out, or structure of the *New York Times* following September 11, did. The major change was not only the lack of advertising in the first section of the paper, but also in what had been section B, the World/Nation section. As of September 18, 2001, this section became the A Nation Challenged section.

In regards to the types of advertisements we saw in the periods of each of the two events, we see differences as well. I will draw attention to this fact by means of examples of advertisements that appeared in both periods.

The dominant advertisements in the same period following Pearl Harbor were those for retailers and war bonds. There were a few that were put out by retailers that seemed to equate the American ideal of liberty with shopping. An advertisement for New York retailer Bloomingdale’s does just that, it includes a graphic of the statue of liberty (see Appendix L). In many of the advertisements of the period, consumption was seen as an American freedom, not patriotic act. The advertisements quite often might talk of American values like freedom and liberty, some even included images of great
American symbols, such as the statue of liberty, but left the flag alone. This was not the case in the period following September 11, 2001.

In the period following September 11th, the majority of the advertisements were not from retail outlets, as was the case following Pearl Harbor, but from providers of financial services, the travel industry, and other services. These advertisements appear to either send the message to the readers not to panic and do anything financially rash, or offer a plea to consumers to keep utilizing the services these companies provide to them.

One of the most striking differences between the two periods in regard to advertisement imagery was that of the American flag. The flag appeared in none of the advertisements observed in the period following Pearl Harbor; this was not the case in the period following September 11. Flag imagery was everywhere, not only in advertisements, but on tangible goods, goods to be bought (see Appendix M). This use of flag imagery, whether appearing on tangible goods or used in advertisements, is forbidden by the United States Code. Title 4, Chapter 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Code deals with proper flag etiquette and rules of handling. Observe the following point:

The flag should never be used for advertising purposes in any manner whatsoever. It should not be embroidered on such articles as cushions or handkerchiefs and the like, printed or otherwise impressed on paper napkins or boxes or anything that is designed for temporary use and discarded (2001).

Capitalism trumps patriotism and tradition. The symbol has been degraded and devalued as a result of the “patriotic” fervor that came in the aftermath of the attacks on the World Trade Center and Pentagon.
CHAPTER FIVE

Discussion

In discussing the results of the study, it was my intent to cover each part of the study sequentially. I have attempted to illuminate the most robust findings of the two content analyses. I followed this section with a discussion of the qualitative analysis of the structure of the *New York Times* in the samples examined, which will include a discussion of advertising content and placements. The final part of the discussion will transcend the data source of the *New York Times* and include a close qualitative analysis of those individuals I have identified as “claims-makers,” (Spector and Kitsuse, 2001:79) who have the ability, largely as a result of their social position to define the problem of terrorism against which the United States military is currently waging war.

Discussion of Primary News Content Analysis

In the immediate aftermath of the events of September 11, 2001, we have seen in the *New York Times*, some discussion of not only the events, the impending military retaliation as retribution for the loss of nearly 3,000 lives, but also the effects of the U.S. led military strikes against members of the Taliban, al Qaeda, and the people of Afghanistan. In addition to the stories dealing with the military action and terrorism, there can be seen stories dealing with the economic backlash that the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon have caused within American society. The stories dealing with the economy, the terrorist threat, and the military retaliation are interspersed with those dealing with general interests, that is, they bear no relation to either the economic backlash or America’s “War on Terror.”
As a result of applying the coding sheet to the articles, I was able to see a shift in not only what was being reported regarding each attack, but also a change in the very structure of the *New York Times*. For example, in the 2001 sample, full-page advertisements appear closer to the front of the paper than they did as opposed to the 1941-1942 sample. Another change can be seen in that there was more “news” in the 1941-1942 issues sampled when compared to those of 2001. On average, the number of articles in the 1941-1942 sample was twice that of those found in the 2001 sample, although more paragraphs were present in the sample from 2001 than the sample from 1941-1942.

In regard to the coverage of the actual events, and those said to have been involved, it can be seen that the pictures were painted via the newspaper coverage in a similar way. Just as Franklin D. Roosevelt warned the citizens of the U.S. to brace for a long and bloody war, so has George W. Bush. Osama bin Laden has been likened to Adolph Hitler, just as Saddam Hussein was during the Persian Gulf “War.”

One of the most startling findings of the study was the drop that was seen in the number of paragraphs having a military focus. This drop can be seen between the 1941-1942 and 2001 samples; the coverage drops nearly 20%. Most alarming is the drop in the total number of articles coded as having a military focus that occurred within the 2001 sample. There was a significant drop in the number of articles having a military focus from the 09/12/2001 to 10/09/2001 sample to the 10/10/2001 to 11/06/2001 sample. The number of paragraphs having a military focus between the two samples drops from 64% to 21%, a decrease of more than 40%. An important fact to keep in mind in order to put these numbers in perspective is that the U.S. and its allies began the bombing campaign
in Afghanistan on October 7, 2001. Given that this activity was taking place we can assume that there would be more news to report; however, this news does not appear in the *New York Times*. I liken this to having media coverage of the opening ceremonies of the Olympic Games, but then having no coverage of the actual competitive events themselves. How can the American public participate in the decision-making process if it lacks knowledge of the issues and events at hand?

The immediate question to ask regarding this lack of military or war coverage is simply: “Why?” Is there just no news to be reported, or are journalists being barred from reporting the news? If journalists are being barred from getting and thus reporting the “scoop,” then what is the reason behind this? If journalists are being denied access to the developing events, what could be the possible impact of such restrictions?

Information that could lead us to an answer to the above questions has been compiled by Marc Herold, of the University of New Hampshire. Professor Herold compiled and released a dossier on civilian casualties in Afghanistan. Herold said of the bombing campaign that it “took a very heavy toll upon the urban infrastructure, destroyed buildings, communication systems, water and electricity supplies, and fuel storage depots” (Philips, 2002:272) The count compiled by Herold includes only what are referred to as impact deaths, that is, deaths that occur when a bomb detonates. The count does not include those persons dying later from hunger, disease, or injuries. According to Herold’s findings, which were complied from local and Asian news sources, there were an estimated low of 2073 and an estimated high of 2444 civilian casualties in Afghanistan in October and November of 2001 (Herold, 2002).
In answering the above questions, related to media coverage of the so called “War on Terror,” it seems important to look at more contemporary examples of media coverage of U.S. military involvement. Such an example would be the coverage of the American military’s “first truly media war” (Patterson, 1984:37) Vietnam.

During the Vietnam War, American Journalists were allowed almost full access to U.S. troops and their activities. As a result, news of the conflict, and the American G.I.s involved, ended up on the doorsteps and living rooms of American civilians at home. It is said that this coverage had an effect not only on the way that the U.S. military conducted the war, but also on the way in which the American public felt about the war. It has been said that this media coverage of the war in Vietnam was preeminent in determining the final outcome of the conflict. It has been said that the media’s handling of the U.S. military in Vietnam led President Lyndon Baines Johnson to decline seeking a second term in office (Arnett, 1997:37).

Given the fact that journalists have been “denied access to American troops in the field in Afghanistan to a greater degree than in any previous war involving U.S. military forces” (Hickey, 2002: 57), what predictions can be made regarding the possible repercussions of such denial of access? What could be the possible effects of such lack of coverage on the effort to eradicate terrorism? What could be the possible effects on the opinion which is held by the American public regarding the Bush administration? What could be the effects on the opinion held about the American press?

There are of course stark differences in the two conflicts, particularly in relation to the troops doing the fighting, as well as they way in which the fighting is done. During the Vietnam War, the draft was utilized as a means by which to supply troops for the
effort; during the current “War on Terror” the troops involved are all volunteers. While
the Vietnam War was fought to the largest degree by troops on the ground, the current
“War on Terror” is being fought by high-tech weapons, machines. The fact that the U.S.
military relied to a large degree on draftees to get the job done in Vietnam gave the
American public a sense that what was going on was their business, and the media
delivered. The job that the media was allowed, or even expected to do, resulted in a
informed public, an informed public that could then express its support or dissent in
regards to the military action and effort. The media coverage of Vietnam led to its
eventual extreme lack of popularity, and eventually its end.

Discussion of OP/ED/Letters Content Analysis

Within the first period, that from the 2 month period following the attack on Pearl
Harbor, the topics that were covered were very diverse, including such things as pieces
devoted to the Axis powers, Hitler, the bombing of Manila, Pearl Harbor, civilian
defense, censorship, the War Production Board, how “careless talk costs lives,” thrift,
rationing, getting the “sniffles,” Woodrow Wilson’s 85th birthday, walking to work, dogs
in air aids, and the creation of the AFL-CIO.

Many of the pieces within this section following the Pearl Harbor attacks were
focused on the idea of sacrifice as aiding in the war effort. Rationing and sacrifice were a
reality of the American cultural experience as a result of the U.S. involvement in the
Second World War, not only were the American public asked to do their part by being
frugal and conservative in regards to their use of resources, but they were mandated to do
so through legislation that was passed to ensure that they did. Staples and food products
were rationed, as were such items as rubber and fabric. This greatly affected the
availability of many consumer goods. At the time, being American meant being frugal. Doing one’s part meant doing without. The extent to which this was the case for Americans during the Second World War is clear to see in the OP/ED/Letters pieces of the period.

This difference in what was seen as the civilian role in the war effort between both periods is clearly seen in the findings related to OP/ED/Letters pieces coded as being economic in focus, especially when we collapse the sample period into the first and second 28-day periods following each event (see Table 10, p.52). We see in this analysis, an illustration in the way in which the reality of each period was constructed by or perceived by the *New York Times* and its readers. In the period following the Pearl Harbor attack, there can be observed a great deal more focus on the economy in the OP/ED/Letters pieces than there is in the period following the September 11 attacks. A total of 34% of the pieces in the sample were focused on economic issues in the first month, and 26% in the second month following the attack. The period following September 11, 2001 contains considerably less space in the sample pieces devoted to economic issues. Only 4% of the pieces in the sample of the first 28-day period are devoted to economic issue, this increases to 8% for the second month in the sample; both considerably lower than pieces of economic focus in each 28-day period following Pearl Harbor.

**Discussion of Qualitative Observations**

In addition to those illustrated by the results from the content analyses discussed above, there can be seen other differences between the realities of the two periods in American history as seen in the *New York Times*. One of the starkest differences is
related to the way in which the civilian population during each period was told how they could aid in the war effort.

In the period immediately following Pearl Harbor, there was a great deal of coverage in the New York Times related to stimulating and sustaining production in order to support the war effort. In the period following the attacks of September 11th, the focus was not on supporting production, but rather supporting the economy by encouraging consumption. This clearly illustrates the extent to which the modern American economy is dependent upon consumption and spending. The American civilian is not expected to sacrifice goods to aid in the “war on terror,” but rather to consume them. The American civilian is not expected to save, but to spend. Based upon the content of the New York Times we can see the way that civilians believed they could do their part in aiding in World War II was by conserving and producing; the American citizenry was told following September 11 that it was not conservation or production that would stabilize the country, but rather consumption. These two messages are extremely contradictory to one another.

Another difference is in the way in which those viewed as being the enemy is portrayed during each period. As is most often the case, the group viewed as enemy is painted in a very unfavorable light.

In the period directly following the attack on Pearl Harbor those individuals of Japanese descent, whether they were American citizens or not, were at least dehumanized, if not demonized in the press. This led to the general agreement in the government, as well as among the Caucasian population that they were a security risk. This in turn led to the eventual rounding up and internment of a great number of
Japanese-Americans during the years of the conflict. According to Roger Daniels “...nearly 120,000 Japanese Americans were taken from their homes in the spring and early summer of 1942 and incarcerated in concentration camps by the United States government.” Of those individuals detained, “more than two-thirds of them (were) American citizens” (Daniels, 1993:3).

In the days and weeks immediately following the events of September 11th, the American Muslim community was subject to not only threats of violence, but also to direct acts of aggression carried out by individual actors as well as angry mobs. Mosques were burned, and people who looked like “terrorists” were assaulted. There was a large public outcry against such acts from Muslims and non-Muslims alike. If such an outcry took place on behalf of Japanese-Americans following Pearl Harbor, it did not appear in the sample that I examined from that period in the *New York Times*. If letters such as the one above had been allowed to appear in the media outlets following Pearl Harbor, would the internment of Japanese-American citizens had been allowed to take place to the extent which it did? This is an interesting difference that possibly illustrates the extent to which American society has become more tolerant of certain ethnic groups.

**Discussion of Claims-making Processes Related to Framing the “War on Terror” and the Terrorist Threat**

In the examination of the articles being military in focus in the *New York Times* following the attacks of September 11, the most interesting finding was in degree to which articles coded as military in focus decreased in the sample month that coincided with the commencement of the “war on terror,” the bombing of Afghanistan. It is my contention that this tremendous drop in coverage in the news narratives related to the
terrorist attacks and the way in which they are being dealt with militarily, will in turn limit the extent to which it is experienced by those consumers of the news narratives seen in the *New York Times*.

Of the comparatively few articles dealing with military and terrorism related issues in the second month following September 11th seen in the *New York Times*, I was able to notice that there were also few individuals seen to be the sources of such news narratives. Overwhelmingly, those individuals who commented on the reality of the causes of the terrorist attacks, the terrorists, and the military response, were members of the Bush administration. It is these individuals who have disproportionate influence over the way in which the American public perceives the people behind, the causes, and consequences of the events. I have identified these members of the Bush cabinet as “claims-makers”, those individuals who are in a position to aid in the way in which the events are framed and later perceived as real by those who receive the mediated news narratives. The “claims-makers” are those individuals who are high ranking officials in the United States government that meet the following criteria:

1. They have an extreme degree of access to the mainstream media.
2. They can be seen as representing the official stance of the U.S. government on the issue of terrorism.
3. They are the source of the dominant narratives about why the U.S. was attacked on September 11th, and what should be done about it.

The following quotations were found on the website of the United States Department of State International Information Programs. The quotations are excerpts from press releases, speeches, and radio addresses that were later transmitted by the
mainstream media. All of the statements from which the excerpts were drawn were made within the first few weeks following the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks on the Pentagon and World Trade Center.

The individuals that I have identified as claims-makers include the following: President George Bush, Attorney General John Ashcroft, Vice President Dick Cheney, White House Press Secretary Ari Fleischer, Secretary of State Colin Powell, and Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld. The following excerpts were culled from official transcripts as released by the State Department (http://usinfo.state.gov/topical/pol/terror/archlist.htm).

In order to facilitate a logical flow in the passage that follows, I have chosen to break the quotations of the claims-makers into categories followed by an interpretation of each class of “claim” prior to moving on to the next category. Each category of claims can be viewed as the answers put forth by the claims-makers to the question posed at the title of each section. It is my contention that these claims helped the public to develop their ideas of the terrorists, the nature of the issue of terrorism, the possible targets of terrorism, as well as how the issue should be dealt with. I have chosen to add emphasis to those words or phrases within the claims that serve to answer the questions posed in each section.

**Who are the terrorists? What are their characteristics?**

President Bush:

9/12/01:

- “This enemy *hides in shadows*, and has *no regard for human life*. This is an enemy who *preys on innocent and unsuspecting people*, then *runs for cover.*”
(Remarks In Photo Opportunity With The National Security Team The Cabinet Room)

9/15/01:

- “None of us could have envisioned the **barbaric** acts of these terrorists…” (Radio Address of the President To The Nation)
- “This is a new kind of -- a new kind of **evil**.” (From a press conference on the South Lawn of the White House)
- “**They hide in caves.**” (From a press conference on the South Lawn of the White House)

9/17/01:

- “It’s an enemy that likes to **hide** and **burrow** in, and their network is extensive. There are no rules. It’s **barbaric** behavior. They slit throats of women on airplanes in order to achieve an objective that is beyond comprehension. And they like to hit, and then they like to **hide** out.”

01/29/02:

- “They were as **wrong** as they are **evil**.” (State of the Union Address)

Secretary of State Colin Powell:

09/11/01:

- “Once again we see terrorism; we see terrorists, people who **don’t believe in democracy**, people who believe that with the destruction of buildings, with the murder of people, they can somehow achieve a political purpose.”

Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld:

09/11/01:

- “A terrorist can attack at any time at any place using any technique. It is physically impossible to defend at every time in every place against every technique.”

As seen in the above excerpts from the statements of the claims-makers in the current Bush administration, the deviant individuals responsible for the attacks of September 11, and terrorists in general have been described as being a cowardly enemy
who are evil. The evidence put forth by the claims-makers to support the assertion that they are cowardly people with no regard for human life is that after they carry out the acts of terror, they hide in caves. In actuality, the individual terrorists directly involved in the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon had no opportunity to hit and then hide out, on the contrary, were incinerated they at the moments the aircraft crashed.

According to the claims-makers, the terrorists were not only motivated by the fact that they are evil and barbaric, but also due to the extent to which they do not believe in democracy.

The way in which the terrorists were characterized served to dehumanize them, thus making retributive policy an easy sell. After all, how else can such an enemy be dealt with?

Who are the victims? How / Why were they victimized?

President Bush:

9/11/01:

- “Thousands of lives were suddenly ended by evil, despicable acts of terror.”

9/12/01:

- “This enemy hides in shadows, and has no regard for human life. This is an enemy who preys on innocent and unsuspecting people, then runs for cover.”
  (Remarks By The President In Photo Opportunity With The National Security Team The Cabinet Room)

In the above claims, which offer an explanation of who the victims were, as well as why they were targeted, we see that their lives ended suddenly. President Bush
asserted that the victims were targeted by virtue of the facts that they were both innocent and unsuspecting. The suggestion here is that when we, the public are unsuspecting, is exactly when we are most vulnerable to meet our respective fates at the hands of terrorists. Remember, the terrorists are cowards, and as such, why would they choose to attack a target population that was ready? The claims suggest that maybe if we are vigilant, and suspect such an attack, that we will be safe in the future.

Who are the heroes?

President Bush

9/15/01:

- “Over the past few days, we have learned much about American courage -- the courage of firefighters and police officers who suffered so great a loss, the courage of passengers aboard United 93 who may well have fought with the hijackers and saved many lives on the ground.” (Radio Address of the President To The Nation)

01/29/02:

- “A few days before Christmas, an airline flight attendant spotted a passenger lighting a match. The crew and passengers quickly subdued the man, who had been trained by al Qaeda and was armed with explosives. The people on that plane were alert and, as a result, likely saved nearly 200 lives. And tonight we welcome and thank flight attendants Hermis Moutardier and Christina Jones.” (President Bush’s State of the Union Address)

We see, in the above claims, that as a result of the terrorist attacks, the extent of American courage was illustrated. This courage was exemplified by the civil servants who actively responded in the aftermath of the attacks, the police officers and firefighters. Through their heroic deeds, many lives were undoubtedly spared. Although
many of the heroes acted in response to the attacks, others were more proactive in their approach. As a result of the vigilance and bravery of the passengers and flight attendants, another terrorist plot was foiled.

What is at stake? What is under attack?

President Bush:

9/11/01:

- “Today, our fellow **citizens**, our **way of life**, our very **freedom** came under attack in a series of deliberate and deadly terrorist acts.”
- “America was targeted for attack because we’re the brightest beacon for **freedom** and **opportunity** in the world. And no one will keep that light from shining.”
- “Yet, we go forward to defend **freedom** and all that is good and just in our **world**.”

9/12/01:

- **Freedom** and **democracy** are under attack.”
- “This enemy attacked not just **our people**, but all **freedom-loving people** everywhere in the world. The United States of America will use all our resources to conquer this enemy.”
- “This will be a monumental struggle of **good** versus evil. But good will prevail.” (Remarks By The President In Photo Opportunity With The National Security Team The Cabinet Room)

9/15/01:

- “Because this is **America**. This is who we are. This is what our enemies hate and have attacked. And this is why we will prevail.” (Radio Address of the President To The Nation)
- “They can’t stand **freedom**; they hate what **America** stands for.” (From a press conference on the South Lawn of the White House)

9/20/01:

- “They hate **our freedoms** -- our **freedom of religion**, our **freedom of speech**, our **freedom to vote and assemble** and disagree with each other.” (Address to a Joint Session of Congress and the American People)
White House Press Secretary Ari Fleischer:

09/12/01:

- We will defend freedom and all that is good and just in our world.”

Secretary of State Colin Powell:

09/11/01:

- “I think every civilized nation in the world recognizes that this was an assault not just against the United States, but against civilization.”

09/12/01:

- “It’s a scourge not only against the United States, but against civilization, and it must be brought to an end.”
- “It’s a war against civilization. It’s a war against all nations that believe in democracy.”

- From the Fox Morning News with Tony Snow:

  Question: “We have an international terrorist network. There is no way we can negotiate with these people, is there?”

  Secretary Powell: “No. They have to be rooted. They have to be destroyed. And we are hard at work on that this morning. We are trying to make sure that the world understands that this was an assault not just on America, but on civilization…”

09/21/01:

- “It wasn't an assault on America. It was an assault on civilization, it was an assault on democracy, it was an assault on the right of innocent people to live their lives.”

As seen in the above claims, we, as Americans have much to lose at the hands of terrorists. The above statements of the claims-makers help to shape the public’s perception of what is at stake. According to the claims-makers, what is really at stake, or under attack, are core American values, as well as our way of life. The core American
values of freedom, democracy, and opportunity are what have been attacked by the terrorists. The claim-makers extend the threat beyond the geographical and ideological borders of the United States in their assertion that human civilization as a whole has been attacked and as a result, the totality of goodness has been threatened. This in my estimation serves to further dehumanize the terrorists; this sets them apart from the “civilized” world community.

How will terrorism be dealt with? How long will it take?

President Bush:

9/11/01:
- ”Terrorism against our nation will not stand.”

9/15/01:
- “Victory against terrorism _will not take place in a single battle_, but in a series of decisive actions against terrorist organizations and those who harbor and support them.” (Radio Address of the President To The Nation)
- **From a press conference at Camp David:**
  
  **Question:** “Sir, how much of a sacrifice are ordinary Americans going to have to be expected to make in their daily lives, in their daily routines?

  **The President:** “Our hope, of course, is that they make _no sacrifice whatsoever_.”

  - “We will rid the world of the evil-doers. We will call together freedom loving people to fight terrorism.”
  - This crusade, this war on terrorism is _going to take a while_.”

9/20/01:

- “…the only way to defeat terrorism as a threat to our way of life is to _stop it, eliminate it, and destroy it_ where it grows.” (Address to a Joint Session of Congress and the American People)
01/29/02:

- “Whatever it costs to defend our country, we will pay.”
- “For too long our culture has said, ‘If it feels good, do it.’ Now America is embracing a new ethic and a new creed: ‘Let’s roll.’” (President Bush’s State of the Union Address)

Vice President Dick Cheney:

09/16/01:

- "We will not allow him to achieve his aims. We’re not about to change our policies or change our basic fundamental beliefs.”

Secretary of State Colin Powell:

09/13/01:

- “The attack that took place in Washington and the attack that took place in New York were directed against America, but they really are directed against civilization, and we have to respond with a full-scale assault against this kind of activity…”
- “So it’s going to be a long campaign against many terrorist organizations, and the whole world has to be united in that campaign.”

09/16/01:

- “It’s a law enforcement war.”
- **Interview on CNN's Late Edition with Wolf Blitzer**

  **Mr. Blitzer:** “When you say long term, how long?”
  
  **Secretary Powell:** “We’re probably going to be in the counter-terrorism business at a very high level of intensity for as long as anyone can imagine…”

Attorney General John Ashcroft:

9/30/01:

- “It’s our job to do whatever we can to **interrupt** it and to **disrupt** it.”
Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld:

09/11/01:

- Transcript: Briefing by Rumsfeld, Shelton on Terrorist Attacks

  **Sec. Rumsfeld:** “Senator Levin, you and other Democrats in Congress have voiced fear that you simply don’t have enough money for the **large increase in defense** that the Pentagon is seeking, especially for missile defense, and you fear that you’ll have to dip into the Social Security funds to pay for it. Does this sort of thing convince you that an emergency exists in this country to **increase defense spending**, to dip into Social Security, if necessary, to pay for defense spending, **increase defense spending**?”

  **Sen. Levin:** “One thing where the committee was unanimous on, among many, many other things, was that the -- we authorized the full request of the president, including the $18 billion. So I would say that Democrats and Republicans have seen the need for the request…”

In the above category of claims, we are able to get a glimpse of the way in which the perceived terrorist threat might be dealt. One of the main characteristics of the “war on terror” is that it is going to be a very long, involved campaign, one which will utilize American military might and be carried out in a preemptive and punitive manner. We see, based on the statements of the claims-makers, that the objective of combating terrorism will not be met through diplomacy or changes in policy. According to the claims, the terrorists must simply be destroyed. We see that the problem of terrorism will be dealt with not as public issue, but rather as a personal problem.

In addition to the excerpts seen above, which have been categorized according to the implicit / explicit nature of each, there are a number of commonalities that exist in most of the official statements that have been made by the claims-makers in relation to the attacks of September 11th, as well as the terrorists believed to have been involved. First, the attacks themselves are referred to not only as an assault on America, but also an
“assault on civilization.” Second, the terrorists have been labeled as being “evil-doers” who were motivated by the fact that “they hate our freedom” or otherwise “can’t stand freedom.” Third, they have been dehumanized in the sense that they have been characterized as being “barbaric” individuals who “hide in caves.”

In my judgment this narrow characterization of the terrorists by the “claim-makers,” that creates the dominant narratives that trickle into the mainstream media, serves to draw our attention away from the structural factors that bear influence on these terrorists. As a result, this narrows the focus of the current policy, and in turn limits the potential of current policy from being effective. Rather than stifling terrorism, these statements ignore the structural issues which allow terrorism to blossom.
CHAPTER SIX

Conclusion

In beginning the concluding statements of this project, I believe that it is necessary to draw attention to the differences that exist in the samples from the New York Times relating to the two monumental periods in American history. In spite of the fact the Pearl Harbor and September 11 have been compared as equivocal events in time, the differences between the two periods, as illustrated as a result of the analyses conducted in this study, are numerous and clear. Among these differences are such things as where the United States was situated during each period in relation to its geopolitical position regarding its military and economic prowess. The differences, as illustrated by the comparison of the various elements of the New York Times during each period, point to the extent to which American culture has shifted and changed.

When examining the actual events themselves, the difference between the two is quite apparent. The attacks carried out at Pearl Harbor were directed at military hardware, tangible tools of defense and war, and were conducted by a conventional military force. The attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001 were not directed at military hardware, and although they did destroy physical objects, they also destroyed symbols. The Pentagon and the World Trade Center can be viewed as symbols, symbols of American post-Cold War military and economic supremacy. When these symbols were attacked, it most definitely knocked the American eagle from its perch.

There are further differences between the two events that have come to light as a result of the quantitative elements of this study. The content analysis of the OP/ED/Letters pieces of the New York Times illuminated the differences in the amount of
attention paid to the issue of the American economy in the aftermath following each period. The idea of consumption as a patriotic duty was seen clearly in the *New York Times*, specifically in the advertising content, and especially in the degree to which the American flag appeared within the advertisements. This is in stark contrast to the message of thrift as a patriotic duty that was mediated to the American public during World War II. The current American economic system, driven by consumption, has been a great source of hostility towards the United States government and culture. It appears as if those things which we are asked to do will not help, but rather harm us. George Ritzer draws attention to this double-edged sword of consumption when he states:

> The great capacity of Americans to spend and consume is *both* a great source of national strength *and* the nation’s Achilles heel in that it has helped to create a hostility that found expression on September 11 and beyond and may well find other ways of expressing itself in the years to come (2002:211).

The content analysis of the primary news articles appearing in the first section of the *New York Times* revealed a substantial shift in the manner in which issues of military concern had been covered between the two periods. This points to the difference not only in the nature of the conflicts; but the manner in which they are fought. It also points to a number of possibilities in relation to the nature of the current war on terror which the American military machine is pursuing. Herman and Chomsky’s Propaganda Model, dealing with the way in which media functions in democratic societies focuses on the “inequality of wealth and power and its multilevel effects on the mass-media interests and choices” (Durham and Kellner, 2001, 280) is particularly applicable here. Their model “traces the routes by which money and power are able to filter out the news fit to
print, marginalize dissent, and allow the government and dominant private interests to get their messages across to the public” (280). Elements of Herman and Chomsky’s “Propaganda Model” prove to be useful resources, particularly two of the five mediated news “filters” it proposes. The third filter is concerned with “the reliance of the media on information provided by government, businesses, and ‘experts’ funded and approved by these primary sources and agents of power” (280), while the fifth filter deals with “‘anticommunism’ as a national religion and control mechanism” (280). We can see these two elements working together and reinforcing each other in the examination of the news content of the New York Times in the period following September 11, 2001, as well as the analysis of the narratives put forth by the claims-makers. Now, antiterrorism has replaced “anticommunism” as a social control mechanism and rallying point for the conservative war hawks.

Specifically related to the September 11, 2001 attacks and the “war on terror,” that is currently being waged, the analysis of the claims made by those members of the Bush administration whom I have identified as claim-makers and fabricators, can be seen to fit the typology of a crime myth. Kappeler, Bloomberg, and Potter discuss a number of characterizations of such myths. They say that such common characterizations include:

1. the identification and targeting of a distinct deviant population
2. the presence of an “innocent” or “helpless” victim population
3. the emergence of brave and virtuous heroes
4. the existence of a substantial threat to established norms, values, or traditional lifestyles (2001:17)
The rhetoric of the claims-makers of the Bush Administration shows the way in which the problem of terrorism has been presented to have all of the makings of a crime myth. To illustrate my point:

1. A “distinct deviant population” has indeed been targeted: the terrorists, the followers of Osama bin Laden. The terrorists have been characterized as having the following personality characteristics or attributes, they are “cowardly,” “barbaric,” “evil” people who “don’t believe in democracy,” “hide in shadows,” and have “no regard for human life.”

2. There is the “presence of an ‘innocent’ or ‘helpless’ victim population” as President Bush put it: the terrorists are “an enemy who preys on innocent and unsuspecting people.” (see 09/12/01 excerpt from: Remarks By The President In Photo Opportunity With The National Security Team The Cabinet Room)

3. “Brave and virtuous heroes” have emerged: the “firefighters and police officers who suffered so great a loss,” the “passengers aboard United 93,” (see 09/15/01 excerpt from: Radio Address of the President To The Nation) and “flight attendants Hermis Moutardier and Christina Jones” (see 01/29/02 excerpt from: President Bush’s State of the Union Address) who foiled shoe-bomber Richard Reed.

4. The terrorists have attacked “freedom and democracy,” (see 09/12/01 excerpt from: Remarks By The President In Photo Opportunity…) because they “hate our freedoms – our freedom of religion, our freedom of speech, our freedom to vote and assemble and disagree with each other,” (see 09/20/01 excerpt from: Address to a Joint Session of Congress…) values that are near and dear to us as Americans that are deeply ingrained in our culture.

To conclude, when looked at as a whole, the lack of coverage of the “war on terror” in the mainstream American media, as exemplified by the New York Times, in addition to the narrow focus and simplistic explanation offered by the clams-makers, serves to limit the constructed reality and hence possible questions that the receivers of
such mediated narratives have. It appears as if these limitations not only serve to construct limited perspective on the current situation, but also have the potential to undermine the democratic ideals that are said to be at the foundation of our country. If the populace lacks information, they cannot fully engage in the decision making process, they cannot therefore engage in the democratic process. In light of the findings of this study, it appears as if Walter Lippmann was not far from the truth when he stated: “Possibly a war can be fought for democracy; it cannot be fought democratically” (Lare and Rossiter, 1965, 52).

Taken together the findings suggest that those in power are able to manipulate the mediated narratives to their benefit, create a narrow reality, and marginalize dissent among the citizenry.

Suggestions for further research include the following: conduct a content analysis of two constructed weeks in two month period prior to each event, conduct a content analysis of the claims of the claims-makers, and conduct a content analysis of the A Nation Challenged section of the New York Times. Conducting a content analysis of two constructed weeks in the two month periods preceding each event would allow a baseline to be established from which to put the New York Times coverage into perspective. Through a content analysis of the claims of the claims-makers, the extent to which the messages contained in the rhetoric put forth by them could be quantified. A content analysis of the A Nation Challenged section of the New York Times would make possible a more comprehensive analysis of the coverage of both the attacks of September 11, 2001 as well as the response to the attacks by the United States military. This proposed research would function to enable us to gain a clearer picture of the way in which the
"New York Times" and claims-makers responded to the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks.
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APPENDIX C

Examples of Articles Coded as Military in Focus

Siren Tests Today; Blast of 15 Minutes Real Raid Warning

A test of the most powerful siren in the city, the steam-driven device on top of the Consolidated Edison Company’s plant at First Avenue and Forty-eighth Street, will be made at 4 o’clock this afternoon and will be followed at 4:15 P.M. by the testing of two of the seventy new ‘sirendrones’ acquired by the city this week for air-raid alarms.

Both tests will consist of the sounding of a series of dots and dashes, unless an actual air raid should coincide with the test. In that event the sirens will be blown continuously for fifteen minutes. The test of the ‘sirendrones’ will be held at Spring and Lafayette Streets, near Police Headquarters.

Employees of Bank Form ‘Japanese Sinking Fund’

The Navy Relief Society here received yesterday a check for $20 from a group of employees of the Sterling National Bank and Trust Company at Broadway and Thirty-ninth Street, who have organized a ‘Japanese Sinking Fund’ to which contributions are made each time a Japanese naval vessel is sunk by the United States Navy.

In a letter accompanying the check, the banking ‘club’ told Rear Admiral Adolphus Andrews, commandant of the Third Naval District and commander of the North Atlantic Naval Coastal Frontier, that they “hope the United States Navy will keep us ‘busted.’”

In his reply, the admiral wrote:

“Let me thank you and say that if the opportunity is ever presented to me to direct the firing of our guns toward Japanese targets I am going to ask the gunners to put a little extra force behind the shells for the ‘Japanese Sinking Fund.’”

ROOSEVELT APPEALS TO HIROHITO AFTER NEW THREAT IN INDO-CHINA; GERMANS TRAPPED AT TAGANROG

GUAM BOMBED; ARMY SHIP IS SUNK

U.S. Flies Head North From Manila—Battleship Oklahoma Set Afire by Torpedo Planes at Honolulu

104 SOLDIERS KILLED AT FIELD IN HAWAI

President Fears ‘Very Heavy Losses’ on Cahu—Churchill Notices Japan That a State of War Exists
On Doomed Flight, Passengers Vowed To Perish Fighting

By JODI WILGOREN and EDWARD WONG

They told the people they loved that they would die fighting.

In a series of cellular telephone calls to their wives, two passengers aboard the plane that crashed into a Pennsylvania field instead of possibly toppling a national landmark learned about the horror of the World Trade Center. From 35,000 feet, they relayed harrowing details about the hijacking in progress to the police. And they vowed to try to thwart the enemy, to prevent others from dying even if they could not save themselves.
'JUST BRING HIM IN'  

President Hints He Will Halt War if bin Laden Is Handed Over

By PATRICK E. TYLER  
and ELISABETH BUMILLER

WASHINGTON, Oct. 11 — President Bush said today that United States forces would attack Afghanistan for "as long as it takes" to destroy the Qaeda terrorist network of Osama bin Laden, but he offered to reconsider the military assault in Afghanistan if that country's ruling Taliban would surrender Mr. bin Laden.

At a news conference in the White House, Mr. Bush also embraced for the first time the idea that the United Nations could play a central role in the rebuilding of Afghanistan after an eventual ousting of the radical Islamic Taliban government.

Mr. Bush tonight gave the Taliban another chance to halt America's military action by handing over Mr. bin Laden.
APPENDIX D

Examples of Articles Coded as Economic in Focus

_Tire Rationing Comes as Blow to Auto Owners and Truckmen_

Realization that Federal tire rationing after Jan. 5 would prevent considerably more than 85 per cent of the nation's motor vehicle users from obtaining tires needed automobile owners here yesterday.

Assurances came from several informed quarters that no immediate privation was likely to occur, though the pinch might be felt by automobile and truck owners when tire equipment begins to wear out next fall.

_Leon Henderson, Price Administrator, issued the order for rationing on Friday to take effect as soon as the ban on tire sales, effective since Dec. 16, ends next Sunday._

Delivery truck users were concerned over the order, which bars replacement of tires on vehicles delivering milk, bread and packages to homes. Some fleet operators suggested deliveries every other day, as well as Federal proposals to combine competing services.

Stores, dairies and bakeries, however, were inclined to await clarification of their problem through nation-wide plans to be discussed at industry conferences in Washington.

Motorists, eliminated under the order from the right to obtain new tires and whose passenger cars comprise more than 80 per cent of the estimated 35,000,000 vehicles in the United States, were advised to "save their rubber" by minimum car use, driving at least 40 miles an hour and having worn tires retreaded or recapped.

A local tire rationing board for New York City will be announced late tomorrow afternoon. George A. Sloan, member of the city De-

Continued on Page Fifteen

_Auto Dealers Ask Aid from Congress_

Request Authority for President to Fix Inventories on Articles Needed for War

 ALSO 'FROZEN' CAR PRICES

Want a Government Agency to Buy, on a Merchant's Demand, 'Frozen' Products

_Special to The New York Times.
CHICAGO, Jan. 21—Delegates to the convention of the National Automobile Dealers Association were starting for their homes tonight with little hope for any speedy solution of the problems created by the government's orders banning automobile production after Jan. 31 and the regulations affecting tires.

The convention approved a resolution asking Congress to enact four measures. These were:
HARD COAL REGION ASKS FEDERAL AID

Witnesses Tell Inquiry Group
It Must Come Soon to Save Area of ‘Ghost Towns’

THEY SUGGEST TWO FORMS

At Shamokin and Mahanoy City
They Plead for War Industries
and Cut in Oil for Home Use

Special to The New York Times

MAHANOY CITY, Pa., Jan. 28
Scores of witnesses who said they represented "the forgotten people of America" appeared before the Federal Antitrust Economic Investigating Committee at two hearings today to warn that many towns and cities in this region were teetering on the verge of bankruptcy and that some face actual obliteration unless prompt assistance were forthcoming from Washington in one of two forms.

Tighter Airport Security Will Slow Business Fliers

By JOE SHARKEY

With the nation's airports closed, thousands of travelers struggling to return home from business trips, and conferences and corporate meetings canceled, the business travel industry faces turmoil for the coming week and uncertainty about the near future.

While it was too early to predict how severely domestic business travel would be affected, and for how long, by the terrorist attacks in New York and Washington on Tuesday, tighter security is a given, said Marianne McInerney, executive director of the National Business Travel Association, whose members include nearly 2,000 corporate travel managers as well as airlines, hotels, car rental companies and others involved in the $185-billion-a-year business travel industry.
Financial District Vows to Rise From the Ashes

By STEVE LOHR

Wall Street is not merely the financial nerve center of capitalism, but also a community of fierce competitors, colleagues and friends. It is a community shaken, humbled, angry and determined.

Nearly everyone who has made a career in the New York financial industry knows someone who is missing, presumed dead. Bankers, traders and brokers have spent the last two days fearfully calling the homes of those who worked on Manhattan's devastated southern tip, hoping to hear familiar voices, safe and alive.

They have mourned friends who didn't make it and cursed "the barbarians," as one investment banker described those responsible for the attack on the World Trade Center.

The Economic Stimulus We Need

By Alan S. Blinder

Princeton, N.J.

It is time to put past the debate over whether or not the United States economy needs a fiscal stimulus and get on to the questions of how large and what kind. While history offers no real parallels to the terrorist attack on Sept. 11, it is all too certain that the American economy entered a recession on that day. If not before. Prior to the attack, only the mighty consumer was keeping the economy above water. And while the official data will be marred for some time, consumer spending probably fell off a cliff on Sept. 11. The longer we wait, the more likely it is that the recovery will become a victory over our economy.

Three principles should guide the debate over the stimulus plan. We must act quickly. No policy action can match the speed of the likely deterioration in consumer spending — in that sense, we are already behind the curve. So we must limit policies that can work only through Congress quickly. Second, we must remember that rapid action can do more than put off the inevitable. For example, the Federal Reserve has already cut interest rates and will probably do so again.

A federally backed sales tax cut will revive spending.

on Oct. 2. But these rate cuts will not affect spending for many months to come. An effective stimulus must lead to new spending promptly.

Third, the stimulus program must not damage the long-term prospects for federal budget surpluses, long-term interest rates and future spending.

These three principles eliminate many of the ideas that have been bandied about in Washington. And they lead me to recommend the following:

- A federally backed sales tax cut, not a temporary increase in defense spending. A sales tax cut acts much more quickly at boosting consumer spending than a budget increase. Hence, it's the highest priority right now. Since most sales taxes are regressive, reducing them would benefit low-income families, many of whom live from paycheck to paycheck. Such people are likely to spend the gains quickly. But everyone who purchases taxable items would receive a tax cut.

Since the proposed sales tax cut would be temporary, it would not damage the long-run budget outlook. As Alan Greenspan and many others have observed, fear that the stimulus is disappearing has kept long-term interest rates high for months. A stimulus program must not exacerbate those fears.

- The effectiveness of many types of tax cuts — the type of tax cuts — is undermined by making them temporary, because most people base their spending decisions on more than this year's income. But the situation is just the reverse for a sales tax cut. The impact of a lower sales tax is actually enhanced by making it explicitly temporary, because doing so creates clear incentives (after all, small sums to pay now rather than later).

Finally, we could strengthen the stimulus by offering special tax rebates to New Yorkers, which, as the chief victims of the harrowing events of Sept. 11, is suffering a sharp economic downturn.

A temporary sales tax cut would be politically attractive, reminiscent of the relatively simple to boot. The American economy is going to experience a recession, almost certainly, but if we act quickly and decisively, it can be a short one.
Tourism Industry Pins Hopes on Heritage and Culture

Crowds that were smaller than usual after the Sept. 11 attacks made their way down Main Street in Disney World's Magic Kingdom. Hotels and attractions cut back workers' hours and have laid off some people.

With Sagging Economy as Ally, Democrats in Congress Go on the Attack.

By ADAM CLYMER

WASHINGTON, Nov. 19 — The halls of Congress will reverberate with shouts of "big corporations," "class warfare," and "terrorism" next week, unless the phrase "point of order" draws them out.

With the bipartisanism of September in tatters, Democrats are on the attack in both houses, sensing that a sagging economy will help them in next year's elections and that they can paint Republicans as insensitive to distress.

In the Senate they are pushing a $66.4 billion economic stimulus bill tilted heavily toward direct help for the unemployed.

Republicans argue that tax cuts for people with high incomes and corporations will lead to investments that create more jobs. Some also contend that pushing a plan that President Bush opposes verges on the unpatriotic. And they regularly condemn the Democrats for pushing ahead without trying for a compromise with them.
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GAY THRONGS GREET '42 IN TIMES SQUARE UNDAUNTED BY WAR

Grim Reminders of Danger
in Event of an Air Raid
Surround Revelers

2,000 POLICE ON GUARD

Din Greater than in Peace
Years—Celebration Is Far
Happier Than in 1917

If Axis ears did not hear last
night's revelry in Times Square it
was—not that New Yorkers didn't
try. Tremendous waves of sound
washed against the midtown towers
when the traditional lighted
tallant at midnight and
the lighted legend "1942" broke
bright against the murky sky.

REFUSES TO DROP NEWS-RADIO STUDY

FCC Denies Plea That It
Hampers War Effort

WASHINGTON, Jan. 21—
Despite a plea that interference now
with newspaper ownership of radio
stations would hinder a unified war
affect, the Federal Communications
Commission unanimously refused
today to drop its investigation of
this matter. It declared that early
completion of the inquiry would
actually speed the war drive.
N. B. C., C. B. S. SUED AS RADIO MONOPOLY

Federal Actions Filed in Chicago Also Accuse Company Officers and the R. C. A.

BREAK-UP OF CHAINS ASKED

Heads of the Companies Declare Adoption of FCC Ideas Would Bring Chaos on Air

Special to The New York Times.

CHICAGO, Dec. 31—The Department of Justice began action today to halt alleged domination of radio broadcasting by the National Broadcasting Company and the Columbia Broadcasting System. Two civil suits were filed in Federal District Court to break up alleged monopolistic holdings and enjoin network owners from practices through which it is charged that they hold control.

FAMILY SHRINKAGE IN U. S. IS TRACED

Census Expert Forecasts That Average Home Group in 1980 Will Have Only One Child

SOCIOLOGISTS MEET HERE

1,200 Attend Discussions of Social Problems of Nation in Time of War

By 1980 there will be only one child in the average family in this country, compared with three in 1970, Paul C. Glick of the United States Census Bureau forecast yesterday at the opening session of the thirty-sixth annual meeting of the American Sociological Society at the Hotel Roosevelt.
NEW X-RAY METHOD BARES INNER BRAIN

Two Doctors Here Discover Substance That Can Be Injected into Cavities

GIVES ACCURATE PICTURES

Air, Used Heretofore, Gave Far Less Certain Clues to Tumors or Foreign Bodies

A revolutionary new method for making X-ray pictures of the interior of the brain, thus helping to locate accurately hidden brain tumors or foreign bodies, was described last night at a joint meeting of the New York Neurological Society and the section of Neurology and Psychiatry of the New York Academy of Medicine, held at the Academy Building, Fifth Avenue and 103d Street.

CIVIL WAR VETERAN, 95,
Here to Aid 'Uncle Sam'

John M. Claypool
The New York Times

John Milton Claypool, nonagenarian commander-in-chief of the United Confederate Veterans and an eager volunteer for civilian defense work, arrived in New York yesterday with "still a lot of pep left to do anything I can for Uncle Sam."
2 Black Men Charged in Killing Of White Officer in 1969 Riot

By JERE LONGMAN

YORK, Pa. Oct. 10 — A continuing self-examination of a troubling episode in this city's past has led to more murder charges stemming from a race riot more than three decades ago.

Two black men were charged today in the death of a white police officer during the riot, which lasted 10 days in 1969.

Five months ago, the city was stunned when its mayor, Charlie Robertson, who is white, was charged in the killing of a black woman during the same disturbance.

Mr. Robertson, who was a police officer at the time, has decided not to seek re-election. No trial date has been set.

Today, Stephen Freeland, 49, and Lewis Wright, 54, were both charged with first- and second-degree murder in the shooting death on July 18, 1969, of a rookie police officer, Henry Schaad. The two men were held without bail. Neither entered a plea.

"It's something we've wanted for 32 years," Officer Schaad's brother, Barry Schaad, told reporters. "Of course, I know this is just the first step. God willing, I'll still be alive and healthy to see the end result of this — that being some convictions and sentences."

Henry Schaad is the only police officer ever shot to death in York County, District Attorney H. Stanley Rebert said in an interview tonight. He was killed on the second night of rioting that year.

The wounding of a black teenager by a white gang member. Officer Schaad was riding in an armored car and was hit by a bullet that pierced the armor.

An affidavit filed today's arraignment of the two men cited numerous witnesses who said they saw Mr. Freeland firing at the car, according to The Associated Press. More than 60 people were injured in the riots. 100 were arrested and entire city blocks burned in this racially mixed city of 41,600.

Three days after officer Schaad was killed, Lillie Belle Allen, 27, was shot to death by gunfire from a group of whites as she and relatives drove to buy property. She was killed by a shotgun blast after her family's car was surrounded by a white mob and she tried to take over the driving from her sister.

Both killings went unsolved for years. The cases were reopened in 1991, after a witness came forward, Mr. Rebert said.

"There are some who question the investigation, but there are others who do not," Mr. Rebert said. "The mood is mixed; but for the most part positive. I don't think there is any other path to take."

Mayor Robertson has admitted attending a rally and yelling, "White power," but he has pleaded not guilty in the death of Ms. Allen. Eight other men have been charged in her death.

Four of them have been offered plea deals by the prosecution. All have pleaded not guilty.

---

After Life Of Frugality, Woman Gives $3.5 Million

BOWLING GREEN, Ky., Sept. 27 (AP) — A woman who was so frugal that she slept in the hallway of her boardinghouse so that each man had a room has left $3.5 million to her alma mater.

Shrewd stock investments allowed the woman, Mary Hutto, to raise the money she donated to Western Kentucky University for scholarships, said Leon Beck, the university's former director of planned giving.

"She saved money because she never thought she'd have enough to live on," Mr. Beck told The Courier-Journal in Louisville. "She lived in a little cutout in the hallway with a little shelf around her so she wouldn't take up too much of the bedroom."
Limbaugh Tells Listeners He’s Nearly Deaf

By BILL CARTER

Rush Limbaugh, the country's top political talk radio host, with an audience that reaches 25 million a week, announced to his listeners yesterday that he had suffered severe hearing loss over the last three months and was almost totally deaf.

Mr. Limbaugh, who has led the conservative talk-radio movement for 15 years and who is widely acknowledged to have influenced several political campaigns, particularly the Republicans' takeover of both houses of Congress in 1994, signed the biggest contract in the history of radio in July. That contract runs for three years, paying Mr. Limbaugh $35 million. His station, Premiere Radio Networks, said yesterday that if it remained committed to keeping his program on the air.

Mr. Limbaugh said he would rely on advances in technology, which he said were necessary, to keep broadcasting his daily three-hour program, which broadcasts five days a week.

"I have options," Mr. Limbaugh said. "I can still do this, get up, go to the studio and do the radio program."

"Any time the contract of his program ends, this would be a significant gap in the industry, with a few years where we're used to seeing him."

Mr. Limbaugh and other radio executives expressed shock at the sudden announcement, "It's just staggering," said Tom Taylor, the editor of Inside Radio, a daily newsletter. "We never thought this would happen to this extent."

Several of Mr. Limbaugh's listeners said that in recent months they had noticed a change in his speaking patterns. Mr. Limbaugh acknowledged on the air that doctors had told him that he needed surgery to help his hearing.

"I can't hear radio. I cannot hear television. I cannot hear music," he said. "Over all, it all went back to the ear, and we had a slightly different look in the eyes, and you know how we're moving," he said. "But this is a difficult time." Mr. Limbaugh said he would consider Host is the show, without phone calls.

Mr. Limbaugh said he was currently doing the show, with phone calls.

"Do I want to take calls, well, I'm going to have to do it," he said.

"And if I want to take calls, well, I'm going to have to do it," he said.

A body blow to the nation's No. 1 talk radio show.

"The finest doctors and clinics throughout the country."

"The only radios mentioned for what has happened in the family."

"It's going to be hard to get in my family."

"And I can't even hear music."

"I can't even hear music."

"I cannot hear radio. I cannot hear television."

"I cannot hear music."
Thurmond Taken to Hospital After Fainting

By The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Oct. 2 — Senator Strom Thurmond, the oldest and longest serving member of the Senate, fainted this morning after a vote on the Senate floor and was taken to a local hospital for observation.

Mr. Thurmond, 88, a South Carolina Republican, slumped over his Senate desk at 10:30 a.m. and was helped to the floor by colleagues and aides until the attending physician at the Capitol arrived to treat him. He told the doctor he felt weak and lightheaded.

Senator Bill Frist, a Tennessee Republican who is a retired heart transplant surgeon, also attended to Mr. Thurmond, who was taken to Walter Reed Army Medical Center.

“It was a simple faint,” said Mr. Frist, who accompanied Mr. Thurmond in an ambulance to the emergency room. “He is stable, wide awake. His heart and lungs are good. He’ll probably be back in a day.”

Senator Trent Lott of Mississippi, the Republican leader, said Mr. Thurmond was back to his normal self by the time he left the Senate floor in a wheelchair, an oxygen mask covering his mouth. “He waved as he left,” Mr. Lott said.

Mr. Thurmond has been in the hospital repeatedly this year, mostly after fainting spells.

Mr. Thurmond has said he will not seek re-election next year.

Safety Panel Voting Today On a Recall Of BB Guns

By JULIAN E. BARNES

The Consumer Product Safety Commission will vote today on whether to seek a recall of seven million Daisy BB guns that some contend can fire pellets even when they appear to be empty and that have been blamed for 23 deaths and many injuries in 30 years.

The vote — which will come a day before Ann Brown, the chairman of the commission, is scheduled to step down — has become highly contentious. The Daisy Manufacturing Company has maintained that its air guns are not defective, and the National Rifle Association has urged its members to oppose any action.

At the center of the debate are two high-velocity air guns made by Daisy, the model 888 and the 856. The commission has been investigating whether guns made before 1999 are defective because BB’s can lodge inside guns that appear empty.

The commission is also investigating whether all of the high-velocity Daisy guns, including ones on the market, are faulty because they do not have automatic safeties.

Andrew Youman, a lawyer who sued Daisy, said the company’s high-velocity air guns had been responsible for 23 deaths from 1977 to 1998 and about 20 brain injuries. Daisy sells about 250,000 a year, Mr. Youman said.
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### Reliability Report---Primary Articles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paper</th>
<th>Coder A</th>
<th>Coder B</th>
<th>Coder C</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>420120</td>
<td>420120</td>
<td>420120</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>420120</td>
<td>420120</td>
<td>420120</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>93.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paper</th>
<th>Coder A</th>
<th>Coder B</th>
<th>Coder C</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>011014</td>
<td>011014</td>
<td>011014</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paper</th>
<th>Coder A</th>
<th>Coder B</th>
<th>Coder C</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>011003</td>
<td>011003</td>
<td>011003</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>93.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paper</th>
<th>Coder A</th>
<th>Coder B</th>
<th>Coder C</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>011014</td>
<td>011014</td>
<td>100114</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>93.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paper</th>
<th>Coder A</th>
<th>Coder B</th>
<th>Coder C</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>011003</td>
<td>011003</td>
<td>011003</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 2:</td>
<td>Coder A</td>
<td>Coder B</td>
<td>Coder C</td>
<td>Reliability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 2:</td>
<td>011003</td>
<td>011003</td>
<td>011003</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 3:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 4:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 5:</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 6:</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall = 86.8%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paper 4</th>
<th>Coder A</th>
<th>Coder B</th>
<th>Coder C</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Line 2:</td>
<td>011011</td>
<td>011011</td>
<td>101011</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 3:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 4:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 5:</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 6:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall = 100%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line 2:</th>
<th>Coder A</th>
<th>Coder B</th>
<th>Coder C</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Line 2:</td>
<td>011011</td>
<td>011011</td>
<td>101011</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 3:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 4:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 5:</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 6:</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall = 93.4%

Intercoder Reliability = 95.05%
APPENDIX G

Coding Instructions OP/ED/Letters Section

1. **Title of Piece**: Handwrite the title of the piece you are coding.

2. **Date**: Handwrite the date of the article, year first, then month, then day (e.g. 41 12 07).

3. **Length**: Handwrite the length of the article in paragraphs.

4. **Source**: Handwrite the number corresponding to the source of the piece coded.

5. **Type of Piece (Focus)**: Handwrite the number corresponding to the dominant focus of the piece coded.
APPENDIX H
Coding Sheet for OP/ED/Letters Section


<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Title of Piece (if applicable)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Date (Year-Month-Day)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>01-06/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Length in Paragraphs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>07-08/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Source of Piece</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>09/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = Editorial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = Letter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 = Article</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Type of Piece (focus)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = Military</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = Economic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 = Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. Title of Piece (if applicable) |   |   |   |   |   |
2. Date (Year-Month-Day) |   |   |   |   | 01-06/ |
3. Length in Paragraphs |   |   |   |   | 07-08/ |
4. Source of Piece |   |   |   |   | 09/ |
1 = Editorial |   |   |   |   | |
2 = Letter |   |   |   |   | |
3 = Article |   |   |   |   | |
5. Type of Piece (focus) |   |   |   |   | 10/ |
1 = Military |   |   |   |   | |
2 = Economic |   |   |   |   | |
3 = Other |   |   |   |   | |

---

1. Title of Piece (if applicable) |   |   |   |   |   |
2. Date (Year-Month-Day) |   |   |   |   | 01-06/ |
3. Length in Paragraphs |   |   |   |   | 07-08/ |
4. Source of Piece |   |   |   |   | 09/ |
1 = Editorial |   |   |   |   | |
2 = Letter |   |   |   |   | |
3 = Article |   |   |   |   | |
5. Type of Piece (focus) |   |   |   |   | 10/ |
1 = Military |   |   |   |   | |
2 = Economic |   |   |   |   | |
3 = Other |   |   |   |   | |
## APPENDIX I

### Reliability Report---OP/ED/Letters Pieces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paper 1</th>
<th>Coder A</th>
<th>Coder B</th>
<th>Coder C</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Line 2:</td>
<td>420131</td>
<td>420131</td>
<td>420131</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 3:</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 4:</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 5:</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall = 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Line 2: | 420131  | 420131  | 420131  | 100%        |
| Line 3: | 5       | 5       | 5       | 100%        |
| Line 4: | 3       | 3       | 3       | 100%        |
| Line 5: | 1       | 1       | 1       | 100%        |
| Overall |         |         |         | Overall = 100% |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paper 2</th>
<th>Coder A</th>
<th>Coder B</th>
<th>Coder C</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Line 2:</td>
<td>420125</td>
<td>420125</td>
<td>420125</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 3:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 4:</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 5:</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall = 91.75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Line 2: | 420125  | 420125  | 420125  | 100%        |
| Line 3: | 1       | 1       | 1       | 100%        |
| Line 4: | 1       | 1       | 1       | 100%        |
| Line 5: | 3       | 3       | 3       | 100%        |
| Overall |         |         |         | Overall = 100% |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paper 3</th>
<th>Coder A</th>
<th>Coder B</th>
<th>Coder C</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Line 2:</td>
<td>011015</td>
<td>011115</td>
<td>011015</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 3:</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 4:</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 5:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall = 91.75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Line 2: | 011015  | 011015  | 011015  | 100%        |
| Line 3: | 4       | 4       | 4       | 100%        |
| Line 4: | 2       | 2       | 2       | 100%        |
| Line 5: | 3       | 3       | 3       | 100%        |
| Overall |         |         |         | Overall = 100% |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paper 4</th>
<th>Coder A</th>
<th>Coder B</th>
<th>Coder C</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Line 2:</td>
<td>010928</td>
<td>010928</td>
<td>010928</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 3:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 4:</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 5:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall = 100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Line 2: | 010928  | 010928  | 010928  | 100%        |
| Line 3: | 1       | 1       | 1       | 100%        |
| Line 4: | 2       | 2       | 2       | 100%        |
| Line 5: | 2       | 2       | 1       | 67%         |
| Overall = 91.75% |

Intercoder Reliability = 96.90%
APPENDIX J

Front Page Coverage in *New York Times*---December 7, 1941
APPENDIX K

Front Page Coverage in *New York Times*—September 11, 2001

---

**Nuclear Booty:**

More Smugglers Use Asia Route

By JIM DYER

A federal dragnet has begun sweeping through nuclear-powered systems in the United States, after the September 11 terrorist attacks, as the Bush administration struggles to prevent another attack. The FBI has been investigating the theft of nuclear materials in the United States and abroad, and the probe has cast a wide net across the world, from China to Russia. The FBI has been working closely with international law enforcement agencies and the U.S. government, and has made several arrests in recent weeks. The investigation has focused on the theft of nuclear materials from the United States, and on the possibility of weapons-grade plutonium being used in a terrorist attack.

---

**City Voters Have Heard It All As Campaign Din Near End**

By JIN HEW

The campaign for mayor of New York City has reached its end, as candidates battle for the vote in the city's most closely watched race. The race has been marked by pledges to improve the city's schools and its economy, and by charges of corruption and scandal. The candidates have been accused of accepting large campaign contributions from businesses and the wealthy, and of using their positions to benefit themselves. The race has been marked by a polarizing atmosphere, with some candidates blaming the other side for the city's problems.

---

**Violence in Mideast, Debate Plans to Talk**

The violence in the Middle East has been a major issue in the campaign, as candidates have vowed to work towards a peace deal. The violence has been marked by a series of terrorist attacks and bombings, and by the ongoing conflict between Israel and the Palestinians. The candidates have been divided on how to approach the conflict, with some calling for a strong response to the violence, and others calling for dialogue and negotiation.

---

**School Dress Codes vs. a Sea of Bare Flesh**

By MATTHEW LAMBERGER

With the start of the school year, many parents and students are concerned about the issue of dress codes and the freedom of expression. Some parents have called for dress codes to be relaxed, while others have advocated for a stricter approach. The issue has been controversial, with some students opting to wear revealing clothing, while others have been disciplined for doing so. The debate has highlighted the tension between the freedom of expression and the need for public safety.
APPENDIX L

Advertisement in *New York Times*---Pearl Harbor Period

*SWEET LAND OF LIBERTY*

This is a time when everyone in this country might well stop to think, "Now is the moment to be aware of what America is and what it means to me to live here." If everyone did so, there would be more than flags flying.

This is the time for us to reaffirm our enduring faith in the free spirit, free life and free enterprise that are America. It is a time for us to be grateful for the right to call our own the proud banner that ever has been, and is today, a rallying symbol for free men.
APPENDIX M

Advertisements in the New York Times---September 11 Period
Let your kids show their true colors.

Make a Flag. Make a Difference.

September 27th–30th

Now through Sunday, bring your kids to Toys"R"Us or Kids"R"Us to make an American Flag. All materials are available in store for free. On behalf of each child participating in this program, Toys"R"Us will donate $1 to the Save the Children's "Help for Haiti" Emergency Relief Fund. Each of these flags will be proudly displayed at the front of our store.

In addition to our other efforts, nothing would fulfill us more than to deploy millions of kids' flags knowing that together we can make even more of a difference. It's our way of knowing the thousands of families affected by our nation's recent tragedies. It's also a reminder that no challenge, however big, is more important than love to spend time with your kids.
It would take a really large ship to hold all the emotions we're feeling for New Yorkers. Fortunately, we have one.

We're honored to launch Adventure of the Seas, the world's largest cruise ship. Right here in New York Harbor.