ISOLATED INCIDENTS OR DELIBERATE POLICY?
MEDIA FRAMING OF U.S. ABU GHRAIB AND
BRITISH DETAINEE ABUSE SCANDALS DURING THE IRAQ WAR

Ramune Braziunaite

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate College of Bowling Green
State University in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

August, 2011

Committee:

Catherine Cassara, Advisor

Timothy Pogacar,
Graduate Faculty Representative

Joseph Oliver Boyd-Barrett

Nancy H. Brendlinger

Matthew Heinz

ABSTRACT

Catherine Cassara, Advisor

In order to examine how the detainee abuse by American and British forces tested not only the media's ability to report on human rights abuses but also their professed ability to serve as watchdogs for their respective governments, this dissertation used the constructionist framing approach to compare news stories about abuse in Iraq that appeared in the *New York Times,* the *Washington Post*, the *Guardian* and the *Times* (London), from April 29, 2004 to May 14, 2004.

Findings showed that abuse conducted by the American troops was covered extensively by the newspapers in both countries while the American newspapers tended to ignore revelations of abuse by British troops. However, volume is not the only significant measure of coverage quality. Reporting on human rights abuses is a complex process demanding both resources to investigate abuse as well as careful consideration about when and how to disclose them to the public. While Abu Ghraib photographs were the strongest impetus for disclosing the abuse by American soldiers, news coverage of British abuse was complicated by initial publication of what turned out to be photos of staged reenactment of abuse.

The study found noteworthy differences in how the four newspapers defined, interpreted, evaluated, and treated abuse by both armies. Contrary to findings suggested by previous research, the newspapers examined in this study favored attribution of responsibility to the system rather than individuals in their coverage of U.S. events. However, the newspapers blamed individuals for the abuse by British forces. The four newspapers were similar in how they depersonalized and dehumanized Iraqi victims by utilizing the "them

versus us" dichotomy to frame the people who appeared in the coverage. Reliance on official

sources was noted as another significant commonality. The differences, however, were

reflected in how the four newspapers utilized labels to portray the severity of abuse. These

and the other findings from the study point to how valuable framing analysis is as an

approach to exploring how the media function to constrict, manipulate or simply form

readers' attitudes, values and knowledge of topics of such vital importance as torture and

abuse.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It has been a long journey and completing this work is definitely a high point in my academic career. I could not have come this far without the assistance of many individuals, and I want to express my deepest appreciation to them. Their examples as researchers and educators as well as responsible and engaged citizens will continue to serve as inspiration for my future academic career.

First and foremost, I must thank my advisor Dr. Catherine Cassara who provided guidance, advice, and encouragement from the very beginning of this work. I could not have done this without her believing in me and my research and writing abilities. She has been patient when I needed more time, supportive when I was searching for ideas, and encouraging when I felt lost in the vast field of study of international media and communication. Dr. Cassara introduced me to the study of human rights reporting and helped me grasp the media's role in covering war and conflict. Classes I took with Dr. Cassara on international news and global journalism contributed to my personal development and ability to contribute to international communication research. I am forever in dept to Dr. Cassara for spending countless hours helping me make sense of this complicated and important area of study. I am thankful to her for our long discussions and her continuous support and encouragement.

My committee members deserve a special note of praise. I wish to thank Dr. Nancy Brendlinger for watching over me since my first days as a graduate student at BGSU. I enjoyed taking classes with Dr. Brendlinger that introduced me to the study of journalism and media systems. Her apt and insightful observations as well as constructive criticism on my research helped me focus my ideas. I am indebted to her for continuous support and

encouragement. I wish to thank Dr. Matthew Heinz for helping me build my confidence as a teacher during my first years of teaching at BGSU. Dr. Heinz is responsible for expanding my understanding of how culture influences communication and encouraging me to explore the power of language in shaping our realities. I appreciate the advice and critique I received from Dr. Oliver Boyd-Barrett. Having an internationally renowned scholar on my dissertation committee was an honor. Dr. Boyd-Barrett's comments, questions, and advice were thought provoking and pushed me to enrich my ideas. Dr. Timothy Pogacar also deserves my sincerest thanks for support, encouragement, and apt observations.

Many friends and colleagues in the School of Media and Communication at BGSU helped me to stay focused. Special thanks goes to Dr. Lara Martin Lengel who has befriended me and guided me towards excellence with her own personal example. Dr. Lori Liggett deserves my gratitude for carefully reading and editing of my manuscript. Her encouragement and friendship is greatly appreciated. Dr. Stephen Croucher was instrumental in helping me shape my confidence as a researcher. Dr. Mike Robison, Dr. Molly Swiger, Dr. Brigit K. Talkington, Kate LaPierre and many other friends provided emotional support during this journey.

I would like to express my heart-felt gratitude to my immediate family--my parents, by brother, my niece and of course my husband. Their loving care and support made this journey possible.

I must also acknowledge the Fulbright scholarship which brought me to BGSU. I am also grateful for the GradSTEP program that allowed me to continue my studies at BGSU.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

INTRODUCTION

As early as March 2003, human rights activists began raising questions about cruel and humiliating treatment of war captives by coalition forces operating in Iraq and Afghanistan. Such treatment of prisoners violates Article 17 of the Third Geneva Convention and the United States and Britain's official policies on combat and occupation. British and American media gave little attention to activists' concerns.[1] This neglect continued even though in May of that year the *Guardian* and the *New York Times* both ran nominal coverage about the existence of disturbing photographs taken at a Basra humanitarian aid camp in southern Iraq in May 2003. Those pictures showed British soldiers forcing Iraqis to strip bare and simulate oral and anal sex. Only when the April 28, 2004, edition of CBS *60 Minutes II* broke the news of prisoner mistreatment by U.S. troops in Baghdad's Abu Ghraib prison did the issue of detainee abuse reach public awareness in both countries and begin to attract the mainstream media attention. The CBS report included graphic photographs of naked prisoners piled on top of each other, some hooded and wired with electrodes, and American soldiers were shown posing in many of the scenes.

Following the CBS report, on May 1, 2004, the *Daily Mirror* published photographs of alleged prisoner abuses by U.K. troops showing a soldier allegedly from the 1st Battalion, the Queen's Lancashire Regiment (QLR) urinating on a hooded Iraqi prisoner sitting on the

---

[1] Amnesty International, "Iraq: One Year on the Human Rights Situation Remains Dire," *Amnesty International Report,* March 18, 2004, Index Number: MDE 14/006/2004 http://www.amnesty.org/en/library/info/MDE14/006/2004 (accessed August 15, 2010); Eric Umansky, "Failures of Imagination," *Colombia Journalism Review* 45, no. 3 (September/October 2006): 20.

floor.[1] In the U.S., the *60 Minutes II* report was followed in two days by a *New Yorker* article written by Seymour Hersh that indicated the Bush administration had been investigating charges of prisoner abuse since January 2004.[2] The Hersh exposé was accompanied by more graphic and damaging photographs. Both the CBS report and the Hersh essay relied on information generated by an investigation undertaken for the Pentagon by General Antonio Taguba. That Pentagon report documented abuse and included accusations against individual soldiers, as well as a more broadly based indictment of military organizational and leadership failures that made possible the abuses at Abu Ghraib.

In the wake of the *60 Minutes II* and *New Yorker* reports, coverage of the Abu Ghraib scandal began to dominate the news media around the world and as more incidents of misconduct came to light, Abu Ghraib became the measuring stick by which later instances of soldier misconduct and abuse would be evaluated. For example, when the media later reported on members of the 3rd Battalion 1st Marine Regiment carrying out a massacre in the town of Haditha in November 2005, the Abu Ghraib incident was used as evidentiary proof that the war on terror was producing human rights abuses and violations of international law. Additionally, international debate expanded beyond questions of alleged abuse to examinations of U.S. and British government accountability for mistreatment.

This dissertation provides analysis of the U.S. and British media coverage of prisoner abuses committed by U.S. and British military forces in Iraq. It compared coverage of news stories that appeared beginning with the end of April and running through mid-May 2004 in the *New York Times,* the *Washington Post*, the *Guardian,* and the *Times* (London). At issue

---

[1] Though these photos were later proven to be fakes, they were the used by the media to contemplate the abuse by both coalition forces.

[2] Seymour Hersh, "Torture at Abu Ghraib," *New Yorker*, April 30, 2004. This exposé was first published in the online version of the *New Yorker* magazine on 30 April, 2004 and appeared in the paper issue on May 10, 2004.

was the papers' handling of charges of prisoner abuse at Abu Ghraib by American troops, as well as their handling of accusations that British forces in Basra mistreated Iraqi detainees.

The dissertation focused on these newspapers because they are the papers most widely read by policy makers, media decision makers, nongovernmental organizations, and the international community in general. Prior research bears out the reliance of those audiences on newspaper news sources in preference to television.[1] The research considered news stories only--not editorials or letters to the editor--using a framing approach that allowed for a more in-depth reading of media coverage than the traditional news "objectivity and bias" approach to the analysis of foreign news coverage. Adopting a constructivist approach to scrutinize the news frames, the study considered what factors might have contributed to interpreting the events in a particular manner. That is, it examined news framing not as an unproblematic media process of constructing the news, but rather as a way of exploring how the media create the meanings which, if unquestioned, become commonly accepted interpretations of reality. In this approach to media research, framing provides both guidance for methodological choices and the structure of what would commonly be cast as the theoretical context of the work.

Studying printed coverage of detainee abuse by the coalition forces was a viable means to test the media independence from their governments' official interpretation of events. The seemingly delayed coverage of the incidents of abuse raises questions about the news media's ability or willingness to report on human rights issues connected to the war on

---

[1] Pew Research Center, "Press Accuracy Rating Hits Two Decade Low. Public Evaluations of the News Media: 1985-2009," *Pew Research Center*, September 13, 2009, under "Survey Reports," http://people-press.org/report/543/ (accessed July, 2, 2010); Douglas Van Belle, "Bureaucratic Responsiveness to the News Media," *Political Communication* 20, no. 3 (2003): 274; Piers Robinson, *The CNN Effect* (London: Routledge, 2002), 2-3.

terror. A large body of media research has explored the war-time relationships of media organizations, individual journalists, and governments. Some scholars have suggested that the media are often co-opted to support their nations' governmental policies and to mobilize the public in favor of those positions.[1] Other studies made an even stronger case which argued that the media intentionally succumb to governmental ideologies as the result of their reliance on governmental sources, a line of thought which led to the developments of the "media propaganda" and the more situational "political contest" models.[2] In contrast, other scholars have identified instances when media professionals and their organizations have acted independently of their nation's policies and challenged official ideologies.[3] Those studies have found that civilian casualties can "trigger instances" for journalists to act in ways that can be perceived to be in opposition to governmental versions of events. Scholars suggest this becomes particularly true when civilian deaths appear not only to have been avoidable but intentional and may actually have been used as a means to influence the outcome of the conflict. For instance, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization was suspected of bombing civilian targets during an air campaign against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia in 1999 in order to put pressure on Slobodan Milosevic.[4] Similarly, NATO's "accidental" bombing of trains in Kosovo that year led journalists to question the veracity of military briefings and encouraged them to investigate the true intentions of military

[1] For general overview see Stephen Reese and Bob Buckalew, "The Militarism of Local Television," *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 12 (1995): 40-59; also see Oliver Boyd-Barrett, "Understanding the Second Casualty," in *Reporting War*, ed. Stuart Allan and Barbie Zelizer (New York: Routledge, 2004), 25-42.
[2] The media propaganda model advocated by Herman and Chomsky is described in their seminal work *Manufacturing Consent* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1988). The political contest model which rests on the premise that the political process is more likely to influence the media than other way around is examined by Gadi Wolfsfeld in *Media and Political Conflict* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).
[3] See Claude Cookman, "An American Atrocity" *Journal of American History* 94.1 (2007): 154-162; Greg McLaughlin, "Rules of Engagement" *Journalism Studies* 3, no. 2 (2002): 257-266.
[4] Tarcisio Gazzini, "NATO Coercive Military Activities in the Yugoslav Crisis (1992-1999)," *EJIL*, 12, no. 3 (2001): 408.

intervention in that region.[1] In this way, the abuse and torture of detainees in Afghanistan and Iraq can be argued to have caused journalists to question both the truthfulness of information handed out at U.S. and British military briefings and the degree to which the administrations in both countries were aware and perhaps even culpable for the abuse.

The dissertation research is important because it provides an opportunity to explore and theorize about the realm of political communication and media coverage of an international conflict as well as presents an examination of an intricate impact of political and cultural context on the news media behavior within national settings. Mowlana argued that many changes in the international arena toward the end of the 20th century cannot be understood without recognizing how culture and human dimension become relevant aspects of political affairs.[2] Van Gorp observed that since culture is a primary base that guides comprehension of the world outside, a variety of frames in a particular culture provides "the linkage between news production and consumption."[3] Prisoner abuse scandals in Iraq highlight the importance of culture in international relations as the abusers used the most sacred taboos of Islamic culture to degrade, humiliate and torture Iraqi detainees. There may not be a way to find out whether their cultural beliefs were exploited intentionally or not. However, reactions from the media and the public did not ignore the cultural significance of what the images of Abu Ghraib revealed about prisoner treatment in Iraq. It became necessary for journalists and the public to become informed about Islamic cultural and religious taboos in order to be able to adequately comprehend and report on the abuse of Iraqis.

---

[1] Greg McLaughlin, "Rules of Engagement" *Journalism Studies* 3, no. 2 (2002): 257-266.
[2] Hamid Mowlana*, Global Communication in Transition* (Sage Publications, 1996).
[3] Baldwin Van Gorp, "The Constructionist Approach to Framing," *Journal of Communication* 57, no. 1 (2007): 61.

An important factor in the study's deliberations is the impact of new media technologies on news circulation and their ability to carry stories across borders in the blink of an eye. Quite likely the discussion of the cultural ramifications of prisoner abuse might not have been possible if not for the emergence of the notorious Abu Ghraib photographs. Mirroring the significance of the My Lai Massacre photograph taken by Army Sgt. Ron Haeberle, the Abu Ghraib photographs propelled the story to national and international attention.[1] The question of whether the photographs were war trophies or interrogation tools remains contested. Nonetheless, the widespread availability of digital photography continues to influence how the Iraq war is being reported, viewed, and documented by the media outlets and soldiers alike. Thus, this dissertation explores the way the media used introspection when reporting on how the photographs affected the coverage of detainee abuse in Iraq by the international media.

Overall, this research contributes to the literature that examines the media coverage of war at a critical juncture when both the war on terror and advances in communication technologies have increased governmental control over information available to journalists and audiences alike. The study applied the constructivist paradigm that casts journalists as information processors who "create 'interpretive packages' of the positions of politically invested 'sponsors' (e.g. sources) in order to both reflect and add to the 'issue culture' of the topic."[2] Constructionist perspective is built on the assumption that framing enables journalists and the audiences to make different meanings of events, issues and persons

---

[1] Claude Cookman, "An American Atrocity," *Journal of American History* 94, no. 1 (2007): 154-162.
[2] Paul D'Angelo, "News Framing as a Multiparadigmatic Research Program" *Journal of Communication* 52, no. 4 (2002): 877.

depending upon what frames are applied to a media text.[1] According to this perspective, frames are a part of the social construction process and, thus, their use is so normal and natural that they became invisible. The goal of the researcher then is to reconstruct frame packages by determining framing and reasoning devices that are "demonstrably part of media content and discourse."[2]

The research design was modeled on Entman's use of news frames as a means of comparing American coverage of a Soviet fighter's downing of a Korean Air Lines Flight in 1983 with American coverage of a U. S. navy ship's downing of an Iran Air Flight in 1988.[3] Entman argued that such comparisons help to detect and clarify media frames that might otherwise appear to be unproblematic interpretations of events. Therefore, to examine the abstract nature of frames, this dissertation applies quantitative research methods in combination with the interpretative stance of qualitative methods. As a research inquiry, framing draws on both agenda-setting and media priming theories but goes further to consider the role of media in hegemonic processes within democratic societies. Any research that contributes to understandings of media performance in coverage of modern warfare offers the possibility that scholars and media professionals alike can reflect on the importance of their work to the larger society.

However, the significance of this type of research goes beyond its implications for a particular body of international news--in this case prisoner abuse and the Geneva Convention. At stake is the very health and well-being of civil debate in U.S. and British

---

[1] See William Gamson, "News as Framing," *American Behavioral Scientist* 33, no. 2 (1989): 158; Baldwin Van Gorp, "The Constructionist Approach to Framing," *Journal of Communication* 57, no. 1 (2007): 62; Robert Entman, "Framing: Toward Clarification of a Fractured Paradigm," *Journal of Communication*, 43 (1983): 52.
[2] Van Gorp, "The Constructionist Approach to Framing," 71.
[3] Robert Entman, "Framing U.S. Coverage of International News," *Journal of Communication* 41, no. 4 (1991): 6-27.

democracies. The possibility of prisoner mistreatment by soldiers working at the behest of democratic governments damages not only the overall image of coalition forces, but also creates a devastating legacy for the Bush and Blair administrations. Both the U.S. and British governments countered the allegations of detainee mistreatment with promises to investigate and prosecute those guilty of the worst abuses and assurances that they were only the acts of a few "bad apples." It is difficult to trust that position because the media coverage has since brought to light evidence suggesting that prisoner abuse occurred with the knowledge and consent of high ranking officials in both countries.

To minimize the effects of the scandal, both governments employed the rhetoric of investigation and transparency, proclaiming that torture and democracy cannot coexist. However, activists and scholars remind us of a long history of torture carried out by democracies going back nearly two hundred years.[1] Various physical torture techniques that induce pain without leaving visible signs, which are known as "clean techniques," appeared first as punishments during military operations in French and British colonies, as well as in the history of American slavery.[2] Many of the torture techniques that came to light in Afghanistan and Iraq such as waterboarding, forced standing, sleep deprivation, or exposure to loud noise were used by the modern democracies well before World War II. Those techniques were carefully studied, evaluated, and perfected by the police and military institutions of democratic countries. Rejali explained that the use of clean techniques goes had in hand with democracies due to public monitoring.[3] That is, democracies are interested in hiding torture and making torture allegations less credible by avoiding leaving visible

---

[1] Darius Rejali, *Torture and Democracy* (Princeton University Press, 2007).
[2] Ibid., 4.
[3] Ibid., 5.

wounds of photographs of actual torture.[1] Consequently, much of the history and nature of torture techniques employed as a result of official governmental policy remains unknown to the general public, but by professional obligation the media have the responsibility to explore the issues and inform the public.

A close reading of the coverage of prisoner abuse scandals tested the media's professional ability to serve as the fourth estate in democracies during times of war and in covering atrocities. Contrasting treatment of the same events in U.S. and British newspapers helped to identity the difference in journalistic philosophies and practices as well as illuminate varying notions of newsworthiness and the place of the media in robust civic debate. Prior research suggests this exploration of media diversity need not be limited to a comparison between the two countries' media outlets, but that it may be useful to compare the content of newspapers within one country.[2] The study also added to the understanding of how events themselves, as well as cultural and political processes surrounding these events, contribute to the media's ability to provide quality coverage of complicated issues such as torture of detainees.

Finally, the study extends the ongoing discussion of linking torture to issues of human rights and discrimination. The first Amnesty International campaigns against torture were aimed at preventing abuses of state power against political prisoners.[3] During the 1980s and 1990s the reports of torture against political prisoners declined, and human rights groups noted the rise of ill-treatment of civilians in which the perpetrators were not official

---

[1] For a general review on the history of torture see Michael Kerrigan, *The Instruments of Torture* (New York: The Lyons Press, 2007).

[2] Daniela Dimitrova and Jesper Stromback, "Mission Accomplished," *Gazette* 67, no. 5 (2005): 399-417; William Gamson and Andre Modigliani, "Media Discourse and Public Opinion on Nuclear Power," *American Journal of Sociology* 95, no. 1 (1989): 1-37;

[3] Amnesty International, *Combating Torture* (London: Amnesty International Publ., 2003), 10.

government forces but rather members of opposition groups. In many instances torture could be linked to discrimination against women, children, or the poor, or discrimination based on ethnic, racial, or sexual identity.[1] This discrimination and hatred of "the Other" may be a plausible factor that contributed to soldiers' behaviors and attitudes in Iraq. That is, prisoner abuse in Iraq can be linked to extreme prejudice against people from Middle Eastern and Muslim backgrounds, which increased after the September 11, 2001 attacks. American and British interrogators confessed that they began seeing torture as a natural way to gather intelligence as well as "a very emotionally satisfying response to the vicious 9/11 attacks."[2]

Hatred of "the Other" is not a new phenomenon. War in particular makes it easy to see the enemy as the inhuman "Other." Media coverage of the enemy during the Cold War was dictated by the "them versus us" mentality. Just as the Cold War frame influenced international relations on both the diplomatic and individual levels, the threat of terrorism is an underlying theme of today's international relations. Studies show that the media facilitate construction of Islam and Muslims as dehumanized, de-individualized and expendable "Other."[3] Costigliola noted that seemingly objective reality is often formed by emotions-- "whether compelling anger or dislike, underlying moods of satisfaction or discomfort, or predispositions based on personal predilections or past experiences."[4] Determining the influence of emotion in international diplomacy is rather difficult as political officials, when presenting their arguments, frame them in rational terms. Therefore, it is important to consider the possibility that emotional reactions to terrorist attacks influenced the decisions

---

[1] Ibid., 10.
[2] Tony Lagouranis and Allen Mikaelian, *Fear up Harsh* (New York, N.Y.: NAL Caliber, 2007), 248.
[3] Erin Steuter and Deborah Wills, "Discourses of Dehumanization," *Global Media Journal* 2, no. 2 (2009): 7-24.
[4] Frank Costigliola, "Like Animals or Worse," *Diplomatic History* 28, no. 5 (November 2004): 754.

of policy makers supporting the war in Iraq and individual soldiers handling Iraqi detainees. This study was an opportunity to examine whether the media were susceptible to any nationalized, emotional narratives that suggested prejudice toward Islam.

The dissertation is organized into six chapters. The first chapter of the dissertation provides background information necessary to understand the nature of detainee treatment in Iraq by coalition forces. The second chapter provides the review of the literatures that forms the basis for the theoretical and methodological approaches considered in this study. The third chapter details the study design and method of analysis. The fourth chapter presents the study results. The fifth chapter discusses the findings of this dissertation followed by an analysis of their significance and suggestions about the contributions this research makes to the literature of the field. The concluding chapter provides theoretical implications of the study findings and limitations of the study followed by a complete list of the references dealing with news framing, coverage of allegations of prisoner abuses, and the role of the media in covering national policies in times of war. Appendices provide an overview of convictions that resulted from the investigations in the U.S. and the U.K.; a sample list of news articles covering abuse accusations by coalition forces leading up to the CBS and *New Yorker* coverage of April 2004; a sample of LexisNexis Academic search results utilizing different search keywords and indicating the number of items published by the four newspapers during different time periods; as well as sheets that were used to code data.

CHAPTER 1

BACKGROUND

The chapter provides information necessary as a foundation to the analysis and discussion of how the U.S. and British media came to cover charges of abuse at Basra and Abu Ghraib. That discussion begins with a history of how events and policy decisions in Afghanistan and Iraq influenced how coalition forces in Iraq came to treat Iraqi detainees and concludes with an analysis of the character and extent of the actual abuses of the detainees. A second major section of the chapter explores the coverage of that treatment prior to the breaking of the Abu Ghraib story. The chapter continues with a brief examination of the rhetorical implications of the use of terms such as "abuse" and "torture," a subject that gets lengthy analysis later in the dissertation. A final section of the chapter analyzes the legacy of the Abu Ghraib events and their coverage in the media.

The War on Terror and Detention Policies

The story of what happened in Basra and later in the Abu Ghraib prison has its roots in Afghanistan with the development of the coalition detention policies and actions that came to shape later detainee treatment in Iraq. This overview traces that story, addresses the nature of the allegations of detainee abuse, and analyzes separately how the British and U.S. governments investigated and responded to those charges.

Detention Facilities

The United States and the United Kingdom launched their war in Afghanistan on October

7, 2001, as a response to the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks on the New York World Trade Center. This campaign marked the beginning of the George W. Bush administration's global war on terror. When the war in Iraq began two years later in March 2003 the same coalition forces moved into Iraq, and often the very same troops actually transferred from one field of operations to the other, apparently taking with them standard operating procedures that had been developed in response to the war against the Taliban and later Al Qaeda.[1]

While the initial, military campaign in Iraq involved a multinational force, many countries withdrew their troops as the war became more and more unpopular and violent. By the fall of 2005, the vast majority of troops were from the United States, thus the media began to refer to the forces as the "U.S. led coalition." By the end of 2008, the other two countries that still had significant numbers of troops in Iraq were the United Kingdom and Australia. Although the reasons for the initial U.S. invasion of Iraq are intensely debated and the stated rationale for the entry of the multinational forces has changed over time, the war in Iraq has become the most tangible and visible manifestation of the Bush's war on terror. In addition to active combat, the war on terror necessitates the collecting of intelligence which, in turn, necessitates detaining and interrogating large numbers of terror suspects. The coalition forces conducted detention operations first at 25 sites in Afghanistan and at the strategic operation and detention center at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and later in 17 cities in Iraq. In March 2004, as the Abu Ghraib story was about to break, the detainee population in Iraq hit its peak at 110,000.[2] Detention facilities varied from makeshift buildings and army barracks to prison camps with tents surrounded by

---

[1] Independent Panel. "Independent Panel Delivers Detention Operations Report*," DoD News Reports*, 2004. http://www.defenselink.mil/releases/2004/nr20040824-1160.html (accessed October, 18, 2008).
[2] Ibid.

razor wire and elevated guard towers.[1] During the years of 2003 and 2004, at the time when most

of the reported abuses occurred, there were four main facilities in Iraq: Abu Ghraib, Camp

Bucca, Camp Cropper, and Camp Shu'aiba.[2] The first three were controlled by U.S. forces. The

Abu Ghraib prison was a pre-existing complex of buildings near Baghdad, a notorious jailhouse

used during the Saddam Hussein regime. Camp Bucca, the biggest U.S. detention facility, was a

100-acre prison camp in the desert near Umm Qasrin in the south of the country. Camp Shu'aiba

was a major British base located south of Basra and generally housing less than 200 detainees. In

addition, six smaller makeshift facilities were maintained by U.S. forces at the brigade or

divisional levels.[3]

Interrogation Policies and Procedures Leading to Detainee Abuse

As early as March 2003, the human rights groups Amnesty International, International

Red Cross, and Human Rights Watch declared that both U.S. and British forces regularly used

"torture-like" methods during the interrogation of suspects in Afghanistan and Guantanamo Bay.

While the governments denied those torture allegations, they admitted that sleep deprivation,

humiliation, standing in painful or awkward positions for long periods, and exposure to extreme

temperature were approved interrogation techniques that were considered successful means to

extract information from detainees.[4] The Bush Administration had previously stated that the

Geneva Conventions did not apply to all Taliban and al Qaeda detainees held in Bagram or

---

[1] Steven Strasser, ed., *The Abu Ghraib Investigations* (New York: Public Affairs, 2004), 77-78.
[2] Ibid., 62.
[3] Global Policy Forum. "Detention and Prisons," Chapter 4 in *Report: War and Occupation*, Global Policy Forum, 2007, under "Coalition Prisons" http://www.globalpolicy.org/security/issues/iraq/occupation/report/detention.htm (accessed October 11, 2008).
[4] Seymour Hersh, "Chain of Command," *New Yorker*, May 17, 2004.

Guantanamo, as they were not "enemy combatants" or "lawful combatants."[1]

The standard terminology that would have clearly determined legal rights for the detainees was "prisoners of war" or "criminal detainees," but the U.S. Government avoided using these.[2] Instead, Bush declared those detainees to be "security detainees" or "unlawful combatants."[3] As a result, prisoners in Afghanistan and Guantanamo had no real legal status.[4] There were no legally enforced procedures that enabled "security detainees" to demand civil or human rights, and there were no mechanisms to prove innocence or to gain release. In fact, U.S. authorities rarely brought formal charges against detainees or brought them to trial. For example, of the 775 detainees brought to Guantánamo, more than 400 were released without charge.[5] Further, the U.S. insisted on its right to hold these prisoners indefinitely, based on "military necessity" or "imperative reasons of security."[6] These terms have been borrowed from international law where they are generally thought to have a limited meaning for a short duration in wartime emergencies. The laws were not intended to keep thousands of persons imprisoned for many years without being formally charged, having access to legal representation, and then given a fair trial to determine guilt or innocence. However, in the wake of September 11, the president declared the war on terror creates "extraordinary emergency" that allows the U.S. to detain foreign citizens as "unlawful combatants."[7] More importantly, the labels "security detainees," "security internees," or "unlawful combatants" afforded the U.S. harsher

---

[1] Jay Bybee, "Memo from Jay Bybee to Alberto Gonzales. Status of Taliban Forces Under Article 4 of the Third Geneva Convention of 1949," Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legal Counsel, February 22, 2002, under "Read the Key Documents" http://www.torturingdemocracy.org/documents (accessed September 9, 2007).

[2] Karen Greenberg and Joshua Dratel, eds., *The Torture Papers* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005). 912; Amnesty International, *Combating Torture* (London: Amnesty International Pub., 2003), 54.

[3] Strasser, *Abu Ghraib Investigations,* 90.

[4] Greenberg and Dratel, *The Torture Papers,* 948.

[5] Citizens for Global Solutions, "The Guantanamo Bay Detention Center," under "Issues" http://www.globalsolutions.org/guantanamo (accessed July 27, 2009).

[6] Greenberg and Dratel, *Torture Papers,* 367.

[7] Philip Gourevitch and Errol Morris. *Standard Operating Procedure* (New York, Penguin Group, Inc., 2008), 29.

interrogation techniques which at the beginning were intended to be applied only in Guantanamo and required a specific authorization by the Secretary of Defense. These "augmented" techniques migrated from Guantanamo to Afghanistan to Iraq.[1] Only in June 2008 the "security detainees" were reclassified by the United States as "enemy combatants."[2]

Experts agree that the situation in Iraq was worsened by the lack of coalition preparedness for peacekeeping operations.[3] Both U.S. and U.K. troops had been trained for combat operations and did not expect to become the only law enforcement institutions in Iraq. Although the British Army had experience with internment camps in Northern Ireland and peacekeeping operations in Kosovo, the first waves of British soldiers deployed to Iraq were only trained in war-fighting skills and not peacekeeping procedures.[4] The British Law of Armed Conflict describes in detail the manner in which prisoners of war are to be handled but provides little information regarding the treatment of civilian detainees. U.K. Regimental Police were trained to run unit guard rooms in barracks, but they had little preparation for handling civilian prisoners. Moreover, the U.K. Chief of Defense Intelligence admitted that though military personnel were regularly trained in the law of armed conflict, none of the civilian intelligence personnel were provided with any training that included the Geneva Conventions.[5]

Similarly, U.S.-controlled detention facilities were primarily staffed by untrained military police (MP) units that were unfamiliar with Geneva Convention laws regarding the treatment of

---

[1] Strasser, *Abu Ghraib Investigations,* 14; Gourevitch and Morris, *Standard Operating Procedure*, 29.
[2] Citizens for Global Solutions, "The Guantanamo Bay Detention Center" under "Issues" http://www.globalsolutions.org/guantanamo (accessed July 27, 2009);
[3] Robert Aitken, "The Aitken Report. An Investigation into Cases of Deliberate Abuse and Unlawful Killing in Iraq in 2003 and 2004." Cageprisoners Ltd, www.cageprisoners.com/download.php?download=686 (accessed April, 11, 2008); Steven Strasser, *The Abu Ghraib Investigations*, 56.
[4] Robert Aitken, "The Aitken Report," 13.
[5] Ann Taylor, "The Handling of Detainees by UK Intelligence Personnel in Afghanistan, Guantanamo Bay and Iraq," *Intelligence and Security Committee Report*, 2005, 21. http://www.statewatch.org/news/2009/jun/uk-mi5-toture-intel-cttee-rep.pdf (accessed February 18, 2008).

detainees.[1] Consequently, coalition forces were in need of on-the-job training. To facilitate this

training and to make military intelligence (MI) and military police (MP) work more closely

together Maj. Gen. Geoffrey Miller visited Abu Ghraib in August 2003 at the request of

Combined Joint Task Force 7 to provide advice on facilities and operations at the prison. Miller

used his prior experience at Guantanamo to develop recommendations for detention operations in

Iraq. As Geneva Conventions did not apply in Guantanamo, Miller called for stronger,

command-wide interrogation policies.[2]

Concurrently, U.S. policies on interrogation and detainee handling were being revised at

the governmental level, and the use of vague language to describe the status of detainees helped

to shape the context in which those policies were formulated and rewritten. In December 2002,

Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld's office authorized interrogation techniques for

"unlawful combatants" detained at Guantanamo. Those interrogation techniques included the use

of dogs, removal of clothing, sleep deprivation, and other methods designed to break down

detainees' resistance to questioning. This new directive even allowed interrogators to withhold

medical care in nonemergency situations as a way to make the detainees "talk."[3] In total, 16 new

authorized interrogation techniques were added to Army Field Manual 34-52 which already had

a list of 17 authorized interrogation methods.[4] The new, harsher techniques were to be used only

with Rumsfeld's approval for security detainees held at Guantanamo. Moreover, the Bush

Administration assured that prisoners would be treated humanely and consistent with the

---

[1] Strasser, *Abu Ghraib Investigation*, 70.
[2] Antonio Taguba, "Article 15-6. Investigation of the 800th Military Police Brigade. Report." Department of
Defense, 2004, 7 www.fas.org/irp/agency/dod/taguba.pdf (accessed February 18, 2008).
[3] Sherwood Ross, "U.S. Doctors Approve Torture and Denied Medicine to Prisoners," *Pacific Free Press*,
http://www.pacificfreepress.com/news/1/6540-doctor-approved-torture-and-denying-medicine-to-prisoners.html
(accessed June 8, 2009).
[4] Strasser, *Abu Ghraib Investigations,* 90.

principles of the Geneva Convention.[1]

The policy was once again modified in April 2003 when Rumsfeld assigned Air Force Gen. Counsel Mary Walker to study interrogation techniques. Walker's Working Group reviewed 35 techniques and ultimately recommended the approval of 24 techniques, which were used at Guantanamo.[2] In addition, as part of its mandate, the Working Group was to review a list of interrogation techniques that were being used in Afghanistan. That list included some harsher techniques not listed in Army Field Manual 34-52 such as sleep deprivation, stress positioning, and waterboarding, to name just a few. The list was published in a Special Operations Forces Standard Operating Procedures document in February 2003.[3] On September 14, 2003, Lt. Gen. Ricardo Sanchez, commander of Combined Joint Task Force 7, signed a memorandum authorizing interrogation techniques beyond Field Manual 34-52 and beyond those approved for Guantanamo. These left room for interpretation and made possible the execution of harsher methods. Miller's recommendation for the MP to work closer with MI resulted in military police preparing detainees for interrogations. This was disastrous as first, MP did not have appropriate training and, second, the MP was already overextended as the ratio of MP to detainees quickly grew to 1 to 75. In comparison, Guantanamo MP had a ratio of 1 to 1 with detainees.[4]

The "augmented" interrogations techniques such as sleep deprivation, exposure to loud noise, use of dogs, stress positions and many others were depicted in the pictures at Abu Ghraib. The similarity between approved torture techniques for "unlawful' combatants" and the treatment of Abu Ghraib prisoners is obvious. During the official Department of Defense's

---

[1] Greenberg and Dratel, *The Torture Papers,* 841.
[2] Strasser, *Abu Ghraib Investigations,* 32.
[3] Independent Panel. "Independent Panel Delivers Detention Operations Report," *DoD News Reports*, 2004. http://www.defenselink.mil/releases/2004/nr20040824-1160.html (accessed October, 18, 2008).
[4] Strasser, *Abu Ghraib Investigations,* 78.

investigation, Lt. Gen. Anthony Jones explained that some military intelligence personnel who worked at Abu Ghraib had previously served at both Guantanamo and similar facilities in Afghanistan and as a result, they had "become confused" about which interrogation techniques were condoned for gathering intelligence at which facilities.[1] Before transferring to Iraq, another group of MI officers had worked in support of Special Operations Forces in Afghanistan and had learned about techniques from Special Operations Forces Standard Operating Procedures documents that were approved for the handling of Afghani detainees, and these procedures were carried over into Iraq. According to former Iraq Army interrogator Tony Lagouranis, all Special Operations Forces were trained in the military's Survival, Evasion, Resistance, Escape (SERE) program on how to resist breaking under torture.[2] The techniques that passed as "torture" under SERE resemble what was happening at Abu Ghraib. These interrogation techniques were in place until October 2005, when Senator John McCain's proposed and the U.S. Senate approved an amendment to a military spending bill restricting interrogators from using inhuman techniques in the U.S. detention facilities both abroad and at home.

British military personnel experienced similar confusion over acceptable rules for detainee treatment. While the U.S. military had a long history of applying torture techniques in order to gather intelligence during the Cold War era, British history is also tainted with the abuse of detainees, particularly its internment practices in Northern Ireland in the 1970s.[3] Those abuses led to the European Court of Human Rights (ECHR) investigating the case of "N. Ireland versus the U.K." with the latter accused of using unacceptable interrogation methods known as the

---

[1] Anthony Jones and George Fay. *Investigation of Intelligence Activities at Abu Ghraib*. Department of Defense, Washington DC, August 23, 2004. FindLaw.com http://news.findlaw.com/hdocs/docs/dod/fay82504rpt.pdf (accessed June 29, 2010), 8.
[2] Tony Lagouranis and Allen Mikaelian, *Fear up Harsh* (New York, N.Y.: NAL Caliber, 2007).
[3] Michael Otterman, *American Torture* (Carlton, Australia, Melbourne, University Press, 2007); Robert Aitken, "The Aitken Report," Cageprisoners Ltd.

"Five Techniques"--wall standing, hooding, subjection to noise, sleep deprivation as well as food and drink deprivation. The ECHR concluded that while the combined use of the Five Techniques did not constitute torture it did amount to a practice of inhumane and degrading treatment and was therefore in breach of Article 3 of the European Convention on Human Rights. It further found that although the Five Techniques were never officially authorized in writing, they were nevertheless taught orally at the Intelligence Centre, the forerunner of the Defence Intelligence and Security Centre (DISC). In 1972 Prime Minister Edward Heath asserted in the House of Commons the techniques would not be used in the future as an aid to interrogation. The immediate response to the Prime Minister's declaration was the release in June 1972 of the Joint Intelligence Committee's "Directive on Interrogation by the Armed Forces in Internal Security Operations," which specifically proscribed the Five Techniques as an aid to interrogation.[1]

When charges of abuse by British soldiers in Iraq came to light in 2003 and 2004, the abused detainees not only alleged that they had been subjected to beatings and humiliation, they also reported that they were forced to stand in stress positions, hooded, exposed to loud noise, and deprived of sleep. Gen. Robert Aitken, who was in charge of U.K. government's investigation, prepared a report which was published in 2008 under the title "The Aitken report: An investigation into cases of deliberate abuse and unlawful killing in Iraq in 2003 and 2004," in which he acknowledged that interrogation techniques that had been banned 35 years ago in Great Britain were being used again in Iraq.

Although torture and abuse allegations were of utmost importance, human rights organizations complained the general living conditions at detention facilities in Iraq and Afghanistan violated international humanitarian law and were just as serious as torture and abuse

---

[1] Robert Aitken, "The Aitken Report," 11.

practices. In 2003 Amnesty International reported that detainees at Camp Bucca were held in tents in extreme heat and were not provided with sufficient drinking water or adequate washing facilities. Food quality was poor, and in many facilities, prisoners were placed in overcrowded cells. It was evident that coalition forces were not capable of handling the influx and flow of detainees properly. Increasingly, political pressure to provide intelligence resulted in many unjustifiable arrests. The detainees included women, the elderly, and even 200 juveniles.[1] Reports indicated that children as young as ten years old had been held for long periods. Some were falsely arrested, others were taken to prison in place of family members suspected of crimes, and yet others were arrested because poverty turned them to crime.[2]

The U.S. and British governments were able to ignore reports of abuse and improper detention conditions until January 13, 2004. On that date, American soldier Joseph Darby placed an anonymous note and computer disk containing photographs showing abusive practices under his commander's door at Abu Ghraib. Darby's actions prompted coalition commander Lt. Gen. Ricardo Sanchez to order Army Maj. Gen. Antonio Taguba to investigate the behavior of military police at the facility.[3]

The media worked as a catalyst for revealing information to the public. A *60 Minutes* investigative report on April 28, 2004, broke the news of prisoner mistreatment in Abu Ghraib to a large audience. It was followed by the April 30, 2004, article by Seymour Hersh in the *New Yorker* in which the author cited Taguba's report as his major source.[4] The *60 Minutes* broadcast

---

[1] United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs. "Iraq: Child Prisoners Left Without Support." *IRIN: Humanitarian News and Analysis,* July 30, 2006. http://www.irinnews.org/Report.aspx?ReportId=59903 (accessed October11, 2008)

[2] Gourevitch and Morris, *Standard Operating Procedure,* 42.

[3] Maj. Gen. George Fray was assigned to investigate the behavior of the 205th Military Intelligence Brigade and Lt. Gen. Anthony R. Jones was instructed to investigate the possible involvement of personnel higher in the chain of command than the 205th Military Intelligence Brigade.

[4] Seymour Hersh, "Torture at Abu Ghraib," *New Yorker*, April 30, 2004.

was delayed by two weeks at the request of the Department of Defense and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Gen. Richard Myers.[1] However, CBS went ahead with its newscast after learning that the *New Yorker* was about to publish the photographs. Along with the general public, many U.S. officials learned of the Abu Ghraib scandal for the first time from the CBS *60 Minutes* report and the *New Yorker* article.

Ironically, media reports regarding the existence of photographs showing British soldiers abusing Iraqi civilians had surfaced in May 2003, approximately a year before the Abu Ghraib story broke. The *Guardian* and the *New York Times* both published stories about the existence of photographs of Iraqi looters being tied up and abused at the Bread Basket Camp near Basra. The photos were merely described in the above mentioned newspapers but actual images were published in the *Sun* (London). There was no follow up on these reports. Only after the Abu Ghraib photos surfaced did the *Daily Mirror* publish any photographs of alleged prisoner abuses by U.K. troops (May 1, 2004, front page). A *Daily Mirror* front page image showed a soldier allegedly from the 1st Battalion, the Queen's Lancashire Regiment (QLR), urinating on a hooded Iraqi prisoner sitting on the floor. The newspaper quoted unidentified soldiers as saying the hooded prisoner was abused for eight hours, threatened with execution, and then pushed from a moving vehicle. The authenticity of the photographs was called into question a day later and on May 14, 2004, the *Daily Mirror* reported that it had been the victim of a hoax and the pictures were staged reenactments of actual abuse. According to witnesses, the photos were reenactments of the murder of Baha D'oud Salim Mousa, a 26-year-old hotel receptionist from Basra. Mousa who was beaten with rifle butts on May 17 through 24, 2003, later died as the result of the injuries he sustained in those beatings. The fake photographs called into question the media's

---

[1] David Peterson, "Self-Censorship and Torture: Abu Ghraib, CBS and American Power." *Counter Punch*, May 4, 2004. http://www.counterpunch.org/peterson05042004.html (accessed May 19, 2006).

credibility. Politicians and military personnel accused the media of being irresponsible and asserted that their allegations of torture at Abu Ghraib placed coalition soldiers at greater risk in Iraq. Nevertheless, the existence of actual photographs prompted both the U.S. and British governments to investigate the allegations of torture and to hold accountable those who were directly responsible. The next two sections of this chapter review the government investigations and their findings.

U.S. Government Investigations and Response

Maj. Gen. Antonio M. Taguba's 53-page final investigative report dated April 4, 2004, concluded that U.S. soldiers had committed serious breaches of international law at Abu Ghraib in egregious acts of wanton criminal abuse.[1] Taguba found that between October and December 2003 there were numerous instances of criminal abuse of prisoners. Presenting his findings to Gen. David McKiernan on March 3, 2004, Taguba cited widespread abuse of prisoners by military police and intelligence officers and on March 20 Brig. Gen. Mark Kimmitt announced to the media that six military personnel had been charged with criminal offenses. Those charged were: Staff Sgt. Ivan (Chip) Frederick II, Spec. Charles Graner, Sgt. Javal Davis, Spec. Megan Ambuhl, Spec. Sabrina Harman, and Spec. Jeremy Sivits. A seventh soldier charged later, Private Lynndie England, attracted a great deal of media attention because she appeared in many photos of abuse. Seventeen others were suspended from duty, including the seven U.S. officers who ran the prison. The commanding officer at the prison, Brig. Gen. Janis Karpinski, was demoted to the rank of colonel on May 5, 2005 (see Appendix A for detail charges and convictions of the soldiers listed above).

---

[1] Antonio Taguba, "Article 15-6. Investigation of the 800th Military Police Brigade. Report." Department of Defense, 2004. www.fas.org/irp/agency/dod/taguba.pdf (accessed February 18, 2008).

Taguba's report indicated there were numerous organizational and leadership failures at Abu Ghraib. While the Bush administration insisted on blaming the individuals and claimed no knowledge of the abuse, the International Red Cross reported that it had been making allegations of prisoner abuse for more than a year. An FBI paper trail also confirms the link between the Abu Ghraib prison abuse scandal and the White House. On December 21, 2004, the American Civil Liberties Union released copies of FBI internal memos, obtained under the Freedom of Information Act, concerning alleged torture and abuse at Guantanamo Bay, in Afghanistan, and in Iraq. A memo dated May 22, 2004, and titled "On Scene Commander--Baghdad" referred explicitly to an Executive Order by the president that sanctioned the use of extraordinary interrogation tactics by U.S. military personnel.[1] The sanctioned methods were sleep deprivation, hooding prisoners, playing loud music, removing all clothing, forcing them to stand in stress positions, and the use of dogs.

The U.S. government committed to conducting speedy investigations of abuse charges. The final report entitled the "Independent Panel Delivers Detention Operations Report" was released in August 2004.[2] The four members of the panel were appointed by Secretary Rumsfeld, ostensibly to provide him with objective, independent advice and recommendations regarding the allegations of abuse at the U.S. detention facilities in Iraq. The committee members were James Schlesinger, Harold Brown, Tillie Fowler, and Charles Homer.[3]

---

[1] The New Standard Staff, "President Authorized Abu Ghraib Torture, FBI E-mail Says," *The New Standard*, December 21, 2004 http://newstandardnews.net/content/index.cfm/items/1348 (accessed April, 24, 2010).
[2] Independent Panel. "Independent Panel Delivers Detention Operations Report," *DoD News Reports*, 2004. http://www.defenselink.mil/releases/2004/nr20040824-1160.html (accessed October, 18, 2008).
3 James R. Schlesinger, who was secretary of defense for Presidents Nixon and Ford and secretary of energy for President Carter, served as the panel's chairman. The other three appointees were members of an independent panel. Harold Brown, was secretary of defense for President Carter; former U.S. Representative Tillie K. Fowler, was senior member of the House Armed Services Committee; and retired Air Force Gen. Charles A. Horner, had led the air campaign in the 1991 Iraq War and former commander of the North American Aerospace Defense Command and Space Command.

The panel concluded that the events at Abu Ghraib prison from October 2003 to December 2003 were acts of brutality and sadism. The abuses were found to have been committed both by military police and military intelligence. Five detainee deaths were determined to have resulted from abuse by U.S. personnel. The report also acknowledged various other incidents of abuse. By the end of 2004, out of 155 completed investigations, 66 had resulted in a determination that detainees were abused. The panel findings did not determine that incidents of detainee abuse were the result of "policy promulgated by senior officials or military authorities," leaving the impression that the torture and abuse were the actions of "a few bad apples."[1]

The testimony of the soldiers' convicted for their crimes at Abu Ghraib made it clear that Army officers and CIA operatives condoned the beatings and humiliation of Iraqi prisoners.[2] Officers repeatedly praised enlisted soldiers who abused inmates, according to testimony. The chain of accountability reached from Baghdad to Washington, including retired Lt. Gen. Ricardo Sanchez, commander of coalition forces, to former Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld and former Attorney Gen. Alberto Gonzales, who wrote the legal pretext that legitimized torture, and then to the Oval Office and President George W. Bush, president and commander-in-chief. Yet no officers or civilian leaders were punished for a scandal that fueled the Iraqi insurgency and did immeasurable harm to the United States' reputation throughout the world.

One of the significant issues that arose from the Abu Ghraib investigations was the role that government contractors played in the abuse of detainees. Taguba reported that two American contractors, John Israel and Steven Staphanovic were directly involved in the abuses at Abu

---

[1] Independent Panel. "Independent Panel Delivers Detention Operations Report," 5.
[2] See Philip Gourevitch and Errol Morris *Standard Operating Procedure* (New York, Penguin Group, 2008) for detail interviews with the accused soldiers.

Ghraib. John Israel "misled" investigators by denying he had witnessed misconduct and did not have "security clearance." John Israel was employed by U.S. Army contractor, the Titan Corporation, of San Diego. Titan provided Arabic linguists to military units in Iraq. Staphanovic worked for CACI International,[1] another contractor that supplied translators to the U.S. Army. Taguba found that Staphanovic "allowed and/or instructed MPs, who were not trained in interrogation techniques, to facilitate interrogations by 'setting conditions' which were neither authorized and in accordance with applicable regulations/policy. He clearly knew his instructions equated to physical abuse."[2]

There were also questions about the involvement of Israelis who trained U.S. military personnel.[3] There is evidence that the Pentagon asked Israel for its "rules of engagement" in the occupied West Bank and Gaza. According to the Associated Press, "in January and February of 2003, Israeli and American troops trained together in southern Israel's Negev desert."[4] The use of sexual humiliation in particular suggests the similarity between Abu Ghraib abuses and the actions of Israeli General Security Service or "Shin Bet," which was reported to have used sexual torture against Palestinians detained in the Occupied Territories since the beginning of the Israeli occupation of the West Bank and Gaza in 1967.[5] Sexual torture and humiliation were intended to elicit strong reactions from Muslim detainees because those methods disrespect Islamic cultural

---

[1] The original name of the company was California Analysis Center, Inc. In 1967, the company was renamed Consolidated Analysis Centers, Inc. The company name was officially changed to CACI, Inc. in 1973. With the business expanding internationally, the company became CACI International Inc in 1986. http://www.caci.com/about/term.shtml (accessed August, 9, 2010).

[2] Antonio Taguba, "Article 15-6. Investigation of the 800th Military Police Brigade. Report." Department of Defense, 2004. www.fas.org/irp/agency/dod/taguba.pdf (accessed February 18, 2008), 48.

[3] See Seymour Hersh, "Israeli Agents Operating in Iraq, Iran and Syria," interview by Amy Goodman, *Democracy Now*, June 22, 2005 http://www.democracynow.org/2004/6/22/seymour_hersh_israeli_agents_operating_in (accessed August, 9, 2010); Harvey Thompson, "Iraq Occupation Makes Possible Record," *Global Policy Forum*. February 28, 2006. http://www.globalpolicy.org/component/content/article/168/35985.html (accessed May 13, 2010).

[4] Associated Press, "Israel Patriot," *AP Archive*. March 30, 2003. http://www.aparchive.com/ (accessed May 13, 2010).

[5] Gary Menicucci, "Sexual Torture: Rendering, Practices, Manuals," *ISIM Review* 16 (2005): 19.

and religious taboos on nudity and demean Islamic notions of masculine identity. One of

Staphanovic's co-workers, Joe Ryan, who was not named in the Taguba report, reported he

underwent an Israeli style interrogation course before going to Iraq.[1]

By 2005 evidence was emerging that the United States was working alongside agents in

Africa, Asia, and the Balkans to "render" suspected members of Islamic groups to countries

where torture is commonly practiced and less scrutinized.[2] Rendition is unethical, undemocratic,

inhumane, unacceptable and illegal according to the International Law. Even though the U.S.

government vowed to investigate the abuses and punish those responsible, many questions

remain unanswered.

U.K. Government Investigations and Response

As previously mentioned, British investigations began earlier than those of the United

States did but lasted longer. The most comprehensive U.K. Army report on the investigation and

resulting charges was prepared by Brigadier Robert Aitken.[3] The Aitken report concluded that

there was no systematic abuse by British soldiers committed in Iraq. Aitken recommended that

army interrogation techniques should be better explained to soldiers and its "core values" should

be better instilled in staff, but otherwise he concluded that no systematic abuse had taken place.

The Aitken's report did hint at shortcomings in the British government's planning of the Iraq war

and questioned why interrogation techniques banned 35 years ago were now being used in Iraq.

---

[1] Robert Fisk, "Follow Torture Trail at Abu Ghraib," *Seattle Post-Intelligencer*, May 28, 2004.
[2] Craig Whitlock, "CIA Ruse is Said to Have Damaged Probe in Milan," *Washington Post*, December 5, 2005.
[3] Robert Aitken, "The Aitken Report. An Investigation into Cases of Deliberate Abuse and Unlawful Killing in Iraq in 2003 and 2004." Cageprisoners Ltd, www.cageprisoners.com/download.php?download=686 (accessed April, 11, 2008). The author of the report, Brigadier Robert Aitken, was commissioned into the Royal Regiment of Wales in 1977 and has served in Bosnia, where he was Commander British Forces for the six months prior to becoming Commander 160 (Wales) Brigade in May 2001. He attended the Royal College of Defence Studies in 2004 and assumed his current appointment as Director of Army Personnel Strategy in December 2004.

He suggested one reason the killings and abuse of Iraqis had taken place was due to the pressure placed on British forces.

The report specified that 229 allegations of criminal activity had been investigated by the Service Police, 20 of which had been dealt with either by court-martial trial or by summary dealing within the chain of command. The range of incidents investigated was wide. It included investigations into shooting incidents, traffic accidents, fraud, and other crimes.[1] The report specifically focused on six cases investigated by the Service Police which involved allegations of deliberate abuse. Only in two cases were soldiers found guilty. One of them was the Bread Basket case of abuse of Iraqis detained by British soldiers in May 2003. The second investigation that resulted in charges against the U.K. soldiers was the death of the Baha Mousa on September 15, 2003.

The investigations into the Bread Basket case began in May 2003, after Gary Bartlam, a British soldier and member of the Desert Rats, while at home on leave dropped off a roll of film for processing at a shop in Tamworth, England. Some of the pictures showed soldiers forcing Iraqis to strip bare and simulate oral and anal sex with each other.[2] When the shop clerk saw the images she called the police and Bartlam was arrested. Further investigation revealed that three other soldiers from the 1st Battalion of the Royal Regiment of Fusiliers were involved in the incident outside of the Army's Bread Basket supply camp half a mile west of Basra. The investigation led to charges against Bartlam and three other soldiers--Cpl. Daniel Kenyon and Ln. Cpl. Darren Larkin and Ln. Cpl. Mark Cooley. The group had been part of an operation to stop Iraqi looters from stealing humanitarian aid from a British-run camp half a mile west of

---

[1] Robert Aitken, "The Aitken Report," 3.
[2] Tony Paterson, "Simulated Sex and a Forklift Hanging: A Catalogue of British Abuses in Iraq," *CounterPunch*, January 19, 2005 http://www.counterpunch.org/paterson01192005.html (accessed July 8, 2010).

Basra.[1] Bartlam plead guilty soon after his arrest and the other soldiers were tried in court-martial in Osnabrück, Germany, in February 2005. All three of them pleaded or were found guilty on several charges and were sentenced five months to two years in jail and were dishonorably discharged from the Army (see Appendix A for further details on charges and punishment).[2]

In a separate case--the one triggered by the photos of the abuse reenactment--seven officers and soldiers from the 1st Battalion, Queen's Lancashire Regiment (QLR) were court-martialed for the beating death of Baha D'oud Salim Mousa in September 2003 as well as other incidents of Iraqi abuse. They were: Ln. Cpl. Donald Payne, Ln. Cpl. Wayne Crowcroft, Sgt. Kelvin Stacey, Private Darren Fallon, Col. Jorge Mendonca, Maj. Michael Peebles and Warrant Officer Mark Davies. The court-martial lasted from September 4, 2006, to April 30, 2007. Three of the soldiers (Payne, Crowcroft, and Fallon) were charged with war crimes under the International Criminal Court Act of 2001 and were tried in Britain rather than by the International Criminal Court at the Hague. All other courts-martial also occurred in Britain. Cpl. Donald Payne pleaded guilty to inhumane treatment of Mousa and the others were acquitted (see Appendix A for detail information about the charges and courts-martial proceedings).[3]

Because of the fake photographs, the Mousa case got a great deal of coverage in all four newspapers. Another incident also attracted media attention because it involved video footage that showed British soldiers beating Iraqis during a riot in Al Amarah in April 2004. That footage was aired by the *News of the World*. The footage was taken by one of the soldiers watching the event. However, the British soldiers responsible for the beatings did not face

---

[1] Robert Aitken, "The Aitken Report," 4.
[2] CNN World, "UK Soldiers Jailed Over Iraq Abuse," *CNN.com*, February, 26, 2004.
[3] Aitken, "The Aitken Report," 3.

criminal charges when the footage emerged in 2006 because the Army Prosecuting Authority

(APA) said that charges of battery had a six-month statute of limitations. Numerous other cases,

such as the drowning of the 15-year-old Ahmed Kareem resulted in dismissed charges or "not

guilty" findings of the U.K. investigations.[1]

The British MoD continued to investigate new alleged instances of abuse and sexual

humiliation of Iraqis by British soldiers in 2007, 2008, and even 2009. Phil Shiner, the lawyer

representing abused Iraqis stated that many Iraqis were afraid to come out and made their abuse

known only after the British troops withdrew in 2009.[2]

Summary and Analysis of Detainee Abuse by Coalition Forces

The determination of whether proper training or better leadership and oversight would

have prevented the most serious detainee abuses in Iraq is beyond the scope of this dissertation.

Assigning blame to U.S. and British government policies and failures in army leadership is also

not the goal of this research. It is, however, apparent that the Abu Ghraib fiasco was not just

about a few bad apples. Insufficient training, lack of order and morale were contributing factors.

However, the government policies towards what was acceptable and tolerated in the war on

terror dictated the behavior of soldiers and other personnel at the detainee camps.

The British investigations discovered that British abusers followed similar paths to the

mistreatment of detainees. The media in the U.K. dubbed the story "Britain's Abu Ghraib." The

Guardian reported that the allegations of detainee and prisoner mistreatment by British troops

were extremely embarrassing to the British army, in part because it had always taken pride in

---

[1] Ibid., 3.
[2] Robert Verkaik, "Britain's Abu Ghraib: Did Britain collude with US in abuse of Iraqis?" *Independent*, November 14, 2009 http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/britains-abu-ghraib-did-britain-collude-with-us-in-abuse-of-iraqis-1820545.html (accessed August, 13, 2010).

being more tolerant and understanding towards the Iraqis than the American military.[1] The pre-action protocol letter by Phil Shiner served to the MoD in November 2009 said: "Due to the wider access of information and disclosure in the US, we do know that sexual humiliation was authorised as an aid to interrogation at the highest levels of the US administration. Given the history of the UK's involvement in the development of these techniques alongside the US, it is deeply concerning that there appears to be strong similarities between instances of the use of sexual humiliation."[2] The new cases brought to the MoD's attention suggested that coalition forces created a culture of abuse.

One major difference is noticeable between the U.S. and British cases. While U.S. abuses primarily took place within the confines of the various detention facilities during interrogation sessions, British abuses most often occurred at the time of arrests or during contact between British soldiers and Iraqi civilians--namely shooting incidents that involved civilians.

A common theme of both the British and U.S. abuse scandals came to light when photographic evidence surfaced. In the case of Abu Ghraib, the pictures publicized by *60 Minutes* and the *New Yorker* brought the abuses to light. In the British case, first there was a minimal coverage of the existence of photos showing Iraqis being abused at the Breadbasket Camp near Basra on May 15, 2003. Later, the *News of the World* also came across the video footage taken by one of the soldiers witnessing beating of some youths during a riot in Al Amarah in April 2004.

As mentioned in the introduction, the debate continues about what constitutes torture and whether the interrogation techniques approved by the U.S. and British administrations are

---

[1] Richard Norton-Taylor, "Soldier Arrested Over Iraqi Torture Photos" *Guardian*, May 31, 2003.
[2] Ibid.

contrary to the guidelines set forth by the Geneva Convention.[1] However, it is clear that the

mistreatment recorded by photographs and video is inhumane, and human rights activists tried to

bring this to the governments' attention as soon as the war on terror began. The next section will

look at the paucity of information that appeared in the mainstream media before the Abu Ghraib

story broke.

<div align="center">Media Coverage Before the Abu Ghraib Story Broke</div>

Before April 2004 there was little indication of the misconduct by the coalition forces in

either Afghanistan or Iraq. Media outlets were not reporting that angle of the war on terror.

However, December 15, 2001, the *Guardian* published an article that reported Amnesty

International's call for an inquiry into the shooting of hundreds of prisoners in northern

Afghanistan.[2] The story mentioned video footage that existed and showed British troops firing a

machine gun at human targets. On February 8, 2002, the *Guardian* reported on Amnesty

International's concerns that the Geneva Conventions were not being applied to Taliban soldiers

captured in Afghanistan.[3] The story reported that, according to the White House, detainees were

treated in compliance with the Geneva Convention. On December 26, 2002, the *Washington Post*

published a page-one story about prisoner abuses at secret Central Intelligence Agency detention

centers in the U.S.-occupied Bagram air base in Afghanistan. The article quoted a U.S. official

who admitted that detainees were being sent to other countries to be tortured with the purpose of

---

[1] Steven Strasser, ed*., The Abu Ghraib Investigations* (New York: Public Affairs, 2004); Philip Zimbardo, *The Lucifer Effect* (New York: Random House Trade Paperbacks, 2008).
[2] Richard Norton-Taylor, "War in Afghanistan: Massacre: SAS Role in Fort Deaths Questioned: Footage Shows British Soldiers in Action," *Guardian*, December 15, 2001, 7.
[3] Mathew Engel and Duncan Campbell, "Amnesty Dismisses New U.S. Line on Captives," *Guardian*, February 8, 2002, 14.

extracting information.[1] Only a few individuals and organizations took heed of the story, among those who did were John Sifton, a counterterrorism researcher at Human Rights Watch, and several human rights organizations including the American Civil Liberties Union.[2]

March 4, 2003, two weeks before the U.S. Invasion of Iraq, the *New York Times* published Carlotta Gail's story announcing that the United States military would investigate the homicide of an Afghan man in American custody in December 2003.[3] Eric Umansky later wrote that it was Howell Raines, then the *Times'* top editor, who was responsible for burying the story on page 14 and who, initially, even insisted that the story was improbable.[4] March 23, 2003, the *Daily Telegraph* reported that the International Committee of the Red Cross accused coalition forces of failing to follow the Geneva Convention in their treatment of prisoners of war.[5]

Newspapers began to devote more attention to the treatment of prisoners of war when the Arab television station Al-Jazeera showed pictures of U.S. prisoners of war. The March 23, 2003 edition of the *Guardian* and the March 27, 2003 the *Daily Telegraph* juxtaposed "unethical" images of coalition soldiers on Arab TV with similar pictures of detainees at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba which showed detainees wearing orange jumpsuits after being deprived of their own clothing and belongings, which is in breach of the Geneva Convention.[6]

May 17, 2003, the *New York Times* published a story about Basra, Iraq, in which

---

[1] Dana Priest and Barton Gellman, "U.S. Decries Abuse but Defends Interrogations 'Stress and Duress' Tactics Used on Terrorism Suspects Held in Secret Overseas Facilities," *Washington Post*, December 26, 2002.
[2] Eric Umansky, "Failures of Imagination," *Colombia Journalism Review* 45, no. 3 (September/October 2006): 20.
[3] Carlotta Gail, "Threats and Responses. U.S. Military Investigating Death of Afghan in Custody," *New York Times*, March 4, 2003.
[4] Umansky, "Failures of Imagination," 17.
[5] Sandra Laville, "Red Cross Criticises Allies Over Captives," *Daily Telegraph*, March 23, 2003.
[6] Matt Wells and Duncan Campbell, "Footage of Captives Puts News Channels Under Pressure From Pentagon," *Guardian*, March 23, 2003; Joshua Rozenberg, "Why There are Two Sides to Every Picture?" *Daily Telegraph*, March 27, 2003.

detainees claimed they were abused by U.S. and British soldiers.[1] Another *Guardian* article on May 22, 2003, covered charges of a British colonel being accused of abuse.[2] This was followed by articles appearing May 31, 2003 in the *Daily Telegraph,* the *Guardian,* and the *New York Times* in which the arrest of Gary Bartlam was reported--the British soldier who dropped a roll of film off for developing at a shop with humiliating pictures of Iraqi detainees.[3] A June 6, 2003, story in the *Daily Telegraph* reported about Abd al-Jabbar Mossa who died after being arrested by British troops in Basra.[4] His family claimed Mossa was assaulted by British soldiers. None of these stories were followed up with journalistic rigor until May 2004.

As journalists were not allowed to visit any of the prisons in either Iraq or Afghanistan, the only way they could have reported the story was by questioning released detainees. Charles Hanley, a special correspondent for the Associated Press, followed up on the information published in the Amnesty International report that charged the U.S. of human rights abuses. Hanley's findings suggested that the Amnesty allegations were based on leaks from the International Committee for the Red Cross, whose work is well regarded, but whose findings were supposed to be confidential.[5] Hanley never got a response from military officials, but several detainees with whom he spoke corroborated the Amnesty International report. Interestingly, Charles Hanley's AP story was filed in November 2003, but received no attention in the U.S. media. Reportedly, Hanley later found a quote in his notes from a detainee who said, "If only somebody could get photos of what's happening."[6]

---

[1] Marc Lacey, "Iraqi Detainees Claim Abuse by British and U.S. Troops," *New York Times*, May 17. 2003.
[2] Richard Norton-Taylor, "US Troops Accuse War Hero of Abuse," *Guardian*, May 22, 2003.
[3] Nick Britten and Michael Smith, "Soldier Questioned over POW 'Torture' Photo," *Daily Telegraph*, May 31, 2003; Richard Norton-Taylor, "Soldier Arrested Over Iraqi Torture Photos," *Guardian*, May 31, 2003, 7; Lizette Alvarez, "After the War: British Troops," *New York Times*, Foreign Desk May 31, 2003, 6.
[4] Peter Foster, "My Father Died after Beating by British," *Daily Telegraph*, June 6, 2003.
[5] Umansky, "Failures of Imagination," 21.
[6] Umansky, "Failures of Imagination," 22.

On January 21, 2004, CNN informed the public that the U.S. Army was investigating soldiers who had posed for photos with partially unclothed Iraqi prisoners at the Abu Ghraib prison. The story was prompted by a press release issued by U.S. Central Command January 16, 2004 which announced an investigation into "reported incidents of detainee abuse at a Coalition Forces detention facility."[1] However, coverage of the allegation did not erupt until CBS's report of April 28, 2004, even though it appears that the media received advance warning from the U.S. Army. Leaks from the government and availability of digital photographs were the key players in the breaking of the story by the media. The Bush administration tried to silence the story at the last minute. According to Dan Rather, CBS held off on reporting the story for two weeks at the request of Richard Myers, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The military feared that photographs of detainees being abused would worsen an already complicated situation in Fallujah and Najaf, and place in greater harm both soldiers and American civilians being held hostage in Iraq.[2]

The media coverage exploded after the initial airing of the Abu Ghraib pictures. Even though abuse conducted by British soldiers was reported earlier than that at Abu Ghraib, it was the media coverage of the Abu Ghraib scandal and subsequent public outcry that forced both the U.S. and British governments to address the actions of troops. This suggests that the media were facing difficulties in seeking out and disclosing human rights abuses. Only after the story became "the scoop" all media outlets show interest and devote resources to investigate and report the wrongdoing of individuals as well as examine the policies and procedures that led to the abuse of

---

[1] United States Central Command, "Detainee Treatment Investigation," *CENTCOM News Releases*, January 16, 2004 http://www.centcom.mil/sites/uscentcom2/default.aspx (accessed November 11, 2007); Sherry Ricchiardi and Melissa Cirillo, "Missed Signals," *American Journalism Review* 26, no. (2004): 22..
[2] David Peterson, "Self-Censorship and Torture: Abu Ghraib, CBS and American Power." *Counter Punch*, May 4, 2004. http://www.counterpunch.org/peterson05042004.html (accessed May 19, 2006).

detainees in Iraq by the coalition forces.

<center>Definitions</center>

Before embarking on further exploration of how the American and British media covered the prisoner abuse scandals, it is necessary to elucidate terminology used to reference the behavior of coalition forces toward detainees and civilians in Iraq in 2004. Although the labels used by the media to expose the events in question were later questioned and examined as part of the mechanisms used to frame the events, it is necessary to acknowledge this author's choice to refer to the events as "abuses" rather than the much stronger label "torture" or the more lenient term "mistreatment." Acknowledging the incongruity of criticisms directed at the media for their use of lenient terminology, the author wishes to explain that the choice of the label abuse was influenced by the lack of agreement on what constitutes torture. Historically, the term meant torment and suffering in the process of eliciting truth. Rejali explains that, to Ancient Greeks and Romans, some testimony would not be considered truth unless it was coerced under torture.[1] Torture was also considered to be a viable information gathering tool in Medieval and early modern European courts. Only recently torture was considered ineffective in incriminating the subject. In fact, it was Chief Heinrich Muller's 1942 directive to the Gestapo that prohibited torture to induce confessions about a prisoner's own criminal acts.[2]

The basic definition of torture known to the international community today is contained in the Declaration on the Protection of All Persons from Being Subjected to Torture and Other

---

[1] Darius Rejali, *Torture and Democracy* (Princeton University Press, 2007), 57. See also Michael Kerrigan, *The Instruments of Torture* (New York: The Lyons Press, 2007) for review of torture techniques and tools throughout the history of humanity.
[2] Ibid., 94.

Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment.[1] The Declaration was adopted by the

United Nations General Assembly Resolution 3452 (XXX) on December 9, 1975. Article 1

defines torture as:

> any act by which severe pain or suffering, whether physical or mental, is
> intentionally inflicted on a person for such purposes as obtaining from him or a
> third person information or a confession, punishing him for an act he or a third
> person has committed or is suspected of having committed, or intimidating or
> coercing him or a third person, or for any reason based on discrimination of any
> kind, when such pain or suffering is inflicted by or at the instigation of or with the
> consent or acquiescence of a public official or other person acting in an official
> capacity. It does not include pain or suffering arising only from, inherent in or
> incidental to, lawful sanctions to the extent consistent with the Standard Minimum
> Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners.[2]

Article 2 of the Declaration adds that torture constitutes an aggravated and deliberate form of

cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment. As this definition suggests, torture is the

intentional infliction of severe mental or physical pain or suffering by or with the consent of the

state authorities for a specific purpose. As it encompasses anything from inflicting severe pain to

degrading treatment, the definition of torture becomes vague and has been used by politicians to

defend the actions of soldiers at Abu Ghraib and Basra as not constituting torture. First, the U.S.

government denied any existence of official policy for torture and second, the U.S. government

argued that the severity of suffering at Abu Ghraib does not rise to the "standards" of torture.

This led to a debate among legislators, politicians, scholars, human rights activists, and

journalists about the definition, effectiveness, causes, and consequences of torture. As a result,

the history of U.S. involvement in using torture techniques throughout other conflicts beginning

with the Cold War and continuing with the war on terror was made known to the public by

---

[1] *Declaration on the Protection of All Persons from Being Subjected to Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment*, G.A. res. 3452 (XXX). U.N. (December 1975) http://www2.ohchr.org/english/law/declarationcat.htm (accessed November 24, 2007).
[2] Ibid., Art. 1 Para 1.

several writers such as Darius Rejali, Karen Greenberg, Michael Otterman and Mark Danner and

many more.[1] Although detailing the timeline of torture's definition and discourse is beyond the

scope of this dissertation, it is worth mentioning that even the world publics are split in how they

view torture. Public opinion polls repeatedly showed that many believe that torture can be

justified in some instances such as the "ticking bomb" scenario.[2]

Neither is abuse well-defined. The term derives from the words "abnormal use" and can

be broadly applied to anything from misuse of power, equipment, and medicine to "abnormal"

treatment of a person. In the context of domestic abuse and violence, abuse is defined as the

attempt to control by the use of fear, violence, and/or intimidation. The methods of abuse can be

physical, emotional, sexual, or psychological. In addition, abuse is defined in the human rights

literature. According to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights adopted and proclaimed by

General Assembly Resolution 217 A (III) of 10 December 1948, human rights violations are

defined as abuses of people when fundamental human rights are violated.[3] More specifically,

abuse is a term used when a government violates national or international law related to the

protection of human rights. According to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights,

fundamental human rights are violated when:

> A certain race, creed, or group is denied recognition as a "person" (Article 2); Men and
> women are not treated as equal (Article 2); Different racial or religious groups are not
> treated as equal (Article 2); Life, liberty or security of person is threatened (Article 3);
> Cruel, inhuman or degrading punishment is used on a person (such as torture or
> execution) (Article 5); Victims of abuse are denied an effective judicial remedy (Article
> 8); Punishments are dealt arbitrarily or unilaterally, without a proper and fair trial (Article

---

[1] Darius Rejali, *Torture and Democracy* (Princeton University Press, 2007); Karen Greenberg, ed., *The Torture Debate in America* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005); Michael Otterman, *American Torture* (Carlton, Australia, Melbourne, University Press, 2007); Mark Danner, *Torture and Truth* (New York: New York Review Books, 2004).
[2] BBC poll, October 26, 2006 http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/6063386.stm#table; MSNBC poll, December 9, 2005 http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/10345320/.
[3] *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, G.A. res. 217A (III), U.N. Doc A/810 at 71 (1948) http://www.un.org/en/documents/udhr/index.shtml (accessed August 9. 2009).

11); Agents of state engage in arbitrary interference into personal or private lives. (Article 12); Freedom of speech or religion is denied (Articles 18 & 19).[1]

The situation at Abu Ghraib and other detention facilities controlled by coalition forces in 2003 and 2004 clearly violated articles 3, 5, 8 and 11.[2] That is, the treatment of detainees and civilians in Iraq by coalition forces would fall under the larger context of human rights violations and in this discourse the term abuse can be considered an appropriate label. The conditions in Iraqi prisons and detention facilities clearly threatened prisoners' lives, liberty, and security. The detainees were treated cruelly and inhumanly. It is clear that the vengeance administered by the soldiers amounted to degrading punishment, which encompassed everything from humiliation to torture. Punishment was random, often administered for soldiers' entertainment or for the purpose of taking "trophy pictures." The abuse also included disregard for Islamic culture because often their religious beliefs were violated in order to make the abuse more painful and demeaning. Although both administrations minimized the role of the government policies in the abuses, whether the abuses were the result of government policies or that of individual perpetrators, the treatment of Iraqi prisoners and detainees represent violations of international human rights and international law.

It is important to stress when the events at prisons and detention facilities in Iraq are labeled as abuse, results might be presented as less problematic than if they were labeled as torture. As with any linguistic choice, the desired effect on the reader should determine whether it was used properly or not. In other words, the author's intent to "promote a specific problem definition" should guide the linguistic choice. In this case, the author chooses to use a broader

---

[1] Universal Declaration of Human Rights, G.A. res. 217A (III), U.N. Doc A/810 at 71 (1948) http://www.un.org/en/documents/udhr/index.shtml (accessed August 9. 2009).
[2] Amnesty International, "Iraq: Beyond Abu Ghraib: Detention and Torture in Iraq." March 6, 2006, AI Index: MDE 14 /001/2006. http://www.amnesty.org/en/library/info/MDE14/001/2006/en (accessed August 15, 2010).

term abuse over the any other available labels (such as torture, mistreatment, ill-treatment, etc.) is not to minimize the actions of the soldiers, but to simply have a consistent term to reference the events throughout the document. The effect of the choice on the audience if one dominated the coverage will be discussed in the latter sections of this dissertation.

Abu Ghraib's Legacy

The news of prisoner mistreatment during the war on terror in Iraq evoked discussions that questioned the ideals of democracy propagated by the two leading coalition forces, the United States and Great Britain. Prisoner mistreatment at Abu Ghraib produced gruesome images that forced the U.S. government not only to rebuild America's image, but also to defend the legitimacy of war in Iraq. As the prisoner torture scandals surfaced in 2004, perhaps more worrisome to democratic ideals were the results of a CNN poll conducted May 03, 2004 in which 47% of the 237,131 respondents answered affirmative to the question "Is torture ever justified during interrogation?"[1] Although the poll was not scientific and reflected only the opinions of Internet users who chose to participate, it was an example of "with-us-or-against-us" mentality that had emerged in the U.S. in the post-9/11 era.

The prisoner abuse scandals undoubtedly will remain devastating symbols of the war in Iraq. On the eve of New Year 2010, popular media named Abu Ghraib as one of biggest scandals of the first decade of the 21st century. The sympathy the world felt towards the U.S. shortly after 9/11 diminished with Abu Ghraib, Guantanamo and other acts in Iraq and Afghanistan. Although Abu Ghraib is no longer a detention facility, at Guantanamo the U.S. continues to hold detainees

---

[1] CNN. "Is torture ever justified during interrogation?" *CNN.com*, May 3. 2003
http://www.cnn.com/POLLSERVER/results/10612.content.html

in top secrecy and without access to courts, legal counsel, or family visits.[1] Emblematically, the

Abu Ghraib story has been more damaging since it is the same location where torture thrived

under Saddam Hussein's regime. The Abu Ghraib scandal might have contributed to deepening

the bitter attitude of the Iraqi people toward the occupying coalition forces as it made Iraqis

question how western style democracy could realistically protect their rights while abusing the

civil liberties of others. Although not as widely known as Abu Ghraib, the accounts of British

soldiers abusing civilians and detainees only added aversion to already disturbing reports of

disregard for human life and dignity by coalition forces.

Coalition forces were definitely aware of the damaging effects of the prisoner abuse

scandal. Immediately after the Abu Ghraib scandal broke, both the U.S. and British governments

were quick to respond with assertions that these acts were the wrong doing of several individuals

and that the governments would undertake investigations and severely punish those individuals

responsible. Abu Ghraib was indeed an obstacle that damaged the U.S. image abroad. Some

expressed their disgust by protesting, others by creating cartoons that shamed the two leading

world powers.[2] In May 2006, speaking after a summit with British Prime Minister Tony Blair,

Bush acknowledged Abu Ghraib by saying "I think the biggest mistake that's happened so far, at

least from our country's involvement, is Abu Ghraib. We've been paying for that for a long

period of time."[3] As more stories of soldiers' misconduct broke, Abu Ghraib remained the

measuring stick used to evaluate the severity of the issue.

---

[1] According to Associated Press, as of July 2010, 176 detainees remain at Guantanamo. Associated Press, "Captives Freed in Spain, Latvia," July, 22, 2010. http://www.miamiherald.com/2010/07/22/1741924/spain-takes-in-3rd-captive-from.html

[2] Examples of such cartoons can be found at "Cartoon Stock. News Cartoon Directory" http://www.cartoonstock.com/newscartoons/directory/a/abu_ghraib.asp

[3] John Woolley and Gerhard Peters, "The President's News Conference with Prime Minister Tony Blair of the United Kingdom. *The American Presidency Project*, May 25, 2006 http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=46 (accessed June 29, 2006).

As part of the damage control process after the Abu Ghraib photographs surfaced in January 2004, the U.S. freed a number of detainees from Abu Ghraib. Later in April 2006, the Iraqi Justice Minister Abd al-Hussein Shandel announced that Abu Ghraib would close and the U.S. military would transfer the 4,500 prisoners held there to Camp Cropper, which at that time housed Saddam Hussein. The prison would be used as a storage facility for the Justice Ministry. The official reason given for the transfer was regular attacks by insurgents. Finally, in August 2006, about 3,000 detainees from Abu Ghraib were redistributed to two other U.S. prisons, Camp Bucca in the south and Camp Cropper at the U.S. base adjoining Baghdad International Airport. Although Abu Ghraib is officially closed, the images of torture remain signs of Iraq destruction and will be continuously remembered as proof that the U.S. is not following the moral standards of warfare. In 2006, the media reported that one of their own--a Pulitzer Prize-winning Iraqi photojournalist--had been held by the U.S. military at Camp Cropper for five months without charges or trial on suspicion of collaborating with insurgents.[1]

Even though the Bush administration continued to insist that "the United States does not torture," the reality is that it has happened.[2] The evidence shows that techniques the world knows as torture have been used. More disturbing is the sanctioned practice of "extraordinary rendition"--sending detainees secretly to Third-World countries where torture almost certainly occurs. Maybe one aspect of the legacy of Abu Ghraib is the fact that practices such as rendition have come out of the closet. Experts say that torture doesn't produce reliable information. Worse, human rights violations by democratic governments can only generate greater hatred and fuel fundamentalist interest to continue violence against democratic nations. Sadly, torture

---

[1] Alan McCombs, "U.S. Holds Iraqi Journalist for 5 Months," *United Press International*, September 19, 2006 http://www.upi.com/SecurityTerrorism/view.php?StoryID=20060918-054630-7154r (accessed July 17, 2009).
[2] CNN, "Bush: The Government Does Not Torture," *CNN.com*, October 5, 2007 http://www.cnn.com/2007/POLITICS/10/05/bush.torture/index.html (accessed (May 25, 2008).

scandals produced little outrage from the public. Both in the U.S. and the U.K., the investigations were slow and were not directed at reevaluating the immorality of war. Even if Abu Ghraib was acknowledged by Bush as the worst U.S. mistake in Iraq, it did not lead to Congressional investigations. There was little public outcry over the abuse as well. Stephen Eisenman wondered if the pictures represent "a kind of moral blindness--let's call it the 'Abu Ghraib effect'--that allows them [the public] to ignore, or even to justify, however partially or provisionally, the facts of degradation and brutality."[1] Clearly, the torture scandal raises questions about people's in the United States and Great Britain ability to respond with outrage to images that represent humans suffering from torture, humiliation, sexual and physical abuse. Therefore, there is a need to understand if the media coverage of these events could have contributed to this apathy.

---

[1] Stephen Eisenman, *The Abu Ghraib Effect* (London, UK: Reakton Books, 2007), 9.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Scholars studying this type of subject are presented with a wealth of research to guide their investigations. That very wealth presents a challenge for researchers carving out the parameters of their distinct research endeavors. Therefore, it becomes incumbent on them to focus their analyses carefully in order to cover the material that will lend insight to their work, excluding the many valuable studies that are not particularly appropriate in this context.

To establish the theoretical and methodological parameters for this analysis of coverage of detainee abuses in Iraq, this review of literature breaks down into four parts, several of which then break into subsections.

The chapter begins with an overview of the work scholars have done that deals specifically with the Abu Ghraib scandal. A second large part of the chapter reviews the literature analyzing media coverage of war and exploring the challenges of human rights reporting. A third section discusses the challenges presented by research that compares the nature of international news coverage in different countries, leading to a review that specifically looks at research that compares British and American media and their political communication systems. This section ends with a brief overview of the four newspapers selected for analysis. The fourth and largest section of the chapter presents "framing," both as a theory to understand the news media's role in influencing the public's perceived realities and as methodological framework for media research. The examination of framing theory pays special attention to constructivism as the basis for understanding how news is both

produced and consumed. The methodological discussion pays detailed attention to Entman's

comparative approach to framing research developed through an investigation of how the

U.S. media used frames to establish different interpretations of seemingly similar

international incidents.[1] The section ends with description of the five research questions this

study aims to answer.

<div align="center">Studies on Abu Ghraib</div>

The Abu Ghraib scandal generated much interest from investigative journalists,

media, political and human behavior scholars, the critics of the Bush administration, human

rights, and medical organizations. As a result, Abu Ghraib's legacy has been examined from

a variety of different perspectives. Some researchers and analysts have focused on finding

out what really happened at Abu Ghraib and the role of governmental policies in the scandal.

For example, besides the original the *New Yorker* article "Torture at Abu Ghraib," Seymour

Hersh published two more stories in the *New Yorker* titled "Chain of Command," and "The

Gray Zone," detailing the government's involvement in the Abu Ghraib scandal.[2] Later,

Hersh collected all of his evidence into the book titled *Chain of Command: The Road from*

9/11 to Abu Ghraib.[3] Hersh, an experienced investigative journalist who broke the news of

the My Lai massacre in Vietnam in 1969, thoroughly documented how Abu Ghraib was not

an isolated incident, but rather a conscious effort to circumvent the Geneva Conventions in

order to get information from the detainees. Similar evidence was collected by several other

---

[1]Robert Entman, "Framing U.S. Coverage of International News," *Journal of Communication* 41, no. 4 (1991): 6-27.
[2]Seymour Hersh, "Torture at Abu Ghraib" *New Yorker*, April 30, 2004; Seymour Hersh, "Chain of Command," *New Yorker*, May 17, 2004; Seymour Hersh, "The Gray Zone," *New Yorker*, May 24, 2004.
[3]Seymour Hersh, *Chain of Command* (New York, Harper Collins, 2004).

scholars and journalists.[1] Pfiffner, in particular, connected torture at Abu Ghraib to public policy processes.[2] Miles documented failures by medical personnel.[3] After investigating the role of health workers at the Abu Ghraib prison Miles argued that the medical system failed to accurately report illnesses and injuries. More importantly, Miles indicated that knowledge of torture and degrading treatment was known to medical personnel, but before the Army's investigation in 2004, there were no health records reporting abuse and torture.[4] Hedges and Hasian focused on the lack of attention to the Abu Ghraib scandal during the 2004 election campaign. They argued that the Bush-Cheney campaign took advantage of cultural amnesia about Abu Ghraib while the Kerry-Edwards campaign remained silent in fear of appearing too "soft" on terrorism.[5]

Other scholars have contemplated on what made ordinary soldiers and intelligence personnel engage in vicious acts of human degradation and torture. Phillip Zimbardo explored the psychology of torture focusing on factors that lead good people to engage in evil acts or, more specifically, what circumstances lead to people undergoing transformation of the "Lucifer Effect."[6] Zimbardo is the researcher behind the famous Stanford Prison Experiment conducted in 1971. In that study, normal college students were randomly assigned to play the role of guard or inmate for two weeks in a simulated prison, yet the

---

[1] Edward Greer, "We don't Torture People in America," *New Political Science* 26, no. 3 (2004): 371-387; Michael Otterman, *American Torture* (Carlton, Australia, Melbourne, University Press, 2007); Philip Gourevitch and Errol Morris, *Standard Operating Procedure* (New York, Penguin Group, Inc., 2008). James Pfiffner, "Torture and Public Policy," *Public Integrity* 7, no. 4 (2005): 313-329.

[2] James Pfiffner, "Torture and Public Policy," *Public Integrity* 7, no. 4 (2005): 314.

[3] Steven Miles, *Oath Betrayed* (New York, NY: Random House, 2006); Steven H. Miles, "Abu Ghraib: Its Legacy for Military Medicine," *The Lancet* 9435 (2004): 725-729.

[4] Steven Miles, "Abu Ghraib: Its Legacy for Military Medicine," *The Lancet* 9435 (2004): 726.

[5] James Hedges and Marouf Hasian, "Campaign Posturing, Military Decision Making, and Administrative Amnesias," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 8, no. 4 (2005): 697.

[6] Philip Zimbardo, *The Lucifer Effect* (New York: Random House Trade Paperbacks, 2008), 375.

guards quickly became so brutal that the experiment had to be shut down after only six days.[1]
After extensive evaluation of soldiers profiles and Abu Ghraib procedures, Zimbardo concluded that not only the soldiers have to be held accountable for the abuse, but so do those higher up the chain of command. He suggested that George Tenant, former Head of the CIA, Donald Rumsfeld, Dick Cheney, and President Bush were directly accountable for creating conditions of power and corruption in the detention facilities.[2]

Themes of the administration's responsibility resonated in a number of documentaries about Abu Ghraib. The 2007 documentary "Ghosts of Abu Ghraib," directed by Rory Kennedy, investigated the abuses and concluded that the soldiers were following orders approved by Donald Rumsfeld. The documentary included interviews with members of the 372nd Military Police Company, who were directly responsible for most of the torture. Another documentary, "Standard Operating Procedure" by Errol Morris, released in 2008, provided more interviews with the soldiers and additional insight into their psyches.[3] Similarly, Frontline's 2005 documentary "The Torture Question" traced the history of how decisions made in Washington in the immediate aftermath of September 11--including an internal administration battle over the Geneva Conventions--led to a powerful interrogation policy that laid the groundwork for prisoner abuse in Afghanistan, Guantanamo Bay, and Iraq.

Other scholars and media practitioners focused on examining the images of abuse and how they illuminate the complexity of multiple discourses that emerge from Abu Ghraib.

---

[1] Philip Zimbardo, *Stanford Prison Experiment* (Stanford, CA, Philip G. Zimbardo, Inc. 1972). http://www.prisonexp.org: (accessed February, 1, 2008).
[2] Zimbardo, *The Lucifer Effect,* 325.
[3] See also Philip Gourevitch and Errol Morris, *Standard Operating Procedure* (New York, Penguin Group, Inc., 2008).

Puar tackled the question of sexual humiliation in posed photographs and claimed that

Pentagon officials intended to exploit homosexuality as one of the cultural taboos in Islam.[1]

There is evidence that two books--Edward Said's *Orientalism* and Raphael Patai's *The Arab*

Mind--were studied for military security purposes.[2] Homosexual acts in Islamic law are

tantamount to sexual torture and humiliation, and military officials wanted to utilize these

taboos to gain intelligence. Eisenman examined the photographs of torture as artifacts that

have gruesome resemblance to the works of art representing defeated warriors from

Hellenistic Greek sculptures or the slaves of Michelangelo.[3] To Eisenman, Abu Ghraib

pictures merit their own public discourse as representations of Western arrogance, power,

and violence.[4] Many other scholars examined the power of Abu Ghraib photographs and their

ability to refract the dominant discourse of the U.S. foreign policy and to serve as a platform

of protest and opposition.[5]

Media scholars have analyzed the coverage of prisoner abuse in terms of medias'

ability to be independent of official interpretations of events. Bennett, Lawrence, and

Livingston examined the extent to which leading news organizations used independent

documentation and argued that the leading national news organizations in the U.S. did not

produce a framework that strongly challenged the Bush administration's interpretations of

the events.[6] Their study supported the indexing model of the press behavior which suggests

that the press challenges official U.S. administration's versions of foreign policy issues only

---

[1] Jasbir Puar, "Abu Ghraib: Arguing Against Exceptionalism," *Feminist Studies* 30, no. 2 (2004): 522-534.
[2] Ibid., 525.
[3] Stephen Eisenman, *The Abu Ghraib Effect* (London, UK: Reakton Books, 2007).
[4] Ibid., 17.
[5] Kari Andén-Papadopoulos, "The Abu Ghraib Torture Photographs," *Journalism* 9, no. 1 (February 2008): 23; Dora Apel, "Torture Culture," *Art Journal* 64, no. 2 (Summer2005): 99.
[6] Lance Bennett, Regina Lawrence, and Steven Livingston. "None Dare Call it Torture," *Journal of Communication* 56 no. 3 (2006): 467-485; see also a chapter by the same title in Lance Bennett, Regina Lawrence, and Steven Livingston. *When the Press Fails* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007).

when opposing views emerge among elite U.S. politicians.[1] In the absence of such

opposition, the media tend to tie or index "story frames to the range of sources and

viewpoints within official decision circles, reflecting levels of official conflict and

consensus."[2] Lawrence also commented on the apparent homogeneity of Abu Ghraib

coverage.[3] Rajiva provided an insightful overview of media reaction to Abu Ghraib, as well

as investigated the story of Nick Berg's killing. Berg was a U.S. businessmen who is

believed to be killed by Abu Musab al-Zarghavi, an al Qaeda operative, who claimed that

Berg's death was carried out to avenge abuses of Iraqi prisoners.[4] Rajiva was particularly

critical of the more conservative media outlets which essentially repeated the

administration's interpretation of events as "alleged," "limited," and "un-American."[5]

Other scholars noted that the media were able to produce coverage that was quite

critical of the administration's attempt to portray prisoner abuse as an isolated incident.

Porpora, Nikolaev, and Hagemann challenged Bennett, Lawrence, and Livingston's findings

that the *Washington Post* supported the Bush administration's version of events.[6] Instead,

Porpora et al. argued that the findings were an attribute of a flawed research method that

overemphasized the significance of two labels "abuse" and "torture," as defining

characteristics of two different frame options: individual and higher level policy

---

[1] Lance Bennett, "Toward a Theory of Press-State Relations in the United States," *Journal of Communication* 40, no. 2 (1990): 103-125.

[2] Bennett, Lawrence, and Livingston. "None Dare Call it Torture," 468.

[3] Regina Lawrence, "Seeing the Whole Board," *Political Communication* 23, no. 2 (2006): 229.

[4] Lila Rajiva, *The Language of Empire* (New York, NY: Monthly Review Press, 2005).

[5] Ibid., 26.

[6] Douglas Porpora, Alexander Nikolaev, and Julie Hagemann, "Abuse, Torture, Frames and the Washington Post," *Journal of Communication* 60, no. 2 (2010): 254-270; Bennett, Lawrence, and Livingston. "None Dare Call it Torture," *Journal of Communication* 56 no. 3 (2006): 467-485; Lance Bennett, Regina Lawrence, and Steven Livingston. *When the Press Fails* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007).

responsibility frames.[1] Porpora et al. concluded that the *Washington Post* consistently

included a critical presentation and counterframing of Abu Ghraib scandal even in an

absence of strong reactions from political elites. Contrary to the indexing model, Porpora et

al. suggested the *Washington Post* coverage was closer to Entman's cascade activation

model.[2] The cascade activation model is built on framing theory in that it examines the media

coverage of issues and events as framing contests in which multiple levels of the system

participate: the administration, the other elites, news organizations, the texts they produce,

and the public.[3]

Journalists themselves observed that although media were aggressive and skeptical

about the administration's attempts to lay blame on a handful of soldiers when the story

broke, they were too slow to report the abuse.[4] Research suggests that the incidents at Abu

Ghraib took place between October and December 2003, but the coverage didn't explode

until CBS *60 Minutes* aired the story on April 28, 2004. Nevertheless, the above studies

indicated that media were able to use the forum that abuse coverage created to discuss and

question military misconduct and to reflect on their relationship with the government, as well

as their role in the fight against terror.

The coverage resulting from the *Daily Mirror's* fake photographs allowed media to

question the value of news and how the choices made by media can influence international

realities. As such, Abu Ghraib is an important story that allows us to understand media and

their coverage of human rights violations, the war on terror, governmental responsibility, and

---

[1] Porpora, Nikolaev, and Hagemann, "Abuse, Torture, Frames and the Washington Post," 256.
[2] Robert Entman, *Projections of Power* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004), 9.
[3] Ibid., 9.
[4] Sherry Ricchiardi and Melissa Cirillo, "Missed Signals," *American Journalism Review* 26, no. (2004): 22-29; Rem Rieder, "Toothless Watchdogs," *American Journalism Review* 26, no. 4 (2004): 6; Eric Umansky, "Failures of Imagination," *Colombia Journalism Review* 45, no. 3 (September/October 2006): 16-31.

many other issues that emerge in the discourse in relation to the prisoner abuse stories. Keeping in mind that the coverage of prisoner and detainee abuse in Iraq can not be separated from a larger context of media coverage of war and human rights abuses, the next section will provide a review of literature that addresses the complexities of media functions during the times of conflict.

<div align="center">Media's Role in Covering Conflict and Human Rights Abuses</div>

Mass media and information technologies are the vital forces shaping political, economic, cultural, and ideological processes affecting individual lives around the globe. Increasingly, the media are turning to be the dominant human resource with potential to help prevent and moderate violence. As such, the study of media's ability to cover war and human rights abuses is an important area of discussion and analysis.

At this critical juncture when both the war on terror and advances in information technology have heightened governmental control over information available to journalists and audiences alike, the media reaction to the Abu Ghraib prison scandal provides a significant site for critical examination. Prisoner mistreatment damaged not only the image of the coalition forces, but also created a devastating legacy for the Bush administration. Both U.S. and British governments countered the allegations of detainee mistreatment with promises to investigate and prosecute those guilty. However, both administrations dismissed the possibility that the worst crimes and the acts of abuse occurred with the knowledge and consent of high ranking officials in both countries. More importantly, both administrations denied that the policies on detention and interrogation procedures set the conditions for the abuse to become possible. A close reading of the coverage of prisoner abuse scandals tests the media's ability to serve as the fourth estate in democracies during times of war and tests

their professionalism in covering atrocities. Because the treatment of the prisoners and

detainees in Iraq constitute severe violations of human rights, it is important to examine

human rights coverage as a particular media reporting genre. The following two sections will

briefly outline the studies on media's role in the coverage of war and human rights abuses.

The Significance of Studying Media during the Times of War

During times of war, the media often assume the position of supporting their

government and mobilizing the public behind governmental actions. Many studies have

documented the so called "media propaganda" model in which the media, due to their

reliance on governmental sources, intentionally or unintentionally subscribe to governmental

ideologies.[1] The main argument of these studies is that when the public perceives a given

situation according to government promulgated news reporting it is more inclined to support

governmental policies and actions.[2] Though many studies documented the effects of the

propaganda model, media coverage of war becomes more complicated as globalization and

new technologies are changing the world of media production and dissemination.[3] Collle

observed that the propaganda model, though useful in guiding researchers to focus on "the

structural advantages of government power and corporate interests," also short-circuits the

---

[1] Lance Bennett, "Operation Perfect Storm," *Political Communication Report* 13, no. 3 (Fall 2003); Christiane, Eilders and Albrecht Luter, "Research Note: Germany at War," *European Journal of Communication* 15, no. 3 (2000): 415-428; Edward Herman and Noam Chomsky, *Manufacturing Consent* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1988); Phillip Knightly, *First Casualty* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2002); Jothik Krishnaiah, Nancy Signorielli, and Douglas McLeod, "The Evil Empire Revisited," *Journalism Quarterly* 70, no. 3 (1993): 647-655; David Miller, Introduction to *Tell Me Lies* ed. David Miller (London: Pluto Press, 2003), 1-3; Richard Vincent, "A Narrative Analysis of U.S. Press Coverage of Slobodan Milosevic and the Serbs in Kosovo," *European Journal of Communication* 15, no. 3 (2000): 321-344.

[2] Shanto Iyengar and Adam Simon, "News Coverage of the Gulf Crisis and Public Opinion," *Communication Research* 20, no. 3 (1993): 365-83.

[3] Simon Cottle, *Mediatized Conflict* (Berkshire, UK: Open University Press, 2006), 18.

complexities of media representation in a fast changing mediatized reality of war.[1] Cottle

argues that the media contest paradigm as outlined by Wolfsfeld as well as the media culture

paradigm add to the understanding of research on mediatized conflicts. The media contest

paradigm argues that the media do not always support the dominant views and that the news

media could be used as tool for political influence by marginalized groups.[2] The media

culture paradigm, informed by the cultural studies theorizing, expands the role of media into

broader realms of everyday existence and examines the pervasiveness of the media in

forming attitudes and opinions on social and political issues as well as media's influence on

identity formation. Cottle argues that all three paradigms provide useful concepts and

theoretical frameworks to the study of modern warfare and media's role in covering violence

and conflict.[3] Other scholars go as far as to elaborate that the media are neither the outsiders

of the government process nor the objective purveyors of the political process. They are

better described as a fourth branch of the government that governs in constant conjunction

with the other three.[4] This perspective sees the media as political institutions that are integral

to the political processes in both national and international affairs.

One of the examples of the cultural paradigm at work is the extent of media influence

in forming of peoples attitudes about their ethnic, national, class or any other aspect of

identity. The media dichotomize the world and reflect the core values of a society that

separate good from bad and positive from negative. Often, when a nation is at war, the media

tend to simplify the issues by utilizing a "them versus us" dichotomy intended to dehumanize

---

[1] Simon Cottle, *Mediatized Conflict* (Berkshire, UK: Open University Press, 2006), 20.
[2] Ibid., 22.
[3] Ibid., 28.
[4] Thimothy Cook, "The Media as the Fourth Branch of Government," In *Governance IV: Problems, Process, and Interaction*, ed by Kenneth W. Thompson (New York: University Press of America, 1993), 106.

the enemy and unify citizens to support the troops. More importantly, it is not only politicians and the media that resort to this dichotomous way of thinking. During prolonged periods of war a society-wide change in the way human beings perceive themselves and their enemies may occur.[1] Whether it is the issue of dehumanization demonstrated by the Stanford prison experiments, or of the power of individual authority demonstrated by Stanley Milgram, war creates an environment in which the likelihood of individuals engaging in unthinkable acts against other human beings greatly increases.[2] In today's global world, and more specifically during the times of the war on terror, the media can help facilitate this creation of subjective reality on either side of the conflict.

War itself fits well into the parameters of professional journalism: It is "newsworthy" because it is dramatic, violent, dangerous, emotional, episodic, and with current technology, it can be covered instantaneously.[3] More often than not, the media coverage of war is influenced by government officials' perception of reality. For example, Iyengar and Simon found that during the Gulf War, more than 50 percent of the news came directly from governmental spokespersons.[4] In addition, the episodic nature of coverage was found to make the audiences susceptible to supporting military resolutions of the crisis as opposed to looking for diplomatic solutions.[5] Thus, even with the advancement of technologies that enable coverage by myriad sources, event-oriented international coverage still has the

---

[1] Stefan Vetter, "Understanding Human Behavior in Times of War," *Military Medicine* 172, no. 12 (2007): 9.
[2] Philip Zimbardo, *Stanford Prison Experiment* (Stanford, CA, Philip G. Zimbardo, Inc. 1972), http://www.prisonexp.org: (accessed February, 1, 2008); Stanley Milgram, *Obedience to Authority* (New York, Harper & Row, 1974).
[3] For a more in depth discussion on war coverage as specific media genre see Oliver Boyd-Barrett, "Understanding the Second Casualty," in *Reporting War*, ed. Stuart Allan and Barbie Zelizer (New York: Routledge, 2004), 26.
[4] Shanto Iyengar and Adam Simon, "News Coverage of the Gulf Crisis and Public Opinion," *Communication Research* 20, no. 3 (1993): 382.
[5] Ibid., 381.

potential of being corrupted by official government sources. Other researchers questioned whether the coverage of international news is being changed by new technologies. The researchers were hopeful that the media's tendency to focus on live feeds with emphasis on spontaneity may lead to coverage that is less reliant on officials providing interpretations of international events.[1] However, after examining CNN International desk stories from 1994 to 2001, Livingston and Bennett suggested that even though there is an increase in live event-driven news journalists are still relying on authorized spokespersons to provide officially sanctioned interpretations of international events.[2] Similarly, the so called "CNN effect," which predicted that the media may affect policy making decisions, has been dismissed by researchers for the lack of evidence that the media by themselves alone have ability to change government policies.[3]

On some occasions, however, the media can be quite independent of the official ideology. For example, McLaughlin examined journalists' susceptibility to military briefing materials and official sources during the Kosovo war and found that the "accidental" bombings of civilians, particularly the bombing of a civilian train and refugee convoy in April 1999, created an atmosphere in which journalists asked courageous and controversial questions at official briefings.[4] Thrall observed that the media tend to be more critical of war as the number of casualties rises.[5] Some argued that the growing number of U.S. casualties in Vietnam War and the diminishing public support resulted in more critical media coverage. Though this argument was not supported with systematic research, it still allows us to

---

[1] Steven Livingston and Lance Bennett, "Gatekeeping, Indexing, and Live-Event News," *Political Communication* 20 (2003): 372.
[2] Ibid., 374.
[3] Warren Strobel, *Late-Breaking Foreign Policy* (Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press, 1997), 5.
[4] Greg McLaughlin, "Rules of Engagement," *Journalism Studies* 3, no. 2 (2002): 264.
[5] Trevor Thrall, *War in the Media Age* (Cresskill, N.J.: Hampton Press, 2000), 46.

question the role of war casualties and interaction between the media coverage of casualties and public dissent. [1] If there is a relationship between war casualties and the media's detachment from government propaganda, then the prisoner abuse scandals also should have provoked media defiance.

David Altheide argued that even though journalists are socialized into the norms of their profession, they "are not simply molded into a uniform ideological shape, but rather, they play a major role in adapting their reportage to professional, personal and organizational experiences."[2] Altheide suggested this produces different reporting perspectives among media when journalists are able to distance their reportage from the values and opinions of U.S. leaders, particularly when covering international events. Similarly, Morales found that even though the American coverage of Latin America in the 1970s was slanted towards "deviant and negative," the coverage was not decidedly supportive of U.S. political and business interests or values.[3]

Other studies present mixed results pertaining to the media bias in war coverage. Herman and Chomsky found that the U.S. media coverage of politics in El Salvador, Guatemala, and Nicaragua during the early 1980s was biased to favor the interests of American business and government elites, while Soderlund and Schmitt found the coverage of El Salvador in U.S. and Canadian newspapers during the same period tended to be critical

---

[1] Daniel Hallin, "The Media, the War in Vietnam, and Political Support," in *We Keep America on Top of the World* ed. by Daniel Hallin (Routledge, London, New York, 1994) 40–57.

[2] David Altheide, "Media Hegemony: A Failure of Perspective," *Pubic Opinion Quarterly* 48, no. 2 (1984): 480-481.

[3] Waltraud Morales, "Revolutions, Earthquakes, and Latin America," in *Television Coverage of International Affair*, ed. William Adams (Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 1982), 79-116; For further discussion about newsworthiness in international reporting see Pamela Shoemaker, Lucig Danielian, and Nancy Brendlinger, "Deviant Acts, Risky Business and U.S. Interests." *Journalism Quarterly* 68, no. 4 (1991): 781-795; Tsan-Kuo Chang, Pamela Shoemaker, and Nancy Brendlinger, "Determinants of International News Coverage in the U.S. Media," *Communication Research* 14, no. 4 (1987): 396-415.

of U.S. involvement in the region.[1]

The difficulty of covering the war on terror, however, is addressed in the centuries' old adage, aptly observed by Winston Churchill: "In wartime, truth is so precious that she should always be attended by a bodyguard of lies."[2] The challenge for journalists covering the war on terror is not only having access to the battlefield and uncensored information from the military, but also, the job of separating factual information from disinformation campaigns created by governments. Beelman pointed out that the two leading coalition forces of the war on terror, the United States and Britain, previously engaged in routine lying to reporters during the Kosovo war.[3] Restricting access to battlefields and troops were impossible to impose, and thus intentional and routine lying took place in order to support NATO's mission. Subsequently, the U.S. government's policy on Information Operations is even a stronger suspect of deception during the war on terror. The most successful in the latest of the military tactics is embedding of journalists with military units during the war in Iraq. This allowed the military to control the media coverage of war without much effort as the journalists who travel with the military resort to emphasizing the dramatic and spectacular at the expense of providing coverage needed to understand larger context and consequences of war.[4] Hence, it could be argued that the media often fail to provide quality coverage of wars.

---

[1] Edward Herman and Noam Chomsky, *Manufacturing Consent* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1988); Walter Soderlund and Carmen Schmitt, "El Salvador's Civil War as Seen in North and South American Press," *Journalism Quarterly* 63 (1986): 268-274.
[2] Anthony Brown, *Bodyguard of Lies* (Guilford, CT, HarperCollins Publishers, 2002), 389.
[3] Maud Beelman, "The Dangers of Disinformation in the War on Terror," *Nieman Reports* 55, no. 4 (2001): 16.
[4] Simon Cottle, *Mediatized Conflict* (Berkshire, UK: Open University Press, 2006), 95.

Human Rights Reporting

Being skeptical of the truthfulness of the media reports applies not only to the

coverage of war--it is also a concern for human rights reporting. Rosenblum observed that

human rights issues have been exploited throughout history and he noted that "some ignore

atrocities, and others invent them."[1] For example, in 1991, a blatant lie about Iraqis taking

sick Kuwaiti babies from incubators and leaving them on cold floors provided tacit support

for the U.S. to embark on the Gulf War.[2]

History is full of stories in which the media were used to inflict violence, as in the

recent cases of murder and genocide in Rwanda. The pro-state radio stations in Rwanda were

used to mobilize Hutu citizens to kill the Tutsi population in 1994 after the suspicious death

of the Rwandan President, Juvenal Habyarimana.[3] Inevitably, history presents considerably

more examples of atrocities that were ignored than those that were invented. This is due to

the fact that reportage of human rights abuses can be difficult for both the journalists to find

out about and audiences to follow the intricate details. In some instances, journalists may not

be as through and objective in reporting of human rights abuses because of their inexperience

in "taking testimony from people whose passions are inflamed, who are acutely distressed, or

who have suffered great trauma."[4] When done right, however, human rights reporting can be

---

[1] Mort Rosenblum, *Who Stole the News?* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1993), 261.
[2] The baby incubator story was a prominent part of a Hill & Knowlton's campaign in fighting the war against Iraq. Hill & Knowlton' was PR firm which took on the campaign for citizens for a Free Kuwait one week after Iraq invaded Kuwait on August 2, 1990. On November 27, the firm presented the baby incubator story before the United Nations Security Council. The eye witness was 15 year old girl Nayirah who later was proven to be the daughter of the Kuwaiti ambassador to the United States. See John Stauber and Sheldon Rampton. *Toxic Sludge is Good for You* (Monroe, Maine: Common Courage, 1995), 169 and John MacArthur and Ben Bagdikian, *Second Front* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1992), 68 for more info on the "baby incubator" story.
[3] Clair Apodaca, "The Whole World Could Be Watching," *Journal of Human Rights* 6, no. 2 (April 2007): 149.
[4] Carrol Bogert, "Similar Paths, Different Missions," *Nieman Reports* 64, no. 3: (2010): 60.

a powerful genre of reporting, one capable of providing counterbalance to planted stories by politicians who seek to maintain a positive image.[1]

However, the work of uncovering and identifying human rights violations is difficult. By definition, a human rights violation is committed by the State through its agents (the police, armed forces, or anyone acting with the authority of the State) against an individual.[2] Professional human rights workers and journalists have to be aware of international laws and practices in order to be effective in fighting against them. The core of international human rights law is the International Bill of Human Rights.[3] Human rights are also protected in the constitutions and national laws of individual nations. The main political body dealing with human rights issues is the United Nations Commission on Human Rights. It sets the standards for international treaties and undertakes the investigation of human rights violations by establishing procedures and mechanisms to respond to them.[4] In addition, human rights are further protected by the many treaties and agreements governments sign which oblige them to ensure specific rights and freedoms. International human rights law enforcement is monitored by human rights organizations that make violations public. Among these organizations are: Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch, the Global Democracy Network (GDN), the Fourth World Documentation Project, and Freedom House. Their tasks vary from collecting and disseminating information on human rights and humanitarian laws to documenting human rights conditions in regions around the world. Enforcement is often limited to making the outside world aware of atrocities so that the international community

---

[1] Mort Rosenblum, *Who Stole the News?* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1993), 200.
[2] Kathryn English and Adam Stapleton, *The Human Rights Handbook* (Wivenhoe Park, Colchester: Human Rights Centre, University of Essex, 1995), 25.
[3] International Bill of Human Rights. G.A. res. 217A (III), U.N. Doc A/810 at 71 (1948) http://www.un.org/en/documents/udhr/index.shtml (accessed August 9. 2009).
[4] English and Stapleton, *The Human Rights Handbook,* 9.

might take action against the violating country. Violators of international human rights law can be brought up to the International Court of Justice, which is the principle judicial organ of the United Nations.

There are a number of formal and informal procedures at the international level that can be used to exert pressure on violating governments to put an end to persistent human rights abuse, but many of these outlets are cumbersome and time consuming. The most effective form of pressure comes from the mere fact that when governments are exposed, their international standing is damaged. The media then are the tools for the NGOs and human rights activists that can be used to shame the perpetrators into changing their behavior.[1]

Obviously, countries violating human rights are not eager to disclose their wrong doing. But even when discovered, human rights abuses do not necessarily get large scale attention by the international media. Editorial decisions about what is "truth" or what is "newsworthy" prevent even significant investigative stories from being published.[2] At other times, journalists censor themselves because researching some stories might be risky and even dangerous. Cassara contended that a government's policy toward human rights can also be a contributing factor that determines media interest and ability to document and report human rights violations. For example, President Carter contributed to human rights policy enforcement beginning 1977 when he brought civil rights experts into the State Department, initiated reports on human rights, and instructed diplomats and consulates to monitor violations of human rights.[3]

---

[1] Clair Apodaca, "The Whole World Could Be Watching," *Journal of Human Rights* 6, no. 2 (April 2007): 149.
[2] Carrol Bogert, "Similar Paths, Different Missions," *Nieman Reports* 64, no. 3: (2010): 61.
[3] Catherine Cassara, "U.S. Newspaper Coverage of Human Rights in Latin America, 1975-1982," *Journalism*

The image of the U.S. as a supporter of human rights enforcement has been damaged by the Abu Ghraib scandal. It is documented that the U.S. government attempted to avoid charges of human rights violations as soon as the coalition forces began gathering detainees in Afghanistan and later in Iraq. In particular, the government began looking for loopholes in the law and (1) established the detainee base in Guantanamo, and then (2) labeled al-Qaeda and Taliban fighters "enemy combatants" in order to avoid applying the Geneva Conventions to detainees. [1] Not surprising, the ideology of secrecy made it difficult for journalists to investigate and find out about the treatment of detainees in Afghanistan and Iraq. If not for governmental leaks and the smart work of a few specific journalists, the memos would still be hidden in secrecy.

Seymor Hersh, the journalist whose reporting facilitated the earliest reportage of the Abu Ghraib story on *CBS 60 Minutes,* previously had broken another infamous military scandal--the My Lai Massacre, an incident in South Vietnam in which U.S. soldiers tortured and killed nearly 500 civilians in March 1968. Hersh broke the story of the My Lai Massacre in November, 1969. His reporting prompted widespread condemnation around the world and reduced public support for the Vietnam War in the United States. Lt. William Calley was court-martialed in 1971 for the atrocity.[2] He was convicted of premeditated murder for ordering the shootings.

It is no coincidence then that the Human Rights Handbook lists journalists among the

---

and Mass Communication Quarterly 75, no. 3 (1998): 479.

[1] Greenberg and Dratel, *The Torture Papers*, 948.

[2] Hersh wrote about the massacre and its cover-up in the books *My Lai 4* (1970) and *Cover Up* (1972). Most of his articles on Abu Ghraib were published as a book collection titled *Chain of Command* (2004), see also Claude Cookman, "An American Atrocity," *Journal of American History* 94.1 (2007): 157.

primary group of people responsible for monitoring human rights abuses.[1] Moreover, the international community understands the importance of the media in securing human rights and has, therefore, specifically included provisions for access to the media in several human rights documents. Article 19 of the 1948 Universal Declaration on Human Rights states that "everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive, and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers."[2]

Other groups in society deemed responsible for human rights monitoring are: medical professionals, law enforcement officers, lawyers and judges, religious and work groups, as well as intellectuals and business associations. Because of their role in the society, journalists and other groups have to be reminded of their special role and responsibilities, and should be encouraged to understand human rights standards and participate in networks that disseminate and share information regarding human rights violations. As such, the work of journalists and human rights practitioners should be to inform the public about possible human rights abuses and to encourage the international community to act, so that when confronted, violating governments can not claim ignorance.

Obviously, the media's ability to access and report on human rights violations will be affected by the location of events, nature of conflict and government structures and openness as well as the media's ability to access information and their ability to report the events objectively. Media professionalism routines as well as cultural biases may affect not only whether, but also how, human rights violations are presented to global audiences. The next

---

[1] Kathryn English and Adam Stapleton, *The Human Rights Handbook* (Wivenhoe Park, Colchester: Human Rights Centre, University of Essex, 1995).
[2] *Universal Declaration of Human Rights,* G.A. res. 217A (III), U.N. Doc A/810 at 71 (1948) http://www.un.org/en/documents/udhr/index.shtml (accessed August 9. 2009).

section will explore a comparative approach to the study of the media as a way to examine

some of the intricacies of the media coverages of international news including conflict and

violence.

Comparative Research of International News Coverage

Researchers contend that comparative studies provide an examination of alternative

views of media professionalism, enhance our understanding of the relationship between the

media and a country's political elites, and illuminate diverse notions of newsworthiness.[1]

Simply put, comparative analysis allows us "to notice things we did not notice and therefore

had not conceptualized."[2] That is, the comparative approach facilitates theoretical

development of how we understand news processes. Recent research demonstrates the

importance of the comparative method in testing existing media theories across national

borders. In particular, research reveals that mass media concepts developed by U.S. scholars

did not function identically in other countries.[3] Researchers note that often coverage reflects

marketing perspectives and geographic/political orientations of different media. For example,

the study of newspaper discourse related to the Kosovo War noted that newspapers in

Sweden, Greece, and Norway questioned the legality and legitimacy of the war in much

stronger terms than the newspapers in Britain, and this reflected the political attitudes and

---

[1] For a review of literature on comparative media studies see Daniela Dimitrova and Jesper Stromback, "Mission Accomplished," *Gazette* 67, no. 5 (2005): 399-417; Klaus Bruhn, Jensen, ed., *News of the World* (London: Routledge, 1998); Melvin Kohn, ed., *Cross National Research in Sociology* (Newbery Park, CA: Sage, 1989); Sonia Livingstone, "On the Challenges of Cross-National Comparative Media Research," *European Journal of Communication* 18, no. 4 (2003): 477-500.

[2] Daniel C. Hallin and Paolo Mancini, *Comparing Media Systems* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 3.

[3] John Downing, *Internationalizing Media Theory* (London, Sage, 1996). Olaf Werder, "Debating the Euro" *Gazette* 64, no. 3 (2002): 219–33; Dominique Brossard, James Shanahan, and Katherine McComas, "Are Issue-Cycles Culturally Constructed?" *Mass Communication and Society* 7, no. 3 (2004): 359–77.

ideologies of the respective countries.[1]

International news is a prime subject of comparative studies. Although the comparative approach primarily analyzes similarities and differences in coverage, there are several other issues that international media scholars have to address. The issue of *manifest* and *latent* content becomes complicated because the active symbols used in any language tend to change in meaning with the passage of time.[2] Researchers attempting content analysis across different countries also face cultural and linguistic barriers when interpreting and coding media messages. Hence, comparative cross-national research also brings up the problem of *etic* and *emic* research.[3]

Researchers attempting cross-national comparative media research also have to be aware that while identifying differences they might exaggerate national stereotypes and overstate internal homogeneity.[4] Comparative studies are often criticized because many researchers limit themselves to generating national findings in the form of nation-by-chapter reporting, requiring the reader to craft any comparisons.[5]

Another issue in comparative studies is how the selection of countries for comparisons is made. There can be two ways of comparing how the same events were

---

[1] Stig Nohrstedt, Sophia Kaitatzi-Whitlock, Rune Ottosen, and Kristina Riegert, "From the Persian Gulf to Kosovo," *European Journal of Communication* 15, no. 3 (2000): 383-404.

[2] In content analysis *manifest* content is visible, surface content of communication; *latent* content refers to underlying or implicit meaning. The issue of *manifest* vs. *latent* content will be explored a bit more detail in this chapter as an important part of framing approach to the study of media. Also, see William Gamson, "News as Framing," *American Behavioral Scientist* 33, no. 2 (1989): 157-161 for more on how framing addresses this issue.

[3] In intercultural communication research *emic* approach refers to a culture specific account or description whereas *etic* is an approach of describing the culture in terms that can be applied to other cultures. For more on *emic* vs *etic* see William Gudykunst and Stella Ting-Toomey, "Communication in Personal Relationships Across Cultures: An Introduction." In *Communication in Personal Relationships Across Cultures*, ed. William Gudykunst, Stella Ting-Toomey, and Tsukasa Nishida (Thousand Oaks, London: Sage, 1996), 3-18.

[4] Sonia Livingstone, "On the Challenges of Cross-National Comparative Media Research," *European Journal of Communication* 18, no. 4 (2003): 491.

[5] Ibid., 492.

reported in the media of different countries.[1] One is the most similar systems design and the other is the most different systems design. When similar countries are selected for analysis it is possible to study differences that exist within those similar systems. This approach primarily emphasizes cultural and political differences. When different countries are selected for analysis, the approach stresses intercultural similarities by identifying commonalities in otherwise different systems. Dimitrova and Stromback used the most different systems design to study the coverage of the Iraq war in the United States and Sweden.[2]

This dissertation takes the first approach as the United States and Great Britain have demonstrated similar attitudes towards the war, as well as having been accused of detainee and civilian abuses. In addition, Hallin and Mancini, authors of the most recent comprehensive study on the classification of the media systems, argued that the United States and Great Britain fall under the Anglo-American or Liberal Model of the mass media because of their similarities in key areas of the media systems: the development of media markets, political parallelism, journalistic professionalism, and the role of the state.[3] The Liberal Model (prevails in Great Britain, Ireland, and North America) is characterized by the relative importance of market mechanisms and commercial media. The Democratic Corporatist Model (prevails in northern continental Europe) separates itself with the coexistence of commercial media and media that represent social and political groups. The Polarized Pluralist Model (prevails in the Mediterranean countries of southern Europe) is characterized by integration of the media into party politics.[4]

---

[1] Daniela Dimitrova and Jesper Stromback, "Mission Accomplished," *Gazette* 67, no. 5 (2005): 400.
[2] Ibid., 401.
[3] Daniel, C. Hallin and Paolo Mancini, *Comparing Media Systems* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 87.
[4] Ibid., 11.

Notwithstanding the similarities in war attitudes or involvement in prisoner abuse scandals or their adherence to the same Liberal Model of mass media, the United States and Great Britain still present different cultural, economic, and political environments that result in substantial differences and modifications of how the Liberal Model is manifest in the United States and the U.K. Thus, any claims of similarity between the two media systems have to be made with caution. This is particularly relevant for the study of media content. Downing argued that in order to study media content, researchers need to apply an integrated approach and consider the political, cultural, and economic differences of each country.[1] This is even more relevant to the study of foreign news because, in addition to dealing with the cultural, political, and economic forces of their own country, the media encounter different interpretations of social reality as shaped by a foreign culture. They must also take into account different political ideologies and various economic and social situations. This makes it difficult for reporters to be completely objective, impartial, and detached from their subject matter. The following section will highlight the similarities and differences between the political and media systems in the United States and Great Britain.

Similarities and Differences between the United States and the United Kingdom

Even though media systems and their roles are not identical in the United States and the United Kingdom, both countries provide good context for comparative media studies as both function under democratic systems of governance representing similar attitudes and perceptions towards the role of government in relation to individuals' rights, liberties, and

---

[1] John Downing, *Internationalizing Media Theory* (London, Sage, 1996), 229.

freedoms.[1] As mentioned, both are considered to be examples of the Liberal Model of media systems. The media in both countries are seen as performing the role of the "fourth estate" as well as embracing the ideals of freedom of the press.[2] Nevertheless, the United States and the United Kingdom represent different cultural and political environments, which influence how the respective citizenry deal with a variety of societal issues. Consequently, this results in different notions of media professionalism and delineates the basic philosophies of the role of media in each society. This can be partially attributed to the development of the mass-circulation press that accounts for distinct differences in the nature of media outlets, their relation to audiences, and their role in social and political communication.[3] Before the issue of commercialization is addressed, the following will briefly review the political environments in the U.S. and the U.K. to highlight the different contexts in which the media of the two countries are functioning.

The U.S. cultural and political environment is built on the absence of feudal traditions and the creation of a "new world in a new land" by separatist groups who left Europe in search of freedom from religious persecution. A further development of American democracy resulted in a political system driven by voting citizens, not an aristocracy, and "wariness of those whom they elect to power."[4] Historically, the "American way of life" is strongly populist and based on an ideology of "choice" in which citizens are able to solve any societal problems pragmatically. Influenced by these historical and cultural expectations, the

---

[1] Frank Dardis, "Military Accord, Media Discord," *International Communication Gazette*, 68, no. 5-6 (2006): 411.

[2] Ibid., 411.

[3] Daniel, C. Hallin and Paolo Mancini, *Comparing Media Systems* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 87.

[4] Josef Ernst, "The Structure of Political Communication in the United Kingdom, the United States, and the Federal Republic of Germany," vol. 116 of *European University Studies*. Series XXXI. *Political Science* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang Publishing, 1998), 19.

U.S. Constitution dictates a strict separation of powers of the three branches of government so that no individual can be a member of more than one. In the U.K., all ministers in the government are members of the legislature, and senior judges sit in the upper house of Parliament. Not to mention, the United States has a presidential system whereas the British political system is headed by a hereditary monarchy that holds ceremonial powers only. In addition, the United States is a federal system with both a Senate (representing the States) and a House of Representatives (representing the citizens). Three parts of the United Kingdom--Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland--have special status and local administrations. However, England--which represents more than 80 percent of the total U.K. population--does not have a clear and strong sense of regionalism. Therefore, the British political system does not have anything equivalent to the federal system of the 50 states in the U.S.

This difference in political systems resulted in different professional standards for journalists in the U.S. and U.K. The U.S. media roles are influenced by defining journalism professionalism in terms of taking a self-assured and sometimes adversarial attitude towards political institutions.[1] In the U.K., the relationship between the government and society can be characterized by a search for the "common good," and members of different classes look to the government for protection. The media serve as instruments for social unity highlighting shared interests and knowledge.[2] Clashes between the old aristocracies and the masses paved the way for consensus and political bargaining processes in which old policies can be replaced with new. Political culture in England can be described as searching for satisfactory solutions to common problems, and the process is likely to "swing back and forth

---

[1] Thomas Patterson, *Out of Order* (New York: Vintage, 1994), 34.
[2] Martin Conboy, *Journalism: A Critical History* (London: Sage, 2004), 192.

between fundamental and circumstantial, procedural and substantive necessities."[1]

Compared to the other models of media systems, the Liberal Model countries do not have strong traditions of establishing rigorous professional self-regulation norms and values. That is, journalistic self-regulation occurs informally and is organized within individual news organizations.[2] Hence, journalists in the U.S. and the U.K. have different notions of journalism professionalism and may even criticize each other for not adhering to the same principles of professionalism. For example, U.K. journalists may perceive American reporting as lacking independent judgment, whereas American journalists argue that their European counterparts produce coverage that lacks balance and objectivity.[3]

Both media systems are highly privatized.[4] The difference is that in the U.K. private ownership lies in aristocratic and party traditions, whereas in the U.S., the media are supposed to be free from government influence.[5] More important, however, is the different market structure that has developed in the U.S. and the U.K. The U.S. is characterized by a distinct local newspaper market where local newspapers cater to cross-class readership of a particular locale. The British market is a class-stratified market with a separation between "quality" papers with mainly middle- to upper-class readership and the sensationalist tabloids.[6] In addition, commercialism has resulted in the tradition of "fact-centered discourse" which emphasizes information and accuracy over political rhetoric and

---

[1] Ibid., 24.

[2] Daniel, C. Hallin and Paolo Mancini, *Comparing Media Systems* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 224.

[3] Ibid., 226.

[4] David Croteau and William Hoynes, *The Business of Media* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press, 2001), 233.

[5] Of, course, one needs to keep in mind the issues of political influence and censorship, which were discussed earlier. See Lance Bennett's *The Politics of Illusion* for a longer discussion on the media influences in the U.S.

[6] Daniel, C. Hallin and Paolo Mancini, *Comparing Media Systems* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 206.

commentary which is more common in, for example, French media or the Democratic

Corporatist Model of mass media. Nevertheless, when the two countries are compared, the

British system is found to be more editorialized. U.K. newspapers are more likely to focus on

the expression of opinions rather than on impartiality or objectivity, which is the assumed

role of the media in the U.S.[1] In addition, while political affiliation may not be visible in U.S.

media and diminishing in the British media, the political orientations of British newspapers

are still apparent today.

Besides commercialism, the realm of political culture is one other possible

explanation for these differences.[2] Although most democratic countries use proportional

representation as their electoral system, both the U.S. and the U.K. are divided into a number

of constituencies. Whoever wins the majority of votes in each constituency wins that

constituency regardless of the proportion of the vote secured. Both in the U.S. and the U.K.,

the media serve as vehicles of communication between the electorate and their

representatives. The difference, however, between U.S. and U.K. political cultures is

distinguished by British society placing higher importance on political activity in general.

Thus, the media tend to devote more attention to political communication and report on it

more thoroughly.[3] Political parallelism, even though it has been diminishing, is still more

visible in Britain There are three major political parties in the British system of politics: the

Labour Party (often called New Labour)--the centre-Left party; the Conservative Party

(frequently called the Tories)--the centre-Right party; and the Liberal Democrat Party

(known as the Lib Dems)--the centrist, libertarian party. Both the quality and tabloid

---

[1] Josef Ernst, "The Structure of Political Communication," 19.
[2] Daniel, C. Hallin and Paolo Mancini, *Comparing Media Systems* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 214.
[3] Ibid., 215.

newspapers have political identities as represented by political affiliations of their readers. Forty-two percent of the *Times* readers support conservatives, whereas 67 percent of the *Guardian's* readers are tied with the Labour party. The American political system is dominated by two political parties: the Democratic Party and the Republican Party (often known as the "Grand Old Party" or GOP). Even though U.S. newspapers might have editorial affiliations with one or the other party, most newspapers assume centrist views and avoid aligning their news coverages with party ideologies. The dichotomy of the two-party system in the U.S. also results in both parties moving more towards the center during political campaigns. Thus, compared with the U.S., the British party system is better defined, and each party has clear ideological characteristics which results in stronger political rhetoric in news coverage.

Both media systems have earned their share of criticism. As the literature suggests, both the media in the U.S. and Great Britain might be susceptible to governmental censorship during times of war.[1] More importantly, the value of neutrality that developed as a result of commercialism resulted in the media being compliant with governmental points of view. Edwards and Cromwell examined the media coverage of wars in the U.S. and the U.K. argued that neutrality in media reports is built on several major biases.[2] The media failed to question the legitimacy of wars or the U.S. and the U.K. governments' direct responsibility for the deaths of millions of people in Iraq because of their professional bias towards balanced reporting that is based on legitimate or official sources. The researchers argued that when news is dominated by mainstream political, business, and military sources, only the

---

[1] Glasgow University Media Group, *War and Peace News* (Philadelphia: Open University Press, 1985).
[2] David Edwards and David Cromwell, *Guardians of Power* (London: Pluto Press, 2006), 11.

views of the establishment are reported.[1] This compliance with Herman and Chomsky's propaganda model has been documented by many other studies. For example, the *New York Times* and the *Times* supported the American war frame in their early coverage of the Iraqi war.[2] Other scholars found that the media in the U.S. and the U.K were similar in that they avoided providing in-depth coverage of the war and instead focused on an episodic news format in which they detailed accounts of individual events of capture, rescue, or death while leaving larger issues unexplored.[3] Some scholars attributed this to the cultural value of individualism which favors an emphasis on individual actors rather than the community.[4]

Other scholars, however, argued that when covering the war in Iraq, the British media were found to cover the events in ways that offered an opportunity to "corral facts and to ask tough questions."[5] In contrast, the U.S. media presented the war as "an 'exciting' story" which resulted in depicting war as a sanitized event.[6] The British media were also found to be divided in their ideological views. For example, the *Guardian* opposed the war in Iraq, whereas the *Times* covered events with more support for British involvement in the conflict.[7]

Cultural differences in news practices and the internalization of international policies in each culture were found to have influenced the coverage of terrorism in the *New York Times*, the *Washington Post*, the *Financial Times*, and the *Guardian*.[8] U.S. newspapers emphasized the military frame by relying on military sources and focusing on insider

---

[1] Ibid.
[2] Narasimhan Ravi, "Looking beyond Flawed Journalism," *Press/Politics* 10, no. 1 (2005): 60.
[3] Ibid., 60.
[4] Ibid., 60.
[5] Russ Baker, "Comparing American and British War Coverage," *The Nation*. April 28, 2003.
[6] Ibid.
[7] Narasimhan Ravi, "Looking beyond Flawed Journalism," *Press/Politics* 10, no. 1 (2005): 60.
[8] Zizi Papacharissi and Maria de Fatima Oliveira, "News Frames Terrorism," *Press/Politics* 13, No.1 (2008): 68.

politics.[1] U.K. newspapers emphasized the diplomatic frame and utilized a more international scope of reporting.[2] Other studies found that British and American newspapers used the same historical narratives when reporting news following the 9/11 attacks.[3] The authors suggested that by relying on U.S. history to explain 9/11, the newspapers might have created a shared history or shared understanding of the historical context of the incident. As a result, although the attacks occurred in the U.S., the event resonated with Great Britain. Nevertheless, there were differences in how the history was used. British newspapers, as their tradition dictates, devoted lengthy and eloquent discussions to history, whereas the U.S. media selected bits of historical evidence through the coverage.[4] Two British newspapers (the *Times* and the *Independent*) relied on the Soviet experience in Afghanistan, while U.S. newspapers (the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post*) pointed out the lessons of lax security which made the nation vulnerable. These differences in coverage are good examples of how the media culturally appropriated different frames to give meaning to the events or issues covered.

Comparisons of the four newspapers present an opportunity to find idiosyncrasies not only as they relate to the media in different countries, but also how each medium adheres to different journalistic styles and philosophies. As mentioned previously, the U.K. media often present a range of opinions in their coverage of both national and international news.[5] This suggests that even during a time of war when the country is expected to seek a unified discourse in support of the troops and "the national interest," newspapers present news

---

[1] Ibid., 68.
[2] Ibid., 69.
[3] Betty Winfield, Barbara Friedman, and Vivara Trisnadi, "History as the Metaphor Through Which the Current World is Viewed," *Journalism Studies* 3, no. 2 (2002): 297.
[4] Ibid., 298.
[5] Narasimhan Ravi, "Looking beyond Flawed Journalism," *Press/Politics* 10, no. 1 (2005): 60.

differently to both satisfy their respective audiences and journalistic philosophies. The U.S.

media were noted to have similar characteristics when covering the Persian Gulf War.[1]

Moreover, media scholars argue that the media in the United Kingdom do not have a unified

"national agenda" and that the taken-for-granted model of a British national press is

simplistic.[2] Instead, the U.K. press is a complex mosaic of explicit "citizenship and national

identities and implicit 'national' title."[3] More importantly, newspaper readers are comprised

of various publics and "news agendas and deictic language is deployed in different ways for

different audiences in different parts of the United Kingdom. That is, readers in England are

not exposed to any routine flagging of Englishness comparable with the flagging of

Scottishness in newspapers bought in Scotland. This brings to mind Bernard Shaw's quip that

England and America were countries divided by a common language."[4] In the light of these

findings, this study addresses not only how the coverage of the prisoner abuse scandal varied

between the newspapers of the U.S. and the U.K., but also how different journalistic

philosophies were reflected in the newspapers within each country. The following section

briefly describes each of the newspapers that were selected for the study.

<div align="center">The Four Newspapers Compared</div>

The *New York Times* is the largest metropolitan newspaper in the U.S. It is published

daily in New York City. The *New York Times* coverage is credited with maintaining balance

and integrity, and it is generally considered to be the newspaper of record for the United

---

[1] Lynda Kaid, Barbara Harville, John Balloti, and Maria Wawrzyniak, "Telling the Gulf War story" in *Dessert Storm and the Mass Media*, eds. Bradley Greenberg and Walter Gantz (Cresskill, New Jersey: Hampton Press, 1993), 86-98.

[2] Michael Rosie, Pille Petersoo, John MacInnes, Susan Condor, and James Kennedy, "Mediating Which Nation?" *Social Semiotics* 16, no. 2 (2006): 327-344.

[3] Ibid., 341.

[4] Ibid., 342.

States. The newspaper's motto, coined by Adolph S. Ochs--"All the News That's Fit to Print"--has been attacked as arrogant and unwarranted by both conservatives and liberals.[1] The *New York Times* carries comprehensive coverage of national, foreign, business, and local news from its extensive foreign and U.S bureaus. The Sunday edition of the *New York Times* is known worldwide and contains the most in-depth coverage of any topic. While some conservatives believe that the *New York Times'* reporting on social issues has a liberal slant, some liberals view the paper as conservative because of its failure to use its vast journalistic resources to critique and expose structural and economic inequality in the United States. There are also instances leading to questions of the newspaper's neutrality and long standing tradition of objective reporting. One of the most recent scandals suggesting the *New York Time's* culpability for the war in Iraq involves Judith Miller who authored erroneous articles about the existence of weapons of mass destruction in Iraq adds to the support of the propaganda model.[2] Nevertheless, the newspaper remains an influential news source for the audiences around the globe. Thus, examination of how the paper covered abuses by the coalition forces adds to the literature examining the media's role in political communication. According to the Audit Bureau of Circulation Report of March 2005, the *New York Times'* daily circulation was 1,136,433, and 1,680,582 on Sundays.[3] The paper is owned by The New York Times Company, which publishes 18 other newspapers, including the *International Herald Tribune* and the *Boston Globe*. The company's chairman is Arthur Ochs Sulzberger Jr., whose family has controlled the paper since 1896.

---

[1] Francine Silverman, "The Man Who Saved the Times," *Editor & Publisher*, 8 (June 1996) 16.
[2] See Oliver Boyd-Barrett, "Judith Miller, The New York Times, and the Propaganda Model," Journalism Studies 5, no. 4 (November 2004): 435-449 for a detail review of the case.
[3] Audit Bureau of Circulations. "Top 200 Newspapers by Largest Reported Circulation," 2005 http://www.accessabc.com/reader/top150.htm (accessed June 2008).

The *Washington Post* is the largest and oldest newspaper in Washington, D.C. It gained worldwide fame in the early 1970s for its Watergate investigation by Bob Woodward and Carl Bernstein. The *Washington Post* has distinguished itself through its reporting on the White House, Congress, and other aspects of the U.S. government. The *Washington Post* emphasizes international news, deploying correspondents from its 16 foreign bureaus to produce in-depth articles from around the world. The *Washington Post* is standard reading for members of Congress, diplomats, government officials, journalists, business lobbyists, and lawyers in Washington and across the nation.

Just as with the *New York Times*, the neutrality of the *Washington Post* has its supporters and critics. On one hand, the majority of the paper's political endorsements have historically been awarded to Democratic candidates, but on the other and, it has carried a number of right-wing columnists in recent years, including George Will and Michael Kelly. Though in the coverage of international relations both the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post* regularly express criticism of government policies, in some instances, for example, U.S. policy in Bosnia the *Washington Post* was found to be much more critical than the *New York Times*.[1] According to the Audit Bureau of Circulation report of October 2, 2005, the *Washington Post's* daily circulation was 715,181, 660,182 copies on Saturday and 983,243 on Sunday.[2] The newspaper is owned by The Washington Post Company, a company that also owns Kaplan, Inc. and many media ventures aside from the *Washington Post*.

The *Times* (London) is a national newspaper published daily in the United Kingdom.

---

[1] Yehudith Auerbach and Yaeli Bloch-Elkon, "Media Framing and Foreign Policy," *Journal of Peace Research* 42, no. 1 (2005): 83-99.
[2] Audit Bureau of Circulations. "Top 200 Newspapers by Largest Reported Circulation," 2005 http://www.accessabc.com/reader/top150.htm (accessed June 2008).

It is the second-highest circulation newspaper of the U.K. among the quality papers.[1] The newspaper is sometimes referred to by people outside the U.K. as the *London Times* or the *Times of London* in order to distinguish it from the many other *Times* papers such as the *New York Times*. The British Business Survey 2005 named the *Times* as the U.K.'s leading daily newspaper for business people.[2] Considered the United Kingdom's newspaper of record, the *Times* is a serious publication with high standards of journalism. Traditionally it adheres with the conservative party line though there is some indication that recent readers align with the Labour Party.[3] Monday-Saturday the paper is called the *Times* and on Sunday as the *Sunday Times*.

Although celebrity and sports related news constitutes a big part of the *Times* coverage, it is rarely given prominence on the front page. Nevertheless, the paper has received criticism as well. Robert Fisk, seven times British International Journalist of the Year, resigned as foreign correspondent in 1988 because his article on the shooting down of Iran Air Flight 655 was censored.[4] The figures from the national readership survey showed the *Times* to have the highest number of 25 to 44 year old readers and the largest numbers of readers in London of any of the quality papers.[5] Average circulation figures for November 2005 show that the *Times* sold 692,581 copies per day.[6] The newspaper is owned by the News Corporation group that headed by Rupert Murdoch.

---

[1] Frank Dardis, "Military Accord, Media Discord," *The International Communication Gazette*, 68, no. 5-6 (2006): 415.
[2] Economist Group, "British Business Survey," 2005, http://printmediakit.economist.com/BBS_2005.240.0.html (accessed June 7, 2008)
[3] Ben Hall, Tim Burt, and Fiona Symon, "Election 2005: What the papers said," *Financial Times* (London), May 3, 2005.
[4] Icon Group International, *Censors: Webster's Quotations, Facts and Phrases* (Icon Group International, Inc., 2008), 165.
[5] National Readership Survey, "Readership and Profile Reports for all NRS Publications," 2006. http://www.nrs.co.uk/open_access/open_topline/newspapers/index.cfm (accessed June 7 2008)
[6] Ibid.

The *Guardian* is one of Britain's oldest newspapers. The *Guardian* is published

Monday through Saturday. Until 1959 it was called the *Manchester Guardian*, reflecting its

provincial origins, although it has been based in London since 1964. In 1988, the *Guardian*

was named Newspaper of the Year. In the 1993 British Press Awards, two *Guardian*

reporters were cited for major honors for their coverage of the conflict in former Yugoslavia.

The *Guardian* is fourth in circulation among the U.K. newspapers and is generally

recognized as a traditionally non-conservative newspaper[1] affiliated with the centrist Liberal

Party[2]. During the earliest days of the Afghanistan (2001) and Iraq (2003) wars, the

Guardian attracted a significant proportion of anti-war readers as one of the mass media

outlets most critical of U.K. and U.S. military initiatives.[3] The newspaper also gained readers

in the United States where there were few "anti-war" rivals. Until the foundation of the

Independent, the *Guardian* was the only serious national daily newspaper in Britain that was

not clearly conservative in its political affiliation. According to the U.K. National Readership

Survey estimates, average daily circulation for the *Guardian* in 2006 was 381,790.[4] The

paper is owned by the Scott Trust, via the Guardian Media Group. The trust was set up to

ensure the newspaper's editorial independence from the takeovers by the commercial media

conglomerates.

Although the four newspapers do not encompass all ranges of U.S. and U.K. print

media, the circulation and potential readership of each paper represent the range of

---

[1] Dardis, "Military Accord, Media Discord," 415.
[2] The Liberal Party was one of the two major British political parties from the early 19th century until the 1920s, and a third party up to 1988, when it merged with the Social Democratic Party (the SDP) to form a new party which would become known as the Liberal Democrats. A new branch of the Liberal Party was formed in 1989 by a group of people who felt that the merger of the old Liberal Party with the Social Democratic Party to form the Liberal Democrats had ended the spirit of the Liberal Party, claiming that the new Liberal Democrat party was dominated by Social Democrats.
[3] Narasimhan Ravi, "Looking beyond Flawed Journalism," *Press/Politics* 10, no. 1 (2005): 57.
[4] Ibid.

journalistic philosophies and practices suitable for comparing the coverage of detainee abuse events in Iraq. The following section of this dissertation will further explore theoretical and methodological considerations that formed the basis of research design utilized in this study.

Framing as an Approach to News Media Analysis

The current study applied the framing approach to guide the comparison of news coverage of prisoner abuses by British and U.S. troops in Iraq. In an absence of the "objective standard" against which the media coverage of an event could be evaluated, a comparative approach presents a valid alternative to critically assess newspaper reports. By examining these differences and similarities, the framing approach attempts to deconstruct not only "what" the media are telling its readers to think, but also "how" the readers are to think about those issues.

The framing approach operates under the assumption that it is possible to tell many stories about the same events or issues. That is, a comparison of how the same events are reported in different countries can help identify the issues emphasized and omitted by the newspapers of different countries. This in turn can disclose evidence of ideological differences in media coverage. As Entman pointed out, "comparing media narratives of events that could have been reported similarly helps to reveal the critical textual choices that framed the story but would have otherwise remain submerged in an undifferentiated text. Unless narratives are compared, frames are difficult to detect fully and reliably, because many of the framing devices can appear as "natural, unremarkable choices of words or images."[1]

---

[1] Robert Entman, "Framing U.S. Coverage of International News," *Journal of Communication* 41, no. 4 (1991):

The following sections will provide a detail review of framing as a theory and a method of news analysis. It begins with the review of origins as well as major research developments of framing as an approach to the study of news media.

Overview of Framing Research

Erving Goffman introduced the framing approach in 1974 in his seminal work *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience*. Goffman credited psychologist Gregory Bateson with originating the metaphor. To Goffman, framing was an everyday activity that individuals engage in order to make sense of their surroundings.[1] The framing approach has been used to examine how the media frames influence individuals' information processing and cognitive activities. Although Goffman stated that all of us engage in the activity of framing, the effects of media frames have significant influence in forming public opinion in the information age when most people rely on the media to inform them about events and issues regardless of proximity.[2] Hence, framing has become an important approach to analyzing mediated political communication processes.

The most often cited definition of framing is the one offered by Entman who stated that "to frame is to select some aspects of a perceived reality and make them more salient in a communicating text, in such a way as to promote a particular problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation, and/or treatment recommendation."[3] Frames then "define

---

6.

[1] Erving Goffman, *Frame Analysis* (New York: Harper and Row, 1974), 7.

[2] According to PEW Research Centre study conducted in 2010, 66 percent of Americans use television for national and international news. Newspaper readership is declining from 34 percent to 31 percent of Americans reflecting the growth of the Internet—41 percent of the study participants use the Internet for their national and international news. Full report available at See http://people-press.org/2011/01/04/internet-gains-on-television-as-publics-main-news-source/

[3] Robert Entman, "Framing: Toward Clarification of a Fractured Paradigm," *Journal of Communication* 43

problems by determining what a causal agent is doing with what costs and benefits; diagnose causes by identifying the forces that create the problem; make moral judgments by evaluating causal agents and their effects, and suggest remedies by offering and justifying treatments for the problems."[1] To Gamson and Modigliani frame is "a central organizing idea … for making sense of relevant events, suggesting what is at issue."[2] Gitlin further elaborated that framing refers to "persistent patterns of cognition, interpretation and presentation, of selection, emphasis, and exclusion, by which symbol handlers routinely organize discourse."[3] As such, frames are not merely deeply held cognitive interpretations of events, but also strategic devices that can be actively selected and applied by politicians, journalists, and audiences to construct their own representations of a reality.

Further, Goffman suggested that frames help classify or define the situation by allowing users to "locate, perceive, identify, and label a seemingly infinite number of concrete occurrences defined in its limits."[4] Therefore, the frame is seen as a malleable and emergent mental construct. Hertog and McLeod highlighted that framing provides the context for the occurrence as "the frame used to interpret an event determines what available information is relevant."[5] Later, Hertog and McLeod revised their view of frames and described them as "comprehensive structures of meaning made up of a number of concepts and the relations among those concepts. Although each frame provides principles for the organization of social reality, frames are more than just principles. Frames have their own

---

(1993): 52.

[1] Ibid.

[2] William Gamson and Andre Modigliani, "Media Discourse and Public Opinion on Nuclear Power," *American Journal of Sociology* 95, no. 1 (1989): 3.

[3] Todd Gitlin, *The Whole World is Watching* (Berkley, CA: University of California Press, 1980), 7.

[4] Goffman, *Frame Analysis*. 21.

[5] James Hertog and Douglas McLeod, "Anarchists Wreak Havoc in Downtown Minneapolis," *Journalism & Mass Communication Monographs* 151 (1995): 4.

content, as well as a set of rules for the processing of new content."[1] Another way that news

frames have been explained is that "they give a story a spin."[2]

Stephen Reese emphasized that the word "frame" should be understood as both a

noun and a verb, and the process of framing should be studied as both an active process and a

result. Reese then defined frames as "organizing principles that are socially shared and

persistent over time, that work symbolically to meaningfully structure the social world."[3]

Reese's definition illuminates how framing is concerned with the way interests,

communicators, sources, and culture function together to help make sense of the world

around us. Similarly, Pan and Kosicki noted that variety in theoretical approaches to the

framing inquiry implies that it can be studied both as a strategy of constructing and

processing news, and as a characteristic of news discourse itself.[4] And even earlier, Gitlin

pointed out that media frames organize both the worlds of journalists who are constructing

news and audiences who rely on those news stories.[5]

Gamson, talking about manifest and latent content, emphasized that facts in a news

story "take on their meaning by being embedded in a frame story line that organizes them

and gives them coherence, selecting certain ones to emphasize while ignoring others."[6] He

suggested thinking of news as telling stories about the world, rather than as just presenting

information. Pan and Kosicki elaborated how the framing perspective acknowledges news

---

[1] James Hertog and Douglas McLeod, "A Multiperspectival Approach to Framing Analysis" in *Framing Public Life*, eds. Stephan Reese, Oscar Gandy, and August Grant (Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers, 2001), 140.

[2] Russell Neuman, Mariun Just, and Ann Crigler, *Common Knowledge* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), 120.

[3] Stephen Reese, "Prologue: Framing Public Life," in *Framing Public Life*, eds. Stephen Reese, Oscar Gandy, and August Grant (Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers, 2001), 11.

[4] Zhongdang Pan and Gerald Kosicki, "Framing Analysis," *Political Communication* 10 (1993): 57.

[5] Todd Gitlin, *The Whole World is Watching* (Berkley, CA: University of California Press, 1980), 7.

[6] William Gamson, "News as Framing," *American Behavioral Scientist* 33, no. 2 (1989): 157.

construction and consumption, which are processes embedded in shared beliefs about society.[1] Variables influencing news construction are: journalistic philosophies, rules, conventions, routines, and anticipated audiences' responses. Consumption of news is an active process of interpretation and reconstruction--when news reaches the audience, the text attributes (structural and lexical) will influence the decoding process, but it will still be the active, not passive consumption of news.[2]

Finally, the media framing concept is above all significant since it offers an alternative to the old "objectivity and bias" paradigm. In addition to offering a way to observe media content inadequacies in representing social reality, the framing approach helps to understand mass communication effects and offers alternatives for communication practitioners constructing media messages. Hackett argued that framing is a useful concept for the study of news ideology as it has the potential to get beneath the surface of news coverage and explore hidden assumptions.[3] Because of its holistic approach, framing analysis distinguishes itself from several other approaches to news analysis, such as agenda-setting or media bias traditions.[4]

Framing perspective is based on the assumption that it is possible to tell many different stories about the same event. Even though several stories about the same event can have the same facts, some of the facts will be used to emphasize one or the other frame. If the same facts are used in all potential frames then, according to Gamson, this information is the least important because it tells little about the meaning of the event.[5] More important are the

---

[1] Pan and Kosicki, "Framing Analysis," 57.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Robert Hackett, "Decline of a Paradigm?" *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 1, no. 3 (1984): 248.
[4] Stephen Reese, "The Framing Project," *Journal of Communication* 57 (2007): 151.
[5] William Gamson, "News as Framing," *American Behavioral Scientist* 33, no. 2 (1989): 158.

facts that reveal the implicit story line. Hence, frame analysis is about looking for omissions

as well as inclusions because sometimes what is missing in the story affects the way it is

framed and how it will be understood.

Researchers recognizing the significance of media framing effects investigated how

the media frames affect audiences. For example, Iyengar demonstrated that coverage of

social issues when presented around specific instances and individuals (episodic versus

thematic frames) encouraged attributions of responsibility of these problems to the people

featured in the media, not society as a whole.[1] Iyengar and Simon also tested how episodic

versus thematic reporting can affect the public's attitudes towards conflict. They found that

episodic coverage of the 1991 Gulf crisis strengthened a preference for punitive (military) as

opposed to diplomatic or economic remedies.[2]

One of the reasons that framing has an effect on public opinion is because people

remember some facts more if they have been repeated often by media. Availability theory

suggests that "people asses the frequency of the class or the probability of an event by the

ease with which instances or occurrences come to mind."[3] Combs and Slovic tested

availability theory in a mass communication context.[4] They found a positive correlation

between how often newspapers reported various causes of death, and people's inferences

concerning the frequency of such deaths.

Concurrently, scholars found media framing effects to be limited since people

receiving messages interpret those using preexisting meaning structures or schemas. Thus,

---

[1] Shanto Iyengar, *Is Anyone Responsible?* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991), 15.

[2] Shanto Iyengar and Adam Simon, "News Coverage of the Gulf Crisis and Public Opinion," *Communication Research* 20, no. 3 (1993): 365-383.

[3] Daniel Kahneman and Amos Tversky, "Judgment under Uncertainty," *Science* 185, no. 4157 (1974): 1127.

[4] Barbara Combs and Paul Slovic, "Causes of Death: Biased Newspaper Coverage," *Journalism Quarterly* 56 (1979): 837-843.

framing researchers incorporated the concept of schemata theories into the framing inquiry. Schemata also add to the complexity and confusion for theoretical categorization of framing research since even amongst the scholars using schemata a approach there is considerable disagreement about the precise definition of "schemata" and various other terms ("social scripts," "cognitive maps") used by scholars to examine information processing by audiences.[1]

In general, schematas perform several functions: they determine what information will be noticed, they help individuals organize and evaluate new information so that it fits into their established perceptions, they make it possible for the people to go beyond the information presented to them and fill in the missing information, and finally, they help to solve problems because they contain information about likely scenarios and ways to cope with them.

Several scholars analyzed how individuals' personal characteristics work with or against media framing efforts. Some have been concerned that, confronted with ample information, audiences would not be able to process it accordingly, and thus, as a result, political learning from the mass media may hinder publics' civic duties. For example, Graber in her 1988 book *Processing the News* explored how audiences process news and construct meaning using their cognitive representations or schemata. During the long term study with 168 registered voters in Evanston, Indiana, who were divided into five demographically different panels, Graber examined how their personality, experiences, life-style, and world views as well as the status of political and economic conditions, affected their processing of political information. She discovered that people usually have certain criteria for selecting

---

[1] Amos Tversky and Daniel Kahneman, "The Framing of Decisions and the Psychology of Choice," *Science* 211 (1981): 453-458.

and reflecting information based on their individual experiences, interests, and needs.[1]

Graber found that people did not use these criteria all the time, and even when scanning the

news, they were capable of becoming informed about current affairs. Specifically, people

knew how to cope with information overload and were able to balance their own information

needs with a moderate willingness to perform their civic duties. As such, voters "learn to

extract essential kernels of information from news stories while discarding much of the

chaff."[2]

Due to the complexity of the concept, researchers have approached framing from

numerous perspectives: sociological, psychological, cultural, rhetorical, narrative, or critical.

Driven by different research questions, researchers varied in both how they define framing

and which theoretical approaches they practiced. The following section will review the most

prominent theoretical conceptions of framing and will present the constructionist approach as

the most appropriate means to study news coverage of the detainee abuse scandals.

Theoretical Perspectives: An Argument for Constructionist Approach

The complexity of the framing concept is reflected in the multitude of ways in which

it has been conceptualized and studied. This resulted in an interesting discussion of the

"fractured paradigm."[3] D'Angelo, in his response to the "fractured paradigm" concern, made

a strong case for continuing with a variety of approaches to utilize framing and suggested

framing can follow three distinct theoretical and methodological standpoints: cognitivist,

---

[1] Doris Graber, *Processing the News* (New York: Longman, 1984), 96.
[2] Ibid., 97.
[3] Robert Entman, "Framing: Toward Clarification of a Fractured Paradigm," *Journal of Communication* 43 (1993): 51.

critical, and constructionist.[1] Scholars applying the cognitivist perspective are interested in how individuals' schemata influence news interpretation. Critical scholars approach media influences as hegemonic processes and attempt to deconstruct dominant frames in the media. Constructivists are interested in how the media socialize audiences by providing particular readings of issues. Though framing scholars often synthesize ideas from the three perspectives it is important for a researcher to articulate the paradigmatic image guiding her research. The following sections will give a brief overview of each of those paradigms.

Cognitivist Perspective

Within the cognitive paradigm, news frames are conceptualized as themes that create semantic associations within an individual's schemata. Cognitivists are interested in detecting thoughts that mirror propositions encoded in frames. The underlying assumption of cognitivist studies is based on the idea that individuals, when making decisions, formulating judgments, or expressing opinions, rely on accumulated information that is easily accessible. This information activates prior knowledge that helps them to make decisions and form interpretations.

Cognitivist studies find that journalists routinely use different frames about an issue or event within a single news item or among many stories to create meaning. The image of negotiation characterizes the cognitive paradigm. In that sense, news media make topics and frames accessible to individuals in order to influence their "trains of thought." Negotiation occurs at the point of contact between the frame and the individual's prior knowledge, which

---

[1] Paul D'Angelo, "News Framing as a Multiparadigmatic Research Program," *Journal of Communication* 52, no. 4 (2002): 870-889.

is theorized to exist as semantic nodal structures arrayed schematically in memory.[1]

In social science, much of early cognitivist development shows the influence of work of the Gestalt theorists who, unlike behaviorists, placed great emphasis on the importance of organizational processes in perception and learning. Therefore, according to cognitivists, for learning to occur, it must be incorporated within existing cognitive structures, and the new experience and prior knowledge must overlap.[2] In addition to analyzing how prior knowledge is activated, cognitivists are interested in how frames help to modify existing schematas, or how frames work in order to suggest a particular interpretation of an event or issue.[3]

Researchers in the cognitive paradigm often examine framing effects with experiments and design studies to detect slight variations in activated knowledge since they find that individuals can flexibly decode frames and use them to make decisions and judgments.

Critical Paradigm

Scholars who work within the critical paradigm clam that frames are outcomes of news gathering routines by which journalists convey information about issues and events from the perspective of values held by political and economic elites.[4] These frames are thought to dominate news coverage, and, in turn, they are also believed to dominate audience interpretation of events. Thus, this perspective is characterized by the images of power and

---

[1] See for example Graber, *Processing the News.*

[2] Daniel Kahneman and Amos Tversky, "Choice, Values, and Frames," *American Psychologist* 39 (1984): 341-350.

[3] Woong Rhee, "Strategy and Issue Frames in Election Campaign Coverage," *Journal of Communication* 47, no. 3 (1997): 26-48.

[4] See Todd Gitlin, *The Whole World is Watching* (Berkley, CA: University of California Press, 1980); Robert Hackett and Yuezhi Zhao, "Challenging a Master Narrative," *Discourse & Society* 5, no. 4 (October 1994): 509-541; Gaye Tuchman, *Making News* (New York: Free Press, 1978); Stephen Reese and Bob Buckalew, "The Militarism of Local Television," *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 12 (1995): 40-59.

domination. Critical scholars believe that frames are linked to hegemonic processes that limit the range of public debate. An example of ideological powers at work in the U.S. media is provided in the study by Keshishian on how the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post* reported on two earthquakes--the Armenian earthquake of December 7, 1988, and the Iranian earthquake of June 21, 1990.[1] These two events were similar but took place in countries of contrasting political relations with the United States. At the time of the earthquake, Armenia was one of the republics in the former Soviet Union, where glasnost and perestroika were well under way. As a result, U.S. relations with Armenia and the Soviet Union were improving. On the other hand, at the time of the Iranian earthquake, relations with Iran had been contentious since the 1979 Iranian revolution and the taking of American hostages. Although the author's study did not specifically pertain to news framing, her analysis of the discursive practices of the news stories identified not only what was reported about each earthquake, but why the socio-political environment at the time determined how the two earthquakes were reported differently. Both newspapers treated the Armenian earthquake with more sympathy. This was evident in the greater amount of news reports, and also the more compassionate language used to describe the events.

Overall, critical scholars argue that news organizations select some information and intentionally omit other information so that different frames either will not exist, or what is selected will foster a single viewpoint that is supportive of the status quo. Critical scholars do not treat political power as being distributed in a pluralistic way, and they believe that many political views should be made available to the public. Also, critical scholars (contrary to cognitivists) believe that media organizations intentionally omit certain information to

---

[1] Flora Keshishian, "Political Bias and Nonpolitical News," *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 14 (1997): 332-343.

promote a single point supporting the status quo. This contrasts with cognitivist scholars who believe that journalists routinely create different meaningful frames about an issue or event within a single news frame. Critical scholars often measure public opinion in the aggregate to show how it is swayed by frames.

Constructionist Perspective

This study proposes to use the constructivist approach to analyze the media response to prisoner abuse cases. The constructionist perspective considers journalists as information processors who create "'interpretive packages' of the positions of politically invested 'sponsors'."[1] From this perspective, the media engage in story construction by both reflecting and adding to the "issue culture" of the topic.[2] As a result, the media create frames that might be biased toward the views of their sources. This is particularly relevant for the study of war coverage as prior research showed that heavy reliance on military sources promote a military framework.[3]

Constructionists do not see source selection as a process of media hegemony; rather they believe news organizations limit the range of information about a topic because journalists judge that there are few credible sources.[4] Hence, understanding journalism philosophies and journalistic routines is an important aspect of constructionist research. A paradigmatic image of co-optation supports constructionist framing research. Contrary to the

---

[1] Paul D'Angelo, "News Framing as a Multiparadigmatic Research Program," *Journal of Communication* 52, no. 4 (2002): 877.
[2] William Gamson and Andre Modigliani, "Media Discourse and Public Opinion on Nuclear Power," *American Journal of Sociology* 95, no. 1 (1989): 1-37.
[3] Stephen Reese and Bob Buckalew, "The Militarism of Local Television," *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 12 (1995): 40-59.
[4] Paul D'Angelo, "News Framing as a Multiparadigmatic Research Program," *Journal of Communication* 52, no. 4 (2002): 877.

critical paradigm's image of domination, the co-option image allows constructionists to see frames as a "tool kit" from which media readers can draw in order to form their opinions about issues. Constructionists also acknowledge that even though media may be able to construct multiple interpretations and explanations of events, inevitably, each text is subjected to what Stuart Hall explained as the "preferred reading" phenomenon, which occurs when dominant ideology is inscribed in a media text.[1] In a process, framing might result in misrepresenting communities, constricting political awareness of individuals, thwarting the aims of social movements groups, and setting parameters for policy debates not necessarily in agreement with democratic norms.[2]

Constructionists examine news not as an objective portrait of reality, but as a socially constructed product which derives its meaning in the social sphere.[3] In this sense, constructionists approach framing as a cultural phenomenon arguing that frames can not be separated from the large social context of news construction and consumption.[4] In fact, constructionists are concerned with how frames get embedded in media content, how they work, to promote particular interpretations of events and how they interact with journalists and audiences schematas.[5] Reese's definition of frames as "organizing principles" that

---

[1] Stuart Hall, "Encoding/Decoding," in *Culture, Media, Language*, eds. Stuart Hall, Dorothy Hobson and Andy Lowe (London: Hutchinson, 1980), 136.

[2] Paul D'Angelo, "News Framing as a Multiparadigmatic Research Program," *Journal of Communication* 52, no. 4 (2002): 877.

[3] For more detail discussion on constructionism see Peter Berger and Thomas Luckman, *The Social Construction of Reality* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1966) or Gaye Tuchman, *Making News* (New York: Free Press, 1978).

[4] See for example the following studies: James Hertog and Douglas McLeod, "Anarchists Wreak Havoc in Downtown Minneapolis," *Journalism & Mass Communication Monographs* 151 (1995): 1-48; Baldwin Van Gorp, "The Constructionist Approach to Framing," *Journal of Communication* 57, no. 1 (2007): 60-78; Baldwin Van Gorp, "The Influx of Refugees Bordered by Frames," (paper prepared for presentation at the theme session "Communication in Borderlands" of the 2003 annual meeting of the International Communication Association, May 23 – 27, at San Diego, CA, USA.)

[5] Van Gorp, "The Constructionist Approach to Framing," 61.

structure a social world of the audiences is central to the constructionist perspective.[1] That is, constructionists are concerned how central concepts of the frame emerge from myths, narratives, and metaphors that resonate within the culture. Constructionists argue that myths, narratives, and metaphors have symbolic power which may activate a series of ideas, experiences, and feelings that members of a society know and can relate to. When media rely on widespread recognition of frames they gain the power to create and communicate meanings that are accepted and understood by individuals within a specific culture.[2]

Ultimately, constructionists are concerned with examining "the typical manner in which journalists shape news content within a familiar frame of reference and according to some latent structure of meaning and, on the other hand, to the audience who adopts these frames and sees the world in a similar way as the journalists do."[3]

Consequently, in order to explain why a particular news frame dominates, one needs to undertake analysis of the historical context, news routines, newsroom culture, and political environment in which the story was produced.[4] In other words, one cannot study news in a vacuum. The study of news frames and how they are constructed and consumed requires a broad understanding of historical, political, cultural, and economic determinants of news media processes.

In order to study this interplay between the media frames and audience interpretation media scholars utilizing constructionist perspective adopted various methodological approaches which will be outlined in the next section.

---

[1] Stephen Reese, "The Framing Project," *Journal of Communication* 57 (2007): 150.
[2] For more detail review of how culture impacts frames and their power see See Baldwin Van Gorp, "The Constructionist Approach to Framing," *Journal of Communication* 57, no. 1 (2007): 61
[3] Van Gorp, "The Constructionist Approach to Framing," 61
[4] Christopher Hanson, "The Power of the Story: Narrative Analysis as a Tool for Studying the News" (paper presented at the annual meeting of Association for Educators in Journalism and Mass Communication, New Orleans, Louisiana, August, 1999).

Framing as a Method for Analyzing News Coverage

Although framing as a research approach has been praised for merging both quantitative and qualitative content analysis, different ways in how media frames can be detected resulted in some confusion as to which methods qualify for the framing approach and which ones are quantitative/qualitative content analyses used to detect other media effects such as priming or agenda-setting.[1] Scholars describe their methods used to detect media frames as content analysis, textual analysis, rhetorical analysis, narrative analysis, or discourse analysis. Scheufele observed that some of the methods are even incompatible with each other.[2]

The different goals and objectives of research usually dictate which methods are appropriate. As with any study of media content, framing is susceptible to the limitations of both quantitative and qualitative approaches. Critics of quantitative content analysis argue that it puts too much emphasis on comparing the frequency of items' appearance.[3] They argue that in some instances an appearance of one single symbol may have a crucial impact on the message. Qualitative content analysis may face the limitation of the researcher reading too much into the message content and failing to understand the message as the audience would read it.

Researchers approaching media content analysis also discover the distinction between "manifest" and "latent" content. Analysis of manifest content assumes that with the message "what you see is what you get." Latent analysis is "reading between the lines." Another way

---

[1] Stephen Reese, "The Framing Project," *Journal of Communication* 57 (2007): 151.
[2] Dietram Scheufele, "Framing as a Theory of Media Effects," *Journal of Communication* 49, no. 4 (1999): 103-122.
[3] Daniel Riffe, Stephen Lacy, Frederick Fico, *Analyzing Media Messages* (Mahwah, NJ, 2005), 36.

manifest meaning is understood is that it involves denotative meaning--the meaning most people apply to given symbols. Latent or connotative meaning refers to meaning given to symbols by individuals. In attempting to avoid the connotative interpretations, content analysis researchers often use multiple coders to apply the same rules to examine the content. Gamson suggested that framing is the one approach able to at least partially bridge manifest and latent distinctions.[1] That is, frames are understood as manifestation of latent content. In addition, when analyzing news content, researchers most often focus on the intent of the sender.

Although framing researchers recognize that there can be multiple senders and multiple frames within one story, they seek out the preferred reading of the news. As a result, framing researchers (as well as other scholars engaged in content analysis) have to address the issues of reliability and validity in their analysis. In order to address this, researchers often begin with identifying framing devices which constitute media frame.

Framing Devices: Tools to Detect Media Frames

Literature identifies three different ways to determine and measure frames: the media package, multidimensional, and list of frames.[2] The media package presents the keywords and common language that help to identify a particular frame. For example, Gamson and Modigliani took language from pamphlets and other writings by advocates of nuclear power as representative of "progress" and composed a paragraph description or "the package" of the

---

[1] William Gamson, "News as Framing," *American Behavioral Scientist* 33, no. 2 (1989): 158.
[2] James Tankard, "The Empirical Approach to the Study of Media Framing," in *Framing Public Life*, eds. Stephen Reese, Oscar Gandy, and August Grant (Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates), 95-105.

core frame.[1] The package then serves as shorthand, making it possible to display the frame as metaphor, catchphrase, or other symbolic device.

The multidimensional approach to measuring media frames conceptualizes framing as involving various elements or dimensions of stories. Pan and Kosicki's constructionist approach would fall under this category as they identified several devices: syntactical structures, script structures, thematic structures, and rhetorical structures.[2] Both the media package and multidimensional approaches are most often used to find a particular frame present in media coverage. Reese and Buckalew's study of coverage of the Gulf War on local TV news in Austin, Texas, falls under this category as they suggested that frames can be embedded in source, story construction, visual imagery, editing and linguistic elements.[3] They paid particular attention to the source of the story since they approach news framing from the routines approach. According to Shoemaker and Reese, the routines of newsgathering within local television can affect news content.[4] In particular, heavy reliance on military sources for the Persian Gulf War coverage would be promoting a military framework. Similarly, Yang analyzed how the Kosovo War was framed in the U.S. and China and examined the media frames through the study of placement, keywords, metaphors, symbols, sources, and topics.[5] Another example of the multidimensional approach to studying frames in the coverage of international conflict is provided by McCoy and Atwood.[6]

---

[1] William Gamson and Andre Modigliani, "Media Discourse and Public Opinion on Nuclear Power," *American Journal of Sociology* 95, no. 1 (1989): 1-37.

[2] Zhongdang Pan and Gerald Kosicki, "Framing Analysis," *Political Communication* 10 (1993): 55-75.

[3] Stephen Reese and Bob Buckalew, "The Militarism of Local Television," *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 12 (1995): 55.

[4] Pamela Shoemaker and Stephen Reese, *Mediating the Message*, 2nd ed. (White Plains, N.Y.: Longman, 1996).

[5] Jin Yang, "Framing the NATO Air Strikes on Kosovo Across Countries," *Gazette* 65, no. 3 (2003): 231-249.

[6] Kelley McCoy and Rita Atwood, "The Portrayal of Israelis and Palestinians in the New York Times During the First Six Months of the Intifada, December 1987--May 1988" (paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Educators in Journalism and Mass Communication, Anaheim, CA, August, 1996),

They examined the portrayal of Israelis and Palestinians in the *New York Times* during the Intifada, or Palestinian uprising. Although their study was not labeled as framing, it gives insight into how one can use in-depth content textual analysis which can be quantifiable so that large amounts of text can be examined. In particular, McCoy and Atwood examined each story on the Intifada according to whether it focused on the Israeli leaders and people or Palestinian leaders and people.

The list of frames approach was suggested by Tankard and in this case, a researcher identifies a number of possible frames for a particular news subject.[1] To assist coders with the content analysis, each frame would be defined in terms of specific keywords, catchphrases, and images. In addition, Tankard's list of frames approach involves giving specific attention to 11 framing mechanisms: headlines, subheads, photographs, leads, selection of sources, selection of quotes, graphics, statistics, pull quotes, concluding statements. Tankard explained that the list of frames approach is influenced by agenda-setting research where agenda setting researchers were thinking in terms of lists of issues. The difference, however, is that the framing approach is more interested in *how* rather than *what* is presented in the news. Both the list of frames and the media package approaches focus on how the issue is defined by inclusion and exclusion of certain elements.

Although the distinction between the three methodological approaches is useful for the purposes of the literature review, each study design is dictated by the focus of the study, the particular research questions posed and the data available for analysis. What is clear from the review of different methodologies is that the researcher has many tools at her disposal.

---

http://list.msu.edu/cgi-bin/wa?S1=AEJMC (accessed April, 14 1999).
[1] James Tankard, "The Empirical Approach to the Study of Media Framing," in *Framing Public Life*, eds. Stephen Reese, Oscar Gandy, and August Grant (Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates), 95-105.

For the purposes of this study, two different approaches were used: the "media package" approach was combined with the "multidimensional" approach. More specifically, Pan and Kosicki's approach to determining framing devices through the five structures of news discourse were used for this dissertation. The specific research design of deconstructing news texts and identifying media frames will be explored in the next chapter. The final section of this chapter will draw on Entman's comparative study in order to pose the specific research questions appropriate for the study of the coverage of detainee abuse in the U.S. and U.K. newspapers. Though Entman's theoretical paradigm draws from the critical perspective, this dissertation utilizes Entman's comparative approach to highlight the constructionist paradigm of the framing approach.

Comparative Study as Model for Analysis of Detainee Abuse Coverage

As Entman pointed out, the sheer number and variety of framing studies and methodologies results in the lack of theoretical rigor in news framing analysis.[1] He implied that resolving fragmentation in the concept of framing might contribute to the creation of core knowledge for the communication studies discipline. Entman called for "a general statement of framing theory that shows exactly how frames become embedded within and make themselves manifest in a text."[2] In other words, framing analysis should be focused on how frames are created to "promote problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation, and /or treatment recommendation"[3] with the overall intention to further an

---

[1] Robert Entman, "Framing: Toward Clarification of a Fractured Paradigm," *Journal of Communication*, 43 (1993): 51-58.
[2] Ibid., 51.
[3] Ibid., 52.

understanding of "the power of a communicating text."[1] One of the ways to develop a more precise understanding of framing is to develop continuity and consistency in framing research methods. More guidance on how these frames can be detected is in Entman's earlier work in which he compares and contrasts how the U.S. media framed two events: the shooting down of the Korean Air flight in 1983 and the Iran Air flight in 1988.[2]

Entman found that the Iran Air incident did not receive as much coverage as the KAL incident. Entman distinguished that, in relation to the four salient aspects of the text (responsibility, identification, categorization and generalization), the newspapers formed different ways of reasoning about the two events, although both events did not necessarily require different judgments since in both instances nearly 300 innocent civilians died because of military actions. In particular, Entman found that in the case of the Korean airplane the responsible agent was identified as the Soviets, or Moscow, implying that the Soviet government caused the accident. Agency was downplayed or altogether missing in coverage of the Iran Air incident. He found that in case of the Korean incident, the victims were humanized; while Iranian victims were much less visible. For example, when covering the Korean tragedy, CBS showed pictures of victims and grieving relatives. In covering the Iran Air story, the media produced fewer reports empathizing with the victims, making it more of a story about technology and human errors. Also, the Korean incident was categorized as criminal and evil, as opposed to the Iranian event which was labeled as an accident. Finally, the Korean incident was generalized and used as a symbol of Soviet government and culture. In the coverage of the Iranian incident, generalizations about the U.S. were absent.

---

[1] Ibid., 51.
[2] Robert Entman, "Framing U.S. Coverage of International News," *Journal of Communication* 41, no. 4 (1991): 6-27.

The following is the list of questions that this dissertation answered using Entman's comparative approach to deconstruct how framing was used to depict the media interpretation of detainee abuse cases:

1. What was the salience of the prisoner treatment story in the newspapers selected for analysis? That is, how important was the issue of detainee abuse in terms of the volume it received in the coverage? What topics and issues were covered and which ones were omitted?

2. Who or what was portrayed as the responsible agents? Were the media attributing responsibility for abuse to the system (interrogation policies and procedures set by the administrations) or the actions of just a few deviant individuals? How was the attribution of responsibility constructed through the use of episodic and thematic reporting?

3. Were readers encouraged or discouraged to identify with the people in the news stories? That is, how were the abused detainees portrayed? How were the soldiers who committed the abuses portrayed? What other newsmakers emerged in the coverage and how were they portrayed?

4. How were the acts categorized? That is, did the coverage promote certain kinds of moral judgments and evaluation? Specifically, how were the events named and explained? When explaining the events, what kinds of explanations received prominence in the coverage?

5. What conclusions and generalizations were drawn from the abuse about the nature of the two countries? Also, what conclusions were offered about the role of the media in bringing the abuse to light?

The first question relates to how much coverage the detainee abuse received and addresses the media priming and agenda setting effects.[1] The second question relates to the placement of blame that resonates throughout Iyengar's work and suggests that episodic reporting encourages the public to place blame on those who were abused. [2] The last three questions are designed to deconstruct the media framing structures that "promote a particular problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation, and/or treatment recommendation."[3] Specific methodological considerations of the constructionist framing approach will be addressed in the next chapter of this dissertation.

---

[1] See studies by Shanto Iyengar, "Television News and Issue Salience" *American Politics Quarterly* 7, no. 4 (1979): 395-416; Maxwell McCombs and Donald Shaw, "The Agenda-Setting Function of Mass Media," *Public Opinion Quarterly* 36 (Summer 1972): 176-187; Denis McQuail, *Mass Communication Theory*. 4th ed. (London: Sage, 2000); Dietram Scheufele, "Agenda-Setting, Priming, and Framing Revisited," *Mass Communication & Society* 3, no. 2/3 (2000): 297-316.

[2] Shanto Iyengar, *Is Anyone Responsible?* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991).

[3] Robert Entman, "Framing: Toward Clarification of a Fractured Paradigm," *Journal of Communication*, 43 (1993): 52.

CHAPTER 3

METHOD

This dissertation took the constructivist framing approach to compare how four newspapers--the *New York Times*, the *Washington Post*, the *Guardian* and the *Times* (London)--covered abuses by troops from the two primary coalition forces operating in Iraq. Methodologically the dissertation combines quantitative methods with the interpretative nature of qualitative methods. More specifically, this dissertation deconstructs the structural, syntactical, linguistic, and rhetorical as well as reasoning devices of the framing of that coverage. The existence of several approaches to deconstructing media frames allows for flexibility in arriving at an appropriate research. This chapter outlines the design of the study, as well as the process by which the significant frames were identified and defined and how the coverage was then analyzed and how the data produced by that analysis was processed.

The chapter has three parts. Part one describes how the parameters of the study design were set, including the rationale for selection of these newspapers, explanation of the unit of analysis, identification of the time period for which coverage would be reviewed, and finally description of the process by which stories were included in or excluded from the study sample. Part two describes how the constructivist approach to framing was operationalized for the purposes of this research. This includes how the frames present in the coverage were identified and the labels and definitions for those frames. Part three describes how the quantitative and qualitative content analysis instrument was developed and then used to systematically record characteristics of the news reports as well as identify which frames appeared in which stories and how the data produced by that process was then analyzed.

Study Design

Newspapers

The study focused solely on newspaper coverage (as opposed to other media formats) because printed news provides an opportunity for in-depth examination into how the story of detainee abuses was presented to the public and because policy makers, opinion leaders, and broadcasters primarily turn to newspapers for much of their international news. For example, Van Belle suggested the *New York Times* serves as an indicator of salience in the news media.[1] Robinson noted that print media due to their tendency to express overt political opinions are more potent in influencing public elites.[2] According to Pew, general public, though turning to television and the Internet for their local news, name the newspapers as an important source for national and international news.[3]

The four newspapers that have been selected for analysis--the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post* from the United States, and the *Times* (London) and the *Guardian* from Great Britain--are the prestige newspapers in their respective countries.[4] The four newspapers also represent a range of newspaper genres (types) based on their different audiences, journalistic philosophies, and formats. A more detailed discussion of the newspaper profiles was provided in the previous chapter.

---

[1] Douglas Van Belle, "Bureaucratic Responsiveness to the News Media," *Political Communication* 20, no. 3 (2003): 274.

[2] Piers Robinson, *The CNN Effect* (London: Routledge, 2002), 2-3.

[3] Pew Research Center, "Press Accuracy Rating Hits Two Decade Low. Public Evaluations of the News Media: 1985-2009," *Pew Research Center*, September 13, 2009, under "Survey Reports," http://people-press.org/report/543/ (accessed July, 2, 2010).

[4] Abbas Malek, "New York Times Editorial Position and U.S. Foreign Policy," in *News Media and Foreign Relations*, ed. Abbas Malek (Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 1996); John Merrill, *Global Journalism* (New York: Longman, 1983); John Merrill, "The Global Elite," *Global Journalist,* January 1, 2000, under "Stories," http://www.globaljournalist.org/stories/2000/01/01/the-global-elite/ (accessed August 10, 2006); John Merrill and Harold Fisher, *The World's Great Dailies* (New York: Hastings House, 1980); Sophia Peterson, "International News Selection by the Elite Press," *Public Opinion Quarterly* 45, no. 2 (1981): 143-163.

Unit of Analysis

The unit of analysis is the text of each of the news stories included in the sample. Although the dramatic images were a big part of how abuses were brought to light, this study does not include analysis of any the visual images that accompanied the news articles. Contrary to what previous research and common sense suggest about the power of pictures, an experiment conducted by Fulwider, Greenhill and Weaver suggested that written narratives, not the Abu Ghraib photographs, caused stronger emotional reactions from the public.[1] Interestingly, when the study differentiated between the less disturbing and more disturbing depictions of violence, it was the less disturbing category in both picture and prose that resulted in a stronger influence on participants' opinion about violence and torture.[2] Namely, participants exposed to the less disturbing depictions were less likely to endorse torture. Whether this is due to social distancing or the nature of human imagination, the authors suggested that "mental images" that are formed as a result of reading a narrative have a stronger staying power to affect a person's opinion. Their findings resonate with Eisenman's discussion on how current society has been desensitized to visual images of violence, power and nudity.[3] Therefore, focusing specifically on how written narratives of abuse were constructed by the media presents an important research opportunity.

By focusing on a textual analysis of news discourse this study examines how media are creating frames which, in turn, influence how the audience interprets the message. By the choice of specific words to depict both the victims and the abusers media accounts encourage

---

[1] John Fulwider, Kelly Greenhill and David Weaver, "The Power of Pictures? Preliminary Evidence from the Case of Abu Ghraib" (paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, IL, April 12-15, 2007).
[2] Fulwider, Greenhill and Weaver, "The Power of Pictures," 23.
[3] Stephen Eisenman, *The Abu Ghraib Effect* (London, UK: Reakton Books, 2007).

readers to empathize with either the detainees or the coalition soldiers. Media demonstrate the power to place responsibility on either the individuals accused of abusing prisoners or their government, and thus judgments of guilt or innocence may be formed.[1] Further, by selectively labeling military actions as either "abuse," "torture," or "misconduct," media provide different explanations for why the abuse happened and suggest different remedies for the issue.

<div align="center">Time Period</div>

The newspaper coverage chosen for analysis began on April 29, 2004 and ended May 14, 2004. The start date of April 29, 2004, was chosen because it was the day following the CBS's *60 Minutes II* exposé of the abuses at Abu Ghraib. The decision to analyze sixteen days of coverage was made based on an in-depth analysis of the "life" of the abuse stories. To determine what timeframe was appropriate, the researcher used a LexisNexis Academic guided news search to identify the articles related to detainee abuse coverage in the four selected newspapers from April 29, 2004, through the end of that year. Tabulations of the number of stories indicated that the bulk of coverage occurred during the first three months after the story broke (see Table 1). Since three months of coverage by the four newspapers would have produced an unmanageably large sample, further examination identified an optimal length of time--one that would be manageable and intellectually viable. As mentioned, the sixteen-day period after the Abu Ghraib scandal broke (April 29, 2004--May 14, 2004) produced a fruitful sample for analysis. Analyzing a shorter period of coverage would have missed key developments in the story, while anything longer would have made

---

[1] Shanto Iyengar, *Is Anyone Responsible?* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991).

the data set unmanageable.

Table 1. LexisNexis Academic guided news search results using key term "Abu Ghraib"

Newspaper	6 months	3 months	16 days
New York Times	723	556	115
Washington Post	612	462	119
Guardian	242	175	81
Times	238	196	111
Total	1815	1389	426

The sixteen days selected for the content analysis are important because they encompass both the coverage of the U.S. scandal and coverage of the charges against British troops. This is significant because the broadcasting of charges against the Americans prompted journalists to reconsider the British charges and ultimately dub that incident the "British Abu Ghraib." In addition to the principal stories themselves, this period includes the British tabloid *Daily Mirror's* publication of faked photographs ostensibly picturing British soldiers abusing prisoners.[1] Although the pictures in question were identified as fabrications, the incident triggered an important media debate about the ethics of publishing images of humiliation and torture, particularly when showing them might have placed coalition troops in danger. In conjunction with the *Daily Mirror* photograph hoax the media rediscovered the genuine photographs of British prisoner abuse that had been exposed in March 2003 but generally ignored by the media at that time. Moreover, the period included the coverage of preparation for the first courts-martial of those charged with the abuse. The study sample ends just after the beheading of Nick Berg--an act which Islamic militants proclaimed to be their response to the Abu Ghraib abuses. The next section will provide further details on the number and nature of stories that were selected for analysis.

---

[1] Rupert Hamer, "Brit Troops In Iraq Abuse Shame: We'll Get Scum," *Sunday Mirror*, May 2, 2004.

Sample Selection

The study sample was identified through a guided search using Lexis Nexis

Academic database. The following key terms were used to identify the articles: Iraq, U.S.

soldiers, American soldiers, British soldiers, prisoners, Abu Ghraib, abuse, torture, and

mistreatment. As Table 2 indicates, initial search for the 16 day period produced 426

newspaper articles (see Appendix C for sample search results produced using different time

and keyword parameters). Stories from all sections of the newspapers were considered for

inclusion, but the number of articles was narrowed down after a careful reading determined

which articles did not fit the parameters and purposes of the study. For example, articles that

briefly mentioned prisoner and detainee treatment by coalition forces but did not make these

topics their primary focus were eliminated. To illustrate, a number of articles focused

primarily on election campaigns in the U.S. and the U.K., but mentioned detainee abuse

within the context of the elections. If abuse of detainees by coalition forces was not the focus

of the article, even though it was briefly mentioned, those stories were excluded from

analysis.

Table 2. The number of articles on detainee abuse published during the time period 4/29/2004--5/14/2004

	Articles included for analysis	*Editorials/Letters /Commentary*	*Abuse not a focus/articles less than 100 words*	*Total*
New York Times	69	29	17	115
Washington Post	72	31	16	119
Guardian	58	18	5	81
Times	62	35	14	111
Total	261	113	52	426

Another set of articles excluded from analysis were short news briefs and short news stories, of 100 words or fewer, that are typically excluded from framing studies.[1] Finally, all editorial and commentary material was excluded from analysis because, by their very nature, such pieces are deliberately and explicitly framed to suggest a particular interpretation of events, making analysis superfluous for the purposes of this study.

Only those articles that focused directly on prisoner treatment in Iraq by the coalition forces and the consequent coverage of the U.S. and U.K. governments' reactions, policies, and investigative efforts were included in the sample. Table 2 shows the number of articles that were excluded and included in the data sample for analysis. The final sample contains 69 articles from the *New York Times*, 72 from the *Washington Post*, 58 from the *Guardian*, and 62 from the *Times* (London), totaling 261 news articles.

In addition to assessing coverage patterns and volume, the first stage of the analysis included a close reading of stories from each of the papers. This reading served multiple purposes. First, the information gleaned from the stories contributed both to the development of the project's background section and produced insights about the kinds of journalistic issues that arose as the result of the development in the story. Second, this reading began the process of compiling a list of possible frames appearing in the news articles. Finally, the analysis helped establish the categories for inclusion on the coding instrument as well as the description and explanation of these categories.

---

[1] Daniela Dimitrova and Jesper Stromback, "Mission Accomplished," *Gazette* 67, no. 5 (2005): 408.

Frame Identification and Definition

Methodological considerations in this dissertation study were guided by the constructionist perspective on news framing and consumption. The research began with inductive compilation of an inventory of frames on the basis of preliminary reading of the research sample as well as an exhaustive review of literature dealing with framing. The researcher subsequently determined through the deductive process to what extent these devices were present in the data set. This constitutes a heuristic approach to news media research whereby the researcher records a series of manifest variables of news content that in turn represent a latent concept--an abstract frame.[1] This section explores the process by which the key frames were identified. It begins with explaining the framing and reasoning devices used by constructionist framing researchers to identify frames, and it provides a description of each of the frames that emerged as dominant frames in the coverage of Iraqi abuse scandal.

A close reading of the coverage led to the early classification of a set of key frames appropriate to the study: events, investigations, systemic responsibility, individual responsibility, diagnostic, prognostic, human interest, image, and media reflexivity. While these frames derive from the coverage, they are also compatible with those used in studies which provide key points of reference for this research.[2] Each of these frames was then operationalized using Pan and Kosicki's framing devices approach, which included describing the script structures, thematic structures, syntactical structures, the rhetorical

---

[1] Baldwin Van Gorp, "The Constructionist Approach to Framing," *Journal of Communication* 57, no. 1 (2007): 78.

[2] See Daniela Dimitrova and Jesper Stromback, "Mission Accomplished," *Gazette* 67, no. 5 (2005): 399-417; Robert Entman, "Framing U.S. Coverage of International News," *Journal of Communication* 41, no. 4 (1991): 6-27; Zhongdang Pan and Gerald Kosicki, "Framing Analysis," *Political Communication* 10 (1993): 55-75.

structures as well as lexical choices and sources that would be associated with each frame.[1]

Reasoning devices were examined as causal statements or implicit statements which according to Van Gorp work together with discursive elements of the text to produce a "frame package."[2] This means that each frame could be described as a package of specific sorts of facts and information that occurred together and constituted a whole. In fact, by the end of the inductive phase of the research, each frame could be described by examples of several representative framing and reasoning devices. This study particularly considered the fact that how stories are framed is affected by what sources reporters use for their stories and, thus, story sources were also coded. The elaboration of each of these coding categories is described in more detail in the following paragraphs.

During the inductive process that led to the development of the framing classification system, each frame was defined in terms of *script structures* or narrative components. Scripts help journalists construct their stories and readers interpret them. As Pan and Kosicki suggested, script structures can often be determined by the five *Ws* and the *H* of the news writing format: who, what, when, where, why, and how. In many cases the five *Ws* and the *H* are deployed to differentiate events (episodic) versus investigative (issue/thematic) approaches to reporting--episodic coverage tends to overlook the "why" while issue or thematic coverage tends to be more complete. Given the topic, the differences between the events and investigative approaches to reporting are so distinct and fundamental that these approaches themselves determined which frames were possible in the coverage of prisoner abuse by coalition troops in Iraq. In other words, the five *W*s and the *H* script structure

---

[1] Zhongdang Pan and Gerald Kosicki, "Framing Analysis," *Political Communication* 10 (1993): 55-75.
[2] Baldwin Van Gorp, "The Constructionist Approach to Framing," *Journal of Communication* 57, no. 1 (2007): 71.

played such big part in the reporting that these choices often corresponded with whether the

newspapers conformed, or challenged how the administrations of the two countries were

presenting the events in Iraq. That is, following Iyengar's research, this study also confirmed

that the events approach to reporting is inclined to place blame on individuals while the

investigative approach looks at the larger context of why the abuse occurred.[1]

The reasoning underlying the coverage was examined by deconstructing *thematic*

structures of text. Thematic structures represent a hierarchy of subthemes or reasoning

devices connected through background information, episodes, and empirical data presented

by sources and journalists' observations.[2] Thematic structures represent a hypothesis-testing

feature of news reports, therefore reasoning devices often appear in the "*if... then*" format.

For instance, reporters sometimes addressed stories about Abu Ghraib by exploring the

prisoner abuse in the context of the training the reserves had or had not been given prior to

their arrival in Baghdad. This falls into what Entman considered one of the four major

functions of framing: problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation and/or

treatment recommendation.[3] In this research, reasoning devices were a dominant means of

making sense of individual versus systemic responsibility frames as well as diagnostic,

prognostic, image, and media reflexivity frames.

In some instances, frames were determined by *syntactical structures*, or rules

newspapers follow in constructing the sequential structural parts of the story: headline, lead,

body of the story--including episodes and background--and closure. According to Pan and

Kosicki, placement of expert quotes and empirical data may be effective framing devices in a

---

[1] Shanto Iyengar, *Is Anyone Responsible?* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991), 3.
[2] See Pan and Kosicki, "Framing Analysis," 60 or Van Gorp, "The Constructionist Approach," 72.
[3] Robert Entman, "Framing: Toward Clarification of a Fractured Paradigm," *Journal of Communication*, 43 (1983): 52.

way that they give validity to a certain point of view and marginalize other perspectives or points of view.[1] Professional conventions in news writing, especially in U.S. journalism, dictate that news articles be organized in the form of an inverted pyramid, beginning with the most potent elements at the top of the pyramid. Often, framing effects result in incongruence between the frames that appear in different structural parts of the story. Because the headline and the lead are written by different people, the possibility exists that they will offer different frames for the story and activate different interpretations in the readers' minds. This research project paid particular attention to syntactical structures in cases where news article included contradictory news frames. On some occasions even examination of syntactical structures was not helpful in determining which one of the frames was dominant, and the article was coded as applying several frames even if the frames were incongruent. More of these instances appeared in the U.S. newspapers than in the U.K. newspapers.

Frames were also determined by *rhetorical structures*--stylistic choices such as metaphors, catchphrases, and labels made by journalists. The goal of rhetorical devices is to "invoke images, increase salience of a point, and increase vividness or a report."[2] Gamson and Modigliani included visual images in this category as well. However, images were not the focus of this research.[3] Phrases such as "a few bad apples" or "the gloves are off" or "Gitmotize Abu Ghraib" are examples of rhetorical devices that showed up in coverage used to enlist a particular interpretation of an event.

One of the most important rhetorical considerations for this research was the labeling of the events. Lexical choices of words or labels may have various levels of influence. For

---

[1] Pan and Kosicki, "Framing Analysis," 60.
[2] Pan and Kosicki, "Framing Analysis," 62.
[3] William Gamson and Andre Modigliani, "Media Discourse and Public Opinion on Nuclear Power," *American Journal of Sociology* 95, no. 1 (1989): 1-37.

the purposes of this research lexical choices are investigated as rhetorical devices, though Pan and Kosicki suggested that lexical choices may designate different categories in any of the four structures of news discourse: syntactical, script, thematic and/or rhetorical structures.[1] Some researchers designate the whole frame package based on one word or a label.[2] Bennett, Lawrence and Livingston argued that the label "torture" resonates with the systemic responsibility frame whereas the less forceful "abuse" speaks to the individual responsibility frame.[3] Although not directly related to any particular frame that is identified in this study, the use of labels such as "torture," "abuse," "misconduct" and many others was examined. Van Dijk argued that in some scenarios ("terrorist" versus "freedom fighter"), the choice of words is not "so much a question of semantics as an indirect expression of implied but associated values incorporated in shared-word meanings."[4]

Just as labels, sources are the key elements of the four structures of news discourse. That is frames are shaped by sources mentioned in the story. Hence, attention was given to the source(s) attribution. In particular, each frame was defined by the use of different kinds of sources: military officials, government officials, investigative reports by military and governments, Red Cross reports, human rights activists, individuals who engaged in abuse directly, their lawyers, family members, detainees who were abused, other media outlets, and many other sources. Sources vary in their credibility and thus have great impact on whose perspective will be portrayed as a dominant frame in the news story. The U.S. media are notorious for having bias towards official sources. Therefore, quotes by government and

---

[1] Pan and Kosicki, "Framing Analysis," 62
[2] Lance Bennett, Regina Lawrence, and Steven Livingston, "None Dare Call it Torture," *Journal of Communication* 56 no. 3 (2006): 467-485.
[3] Bennett, Lawrence, and Livingston, "None Dare Call it Torture," 471.
[4] Teun van Dijk, *News as Discourse* (Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1988), 81.

military officials can be construed as forming the dominant frame of the news article.

As mentioned, the study identified the presence of nine key frames that emerged in the media coverage of detainee abuse stories. Each of the frames can be described as a package which "offers a number of different condescending symbols that suggest the core frame and positions in shorthand, making it possible to display the package as a whole with a deft metaphor, catchphrase, or other symbolic device."[1] See Appendix D for how each of the frames was defined as a set of questions that were used for coding purposes when identifying what frames appeared in each of the news articles. The following will describe each frame or "frame package" in more detail.[2]

1. The events frame. News articles were labeled as having utilized the *events frame* if they emphasized a simple journalistic script structure of *who, what, when, where, and how*. This included reporting on what happened in Iraq, announcing investigations, reporting government reactions, and any other ongoing details that were presented in a matter of fact nature of reporting. The events frame did not include a more in-depth discussion of *why* the abuse occurred or the larger consequences of the abuse. The events frame was normally considered to be applied in the articles that did not have any other major frame emerging and the nature of reporting did not include thematic coverage. In other words, the events frame corresponds to the episodic nature of news coverage explored by Iyengar.[3]

However, in the instances when the responsibility frame was emerging as one of the frames applied to the news story, each article was assigned either to the events or the

---

[1] Gamson and Modigliani, "Media Discourse and Public Opinion on Nuclear Power," 3.
[2] Van Gorp (2007: 4) utilized the term "frame package" whereas Gamson and Modigliani (1989: 3) utilized the term "media package." The later implies that the package is a product of media but Van Gorp agued that frames emerge as a result of culture and societal linkages therefore, the term "media package" is a bit misleading.
[3] Iyengar, 1991.

investigation frame to evaluate the relationship between responsibility frames and the nature of news coverage in terms of events and investigative types of reporting.

2. Investigation frame. The *investigation frame* was identified to be present in articles that focused on discovering larger issues and causes of the detainee treatment in Iraq. Articles were considered to have utilized this frame if the reporting focused on the *why* part of the news script. For the purpose of this analysis, the investigation frame excluded detailed descriptions of the abuse itself and focused on explorations of reasons *why* the abuse occurred and other procedural aspects of *how* the abuse came to light and *what* steps the governments took to investigate the abuse. This included reporting on the Red Cross allegations of serious legal breaches in prisons in Iraq and Afghanistan. The investigation frame corresponds to what Iyengar considered thematic type of reporting. This frame was often accompanied with the responsibility, diagnostic or prognostic frames. To examine Iyengar's suggestion that thematic reporting leads to attribution of responsibility to the system, all of the articles which utilized the responsibility frame were also evaluated to determine whether the investigation or the events frame were utilized in the news story as well.

3. Systemic responsibility frame. The *systemic responsibility frame* was characterized by emphasis on systemic failures of leadership and broader governmental policies that resulted in detainee abuse. The systemic responsibility frame was considered to be utilized in the articles placing accountability on the policies and procedures formed and dictated by the individuals at the top of military and government institutions, including Lieutenant General Ricardo A. Sanchez, the White House Counsel Alberto R. Gonzales, the White House Chief of Staff Donald Rumsfeld, and President George W. Bush. The systemic responsibility frame

was considered to be utilized in the news stories which discussed the bypassing of the

Geneva Convention for high security detainees in Guantanamo. One of the reasoning devices

for the systemic responsibility frame was the focus on how widespread the abuse was. Other

articles constructed the responsibility frame by exploring the role of changing interrogation

procedures as well as pressures to produce intelligence that emerged during the time of war

against terrorism.

4. Individual responsibility frame. The *individual responsibility frame* was

characterized by emphasis on the persons directly responsible for the events. Articles were

considered to utilize this frame if much of the script or narrative structure emphasized the

actions of individuals participating in the abuse. This frame was characterized by the

presence of such rhetorical devices as describing the abusers as "a few bad apples," or

providing explanations (reasoning devices) that the abuse was random and done by a few

individuals, or by using apparently self-evident rhetorical claims such as "we do not torture

people in America."

5. Diagnostic frame. The *diagnostic frame* can be found in articles that focused on

labeling and categorizing events in Iraq as well as presenting a broader discussion about what

happened and what caused it. This frame was applied to articles that included discussions of

broader policies, or specific situations in detention facilities, such as the killing of a British

soldier, or riots at Abu Ghraib as potential causes of prisoner and detainee treatment in Iraq.

In addition, the diagnostic frame was also utilized in articles focusing on individuals' violent

natures as the culprit for the abuse. Since both the immediate reactions and later

investigations provided numerous explanations of why the abuse occurred, the interest in

identifying the diagnostic frame was not as much how it was constructed and what kinds of

framing devices constituted that frame, but the focus of the research was to identify what kinds of explanations received attention in the coverage. In addition, it is important to note that the diagnostic frame was often present in articles in conjunction with the individual or the systemic responsibility frames which often emerged as dominant frames of a news article and obviously influenced what kinds of diagnoses were presented in the article. The labeling of events, on the other hand, occurred in many more news articles and offered different perspectives on how to interpret the events, beginning with such labels as "abuse" and ending with "torture." The choice of labels, though they are part of the diagnostic frame, will be discussed as their own separate framing device.

6. Prognostic frame. The *prognostic frame* was considered to have been applied if an article discussed possible consequences for both the U.S. future in Iraq and individuals who were found to be responsible for the abuse. This frame was also applied in articles that suggested possible solutions to the problem. Just as the diagnostic frame, articles applying the prognostic frame might have suggested different possibilities and scenarios of what and how should be done to resolve the situation. Therefore, the main interest for this study was not how the prognostic frame was constructed, but the range of options for future solutions the newspapers included in their coverage.

7. Human interest frame. The *human interest frame* was characterized by an emphasis on the people involved in the abuse--military personnel in charge, the people who played major roles in both investigations of abuse (i.e. Taguba) or who were responsible for bringing the stories out in the open (i.e. Darby). More importantly, the frame was used to cover the victims of abuse as well as other relevant news actors (i.e. Berg). The human interest frame was considered to have been utilized in stories that provided a human example or "human

face" to events and issues. The frame was constructed by including examples of how individuals or groups were affected by the events. This frame also meant that the story included personal vignettes that generate feelings of outrage, empathy, sympathy, or compassion. Many articles that utilized the human interest frame also utilized some aspects of the individual responsibility frame.

8. Image frame. The *image frame* was determined to be present when an article emphasized how the abuse reflected on the moral and symbolic standing of the coalition forces as well as the two governments. Articles that employed the image frame discussed the damage done to the future work on the part of the U.S. in policing of human rights violations around the globe. Some articles utilized this frame to discuss the damage done to the coalition forces, particularly the image of the British army which dealt with the issues of human rights violations while fighting in Northern Ireland.

9. The media reflexivity frame. The *media reflexivity frame* was characterized by an emphasis on the media itself, such as journalists' involvement in breaking the story or reflections on adverse results of publicizing the abuse (especially in the case of the *Daily Mirror* scandal).

Table 3 below summarizes the frames identified in each of the newspapers in relation to the U.S. and U.K. abuses. The later sections of this dissertation will discuss how the frames were used and constructed to portray U.S. and U.K. events differently to promote different meanings and interpretations of the events in Iraq. Each newspaper emphasized different frames in their coverage.

Table 3. Frames utilized in the coverage of the U.S. and U.K. events by the four newspapers

		New York Times		Washington Post		Guardian		Times	
		US	UK	US	UK	US	UK	US	UK
Events	#	23	4	30	8	16	27	16	13
	%	*35*	*44*	*44*	*73*	55	75	37	46
Investigations	#	19	1	24	0	9	2	21	12
	%	*29*	11	*36*	*0*	31	6	49	43
Systemic	#	13	0	23	0	11	3	10	5
	%	20	0	34	0	38	8	23	18
Individual	#	13	4	12	4	5	8	3	7
	%	20	44	18	36	17	22	7	25
Human Interest	#	17	0	15	0	4	2	9	1
	%	26	0	22	0	14	22	21	4
Diagnostic	#	17	0	23	1	6	4	15	8
	%	26	0	34	9	20	11	35	29
Image	#	16	4	10	4	4	8	13	8
	%	25	44	15	36	14	22	30	29
Prognostic	#	4	2	10	2	2	4	4	4
	%	6	22	15	18	7	11	9	14
Media Reflexivity	#	4	1	1	2	1	5	2	4
	%	6	11	1	18	3	14	5	14
Total		65	9	67	11	29	36	43	28

A more detail examination of frames constructed and utilized by each of the newspapers will be provided in the sections that follow as comparisons of frames used guide the answers to research questions 2 through 5.

Coding Process

This section describes how the coding of the data was accomplished. Holsti defines coding as "the process whereby raw data are systematically transformed and aggregated into units which permit precise description of relevant content characteristics."[1] The rules by

---

[1] Ole Holsti, *Content Analysis for the Social Sciences and Humanities* (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1969),

which this process is accomplished are dictated by the type of method selected as the best approach to make linkages between the research goals and the data.

As mentioned, a combination of quantitative and qualitative content analysis approach was used to produce the data. Content analysis encompasses a family of analytic approaches ranging from impressionistic, intuitive, interpretive analyses to systematic, strict textual analyses.[1] Therefore, researchers differentiate between qualitative and quantitative content analysis.[2] By its nature, content analysis becomes an appropriate approach to examine how language is used in texts to communicate meaning. Hsieh and Shannon differentiate between conventional, directed, or summative approaches in content analysis.[3] The three differ in how the researchers record their data and how they arrive at coding categories. In conventional content analysis coding categories emerge from the data. This approach is useful when the theory about the phenomenon is limited. The directed approach is useful when previous research and theories about the phenomenon already exist and researchers attempt to further illuminate the theory. This research project employs a summative content analysis approach which focuses on the latent meanings of textual materials. Summative content analysis combines quantification of manifest content with interpretation of latent content which leads to understanding the contextual use of language.[4] In other words, summative content analysis allows for systematic scrutiny of each story in

94.

[1] Karl Rosengren, "Advances in Scandinavia Content Analysis," in *Advances in Content Analysis,* ed. Karl Rosengren (Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1981), 9-19.

[2] Bernard Berelson, *Content Analysis in Communication Research* (Glencoe, IL: Free Press, 1952); Hsiu-Fang Hsieh and Sarah Shannon, "Three Approaches to Qualitative Content Analysis*," Qualitative Health Research* 15, no. 4 (2005): 1277-1288; James Tankard, "The Empirical Approach to the Study of Media Framing," in *Framing Public Life*, eds. Stephen Reese, Oscar Gandy, and August Grant (Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates), 95-105; Holli Semetko and Patti Valkenburg, "Framing European Politics," *Journal of Communication* 50, no. 2 (2000): 93-109.

[3] Hsieh and Shannon, "Three Approaches to Qualitative Content Analysis," 1278.

[4] Holsti, 25.

the sample and may even arrive at numerical representations of the study's results.[1]

However, while it produces numbers, those findings are purely nominal and are not subject to

statistical analysis. Rather the numbers aid the researcher to describe the meanings imbedded

into the media content. While conventional content analysis research design would require

collecting data by reviewing the original source in order to determine the article's visual

appeal and placement in the newspaper, the current study focuses on the cognitive and

linguistic characteristics of the text. This method does not necessitate examining the source

material in their original placement even though page numbers and section locations are

noted in the research process because this information is provided by the LexisNexis

Academic database.

The process of coding the data set began after the news frames were already

identified and described. At this point the researcher was familiar with the data set. To

produce a systemic representation of each news article Excel program was used to record the

data. The data set was first separated into four sets, by newspaper. Each newspaper was

coded separately. Each article was given a numeric label beginning 1 and ending with the

number of the articles that were included in the analysis. Numbering was repeated for each

data set for the four newspapers.

Once the numbering was completed, each article was assigned an entry in an Excel

table. The rows represented each news article and the columns recorded the following

characteristics of the news article: date of publication, headline, author(s), page number/

section placement, country of focus, topics covered, frame(s), framing devices (which

included noting syntactic, script, thematic and rhetorical structures that were utilized to

---

[1] Hsieh and Shannon, 1285.

construct the frame), labels, sources cited, any other information which contributed to the framing of the news story that was not captured by the other coding categories.

Several of the above listed coding categories (i.e. date, headline, authors) are self explanatory. The country of focus was either the U.S. or U.K. Most articles focused on either the U.S.'s or the U.K.'s events and some covered both countries. The topics column was used to report all topics that were covered in each of the articles. In many cases each article focused on several topics. The range of topics started with describing the abuse and ended with discussion of interrogation policies and procedures. The frames were noted using the categories of frames described above. Some articles utilized one dominant frame and many articles combined two or three frames together. Labels, although deemed to be part of the rhetorical structures, were separated into their own category. Here the researcher noted each of the labels that was utilized to refer to the abuse--starting with torture and ending with misconduct. In many cases an article included several labels. The number of times each label appeared was not noted, only the appearance of a label in the news article was noted. The sources cited column recorded any of the people or documents referenced in the article. The last column noted any other observations including interpretations or generalizations made in the story.

All data were coded by the researcher. From the positivist perspective, to avoid coder subjectivity, data should be coded by two or more independent coders to assure objectivity. However, this study takes a more interpretivist approach to data analysis and therefore coder reliability is not a concern.

The coding produced data that were later organized into tables to provide different representations of media texts. For the purposes of answering each research question the

data were organized according to the number of articles, focus of the coverage (U.K. vs U.S.), topics covered, frames applied and labels used. Each research question necessitated examining different sets of data. Question one focused on frequency analysis of articles devoted to the events relating to the U.S. and U.K. events as well as the volume of coverage in the four newspapers. It also included an analysis of topics covered by each of the four newspapers. Questions two and three focused on how the specific frames--the responsibility and the human interest frames--were constructed. Question four focused on labels used to identify the events as well as the construction of the diagnostic frame. Finally, question five addressed how the newspapers utilized image and prognostic frames that explored the generalizations that emerged from the coverage on the implications of abuse on the future of U.S. and U.K. actions in Iraq as well as the role of these counties in future international relations.

Limitations of the Constructionist Method

The results of the analysis are reported in the next chapter of this dissertation. Before moving on to the next chapter it is important to acknowledge some of the methodological implications for using the constructivist approach to examine media texts. Although the goal of deconstructing media frames in the news reports implies that the research investigates the frames produced by the journalists, the study does not attempt to claim that this is how the audience was receiving the media texts. The processes of text construction and deconstruction are often a very subjective one and the goal of this research was not to suggest how the media audiences were receiving messages produced by the news makers. Meanings derived from news are influenced by active interpretations by audiences which are formed

based on their knowledge and experiences.[1] At the same time, the dominant frames appearing in the media can affect news media receivership and therefore some limited conclusions about how the audience might interpret these events could be made.

One of the most problematic areas of constructivist approach is its ability to produce detailed descriptions of how each frame is constructed. This presents a challenge for larger data sets. The seminal work by Pan and Kosicki which provides the most comprehensive constructionist model of news analysis, includes an illustration of how their model should be applied using a single news story. Since the goal of the constructionist method is to analyze how a particular topic or issue is discussed and presented in an article and how different ways of thinking about the issue or event relate to the large context of reality construction, framing analysis produces a very detailed examination of each news item. Ideally, each meaningful proposition of a news article merits analysis and coding as a separate entry on the researcher's data coding sheet. This influences how the researchers present aggregate findings. Though some quantitative data are produced as a result of the data analysis, the researcher must present the results in a detailed narrative form. This narrative is built by using references to many original news articles, as well as specific examples of how each of the frames was constructed, how the frame construction differed from one article to another and one newspaper to another. Since this dissertation was set to study four newspapers from two different countries, the descriptions of how each of the frames were executed differently in different newspapers resulted in data that is detailed and rich with examples, quotes, interpretations, and explanations of many facts, as well as framing devices present in the

---

[1] See Dietram Scheufele, "Framing as a Theory of Media Effects," *Journal of Communication* 49, no. 4 (1999): 103-122; Dhavan Shah, Nojin Kwak; Mike Schmierbach, and Jessica Zubric, "The Interplay of News Frames on Cognitive Complexity," *Human Communication Research* 30, no. 1 (2004): 102-120.

news text.

Finally, the constructionist approach to studying media texts requires a constant back and forth evaluation and reevaluation of coding categories. As the researcher becomes more and more familiar with the text, some new categories may emerge and others may need to be removed. During the completion of this research study, there was a temptation for the researcher to identify more frames that are unique to the specific topic. However, to advance framing theory and method, it was important to identity frames that could be transferable to different kinds of coverages. For example, the researcher identified "photograph authenticity" as one of the unique frames needed to be considered for this study. The *Daily Mirror* publishing fake photographs influenced the coverage of British abuse so significantly that it became a script structure utilized by several news stories. Upon later consideration, the researcher recoded the authenticity frame as either the events frame or investigations frame or media reflexivity frame as it was too specific to the British coverage and did not carry the potency of becoming an identifiable frame in the coverage of other topics or issues.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

As indicated, framing of the prisoner and detainee abuse coverage in the U.S. and

U.K. media can be examined by applying Entman's framework and focusing analysis on the

following five aspects of the coverage: salience of the event; portrayal of responsible agency;

encouragement or discouragement to identify with those directly affected; categorization of

the act; and generalization of the act. [1] These five categories constitute the study's definitions

of framing and dictate the formulation of its research questions. The chapter presents how

framing of coverage in each of the papers addressed those research questions. The first

section examines the importance of judgment or the overall salience of the abuse coverage in

all four newspapers. The second section tackles the questions of who (individual or

individuals) or what (system or policy) was assigned responsibility for the abuse.

Specifically, this section deals with the assignment of blame on individuals versus system.

Extending previous research on the impact of episodic versus thematic coverage, the second

research question also highlights the relationship between the type of reporting and the

assignment of responsibility. The third section examines how the four newspapers portrayed

both the victims of abuse and their abusers, as well as various other news subjects that were

important in the coverage of the abuse stories. The fourth section tackles various framing

---

[1] Robert Entman, "Framing U.S. Coverage of International News," *Journal of Communication* 41, no. 4 (1991):
6-27.

devices that resulted in the newspapers' categorizing the events in Iraq. Specifically, that section examines linguistic choices that were utilized by the newspapers to promote specific understandings of the events in Iraq as well as provides an analysis of how the newspapers explained the events. The fifth and the final section examines if and how generalizations of the events spoke to the nature of the two countries and their armies. It also examines media's reflections on their own role in bringing abuse to light and subsequent coverage of events in Iraq.

Overall Salience of the Events

The judgment of how important the abuse story was for the papers included in the study was examined by reviewing the volume of coverage of detainee abuse in Iraqi. In addition, salience was measured by comparing the abuse stories to the overall coverage of the war in Iraq during the period of time selected for analysis. Another measure indicating the salience of prisoner abuse stories was review of the specific topics covered by each of the newspapers. Thus, this section will first describe the volume of coverage and then examine the topics covered by each of the four newspapers.

The prisoner abuse scandal received vast attention from the media all around the world. During the 6-month period after the first story broke, the four newspapers examined for this dissertation produced 1,815 stories on the Abu Ghraib scandal. The bulk of the coverage (1,389 stories) appeared during the initial three months after the Abu Ghraib story broke in April 2004 (see Table 1 in Chapter 3). The *New York Times* and the *Washington Post* had more articles when compared to the *Guardian* and the *Times* (London). In order to get a sense of a relative importance of the abuse coverage, Table 4 compares the number of stories on abuse to stories on the war in Iraq during the time period selected for analysis.

Abuse coverage occupied a significant portion of the war in Iraq coverage in general. The *New York Times* published 115 stories on abuse which constitutes 23 percent of the coverage on Iraq. The *Washington Post* published 119 stories on abuse which represents 25 percent of the coverage on the war in Iraq. The 81 news stories in the *Guardian* account for 31 percent of the coverage of the war in Iraq. Finally, the *Times'* 111 stories on abuse account for 44 percent of the stories on the war in Iraq. It appears that even tough numerically, the British newspapers printed fewer stories on the abuse scandal, their relative importance when compared to the coverage of the war in Iraq in general during that time period is higher than that of their American counterparts.

Table 4. Coverage of the war in Iraq compared to detainee abuse during the time period 4/29/2004--5/14/2004

	Articles on War in Iraq in General	*Number Articles on Abuse*	*Percentage of Stories on Abuse*
New York Times	501	115	23
Washington Post	469	119	25
Guardian	264	81	31
Times	249	111	44
Total	113	426	

As it was explained in the method section, the framing analysis required a selection of 261 in-depth stories that focused on detainee abuse. The sample included 69 articles from the *New York Times*, 72 articles from the *Washington Post*, 58 articles from the *Guardian* and 62 articles from the *Times* (London) (see Table 5). Overall, the sheer volume of abuse-related news articles during this time period was large. In all four newspapers, it was not unusual for there to have been three to five articles per issue published about abuse of Iraqis. When the length of coverage is compared, the U.S. media appear to have devoted more attention to the abuse in Iraq. The *New York Time*'s word count was 85,023; the *Washington Posts'* 89,841; the *Guardian's* 41,391 and the *Times'* 47,116. Even though the volume of the coverage may not be the preferred measure of salience, comparative approach outlined by Entman allows to

make judgments about media's salience by comparing how similar events were covered differently in the media.[1]

Table 5. The number and length of articles included in analysis

	Articles included for analysis	*Word count*
New York Times	69	85,023
Washington Post	72	89,841
Guardian	58	41,394
Times	62	47,116
Total	261	263,374

Since comparison of how seemingly similar abuse perpetrated by the two coalition forces is the focus of this research, the next section will report on what topics the newspapers covered when reporting about both scandals. First, the review will begin with examining attention given to the American and British events in broad terms, and then a more specific discussion of topics will be provided.

Covering Abu Ghraib (American Abuse) vs. British Abuse

As shown in Table 6, all articles can be broadly categorized as relating either to U.S. abuses or to U.K. abuses, and several articles appear to address the issues concerning both coalition forces. The four newspapers devoted different attention to both sides. The coverage of British abuse was minimal in the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post*--87 percent and 85 percent of the coverage in the two American newspapers was devoted solely to American stories. *The Guardian* devoted 38 percent of its articles to the Abu Ghraib story, while 50 percent of news stories discussed British abuses. The *Times* (London) covered Abu Ghraib in 55 percent of its coverage and 31 percent of its coverage dealt with British abuses.

---

[1] Robert Entman, "Framing U.S. Coverage of International News," *Journal of Communication* 41, no. 4 (1991): 10.

An interesting finding is that only on a few occasions are abuse allegations against both coalition forces discussed in the same article. More importantly, the identity of the perpetrator was missing or hard to determine in instances when the newspapers utilized information that came from Red Cross reports or Geneva Conventions documents.[1]

Table 6. Number of articles devoted to abuse by both armies

	New York Times		Washington Post		Guardian		Times	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Articles Covering U.S.	60	87	61	85	22	38	34	55
Articles Covering U.K.	4	6	5	7	29	50	19	31
Articles Covering Both	5	7	6	8	7	12	9	14
Total	69	100	72	100	58	100	62	100

The fact that abuse at Abu Ghraib was a much more dominant story is noteworthy because the charges against British forces were just as serious as abuse at Abu Ghraib. This was signaled by the U.K. media labeling the story "Britain's Abu Ghraib."[2] Although the severity of British abuse was obscured when the photos in the *Daily Mirror* were proven to be fakes, the comparison with Abu Ghraib was accentuated later when real photographs of British abuse became public during the court-martial trial of four soldiers from the Royal Regiment of Fusiliers in January 2005. It is important to remember that the existence of these authentic abuse photographs was known in early May 2003 when soldier Gary Bartlam left the photographs to be developed at a shop in Tamworth, Staffordshire.

The following section will report on the topics covered by the newspapers. For the purposes of data analysis and presentation, the topics are separated into three broad

---

[1] See the next section for detailed description of which topics fit this category.
[2] Audrey Gillian, "Shocking Images Revealed at Britain's Abu Ghraib Trial," *Guardian*, January, 19, 2005 http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk/2005/jan/19/iraq.military3; Severin Carrell and Raymond Whitaker, "How Britain was Forced to Face up to its Own Abu Ghraib," *Independent*, January, 23, 2005 http://www.highbeam.com/doc/1P2-1922507.html

categories: topics related to U.S. events, topics related to U.K. events, and topics related to general or common issues, as well as topics that were difficult to attribute specifically to one of the coalition forces.

Coverage of U.S. Events

When covering U.S. events the newspapers reported on various topics. The list of topics and their descriptions are provided below.

Description of Abuses. This category included the description of prison conditions, events related to abuses, injuries, and other similar topics.

Women Inmates. Reports about women inmates were separated into their own category because abuse of women was not reported evenly in all four newspapers.

Deaths in U.S. Custody. This category included facts related to the deaths of Iraqi detainees who were under the control of U.S. troops.[1]

Investigations. Topics included in this category included Rumsfeld's testimony in front of the U.S. Senate Armed Services Committee on May 7, 2004, discussions of Taguba's investigative report, descriptions of when and how investigations began, and discussions of who was informed of the abuses and when.

Photos and Videos. This included the coverage of photos and videos that revealed abuse, descriptions of what was depicted in those photos and videos, and other related topics.

Courts-Martial, Charges, and Consequences. This category included reporting on punishment and charges brought against soldiers involved in abuse as well as the reprimand of several higher ranking officers.

---

[1] At that time, the media reported that there were 33 deaths investigated, and three of them were reported to be suspicious, according to the government reports.

Detention, Interrogation Procedures and Policies. This category included reporting on detention and interrogation policies that were altered after 9/11. It also included coverage of interrogation practices.

Civilian Contractors. This category included topics relating to the role and history of government-hired contractors in the U.S. military.

Situation at Abu Ghraib After Abuse. This topic category included the reports on changes at Abu Ghraib after the abuse had stopped, suggestions on what should happen at Abu Ghraib, Rumsfeld's and journalists' visits to Abu Ghraib.

Victims. This included reporting on who the abuse victims were, information about their families, or their accounts of abuse.

Soldiers Involved in Abuse. This category included information about the soldiers who participated in the abuse, their histories and life stories.

U.S. Image. This category included reports on the damage done to the image of the United States, both home and abroad.

U.S. Military Image. These articles focused on the damage to the U.S. military's image. This included coverage of how the events were damaging to the image of the army and repercussions of that.

Reaction from U.S. Government and Military. This included coverage of reactions by the government and military officials. Among them, were the coverage of public apologies and calls for action, investigation and other types of responses from official sources.

U.S. Public Reactions. This included reactions to the abuse by the people in the U.S. that were neither government or military officials or the family members of the soldiers accused of abuse. In some articles these included reactions from experts on human rights,

human nature or human behavior in war.

World and Media React. These included reactions by the people around the world as well as well as the international media reactions to the abuse.

Analysis of data presented in Table 7 indicates that there were differences in what each newspaper reported. Since the data were coded simply by noting whether the topic appeared in an article, conclusions cannot be made as to how much space was devoted to each topic. However, for the purposes of framing analysis space is not the most significant evidence of salience and this dissertation is more concerned with the fact that some topics were completely left out from the coverage while others received coverage on numerous occasions. Specifically, the U.S. media devoted more attention to such topics as description of abuse at Abu Ghraib, resulting investigations, and government reactions. Abuse descriptions appeared in about 27 percent of articles that were selected for analysis in the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post*. Investigations were the topic for 35 and 33 percent of articles in the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post,* respectively. Reactions from the government were also noted in 27 and 32 percent of the articles in the two U.S. newspapers respectively. These results are not surprising. The U.S. media are known for relying on "official" and "expert" sources when covering international news.[1] Investigations of the Abu Ghraib scandal were just as important to the British newspapers. Although not as distinct as American newspapers, both the *Guardian* and the *Times* (London) addressed some aspect of ongoing investigations in their coverage (about 21 percent and 27 percent, respectively). Descriptions of abuse (17 percent of the *Guardian* articles and 27 percent of the *Times*) and government reactions to them (14 percent of coverage in each) were also

---

[1] Daniela Dimitrova and Jesper Stromback, "Mission Accomplished," *Gazette* 67, no. 5 (2005): 403.

important topics in the British media.

Table 7. Topics related to the U.S. abuses

	New York Times		*Washington Post*		*Guardian*		*Times*	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Description of Abuses	19	27	19	27	10	17	17	27
Women Inmates	2	3	0	0	4	7	4	6.
Deaths in U.S. Custody	5	7	2	3	3	5	2	3
Investigations	24	35	24	33	12	21	17	27
Photos	13	19	7	10	6	10	8	13
Courts-Martial, Charges, and Consequences	13	19	10	14	8	14	9	14
Detention, Interrogation Procedures and Policies	13	19	21	30	17	30	7	11
Civilian Contractors	4	6	11	15	7	12	3	5
Situation at Abu Ghraib After Abuse	10	15	9	12	2	3	6	10
Victims	8	12	6	8	8	14	9	14
Soldiers Involved in Abuse	7	10	6	8	5	9	8	13
U.S. Image	18	26	6	8	4	7	9	14
U.S. Military Image	4	6	2	3	2	3	3	5
U.S. Government and Military Reaction	19	28	23	32	8	14	9	14
U.S. Public Reaction	7	10	5	7	1	2	3	5
World and Media Reaction	14	20	10	14	7	12	14	23
Total*	69		72		58		62	

*The number on the left is the number of total articles selected for analysis. Percentages do not add to 100 percent because several topics could be covered in the same article. Thus, the total percentage column is left blank.

The British media paid more attention to covering the victims of abuse. The *New York Times* covered victims in about 12 percent of its articles, the *Washington Post* in 8 percent of the articles whereas comparatively the two British newspapers gave voice to the victims in 14 percent (the *Guardian*) and 14 percent (the *Times*) of their articles. The pictures of abuse did not have images of women inmates, and that seems to have had an impact on how each newspaper decided to include or ignore the topic. As the data shows, the *Washington Post* chose to ignore the existence of women inmates in the articles selected for analysis. The *New York Times* gave minimal coverage to women inmates. The topic appeared

in four of the articles for each British newspaper, constituting about 7 percent and 6 percent of articles.

The U.S. newspapers provided more discussion about the future of Abu Ghraib. The *New York Times* included the topic in about 14 percent of its articles, and the *Washington Post* covered the aftermath of abuse in 12 percent of its articles. On the other hand, the two British newspapers covered the topic in only 3 percent (the *Guardian*) and 10 percent (the *Times*) of the articles included in this analysis.

The newspapers differed in how they covered detention and interrogation policies or reactions to abuse and several other topics. Here the differences and similarities can be noted not in terms of the U.S. versus the U.K. media but among the four newspapers. The *Washington Post* was more similar to the *Guardian* as both newspapers devoted attention to detention and interrogation policies in about 29 percent of their articles. Both the *Washington Post* and the *Guardian* paid less attention to reporting on how the world reacted to the abuses. The two newspapers covered the topic of world media reactions in 14 and 12 percent of their articles compared to 20 percent in the *New York Times* and 23 percent in the *Times*. Finally, the *Washington Post* and the *Guardian* reported more on the role of private contractors at Abu Ghraib (15 and 12 respectively). The *New York Times* and the *Times* both reported on the role of contractors in about 5 percent of their articles. The *New York Times* and the *Times* included more coverage of the U.S. image (26 and 14 percent respectively) when compared to the two other newspapers. Differences carried on to the coverage of the U.K. topics in the four newspapers and that will be examined in the next section.

Coverage of U.K. Events

When covering the U.K. abuse, the newspapers concentrated on a slightly different

list of topics. Each topic category is explained below.

Descriptions of Abuses. Similar to the U.S. coverage, this category included the coverage of abuses, which included beatings, rape, humiliation and other actions.

Deaths in the U.K. Custody. This category included facts related to the deaths of Iraqi detainees who were under the control of U.K. troops.[1]

Photos. Two separate topics can be identified that dealt with the photographs depicting abuse. First the coverage mentioned the pictures published in the *Daily Mirror* on May 1, 2004, but later those pictures were proven to be fakes. However, there was also a set of authentic pictures that were known to the government since May 2003. These were photos taken by Gary Bartlam, a soldier of the Royal Regiment of Fusiliers.

Courts-Martial, Charges, and Consequences. This included description of charges brought against the soldiers as well as reporting of preparation for courts-martial and law suits brought against the British.

Detention, Interrogation Procedures and Policies. This category included the coverage of British law related to the interrogation and detention of war prisoners.

Victims. This category included reporting on victims as well as their family members.

Soldiers Involved in Abuse. Another topic category included reporting on the soldiers who were associated with abuse, their stories, and reactions to the allegations.

U.K. Image. This included coverage of the damage done to the image of the U.K, both home and abroad.

U.K. Military Image. This included coverage of how the events were damaging to the

---

[1] During the time of the coverage selected for this, were 12 deaths in of detainees in British custody that were being investigated, and later it was discovered that the British Ministry of Defense acknowledged 33 deaths in British custody.

image of the army and repercussions of that.

U.K. Government and Military Reaction. This included coverage of reactions by the government and military officials.

U.K. Public Reaction. This included reactions to the abuse by the people in the U.K. that were neither government or military officials or the family members of the soldiers accused of abuse.

World and Media Reaction. These included reactions by the people around the world as well as well as the international media reactions to the abuse.

Although the list of categories pertaining to British abuse scandals is comparable to the topics related to abuse at Abu Ghraib, there are some that are unique to the British allegations. Namely, the British scandal produced a set of fake photographs resulting in much discussion about photo authenticity issues in quite a few of the articles. Unlike U.S. coverage, the issue of private contracts was not raised.

When covering the U.K. abuse each of the four newspapers assigned different significance to the different topic categories. American newspapers avoided providing descriptions of abuses by the British soldiers. If the *Guardian* and the *Times* described British abuses in 19 and 21 percent of their articles respectively, both U.S. newspapers described British abuses in about 6 percent of their articles selected for analysis (see Table 8). A similar pattern is seen in the reporting of deaths in U.K. custody, U.K. investigations, and even the image of the U.K. military. The newspapers gave minimal coverage of deaths in the U.K. custody: the *New York Times* mentioned them in six percent of articles and the *Washington Post* in four percent of articles whereas the *Guardian* covered civilian deaths in 24 percent of its articles and the *Times* covered the topic in about eight percent of its articles.

Even though the U.K. investigations process was much slower, both British newspapers reported on investigations in about 22 percent of their articles whereas the *New York Times* mentioned investigations in seven percent of the coverage and the *Washington Post* covered the topic in about 3 percent of its articles.

Table 8. Topics related to the U.K. abuses

	New York Times		Washington Post		Guardian		Times	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Description of Abuses	4	6	4	6	11	19	13	21
Deaths in U.K. Custody	4	6	3	4	14	24	5	8
Investigations	5	7	2	3	13	22	14	23
Photos in the *Daily Mirror,* Authenticity Issues	6	9	4	6	17	30	11	18
Photos (Authentic)	2	3	1	1	2	3	9	14
Courts-Martial, Charges and Consequences	2	3	1	1	2	3	2	3
Detention, Interrogation Procedures and Policies	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	6
Victims	0	0	1	1	7	12	4	6
Soldiers Involved in Abuse	1	1	1	1	2	3	3	5
U.K. Image	2	3	2	3	1	2	3	5
U.K. Military Image	2	3	2	3	6	10	5	8
U.K. Government and Military Reaction	8	12	4	6	8	14	5	8
U.K. Public Reaction	0	0	1	1	0	0	3	5
World and Media Reaction	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	2
Total*	69		72		58		62	

*The number on the left is the number of total articles selected for analysis. Percentages do not add to 100 percent because several topics could be covered in the same article. Thus, the total percentage column is left blank.

It is interesting to note that it was primarily the British armed forces image rather than the country's image that was discussed as a consequence of the scandal. The damage to the army's image was discussed in 10 percent of the articles by the *Guardian* and 8 percent in the *Times* while the two American newspapers covered the topic in less than 3 percent of their coverage.

The only U.K.-related topic that gained substantial attention in the U.S. media was the reactions of U.K. government and military which was covered in about 12 percent of the *New York Times* articles and 6 percent of the articles in the *Washington Post*. All other topics received very little coverage. Although the existence of authentic abuse photographs had been known since May 2003, the newspapers in both countries did not pay much attention to those.[1] Only the *Times* covered the existence of authentic photographs in 14 percent of its articles, while the other three newspapers mentioned their existence in one or two of their articles which often constituted one to three percent of the coverage. On the other hand, the *Daily Mirror* photographs and authenticity issues were discussed in 29 percent of the *Guardian's* articles and 18 percent of the *Times* articles. The two American counterparts paid some attention to these photos. The *New York Times* covered them in about 9 percent of its coverage and the *Washington Post* covered them in 6 percent of the articles.

Several other topics that emerged in the coverage of the U.S. events were not addressed in the coverage of the U.K. events. For example, reactions by the U.K. public as well as reactions from people around the world and the international media were not discussed to any great extent in any of the four newspapers. The newspapers did not include much coverage on either the soldiers responsible for the U.K. abuse or the victims of their abuse. The difficulty in determining reactions from the public, or human rights advocates or the international media was further obscured by the manner in which some articles simply reported on abuse conducted by the coalition forces instead on singling out the specific army responsible for the abuse. The next section will explore these common topics.

---

[1] The photos should have been available to all newspapers. The *Sun* revealed pictures showing male Iraqis being forced into sexual positions by their British captors on May 30, 3003.

Coverage of Common Topics

This category of topic include coverage that cannot be attributed as belonging to either U.S. or British events or simply were grouped together for the purposes of making the coverage more suitable for analysis. The list of topics and their descriptions are provided below.

International Law. Topics coded under the International Law included articles that covered the Geneva Conventions, such as how and why it prevents detainees from torture and abuse, as well as discussions on the psychology of torture and more specifically why it is not an effective interrogation tool. Also included in this category were articles that discussed taboos in Muslim culture, such as nudity and sexuality, and why cultural exploitation is protected by the Geneva Conventions.

Terrorist Revenge. This category was comprised of topics that dealt with what can be considered terrorist revenge for the abuses, including the decapitation of Berg, vandalism to British graves in Palestine, and terrorist calls to capture coalition soldiers.

Human Rights Reports. Newspapers also reported on the existence of numerous human rights complaints and reports of abuse since the early months of the war. This topic is listed under the common category because it was often impossible to determine from the coverage if the complaints were directed towards the American or the British troops.

Role of Digital Cameras. Finally, newspapers discussed the reasons why the photos were taken and, specifically how digital technologies impacted how the public learned about the abuse of Iraqis.

As shown in Table 9, International Law was discussed by all four newspapers with about the same frequency. The *Guardian* included discussion on International law in 14

percent of the articles selected for analysis, the *New York Times* in 13 percent of its articles,

and the *Times* and the *Washington Post* included the topic in about 13 and 11 percent of their

articles. Terrorist revenge received most attention from the *Times* (10 percent of articles).

Table 9. Common topics

	New York Times		Washington Post		Guardian		Times	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
International Law	9	13	8	11	8	14	8	13
Terrorist Revenge	5	7	2	3	2	3	6	10
Human Rights Reports	5	7	4	6	10	17	6	10
Role of Digital Cameras	5	7	1	1	4	7	7	11
Total	69		72		58		62	

*The number on the left is the number of total articles selected for analysis. Percentages do not add to 100 percent because several topics could be covered in the same article. Thus, the total percentage column is left blank.

Of the four newspapers, the *Guardian* devoted more coverage to the reports from

Human Rights organizations--17 of its articles dealt with this topic. The *Times* discussed

Human Rights organizations reports and reactions in 10 of the articles, whereas the *New York

Times* and the *Washington Post* included this topic in seven and six percent of their articles

respectively. Related to the photo authenticity theme, some articles questioned whether it was

appropriate to show the abuse photos publicly, and the related topic of why the photos were

taken in the first place were discussed in 11 percent of the T*ime's* articles, while the other

three newspapers devoted less attention to it--seven percent (the *New York Times*), one

percent (the *Washington Post*) and seven percent (the *Guardian*).

Portrayal of Responsible Agency

The second research question was designed to examine one of the most important

aspects of news framing--the assignment of responsibility for the abuses. That is, each news

article was examined in respect to the question "Who or what was portrayed as the

responsible agents/agency?" More specifically, each news article was examined to determine

whether the media were portraying responsibility as a systemic issue or as the actions of just

a few individuals. Attribution of responsibility can be considered the most important framing

mechanism because explanations of who is responsible would change not only how the

events are interpreted but also framing of the consequences and solutions. Media effects

research suggests that attribution of responsibility to individuals on any societal issue relieves

political actors from looking for solutions that would change societal processes and

institutions.[1]

The attribution of responsibility to individuals rather than policy was the explanation

that was offered by administrations on both the U.S. and U.K. sides. Analysis of whether the

coverage resembled both governments' explanations can provide insight into the media's

ability to work independently from governmental influences. If the media were to favor

individual responsibility frames, this would indicate that the media not only succumbed to

official explanations of the events but they would have also successfully relieved public

officials from acknowledging systemic failures and policy wrongdoing. That is, if Iraqi abuse

scandals were covered as the actions of a few deviant individuals, the media could have

---

[1] Shanto Iyengar, *Is Anyone Responsible?* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991); Shanto Iyengar and Adam Simon, "News Coverage of the Gulf Crisis and Public Opinion," *Communication Research* 20, no. 3 (1993): 370.

effectively relieved policy makers from being responsible for the detention policies and interrogation procedures implemented by both coalition armies in Iraq.

Besides literally naming those responsible for the abuses, the media can suggest responsibility by applying "episodic" or events versus "thematic" or investigative frames. Iyengar suggests that the episodic nature of television news discourages viewers to make public officials accountable for resolving a societal problem.[1] In other words, if news is presented as a specific sequence of events, responsibility falls on the individuals involved. On the contrary, thematic news frames place political issues and events in some general context which leads to the attribution of responsibility and accountability to public officials.

Thus, in order to examine how the four newspapers constructed responsibility frames, this study examines the interplay between the events and investigations frames with the individual and systemic responsibility frames. The examination begins with a general overview of how important the issue of assigning responsibility was for all four newspapers. Responsibility question was not explored by all of the news articles. As indicated in Table 10, when covering the U.S. abuses the *New York Times* explored the responsibility frame in 25 articles or about 34 percent of the coverage the *Washington Post* explored responsibility question in 35 articles or about 52 percent of articles, the *Guardia*n applied responsibility frame in 16 articles or about 55 percent of the coverage and the *Times* explored responsibility frame in 13 articles or about 30 percent of the coverage.[2] When covering the U.K. abuses, *New York Times* explored the responsibility frame in 4 articles or about 44 percent of the

---

[1] Shanto Iyengar, *Is Anyone Responsible?* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991), 2.
[2] Note that in Chapter 3 it was indicated that the *New York Times* utilized individual responsibility in 13 articles and systemic responsibility in 13 articles. However, four articles utilized both frames--hence the total articles in the *New York Times* which applied a responsibility frame add up to 22. See Table 3 for a complete list of frames utilized by each newspaper.

coverage the *Washington Post* explored responsibility question in 4 articles or about 36

percent of articles, the *Guardian* applied responsibility frame in 11 articles or about 31

percent of the coverage and the *Times* explored responsibility frame in 12 articles or about 43

percent of the coverage.

Table 10. Responsibility frame

	New York Times		*Washington Post*		*Guardian*		*Times*	
	US	UK	US	UK	US	UK	US	UK
Number of Articles	25	4	35	4	16	11	13	12
Percentages	34	44	52	36	55	31	30	43
Total articles	65	9	67	11	29	36	43	28

The following sections will explore how the responsibility frame was applied by each

of the four newspapers. First, there will be an analysis of how responsibility frames were

applied when covering U.S. abuses, and then the following section will examine

responsibility frames applied by the four newspapers when covering U.K. abuses.

Attribution of Responsibility in U.S. Abuses

The four newspapers differed in how they constructed the responsibility frame when

covering U.S. abuses. As Table 11 suggests, the coverage seems to favor attribution of

responsibility to the system rather than individuals. The systemic responsibility frame was

often combined with the investigative frame of coverage which means that assigning the

responsibility frame was the result of in-depth investigative reporting that explored the *why*

and *how* aspects of the news prism. In addition, the stories which assigned responsibility to

individuals were utilizing the events frame which suggests a more simplistic *who, what,*

when, where news format that focused on relying facts and seemingly objective truths as

opposed to a more elaborate investigative or thematic type of reporting which focused on the

why and *how* parts of the news narrative.

Table 11. Assignment of responsibility in the coverage of the U.S. abuse

US Stories	New York Times		Washington Post		Guardian		Times	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Events & Systemic	3	5	4	6	3	10	1	2
Investigations & Systemic	10	15	19	28	8	28	9	21
Events & Individual	11	17	11	16	5	17	2	5
Investigations & Individual	2	3	1	1	0	0	1	2
Total*	65		67		29		43	

Total represents the number of articles which covered U.S. abuses. The total number of articles utilizing either of the four frames listed in the table would not add up to the number of total articles for the newspaper as a responsibility frame was not explored in all of the news articles. For the complete list of frames, see Table 3 in Chapter 3.

The following section will examine how each newspaper constructed the systemic and individual responsibility frames by combining responsibility frames events and investigations frames, citing sources, and utilizing different framing and reasoning devices.

Construction of the U.S. Responsibility Frames in the *New York Times*

When covering the U.S. story, the *New York Times* utilized the responsibility frame in 22 news articles or about 34 percent of the coverage. In four of these articles the *New York Times* included both systemic as well as individual responsibility frames. This means that each of the frames was explored in 13 news articles or 20 percent of the coverage which gave an impression of "balanced" reporting which has been one of the attributes of the U.S. media for a long time. The following two sections will explore the construction of systemic and individual responsibility frames in the *New York Times*.

Systemic frame in the New York Times. The *New York Times* combined the investigative frame with the systemic responsibility frame in 10 news articles or 15 percent of the coverage, and three additional articles (or about 5 percent of the coverage) utilized the systemic responsibility frame with events or episodic framing (see Table 11). The *New York*

Times relied on military and government reports as its sources when constructing the systemic responsibility frame. The newspaper cited Gen. Antonio Taguba's investigative report and his testimony in front of the Senate Armed Services Committee in 14 articles.[1] Investigations ordered by Maj. Gen. George Fay and Lt. Gen. James Helmly to examine interrogation practices and training of military reservists were also used to give weight to the systemic responsibility frame. Gen. Geoffrey Miller's (chief of interrogations and detentions in Iraq) visit to Abu Ghraib and his recommendation to have prison guards prepare detainees for interrogations were discussed as evidence suggesting systemic responsibility. Even though Miller and other sources (such as civilian official, Stephen Cambone, the Undersecretary of Defense for Intelligence) were quoted denying the direct link between Miller's recommendation and abuse at Abu Ghraib, the newspaper built systemic responsibility frame using these investigative reports.

Gen. Janis Karpinski was another source utilized to construct the systemic responsibility frame. Karpinski spoke with the *New York Times* in hope of defending her own involvement or lack of awareness of what was happening at Abu Ghraib under her watch. The newspaper reported that she was suspended from commanding the 800th Military Police Brigade in January 2004 so she could be used as a scapegoat. The *New York Times* quoted her saying that reservists are "disposable" in the eyes of the army.[2] However, Karpinski's testimony stopped short of disclosing any larger policies that resulted in prisoner abuse. According to Karpinski, the soldiers in the photographs were "bad people," but their actions may have been encouraged by military intelligence officers.

---

[1] Overall, Taguba's name was used 83 times in the articles selected for analysis.
[2] Phillip Shenon, "Officer Suggests Iraqi Jail Abuse Was Encouraged," *New York Times*, May 2, 2004.

The *New York Times* also quoted Staff Sgt. Ivan Frederick, a reservist who was a prison guard in his civilian life to make the systemic responsibility frame stronger. Fredrick and his lawyers were actually responsible for leaking some of the story to the media. The *New York Times* used Frederick's letters in which he explained: "I questioned some of the things that I saw… such things as leaving inmates in their cell with no clothes or in female underpants, handcuffing them to the door of their cell. The answer I got was, 'this is how military intelligence wants it done.'"[1]

The stories of the prisoners themselves added to the systemic responsibility frame in the *New York Time's* reporting. Abu Ahmad, a former prisoner at Abu Ghraib, was quoted saying that severe repeated beatings were part of the prisoner preparation for interrogations at Abu Ghraib.[2]

Statements and reactions from human rights officials were also used to strengthen the systemic responsibility frame. The *New York Times* quoted human rights advocates and prisoners' rights lawyers explaining the importance of changes in interrogation policies approved by the U.S. after 9/11.[3] Some U.S. senators were quoted in support of the idea that abuses at Abu Ghraib were the result of the "new intelligence policy which goes right on up to the Pentagon."[4]

The post 9/11 intelligence policy was the strongest reasoning device provided in the newspaper. One article in particular focused on directives signed by President Bush authorizing the C.I.A. to conduct a covert war against Osama bin Laden's Al Qaeda network.

---

[1] Phillip Shenon, "Officer Suggests Iraqi Jail Abuse Was Encouraged," *New York Times*, May 2, 2004.
[2] Ian Fisher, "Ex-Prisoners of G.I.'s Offer More Claims of Mistreatment," *New York Times*, May 4, 2004.
[3] Don Van Natta, "Interrogation Methods in Iraq Aren't All Found in Manual," *New York Times*, May 7, 2004.
[4] Thom Shanker, "Officials Grapple With How and When to Release Images," *New York Times*, May 10, 2004.

The article accounted interrogation techniques that became accepted as part of this new policy and even labeled these techniques as torture. A frightening quote by an anonymous former intelligence official completed the systemic responsibility frame, "There was a debate after 9/11 about how to make people disappear."[1] Both the significance of the quote and anonymity of the source added to the overall impression that the abuse was more than a doing of a few individuals.

The newspaper also utilized reactions by officials in other countries to strengthen the systemic responsibility frame. It included quotes from politicians and media editorials around the world claiming that the abuse was proving that the White House was "creating an atmosphere of lawlessness" where "torture and ill-treatment by the United States . . . can give an example to some dictators in developing countries."[2]

However, the systemic responsibility frame seems to be always shadowed by the individual responsibility frame. In some instances, the *New York Times* included both of the frames in one article just by giving equal attention to the players on both sides--the administration who was responsible for setting up interrogation and detention policies and individuals who were actually committing the abuse. According to the administration, the issue was "a few bad apples," whereas the individuals involved were suggesting different.

The newspaper acknowledged the dichotomy of the two sides. On some occasions, the *New York Times* pointed out that government and military officials provided contradictory accounts of what happened at Abu Ghraib. For example, the newspaper reported that Gen. Richard Myers, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, gave

---

[1] James Risen, David Johnston, and Neil A. Lewis, "Harsh C.I.A. Methods Cited In Top Al Qaeda Interrogations," *New York Times*, May 13, 2004.
[2] Alan Cowell, "Bush's Words Do Little to Ease Horror at Prison Deeds," *New York Times*, May 7, 2004.

contradictory answers on one of his Sunday talk show television interviews. On one hand, Myers insisted that the abuse was the doing of just a "handful" of solders, but at the same time he acknowledged that the full extent of the abuse is not known yet.[1] Another example of such "balanced" reporting was a May 13 article including the quotes from two senators reacting to the viewing of the photographs. Senator John Cornyn, Republican of Texas, was quoted saying that the photos "did not suggest anything broader or deeper."[2] While Senator Frank Lautenberg, Democrat of New Jersey, was quoted saying that he did not believe that abuse "could have been carried out without the knowledge of higher-ups."[3]

Even when reporting on a victim's account, the newspaper looked for opposing opinions. When reporting on Saddam Saleh Aboud's account of his experience at Abu Ghraib, the *New York Times* included a quote, "I just want to clarify one thing, most of the American soldiers were not bad."[4] He was also cited as having said that the soldiers themselves, as a group, seemed conflicted about what they were doing. It is interesting to note that the three articles that combine the systemic and individual responsibility frames were also written in episodic format, with the focus on reporting about events, rather than on issues and investigations.

In closing, the systemic responsibility frame in the *New York Times* was obscured by the amount of attention devoted to the coverage of the investigations as opposed to the causes and consequences of the abuse. Most of the space in each of the 10 articles that combine the systemic and investigative framing was devoted to a "who knew what and when" type of reporting. Each of the news articles was filled with information on what was said by many of

---

[1] James Risen, "Command Errors Aided Iraq Abuse," *New York Times*, May 3, 2004.
[2] Carl Hulse and Sheryl Gay Stolberg, "Lawmakers View Images from Iraq," *New York Times*, May 13, 2004.
[3] Ibid.
[4] Ian Fisher, "Iraqi Tells of U.S. Abuse, From Ridicule to Rape Threat," *New York Times*, May 14, 2004.

the army generals and political officials. The list of investigations under way and who

ordered them were important pieces of information, but that did not necessarily contribute

much clarity to the issue. This seemingly important information obscured the true importance

of investigative reporting. By focusing on the process of investigation and not the reasons

behind the abuse, the *New York Times* did not construct a very strong systemic responsibility

frame.

    Individual frame in the New York Times. The *New York Times* combined the

individual responsibility frame with the events frame in 11 news articles (17 percent of the

coverage) and only two articles utilized the individual responsibility frame combined with

the investigations frame (3 percent of the coverage). One of those articles combined the

individual and the systemic responsibility frames and focused the recounting of Hersh's

article that was published in the *New Yorker*.[1] The article highlighted Karpinski's and

Frederick's accounts of the events. Another article combining investigative reporting with the

individual responsibility frame used Taguba's report as the major framing device and

highlighted Taguba's conclusions that it was the lack of training and low morale that

contributed to the abusive behavior of the soldiers. Lt. Col. Jerry Phillabaum was quoted

insisting that individuals were solely responsible for the abuse, "If they thought these acts

were condoned, then why were they only done a few nights between 0200 and 0400 instead

of during any time between 0600 and 2400 when there were many others around?"[2]

    The newspaper utilized episodic genre of reporting when assigning blame to

individuals. It focused less on why the abuse happened and more on who was involved in the

---

[1] Seymour M. Hersh, "Torture at Abu Ghraib: American Soldiers Brutalized Iraqis. How Far up Does the Responsibility Go?" *New Yorker*. April 30, 2004.
[2] Douglas Jehl and Eric Schnitt, "In Abuse, a Portrayal of Ill-Prepared, Overwhelmed G.I.'s," *New York Times*, May 9, 2004.

abuse. Many articles reported on the reactions by the government and military officials to the abuse. The newspaper emphasized the notion that "a handful of soldiers" were involved in the abuse by focusing on reporting about their punishment. Government officials, including President Bush, were quoted expressing how disturbed they were by the images and often called for not judging the whole country for the "actions of a few."[1] Rumsfeld was quoted insisting that the abuse "doesn't represent America."[2] Even accounts by the torture victims supported the individual responsibility frame. Hayder Sabbar Abd, one of the victims of abuse who recognized himself in the pictures, was quoted saying that he was never interrogated and never charged with a crime, but he was severely beaten, abused, and humiliated at Abu Ghraib. His testimony added to portrayal of the abuse as random and disorganized.

When Gen. Miller's recommendations were brought up in articles relying on the individual responsibility frame, the focus became not the new interrogation procedures but the behavior of a few civilian contractors who were hired as interrogators. For example, Miller was quoted as defending the new, harsher interrogation techniques as a legitimate way of obtaining intelligence. Miller also acknowledged that sometimes some interrogators misused their "authority and used techniques that were not authorized."[3]

Low morale and chaos at Abu Ghraib were listed as factors that contributed to the abuse. The individual responsibility frame was constructed by showing how unprepared and unprofessional the individual soldiers were who appeared in the photos. Specialist Charles

---

[1] Thom Shanker and Jacques Steinberg, "Bush Voices 'Disgust' at Abuse of Iraqi Prisoners," *New York Times*, May 1, 2004. Christine Hauser, "Many Iraqis Are Skeptical of Bush TV Appeal," *New York Times*, May 6, 2004.
[2] Thom Shanker, "At Iraqi Prison, Rumsfeld Vows to Punish Abuse," *New York Times*, May 14, 2004.
[3] Dexter FIlkins, "General Will Trim Inmate Numbers at Iraq Prison," *New York Times*, May 5, 2004.

Graner's violent past was highlighted in several of the news articles. The newspaper reported

that the two "ringleaders"--Frederick and Graner--were both corrections facilities officers in

civilian life, and this was meant to demonstrate that they might have confused what was

acceptable in detention facilities.[1] However, the newspaper stopped short of exploring the

fact that the people familiar with the U.S. detention procedures committed the most abuse

could prove that it was a systemic issue rather than the doing of a handful of "bad people."

Even when Taguba's investigation was referenced, individual soldiers were made to be

responsible and accountable for what was occurring in this detention facility. Phillabaum, not

the new interrogation and detention policy, was blamed for failing to supervise his troops and

for allowing a climate of abuse to take hold.

Finally, the individual responsibility frame was accompanied by the promise of

punishing the individuals responsible for the abuse. The focus on punishment was

emphasized when newspapers covered Specialist Jeremy Sivits' trial. Sivits plead guilty at a

special court-martial, and as part of his plea, he gave testimony against the other soldiers

responsible for the abuse. According to Sivits, the abuse was initiated by the soldiers

themselves, not dictated by the detention policies or procedures. Sivits testimony portrayed

the abuse as random, gratuitous and much enjoyed by some of the accused soldiers,

specifically, by Graner. Sivits' trial was covered in three of the articles utilizing the

individual responsibility frame.[2]

Overall, when constructing the individual responsibility frame the *New York Times*

---

[1] Douglas Jehl and Eric Schnitt, "In Abuse, a Portrayal of Ill-Prepared, Overwhelmed G.I.'s," *New York Times*, May 9, 2004.
[2] Dexter Filkins, "First Trial Set to Begin May 19 in Abuse in Iraq," *New York Times*, May 10, 2004.
Adam Liptak, "First Baghdad Court-Martial May Set Table for Later Ones," *New York Times*, May 11, 2004.
Kate Zernike, "Accused Soldier Paints Scene of Eager Mayhem," *New York Times*, May 14, 2004.

focused on reporting events such as courts-martial or reactions of officials instead of what happened in Iraq. When compared to the systemic responsibility frame, the individual responsibility frame had a more simplistic framing device repertoire. Repeated claims that the abuse was the doing of just a few bad individuals did not sound very convincing. Even Sivits's testimony loses credibility because it was clear that he was testifying in exchange for receiving a lesser punishment for his own actions. However, even on its own, the individual responsibility frame does not have much merit but it appears to have been used by the *New York Times* to soften the systemic responsibility frame.

Construction of the U.S. Responsibility Frames in the *Washington Post*

The responsibility frames were applied in 52 percent of the coverage: 23 articles (34 percent of coverage) utilized the systemic responsibility frame and an additional 12 articles (18 percent of coverage) applied the individual responsibility frame (see Table 10). One article in the *Washington Post* combined both systemic and individual responsibility frames. The following two sections will explore the construction of these frames in more detail.

Systemic frame in the Washington Post. The majority of *the Washington Post* articles utilizing the systemic responsibility frame also utilized investigations or a thematic type of reporting (see Table 11). Only four articles attributing responsibility were written as events or episodic reporting (6 percent of the coverage). The four articles were similar in a sense that they emphasized the timeline of when the abuses came to light and the process of investigating the abuses. They focused on government officials' reactions and calls to investigate further. [1] Rumsfeld was quoted defending the timing and pace of these

---

[1] Peter Slevin and Robin Wright, "Pentagon Was Warned of Abuse Months Ago*," Washington Post*, May 8, 2004. Jeffrey Smith, "Senators Fault Pentagon As New Photos Emerge," *Washington Post*, May 10, 2004. Jim

investigations. Sen. John Kerry was quoted stating that failures in command and war

mismanagement in general were responsible for the situation at Abu Ghraib. Even though the

emphasis in these three articles was on events--*who, when, what* part of the news script--the

conclusion that the system was somehow responsible for the abuse puts them into the same

systemic responsibility category.

The importance of investigative reporting was emphasized not only with the majority

of the articles taking a thematic or investigative approach to news reporting, it was also

highlighted through a mini series of the three articles that was published on May 9, 10, and

11. Each article was labeled as "First," "Second," or "Last" "of the Three Articles" giving the

investigations frame some continuity.[1] Overall, the systemic frame was emphasized in 19

articles or about 28 percent of the coverage.

When the systemic and investigations frames were combined, several sources

emerged as important framing devices. Taguba's investigation and testimony were utilized in

21 articles.[2] Taguba's report was used by the newspaper to report that abuse occurred

because of "failure in leadership … from the brigade commander on down. Lack of

discipline, no training whatsoever and no supervision. Supervisory omission was rampant."[3]

The *Washington Post* also reported information from a separate criminal investigation by

Maj. Gen. George R. Fay who was assigned to investigate interrogation procedures at Abu

Ghraib. The International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) reports as well as testimonies

by the Amnesty International officials were used to add even more credibility to the systemic

---

VandeHei, "Kerry Assails Bush On Iraq," *Washington Post*, May 13, 2004. Dana Priest and Dan Morgan,
"Rumsfeld Defends Rules for Prison," *Washington Post*, May 13, 2004.
[1] Scott Higham, Josh White and Christian Davenport, "A Prison on the Brink," *Washington Post*, May 9, 2004.
Scott Wilson and Sewell Chan, "As Insurgency Grew, So Did Prison Abuse," *Washington Post*, May 10, 2004.
Dana Priest and Joe Stephens, "Secret World of U.S. Interrogation," *Washington Post*, May 11, 2004.
[2] Taguba's name appeared in the Washington Post 105 times.
[3] David Von Drehle, "Capitol Hill Sees the Flip Side of a Powerful Warrior," *Washington Post*, May 8, 2004.

responsibility frame.

To make the systemic responsibility frame even stronger the *Washington Post* also included testimony by Saher Dabbagh, a former Iraqi lieutenant colonel who worked with U.S. officials at the very beginning of the occupation. The newspaper printed Dabbagh's account that U.S. intelligence officers were warned by Iraqis that they could not be successful performing intelligence and security procedures in Iraq because they were not Iraqis.[1] Dabbagh claimed that any intelligence gathered was false, and the people who were sent to detention facilities like Abu Ghraib were most often innocent and could not have any significant intelligence.[2] Another article reemphasized the innocence of Iraqi detainees and also included a testimony by Malik Dohan, the President of the Iraqi Bar Association who criticized the use of term "security detainees" which afforded the U.S. the right to keep detainees indefinitely and deny them access to attorneys. Dohan was quoted saying "The system is not fair at all."[3] Dismissal of Geneva conventions as culprit for abuse was echoed by Sen. John Kerry.[4]

The *Washington Post* reported on the shift in American priorities after 9/11 as indication that abuse at Abu Ghraib was systemic. John Conroy, author of 2001 book titled "Unspeakable Acts, Ordinary People," was quoted to say that 9/11 resulted in policies that dictated "subordination of human rights to the victory in war against terrorism."[5] The newspaper also quoted Philip Zimbardo, a researcher who conducted the famous Stanford

---

[1] Scott Wilson and Sewell Chan, "As Insurgency Grew, So Did Prison Abuse. Needing Intelligence, U.S. Pressed Detainees," *Washington Post*, May 10, 2004.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Rajiv Chandrasekaran and Scott Wilson, Mistreatment Of Detainees Went Beyond Guards' Abuse. Ex-Prisoners, Red Cross Cite Flawed Arrests, Denial of Rights," *Washington Post*, May 11, 2004
[4] Jim VandeHei, "Kerry Assails Bush On Iraq. Senator Says War Is 'Mismanaged'," *Washington Post*, May 13, 2004.
[5] Ibid.

psychology experiment, who stated that individuals might behave badly when put into a bad situation. Zimbardo was quoted dismissing the "few bad apples" explanation by stating "In my study, we put good people into a bad barrel, they came out bad apples."[1]

In many of the *Washington Post* articles the systemic frame emphasized the argument that the soldiers were acting under the orders of military intelligence. Therefore, relatives and lawyers of the seven accused soldiers were cited as sources contributing to the idea that abuses were sanctioned by the leadership. For example, Frederick's letters home were used in the *Washington Post* as testimony that he was told by MI to prepare detainees for interrogation. His e-mails stated that preparation methods resulted in prisoners "breaking within hours."[2] Graner's lawyer insisted that the photographs themselves were ordered by the intelligence community to be used as interrogation leverage. Sabrina Harman was quoted explaining that the instructions for how each individual prisoner ought to be treated were "made up" by the intelligence officers and often based on the behavior of the detainee. The ones that cooperated were given jumpsuits, mattresses and cigarettes.[3] Harman's mother was quoted saying that Sabrina was "railroaded" because she was not trained to do intelligence work.[4] More importantly, the newspaper printed Harman's account that on many occasions detainees were handed over to the military police not only by intelligence officers but also by CIA operatives and contractors.[5] Karpinski appeared in several articles stating that MI demanded intelligence and dictated the treatment of the prisoners. Another officer of the 372nd Military Police Company unit who remained anonymous was quoted stating that "the

[1] Ibid.
[2] Sewell Chan and Michael Amon, "Prisoner Abuse Probe Widened; Military Intelligence at Center of Investigation," *Washington Post*, May 2, 2004.
[3] Jackie Spinner, "Soldier: Unit's Role Was to Break Down Prisoners," *Washington Post*, May 8, 2004.
[4] Sewell Chan and Jackie Spinner, "Allegations of Abuse Lead To Shakeup at Iraqi Prison," *Washington Post*, April 30, 2004.
[5] Ibid.

leadership problems go much higher than the brigade commander."[1]

Contractors and their role in Iraq war was another big part of the systemic responsibility script. Not only the contractors were reported to have ordered the abuse, they were also reported to exercise significant authority over regular soldiers because of their technical expertise and their close proximity to high-level military officials. The newspaper reported that contractors were virtually indistinguishable and interchangeable position among the soldiers.[2] Hence, their presence complicated a chain of command. Evidence from Taguba's investigation and soldiers' testimony was used to show how contractors contributed to the abuse climate or even directly ordered abuse.

Perhaps intended to minimize systemic responsibility, the *Washington Post* also covered the issue of low morale of soldiers in the 800th Military Police Brigade which resulted both from the additional time they were required to stay in Iraq after the combat operation had ended as well as difficult conditions at Abu Ghraib due to the attacks on the prison, overcrowding of the prison, and a lack of sanitary conditions and additional creature comforts available to soldiers in other locations.

Abu Ghraib's connection with Guantanamo, or the efforts to "Gitmoize" Abu Ghraib were probably the strongest argumentative devices used to build the systemic responsibility frame in the *Washington Post*. One article presented a detailed history of how Guantanamo emerged as a detention place for "enemy combatants."[3] The article discussed U.S. efforts to hurriedly construct Guantanamo facilities, and the headline of the article labeled Guantanamo

---

[1] Sewell Chan and Michael Amon, "Prisoner Abuse Probe Widened; Military Intelligence at Center of Investigation," *Washington Post*, May 2, 2004.
[2] Ariana Eunjung Cha and Renae Merle, "Line Increasingly Blurred Between Soldiers and Civilian Contractors," *Washington Post*, May 13, 2004.
[3] Scott Higham, Joe Stephens, and Margot Williams, "Guantanamo--A Holding Cell In War on Terror; Prison Represents a Problem That's Tough to Get Out Of," *Washington Post*, May 2, 2004.

as a "Problem That's Tough to Get Out Of."[1] Numerous other articles included arguments

that the Abu Ghraib situation highlighted that the administration's general approach to

handling war prisoners and terrorist suspects had changed since the 9/11 attacks.[2] Another

news story detailed Miller's recommendation that the new commander in charge of the 800th

MP Brigade, Brig. Gen. Janis Karpinski, permitted MP to set "conditions for the successful

interrogation and exploitation" of the prisoners.[3] According to Taguba, Miller's

recommendations were noted as in conflict with the army's regulations, and the *Washington

Post* referenced this fact in several of its articles emphasizing systemic responsibility. At the

same time, Miller's explanation that his recommendations meant "having the guard force

passively involved in the ability to interrogate rapidly and effectively" was also covered by

the newspaper.[4] The strongest argument for interrogation policies and procedures being

responsible for the abuse at Abu Ghraib came from an investigative exposé by Dana Priest

and Joe Stephens published on May 11 titled "Secret World of U.S. Interrogation."[5] This was

the last of the three investigative articles that provided the most thorough coverage of the

system of detention facilities utilized by the U.S. military and the CIA which included the

rendition of prisoners to countries like Egypt, Morocco, Jordan and Saudi Arabia where

torture was commonplace during interrogations. The article highlighted the existence of

CIA's "ghost detainees" as well as explored the legality of classifying detainees as "enemy

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Robin Wright and Bradley Graham, "Bush Privately Chides Rumsfeld. Officials Say Pentagon Resisted Repeated Calls for Prison Changes," *Washington Post*, May 6, 2004.

[3] Scott Higham, Josh White and Christian Davenport, "A Prison on the Brink. Usual Military Checks and Balances Went Missing," *Washington Post*, May 9, 2004.

[4] Sewell Chan, "New Head Of Prisons Defends Advice. Guards Were to Be 'Actively Engaged," *Washington Post*, May 9, 2004.

[5] Dana Priest and Joe Stephens, "Secret World of U.S. Interrogation. Long History of Tactics in Overseas Prisons Is Coming to Light," *Washington Post*, May 11, 2004.

combatants."[1] The article also included testimony by the Saudi official who explained that the CIA preferred to interrogate suspects in the Arab world because "their interrogators can speak a detainee's language and can exploit his religion and customs."[2]

The newspaper even questioned Rumsfeld's claims that abuses were "un-American."[3] The newspaper published the results of the opinion poll in which 45 percent of Americans said that torture can be justified under certain scenarios (i.e. ticking bomb). The newspaper also included testimony by Harvard law professor Alan Dershowitz who claimed that since the U.S. employs torture secretly anyways, it would work better if it were made legal, "By making it open, we wouldn't be able to hide behind the hypocrisy."[4]

In conclusion, the *Washington Post* constructed a strong systemic responsibility frame. The coverage can be distinguished by longer and more detailed articles. The *Washington Post* was the only newspaper to designate a series of articles on the detainee abuse at Abu Ghraib. Combined with an extensive investigative type of reporting throughout the coverage, the *Washington Post* constructed the most thorough picture of what was happening at Abu Ghraib at the time of the abuses. Using military and human rights organizations reports, testimony of the soldiers participating in the abuse, and many other non-governmental sources, the newspaper painted a picture of chaos and disorder at Abu Ghraib. In addition, the newspaper acknowledged that constant attacks on the prison from outside as well as prisoner riots on the inside contributed to the system of disorder at Abu Ghraib. The background information on the history of torture by the U.S. military and

---

[1] Ghost detainees were undocumented detainees who were kept secret from the Red Cross and handled by officers from OGAs (other government agencies--military's jargon for the CIA).
[2] Ibid.
[3] Shankar Vedantam, "The Psychology of Torture. Past Incidents Show Abusers Think Ends Justify the Means," *Washington Post*, May 11, 2004.
[4] Ibid.

renditions of the detainees to countries where torture was commonplace were strong

arguments designed to ask questions about the responsibility at the very top of hierarchy.

Individual responsibility frame in the Washington Post. Notwithstanding strong

claims for systemic responsibility, the *Washington Post* coverage also included 12 articles

that framed abuse as individual wrongdoing (see Table 11). This constitutes about 18 percent

of the coverage. All but one article constructing the individual responsibility frame also

utilized the events frame. The one article combining the individual responsibility frame with

the investigative frame relied mostly on Taguba's investigative report and reasoned abuse as

a result of lack of training, low soldier morale, and leadership failures at the prison.[1]

Individual responsibility was constructed by focusing on several middle-ranking officers as

well as contractors: Col. Thomas Pappas, commander of the 205th Military Intelligence

Brigade; Lt. Col. Steven Jordan, the director of the Joint Interrogation and Debriefing Center

inside the prison; Stephen Stephanowicz and John Israel, two employees of CACI

International Inc., an Arlington-based security firm that hired interrogators to work at the

prison. Individual responsibility was constructed by reporting about communication

problems between Karpinski, Phillabaum, and Pappas. The article included such excerpts

from the Taguba report claiming "There was no clear delineation of responsibility between

commands, little coordination at the command level, and no integration of the two

functions."[2] Therefore, even though the article took an investigative approach and provided

quite extensive coverage of the situation at the prison, the focus on individual people

contributed to portraying the abuse as the responsibility of a few individuals, not the system.

---

[1] Sewell Chan and Thomas E. Ricks, "Iraq Prison Supervisors Face Army Reprimand. Probe of Interrogations May Bring More Charges," *Washington Post*, May 4, 2004.
[2] Ibid.

The other 11 articles (16 percent of the coverage) constructed the individual

responsibility frame by focusing on individual soldiers who actually participated in the abuse

and using the events or episodic type of reporting. The episodic frame was utilized when

reporting on Bush's appearance on Arab television or reactions to abuse by government

officials or the public. Detailed descriptions of the actions of soldiers accused of abuse

worked to strengthen the individual responsibility frame.

The newspaper built the individual responsibility by quoting government officials.

These included Bush's statement that abuse "represents the actions of a few people," as well

as Bush calling the abuse "abhorrent" or even his more famous claim that what happened at

Abu Ghraib "does not represent the America that I know."[1] Rumsfeld was quoted repeating

the same sentiments when visiting U.S. troops in Iraq, "It doesn't represent America."[2] Col.

David Quantock, commander of the 16th Military Police Brigade, who took command of

detention operations at Abu Ghraib in late January 2004 strengthened this notion when he

was quoted saying, "We had soldiers we put trust in who didn't deserve that trust."[3] Other

government officials were quoted stating how shocked they were to find out about the abuse

and attesting that they must be "anomalies."[4] Complementing the official perspective, some

articles included the results of opinion polls which indicated that 62 percent of Americans

believed the prison abuse was an isolated incident.[5] The same article included testimony by

several "regular" Americans which included an opinion by barber Eddie Ricci in Florida who

---

[1] Mike Allen and Dan Balz, "On Arab TV, President Says U.S. Is 'Appalled.' Bush Stops Short of Apology in Interviews," *Washington Post*, May 6, 2004.
[2] Josh White, "Rumsfeld Visits Prison in Iraq. Defense Secretary, During Unannounced Trip, Vows 'Justice' for Perpetrators," *Washington Post*, May 14, 2004.
[3] Ibid.
[4] Dan Eggen and Walter Pincus, "Ashcroft Says U.S. Can Prosecute Civilian Contractors for Prison Abuse," *Washington Post*, May 7, 2004.
[5] Manuel Roig-Franzia, "Perspectives on Abuse Separated by Miles in Florida," *Washington Post*, May 9, 2004.

stated that "No matter what this president does, you should never, never, never knock your president at a time of war and make your country look foolish."[1] This quote solidified the notion that no matter the reason for why the abuse occurred, the soldiers directly involved should take the blame, and only they should be punished.

The sentiment was echoed in the opinions of people in Cresaptown, a town where the seven members of 372nd Military Police Company originated from. Frank Willetts, chairman of the Allegany County Republican Central Committee, was quoted saying "What were they thinking?"[2] The article implied that the town which used to be proud of the soldiers was now disappointed in their actions. Several people in town tried to minimize the abuse by saying that the Iraqis were "just humiliated" but they still remain alive, comparison to the abuse of four American civilians in Fallujah on March 31 who were killed and their bodies dragged through the city.[3]

Focus on punishment was a big part of the individual responsibility frame. The newspaper quoted Attorney General John Ashcroft promising to investigate the abuse and John Kerry calling for more investigations. At times, the significance of investigations was minimized by focusing on reporting about investigation procedures necessary to punish individuals. Call for investigations led to the coverage of preparations for a court-martial of Spec. Jeremy Sivits as well as those for Staff Sgt. Ivan Frederick and Sgt. Javal Davis.

Similar to the *New York Time's* coverage, the *Washington Post* published transcripts of Sivits' statements which were recorded in January 2004. These statements were detailed accounts of how five of the six other members of the 372nd Military Police Company would

---

[1] Ibid.
[2] Elizabeth Williamson, "Resentment Over Iraq Prison Abuse. Some See Unit's Home Unfairly Tarnished," *Washington Post*, May 9, 2004.
[3] Ibid.

face courts-martial for abusing detainees. Detailed descriptions of charges against the soldiers and explanations of both the special court-martial and the general court-martial procedures added to the construction of the individual responsibility frame. The fact that Sivits was scheduled for the special court-martial because he had agreed to plea guilty for maltreatment of detainees and agreed to testify against the other soldiers in exchange for a less severe punishment took away some of his credibility. Nevertheless, the coverage of Sivits' charges in combination with detailed descriptions of the abuse worked as evidence adding to the individual responsibility theme.

An interesting twist on individual responsibility emerged in the coverage of Rumsfeld's testimony before the Senate and House Armed Services committee. Responsibility in this case shifted from the soldiers to Rumsfeld who admitted that he was responsible, not for the policy that allowed abuse to occur, but rather he admitted responsibility for the abuse because it happened "on his watch."[1] Needless to say, admittance of responsibility came into the picture only after the public and other government officials demanded Rumsfeld's resignation for what happened at Abu Ghraib.

Explanation for why the photographs were taken varied in articles with the individual responsibility frame. When applying systemic responsibility, intelligence gathering was the reason why the photos were taken. They were to be used to intimidate future detainees. When individual responsibility was argued, the photographs were explained to be taken for soldiers' personal use. The existence of digital cameras and trophy photographs were explained to be the culprits for why the photographs were taken.

Overall, the articles applying the individual responsibility frame were not as thorough

---

[1] Bradley Graham, "Rumsfeld Warns Not All Images Are Out. Secretary Regrets Detainees Abused," *Washington Post*, May 9, 2004.

as the articles applying the systemic responsibility frame. In general, these articles were

much shorter and provided just tidbits of information as they also utilized events type

reporting. In general, this led to a much weaker and less believable concept of individual

responsibility. Nevertheless, when presented out of the larger context of systemic issues, the

articles that utilized the individual responsibility frame contributed to the support of the

official administration's opinion on abuse.

Construction of the U.S. Responsibility Frames in the *Guardian*

       The *Guardian* utilized the responsibility frame when covering the U.S. abuses in 16

news stories or 55 percent of the coverage. The systemic and investigations frames were

combined in 8 articles (28 percent of the coverage), whereas only three articles (10 percent of

the coverage) attributing responsibility to a systemic problem utilized events style reporting

(see Table 11). Individual and events frames were combined in all five articles attributing

responsibility to individuals (17 percent of the coverage).

       Systemic frame in the Guardian. Similar to the other newspapers, the *Guardian*

constructed the systemic responsibility frame through the use of sources. The Taguba report

once again was the major source for systemic responsibility. Taguba's name was cited in 7

news articles in the *Guardian's* coverage.[1] Just as the other newspapers, the *Guardian* cited

Taguba report finding "failure of leadership . . . lack of discipline, no training whatsoever

and no supervision" as well as blaming the higher command for inappropriately putting

military intelligence in charge of Abu Graib.[2] What was different in the *Guardian* was that

the conclusions provided by Taguba about the extent of abuses at Abu Ghraib were qualified

---

[1] Taguba was cited 14 times in the *Guardian*, significantly less when compared to the U.S. newspapers.
[2] Julian Borger, "Harsh Methods Approved at Top," *Guardian*, May 12, 2004.

by the *Guardian* as "evidence of war crimes."[1] Another article using Taguba's report focused

on the "ghost detainees."[2] Other official sources were used by the *Guardian* as well. General

Richard Myers, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, was quoted stating that he could not be

sure the abuses were not systemic. Gen. Karpinski was quoted stating that responsibility for

the abuse was shared at the highest level of the army's leadership, namely, she said that Gen.

Ricardo Sanchez, commander of the U.S. land forces in Iraq, should be held accountable.

The accused soldiers were also quoted in the *Guardian* saying that they asked for training

and guidance from the chain of command on how to handle detainees but received none. The

soldiers even reported not having an opportunity to read the Geneva Conventions until after

the abuse became public.

The *Guardian* used Miller's recommendation that MPs were to set the conditions for

interrogations by softening up detainees as one of the strongest reasoning devices in

constructing this frame. However, Miller's persona was not always identified. In one article

the reporter referred to the team from Guantanamo visiting Abu Ghraib in September of 2003

to give advice on interrogation techniques. Gen. Karpinski's testimony echoed the idea that

MI were not only responsible for instigating the abuse but they went to great length to

prevent her and Red Cross representatives from visiting parts of Abu Ghraib facility where

most of the abuse occurred.

CBS *60 Minutes* II show was another source utilized by the *Guardian* to emphasize

abuse as systemic issue. The newspaper strengthened the systemic responsibility frame by

reporting that the CBS *60 Minutes* II show that aired on April 28, 2004 was in fact delayed at

---

[1] Julian Borger, "US Officer Says Prison Guards Tried to Cover up Abuse of Iraqi Prisoners," *Guardian*, May 3, 2004.

[2] Julian Borger, "Jailed Iraqis Hidden from Red Cross, Says US Army," *Guardian*, May 5, 2004.

the request of General Richard Myers.[1] Though not directly stated, the request to delay the

report added to the notion of the U.S. government's intent to cover up the story.

Contractors and their role in the army were emphasized by the newspaper. Torin

Nelson, the U.S. former MI working in Iraq in 2003 as a private contractor was quoted by the

Guardian blaming the abuses on a failure of command in U.S. military intelligence and an

over-reliance on private firms.[2] Since Nelson can be considered an insider of the U.S.

interrogation system, his testimony added much weight to the systemic frame. Nelson in

particular was concerned with the fact that many detainees were actually innocent. According

to the *Guardian*, contractors were part of a system that operated under pressures to produce

intelligence. This pressure from the administration resulted in unlawful interrogation and

detention techniques.

One article took the issue of contractors a step further and explained that some

contractors were responsible for teaching other contractors and military police how to abuse

prisoners.[3] Specifically, the newspaper reported that contractors were responsible for

spreading R2I--resistance to interrogation--techniques which were taught to special forces as

part of their training to deal with capture. The *Guardian* reported that all of the techniques

visible in the Abu Ghraib pictures resemble the R2I techniques. The *Guardian* explained that

the problem with contractors using those techniques to prepare detainees for interrogation

was that they did not understand the effect. When R2I were used for training purposes they

normally occurred with the supervision of a psychologist. For many, even training sessions

under R2I techniques were difficult to handle. The fact that the *Guardian* connected Abu

---

[1] Gary Younge and Julian Borger, "CBS Delayed Report on Iraqi Prison Abuse After Military Chiefs Plea," *Guardian*, May 4, 2004.
[2] Julian Borger, "Cooks and Drivers were Working as Interrogators," *Guardian*, May 7, 2004.
[3] David Leigh, "UK Forces Taught Torture Methods," *Guardian*, May 8, 2004.

Ghraib with R2I techniques helped support the systemic responsibility frame.

On another occasion the *Guardian* suggested that abuse was widespread and not always part of the interrogation process. The *Guardian* reported that many soldiers admitted that abuse and degradation of detainees was occurring on a regular basis because many soldiers thought that they were dealing with people who were responsible for 9/11 and that led them to assume "the gloves are off" attitude."[1] This attitude, the *Guardian* concluded, steamed from the general policies and attitudes dictated by the administration.[2]

Testimony by human rights workers was used by the *Guardian* to support the systemic frame. The newspaper published a testimony by Cliff Kindy, a member of the Christian Peacekeepers Teams, who suggested that the situation at Abu Ghraib facility was actually better than other places in Iraq and said the publicly-released pictures did not show the worst abuse occurring in Iraq. The *Guardian* also paid attention to an issue that was largely left out of the coverage of other newspapers--women inmates.[3] The newspaper reported not only about Iraqi women being raped by the U.S. soldiers or humiliated by the solders but also noted that women inmates are innocent. The newspaper elaborated that women were often arrested in the place of husbands or fathers during raids if the male suspect was not at home. Nada Doumani of the International Committee of the Red Cross was quoted stating that the system was at fault. Namely, the detainees did not have any judicial rights and procedures.

Overall, the *Guardian* constructed a strong systemic responsibility frame. Even though some of the information published in the *Guardian* was the same as the other

---

[1] Ibid.
[2] Suzanne Goldenberg, "Interrogation: US Forces were Taught Torture Techniques," *Guardian*, May 14, 2004.
[3] Luke Harding, "Focus Shifts to Jail Abuse of Women," *Guardian*, May 12, 2004.

newspapers, it was more inclined to draw stronger conclusions about what the abuse meant in

the context of the Iraq war and the U.S. government's responsibility for Abu Ghraib. The

newspaper did not hesitate to draw connection between 9/11 and changes in interrogation and

detention policies and procedures. The newspaper explored the possibility that even if the

abuse at Abu Ghraib was not part of the interrogation process, it was indicative of the

"gloves are off" attitude that emerged after 9/11. The spread of abuse at Abu Ghraib and

beyond was emphasized in the newspaper when explaining abuse as a systemic issue.

Individual frame in the Guardian. All 5 articles utilizing the individual responsibility

frame emphasized events type of reporting. This means that the individual responsibility

frame was given less in-depth attention, and instead, those articles focused on the basic

structure of the news pyramid.

Just as the other newspapers had done, the individual responsibility frame in the

Guardian was constructed by focusing on the six soldiers who were charged for the abuse.

The *Guardian* often listed these charges in a matter-of-fact manner. The newspaper included

Bush's reaction to the abuse "I shared a deep disgust that those prisoners were treated the

way that they were treated."[1] Brigadier Gen. Mark Kimmitt, the army's top spokesman in

Baghdad, was quoted saying that there was "no excuse" for the soldiers' behavior and that he

felt "appalled … at the actions of these few."[2] Kimmitt was also quoted stating that according

to the investigations no more than 20 soldiers were involved in the abuse, and the majority of

soldiers were doing a good work. Gen. Miller's apology for "the small number of soldiers"

---

[1] Julian Borger, Luke Harding, and Matthew Taylor, "Mistreatment of PoWs Deepens Controversy in Iraq: British Troops in Torture Scandal," *Guardian*, May 1, 2004.
[2] Ibid.

added support to the administration's version of events.[1]

The contractors from CACI International and Titan Corporation were also the focus of the articles that relied upon the individual frame. The *Guardian* reported that one of the contractors was terminated by the army because he violated the rules and allowed MPs to interrogate detainees. When constructing the individual responsibility frame, the soldiers who participated in the abuse were portrayed as rogue tormenters who were acting on their own volition, not as representatives of their governments. Similar to the *Washington Post*, the *Guardian* juxtaposed the evil and violent Graner with the innocent and caring England who, according to her family members, appeared "in the wrong place at the wrong time."[2] The individual responsibility frame was also constructed by giving voice to the victims of abuse and their families. In response to the abuse, they were quoted as having compared the American soldiers to Saddam Hussein. One mother of a detainee called Americans "rubbish" and "garbage."[3]

Overall, the individual responsibility frame was not as strongly and thoroughly constructed in the *Guardian* as the systemic frame. The articles that relied upon the individual responsibility frame were shorter and opted to present the news in an episodic manner. Nevertheless, when the individual responsibility frame appeared as the only significant frame of the article it carried weight in how the reader could interpret the information presented as news.

Construction of the U.S. Responsibility Frames in the *Times*

When covering the U.S. abuses, the *Times* applied the responsibility frame in 13

---

[1] Luke Harding, "Trust us--Errors will not Happen Again," *Guardian*, May 6, 2004.
[2] Suzanne Goldenberg, "From Heroine to Humiliator," *Guardian*, May 8, 2004.
[3] Luke Harding, "Torture Commonplace, Say Inmates' Families," *Guardian*, May 3, 2004.

articles. Ten of those articles (23 percent of coverage) applied the systemic responsibility frame and three of the articles (7 percent of the coverage) used the individual responsibility frame. As Table 11 indicates, the *Times* stories that were applying the events frame were more likely to also utilize the individual responsibility frame. Two out of three news articles that indicated individual responsibility were also utilizing events or episodic reporting. More importantly, nine out of ten articles which applied the systemic responsibility frame were also utilizing the investigative or thematic frames of reporting. The following sections will explore in more detail how each of the frames were constructed in the *Times*.

Systemic frame in the Times. As mentioned, only one of the stories that used the systemic responsibility frame was also utilizing an events frame, and that was the news report about Saddam Salah al-Rawi's testimony and evidence of abuse presented to the Human Rights Organization for Iraq.[1] Interestingly, Rawi's testimony indicated that he had been abused at Abu Ghraib twice: in 1999, Rawi was a prisoner at Abu Ghraib under Saddam's regime; and in 2003 he was tortured there by Americans. The story challenged the Pentagon's claim that the guards at the center of the abuse allegations were acting on their own initiative. The comparison between the two systems contributed to the creation of the systemic frame as it suggested that both Saddam Hussein and the U.S. were engaging in very similar abuses of power. The matter-of-fact reporting contributed to the events frame in this article.

However, the systemic frame in the *Times* was also constructed in conjunction with the investigative frame. Like the other newspapers, when applying the systemic frame the *Times* focused on two investigative reports: Gen. Taguba's report and Provost-Marshal

---

[1] Anthony Loyd, "Torture Worse than Under Saddam, Says Victim," *Times*, May 13, 2004.

Donald Ryder's report.[1] Similar to the other three newspapers, the *Times* repeatedly quoted

Taguba's report for discovering numerous instances of "sadistic, blatant and wanton criminal

abuses."[2] The report was also cited to indicate that the detainee abuse problem was

"widespread and systemic."[3] The *Times* newspaper also covered Taguba testimony before the

Senate Armed Services Committee on May 11, 2004. Overall, either Taguba's report or his

testimony were cited in seven news articles.[4]

The *Times* used Ryder's report to indicate that there was evidence dating back to the

Afghan War that MP had worked with MI to "set favourable conditions for subsequent

interviews."[5] To strengthen the systemic responsibility frame the newspaper also cited

Frederic, who was facing a court-martial at that time. Frederic was cited claiming that he had

been encouraged by MI, made up of CIA officers, linguists and interrogation specialists, to

abuse prisoners in order to prepare them for interrogations. The newspaper also cited Gen.

Karpinski who claimed that reservists were disposable in the eyes of the administration and

that "military high command was trying to lay all blame on the reservists."[6]

Other accused soldiers, or lawyers and family members speaking on their behalf,

were also cited in the stories that suggested systemic responsibility. One story headlined

"Accused Were Let Down by Failure of Officers" quoted Sabrina Harman, friends of Ivan

Frederick, and Lynndie England's lawyer all of whom indicated that the seven accused

---

[1] Ryder Report refers to the official report produced by an inquiry by U.S Provost Marshal General Donald Ryder into reports of abuse by American troops in Iraq. Ryder's report was completed on November 5, 2003 and Taguba report referenced Ryder's investigation. Ryder's remains classified as of June, 2011.
[2] Tim Reid, "Prison Violence a 'Failure of the Leaders'," *Times*, May 12, 2004.
[3] Roland Watson, "US Report Tells of Sadism and Wanton Abuses of Prisoners," *Times*, May 3, 2004.
[4] Taguba's name appears 22 times in the *Time's* coverage.
[5] Ibid.
[6] Ibid.

soldiers were acting on the orders from higher ranking officers.[1] Anonymous "analysts" were referenced stating that the pictures were taken to "intimidate prisoners with evidence of what would happen unless they cooperated."[2] The newspaper included quotes from U.S. Senator Edward Kennedy stating that the abuse at Abu Ghraib "does not appear to be an isolated incident."[3] However, the intensity of the systemic frame was somewhat mitigated in the same article by including a quote from Gen. George Casey, the Army Vice-Chief of Staff, who stated that there had been "a complete breakdown in discipline."[4] The lack of discipline and training are suggestive of individual responsibility framing since it leaves policy or procedural issues out of the coverage.

In addition, the systemic responsibility frame in the *Times* was strengthened by including evidence presented by the Red Cross that repeatedly warned U.S. administrators about the mistreatment of Iraqis by American troops. The newspaper reported that since the beginning of the war in Afghanistan, the administration had changed policies so that the detainment of many prisoners from Afghanistan were considered outside the law, which in turn created a new class of detainee. A strong argument supporting systemic responsibility framing was presented in an article headlined "Repeated Warnings on Abuse Began 14 Months Ago."[5] This news report emphasized that the Red Cross reported the ill-treatment of prisoners in Iraq as early as March of 2003. It detailed numerous attempts by the Red Cross to get response and action from the coalitions forces to change the detainee situation. The newspaper indicated that U.S. military officer's response to the Red Cross complaints about

---

[1] Roland Watson, "Accused Were Let Down by Failure of Officers," *Times*, May 11, 2004.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Roland Watson, "There is More to Come, Say US Leaders," *Times*, May 5, 2004.
[4] Ibid.
[5] Tim Reid, "Repeated Warnings on Abuse Began 14 Months Ago," *Times*, May 11, 2004.

prisoner treatment was that it was "part of the process."[1] The report the news article

referenced had been submitted to the American and British authorities in February of 2004.

The Red Cross report contained graphic and disturbing details of the abuse similar to the

already public photographs of the Abu Ghraib abuse. It also cited several unnamed military

intelligence officials who confirmed to the Red Cross that physical and psychological abuse

at Abu Ghraib was "standard operating procedure."[2]

Perhaps the strongest argument supporting the systemic responsibility frame was used

by Roland Watson in the article "Abuse Scandal Shines Spotlight on US Network of Secret

Jails."[3] In it, he quoted Carroll Bogert of Human Rights Watch who indicated that the abuse

at Abu Ghraib was systematic because the same prisoner treatment was found throughout the

whole U.S.'s detention facilities system. This article emphasized that detainees in

Guantanamo and other facilities were being held indefinitely without charges or access to

attorneys. A lawyer of a detainee in Guantanamo said that "his client had been criminally

abused as part of an officially sanctioned policy."[4] In addition, the newspaper reported on the

existence of a secret network of undisclosed detention facilities. Pentagon officials refuted

the existence of these faculties but their denials were not very prominent in the coverage.[5]

The newspaper also referenced "a military report" about abuses at Abu Ghraib that

mentioned "ghost detainees" brought in by the CIA who were moved around the prison to

avoid Red Cross teams.[6]

The *Times* also discussed the harsher interrogation rules approved by the Pentagon

---

[1] Ibid.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Roland Watson, "Abuse Scandal Shines Spotlight on US Network of Secret Jails," *Times*, May 14, 2004.
[4] Ibid.
[5] Ibid.
[6] Ibid.

and the CIA after 9/11, such as the CIA's "enhanced measures" and "waterboarding" that were used on Khalid Sheikh Mohammed. The *Times* also disclosed the Pentagon's "50 approved" interrogation techniques that included sleep deprivation, extreme hot or cold temperatures, isolation, and putting prisoners in "stress positions" for up to 45 minutes. The newspaper linked Guantanamo and Abu Ghraib and explained that intelligence gathering techniques were enforced after Maj. Gen. Geoffrey Miller visited Abu Ghraib. The final paragraph of one article referenced three Britons who had returned home after spending two years at Guantanamo and claimed that they were stripped, hooded and beaten. They also described sexual humiliation and degradation. The article ended by stating that the stories of those three sounded unbelievable at that time, but "since Abu Ghraib, no longer."[1]

Overall, the systemic responsibility frame was not a dominant frame of the *Time's* coverage of U.S. abuses. Although in sheer numbers, the systemic frame was applied more often than the individual responsibility frame, only three articles applied the systemic responsibility frame as the dominant aspect of coverage. Only one article went so far to explain how the U.S.'s detention policies and procedures were altered to avoid the Geneva Conventions. Similar to the coverage in other newspapers, the vagueness of language used in Taguba's report was used to combine both the systemic and individual responsibility frames. Although Taguba acknowledged "sadistic, blatant and wanton criminal abuses" which were systemic and widely spread, the dominant culprit indicated in his report was a failure of leadership.[2] The report stated that although the abusers were influenced by several MI officers and clearly lacked in training, there was no direct order to abuse prisoners. By

---

[1] Ibid. Also, note that it was not clear when they were reported in the media.
[2] Roland Watson, "America's Catalogue of 'Torture'," *Times*, May 5, 2004. Tim Reid, "Prison violence a 'failure of the leaders'," *Times*, May 12, 2004.

highlighting the phrase "direct order," the newspaper missed an opportunity to explore the government's policy as the culprit for the abuse. At other times, the systemic responsibility frame was weakened by using conflicting frames in the headline and the body of the news article. For example, the main focus of the article titled "Bush Defends Rumsfeld in Prison Scandal" was the report that Bush was displeased with how the Pentagon handled the situation, yet, the headline suggested the opposite.[1]

Individual frame in the Times. As mentioned previously (see Table 11), stories that were utilizing the events frame were more likely to also make use of the individual responsibility frame. Two out of three news articles that relied upon the individual responsibility frame also utilized events or the episodic nature of news presentation. Furthermore, the only news article that applied the individual responsibility frame together with the investigations frame was the article mentioned previously that focused on Taguba's testimony in the Senate. The individual responsibility frame was constructed with clams that there was no direct order from President Bush and Donald Rumsfeld to torture prisoners. The article quoted Taguba concluding that there was no "evidence of a policy or direct order given to these soldiers to conduct what they did."[2]

The two stories that utilized the events frame coupled with the individual responsibility frame were similar in a sense that they also applied the human interest frame. One article featured testimony by an anonymous Iraqi. The key information supporting the individual responsibility frame was his account of how soldiers were conducting the abuse: "It didn't seem part of a plan or an order. The soldiers did it quickly, as if they just wanted to

---

[1] Roland Watson, "Bush Defends Rumsfeld in Prison Scandal," *Times*, May 7, 2004.
[2] Tim Reid, "Prison Violence a 'Failure of the Leaders'," *Times*, May 12, 2004.

take pictures to show their friends of our humiliation and their victory."[1] The individual

responsibility frame was also applied in an article covering the CBS *60 Minutes II* show that

featured a guard's video diary from Camp Bucca. One of the soldiers in the video attested to

the fact that the prisoners were afraid of him. He also admitted getting into trouble with the

higher ranking officers for throwing rocks at the prisoners.[2]

The individual responsibility frame was also constructed with the help of the

reactions of government officials after the Pentagon's three-hour slide show of photos and

video footage that were in the military's possession at that time. The *Times* quoted Ben

Nighthorse Campbell, a Republican from Colorado, stating "I don't know how the hell these

people got into our army."[3] At the same time, individual responsibility framing was

weakened by a quote from England who claimed that she had been ordered by a superior to

pose and smile with the prisoners.

In summary, the *Times'* did not employ a strong individual responsibility frame in its

coverage of the U.S. abuses. It was applied in only three stories and in all of those stories

alternative frames were constructed--i.e. human interest, or events, or even an alternative

systemic responsibility frame. This afforded the reader exposure to different perspectives and

questioned the validity of the individual responsibility argument.

Attribution of Responsibility in the U.K. Abuses

The four newspapers differed in how they constructed the responsibility frame when

covering the U.K. abuses. As Table 12 suggests, the coverage seemed to favor attribution of

---

[1] Anthony Lloyd, "How Could we Have Been Treated this Way?" *Times*, May 5, 2004.
[2] Roland Watson, "'We Shot two Prisoners Today' Camp Guard Boasts in Video Diary," *Times*, May 12, 2004.
[3] Ibid.

responsibility to the individuals rather than the system. The *New York Times* and the

Washington Post did not publish a single story that would suggest systemic responsibility for

the British abuse. The *Guardian* published three stories (9 percent of coverage) suggesting

systemic responsibility and eight stories (22 percent of coverage) suggesting individual

responsibility. The *Times* published five stories (18 percent of coverage) utilizing the

systemic responsibility frame and seven stories (25 percent of coverage) utilizing the

individual responsibility frame.

Table 12. Assignment of responsibility in the coverage of the U.K. abuse

UK Stories	*New York Times*		*Washington Post*		*Guardian*		*Times*	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Events & Systemic	0	0	0	0	2	6	1	4
Investigations & Systemic	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	14
Events & Individual	4	44	4	36	8	22	6	21
Investigations & Individual	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4
Total*	9		11		36		28	

* *Total* represents the number of articles which covered U.K. abuses. The total number of articles utilizing
either of the four frames listed in the table would not add up to the number of total articles for the newspaper as
a responsibility frame was not explored in all of the news articles. For the complete list of frames, see Table 3 in
Chapter 3.

Overall, the events or episodic type of reporting dominated the construction of the

responsibility frame when the newspapers reported the British abuse. Moreover, when

constructing the systemic responsibility frame in the coverage of the U.K. abuses the

newspapers focused not on the interrogation and detention policies as was the case in the

coverage of U.S. abuses, but they highlighted how widespread the abuse was and focused on

why the administration took such a long time to disclose it. Thus, even when the systemic

responsibility frame was applied in the coverage of U.K. events, it differed significantly from

that of the U.S. scandal. The following sections will explore in more detail how each of the

four newspapers constructed the responsibility frame in the coverage of U.K. abuses.

Construction of the U.K. Responsibility Frame in the *New York Times*

When covering U.K. abuses, attribution of responsibility was not important aspect of articles that appeared in the *New York Times*. Only four articles explored assignment of responsibility, and all four of them utilized the individual responsibility frame combined with episodic or events reporting. This accounted for 44 percent of the coverage due to low numbers of articles devoted to the U.K. abuse in general. When exploring responsibility, the *New York Times* focused on the *Daily Mirror* staged photographs even though there was some mention about the existence of the authentic photographs. The newspaper used official sources to construct the individual responsibility frame. Adam Ingram, the Armed Forces Minister, was cited assuring that if British soldiers were to be found guilty of the abuse pictured in the *Daily Mirror* photographs then the responsible soldiers would be punished.[1] Although Ingram was quoted in the same article acknowledging that the British military had been investigating 33 cases of civilian deaths, injuries or ill treatment, no other details about those investigations were provided in the *New York Times'* coverage. With little analysis the coverage implied that the British abuses were isolated acts.

Promises to "punish the soldiers" was echoed in statements given by Prime Minister Tony Blair to the *New York Times*. The newspaper even quoted Blair apologizing for the mistreatment, but his apology was followed up with praise for the majority of British soldiers "doing a brave and extraordinary" job.[2] Defense Secretary Geoff Hoon was quoted insisting that "British military had acted swiftly to investigate allegations of mistreatment by its forces in Iraq and that it was close to bringing charges of brutality against British soldiers in two

---

[1] Anonymous, "British Official Vows A Thorough Inquiry," *New York Times*, May 5, 2004.
[2] Lizette Alvarez, "Doubt Is Cast on Photos Said to Show Britons Abusing Iraqi," *New York Times*, May 4, 2004.

cases."[1] The severity of the British abuse was minimized using the Red Cross report which stated that the British abuse, while serious, was not as extensive as abuse at the American controlled Abu Ghraib.[2]

Overall, assigning responsibility for British abuse was not a big focal point for the *New York Times*. The coverage was scattered, event driven and concentrated only on the reactions of the U.K. government and military officials. The newspaper did not explore the fact that British photographs had emerged much earlier before Abu Ghraib story broke. There was no coverage of the British military detention and interrogation policies or procedures.

Construction of the U.K. Responsibility Frames in the *Washington Post*

Attribution of responsibility when reporting U.K. abuses was not an important aspect of coverage in the *Washington Post*. The newspaper did not publish a single news story that would attribute responsibility to systemic policies. There were only four articles that explored the responsibility frame (36 percent of the coverage) and all applied the individual responsibility frame combined with the events frame. Although the newspaper briefly reported that the Red Cross report indicated that British troops routinely violated British military regulations by placing hoods over prisoners' heads, the coverage was framed as an individual issue by relying on official and military sources and focusing on events rather than issues. Defense Secretary Geoffrey Hoon was quoted assuring the public that accusations of abuse were taken seriously. Blair was quoted apologizing to Iraqi prisoners who had been mistreated by British soldiers, and he called the abuse "absolutely and totally unacceptable."[3]

---

[1] Patrick Tyler, "British Official Says Soldiers May Soon Face Abuse Charges," *New York Times*, May 11, 2004.
[2] Patrick Tyler, "Blair Offers An Apology For Abuses By Soldiers," *New York Times*, May 10, 2004.
[3] Glenn Frankel, "Blair Newly Rebuked Over Prison Abuses," *Washington Post,* May 11, 2004.

Another headline "Iraqis to Take British Soldiers to Court" framed the soldiers as the ones responsible for both the abuse and killings of Iraqi civilians.[1]

The responsibility frame was overshadowed by the fake photographs published in the *Daily Mirror*. Instead of focusing on the evidence provided by the Red Cross and Amnesty International, the *Washington Post* paid more attention to the controversy of the fake photos even though there were suggestions that the pictures might have been taken while reenacting actual abuse. While the *Washington Post* did include testimony by Solders A, B, and C suggesting that abuse was widespread, the newspaper also attacked their credibility and dismissed their claims that abuse was a serious issue. Interestingly, the newspaper reported that the Ministry of Defense was investigating cases of British soldiers opening fire on civilians when there was no apparent immanent threat, as well as the ongoing government investigations. But these reports were constructed utilizing episodic framing, and the newspaper did not take the opportunity to examine the British abuse as a more serious systemic issue.

Construction of the U.K. Responsibility Frames in the *Guardian*

When covering the U.K. abuses the *Guardian* applied the responsibility frame in 12 articles. Three of those articles applied the systemic responsibility frame (nine percent of the coverage) and eight used the individual responsibility frame (22 percent of the coverage) (see Table 12). Furthermore, one article combined the systemic frame with episodic reporting. All articles utilizing the individual responsibility frame were constructed using episodic reporting. These results confirm the literature suggesting that episodic reporting leads to an attribution of blame on individuals. The following sections will explore how the *Guardian*

---

[1] Glenn Frankel, "Iraqis to Take British Soldiers to Court," *Washington Post,* May 12, 2004.

constructed the systemic and individual responsibility frames while covering the U.K.

abuses.

Systemic frame in the Guardian. Systemic responsibility was attributed in only three

of the *Guardian's* articles. Two articles combined events type of reporting with the systemic

responsibility frame. The focus of these articles was the confidential 2003 report by the

International Committee of the Red Cross that was leaked and published in the *Wall Street*

Journal on May 7th, 2004. The systemic responsibility frame was constructed by the

Guardian using evidence highlighted in the Red Cross report which suggested that more than

100 British troops were responsible for the abuse.[1] Though the *Guardian* did not offer many

details about either the nature of abuse or the ongoing government investigations, the fact

that abuses were brought to its attention about a year ago gave support to the idea that the

government put little effort into investigating the abuse or bringing it to the public's

attention.

The *Guardian* recounted information from the Red Cross report which included an

account of a death of Baha Mousa, a hotel receptionist in Basra.[2] Sources cited in later

coverage suggested that the fake *Daily Mirror* photographs were a reenactment of Mousa's

beating. The *Guardian* also reported the existence of abuse photographs taken by Gary

Bartlam, a soldier from the Royal Regiment of Fusiliers. However, their importance was

minimized and more attention was given to the fake photographs published in the *Daily*

---

[1] Nicholas Watt and Richard Norton-Taylor, "Hoon to Face Commons as Disquiet Grows: Abuse Claims Red Cross Says Concerns Raised Over a Year Ago," *Guardian*, May 10, 2004.

[2] Richard Norton-Taylor, David Pallister and Steven Morris, "British Soldiers Accused of Beating Basra Man to Death: Court Battle: Iraqi Families Sue MoD Over Alleged Killings," *Guardian*, May 8, 2004.

Mirror.[1] The *Guardian* reported a soldier's testimony that many photographs of abuse existed and were traded among the soldiers. This emphasis on how widespread the practice was supported the systemic responsibility frame. This was strengthened by an anonymous soldier who was quoted stating that senior officers were aware of the mistreatment and "there was a nod and a wink to certain things."[2] Even though such testimony relied on the systemic responsibility frame because it was widespread and supported by the soldiers' immediate superiors, the newspaper also minimized the seriousness of the issue by reporting that the ministry of defense were denying that such evidence had existed. This took attention and responsibility away from the government officials.

The confidential Red Cross report was also the focus of the only article that looked deeper at the issue of British Army abuse. The article titled "Troops Broke the Law" quoted Geoff Hoon, the Defense Secretary, admitting British forces committed a criminal act when they forcibly placed hoods over the heads of Iraqi captives, considered a serious violation by the British Army.[3] Hooding prisoners was outlawed in 1971 after British troops were accused of human rights abuses in Northern Ireland. The article said the abuse had been known by the government for almost a year and was a larger issue of "incompetence" and a "failure" to plan for post-war Iraq. The seriousness of the government's lack of action to stop the abuse was articulated by Ann Clwyd, the Prime Minister's Human Rights Envoy to Iraq, who demanded answers from the administration about why the report had not been brought to her

---

[1] Sandra Laville, Sarah Hall and Richard Norton Taylor, "Army Claims There is More Evidence Photos were Fake," *Guardian*, May 4, 2004.

[2] Sandra Laville, Richard Norton-Taylor and Helena Smith, "Inquiry Into 'Torture' Pictures: Mirror Stands firm as Doubts Raised over Images of British Abuse," *Guardian*, May 3, 2004.

[3] Nicholas Watt and Richard Norton-Taylor, "Troops Broke the Law, Admits Hoon: Forces Breached Directive on Hooding: Red Cross Report Kept from Ministers," *Guardian*, May 11, 2004.

attention.[1]

Overall, the *Guardian's* coverage did not suggest strong systemic responsibility framing. The focus on episodic coverage as well as a failure to question interrogation and detention practices resulted in the lack of attribution of responsibility to the system.

Individual frame in the Guardian. The individual responsibility frame was constructed by utilizing the episodic type of reporting. All eight of the articles that attributed responsibility to individuals used the events frame. Similar to the construction of the individual frame in the U.S. abuses, the opinions of the government officials were used to suggest that a small number of bad individuals were responsible for the abuse. Blair was quoted saying that British actions were "shameful."[2] Hoon was quoted reiterating Blair's position that "the maltreatment was undertaken by unsophisticated individuals acting on their own, not organised to obtain intelligence."[3] The Chief of General Staff, Gen. Sir Michael Jackson was quoted stating that "such appalling conduct is clearly unlawful, but it also contravenes the British Army's high standards."[4]

Promises to investigate and punish the guilty also played a part in constructing the individual frame. Dennis Barnes, a spokesman for the Queen's Lancashire Regiment which was stationed in Cyprus at the time when the *Daily Mirror* photographs emerged, was quoted stating that "If the allegations prove true, the firmest action will be taken against anybody

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Julian Borger, Luke Harding and Matthew Taylor. "Mistreatment of PoWs Deepens Controversy in Iraq: British Troops in Torture Scandal," *Guardian*, May 1, 2004.

[3] Patrick Wintour and Michael White. "Hoon Calls for Political Solution in Holy Cities," *Guardian*, May 7, 2004.

4 Julian Borger, Luke Harding and Matthew Taylor. "Mistreatment of POWs Deepens Controversy in Iraq," *Guardian*, May 1, 2004.

involved."[1]

Testimony by soldiers who admitted participating in the abuse also contributed to the individual responsibility frame. Namely, the *Guardian* had covered accounts of abuse by the three anonymous soldiers. Soldier A and Soldier B appeared in the coverage immediately after the *Daily Mirror* photographs emerge. They were considered to be the soldiers who provided the *Daily Mirror* with the photographs. Later, on May 7th another anonymous individual, Solider C, corroborated the testimony of the two previous soldiers that abuse had occurred and the photographs were probably real as this was the kind of abuse the soldier had witnessed. Even though the testimony of the three soldiers suggested that higher level officers were aware of the abuse and the abuse was widespread, their being anonymously labeled as "Soldier A," "Soldier B, and "Soldier C" as well as speculations that the first two soldiers received monetary rewards for delivering pictures, created suspicion and suggested they came forward for individual gain rather than because of honest concern about detainee abuse.

Finally, the individual responsibility frame was strengthened with a report that Britain's high court was about to hear the case against QLR members who were responsible for Baha Mousa's death, a hotel receptionist who according to his family was beaten to death. High court hearings similar to the American court-martial were used to emphasize punishment of individual soldiers and thus prove that responsibility for abuse was a result of decisions made individuals, not systemic policies.

Overall, the focus on events and the lack of in-depth investigative reporting resulted in construction of the individual responsibility frame as the dominant responsibility frame in

---

[1] Sandra Laville, Richard Norton-Taylor and Helena Smith. "Inquiry Into 'Torture' Pictures," *Guardian*, May 3, 2004.

the *Guardian's* coverage of abuse by British soldiers. Even though there was some coverage

suggesting widespread abuse as well as the government's unwillingness to alert the media

and the public of ongoing investigation, the *Guardian* focused more on the individual

responsibility frame instead of portraying abuse as a larger systemic issue.

Construction of the U.K. Responsibility Frames in the *Times*

When covering U.K. abuses the *Times* applied the responsibility frame in 12 articles:

five of those articles applied the systemic responsibility frame (18 percent of the coverage)

and seven of the articles used the individual responsibility frame (25 percent of the coverage)

(see Table 12). Furthermore, one article combined episodic coverage with the systemic

frame, and four articles combined thematic coverage with the systemic frame. The opposite

combination was true for the individual responsibility frame. Only one article combined

thematic reporting with the individual responsibility frame whereas the majority of articles

utilizing the individual responsibility frame relied on episodic reporting. Those results are

similar to what the literature would suggest with regards to how episodic reporting leads to

an attribution of blame on individuals. The following sections will describe how the *Times*

constructed responsibility frames when covering U.K. abuses.

Systemic frame in the Times. In the one case in which the *Times* combined the

systemic responsibility frame with an events frame the focus of the article was the fake

photographs in the *Daily Mirror*. The article titled "'Torture' Whistle Blowers May be

Offered Immunity" focused on the Military Police's decision to offer immunity for the

soldiers who were the *Daily Mirror's* informants.[1] The news article focused on finding out

more information about the abuse that took place behind the pictures. The label "torture" in

---

[1] Daniel McGrory, "'Torture' Whistle Blowers May be Offered Immunity," *Times*, May 4, 2004.

quote marks sends a message that the events in the photographs do not constitute torture. The two soldiers quoted in the article talked about the hundreds of pictures of abuse, beating and bullying of Iraqi's by the British soldiers.

The articles that applied the systemic responsibility frame with investigations or thematic reporting had several framing devices in common. First, the three articles that used this combination of framing relied on the confidential Red Cross report which was leaked to the *Wall Street Journal* as their main sources of evidence.[1] The Red Cross recorded a number of serious violations of Geneva Conventions by both British and American troops at the very beginning of the coalition's operations in Iraq or as early as April 2003. According to the *Times,* the report described methods of abuse that included serious violations of international law in how detainees were being treated, housed, and interrogated. Although none of the articles blatantly stated that the detention and interrogation policies were responsible for the abuse, the *Times* constructed the systemic responsibility frame by concluding that even after Red Cross warnings the abuse continued to occur and therefore "might be considered as a practice tolerated by the coalition forces."[2]

One of the issues that received more attention in the *Times* was what the U.K. government was doing to resolve this and *who* and *when* was aware of the abuses. The reasons for *why* the abuse occurred were left unexplored. Another aspect of the newspaper's framing was that it diminished the seriousness of British abuse by describing American abuse as much more serious. Even though allegations of British abuse had emerged much earlier

---

[1] Michael Evans and Chris Johnston, "Red Cross Reported Abuse Months Ago," *Times*, May 8, 2004. Stephen Grey, Dean Nelson, David Connett, Edin Hamzic and Richard Woods, "Hidden 'Sex Abuse' File Could Cost British the Battle for Hearts and Minds," *Times*, May 9, 2004. Daniel McGrory, "Red Cross Heard of Beatings Early in War," *Times*, May 10, 2004. Tim Reid, "Repeated Warnings on Abuse Began 14 Months Ago," *Times*, May 10, 2004.
[2] Tim Reid, "Repeated Warnings on Abuse Began 14 Months Ago," *Times*, May 10, 2004.

than the abuse at Abu Ghraib and U.K. authorities were investigating, this was not a considerable factor in the *Time's* coverage of the responsibility frame.

Only two articles reported that authentic images of the British abuse had existed since May 2003, and those images depicted abuse just as serious as that which has occurred at Abu Ghraib. The newspaper included quotes by Kelly Tilford, the shop assistant who processed Gary Bartlam's photographs and reported them to the authorities.[1] To strengthen the systemic responsibility frame the newspaper included a testimony from two abuse victims who remained anonymous but told accounts of repeated beatings they had incurred while in British custody. Again, the focus of the systemic frame was not necessarily on the policies but on the widespread or serious nature of the abuse.

In conclusion, the *Times* did not make a strong case for the systemic responsibility frame in its coverage of British abuse. The reports focused on comparing the severity of British abuse to that perpetrated by American troops. Although the articles acknowledged how widespread the abuse was and included the Red Cross documentation of violations, there was no detailed investigative reporting to determine if detention policies and interrogation procedures were responsible for this widespread abuse.

Individual frame in the Times. The individual responsibility frame was utilized by the *Times* newspaper more often than the systemic frame. It is important to note that almost all articles using the events and individual responsibility frames were reporting on the *Daily Mirror* photographs published May 1, 2004. The topic of the fake photographs was reported on May 2, 2004, and the coverage was kept alive almost daily until May 14th when it was announced that the photographs were definitely fakes. Therefore, the fake photographs

---

[1] Stephen Grey, Dean Nelson, David Connett, Edin Hamzic and Richard Woods, "Hidden 'Sex Abuse' File Could Cost British the Battle for Hearts and Minds," *Times*, May 9, 2004.

became the most important device for the construction of the responsibility frame.

As was common for all four newspapers, the stories that utilized the events and individual responsibility frames included reactions from the government and military officials. In several articles Gen. Jackson and Tony Blair were quoted condemning the abuse. The events type of reporting resulted in coverage of individual cases of abuse and investigations of specific soldiers rather than investigations of policies and procedures. By putting emphasis on individuals' behavior the news stories successfully promoted individual responsibility as the dominant responsibility frame.

Blaming the abuse on the nature of human beings became a device in constructing the individual responsibility frame in several articles. To explain why soldiers would engage in such cruelty, the *Times* quoted Major-General Patrick Cordingley who said: "You get young men ready to do something that the vast majority of people wouldn't ever want to do: to kill other people. Then next thing you bring them down and you say, 'Now you're a peacekeeper.' Of course there is a small percentage who don't make that change easily."[1] Desmond Morris, an expert on animal behavior, served as another source to highlight the violent nature of individuals as the culprit of abuse. Morris was quoted stating that "people have a natural need to express dominance but few of us ever get the opportunity."[2] In another article, the anonymous Soldier C described the beatings he witnessed explaining that the reason for the violence was that soldiers were trying to fit in the Army. The same article quoted Solder C using the "bad apples" metaphor when talking about investigations and the court-martial of a few responsible soldiers.[3]

---

[1] Adam Nathan and Stephen Grey, "Soldiers Grief that Fuelled Brutality," *Times*, May 2, 2004.
[2] Dipesh Gadher, "Red Cross Anger at Army Actions," *Times*, May 2 2004.
[3] Michael Evans, "TA Soldier 'Saw Iraqis Beaten by Comrades,' *Times*, May 7, 2004.

Another significant framing technique was the promise to punish the responsible individuals. The newspaper published Gen. Jackson's assurances that "all the allegations are already under investigation. If proven, the perpetrators are not fit to wear the Queen's uniform."[1] This absence of discourse exploring abuse as a larger systemic issue assures assigning of responsibility to individuals is the most predominant frame.

Two other articles placed the blame on individuals and focused on revenge as a possible explanation for the abuse.[2] The *Times* reported the death of Captain David Jones as a result of a roadside bomb could have been the reason that triggered soldiers to retaliate. Jones was popular among his Queen's Lancashire Regiment (QLR) friends because of his good nature and attitude. The focus of both articles were the fake photographs, which could have been "trophy pictures" taken during the reenactment of the soldiers' revenge. However, this theory was questioned the next day when the *Times* published another story discussing the authenticity of the photographs that included a statement from the Captain's widow Isobel Jones who questioned the feasibility of revenge explanation. [3] Again, by using revenge as a reasoning device to explain why the abuse occurred, the newspaper strengthened the individual responsibility frame.

In conclusion, the *Times* successfully emphasized the individual responsibility frame in their coverage of the British abuse. By focusing on the events rather than issues surrounding the abuse the newspaper placed more emphasis on individual responsibility. The story of the fake photographs allowed the government and military officials to express their preferred explanations about how the abuse occurred. In addition, the newspaper supplied

---

[1] Michael Evans, "British Soldiers 'Attacked and Urinated Over' Iraqi Prisoner," *Times*, May 1, 2004.
[2] Adam Nathan and Stephen Grey, "Soldiers' Grief that Fuelled Brutality," *Times*, May 2, 2004. David Leppard and Adam Nathan, "Murder of British Soldier May Have Sparked Torture," *Times*, May 2, 2004.
[3] Michael Evans and Stephen, "Torture Photos are Fakes, Say Army Officers," *Times*, May 3, 2004.

their own experts on human behavior to suggest that it was animalistic nature to dominate

over other human beings that was responsible for the soldier's behavior. The revenge for the

death of other soldiers scenario strengthened the individual responsibility frame even further.

Even though the *Times* applied both the systemic and individual responsibility frames, the

power of the systemic responsibility frame was minimized by constant comparisons of

British abuses to the more severe American abuses.

Are the Readers Encouraged or Discouraged to Identify with those Directly Affected?

This question was designed to investigate to what extent each of the newspapers

utilized human interest framing. Human interest frames serve to create an emotional bond

between the readers and those in the news. This bond is necessary to evoke an empathetic

response, and it cannot be built on statistics or general facts. It requires representation of

human drama and "concrete instances of suffering and anguish."[1] Studies show that this type

of coverage may facilitate debates and policies to empower refugees and asylum seekers.[2]

Human interest framing may also result in a more sympathetic coverage of earthquakes.[3]

Most importantly, when covering war victims, the media are capable of evoking "an appeal

for human solidarity in the midst of life's cruelest contingencies."[4] As such, human interest

framing represents the core function of human rights reporting as a specific media genre.

The human interest frame could be applied to any of the news actors in the Iraqi

---

[1] Doug Mine cited in Mort Rosenblum, *Who Stole The News?* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1993), 268.
[2] Baldwin Van Gorp, "The Influx of Refugees Bordered by Frames," Paper presented at the theme session "Communication in Borderlands" of the 2003 annual meeting of the International Communication Association, May 23 – 27, at San Diego, CA, USA; see also Henri C. Nickels, "Framing Asylum Discourse in Luxembourg," *Journal of Refugee Studies* 20, no. 1 (March 2007): 37-59.
[3] Flora Keshishian, "Political Bias and Nonpolitical News,*" Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 14 (1997): 332-343.
[4] James Stewart Ettema, "Discourse That is Closer to Silence Than to Talk" *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 11, no. 1 (March 1994): 18.

abuse coverage, but this study is particularly concerned with how the human interest frame was applied to the victims and soldiers who engaged in the abuse. Other actors that emerged in the coverage of the U.S. events were several governmental and military personnel (Janis Karpinski, Joseph Darby, Donald Rumsfeld, Antonio Taguba) as well as Nick Berg, the American who was killed in revenge for the abuses at Abu Ghraib. The U.K. events coverage, which utilized the human interest frame, featured the family of Iraqi victim shot by British soldiers. In addition, the U.K. events coverage also used the human interest frame when reporting about the British soldiers. In contrast to the American story, the British soldiers featured in the coverage were not the ones who abused Iraqis, but rather they belonged to the same battalion that was under investigation. This section will examine to what extent the human interest frame was applied by each of the newspapers and describe the framing devices applied to both the victims of abuse and abusers as well as other newsmakers.

As indicated in Chapter 3, the human interest frame was utilized by all four of the newspapers. When covering the U.S. abuses the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post* applied the human interest frame most often. The human interest frame was applied in 26 percent of the news articles in the *New York Times* and 22 percent in the *Washington Post* (see Table 13). The *Times* (London) applied the human interest frame in 21 percent of its coverage, whereas the *Guardian* utilized the human interest frame in only 14 percent of the coverage. When covering U.K. abuses the human interest frame was utilized even less. Neither the *New York Times* or the *Washington Post* applied human interest framing when covering U.K. abuses. The two British newspapers applied the human interest frame in a small percentage of the articles--eight percent of the articles in the *Guardian* and less than

four percent of articles in the *Times* used this frame.

Table 13. Human interest frames

	New York Times		*Washington Post*		*Guardian*		*Times*	
	US	UK	US	UK	US	UK	US	UK
Number of Articles	17	0	15	0	4	2	9	1
Percentages	26	0	22	0	14	6	21	4
Total articles	65	9	67	11	29	36	43	28

The following will examine how each of the newspapers utilized the human interest

frame in the coverage of U.S. events and then in the coverage of U.K. events.

Human Interest Frames in the Coverage of the U.S. Events

Human interest frames in the New York Times. Of all four newspapers the *New York*

Times utilized the human interest frame most extensively--17 articles or 26 percent of the

coverage. However, the majority of the articles were primarily concerned with the coverage

of the abusers and not the victims of abuse. Only three articles focused on the victims of

abuse, and nine of the articles focused on the soldiers who were directly involved in the

abuse. Two articles applied the human interest frame in covering Rumsfeld, one article

applied the human interest frame in reporting about Taguba, and three additional articles

covered Berg, the victim of revenge.

The coverage of victims of abuse in the *New York Times* was not very thorough or

sympathetic. All three articles picturing victims were written by the same journalist--Ian

Fisher. One article focused on Hayder Sabbar Abd, Iraqi victim who recognized himself in

the infamous photograph with Lynndie England, pointing and smiling with a cigarette in her

mouth at the naked prisoner with his hand on his genitals. The newspaper gave very little

information about who Abd was or what he had done prior to being detained. Other than

mentioning that Abd was the father of five children, the newspaper focused on who he was not. Quoting Abd, the *New York Times* reported: "The truth is we were not terrorists … we were not insurgents. We were just ordinary people."[1] No further qualifications on Abd's guilt or innocence was offered in the article except to mention that the details of Abd's account could not be verified. Another article provided a list of several former detainees giving their name and age. Although the list of victims seemed to add human faces to the abused, the newspaper did not provide information on who those people were or anything about their lives. That is, the readers would not have learned anything that could help them emotionally connect with the victim. Only the last paragraph in the article mentioned that after being released from detention, Saleh, one of the victims, went back to working as a food inspector with the Ministry of Trade. The final sentence of the article ends with Saleh's statement demonstrating his anger at American occupation: "I realized they came to obliterate a whole society."[2]

Stress, fear and desperation caused by the abuse were the focus of the third article utilizing the human interest frame in reporting about victims of abuse. The newspaper printed testimony by Saddam Saleh Aboud who was tortured in the 1-A block of Abu Ghraib prison. Aboud was quoted saying that after an 18-day torture ordeal he was ready to die.[3] Besides his testimony on how scary and frightening the torture ordeal had been, the article included little about Aboud as a person. The article mentioned that Aboud was a Sunni Muslim trader, who lived near the northern border with Syria.

When the victim was the American contractor Nicholas Berg the newspaper provided

---

[1] Ian Fisher, "Iraqi Recounts Hours of Abuse by U.S. Troops," *New York Times*, May 5, 2004.
[2] Ian Fisher, "Brutal Images Buttress Anger of Ex-Prisoners," *New York Times*, May 10, 2004.
[3] Ian Fisher, "Iraqi Tells of U.S. Abuse, From Ridicule to Rape Threat," *New York Times*, May 14, 2004.

much more detailed and sympathetic coverage. Berg's killing was compared to the death of

Daniel Pearl. Words like "tragic," "slaying," "killers," and "revenge for mistreatment"

signify that an American death is much more cruel and significant than abuse and death of

Iraqis.[1] Berg was portrayed as someone who wanted to rebuild Iraq. His father was quoted

saying that Nick wanted to work in Iraq in order to bring "democracy to a country that didn't

have it."[2] Berg's intellect and engineering talent as well as his teaching of students were

emphasized in the coverage which demonstrated that his was a painful and significant loss

for his family and everyone else who was part of his life. Moreover, the killing of Berg

prompted Rush Limbaugh to state the following about the abuse of Iraqi people: "They're the

ones who are sick … They're the ones who are perverted. They are the ones who are

dangerous. They are the ones who are subhuman. They are the ones who are human debris,

not the United States of America and not our soldiers and not our prison guards."[3]

Limbaugh's statement was a clear example of the "them versus us" mentality that might have

contributed to why the abuse at Abu Ghraib occurred in the first place. The fact that the *New

York Times* included this quote without quoting someone else commenting on Limbaugh's

statement seemed to communicate that the newspaper supported this view.

When the human interest frame was applied to the soldiers who abused Iraqis, the

New York Times constructed appealing images of misguided but generally good natured

individuals. The *New York Times* described the lives of England, Frederick, Graner, and

Sivits as well as information on their future dreams and aspirations. The newspaper included

---

[1] Dexter Filkins, "Iraq Tape Shows the Decapitation of an American," *New York Times*, May 12, 2004. Laura Mansnerus and James Dao, "From Strange Encounter with Iraqi Police to Fatal Capture by Islamic Terrorists," *New York Times*, May 12, 2004.
[2] Laura Mansnerus and James Dao, "From Strange Encounter with Iraqi Police to Fatal Capture by Islamic Terrorists," *New York Times*, May 12, 2004.
[3] Stephen Kinzer and Jim Rutenberg, "Grim Images Seem to Deepen Nation's Polarization on Iraq," *New York Times*, May 13, 2004.

testimony by friends and relatives to paint the picture of who those solders were and how they came to serve in the Army. The newspaper quoted local residents in Cresaptown, the town where most of the accused soldiers were stationed, who expressed a variety of emotions from surprise to disappointment to disgust at what happened at Abu Ghraib. Some of the testimony included by the newspaper bluntly excused the soldiers' behavior: "I don't see how they would not do something--after seeing their buddies dragged through the streets. They're over there to give the Iraqis freedom, and they're getting killed every day."[1]

The articles that applied the human interest frame generally focused on the abusers as good natured people simply being in the wrong place at the wrong time. Details about Frederick, for example, said that he joined the Army Reserve in high school inspired by his uncle William Lawson, who spent 23 years traveling the world with the Air Force.[2] The newspaper reported that after investigations began Frederick lost his ability to sleep and appetite.[3] The newspaper even mentioned his future plans to retire and spend time fishing near his rural home in central Virginia.[4]

England was described as a hard working and independent women who, as a girl, "loved violent weather" and joined the army to get money to study meteorology.[5] Her mother and friends defended England's innocence: "It's not in her nature to do something like that. There's not a malicious bone in her body."[6] The newspaper also reported that England's family "was extremely close" and "spent much time together hunting, camping, fishing and

---

[1] Andrew Jacobs, "Shock Over Abuse Reports, but Support for the Troops," *New York Times*, May 8, 2004.
[2] James Dao and Paul von Zielbauer, "Abuse Charges Bring Anguish in Unit's Home," *New York Times*, May 6, 2004.
[3] Sherri Day, "Near Reservists' Base, Disappointment at Accusations of Abuse," *New York Times*, May 3, 2004.
[4] James Dao and Paul von Zielbauer, "Abuse Charges Bring Anguish in Unit's Home," *New York Times*, May 6, 2004.
[5] Ibid.
[6] James Dao, "From Picture of Pride to Symbol of Abuse," *New York Times*, May 7, 2004.

swimming."[1]

Graner was the only soldier who was portrayed negatively by the *New York Times*. The newspaper reported that after leaving the Army in 1996 with the rank of corporal, he began working at the State Correctional Institution in southwestern Pennsylvania. Graner's violence against his first wife was used as evidence that he was the one responsible for instigating the abuse. The newspaper also reported that Graner was accused of mistreating prisoners in Pennsylvania. However, his good character was defended by Diane DeMarco, a Pennsylvania corrections officer who stated that the accusations by inmates were nonsense as inmates "routinely file lawsuits claiming mistreatment."[2]

Sivits was the other soldier who appeared as part of the human interest frame. Just as with the other soldiers, Sivits friends and family were enlisted to portray him as a good person who was "well liked around town."[3] The *New York Times* reported Sivits' guilty plea, but it did not highlight this as contradictory evidence of guilt and innocence of all the soldiers.

When applying the human interest frame in reporting on Rumsfeld's role and responsibility for the abuse, the *New York Times* focused on Rumsfeld's accomplishments as a politician. The newspaper included a quote by Henry Kissinger who described Rumsfeld as a "skilled full-time politician-bureaucrat in whom ambition, ability and substance fuse seamlessly."[4] Testimony by Rumsfeld's friends painted a picture of a caring and compassionate individual who "spends many of his Sundays with his wife quietly visiting

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Paul von Zielbauer and James Dao, "Guard Left Troubled Life for Duty in Iraq," *New York Times*, May 14, 2004.

[3] Dexter Filkins, "First Trial Set to Begin May 19 in Abuse in Iraq," *New York Times*, May 10, 2004.

[4] Katharine Seelye, "For Six Hours Onstage, the Rumsfeld Survival Rules Displayed, by the Man Himself," *New York Times*, May 8, 2004.

wounded soldiers at Walter Reed Army Medical Center."[1]

Taguba appeared as a true hero in the *New York Time*'s coverage. The newspaper emphasized Taguba's family history as the reason he had a strong sense of what is right and what is wrong. The fact that Taguba's father, a member of a Philippine unit under the United States Army, had been captured and tortured by Japanese during World War II was used as proof of Taguba's expertise and credibility to investigate the abuse accusations. The newspaper reported that Taguba was considered a "hero among Filipinos, whose military service for the United States has often gone unrecognized."[2]

In conclusion, although the *New York Times* coverage added a human face to the abused, reporting was not constructed to create a strong emotional bond between readers and the abuse victims. The human interest frame added some legitimacy to the abuse and torture accusations, but the newspaper repeatedly mentioned that victim testimony was hard to verify, and it was not designed to instill empathy for victims. Rather, it was used to portray victims' anger and animosity towards Americans. When abusers were the focus of the human interest frame, the newspaper provided many more details about the history and character of each of the soldiers involved in the abuse. When covering Nick Berg's beheading the *New York Times* engaged in even more sympathetic and emotional framing techniques using Berg's death as proof that the enemy was ruthless and inhuman. The human interest frame also limited Rumsfeld's responsibility and portrayed Taguba as a hero who uncovered the wrong doing of rogue soldiers.

Human interest frames in the Washington Post. The *Washington Post* utilized the

---

[1] Elizabeth Bumiller, "Rumsfeld Preserves Bearing, But Weighs Ability to Serve," *New York Times*, May 13, 2004.
[2] Douglas Jehl, "Head of Inquiry On Iraq Abuses Now in Spotlight," *New York Times*, May 11, 2004.

human interest frame in 15 articles or 22 percent of U.S. abuse coverage. Three of the articles

focused on the victims of abuse, and five articles utilized the human interest frame when

covering the abusers. Similarly to the *New York Times,* one story focused on Taguba. Darby,

the soldier responsible for making the pictures of abuse known to the higher military

command, was the focus of two additional articles. Berg was covered in two additional

articles as well, and the newspaper also utilized the human interest frames in covering public

reactions.

Much like the *New York Times*, the human interest frame when applied to victims of

abuse provided a detached portrayal of the victims. The newspaper provided names, ages,

and details on how several of the abused were arrested and treated at the U.S. detention

facilities. The victims spoke in their own voice, but the quotes included in the coverage

focused on depicting their horrific experiences and their anger at Americans. There are few

details allowing the readers to learn more about the victims as people. For example,

Muwafaq Sami Abbas, who had three of his brothers and his father detained at Abu Ghraib,

was quoted saying that Americans practiced "savagery" with Iraqis.[1] The newspaper

mentioned that Abbas was a lawyer by training but no other information about his life was

provided. The words "Angry Ex-Detainees" in the headline provided the summary--victims

were angry and their anger was expected to enlist "more hostile forces against the coalition."[2]

More personal information was provided when the victim was Hossam Shaltout,

Egyptian-born Canadian citizen with U.S. permanent resident status. In addition to providing

details of his arrest, the article printed his short bio. Shaltout was working for a private

---

[1] Scott Wilson, "Angry Ex-Detainees Tell of Abuse. Iraqis Say They Endured Physical, Psychological Hardship in U.S. Custody," *Washington Post*, May 3, 2004.
[2] Ibid.

organization Rights and Freedom International and left for Iraq in January 2003 "to convince

the leaders of Iraq that they should step down in order to avoid war with the United States."[1]

Two other victims who appeared in the abuse pictures received more attention. Lazim was

one of the hooded prisoners, and Abd was the prisoner posing alongside England. The

Washington Post printed that Lazim was a salesman and a taxi driver who "deserted Saddam

Hussein's army to support his wife and four small children."[2] Lazim's fear and distress while

in detention also received some coverage. He was being quoted to say that he "was going

crazy" and the "worst part" was "not being able to contact his wife of nine years."[3] One

similarity in the newspaper's coverage of the victims was that their guilt or innocence was

not often discussed. Although each victim's story included some mention that they were

eventually released without charges or seeing any lawyers, there was no discussion of the

reasons the abused were interrogated or whether or not they could have had any substantial

intelligence information. Reading "between the lines," it seems clear that all of the victims

were innocent as they were released but this did not become the focus or point of outrage in

the news coverage. One article even quoted Eddie Ricci, a barber from Florida who

compared Iraqi abuse victims to 9/11 casualties: "Treat 'em well? Well, when those people

were jumping out of buildings [Sept. 11, 2001] nobody was saying treat 'em better."[4] The

same story included testimony by Janan Smither, a psychology professor at the University of

Central Florida who attested that the "fear-mongering, the false pride, the dehumanizing of

'the Other'" were the causes for rogue abuse of Iraqi detainees.[5]

---

[1] DeNeen Brown, "U.S. Resident Claims Torture by Troops," *Washington Post*, May 5, 2004.
[2] Scott Wilson, "Ex-Detainee Tells of Anguishing Treatment at Iraq Prison," *Washington Post*, May 6, 2004.
[3] Ibid.
[4] Manuel Roig-Franzia, "Perspectives on Abuse Separated by Miles in Florida," *Washington Post*, May 9, 2004.
[5] Ibid.

However, when the coverage turned to the abusers, the guilt or innocence of the accused was the key component of the coverage. Sabrina Harman was the first to be reported on in the newspaper. The *Washington Post* reported that she was accused of taking photographs of naked prisoners in a pyramid, as well as photographing and videotaping detainees who were ordered to strip and masturbate in front of other prisoners and soldiers. But charges against Harman were minimized when the newspaper reported that she had never been schooled in the Geneva Conventions' rules on prisoner treatment. Harman's mother Robin was quoted defending her daughter's good nature: "She has this . . . attitude that she is going to save the world."[1] To explain why Harman would pose smilingly alongside an Iraqi corpse, the newspaper reported that Harman's father was a homicide detective and it was not unusual for him to bring home photos of crime scenes for the family to "profile."[2] England, on the other hand, posed for pictures because she was told to do so by her superiors. The pictures, according to her lawyer, were "to be used to frighten and demoralize other prisoners."[3] Her family members contended that England was being used as "a scapegoat" by the administration.[4]

One article in particular devoted much attention to all of the accused solders. The headline "Accused Soldiers a Diverse Group" conveyed that the soldiers were a diverse group of people who joined the army for different reasons.[5] The newspaper emphasized that the seven soldiers (Sivits, Frederick, Davis, Graner, Ambuhl, England and Harman) joined

---

[1] Jackie Spinner, "Soldier: Unit's Role Was to Break Down Prisoners. Reservist Tells of Orders From Intelligence Officers," *Washington Post*, May 8, 2004.
[2] Ibid.
[3] T.R. Reid, "Reservist Followed Orders, Her Lawyers Say," *Washington Post*, May 11, 2004.
[4] Ibid.
[5] Christian Davenport and Michael Amon, "Accused Soldiers a Diverse Group. Families Defend Seven Charged With Abusing Iraqi Prisoners at Abu Ghraib," *Washington Post*, May 9, 2004.

the army for various reasons--some to get better pay or money for college, others for adventure and patriotism. The article emphasized one commonality--the seven soldiers were not prepared or trained properly to guard prisoners.

Frederick and Graner's work as corrections officers in their civilian lives was mentioned as a way to suggest that the two soldiers were in charge of Abu Ghraib events because of their previous prison work. Graner and Frederick differed in that Graner had a violent past and Frederick was a model soldier inspired for military service by his uncle. The newspaper mentioned that Frederick's family launched a campaign to clear his name and posted photographs of him posing with smiling Iraqi children as proof of his good nature. The newspaper printed similar information about Megan Ambuhl--"very clean and wholesome girl"--and Javal Davis--"good father ... good soldier."[1] Even the contractor Stefanowicz who, according to Taguba's report, "ordered or allowed military police to physically abuse prisoners," was portrayed as a high school athlete and a "gentle giant."[2] The newspaper also printed reactions of people at Cresaptown who defended the soldiers--"they thought they were being heroes, breaking these people down."[3]

The "hero" metaphor was once again applied when the *Washington Post* reported about Taguba and Darby. Joseph Darby was the soldier who sounded the alarm on abuse of Iraqi detainees at Abu Ghraib Prison. The newspaper reported that Darby's family "was both proud and anxious."[4] Darby's background was detailed by the newspaper, and it described

---

[1] Ibid.
[2] Ellen McCarthy and Frank Ahrens, "Family and Friends Close Ranks Around Civilian Interrogator," *Washington Post*, May 14, 2004.
[3] Elizabeth Williamson, "In W.Md., Resentment Over Iraq Prison Abuse. Some See Unit's Home Unfairly Tarnished," *Washington Post*, May 9, 2004.
[4] Elizabeth Williamson, "One Soldier's Unlikely Act: Family Fears for Man Who Reported Iraqi Prisoner Abuse," *Washington Post*, May 6, 2004.

him as coming from a poor but hard-working family from southwestern Pennsylvania. His

reporting of the abuse was attributed to his upbringing. That Darby slipped a note about the

abuse to his superior was juxtaposed with his neighbor, Gilbert Reffner, who would slip a

Christmas card with a few dollars under the door of the Darby family house.[1] According to a

women Darby dated, he was "very sweet and kind of shy."[2] But some of Darby's friends

were quoted to suggest that Darby was short tempered.

Like the *New York Times*, the *Washington Post* presented Taguba as an extremely

professional and knowledgeable "by-the-book soldier."[3] Taguba's father escaped from

Japanese detention during World War II, and that was portrayed as the event which allowed

Taguba to understand the seriousness of the abuse allegations. Taguba's Filipino background

also became important--he was only the second Filipino American general. The newspaper

reported that the Army opened doors for his American dream--first getting a college degree

through the ROTC program at Idaho State University and later at military and private

colleges across the country. Overall, Taguba was portrayed as someone who knew of

injustice first hand. The newspaper even mentioned that Taguba's father retired from the

army unhonored and uncelebrated which greatly disappointed Taguba.[4]

Berg's death was also reported utilizing the human interest frame. Unlike the victims

of American abuse, Nick Berg was portrayed as an educated, adventurous, carefree person

and a "unique individual."[5] The *Washington Post* reported that Berg ventured to Iraq to

pursue a business contract, and his family members testified that Berg was not afraid of a

---

[1] Ibid.
[2] Ibid.
[3] David Von Drehle, "Lessons of a by-the-Book Soldier: At Hearing, Taguba Provides Straight Talk During a Time of Elusive Truths," *Washington Post*, May 12, 2004.
[4] Ibid.
[5] Sewell Chan, "Beheading Victim 'Loved Adventure and Risk'," *Washington Post*, May 14, 2004.

challenge. Other people who had encountered Berg on his trip to Iraq described him as a cheerful person who "meant no harm to anyone" and "loved the Iraqi people."[1] His family's anguish and despair when they lost contact with Berg was described in detail that included the use of poetry.[2]

In summary, the *Washington Post* utilized the human interest frame when reporting about victims of abuse, abusers, and other newsmakers such as Taguba and Darby, as well as the victim of vengeance for the abuse perpetuated by Americans. When the human interest frame was applied to the coverage of victims, the *Washington Post* did not create strong emotional connections between readers and the victims other than encouraging feelings of fear and anger. Although the reports indicated that the victims were blameless civilians, their innocence was not the focus of the coverage. In all stories, little space was devoted to portraying the victims as unique individuals with their own life stories, dreams and aspirations. In portraying the abusers, the newspaper devoted much attention to each of them as unique and good natured individuals. When the focus of the coverage was the victim of abuse revenge, the newspaper focused not only on the details of the victim's life but it also appealed to the audience's emotions by hinting that war and violence result in unnecessary and pointless deaths. The hero metaphor was applied when the newspaper covered Taguba and Darby, and both were portrayed as engaged in difficult moral decisions to bring justice for the abuse.

Human interest frames in the Guardian. The *Guardian* utilized the human interest frame in four articles or about 14 percent of the coverage on the American abuse. Three of

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Sewell Chan and Ariana Eunjung Cha, "American Beheaded on Web Video: Militants Say Killing Was Revenge for U.S. Abuses at Iraqi Prison," *Washington Post*, May 12, 2004.

these articles focused on the victims of abuse, and one article focused on the accused solders.

The *Guardian* featured family members of those who were detained. Many family members

were interviewed outside of the Abu Ghraib prison where they gathered regularly hoping to

get to talk to their detained relatives. Former detainees were also quoted to attest to how they

were abused. Often the coverage emphasized relatives' concerns regarding the health of the

detained. The mother of one detainee testified that her son was in need of medical attention.[1]

Another family member told of his 70-year-old father "has a heart complaint."[2] Relatives

often noted that the detained were innocent and arrested randomly, some while walking past

the U.S. military base, or others arrested after their neighbors told the U.S. army of their

support for the resistance.

Similarly to the other newspapers, information about the victims was limited to their

account of abuse, their arrest, or their reactions to the American occupation. Information

about who they were as individuals was missing. Even the article featuring Professor Huda

Shaker, a political scientist at Baghdad University, that reported female inmates at Abu

Ghraib were innocent and had been jailed only because they were married to "high-ranking

and absconding Ba'ath party officials" contained no additional information encouraging

readers to empathize with the women.[3] A brief glimpse at the emotional state of a prisoner

was provided in one other article detailing Salah al-Rawi's testimony about abuse at Abu

Ghraib. At the very end of the lengthy 1386-word article there was a brief mention that after

returning home al-Rawi called off his planned marriage: "I broke off the relationship with my

---

[1] Luke Harding, "Torture Commonplace, Say Inmates' Families," *Guardian*, May 3, 2004.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Luke Harding, "Focus Shifts to Jail Abuse of Women," *Guardian*, May 12, 2004.

fiancee because I felt I couldn't get my dignity back."[1] He also said that Bush's apology would not restore the dignity of all the people jailed at Abu Ghraib. Similar sentiments of resentment were articulated by Majid al-Salim, the brother of one detainee who was quoted saying "the Americans are driving people into the arms of the Maqawama (resistance). We now look back at Saddam's era with nostalgia."[2]

When covering the abusers, and in particular England, the *Guardian* extensively modeled the human interest frame on the coverage of American newspapers. The *Guardian* recounted England's story--fearless young women who was in the wrong place at the wrong time. A slight difference was that the *Guardian* emphasized that England (and other soldiers) were being made "scapegoats."[3] The wording in the headline "From Heroine to Humiliator" suggested that England's naturally upstanding character had been altered by the circumstances, and her good nature was defended by family and friends. The *Guardian* did not cover the other accused soldiers using the human interest frame. Although the newspaper mentioned Graner's violent past and Sivits's upcoming court-martial, the coverage did not utilize many of the techniques of the human interest frame.

In conclusion, similar to the coverage of victims in American newspapers, the *Guardian* made use of the human interest frame to give voice to the victims of abuse, but it focused on what happened to them and not on who they were as individuals prior to Abu Ghraib. England was the only accused soldier whose profile was covered utilizing the human interest frame. Similar to the American framing of England's life, the *Guardian* placed more

---

[1] Rory McCarthy, "'They Abused Me and Stole my Dignity': Prisoner's Tale Iraqi was Bound, Beaten and Forced to Spend 18 Days Naked in Cell," *Guardian*, May 13, 2004.
[2] Luke Harding, "Torture Commonplace, Say Inmates' Families," *Guardian*, May 3, 2004.
[3] Suzanne Goldenberg, "From Heroine to Humiliator: Lynndie England: Family Says Woman Who has Become Face of Prison Abuse has Been Made a Scapegoat," *Guardian*, May 3, 2004.

emphasis on the accused soldiers being depicted as scapegoats by the administration.

Human interest frames in the Times. The *Times* applied the human interest frame in nine articles or about 21 percent of the coverage selected for analysis. Five of these articles focused on the Iraqis and the other four on the Americans. In the articles in which the human interest frame was applied in its depiction of the Iraqi victims, the *Times* focused on detailing the abuse through the victims' voices. Numerous accounts of random humiliation, beatings, and insults were covered by the newspaper. In some articles, victims suggested that the abuse was orchestrated by individual soldiers and was not part of any interrogation.[1] Other articles suggested there was more to the abuse than random beatings by a few soldiers.[2] Interestingly, the newspaper also tended to note whether the abuse claims could be officially verified. Innocence of the victims was also a topic that appeared more often in comparison with the other newspapers. One former prisoner claimed that he had been arrested because he had been found with a gun in his work car.[3]

While the other newspapers focused on the anger of victims towards their abusers, the *Times* framed it by comparing American behavior with Saddam's history of torture. One victim stated "with that humiliation they brought Saddam back to our lives."[4] Another article featured a Kurdish journalist Subhy Haddad who was imprisoned at Abu Ghraib by Saddam. The headlines "Brutality Became the Byword for Abu Ghraib" and "Torture Worse than Under Saddam, Says Victim," suggested that prisoner abuse at Abu Ghraib by Americans had a kind of legacy. Moreover, Saddam Salah al-Rawi's testimony described his experience

---

[1] Anthony Lloyd, "How Could We Have Been Treated this Way?" *Times*, May 5, 2004. Tony Allen-Mills, "America's Shame," *Times*, May 9, 2004.
[2] Tony Allen-Mills, "America's Shame," *Times*, May 9, 2004. Anthony Loyd, "Torture Worse than Under Saddam, Says Victim," *Times*, May 13, 2004.
[3] Anthony Lloyd, "How Could We Have Been Treated this Way?" *Times*, May 5, 2004.
[4] Ibid.

of being tortured at Abu Ghraib twice--by Saddam and by Americans--"Saddam's torture

was 1 per cent of the American's 100 per cent. I spent three years in the prison under

Saddam. When released I was psychologically OK--I forgot it all. I spent four months in Abu

Ghraib under the Americans. I shout in my sleep. My engagement has fallen through. I can't

marry because of my state of mind."[1]

Even though the *Times* seemed to take a different approach to using the human

interest frame when featuring the victims of abuse, there was still one commonality--the

details about the victims' personal life stories were generally missing from the coverage.

Other than mentioning their age and occupation, additional personal information was not

covered in the *Times*.

When the human interest frame was utilized to feature the abusers, the *Times*, just as

all other newspapers, utilized quotes from friends and family members of the accused to

suggest that the soldiers were good people.[2] In exploring the guilt or innocence of the

soldiers, the *Times*, more than the other newspapers, emphasized the reactions of shock and

shame by the people in Cumberland, the town where the reserve unit was stationed. The

Times reported how the people of Cumberland believed the soldiers could not have done

anything so heinous unless they were ordered to do so by superiors. England's lawyer

Giorgio Ra'Shadd explained the innocence of the soldiers: "What is offensive to me is that

we have generals and the Secretary of Defence hiding behind a 20-year-old farm girl from

West Virginia who lives in a trailer park."[3] Another article juxtaposed Lynndie England

against Jessica Lynch in order to emphasize that the abuse of prisoners was a symbol of U.S.

---

[1] Anthony Loyd, "Torture Worse than Under Saddam, Says Victim," *Times*, May 13, 2004.
[2] Tim Reid, "The Little Town of Shame and Defiance," *Times*, May 7, 2004.
[3] Roland Watson, "Accused Were 'Let Down by Failure of Officers'," *Times*, May 11, 2004.

policy failure, just like Jessica Lynch was a symbol of American perseverance.[1]

In addition to applying the human interest frame to the accused soldiers, the *Times* also devoted attention to General Karpinski. One article painted the image of Karpinski from her early childhood: "Karpinski was five years old she dreamed of being a soldier. She lined up her dolls in her New Jersey backyard and wrote "A-OK-US Army" on them.[2] The newspaper, however, did not provide more details about Karpinski's work or her role in the abuse other than to mention that she was put in charge of the American detention facilities even though "she had no experience of prisons, but the Pentagon was desperate."[3]

Overall, the *Times* use of the human interest frame when covering the American abuse was not very extensive. Several victims of abuse were featured telling their story, but just like the other newspapers, the *Times* failed to create coverage empathetic towards the victims and portraying them as unique, interesting individuals. However, the human interest frame was utilized to compare Americans to Saddam Hussein's regime of torture. When the soldiers accused of abuse were covered in the *Times*, their life stories were also covered less extensively when compared to the other three newspapers. While some of the same facts were published in the *Times*, the soldiers' voice was also used to question the official version of events that the abuse was the doing of a few individuals.

Human Interest Frames in the Coverage of the U.K. Events

When covering the U.K. story, the human interest frame was not utilized at all by the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post*. The British newspapers had minimal coverage

---

[1] Roland Watson and Stephen Farrell, "Private Jessica Helped America to Win the War," *Times*, May 8, 2004.
[2] Tony Allen-Mills, "America's Shame," *Times*, May 9, 2004.
[3] Ibid.

utilizing the human interest frame. The *Guardian* published two stories utilizing the human interest frame (5 percent of the coverage), and the *Times* utilized this frame in only one article (4 percent of the coverage).

Human interest frames in the Guardian. The two stories that utilized the human interest frame in the *Guardian* featured the soldiers of the Queen's Lancashire Regiment (QLR). That regiment was accused of being responsible for the abuse pictured in the *Daily Mirror* photographs, which were later proven to be fakes. The other story focused on one of the victims, the girl who was shot by the British soldiers.

The story that focused on the QLR soldiers was constructed to convey the disappointment of the soldiers who learned of the accusations of abuse published in the *Daily Mirror*. The article described the regiment's success in Iraq by listing the awards it had received for their work in Iraq. The 21 medals included a Distinguished Service Order for its commanding officer and a Military Cross for a sergeant-major. The manager of a shop at the British base in Cyprus was quoted defending the regiment's honor: "It's dreadful to think that after all the medals they got in Iraq this is what they're going to be remembered for."[1] Soldiers were quoted to show their disappointment: "I was in Iraq for six months and, yeah, it was the worst experience of my life. We did a good job, and then all this. It's very disheartening."[2]

The emotional connection with the regiment was made even deeper by the *Guardian's* mentioning that soon after learning of the awards the regiment "plunged" into grief as one of their popular Sgt. Maj., Darren Leigh, died of a brain hemorrhage.[3] The

---

[1] Helena Smith, "Bravery, Success, Medals Now Stunned Disbelief," *Guardian*, May 4, 2004.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Ibid.

appearance of the *Daily Mirror* photographs was described through the words of the regiment's commanding officer as an "ill-timed tragedy that has robbed us of a much loved regimental personality."[1] Other soldiers explained that the photos were fabricated by other units because of jealousy--their unit did such a great job that the competing units were eager to destroy their good name. The civilian employee at the base was quoted offering the last impression of the QLR soldiers: "We're not like the Americans who do run wild. We've got much higher standards. Our men are professionals."[2]

The second story in the *Guardian* which utilized the human interest frame focused on one of the victims. It was not a victim of abuse at any of the detention facilities, but rather Hanan Saleh Matrud, an eight-year-old girl who was killed by a British soldier of the 1st Battalion of the King's Regiment. The article mentioned that Hanan's case was one of the many unlawful killings investigated by Amnesty International. It also mentioned "administrative flaws" in the way the incidents had been investigated.[3] Although not much information was presented about Hanan, the article painted a picture of the neighborhood where Hanan's relatives lived: "a small compound of single-storey brick houses in Qarmat Ali, a slum neighbourhood on the northern outskirts of Basra. Open sewage runs through the alleyways between the houses and boys play in dirt green water by an ageing oil pipeline."[4] The father of the girl stated that the death of his daughter made him angry at the British army. Even though the article utilized the human interest frame quite successfully--the girl's death was pictured as an unfortunate and unnecessary death of an innocent--it did not attempt

---

[1] Ibid.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Rory McCarthy, "Prisoner Abuse Scandal: Shot that Killed Girl, 8: One Year on Family Still Awaits Proper Investigation," *Guardian*, May 11, 2004.
[4] Ibid.

to provide any further details on how many other innocent civilians were killed at the hands of the British soldiers. The readers were encouraged to sympathize with the little girl, but there was little exploration of the larger context of the price of war on innocent Iraqis.

Overall, the *Guardian* was successful at utilizing the human interest frame to make the readers empathize with the soldiers. The coverage of the killing of an innocent civilian girl allowed the reader to get closer to the Iraqis because her death was portrayed as an unfortunate event. Without other Iraqis speaking for themselves about the abuse the readers were left wondering if the abuse actually happened.

Human interest frames in the Times. The only story in the *Times* utilizing the human interest frame featured Captain David Jones, the British soldier of the 1st Battalion of the Queen's Lancashire Regiment (QLR) who was killed by a roadside bomb when accompanying a wounded soldier to the hospital. Jones's death was believed to have prompted the abuse pictures published in the *Daily Mirror*. Jones was portrayed as a cheerful and popular soldier. The newspaper reported that his funeral was held at the same church where he had married just over a year ago. Lt. Col. Jorge Mendonca, the battalion's commanding officer, was quoted saying that when he came home for the funeral, Jones's wife had suggested to "leave and pull out of the bleeding place."[1] This story serves as a powerful reminder of the dangers the soldiers faced on a regular basis. It definitely helped readers empathize with the soldiers which served the purposes of the human interest framing.

How are the acts categorized?

This question was designed to highlight a set of linguistic and framing mechanisms

---

[1] Adam Nathan and Stephen Grey, "Soldiers' Grief that Fuelled Brutality," *Times,* May 2, 2004.

that work to promote a particular categorization of the events and issues related to prisoner

treatment in Iraq by American and British soldiers. Categorization serves two features of

framing the "problem definition" and the "causal interpretation" of the events.[1] The

definition feature is explored in this dissertation by examining the language used by each of

the newspapers in labeling the events and soldiers' actions. These labels can be examined as

mechanisms of the diagnostic frame. However, for the purpose of this research, the labels are

examined separately from the larger context of diagnostic framing as their use in the

coverage was often separate from the media's discussion on what were the reasons for the

torture and abuse of Iraqi detainees. In other words, labels appeared separately from the

newspapers' attempts to diagnose what happened in Iraq. They also appeared as seemingly

"natural" parts of the news narrative and were often utilized without giving much attention to

the discussion of how the events in Iraq should be evaluated.

The second part of this section examines the "causal interpretation" feature of

framing by reviewing the range of diagnostic frames offered by each of the newspapers.

Since the diagnostic frame was often constructed in conjunction with the responsibility

frame, some of the devices relevant for the diagnostic frames were already discussed in the

previous sections of this dissertation. Nevertheless, the second section will briefly overview

the framing and reasoning devices utilized to construct the range of diagnostic explanations

that received attention in the coverage of the four newspapers.

Labels

Language is not a neutral tool. The choice of a label used to name the events in Iraq

---

[1] Robert Entman, "Framing: Toward Clarification of a Fractured Paradigm," *Journal of Communication*, 43 (1993): 52.

was an important framing tool utilized by the governments of each country as well as the media. While the label "torture" seems to be favored by the human rights organizations that raised concerns about the prisoner treatment in Iraq, the labels "abuse" and "mistreatment" were preferred by government and military officials.[1] The media, whether consciously or not, adapted the labels used by their sources. When the media adapted the label that seemed to be preferred by the administration, this could be construed as the media's overreliance on official sources. Bennett, Lawrence, and Livingston argued that the Abu Ghraib scandal in particular offered a good opportunity to test government-press relations.[2] In the study of how Abu Ghraib was covered in the U.S. media, Bennett, Lawrence, and Livingston distinguished "torture policy" versus "isolated abuse" based on the media's use of labels such as mistreatment, scandal, abuse, and torture.[3] However, the results of this research show that the choice of labels used in the coverage of the four newspapers was a bit more complicated than a simple juxtaposition of "abuse" versus "torture." The media were actually utilizing a variety of labels when naming the events which ranged from humiliation to sexual assault and ended with torture. For the purposes of representing aggregate data, the labels used by all four newspapers to reference the events in Iraq were placed in seven categories. Table 14 summarizes the labels used by each of the four newspapers.

---

[1] International Committee of the Red Cross, *Report of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) on the Treatment by the Coalition Forces of Prisoners of War and Other Protected Persons by the Geneva Conventions in Iraq During Arrest, Internment and Interrogation*. ICRC, 2004. http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/library/report/2004/icrc_report_iraq_feb2004.htm (accessed February 20, 2005); Lance Bennett, Regina Lawrence, and Steven Livingston, "None Dare Call it Torture," *Journal of Communication* 56 no. 3 (2006): 468.

[2] Lance Bennett, Regina Lawrence, and Steven Livingston. "None Dare Call it Torture," *Journal of Communication* 56 no. 3 (2006): 470.

[3] Ibid., 471.

Table 14. Labels used by the four newspapers

		New York Times		Washington Post		Guardian		Times	
		US	UK	US	UK	US	UK	US	UK
Abuse	#	57	9	54	10	22	17	31	11
	%	*88*	*100*	*81*	*90*	*76*	*47*	*72*	*39*
Torture	#	13	2	18	2	17	15	13	10
	%	*20*	*22*	*27*	*18*	*59*	*42*	*30*	*36*
Mistreatment	#	19	3	18	3	6	6	5	11
	%	*29*	*33*	*27*	*27*	*21*	*17*	*12*	*39*
Humiliation	#	22	4	22	4	11	7	15	2
	%	*34*	*44*	*33*	*36*	*38*	*19*	*35*	*7*
Sexual Nature	#	18	2	17	1	7	3	9	5
	%	*28*	*22*	*25*	*9*	*24*	*8*	*21*	*18*
Force	#	10	6	10	5	8	4	23	12
	%	*15*	*67*	*15*	*45*	*28*	*11*	*53*	*43*
Other	#	7	0	10	0	2	3	3	0
	%	*11*	*0*	*15*	*0*	*7*	*8*	*7*	*0*
Total*		65	9	67	11	29	36	43	28

*The *Total* scores do not add up to 100 percent since any article was likely to utilize more than one label in referencing the events.

The first category was designated for label abuse. Abuse was, of course, the preferred label of the governments, and it was used to signify that the events were the result of the criminal behavior of a few soldiers. By definition the abuse label includes a wide range of meanings such as improper use, misuse, or ill-use.[1] In addition, the term abuse leads to a differentiation of the types of abuse: physical, verbal, or sexual. Thus, the label abuse communicates that someone is being treated wrongfully or harmfully in a variety of ways. In other words, the term abuse carries a vague and ambiguous connotative meaning which makes it harder for the people who did not witness the events to envision what really happened. Rosenblum identified the vagueness of the "human rights abuses" as one of the

---

[1] Universal Declaration of Human Rights, G.A. res. 217A (III), U.N. Doc A/810 at 71 (1948) http://www.un.org/en/documents/udhr/index.shtml (accessed August 9. 2009).

significant detriments of human rights reporting in general.[1] Perhaps because of this vagueness it was a preferred label for the administrations. As Table 14 demonstrates, the label abuse was used extensively by all four newspapers in their coverage of both U.S. and U.K. events. When covering U.S. events, the *New York Times* used the label abuse in 88 percent of the stories, the *Washington Post* used it in 81 percent of the stories, The *Guardian* labeled the U.S. events as abuse in 76 percent of the stories, and the *Times* used it in 72 of its stories. Although percentages are less useful in evaluating the coverage of U.K. events in the American newspapers, the label was used in all nine articles in the *New York Times* and 10 out of 11 articles in the *Washington Post* which reported on the British soldiers' behavior with Iraqi detainees. It is worth noting that abuse was used less in the British media: the *Guardian* used this label in 47 percent of articles and the *Times* used it in 39 percent of articles covering the British story. Such a strong preference for the label abuse by all four newspapers in their coverage of both the U.S. and the U.K. stories may suggest that the media in fact were conforming to the governments' preferred way of framing the events.

Nevertheless, the label torture was also applied to describe the events in Iraq by all four newspapers. As Table 14 indicates, the British newspapers utilized the label torture more extensively. In particular, the label torture appeared in the *New York Times* in 20 percent of articles about the U.S. events and 22 percent of articles about the U.K. events. The *Washington Post* used the label torture in 27 percent of its articles about the U.S. events and 18 percent of articles about the U.K. events. The *Guardian* used the label torture in 59 percent of articles covering the U.S. events and 42 percent of articles covering the U.K. events. Though slightly less extensively, the *Times* also utilized the label torture in about 30

---

[1] See Mort Rosenblum, *Coups and Earthquakes (*New York: Harper & Colophon Books, 1981), 193-268 and Rosenblum, Mort. *Who Stole the News?* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1993), 198.

percent of articles about the U.S. events and 36 percent of articles about the U.K. events. As it was discussed in the introductory section of this dissertation, torture, just as abuse, is not a well defined term. Torture refers to the infliction of pain as punishment or coercion.[1] The vagueness in definition of torture as it is accepted by the United Nations is in the explanation that torture "is severe pain or suffering … inflicted by or at the instigation of or with the consent or acquiescence of a public official or other person acting in an official capacity."[2] The U.S. administration contested both the severity of torture at Abu Ghraib and denied any existence of an official policy of torture. Even though torture discourse in general was not as much part of British political communication, the British administration also avoided accepting torture accusations. Therefore, it is significant that the U.K. media were utilizing the label torture so extensively when covering the U.K. abuses.

The next category connects several terms that can be considered to fall under the label mistreatment. It consists of several labels such as mistreatment, harsh treatment, misconduct, inhuman and ill-treatment. Even though all of these labels could fall under the definitions of abuse, they are separated into their own category as these were the labels used by the media separate from the label abuse. Similar to abuse, all of these labels reference improper or neglectful behavior by the soldiers. Taken on their own, these labels seem to suggest less severe actions than abuse. Misconduct in particular removes attention from the victims and suggests that the soldiers were simply behaving improperly. All four newspapers utilized mistreatment labels with very similar frequency as the label torture. The *New York Times* in fact used these labels in 29 percent of their stories about U.S. events and 33 percent of stories

---

[1] *Declaration on the Protection of All Persons from Being Subjected to Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment*, G.A. res. 3452 (XXX). U.N. (December 1975) http://www2.ohchr.org/english/law/declarationcat.htm (accessed November 24, 2007)
[2] Ibid.

about U.K. events. The *Washington Post* had an identical proportion of articles utilizing the mistreatment category when covering U.S. events and U.K. events (27 percent of articles). The *Guardian* utilized the mistreatment category in 21 percent of articles about U.S. and 17 of articles about U.K. events. The *Times* used this category less often for the U.S. events (12 percent of the coverage) but utilized it in almost 40 percent of their coverage of the British events.

The next category, called humiliation, comprised of labels such as humiliation, degradation, and disgrace, was utilized even more often by the American newspapers. These terms refer to conditions or circumstances that are shameful. Often, these terms accompanied the descriptions of detainees being urinated on and being naked and forced to wear female underwear on their heads. Being shamed is not considered to be as cruel as being abused or tortured, and therefore this category signifies intention to minimize the severity of prisoner treatment in Iraq. One of the sources cited in the *Washington Post* demonstrated the sentiment of humiliation quite well: "I'd rather be naked than dead. The Iraqi prisoners in the photos are alive, just humiliated. Every stinking day I'm humiliated."[1] Over 30 percent of articles in the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post* about U.S. events included references to humiliation. Again, though percentages mean less in the coverage of U.K. events in the American media, humiliation and degradation seem to be preferred more often when compared to torture or mistreatment in the U.S. media's depiction of the British treatment of Iraqis. The main issue that this labeling highlights is that by framing humiliation as a lesser problem, the newspapers missed an opportunity to examine how humiliation and nudity are treated differently in Iraq culture. Nudity is a cultural taboo in Muslim cultures

---

[1] Elizabeth Williamson, "In W.Md., Resentment Over Iraq Prison Abuse. Some See Unit's Home Unfairly Tarnished," *Washington Post*, May 9, 2004.

and humiliation of men by exposing their bodies to others is particularly shameful and hurtful.

The next category grouped all labels that clearly indicated a sexual nature of events. The labels clustered under this category include sexual assault, sexual abuse, sexual humiliation, sadism and rape. All four newspapers made notice of the sexual nature of the treatment of prisoners and detainees in Iraq. All four newspapers utilized this category of labels in more than 20 percent of their articles when covering the U.S. events (the *New York Times* utilized this label in 28 percent, the *Washington Post* in 25 percent, the *Guardian* in 24 percent, and the *Times* in 21 percent of the coverage). When covering the U.K. events, the sexual nature of prisoner treatment was not highlighted as much. The *New York Times* and the *Times* utilized it slightly more with approximately 22 and 19 percent of the articles in the coverage of British abuse. Referencing the sexual nature of prisoner treatment could be an important framing device because it is less believable that sexual humiliation, abuse and rape were part of approved interrogation techniques. Emphasis on the sexual nature of prisoner treatment places responsibility with individuals rather than on government policies. However, upon closer inspection sexual humiliation and abuse could have been the direct result of approved interrogation policies because the government admitted that sleep deprivation, humiliation, standing in painful or awkward positions for long periods, and exposure to extreme temperature were approved interrogation techniques that were considered successful means to extract information from detainees.[1] If the solders were given instructions to humiliate the detainees, sexual humiliation might be one of the easiest ways the soldiers could accomplish this charge. The sexual nature of prisoner abuse depicted in the

---

[1] Seymour Hersh, "Chain of Command," *New Yorker*, May 17, 2004.

Abu Ghraib photographs and later in the U.K. photographs was recognized by academics and activists who were arguing that this type of abuse was intended to exploit nudity and homosexuality Iraqi cultural taboos to coerce detainees into disclosing information.[1]

One other group of terms utilized by the media to categorize the events falls under the umbrella term force which included such labels as beatings, brutality, violence, force, savagery, mock execution, and deliberate punishment. This category of labels was utilized the most in the coverage of U.K. events by American newspapers. The *New York Times* made references to the use of physical force by U.K. soldiers against the detainees in about 67 percent of the articles, and the *Washington Post* utilized labels from this category in nearly 45 percent of their articles. Although the actual frequency was not very high since the U.S. media paid little attention to the U.K. events, the preference for this label in the U.S. newspapers is apparent. Of the two U.K. newspapers, the *Times* utilized this category of labels significantly more than the *Guardian*. The *Times* utilized labels from this category in about 53 percent of articles about the U.S. and 43 percent of articles covering U.K. events. One possible explanation for why the media utilized this category of labels (especially in the case of the U.S. media covering U.K. events) is that it shifts attention away from the interrogation and detention policies and focuses more on the behavior of the soldiers. Violence, force and beatings seem like a less likely consequence of government policies.

The last category in Table 14 is called other and it includes all the other labels that did not fit easily into the categories described above. The labels included: illegal behavior, systemic and illegal abuse, appalling acts, horrifying incidents, sensory assault, breach of international law and war crimes. The *New York Times* and the *Washington Post* utilized

---

[1] Jasbir Puar, "Abu Ghraib: Arguing Against Exceptionalism," *Feminist Studies* 30, no. 2 (2004): 522-534.

more of these kinds of labels and even though the percentages seem smaller when compared to the newspapers' usage of the other labels, some of the labels falling into this category are important to acknowledge. For example it is noteworthy that the *New York Times* commented that the events in Iraq constituted a breach of international laws. The *Guardian* categorized them as war crimes. The *Times* used the label appalling acts. Clearly, the newspapers provided many ways to interpret the events for the audience, and whereas some labels carry the strongest possible judgment and the label of torture, other labels minimize the horror of the events by categorizing them as mistreatment or humiliation.

The next section will continue this discussion of the media's categorizing of the events in Iraq by looking more closely at what kinds of diagnostic frames were utilized by each of the four newspapers.

<center>*Diagnostic Frames*</center>

One of the mechanisms in formulating how the events in Iraq should be understood by audiences was the use of diagnostic frames. Diagnostic frames are designed to answer the *why* component of a news script. Providing an explanation of why the abuse occurred is an important aspect of investigative reporting. As it was shown in Chapter 3 (see Table 3), diagnostic frames were not utilized evenly by the four newspapers in the study. In addition, diagnostic frames were utilized very little overall in the coverage of the British events. When covering the U.S. events, diagnostic frames were applied in 26 percent of the articles in the *New York Times*, 34 percent of the articles in the *Washington Post*, 21 percent of the articles in the *Guardian*, and 35 percent of the articles in the *Times*. In contrast, none of the articles about U.K. events published in the *New York Times* utilized the diagnostic frame; only one article utilized the diagnostic frame in the *Washington Post* (which accounts to 9 percent of

the coverage due to lack of a volume of articles about U.K. events in the newspaper); and 11 percent and 29 percent of the articles in the *Guardian* and the *Times* respectively utilized diagnostic frames when covering British events.

In the coverage of prisoner treatment in Iraq, diagnostic frames often appeared together with the responsibility frame. In some instances, the diagnostic frame seemed to be utilized as one of the "reasoning devices" in construction of the responsibility frame. As a result, the diagnostic frame was often constructed utilizing the same framing devices as the responsibility frame. As it was discussed in the second section of this chapter, if an article focused on the systemic responsibility frame, it often applied investigative type of reporting and there was more attention devoted to the context of the events. If responsibility was assigned to the individuals, the newspapers employed events type reporting, relied on the official sources, and gave little attention to the larger context of the events.

Since a detailed review of how responsibility frame was constructed in each of the four newspapers is included in the second part of this chapter, the following discussion will provide a more focused review of what kinds of diagnostic frames were utilized by each of the newspapers. In other words, since both the immediate reactions and later investigations provided numerous explanations of why the abuse occurred, the interest in identifying diagnostic frames was not as much in how they were constructed but what kinds of explanations received attention in the coverage. In addition, though the same diagnostic frames were utilized to explain both the U.S. and the U.K. events, the frames were constructed differently when they were applied to the actions of the two armies. Thus, the following will also address the differences in how the diagnostic frames were comparatively constructed when applied to the actions of American and British armies.

As shown in Table 15, five diagnostic frames were identified in the coverage: interrogation policies and procedures, lack of preparedness, lack of discipline, chaos and danger, and soldiers exhibiting dominance. The following will examine how each of the diagnostic frames was utilized by the four newspapers.

Table 15. Diagnostic frames

		New York Times		Washington Post		Guardian		Times	
		US	UK	US	UK	US	UK	US	UK
Interrogation Policies and	#	8		14		3	1	4	2
Procedures	%	12		12		10	3	9	7
Lack of Preparedness	#	5		2		2		3	
	%	8		3		7		7	
Lack of Structure and	#	3		7		2	1	3	1
Discipline	%	5		10		7	3	7	4
Chaos and Danger	#	3		5	1	1		1	2
	%	5		7	9	3		2	7
Soldiers Exhibiting	#	3		2			3	2	3
Dominance	%	5		3			8	5	11
Total*		65	9	67	11	29	36	43	28

*The *Total* number represents the number of stories devoted to the U.S. and U.K. events in each newspaper.

The first diagnostic frame listed in Table 15 categorizes the abuse of prisoners as a direct result of interrogation policies and procedures. The news articles utilizing this diagnostic frame suggested that the abuse occurred when the guards were told to "prepare" prisoners for interrogation.[1] Among various framing and reasoning devices utilized to construct this frame were descriptions of interrogation policies and procedures in Iraq and Afghanistan as well as discussions of how the war on terror and the post-9/11 climate affected intelligence gathering policies. Specific topics and sources that were used to build this diagnostic frame varied a bit for U.S. and U.K. events.

In the coverage of U.S. events, Miller's visit to Abu Ghraib and his recommendation

---

[1] Roland Watson and Nicholas Blanford, "US Losing Battle for Hearts, Minds and a City." *Times*, May 1, 2004.

for MP to work closer with intelligence officers was used as one of the key reasoning devices for this frame. Namely, when applying this frame, the newspapers suggested that the MPs were ordered to "soften up" the prisoners.[1] The pictures of abuse were to be used to threaten other prisoners to disclose information. The spread of R2I techniques as well as the use of harsher interrogation techniques derived from Guantanamo were used as evidence suggesting that abuse emerged from interrogation policies and procedures. Ultimately, this diagnostic frame placed blame on top governmental officials--including Donald Rumsfeld who authorized methods of interrogation--as the culprits of abuse. To add more credibility to this argument the newspapers built this frame by citing sources discussing the impact of dismissing the Geneva conventions as well as the general post-9/11 climate and mentality of "them versus us." In many cases this was discussed to convey the idea that torturing prisoners for intelligence does not work.[2]

When this frame was utilized to explain British events, newspapers included references to Britain's history of prisoner treatment in Northern Ireland and emphasized various illegal procedures the British army had used in the past. Prisoner hooding described in the abuse reports as well as depicted in the photographs was used to prove that British soldiers had been engaging in illegal behaviors. The *Times*, for example, reminded that the prisoner treatment in Iraq by British soldiers resembled what used to be "deep interrogation" techniques used on Northern Ireland prisoners--noise, sleep deprivation, restricted diet, and stripping prisoners naked.[3] These techniques were exposed and banned in 1971 as they breached Article 3 of the European Convention on Human Rights.

---

[1] James Glanz, "Torture Is Often a Temptation and Almost Never Works," *New York Times*, May 9, 2004.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Michael Evans, "What They Can Do and What They Can't," *Times*, May 10, 2004.

This frame was the most often utilized diagnostic frame in the coverage of U.S. events by all four newspapers (see Table 15), with the *Washington Post* and the *New York Times* using it most often (12 percent of the total coverage). The *Guardian* and the *Times* used this frame in about 10 percent of their coverage of U.S. events. When covering U.K. events, neither of the American newspapers used this frame. However it is important to note that when the *Guardian* and the *Times* utilized this frame in the coverage of U.K. stories, the specifics of the information was often blurred by referencing Red Cross reports that both U.S. and U.K. soldiers were abusing and torturing prisoners in the process for acquiring intelligence. Even when discussing R2I techniques used by the British as a possible culprit for abuse, information was presented in such a manner that it merged the two armies together. For example, one article in the *Times* quoted a former British special forces officer saying that the R2I techniques "are taught at the joint services interrogation centre in Ashford, Kent, as well as centres in the United States."[1] The article implied that the R2I techniques were taught by and then misused by both coalition forces.

The second diagnostic frame identified in the coverage was focusing on the coalition's lack of preparedness for the war in Iraq in general, as well as the lack of preparedness for the deployment of detention policies and procedures. The news stories that utilized this explanation of prisoner abuse in Iraq focused on the primary sources of abuse, usually the soldiers themselves, recounting that they had received little to no training on Geneva Conventions or intelligence gathering procedures in general. The newspapers also focused on the fact that very few guards were responsible for a large number of detainees as one of the reasoning devices for this frame, but note that this frame was utilized only in the

---

[1] Michael Evans and Chris Johnston, "Red Cross Reported Abuse Months Ago," *Times*, May 8, 2004.

coverage of the U.S. events. None of the newspapers utilized the lack of preparedness frame in covering the U.K. events. However, the soldiers' lack of preparedness for working with prisoners and intelligence gathering was one of the major explanations that emerged from the official U.K. investigations.[1] Again, even though the numbers provided in the table above are not to be used for statistical comparisons, it is apparent that the lack of preparedness by the U.S. Army to handle the detention procedures was emphasized most often by the *New York Times* which utilized this explanation in 8 percent of its coverage. The *Washington Post* used this frame in about three percent of its coverage. The *Guardian* and the *Times* offered this explanation in seven percent of their coverage about U.S. events.

Another explanation offered in the coverage of prisoner treatment was the lack structure and discipline at the detention facilities. When this frame was applied to U.S. events, the reasoning was based on the information garnered from Taguba's report which repeatedly utilized a vague expression of "breakdown in leadership" as one of the culprits for prisoner abuse.[2] Other sources used to construct this frame were military and government officials. Coupled with the systemic responsibility frame, this was often utilized when newspapers reported that some soldiers attempted to question the abuse but received no response from their leadership.[3] Specifically, Frederick's journal was used by the newspapers to argue that the abuse was ordered by officers. Reasoning devices for this frame were based on discussing confusing command structures in reference to the fact that MPs at the recommendation of Miller were instructed to help prepare prisoners for interrogations. Miller

---

[1] Robert Aitken, "The Aitken Report. An Investigation into Cases of Deliberate Abuse and Unlawful Killing in Iraq in 2003 and 2004." Cageprisoners Ltd, www.cageprisoners.com/download.php?download=686 (accessed April, 11, 2008).

[2] Dexter Filkins, "General Will Trim Inmate Numbers at Iraq Prison," *New York Times*, May 5, 2003.

[3] Sewell Chan and Michael Amon, "Prisoner Abuse Probe Widened; Military Intelligence at Center of Investigation," *Washington Post*, May 2, 2004.

was quoted in the *Guardian,* for example, stating that "breakdown in leadership at Abu Ghraib ... had made the abuse possible."[1] Without more specific information this explanation does not mean much but it seems that this frame was favored by the administration. Not surprisingly, when the officials admitted to a breakdown in leadership as a culprit for abuse, they were also quoted as suggesting that all such issues were already resolved. Moreover, the officials tried to minimize what happened at Abu Ghraib. This was done by calling the abuse an "error." The headline of one of the *Guardian's* articles, "Trust Us--Errors will not Happen Again," was a quote from Miller's interview admitting to the breakdown in leadership.[2] A very similar quote from Miller was also published in the *New York Time's* coverage: "we have changed this--trust us."[3] Unfortunately, even when the officials admitted to "errors" it was not clear what these errors were and how they were fixed.

Leadership was also blamed for the abuse by British soldiers. When this frame was applied to explain the British abuse it was constructed focusing on the three anonymous soldiers who sold the fake pictures to the *Daily Mirror*. The *Times* quoted the soldiers explaining that they had participated in the abuse because "officers told them to beat captives."[4] The *Guardian* on the other hand reported that the beatings were not directly sanctioned by the senior officers, however, the newspaper quoted an anonymous soldier saying that senior officers were aware of the abuse and "there was a nod and a wink to certain things."[5]

In the coverage of U.S. events, this frame was utilized the most in the *Washington*

---

[1] Luke Harding, "Trust Us--Errors Will Not Happen Again," *Guardian*, May 6, 2004.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Dexter Filkins, "General Will Trim Inmate Numbers at Iraq Prison," *New York Times*, May 5, 2004.
[4] Russell Jenkins, Michael Evans and Daniel McGrory, "Fury at Drill Hall Over Images that Taint a Regiment," *Times*, May 8, 2004.
[5] Sandra Laville, Richard Norton-Taylor and Helena Smith in Nicosia, "Inquiry Into 'Torture' Pictures: Mirror Stands Firm as Doubts Raised Over Images of British Abuse," *Guardian*, May 3, 2004.

Post in 10 percent of its coverage. The *New York Times* used this frame in 5 percent of the coverage. The *Times* and the *Guardian* applied this explanation in 7 percent of their coverage about U.S. events. This frame was also applied once in both U.K. newspapers when covering U.K. events (see Table 15). Since there were few other diagnostic frames utilized in the coverage of the U.K. events, lack of discipline or leadership breakdown becomes an important frame for the British story.

The fourth diagnostic frame focused on the chaos at the detention facilities as well as the danger the soldiers were facing in Iraq as the reasons for the abuse and subsequent civilian deaths. In the coverage of U.S. events, this frame was constructed by emphasizing the conditions at Abu Ghraib. The newspapers reported that the solders responsible for the Abu Ghraib scandal received fever accommodations in comparison to soldiers at other locations including no showers and other hygiene items, lack of food, as well as restricted communication with the outside world. Moreover, the newspapers reported on the regular attacks at Abu Ghraib by insurgents. Soldiers' low morale was affected by the extended stay in Iraq. Some of the harshest abuse sessions occurred after the prisoner riots at Abu Ghraib. Other abuse was considered to be "vigilante justice"--a female guard used physical force against a prisoner whom she believed to have assaulted Jessica Lynch, an Army private captured by Iraqi soldiers and later rescued by U.S. troops during the war.[1]

When this frame was built to explain British abuse, the newspapers reported on the possibility that the beating of Mousa could have been the soldiers' revenge for the death of a British solider. The *Washington Post's* only article applying the diagnostic frame to U.K.

---

[1] Jeffrey Smith and Josh White, "General Asserts She Was Overruled on Prison Moves," *Washington Post*, May 12, 2004.

events utilized the chaos and danger explanation for British abuse and killings. The *Washington Post* quoted Blair's official spokesman saying that the British troops were operating "in difficult circumstances" in southern Iraq.[1] Col. John Hughes-Wilson, a former British intelligence officer, was quoted emphasizing the difficult conditions: "We're talking about Dodge City, with no police force in the aftermath of a major war, with about 16 different armed groups going round shooting Iraqis. If you're a soldier on the ground there, it must be absolutely terrifying."[2] When covering U.S. events this frame received some attention in both U.K. and U.S. newspapers. This frame was the only diagnostic frame applied in the U.S. newspapers, or more specifically the *Washington Post,* when covering British events. The *Times* used this frame in seven percent of its coverage of U.K. events.

The last diagnostic frame applied by the newspapers placed the blame on the individual solders. This frame emphasized the violent nature of individuals as well as the practice of taking trophy pictures as the culprits for the abuse. In the coverage of U.S. and U.K. events this frame appeared together with the individual responsibility frame. In other words, this frame resembles the "bad apples" explanation preferred by the administrations. Sometimes the coverage even suggested that violence and beatings were acceptable but taking pictures was wrong. When covering U.S. events, the *New York Times* included a quote from a retired postal worker and former prisoner in the Korean War who stated "That stuff goes on, but you don't take pictures like these guys did."[3] In addition, the official sources and soldiers' personal life stories were utilized to attest to the violent nature of the solders. In the case of U.S. abuse, Graner's violent past was used to construct the individual dominance

---

[1] Glenn Frankel, "Iraqis to Take British Soldiers to Court," *Washington Post*, May 12, 2004.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Sherri Day, "Near Reservists' Base, Disappointment at Accusations of Abuse," *New York Times*, May 3, 2004.

and violence frame. One of the framing devices used in the coverage of U.K. events was a quote from an expert on animal behavior, Desmond Morris, who said "people have a natural need to express dominance but few of us ever get the opportunity."[1] Similar sentiment was conveyed in the *New York Times* with a quote "they are animals" from a nurse at the hospital where the abused Iraqi prisoners were cared for.[2] In the sample selected for analysis, the *Guardian* was the only newspaper that did not apply this frame in any of its articles. The *New York Times* and the *Washington Post* used this frame in 5 percent and 3 percent of their coverage of American events. The *Times* used this frame in 5 percent of articles when covering U.S. events. Both British newspapers utilized this frame the most in the coverage of U.K. events. The *Guardian* utilized the diagnostic frame in eight percent of its coverage, and the *Times* utilized the diagnostic frame in 11 percent of its coverage (see Table 15).

In conclusion, though diagnostic frames were not applied extensively by all four of the newspapers selected for analysis, there was noticeable preference to use interrogation policies and procedures as the primary culprits of the abuse when covering U.S. events. Lack of preparedness and leadership failures were also noted by the newspapers. These explanations follow the assignment of responsibility to the system in the coverage of the U.S. events. Though the newspapers largely avoided exploring the reasons behind the U.K. abuse, when it was explored, it was constructed in conjunction with the individual responsibility frame, and thus soldiers' violent nature was portrayed as the most visible explanation of why the abuse occurred.

---

[1] Dipesh Gadher, "Red Cross Anger at Army Actions," *Times*, May 2, 2004.
[2] Ian Fisher, "Ex-Prisoners of G.I.'s Offer More Claims of Mistreatment," *New York Times*, May 4, 2004.

Conclusions and Generalizations Offered by the Media

The final question was designed to examine how the coverage of the events in Iraq exhibited "moral evaluation" and "treatment recommendation" functions of framing.[1] That is, this section examines whether the *if* and *how* generalizations of the abuse scandals spoke to the nature of the two countries and their people. Specifically, the final research question examined the use of three frames--the image frame, the prognostic frame, and the media self-reflection frame. As previously explained, the image frame was used primarily in the articles which included an examination of the moral and symbolic standing of the coalition forces as well, as the two governments, and sometimes by extension, their correlating publics. The image frame is considered a significant part of framing analysis as it offers an opportunity to examine the media's ability to provide coverage that contextualizes events in order to provide the reader with ways to evaluate information beyond its immediate face value. Thus, the media texts examined in this dissertation were evaluated in their ability to invoke moral evaluations of the events in Iraq.

Often, the coverage was projecting how the future of the U.S. and U.K. will be affected by the events in Iraq. Thus, the prognostic frame is also considered to be an important part of framing which leads to a formation of conclusions with regards to the treatment of the problem. By its nature, the prognostic frame offers judgmental generalizations that can either suggest what will happen to the participants and their respective nations in the future, or what should be done by both nations in light of the events in Iraq. Therefore, the media texts were examined to evaluate their ability to invoke various

---

[1] Robert Entman, "Framing: Toward Clarification of a Fractured Paradigm," *Journal of Communication*, 43 (1993): 52.

solutions for what needs to be done as a result of the abuse in Iraq.

Finally, the media self-reflection frame was utilized to offer another aspect of generalization. This frame was found to be utilized in articles that emphasized topics related to the media and their role in the events. These included articles examining journalists' involvement in breaking the story to the public or reflections on adverse results of publicizing the abuse (especially in the case of *the Daily Mirror* scandal). This aspect of the coverage is particularly important when examining the media's role in the coverage of human rights violations. Since the media played a big part in bringing the abuse by coalition forces to light, any discourse that relates to the media exploring their own abilities and role in human rights coverage presents a valuable opportunity for understanding the complex media-government relationship during the time of war.

The following sections will present accounts of how the image and the prognostic frames were constructed in the coverage of U.S. and U.K. events. The second part of this section will be devoted to examining the media self-reflexivity frame.

Image and Prognostic Frames in the Coverage of the U.S. Events

The image frame was utilized in a significant portion of the coverage of U.S. events. As was indicated in Chapter 3 of this dissertation, the *New York Times* utilized this frame in 16 articles or about 25 percent of its coverage, the *Washington Post* used this frame in 10 articles or about 15 percent of the coverage, the *Guardian* applied this frame in four articles or 14 percent of the coverage, and the *Times* applied this frame in 13 articles or nearly 30 percent of its coverage of U.S. events (see Table 3). The prognostic frame was utilized less. The *New York Times* applied it in four articles or only six percent of the coverage, the *Washington Post* utilized it in 10 articles or 15 percent of the coverage, the *Guardian*

included this frame in two articles or about seven percent of the coverage, and the *Times* utilized it in four articles or about nine percent of the coverage. The following will provide a more detailed overview of how the image and the prognostic frames were applied in the coverage of U.S. events by each of the newspapers.

Image and prognostic frames in the New York Times. The *New York Times* applied the image frame quite extensively. Often, the image frame was constructed in order to convey the administration's message articulated by Bush that "the actions of a handful of soldiers should not taint the tens of thousands who serve honorably in Iraq."[1] The same sentiment was articulated by Condoleezza Rice, the national security adviser, speaking on Al Arabiya "no American wants to be associated with any dehumanizations now of the Iraqi people."[2] The administration understood the ramifications of the image fiasco, and the newspaper focused on government and military officials who attempted to distance themselves from the events and wanted to correct the negative image, which, in the words of Rumsfeld "does not represent what America stands for."[3] The majority of the articles (10 articles out of 16) utilizing the image frame in the *New York Times* subscribed to the dominant "it does not represent America" paradigm.[4]

The same sentiments were also articulated through the voices of regular Americans. The newspaper quoted Americans acknowledging the wrongfulness of the soldiers' actions in Iraq; Rosalind Gittings, a teacher from Baltimore, was quoted saying that she was

---

[1] Thom Shanker and Jacques Steinberg, "Bush Voices 'Disgust' at Abuse of Iraqi Prisoners," *New York Times*, May 1, 2004.
[2] Eric Schmitt and Richard Stevenson, "White House and Pentagon Scurry to Draft Responses," *New York Times*, May 5, 2004.
[3] Richard Stevenson, "Bush, on Arab TV Denounces Abuse of Iraqi Captives" *New York Times*, May 6, 2004.
[4] Thom Shanker, "At Iraq Prison, Rumsfeld Vows to Punish Abuse, *New York Times*, May 14, 2004.

"embarrassed to be an American."[1] However, the newspaper also included testimony of those

who considered abuse a normal part of war. For example, Pat Neil, an entrepreneur from

Dallas, was quoted: "This is war. It's not right, but war's not right. Given the circumstances,

I don't see how they would not do something--after seeing their buddies dragged through the

streets."[2] An ethnocentric "them versus us" attitude was even more apparent in the follow up

quote by Neil "They're over there to give the Iraqis freedom, and they're getting killed every

day."[3] This quote represents the attitudes of many Americans who were either misinformed

or did not have motivation to learn about and understand the complexities of war in Iraq.

Nevertheless, the newspaper did manage to explore the seriousness of the Abu Ghraib abuse

ramifications. Many articles in the *New York Times* emphasized the idea that the abuse would

result in the U.S. creating more enemies. This was articulated by many sources, including the

prisoners themselves who affirmed "You are creating enemies. You changed love into hate."[4]

Some articles stated directly that the U.S. image was damaged: "The United States

already had very little credibility in the Middle East, and it is now approaching zero."[5] Iraqi

sources were quoted not only to convey that they did not believe Bush's apology but also to

report that the Abu Ghraib scandal made Iraqis question Washington's intentions: "Nobody

believes that Bush has any good intentions for the Arabs."[6] Other articles went as far as to

conclude that the behavior of the soldiers was proof that the U.S. intentions were to "destroy

---

[1] Andrew Jackobs, "Shock Over Abuse Reports, but Support for the Troops." *New York Times*, May 8, 2004.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Ibid.
[4] Ian Fisher, "Ex-Prisoners of G.I.'s Offer More Claims of Mistreatment," *New York Times*, May 4, 2004.
[5] Abdelmonem Said, the director of Al Ahram Center for Political and Strategic Studies in Cairo quoted in Neil MacFarquhar, "Revulsion at Prison Abuse Provokes Scorn for the U.S.," *New York Times*, May 5, 2004.
[6] Ibid.

and dominate the Arab world."[1]

The existence of two kinds of discourses about the image of the U.S. reflects the newspaper's struggle with balancing the administration's point of view of innocence and portraying Abu Ghraib as an event with serious ramifications for the country's future, and its image and self-identification in international arena. The dominant paradigm attempted to distance America from the events at Abu Ghraib, but the newspaper at least attempted to challenge it.

The prognostic frame applied by the *New York Times* was constructed on the basis of generalization that abuse was a random act and not representative of U.S. values or policies. Specifically, much of the prognostic framing articulated the administration's promises of investigation and punishment. Calls for punishment were often directed at individual soldiers. Specifically, three of the four articles utilizing this frame in the *New York Times* called for individuals to be punished. The newspaper emphasized that U.S. actions were different from dictatorships where abuse allegations would not have been investigated or punished. The newspaper included a quote from Bush's statement on Al Hurra television network: "We're a society that is willing to investigate, fully investigate in this case, what took place in that prison. That stands in stark contrast to life under Saddam Hussein. His trained torturers were never brought to justice under his regime."[2] Rice restated exactly same sentiment in another article later in the coverage: "Democracies handle situations like these differently. You don't have in dictatorships young soldiers who come forward to their superiors to expose behavior they believe to be wrong. You don't have a Congress to ask

---

[1] Neil MacFarquhar, "Revulsion at Prison Abuse Provokes Scorn for the U.S.," *New York Times*, May 5, 2004.
[2] Richard Stevenson, "Bush, on Arab TV Denounces Abuse of Iraqi Captives" *New York Times*, May 6, 2004.

tough questions of the administration. You don't have investigations."[1] The statements of

politicians around the world legitimized this perspective. Gerhard Schroder, the German

Chancellor, was cited denouncing the abuse but at the same time he commended the Bush

administration's response by saying: "It speaks for the strength of American democracy how

they have immediately started getting to the bottom of this."[2] Given the fact that these

comments came in the aftermath of the beheading of Nicholas Berg, the administration's

view was legitimized. The report that all prisoners under American control would be moved

out of the old Abu Ghraib structures and into new facilities called "Camp Redemption"

solidified the constructed image that Americans were doing everything necessary to resolve

the treatment of Iraqi prisoners.[3]

In conclusion, the *New York Times* used the image and prognostic frames to distance

the administration and the country from the actions of a few bad individuals. Though the

newspaper communicated that the U.S. might face serious ramifications in the light of abuse

revelations, the newspaper also applauded the Bush administration's swift and tough actions

against the soldiers responsible for the abuse. This kind of coverage served to reduce the

abuse to isolated incidents which was exactly what the administration wanted to convey.

Although the coverage suggested that U.S. credibility was damaged, the existence of

investigations was overemphasized to show that democratic procedures were in place to

resolve the situation. There was little serious discussion pertaining to the delay in bringing

the abuse allegations to light or even the attempts to hide both the abuse and early alerts by

human rights organizations. Most importantly, very few articles utilizing the image or

---

[1] Elisabeth Bumiller, "Rice Says She and Bush 'Strongly' Support Rumsfeld," *New York Times*, May 9, 2004.
[2] Elaine Sciolino, "France and Germany Jointly Criticize Abuse of Iraqis and Express Horror at Beheading," *New York Times*, May 14, 2004.
[3] Thom Shanker, "At Iraqi Prison, Rumsfeld Vows to Punish Abuse," *New York Times*, May 14, 2004.

prognostic frames hinted at the possibility that abuse was indicative of planned and sanctioned policies. When this was suggested in the coverage, the sources who were quoted were Iraqis who had little credibility, and their testimony was presented in such a way so they appeared to be overreacting to the abuse.

Image and prognostic frames in the Washington Post. The *Washington Post* engaged in similar framing of what Abu Ghraib suggested about the nature of America and its people. The same quotes by Bush appeared in the newspaper's coverage: "Their treatment does not reflect the nature of the American people. That's not the way we do things in America"[1] Rice was quoted saying "no American wants to be associated with any dehumanizations now of the Iraqi people."[2] Secretary of State Colin Powell was quoted articulating his hope that "the acts of a few, I trust, will not overwhelm the goodness coming from so many of our soldiers."[3]

The other side of the issue, the seriousness with which Abu Ghraib affected U.S. standing in the world and broader foreign policy issues was also articulated in the newspaper. Some of the headlines built the stage for this framing: "A Stain on Our Country's Honor and Our Country's Reputation," "Iraq Prison Abuse May Hurt Administration in Court."[4] One telling conclusion offered by an anonymous U.S. diplomat surmised that the major consequence for the U.S.'s reputation was that Washington's ability to criticize other countries on human rights or political reform "just took a serious hit."[5] Rumsfeld stated that

---

[1] Dana Milbank, "U.S. Tries to Calm Furor Caused by Photos; Bush Vows Punishment for Abuse of Prisoners," *Washington Post*, May 1, 2004.
[2] Robin Wright, "Top U.S. Officials Apologize To Arabs for Prisoner Abuse" *Washington Post*, May 5, 2004.
[3] Robin Wright, "In U.S., Seeking To Limit Damage," *Washington Post*, May 4, 2004.
[4] Mike Allen, "A Stain on Our Country's Honor and Our Country's Reputation," *Washington Post*, May 7, 2004.
[5] Howard Schneider, "In Breaking Taboos, Photos Add Insult to Injury," *Washington Post*, May 7, 2004.

the abuse at Abu Ghraib was "a body blow to us" and reinforced the same sentiment.[1] Other officials called the scandal an "international firestorm."[2]

In addition, the *Washington Post*'s coverage used counterframing in conjunction with the government's preferred dominant generalization. For example, Bush's testimony that abuse did not represent U.S. values was followed by a quote from the *Tehran Times* claiming that "the pictures of torture, brutality and sexual sadism are representative of the entire criminal operation being conducted in Iraq."[3] The coverage also seemed to acknowledge more directly that Abu Ghraib resulted in a "set back efforts to cultivate a positive image for the U.S. military in the region."[4] Although the events were blamed on a "handful of individuals," the *Washington Post* was more direct in articulating that it was affecting U.S. reputation and future standing in the international arena. Gen. Richard Myers communicated that what happened at Abu Ghraib will "be used against the United States of America."[5]

Cultural implications of abuse were also explored in the *Washington Post.* First, the newspaper questioned the purity of American morals and values. Yasmine Hagry, a college student at the American University in Cairo, asked "I wonder what their definition is of civilization."[6] Second, the newspaper emphasized cultural significances regarding the nudity that appeared in the photographs, and it explored the fact that nudity and homosexuality are taboos in Islam. An article in the paper cautioned that exploiting nudity represented the worst character of the U.S. people--disrespect for other cultures and more specifically, disrespect

---

[1] Josh White, "Rumsfeld Visits Prison in Iraq. Defense Secretary, During Unannounced Trip, Vows 'Justice' for Perpetrators," *Washington Post*, May 14, 2004.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Ibid.
[4] Sewell Chan, "U.S. Official: Abuse Allegations Are 'a Big Deal.'" *Washington Post*, May 3, 2004.
[5] Ibid.
[6] Howard Schneider, "In Breaking Taboos, Photos Add Insult to Injury," *Washington Post*, May 7, 2004.

for Islam."[1]

Some articles even went as far as to predict larger consequences of the U.S. mission in Iraq. Democratic strategist Geoffrey Garin stated that Abu Ghraib "adds to a growing feeling that the president has gotten us into a mess and he does not have a clear route out of the mess."[2] One article specifically focused on the reactions of the other coalition members and their disappearing political and military support behind the mission. Officials from Spain, Hungary, Poland, Italy, and Denmark were quoted reflecting on minimizing their future involvement in Iraq.

Another aspect of the *Washington Post*'s framing was the use of investigative type of reporting in conjunction with the image frame. This led to coverage that was more focused on *how* and *why* the administration reacted to the Abu Ghraib scandal. Some attention was devoted to examining Bush's apology (or absence of it) the first time he addressed national and international audiences via Arab television channels. The actual word "sorry" was later articulated by Bush when he met with King Abdullah of Jordan. This focus on examining how the official reaction was conveyed led to a questioning of the administration's actions and response to the scandal. The *Washington Post* reported that the administration was working on a strategy to deal with the damage. The Department of State official stated that "the current approach of blaming a few individuals is inadequate."[3] The conclusion suggested by the newspaper was that "people want not just words but action."[4]

Future actions were explored in the articles utilizing the prognostic frame. It was not

---

[1] Howard Schneider, "In Breaking Taboos, Photos Add Insult to Injury," *Washington Post*, May 7, 2004. Ibid?
[2] Mike Allen and Dan Balz, "On Arab TV, President Says U.S. Is 'Appalled.' Bush Stops Short of Apology in Interviews," *Washington Post*, May 6, 2004.
[3] Robin Wright, "In U.S., Seeking To Limit Damage," *Washington Post*, May 4, 2004.
[4] Ibid.

clear, however, what actions could be appropriate or relevant to the situation. One example

of action or consequence reported by the newspaper was postponing the release of the

Department of State's annual report on U.S. support for human rights and democracy around

the world. Later, the coverage mentioned several other action steps which included the

release of detainees and the improvement of conditions at Abu Ghraib. In addition, the

Washington Post emphasized that future actions should include "appropriate compensation"

for the victims and more importantly, the newspaper called for the "immediate and full

disclosure of all relevant information."[1] Keeping in mind that the *Washington Post* was the

newspaper with the most articles adhering to investigative reporting style, the call for the

release of information is not a surprising one. Improving prison conditions, which also

included training soldiers and accelerating the release of prisoners was suggested in six out of

ten articles utilizing this frame. The other prognostic conclusions included predictions that

closely coordinated with the discourse presented in articles that utilized the image frame. The

newspaper suggested that the scandal would hurt U.S. anti-terrorism policies and efforts, and

it would lead to increased hatred and violence against Americans.

Overall, the *Washington Post* drew much more serious conclusions about the Abu

Ghraib implications for the U.S. when compared with the coverage in the *New York Times*.

The dominant frame distancing the army and administration as well as the rest of the country

from the scandal was not given prominence in the *Washington Post*. Instead, the newspaper

focused on articulating the seriousness of the scandal for the nation's image, reputation, and

future role in the Middle East by including the voices of Iraqis as well as international

relations experts. The *Washington Post* also devoted a lot of attention to questioning the

---

[1] Bradley Graham, "Rumsfeld Warns Not All Images Are Out. Secretary Regrets Detainees Abused," *Washington Post*, May 9, 2004.

administration's claims of individual responsibility and raised questions about how the abuse was investigated. Calls for government transparency and full disclosure of policies that were implemented after 9/11 reflected the newspaper's attempt to focus on investigative type of reporting that puts more emphasis on discovering connections among policy making, strategies of the war on terror, and the actions of individuals on the front lines of the war on terror.

Image and prognostic frames in the Guardian. Of the four newspapers, the *Guardian* was the least concerned with utilizing the image frame. There were only four articles in the sample selected for analysis that used this frame in the coverage of U.S. events. The first time this frame appeared it was constructed in such a way that it attributed the abuse to the country as a whole, not as actions of a few, and it generalized the abuse as America's dominance and evil nature. Family members of detainees were quoted saying "the Americans said they would bring us freedom. Is this what they mean?"[1] Another Iraqi added "Saddam Hussein may have oppressed us but he was better than the Americans. They are garbage."[2]

When U.S. officials addressed the U.S. image, the newspaper editorialized administration's comments and perspective. Bush's appearance on Arab television was called a "damage-limitation exercise."[3] Nevertheless, Bush's quote that the people of Iraq "must understand that what took place in that prison does not represent the America that I know" was also included in the coverage.[4] The newspaper also pointed out that Bush's "apology" included a contrast with Saddam Hussein "His trained torturers were never brought to justice

---

[1] Luke Harding, "Iraq Conflict: Torture Commonplace, Say Inmates' Families," *Guardian*, May 3, 2004.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Brian Whitaker, Suzanne Goldenberg and Rory McCarthy, "Arab world scorns Bush's TV 'apology': Pressure mounts in US over Iraq torture scandal," *Guardian*, May 3, 2004.
[4] Ibid.

. . . there were never investigations about mistreatment."[1] However, Bush's perspective did

not stand on its own. It was followed with the conclusion that in the Middle East the abuse

was seen as "symbolic of American intentions towards the region."[2] The symbolic power of

abuse was highlighted by reminding that "abuses have taken place at Abu Ghraib prison

where some of the worst abuses of the Saddam Hussein regime took place."[3]

Another article explored the symbolism of the pictures. Ali Ibrahim, managing editor

of the leading Arabic daily, said "If it was just torture people would understand, but it's the

perversions in the pictures that appear to confirm what some people, such as Bin Laden, say

about the immorality of the west."[4] The strongest comments came from one of the soldiers

who wrote on the *Army Times* website that because of the images of the abuse "every Iraqi

has now become a possible combative, there are no more winning the hearts and minds of the

Iraqi people."[5]

The prognostic frame in the *Guardian* was also not utilized often but when the

newspaper included the narratives about the future, the focus was surprisingly on

investigations and the punishment of the guilty solders. Both articles that addressed the

aftermath of Abu Ghraib were constructed utilizing an events type of reporting and relied

upon the administration's point of view regarding future actions and implications. One article

simply communicated Bush's response "the president wanted to make sure appropriate action

---

[1] Ibid.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Ibid.
[4] Brian Whitaker and Gary Younge, "Media: A Scandal, but Not a Story: The Arab and US Press have Taken a Cautious Approach to Running Images of Iraqi Abuse," *Guardian*, May 10, 2004.
[5] Julian Borger and Luke Harding, "Prisoner Abuse Scandal," *Guardian*, May 11, 2004.

is being taken against those responsible for these shameful and appalling acts."[1] The

newspaper also recapped the two ongoing investigations and charges against the six soldiers

and the upcoming court-martial proceedings as part of its prognostic frame.

Overall, the *Guardian's* use of the image and prognostic frames was not prominent in

the coverage, however, when these frames were utilized, at least in the case of generalizing

the extent to which Abu Ghraib abuse would effect the U.S.'s future standing in the world,

the newspaper communicated the issue as a serious matter that damaged the country's image

and character. The discrepancy between the dominant individual responsibility frame

apparent within the prognostic frame and the emphasis on questioning America's character in

the image frames reflect the lack of coherency in the newspaper's attempt to use the coverage

of events at Abu Ghraib to make judgmental inferences about the country and its future. Even

though the alternative to the administration frame was emphasized, it was used to

communicate the general anti-war sentiment rather than explore the ramifications of abuse as

an extension of U.S. post-9/11 policy in the war on terror.

Image and prognostic frames in the Times. Of the two British newspapers, the *Times*

devoted more attention to generalizations and conclusions about Abu Ghraib by utilizing the

image and prognostic frames more frequently than the *Guardian*. At the very beginning of its

coverage, the *Times* emphasized the seriousness of the abuse for the U.S. image and role in

the Middle East. The newspaper not only labeled the events a "public relations disaster" and

"a recruitment boon for al-Qaeda" but also highlighted the symbolism of Abu Ghraib having

been the place used for torture and executions by Saddam.[2] In the article headlined "Brutality

---

[1] Julian Borger, "Iraq Conflict: Seven US Officers and Sergeants Disciplined for Failing to Stop Abuse,"
Guardian, May 4, 2004.
[2] Roland Watson and Nicholas Blanford, "US Losing Battle for Hearts, Minds and a City," *Times*, May 1, 2004.

Became the Byword for Abu Ghraib" the *Times* reported that events at Abu Ghraib were being viewed with "mythical proportions" because of its history.[1] Abdel-Bari Atwan, editor of the *al-Quds al-Arabi* newspaper was quoted saying "This is the straw that broke the camel's back for America. The liberators are worse than the dictators."[2] The Vatican's Foreign Minister, Archbishop Giovanni Lajolo, evaluated Abu Ghraib as a "self-inflicted" scandal which "could only fuel hatred for the West and Christianity."[3] The Archbishop further elaborated that the "intelligent people in Arab countries" would understand that in democracy such actions are not acceptable and punishable, but "the great mass of people--under the influence of the Arab mass media--cannot but feel aversion and hatred for the West growing in themselves."[4] Notwithstanding Archbishop's questioning of Arab people's ability to think beyond the messages presented by the media, the inclusion of his testimony helped the *Times* construct the image frame that encompassed criticism in contrast to the dominant dismissive strategy preferred by the U.S. administration.

Even when reporting the administration's reactions to what the abuse meant for the U.S. image, the *Times* also managed to communicate the seriousness of events. Bush demonstrated his understanding that Abu Ghraib was a serious issue, "It's a matter that reflects badly on my country."[5] Interestingly, another article applying the image frame was headlined "I Am Very Sorry Prisoners Were Humiliated, Bush Concedes" which seemed to minimize the seriousness of the events at Abu Ghraib.[6] The choice of this headline is a good reminder of the role of syntactical structures as framing devices. Though the *Times* seemed to

---

[1] Richard Beeston, "Brutality Became the Byword for Abu Ghraib," *Times*, May 5, 2004.
[2] Roland Watson and Nicholas Blanford, "US Losing Battle for Hearts, Minds and a City," *Times*, May 1, 2004.
[3] Richard Owen, "Vatican Says US abuse is Worse Than 9/11," *Times*, May 13, 2004.
[4] Ibid.
[5] Roland Watson, "Bush Speaks Out on 'Abhorrent' Abuse," *Times*, May 6, 2004.
[6] Roland Watson, "I Am Very Sorry Prisoners were Humiliated, Bush Concedes," *Times*, May 7, 2004.

communicate the seriousness of Abu Ghraib, this headline contradicts the dominant frame by including the label "humiliation" in its headline.

All of the newspapers reported on Rumsfeld's testimony in front of the Senate Arms committee, but the *Times* editorialized the event and dismissed its significance in the investigation process by calling it a "performance" and explaining that "public testimony before a Senate committee is often more about political theatre and grandstanding than substance."[1] Bush's support for Rumsfeld was reported to be "a lavish show."[2] Nevertheless, the newspaper reported Rumsfeld's surprise visit to Iran where, in front of hundreds of American soldiers, he announced "I'm a survivor."[3] The newspaper reported that Rumsfeld met with troops at Camp Victory, another symbolic place in Iraq because it was located in Saddam Hussein's former palace. It appears that the *Times*, more than the other newspapers, relied on the rhetorical power of language when constructing the image frame. The word choices like "performance" or "lavish show" added a touch of sarcasm to the *Times*' coverage of the administration's efforts to manage the scandal.

A similar tone appeared in the *Time*'s coverage of other topics. For example, Abu Ghraib photographs were labeled as "the album of horrors."[4] The symbolism of the photographs was discussed in the *Times* as part of the image discourse and specifically, it questioned the U.S.'s standing as bearers of freedom and democracy. In one of the articles, the newspaper concluded that the photographs of the abuse served to reinforce "widely held

---

[1] Tim Reid, "'My Deepest Apology' as Rumsfeld Admits He Failed Over Iraq Abuses," *Times*, May 8, 2004.
[2] Philip Webster, Tim Reid and Roland Watson, "Red Cross Warned of Abuse Again and Again," *Times*, May 11, 2004.
[3] Anthony Loyd, "Rumsfeld visits prison at centre of storm to tell troops 'I'm a survivor," *Times*, May 14. 2004.
[4] Roland Watson and Stephen Farrell, "Private Jessica Helped America to Win the War," *Times*, May 8, 2004.

belief in the region that the U.S. is a brutal and racist occupier."[1] Imad Khadduri, an Iraqi former nuclear scientist, was quoted saying "What I saw confirmed my fear of the American way of handling other humans. The standards of decency and morality of the liberators are not as lofty as they claim to be."[2] In another article, a family member of a detainee was said "The Americans should stop saying they represent freedom and democracy. They are the liars and criminals, and their actions here have filled us with hate."[3]

The harshest judgment was offered in an article that reported Nick Berg's beheading and Iraqi reactions to the incident. The *Times* included testimony by a former detainee at Abu Ghraib, Luay Abdul Melik, a Sunni Muslim originally from Fallujah, who justified Berg's death as a response to America's actions. Melik explained that Berg's killing was an example of collective punishment: "The Americans decided to fight Muslims just because those who attacked the twin towers were Muslim. It was the same in Fallujah when they killed countless people just because a small group killed four American contractors. So now we are going to play by their rules of collective punishment and punish all Americans, not just the soldiers alone."[4] Yet another article covering Berg's killing and utilizing the prognostic frame communicated Bush's response "Their intent is to shake our will, to shake our confidence, yet by their actions they remind us of how desperately parts of the world need free societies and peaceful societies."[5] Similarly to the prognostic frame constructed in the other newspapers, the *Times* devoted some attention to the administration's plea to punish the soldiers responsible for the abuse. However, this did not receive the most prominent

---

[1] Roland Watson and Nicholas Blanford, "US Losing Battle for Hearts, Minds and a City," *Times*, May 1, 2004.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Roland Watson and Anthony Loyd, "Bush Orders Punishment for Soldiers Over Abuse," *Times*, May 4, 2004.
[4] Anthony Loyd and Ben Hoyle, "Search for adventure that ended in death," *Times*, May 12, 2004.
[5] Roland Watson, "US Swings Behind Bush in Wave of Revulsion," *Times*, May 13, 2004.

coverage in the newspaper.

Overall, the prognostic frame was not utilized often by the *Times,* and the newspaper offered few perspectives on what actions were appropriate for the future. Similarly to the *Washington Post's* call for action, the *Times* also included statements like "Words alone are not enough"[1] and "We just want action and judgment."[2] In one article, the action which was demanded by the Iraqi administration was the U.S. surrendering control of all prisons in Iraq.[3] In most articles applying the prognostic frame, however, it was unclear what actions should be taken. One Iraqi predicted that "It is impossible for the Americans to recover from this now unless they move out of our country."[4] However, Bush responded "We will complete our mission."[5] Though dismissively, the newspaper also added what was labeled as a "typical citizen's contributions" which urged Bush to "take the gloves off" and use U.S. firepower to finish the war quickly.[6] The newspaper did not provide any further commentary or rebuttal to the "gloves off" approach.

The *Times* approach in offering conclusions and generalizations about Abu Ghraib resulted in a much more anti-American narrative when compared with the other newspapers. The sarcasm in the *Times'* coverage as demonstrated by the word choices and metaphors communicated the newspapers' intention to refute the dominant U.S. notion that the abuse, though a serious mistake, was something that could be easily fixed by punishing a few soldiers. The *Times* used the abuse to highlight the U.S.'s post-9/11 strategies dictated by

---

[1] Roland Watson, "Bush Speaks Out on 'Abhorrent' Abuse," *Times*, May 6, 2004.
[2] Stephen Grey, "Muted Message Lost in Click-Clack of Dominoes," *Times*, May 6, 2004.
[3] Richard Beeston in Baghdad, Philip Webster and Tom Baldwin, "Iraqis Demand Right to Run 'Abuse' Prisons," *Times*, May 13, 2004.
[4] Roland Watson and Stephen Farrell, "Private Jessica helped America to win the war," *Times*, May 8, 2004.
[5] Roland Watson, "US Swings Behind Bush in Wave of Revulsion," *Times*, May 13, 2004.
[6] Ibid.

revenge and misplaced rage. The sources cited in the *Times* were Iraqis, U.S. soldiers, and members of international community. Some of the telling differences in the *Times'* coverage were the generalizations offered in reports on Berg's killing. While the U.S. newspapers used Berg's killing to demonize the enemy in Iraq, the *Times* presented Berg's killing as an example of a consequence or collective punishment brought about by U.S. policies and actions in Iraq. While the other newspapers reported the dominant administration viewpoint, even when including that perspective, the *Times* managed to strip it of legitimacy by ridiculing the U.S. government's reactions as theatrical performances.

Image and Prognostic Frames in the Coverage of the U.K. Events

Contrary to the coverage of U.S. events, the image and the prognostic frames were not as prominent when covering U.K. events. The two American newspapers published four articles each utilizing the image frame that constituted 44 percent (the *New York Times*) and 36 percent (the *Washington Post*) of the coverage due to the low number of articles devoted to the British events in American newspapers (see Table 3). The *Guardian* applied this frame in eight articles which constituted 22 percent of the coverage, and the *Times* applied this frame in eight articles or about 29 percent of its coverage of the U.K. events. The prognostic frame was utilized in two articles each in the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post*. The *Guardian* used this frame in four articles or about 11 percent of its coverage, and the *Times* used this frame in four articles or about 14 percent of its coverage of the U.K. events. The following will provide a more detailed overview of how the image and prognostic frames were applied in the coverage of U.K. events by each of the newspapers.

Image and prognostic frames in the New York Times. The *New York Times* used the

image frame very sparingly. Similarly to the construction of the image frame in the coverage

of U.S. events, the newspaper utilized reactions from government and military officials to

convey conclusions about the consequences of the abuse for the image of the army and the

country. Prime Minister Tony Blair condemned the abuse and said "anyone would be

sickened by any thought that coalition troops have abused Iraqi prisoners."[1] In another article

Blair reiterated that the British army went to Iraq "to stop that kind of thing, not to do it

ourselves."[2] The choice of referring to the "coalition troops" instead of "British troops" was

not accidental. The *New York Times* quoted Blair again speaking at a press conference with

Poland's President Aleksander Kwasniewski during which he reiterated that "the abuse of

prisoners, the torture of prisoners, degrading treatment of people in the custody of coalition

forces, these things are completely and totally unacceptable."[3] Distancing the British army

from abuse and using the more vague term of "coalition forces" had an effect of minimizing

the abuse by British soldiers. This was the preferred approach by the British government, and

it seems to have been supported by the U.S. administration which anxiously waited Britain's

decision on whether to send 3,000 additional troops to Iraq to take the place of Spanish

forces which were leaving. Reports of Blair appearing together with Poland's president or

Blair visiting with the president of France Jacques Chirac to seek help in Iraq supported an

appearance of events in Iraq being the responsibility of the coalition.

Moreover, any specific criticism of the British troops was minimized with statements

of support for the troops who, according to Blair were "doing a brave and extraordinary"

---

[1] Lizette Alvarex, "Doubt Is Cast on Photos Said to Show Britons Abusing Iraqi," *New York Times*, May 4, 2004.
[2] Alan Cowell, "Bush's Words Do Little to Ease Horror at Prison Deeds," *New York Times*, May 7, 2004.
[3] Ibid.

work in Iraq.[1] Interestingly, the newspaper even used testimony by the Red Cross's director

of operations Pierre Krahenbuhl who stated that "concerns about British-run prisons in Iraq,

while serious, were not as extensive as those expressed about abuses in the American-run

Abu Ghraib."[2]

Speculations of the *Daily Mirror* photographs being fakes brought another

opportunity to minimize the seriousness of the abuse. Keith Simpson, the defense spokesman

for the opposition Conservative Party, was angry at the *Daily Mirror* for publishing the

photographs which damaged "not only the good name, but possibly the lives of British

troops."[3] David Barrow, a member of Prime Minister Tony Blair's Labor Party was quoted

insisting that the photographs "besmirch[ed] the name of the Queen's Lancashire Regiment."[4]

Col. David Black of the QLR was quoted relying that the soldiers were "dismayed … that

their good name has been dragged through the mud."[5]

The fake photographs were at the same time used to emphasize that the images would

have a "massive impact" in the Arab and Muslim world on Britain's reputation.[6] Charles

Kennedy, the leader of the Liberal Democrats, was quoted saying that the photographs would

confirm the "worst assumptions about us."[7] The solution to this offered in the prognostic

framing was articulated in the words of Lord Puttnam, Blair's political ally, who stated that

"Mr. Blair had become so closely associated with bad news from Iraq that he should step

---

[1] Lizette Alvarex, "Doubt Is Cast on Photos Said to Show Britons Abusing Iraqi," *New York Times*, May 4, 2004.
[2] Patrick Tyler, "Blair Offers An Apology For Abuses By Soldiers," *New York Times*, May 10, 2004.
[3] Patrick Tyler, "Britain Says Photos Showing Abuse Are Fake," *New York Times*, May 14, 2004.
[4] Ibid.
[5] Lizette Alvarex, "Doubt Is Cast on Photos Said to Show Britons Abusing Iraqi," *New York Times*, May 4, 2004.
[6] Ibid.
[7] Ibid.

down."[1] It seems that prognostic framing was focused on managing the public opinion about Britain not actually investigating and explaining what happened. Other than Blair and Ingram promising to investigate, no further reports or discussion of future actions were offered by the *New York Times*. One quote by Ingram, the Armed Forces Minister, summarized this attitude: "If British soldiers are found to have acted unlawfully then appropriate action will be taken. But our immediate priority is to establish the truth as quickly as possible and we are determined to leave no stone unturned."[2]

Overall, the image and prognostic frames were not applied extensively by the *New York Times* covering the British events. When the image frame was applied, it was constructed to minimize British abuse with rhetoric that combined the responsibility of the two armies making it the concern of "coalition forces." When the image frame was the focus of the coverage it was the image of the army, and not the country or its people that was emphasized the most. The fake photograph discourse led to prognostic framing which called for more investigations of whether abuse actually occurred not for investigations of why it had occurred and what could be done to prevent it in the future.

Image and prognostic frames in the Washington Post. Just like the *New York Times*, the *Washington Post* did not utilize the image frame extensively in its coverage of British abuse. When the image frame was applied, the newspaper included short statements by British officials generalizing that "any decent thinking person" would be disturbed by the photos.[3] Investigations into how the abuse came to be known were highlighted by the *Washington Post*. This was very similar to how the newspaper constructed the image frame

---

[1] Patrick Tyler, "Blair Offers An Apology For Abuses By Soldiers," *New York Times*, May 10, 2004.
[2] New York Times, "British Official Vows A Thorough Inquiry," *New York Times*, May 5, 2004.
[3] Glenn Frankel, "British Troops Face Allegations of Abuse," *Washington Post*, May 5, 2004.

in the coverage of U.S. abuse. Members of the opposition party questioned why the British

government waited so long to disclose the abuse. Hoon was accused of "a persistent and

willful failure to give straight answers" and the government had been perceived as losing "its

grip on its policy in Iraq."[1] These reactions were reported in articles covering the Red Cross

report submitted to the U.S. and U.K. governments in 2003 which, apparently, Blair had not

seen until after the Abu Ghraib scandal broke.

Comparison with U.S. abuse was also part of the image frame constructed to convey

the seriousness of British abuse in the *Washington Post*. The newspaper reported that

according to the British officials "their forces have maintained better relations with the Iraqi

population than their American counterparts."[2] Another article went as far as to report that

British lawmakers were insisting that the "American misconduct had reflected badly on

Britain and jeopardized the lives of British forces in Iraq."[3]

Doubts about whether the allegations of British abuse were true dominated the

Washington Post's discourse about the image of the British Army or the nation. Ingram

accused the *Daily Mirror* of being irresponsible and possibly publishing fake photographs

which "can lay waste to people's reputation."[4] In another article, Ingram was quoted saying

that the media are "casually" vilifying armed forces "without first establishing the facts."[5]

Blair insisted that allegations of abuse, if proved true, "would be completely and totally

unacceptable."[6] Though the coverage made it clear that based on both the Red Cross and

Amnesty International reports allegations of abuse and more importantly the killings of

---

[1] Glenn Frankel, "Blair Newly Rebuked Over Prison Abuses," *Washington Post*, May 11, 2004.
[2] Glenn Frankel, "British Troops Face Allegations of Abuse," *The Washington Post*, May 5, 2004.
[3] Glenn Frankel, "Blair Newly Rebuked Over Prison Abuses," *Washington Post*, May 11, 2004.
[4] Glenn Frankel, "British Troops Face Allegations of Abuse," *Washington Post*, May 5, 2004.
[5] Glenda Cooper, "British Official Says Abuse Photos Are Fake," *Washington Post*, May 14, 2004.
[6] Glenn Frankel, "British Troops Face Allegations of Abuse," *Washington Post*, May 5, 2004.

civilians had occurred, the notion that the pictures published by the *Daily Mirror* could be fakes allowed government officials to avoid accepting responsibility for the abuse. Though the newspaper included reports of government investigations, the seriousness of these revelations was minimized with the fake photograph discourse.

The seriousness of British abuse was highlighted only in passing when Charles Kennedy, leader of the Liberal Democrats, concluded that "whether true or false, … they are going to have a massive impact … across the Muslim world and the Arab world."[1] Other officials expressed concern that the abuse would jeopardize Britain's efforts to maintain good relations with Iraqis. The stakes were raised a bit higher when Edward Leigh, a senior Conservative Party legislator, argued that not just the abuse, but the war in Iraq in general has made "things worse rather than better."[2] Thus, the coverage of the abuse was used to remind of a larger anti-war discourse that was present in the U.K. This was strengthened with reports on public opinion polls that indicated that the majority of Britons wanted to see their troops out of Iraq.

Fear of retaliation was emphasized when utilizing the prognostic frame. Jeremy Greenstock, Britain's former special representative to Iraq, was quoted saying that if the abuse allegations were found to be true "there will be more attacks, more people will be killed."[3] In another article, prognostic framing called for the government to publish evidence that was submitted by the Red Cross. Other than reporting on government officials' promises to investigate and punish those responsible, no further prognostic discourse on the British abuse was offered by the *Washington Post*.

---

[1] Ibid.
[2] Glenn Frankel, "Blair Newly Rebuked Over Prison Abuses," *Washington Post*, May 11, 2004.
[3] Glenn Frankel, "British Soldier Gives Abuse Details," *Washington Post*, May 8, 2004.

Overall, the image or prognostic frames were not used extensively by the *Washington Post* when covering U.K. events. The newspaper emphasized the need for investigations but generally avoided making strong evaluations or conclusions about the British abuse. The fake photograph discourse and emphasis on the good image of the U.K. army minimized the seriousness of abuse at the hands of the British soldiers.

Image and prognostic frames in the Guardian. The *Guardian* utilized the image frame when covering U.K. events quite extensively. The prognostic frame was utilized less often. At the centre of the image discourse were the *Daily Mirror* photographs. The government and military reactions contributed significantly to the construction of both the image and prognostic frames in the *Guardian*. The newspaper included quotes by Blair who evaluated the photographs as "shameful," and Gen. Sir Michael Jackson asserted that such actions "contravene the British army's high standards."[1] Charles Kennedy, leader of the Liberal Democrats, called the actions "a total disgrace and a disservice to all that we stand for."[2] The newspaper quoted an anonymous source who said the pictures "are the greatest recruitment photos that al-Qaida could possibly have wished."[3]

The *Guardian* used the possibility of the photographs being fakes to minimize the responsibility for the abuse. Much of the coverage was constructed by using such language as "if the photographs are real" or "if the accusations are true" and similar wording. The *Guardian* constantly reminded readers that the abuse may not have actually occurred although accounts of ongoing investigations into the deaths and mistreatment of detainees by

---

[1] Julian Borger, Luke Harding, and Matthew Taylor, "Mistreatment of PoWs Deepens Controversy in Iraq: British Troops in Torture Scandal," *Guardian*, May 1, 2004.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Sandra Laville, Sarah Hall and Richard Norton Taylor, "Army Claims There is More Evidence Photos were Fake," *Guardian*, May 4, 2004.

the British soldiers were reported by the *Guardian* even before the *Daily Mirror* photographs had emerged.

Nevertheless, the newspaper articulated the seriousness of the scandal. Hoon was quoted stating that the photographs could be used by critics to undermine "the work of all the military and civilians trying to rebuild Iraq."[1] Similar sentiments were articulated by Charles Kennedy who warned that, true or false, the images would have a massive impact within Iraq and across the Arab world.

It was the image of the army, not the country that was emphasized the most. Several articles focused on the reactions of soldiers of the Queen's Lancashire Regiment which was at the center of the abuse accusations. Soldiers, support personnel, as well as military and government officials evaluated the significance of these accusations to the future standing of the regiment. The headline of one article published on May 4, 2004 summarized this well: "Bravery, Success, Medals Now Stunned Disbelief." One of the sources quoted in the article claimed that "It's dreadful to think that after all the medals they got in Iraq this is what they're going to be remembered for."[2] A soldier claimed that Iraq was "worst experience of my life" but the regiment was "enormously proud of what they had achieved in Basra."[3] Another anonymous soldier stated that soldiers were "shellshocked, incredibly disappointed because we did such a good job there."[4] Soldiers even suggested that the pictures could have been a set up because of the rivalry between the units and the jealousy of the success and reputation of the QLR. But once evidence was released that the *Daily Mirror* photographs

---

[1] Patrick Wintour and Michael White, "Hoon Calls for Political Solution in Holy Cities," *Guardian*, May 7, 2004.

[2] Helena Smith, "Bravery, Success, Medals Now Stunned Disbelief," *Guardian*, May 4, 2004.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Sandra Laville, Richard Norton-Taylor and Helena Smith, "Inquiry into 'Torture' Pictures: Mirror Stands Firm as Doubts Raised Over Images of British Abuse," *Guardian*, May 3, 2004.

were fakes, Ingram concluded that the *Daily Mirror* "dragged the name of the Queen's Lancashire Regiment through the mud."[1]

Comparison to the U.S. scandal was part of the evaluation discourse. One civilian employee concluded: "We're not like the Americans who do run wild. We've got much higher standards."[2] To highlight the British professionalism the newspaper reported on the experience of the U.K. army in past conflicts. The *Guardian* briefly acknowledged that the army was accused of "being heavy-handed" in Northern Ireland but defended the army's image, quoting Hoon who insisted that "they learned that lesson" and received nothing but praise for their experience in Bosnia and Iraq.[3]

When the prognostic frame was utilized, the *Guardian* acknowledged the seriousness of the British abuse scandal. One of the soldiers who reportedly supplied the *Daily Mirror* with the photographs was quoted predicting the long term consequences of the abuse: "We are never going to get them on our side. We are fighting a losing war."[4] Other articles applying this frame called for more investigations and punishment of the individuals. However, there was also a more serious call for the government to accept responsibility and accountability for the abuse and killings of Iraqis. Phil Shiner, the lawyer acting for the families of Iraqi victims, asked for an independent inquiry and the payment of proper damages for the victims' families. He emphasized that without an independent inquiry the families would never get closure and the British public "will never know what has gone

---

[1] Sarah Hall and Matt Wells, "Iraq Crisis: Photos Row: Mirror Editor Refuses to Quit," *Guardian*, May 14, 2004.
[2] Helena Smith, "Iraq Conflict: Bravery, Success, Medals Now Stunned Disbelief," *Guardian*, May 4, 2004.
[3] Patrick Wintour and Michael White, "Iraq Conflict: Hoon Calls for Political Solution in Holy Cities," *Guardian*, May 7, 2004.
[4] Matthew Taylor, "Punched, Kicked, then Left to Die: Iraqi Detainee 'Beaten and Urinated Upon' as Accusations of Wide-Spread Mistreatment Spread to UK Forces," *Guardian*, May 1, 2004.

wrong."[1] Another article included reports from the International Red Cross insisting that British government should begin to apply "public scrutiny required by international standards" and make public the secret rules of engagement.[2]

In conclusion, the *Guardian* utilized the image and prognostic frames more than the American newspapers. However, it did not take the opportunity to offer more serious considerations of how the abuse reflected on the reputation of the country and its standing in the international community. The focus on the fake photographs eliminated the opportunity to examine ethical and moral consequences of the abuse or even to acknowledge that the abuse occurred. The newspaper did focus more on the image and the reputation of the army and provided some discourse that included coverage of the ongoing investigations. Nevertheless, the newspaper avoided or neglected to include a more serious discussion on what the abuse signaled about the moral standing and reputation of the country, its army, as well as its public.

Image and prognostic frames in the Times. The *Times* utilized the image frame in a similar manner as the other newspapers. The official sources expressed "instant condemnation" of the abuse by British forces upon the publication of the *Daily Mirror* photographs. The newspaper included reactions from Blair, Hoon, and Gen. Jackson. Blair stated that anyone would "sickened" by the idea of abuse.[3] Even though the *Times* was the only newspaper that devoted significant attention to the authentic abuse photographs taken by a member of the Royal Regiment of Fusiliers, Gary Bartlam, the image frame emerged

---

[1] Richard Norton-Taylor, "High Court to Hear Claims of Unlawful Killing by Soldiers," *Guardian*, May 6, 2004.
[2] Rory McCarthy, "Prisoner abuse scandal: Watchdog report," *Guardian*, May 11, 2004.
[3] David Leppard and Adam Nathan, "Murder of British Soldier may have Sparked Torture," *Times*, May 2, 2004.

mostly in relation to the coverage of the *Daily Mirror* photographs. Just like the other newspapers, the *Times* reported Kennedy's sentiment that the photographs would damage the country's reputation and encourage the "worst assumptions" about Britons even if proven to be fakes.[1] The *Daily Mirror* editor Piers Morgan defended the authenticity of the abuse images and claimed that "outrageous and unlawful behaviour" is known by the army and administration.[2]

The newspaper also reported that members of the battalion at the center of the accusations were "devastated" upon learning of the accusations published by the *Daily Mirror*.[3] Lt. Col. John Downham, the QLR's regimental secretary, was quoted saying "We are furious that these people have besmirched our good name."[4] Another article remembered the interview given by Lt. Col. Jorge Mendonca, commanding officer of the QLR, who just a few days before the *Mirror* photographs were released expressed confidence that British soldiers "were winning the battle for hearts and minds in Iraq."[5] The newspaper quoted Hoon calling for the *Daily Mirror* to "lift the slur" on the army's name.[6] The newspaper concluded that the damage from the fake photograph scandal was "untold."[7] Later Jackson called the incident "a blemish on the Army's reputation."[8] The idea that the photographs were produced by rivals of the regiment in question or that the money received from the *Daily Mirror* was reason for the photographs to be doctored were explored in the *Times*' coverage.

---

[1] Daniel McGrory and Philip Webster, "Troops Warned over Detainees," *Times*, May 4, 2004.
[2] The Times, "Mirror Editor Issues Detailed Rebuttal," *Times*, May 2, 2004.
[3] Adam Nathan and Stephen Grey, "Soldiers' Grief that Fuelled Brutality," *Times*, May 2, 2004.
[4] David Leppard and Adam Nathan, "Murder of British Soldier may have Sparked Torture," *Times*, May 2, 2004.
[5] Stephen Grey, "Hidden 'Sex Abuse' File Could Cost British the Battle for Hearts and Minds," *Times*, May 2, 2004.
[6] Michael Evans and Russell Jenkins, "Army Urges Hoon to Censure Paper over Fake Photos," *Times*, May 12, 2004.
[7] Ibid.
[8] David Charter and Michael Evans, "Pictures of 'Beatings' Dismissed as Fakes," *Times*, May 14, 2004.

Nevertheless, the *Times* explored the more serious consequences of the abuse and devoted more attention to reporting on the actual abuse incidents and photographs that captured these. One article reported that although the fake photographs produced a lot of "furor," they also prompted other soldiers to come forward with abuse allegations."[1] The article reported that the MoD has been hiding "most damning … file" with abuse photos taken by Bartlam for a year.[2] When describing the actual abuse the newspaper printed accounts that the soldiers "took pride in repeatedly beating the Iraqis."[3]

Comparison with the American scandal was another device used to portray the British abuse as less severe. The newspaper utilized the Red Cross testimony to convey this. However, the newspaper questioned if in fact the British were "really any better?"[4] The newspaper emphasized the fact that although the army did not admit guilt in the shooting of civilians, in many cases compensation was paid to the families of those who were killed at the hands of British soldiers. The *Times* also reported that much evidence of the British abuse was destroyed. The newspaper was critical of the lack of action from the military against any soldiers accused of abuse or unlawful killings.

Thus, when the prognostic frame was applied in the coverage of U.K. events, the newspaper emphasized the need for investigations and demanded the government release information about the abuse allegations. The newspaper concluded that the secrecy could hurt "public confidence in the Government's handling of the situation."[5] The newspaper quoted Adnan Pachachi, the Iraqi elder statesman, who demanded that all prisons in Iraq be

---

[1] Stephen Grey, "Hidden 'Sex Abuse' File Could Cost British the Battle for Hearts and Minds," *Times*, May 2, 2004.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Ibid.
[4] Ibid.
[5] Philip Webster, "Ministers Kept in the Dark over Red Cross Report," *Times*, May 12, 2004.

transferred to Iraqi control which was also construed as pressure for the coalition forces to leave Iraq and give legitimacy to the Iraqi administration. [1] The newspaper also reported that Blair was facing criticism over Britain's alliance with the United States. However, military officials also aided construction of the prognostic frame. They promised to punish those who were responsible and, of course, when the official sources were quoted, responsibility was always implied to be individual.

In conclusion, the *Times* offered more coverage of the severity of the British abuse and focused more on the need for investigations, as well as government and military accountability not only for the abuse but also for the way the investigations were handled. The *Times* highlighted the existence of the actual abuse photographs while the other newspapers focused their attention on the fake photograph discourse. Although the reactions of government officials still dominated the coverage of British abuse, the newspaper extended the image discourse to discuss future implications of British alliance with the U.S. and included more coverage that called for Britain to withdraw troops from Iraq.

Media Reflexivity Frame in the Four Newspapers

Journalists played an important role in bringing the abuse at Abu Ghraib and Basra to light. The dramatic images of torture, abuse and humiliation were not simply reprinted frivolously by the different media. In fact, in their self-conscious attempt to examine the morality of the soldiers' behavior the media also focused on themselves. Thus, the media dealt with introspection and explored the contradictions that the images (fake and authentic) illuminated between the right of the media to publish images that are newsworthy but at the

---

[1] Richard Beeston, Philip Webster and Tom Baldwin, "Iraqis Demand Right to Run 'Abuse' Prisons," *Times*, May 13, 2004.

same time have the potential to inflame negative attitudes towards the occupying forces which were already strong around the world. The following section will explore how each of the newspapers dealt with that introspection first when covering U.S. events, and then covering U.K. events.

Media Introspection Covering the U.S. Events

Media reflexivity was not the dominant frame utilized by the four newspapers. When covering U.S. events, the *New York Times* utilized this frame in four articles (6 percent of coverage), the *Washington Post* in just one article (1 percent of coverage), the *Guardian* in one article (3 percent), and the *Times* in two articles (5 percent). The following paragraphs will provide further details on how the media reflexivity frame was constructed.

One of the key elements of constructing the media reflexivity frame was reporting on how various media dealt with the decision to publish the abuse photographs. The *New York Times* gave an account of how the photos were carried in France, Italy, Turkey, Great Britain, and many other countries by giving specific details on the context surrounding the publication of the photographs. The newspaper noted that the media which were critical of the war in Iraq used the abuse images with a sense of "vindication."[1] For example, the *New York Times* reported that *La Repubblica*, a left-leaning Italian daily, published Abu Ghraib photos alongside a front-page editorial critical of the American-led war. Later, the newspaper noted that *Le Monde*, a French daily, ran a front-page cartoon showing an American military boot crushing the head of an Iraqi while its owner told him, "Repeat After Me: DE-MO-CRA-CY!"[2] The newspaper listed the headlines that accompanied photographs in the

---

[1] Neil MacFarquhar, "Revulsion at Prison Abuse Provokes Scorn for the U.S.," *New York Times*, May 1, 2004.
[2] Ibid.

Guardian and the *Times*. It also noted that the semiofficial daily in Egypt *Al Ahram* "editorialized" the coverage of abuse and reported that the soldiers' behavior was "totally in line with the mission for which they came to Iraq."[1] In other articles, the *New York Times* provided details about the placement of the photos, and how the different media dealt with nudity by blurring genitalia. The *New York Times* also included a passage that an *Al-Jazeera* anchorwomen speaking to Nabil Khoury, a spokesman for the State Department in London, asked if *CBS News* would face censure from the Bush administration which accused *Al-Jazeera* of broadcasting deliberately inflammatory material. Clearly, the *New York Times* saw the significance in exploring how the media around the world covered abuse, and although it appeared to remain objective in their report of how various media approached the abuse photographs, the newspaper still contextualized their reports by indicating the relationship between the particular medium and the U.S., or more specifically, its anti-American or anti-war views.

The *New York Times* also provided an overview of how American newspapers dealt with the images as well. The newspaper included quotes from the different U.S. newspaper editors justifying publishing or not publishing the photographs. For example, Col Allan, the *New York Post's* editor in chief provided justification for the *New York Post's* decision to not publish them because he did not see the reason to publish photographs in which "a handful of U.S. soldiers who've mistreated prisoners" and "that should be allowed to reflect poorly on the 140,000 men and women over there who are risking their lives and doing a good job."[2] The newspaper even included a quote from Bill Keller, its own executive editor, who stated

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Thom Shanker and Jacques Steinberg, "Bush Voices "Disgust" at Abuse of Iraqi Prisoners," *New York Times*, May 1, 2004.

that the newspaper had initially held off on publishing the photos because it "could not, in the time available, ascertain their authenticity."[1] The assistant managing editor for photography of the *Baltimore Sun* justified publishing the photos because "without the photos it's hard for the reader, if they hadn't seen the show, to understand what happened or what was going on."[2] The editor of the *Daily News of New York* stated that if the newspapers wanted to be more than "propaganda sheets" then they had a duty to show the photographs.[3]

As more photographs and videos of abuse emerged, the *New York Times* included more coverage of how newspapers and television networks in the U.S. struggled with the graphic photographs. The *New York Times* explained that even though the importance of the story was usually signaled by the placement of the photographs on the front page, many newspapers chose to place the photographs on inside because of the "nudity and humiliation" in the photographs.[4] The newspaper also noted that broadcast networks and cable news channels dealt with the images differently. It was noted that Fox had been using the images less frequently, and other channels cropped out or obscured parts of the images.

Bill Keller, executive editor of the *New York Times* said that he published additional photographs when he discovered that they portrayed something new, such as one photo in particular that featured a man with a dog that "showed a person actually being terrorized."[5] Whereas the Fox News executive producer was quoted saying that the photos needed to be put into context, and the public already understood what happened thus the network chose to use less of the images. Col Allan, the editor in chief for the *New York Post* was once again

---

[1] Ibid.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Ibid.
[4] David Carr, "News Media Quandary Over Showing Graphic Images of Abuse," *New York Times*, May 11, 2004.
[5] Ibid.

quoted saying that the public did not want to see any more of those images and he insisted that "the images are serving the political agenda of many newspapers."[1] Bill O'Reilly, a host on the Fox News Channel insisted that the images would be used to "promote violence against America."[2]

On the other side of the argument was David Remnick, the editor of the *New Yorker*, which had published Seymour Hersh's stories and who defended the use of the images "the photographs are at the center of things" and thus not publishing them would be a mistake.[3] John Banner, executive producer of ABC's *World News Tonight,* claimed that airing the images was a difficult decision but publishing them is "a responsibility to our audience to inform them of wrongdoing."[4]

An interesting media introspection opportunity emerged in the coverage of the videotaped beheading of Nicholas Berg. Although there was only one story in the sample selected for analysis in the *New York Times* that dealt with the newspaper's reflection on how the media covered the images of beheading, the information provided in this article was detailed and included a review of how the media predominantly in the Middle East covered the news. The *New York Times* reported that newspapers in Lebanon, London based pan-Arab newspapers, and Arab satellite channels, Al Jazeera, and Al Arabiya all covered the story to some extent. The *New York Times* noted that a Kuwaiti paper *Al Siyassah al Kuwaitia* ran a front-page story with a photograph of one of the militants holding up Mr. Berg's head. A summary conclusion was offered early in the story which stated "Most newspapers across the Middle East treated the gruesome videotape as front-page news,

---

[1] Ibid.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Ibid.
[4] Ibid.

though generally secondary to stories about the deaths of six Israeli soldiers in the Gaza Strip."[1]

Interestingly, the newspaper also reported on which newspapers did not cover the beheading with detailed account of other stories that were covered that same day. For example, the *New York Times* noted that Egyptian newspapers ignored the beheading. It also noted that Syrian newspapers ignored the story but covered extensively President Bush's announcement of sanctions against Damascus. The newspaper included an explanation offered by a journalism expert who said that "protecting Americans from copycat killings was the main reason for the scant coverage."[2] The newspaper did not state it directly, but the headline "In Arab World, Press Coverage Of Beheading Varies Widely" suggested that the *New York Times* was not satisfied with the lack of attention to the beheading story or images.

A different "behind the scenes" approach was used to construct the media reflexivity frame in a story on Bernadette Darby, wife of Spec. Joseph Darby, the solder who came forward with evidence of prisoner abuse at Abu Ghraib published in the *Washington Post*. The story gave an account of the "the media cross hairs" that Darby's wife was facing. The report described a scene at Darby's house in which her sister-in-law, Maxine Carroll, was attempting to respond to media requests for comments after Rumsfeld had disclosed Darby's name. The story was headlined "Prisoner Abuse Scandal Brings 27 Seconds of Fame to Soldier's Relative" and it appeared in an unusual section of the newspaper for an abuse story--in the Metro section.[3] The story reported the Darby's wife was hiding out while speaking to

---

[1] Abeer Allam, "In Arab World, Press Coverage Of Beheading Varies Widely," *New York Times*, May 13, 2004.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Elizabeth Williamson, "Prisoner Abuse Scandal Brings 27 Seconds of Fame to Soldier's Relative," *Washington Post*, May 14, 2004.

her attorney about how to respond to the media. The story was filled with quotes and sound

bites that Maxine Carroll was giving to different news outlets while answering the phone or

responding to journalists outside of her sister's duplex. The report made note of a bouquet of

flowers from NBC's *Today* show that were delivered to Maxine Carroll for her promise to

appear on its broadcast first. And it further detailed the negotiations between Carroll and the

Today show for an all-expense-paid trip to New York. It was during this negotiation that

Carroll continued to give interviews and made short statements like "They're just a typical

family. If they're handed lemons, they're going to make lemonade. . . . Have I given you

enough?"[1] The last sentence of the story ends with a statement that "On Thursday's Today

show, Maxine Carroll got 27 seconds."[2] The story did not state it explicitly but it appears that

the *Washington Post* was reflecting on the media's attempt to sensationalize the news and

seemed to convey that there was a lot of absurdity behind the media's attempt to get a quote.

Although Carroll clearly had little to say about the abuse, the media went out of their way

and even competed with each other to be the first to have her on the show for an interview.

The *Guardian* used the media reflexivity frame in a very similar fashion to the *New*

York Times. When reviewing the decisions of the media within the U.S. the *Guardian*

reprinted the exact same quotes from the editor of the *New York Post* who refused to print

pictures because they were showing what only a handful soldiers were doing. The *New York*

Times executive editor Bill Keller was also quoted to have said that the newspaper had

initially held off publishing photos because it "could not, in the time available, ascertain their

---

[1] Ibid.
[2] Ibid.

authenticity."[1] The headline of the article included a phrase "Cautious Approach to Running

Images of Iraqi Abuse."[2] Media reactions in the Middle East were also examined. The

Guardian accounted that the leading pan-Arab newspapers did not publish pictures of abuse

as front page news. The managing editor of the *Asharq al-Awsat* Ali Ibrahim explained that

he did not run the images because they had been published by other newspapers. Ibrahim

added that other Arab media ran the story with headlines such as "Scandal" but his approach

was to report the story and not to inflame it.[3] The newspaper concluded that Arab coverage

had ranged from "disciplined anger" to outright sensationalism in others. The "disciplined

anger" was reported to have been the attribute of the "more important newspapers."[4] Hisham

Kassem, publisher of the weekly *Cairo Times* criticized the Arab media for hypocrisy, "They

talk about American monstrosities as if their own governments have never practised anything

similar."[5]

When constructing the media reflexivity frame the *Times* also provided a review of

how the media around the world treated the abuse revelations. However, the two articles that

used the media reflexivity frame also utilized a more dominant image frame that was

constructed by including accounts of not only how the media reacted to the abuse but also

how politicians in the U.S. and around the world reacted to the abuse. The media reflexivity

frame in the *Times* served the purpose of reviewing the media's role in disclosing the abuse.

The *Times* reported that although in March the Pentagon had announced that abuse

investigations were initiated, it was not until a CBS *60 Minutes II* program obtained copies of

---

[1] Brian Whitaker and Gary Younge, "Media: A Scandal, but Not a Story: The Arab and US Press Have Taken a Cautious Approach to Running Images of Iraqi Abuse," *Guardian*, May 10, 2004.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Ibid.
[4] Ibid.
[5] Ibid.

photographs and was about to air the story that the military became concerned with the scandal. The *Times* reported that in early April 2004, Gen. Richard Myers, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, contacted Dan Rather, the network's senior presenter, to ask that the broadcast be delayed.[1] It also noted that Taguba's report was leaked to the *New Yorker* magazine, and when CBS became aware of the *New Yorker* preparing to publish the article on abuse they aired their own story. The leaking of the Taguba report to the *New Yorker* was called a "crucial piece of the Abu Ghraib jigsaw."[2]

Another article reported that leaking of the Red Cross report to the *Wall Street Journal* substantiated abuse accusations.[3] Although the media reflexivity frame was not prominent in the *Times*, teasing out details on the media's role in breaking of the story presents an important angle of the coverage.

Overall, the four newspapers used the media reflexivity frame differently. The *Washington Post* was critical of the media sensationalizing abuse coverage by focusing on information that was irrelevant. The *New York Times* and the *Guardian* were similar in that they focused on examining how the media around the world dealt with the abuse revelations and, more importantly, the images of abuse. The *New York Times* in particular editorialized the coverage as an indicator of the media's attitude towards the U.S. in general. The *Times* devoted most attention to the media's role in revealing the abuse and covered aspects of the decision-making process that influenced the publication of the initial abuse photographs.

---

[1] Tony Allen-Mills, "America's Shame," *Times*, May 9, 2004.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Philip Webster, Tim Reid and Roland Watson, "Red Cross Warned of Abuse Again and Again," *Times*, May 11, 2004.

Media Introspection Covering the U.K. Events

Similar to the U.S. story, the media reflexivity frame was not utilized extensively in the coverage of U.K. events. The *New York Times* utilized this frame in one article (11 percent), the *Washington Post* in two articles (18 percent), the *Guardian* in five articles (14 percent) and the *Times* in four articles (14 percent). The following paragraphs will provide further details on how the media reflexivity frame was constructed in the coverage of U.K. events.

The only article in the *New York Times* that utilized the media self-reflexivity frame when covering U.K. events was the article published on May 14 when it was officially confirmed that photos of British soldiers abusing Iraqis were fakes. The *New York Times* reported that the photographs in question were "emblazoned" on the pages of the *Daily Mirror* earlier that month under the headline "Vile!"[1] The *New York Times* briefly reported that the there were calls from Parliament for Piers Morgan, the editor of the *Daily Mirror*, to resign and for the paper to publish a front-page apology. Keith Simpson, the defense spokesman for the opposition Conservative Party, was quoted saying that publishing of photographs was "a great wrong" and that the name and lives of the troops "have been traded for what now appear to be cheap news headlines"[2]

The *Washington Post* focused on the fake photograph discourse as well. The newspaper reported not only on the *Daily Mirror's* anti-war sentiment but reviewed how the other U.K. media reacted to the fake images. The newspaper reported that the *Daily Express*

---

[1] Patrick Tyler, "Britain Says Photos Showing Abuse Are Fake," *New York Times*, May 14, 2004.
[2] Ibid.

led its front page with the huge headline "LIARS."[1] It also printed the response from Piers

Morgan, editor of the *Daily Mirror*: "Being called a liar by that lot is like being called a

halfwit by the village idiot."[2] The *Washington Post* focused on Morgan's career and

indicated that it was full of controversy and sensationalism. However, Morgan's friends

stated that Morgan would not have published the photographs unless he had believed them to

be true.

Only one article utilized the media reflexivity frame to focus on British

investigations. The *Washington Post* gave an account of what the other U.K. media printed

about the abuse investigations. The newspaper noted that the *Times* and the *Independent* both

published reports that solders from the Royal Regiment of Fusiliers were under investigation

for abusing and killing Iraqi civilians.[3]

The *Guardian* utilized the reflexivity frame slightly more extensively than its two

American counterparts. The fake photograph discourse, again, dominated the coverage. One

of the earliest stories in the coverage focused on reporting how the *Daily Mirror* obtained the

photographs and that journalists worked on the story in secret, trying to protect it from being

leaked to the other media.[4] The newspaper devoted much attention to describing Piers

Morgan's career. The newspaper recounted that Morgan was the youngest ever editor, but the

focus was Morgan's embarrassments and the spoof of the year award for wrongfully

reporting that Heather Mills McCartney had given birth to a boy when in fact she had given

birth to a girl. The *Mirror*'s responses to criticisms about photo authenticity were evaluated

---

[1] Glenn Frankel, "British Troops Face Allegations of Abuse. Photos of Iraqi Prisoner Are Disputed,"
Washington Post, May 5, 2004.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Ibid.
[4] Patrick Barkham, "Torture Pictures are no Hoax, *Mirror* Insists," *Guardian*, May 4, 2004.

as "characteristically bullish" taking much credibility away from the newspaper.[1] Some

credibility was given to the *Daily Mirror* by noting MoD has had eight days to try and

discredit the pictures.[2] Later in the coverage when the pictures were confirmed by military

experts to be fakes, the coverage was even more negative towards Morgan. The *Guardian*

reported that the pictures could be reenactments of actual events, and that in fact the *Daily*

Mirror might have been a victim of a hoax. But the main focus was on questioning the ethics

of publishing the photographs without having clear evidence of their authenticity. One article

used the media reflexivity frame to recount the media's code of conduct which demands that

mistakes have to be acknowledged as soon as possible. Morgan was encouraged to admit that

they were hoaxed and explain what the newspaper did to verify information before

publishing, why there was such a rush to publish the photos, who was paid for the pictures

and information, and various other concerns were listed by the *Guardian*. The newspaper

concluded that Morgan had to admit his mistake and apologize for it because it was a matter

of "journalistic faith" as well as "safety of people on the ground in Iraq."[3]

Another story focused on the pictures as commodities. The story headlined "Media:

Photo Opportunities" and explained how the pictures were bargained for and which

newspapers were quoted a different price for a smaller or larger set of photos. The newspaper

reported that the TV got to broadcast the images for free giving the *Daily Mirror* the needed

publicity. The price apparently depended on the budget of the newspaper. The *Mail* for

example had the biggest budget and acquired a set of seven pictures for a little less than

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Matt Wells, "Hoon Claims Mirror Photos are Fakes: Defence Secretary also Doubts Soldiers Claims," *Guardian*, May 11, 2004.

[3] Leader Pages, "When to Say Sorry: The *Daily Mirror*," *Guardian*, May 14, 2004.

£10,000.[1] The words in the headline "photo opportunities" is a nice word play on the "photo ops" that are usually linked to politicians posing for PR pictures.

The *Times* focused on unfolding the fake photograph story and utilizing the media reflexivity frame when covering the *Daily Mirror*'s final attempts to legitimize their abuse accusations. The newspaper reported that after the army commanders continued to point out inconsistencies in the black and white images, the journalists at the *Daily Mirror* began to worry about their authenticity.[2] However, the *Times* reported that Morgan still stood by the *Daily Mirror* claims that the images represented actual abuse, even though they may have been pictures capturing reenactments of abuse. The *Times* mentioned that the rival tabloid had turned the photos away because of the lack of evidence. The *Times* also questioned if money was exchanged for the photographs which would help to prove that whoever supplied the *Daily Mirror* with the photographs had their own personal gain in sight. The *Times* also reported on how the fake photographs could affect the *Daily Mirror's* parent company and their shareholders, namely, the newspaper reported that prices decreased after the scandal.

Overall, the four newspapers utilized the media reflexivity frame to emphasize the Daily Mirror's "bullish" approach to the publishing of the fake photographs. The fake photograph discourse was exploited by the British administration to its fullest potential by portraying the media as the culprit for potential revenge on the British troops. Although the actual abuse photographs were available to the media, the fake photographs forced the media to be even more careful in any further considerations to publish images that were emerging from Iraq as the story unfolded.

---

[1] Kevin Maguire, "Media: Photo Opportunities," *Guardian*, May 10, 2004.
[2] Michael Evans, Philip Webster and Adam Sherwin, "Mirror Editor to Face MPs Over 'Fake' Photos," *Times*, May 5, 2004.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

Detainee abuse has been acknowledged to be one of the major coalition failures in the

war in Iraq. The photos of that abuse produced gruesome images of humiliation and torture

acts conducted by the very people who were to bring peace and democracy to the country,

which were then shared with the world. In order to examine how the detainee abuse by

American and British forces tested not only the media's ability to report on human rights

abuses but also their professed ability to serve as watchdogs for their respective governments,

this dissertation compared news stories about abuse in Iraq that appeared in U.S. newspapers

the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post*, and Britain's the *Guardian,* and the *Times*

(London) beginning with April 28, 2004 and ending on May 14, 2004.

Analysis of how the U.S. and U.K. media covered abuse stories contributes to a better

understanding of media-government relationships during war time. More importantly,

comparison of how seemingly similar violations of human rights were framed by the media

of these two nations provided an opportunity to evaluate how journalism practices are shaped

by events themselves and to examine how cultural, political, and social contexts surrounding

the events manifest themselves in the coverage. In-depth comparison of coverage by

newspapers both within and between the U.S. and Britain showcased the power of various

framing techniques that influence both construction and consumption of media texts. This

chapter discusses the most important findings of this dissertation followed by an analysis of

their significance and suggestions about the contributions this research makes to the literature

of the field. The chapter has five parts in keeping with the study's five research questions,

and contributions to the literature are addressed within the discussion of each question.

Salience as the Basics of Framing

All four newspapers--the *New York Times*, the *Washington Post*, the *Guardian*, and the *Times* (London)--in the study sample covered the abuse stories in Iraq extensively and, as the results chapter pointed out, the U.S. media gave the abuse events in Iraq the most attention. The two American newspapers published more and lengthier articles devoted to abuse coverage when compared to their British counterparts. The flow of the news is one of the indicators of salience, as availability of news on a particular topic signals the media's judgment of its importance.[1] The fact that the U.S. media devoted more attention to the abuse coverage means that the audiences in the U.S. had more chances to learn about the abuse from those two newspapers. At the same time, when abuse stories were compared to the coverage of the war in Iraq in general, the British newspapers were found to have devoted more attention to the abuse. That is, abuse coverage in the *New York Times* constitutes 23 percent of the coverage on the war in Iraq during the time period selected for analysis. The *Washington Post* devoted 25 percent of its coverage of the war in Iraq to the abuse stories. However, abuse coverage in the *Guardian* accounted for 31 percent of the coverage of the war in Iraq, and finally, the *Times'* devoted 44 percent of the stories on the war in Iraq to the coverage of the abuse revelations. It appears that even tough numerically, the British newspapers printed fewer stories on the abuse scandal, their relative importance when compared to the coverage of the war in Iraq in general during that time period is higher than that of their American counterparts. This means that the audiences in the U.K. could have

---

[1] Entman, "Framing U.S. Coverage of International News," 9.

been encouraged to place more weight on the abuse in making judgments about the war in Iraq.

This is a significant finding because historically scholars have found the British media to be more vocal in their anti-war views.[1] For example, Peng's study which compared how the *New York Times*, the *Times* (London) and the *People's Daily* (China) covered anti-war protests in 2002 and 2003 found that the *New York Times* and the *Times* were similar in their attention to the anti-war protests stories and, moreover, the *Times* tended to publish lengthier articles than the American newspaper.[2] The *Guardian* was found to be critical of the coalition actions in Iraq and also has prided itself for "high-quality sophisticated global news coverage."[3] Though this dissertation found that the *Guardian* produced coverage critical of the abuse and war in Iraq in general, it is surprising that in comparison to the other three newspapers the *Guardian* had the least number of news stories covering the abuse during the time frame selected for analysis.

Another finding of this dissertation is that the U.K. abuse allegations received little attention in the U.S. newspapers, but the British media gave attention to both the Abu Ghraib scandal as well as abuses by British soldiers. Thus, salience of abuse was framed by reporting on the Abu Ghraib abuse as a more important event. Of course, the abuse perpetrated by both countries was not easily comparable. The way abuses were uncovered and investigated contributed to differences in how events were reported by the media. But

---

[1] Frank Dardis, "Military Accord, Media Discord," *International Communication Gazette*, 68, no. 5-6 (2006): 420; Zengjun Peng, "Framing Antiwar Protests in the Global Village," *International Communication Gazette* 70 (2008): 374; Craig Murray et al., "Reporting Dissent in Wartime," *European Journal of Communication* 23, no. 1 (March 2008): 16.

[2] Zengjun Peng, "Framing Antiwar Protests in the Global Village," *International Communication Gazette* 70 (2008): 374.

[3] Susan Hansen, "Superiority Complex," *Columbia Journalism Review* 46, no. 1 (May 2007): 26. See also Narasimhan Ravi, "Looking Beyond Flawed Journalism," *Press/Politics* 10, no. 1 (2005): 60.

perhaps these findings reflect not only the differences among the events themselves but suggest that the media were facing different political processes and discourses. It is possible that the reasons why the U.S. media and more importantly the U.S. government attempted to minimize the abuse by the British forces had to do with the domestic situation facing their British allies. As some of the news stories at that time noted, the British Prime Minister Tony Blair was pressured to withdraw troops from Iraq. This would have been particularly detrimental to the U.S. forces since they were already facing shortages after other coalition members left Iraq. Thus, it is possible that the U.S. administration avoided commenting on the abuse conducted by the British soldiers to avoid inflaming the U.K. public. The media followed the administration's lead and did not cover the British abuse. On the other hand, the British media emphasized that the abuse was conducted by both coalition forces and this may have been prompted by the need to minimize the shame brought to the British nation and by the need to appease the already growing public contempt with the war in Iraq.

Beyond the overall attention devoted to the abuse by both coalition forces, there were differences in what specific topics the media in the U.S. and U.K. focused on when covering abuse. Even though both the American and British media reported on incidents of abuse, the investigations that followed, and reactions by the U.S. government and military officials, certain topics like the victims of the abuse and more importantly deaths in U.S. custody were covered less in the U.S. media. It is also noteworthy that the British newspapers reported more extensively on the gender of abuse victims when compared to the U.S. newspapers. The *Washington Post* chose not to even mention the existence of women inmates in the articles selected for analysis. The *New York Times* gave minimal coverage to women inmates. This could be an indication of the newspapers' conscious or unconscious attempt to avoid difficult

topics. Women inmates were innocent and had little intelligence value other than the fact that they were captured in place of their husbands who were sought by the U.S. as enemy combatants for interrogation purposes.[1]

However, it is important to note that nationality is not always the strongest predictor of coverage. For instance, the *Washington Post* and the *Guardian* were similar in that they reported more on investigations of abuses, and they were also similar in that they paid less attention to reporting on how the world reacted to the abuses. Both the *Washington Post* and the *Guardian* devoted more attention to the reports from the human rights organizations. This is an important finding and it suggests that media researchers should be cautious when generalizing studies of one or two media outlets to the media practices of a nation as a whole. Journalism practices and philosophies may vary from one publication to the other even within one country. This underlines Rantanen's suggestion to reevaluate the nationalized framework for the study of news and pay closer attention to how location influences news production and dissemination.[2]

The study found that attention to the fake photographs distorted coverage of the British abuse in spite of the fact that pictures of British abuse of detainees--not unlike the Abu Ghraib photos--had appeared in the *Sun* (London) as early as May 2003. Only the *Times* covered the existence of the authentic photographs a bit more extensively. This finding is noteworthy because the existence of the Abu Ghraib photographs has been acknowledged as the key factor in bringing American abuses to light. Though the human rights organizations

---

[1] Luke Harding, "Focus Shifts to Jail Abuse of Women," *Guardian*, May 12, 2004.
[2] See Terhi Rantanen, "The Cosmopolitanization of News," *Journalism Studies* 8, no. 6 (2007): 844. Rantanen was arguing that historically, cities rather than nation states were important for the development of news and thus she is proposing that empirical research should be reevaluated by using cities as a starting point for news media research

complained about prisoner treatment in Iraq since May 2003, it was the Abu Ghraib photographs that first resulted in the government initiating investigations in January 2004 and then, later the leaking of these photographs to the media initiated the breaking of the abuse story to the public in April 2004. The fact that photographs depicting very similar abuse by British soldiers existed and had been known to the British government and both the American and British media since May 2003 but did not cause the same widespread reaction is puzzling. It could be an indication of the media's reliance on each other to signal what is newsworthy, especially, when the material is sensitive such as torture. Journalists themselves acknowledged that they are cautious about publishing such news until others decide that something is significant.[1] Later sections of this chapter address additional possible reasons for this delayed reaction to the abuse.

<center>The Question of Agency as Essence of Framing</center>

Attribution of responsibility can be considered the most important framing mechanism because explanations of who is responsible can change not only how the events are interpreted but also it change recommendations on how to address the underlying issues. Media effects research suggests that attribution of responsibility to individuals on any societal issue relieves political actors from looking for solutions that would change societal processes and institutions.[2] The newspapers avoided attributing responsibility in general. However, when the subject of responsibility was raised, all four newspapers seemed to favor attributing responsibility to the system rather than to individuals in the coverage of the U.S. events and to individuals rather than the system in the coverage of the U.K. events. This

---

[1] Eric Umansky, "Failures of Imagination," *Colombia Journalism Review* 45, no. 3 (2006): 18.
[2] Shanto Iyengar, *Is Anyone Responsible?* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991).

finding is significant.

First and foremost it indicates that at least when reporting on the abuse at Abu Ghraib the media were able to counterframe the dominant frame preferred by the administration. This also contradicts the findings of a study by Bennett, Lawrence and Livingston who argued that the U.S. media (the *Washington Post*, a sample of ten more national newspapers, and CBS *Evening News*) failed to produce a framework that strongly challenged the Bush administration's interpretations of the events.[1] Their examination was limited to locating two frames within the coverage--the abuse frame and the torture frame. They relied on locating labels related to these two frames in the headlines and lead paragraphs of the stories. This dissertation found that when full stories are examined counterframes were located in the coverage. This has methodological implications for framing analysis as it suggests that a nuanced reading is necessary to identify sophisticated framing structures. Moreover, the presence of certain labels is just one of the possible framing devices. Finally, analysis of headlines and first paragraphs of stories may not be sufficient to arrive at an understanding of how coverage presents an issue. While that approach is predicated on the idea that a reader may not go further than the first paragraphs, the issue at hand is how the journalist is presenting the story.

Another finding highlighted in this dissertation is that the systemic responsibility frame was often constructed in the articles which also tended to utilize the investigative frame or adapted a thematic reporting style. This means that assigning the responsibility to the system resulted from application of the investigations frame that explored the *why* and

---

[1] Lance Bennett, Regina Lawrence, and Steven Livingston. "None Dare Call it Torture," *Journal of Communication* 56 no. 3 (2006): 467-485; see also a chapter by the same title in Lance Bennett, Regina Lawrence, and Steven Livingston. *When the Press Fails* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007).

how aspects of the news prism. In addition, the stories which assigned responsibility to individuals were utilizing the events frame which was built on episodic and the more simplistic *who, what, when,* and *where* news format that focused on relying facts and seemingly objective truths as opposed to a more elaborate thematic type of reporting that places the coverage in some general and more abstract context. This finding has a great deal of significance because it confirms previous studies that suggest that the routines of reporting bear significant influence on the quality of the coverage.[1] The thematic genre of reporting demands more time and space at the expense of other news items.[2] Thematic reporting also demands more effort and resources to produce. The newspapers that afforded resources to assign journalists to work on in-depth coverage, which sometimes required traveling to Iraq, produced coverage that was separate from the official version of events.

Attribution of responsibility to individuals rather than policy was the explanation offered by administrations on both the U.S. and U.K. sides. At the first glance, the finding that the media utilized the systemic responsibility frame more prominently when covering the U.S. events suggests that the media were capable of working independently from governmental influences. Nevertheless, when the media turned to cover the U.K. events they seemed to have supported the administration's point of view and emphasized the individual responsibility frame. These findings have to be interpreted with caution given the fact that the responsibility frame was explored in only a portion of the articles selected for analysis. Generally, either the systemic or the individual responsibility frames were applied in about 20 to 35 percent of the coverage. In fact, the *New York Times* seemed to have utilized the

---

[1] Zengjun Peng, "Framing Antiwar Protests in the Global Village," *International Communication Gazette* 70 (2008): 374.
[2] Shanto Iyengar and Adam Simon, "News Coverage of the Gulf Crisis and Public Opinion," *Communication Research* 20, no. 3 (1993): 370.

individual and the systemic responsibility frames in equal number of articles. In some instances, the competing frames were presented in the same news article. Thus, any conclusions of the importance of framing through agency have to be drawn with caution.

It is noteworthy that the *Washington Post* was the newspaper which utilized the systemic responsibility frame the most. In fact, the *Post* constructed the most thorough picture of what was happening at Abu Graib at the time of the abuses. Using Taguba's report, testimony from the soldiers participating in the abuse, victims, and many other sources, the newspaper painted a picture of chaos and disorder at Abu Ghraib. The paper also connected Abu Ghraib to Guantanamo, examined post 9/11 policies, and emphasized the administration's disregard for the Geneva Conventions to construct a strong systemic responsibility frame. The background information on the history of torture by the U.S. military and renditions of the detainees to countries where torture was commonplace were strong arguments designed to pose questions about the responsibility at the very top of the hierarchy. The *Guardian* as well as the *Times* also devoted significant attention to the systemic responsibility frame and used different kinds of framing devices in building their arguments. For example, women inmates were covered in the British press; there was more emphasis on the prison conditions and reports from the human rights organizations in the British newspapers. Though the *New York Times* weakened its systemic responsibility argument by constructing the individual responsibility frame within the same articles, it is still important that the former was articulated at all. The seemingly balanced reporting of the *New York Times* can be attributed to the newspapers tendency to cover news by providing two sides of the story.[1] In this context, this longstanding journalistic tradition may have

---

[1] Eric Umansky, "Failures of Imagination," *Colombia Journalism Review* 45, no. 3 (2006): 18.

served as a shortcoming and could hurt its ability to report on a complex issue of torture.

What is noteworthy is that whether constructing either of the responsibility frames the newspapers devoted much attention to the expert or official sources. This particularly stands out in the coverage of the U.S. events. Though there were no independent investigations or congressional hearings about the Abu Ghraib abuse, the media were able to utilize whatever reports they could access in order to examine the relationship between abuse and policy.[1] In the absence of congressional hearings the media were left to their own abilities to evaluate the significance of the abuse scandal. Thus, the Taguba report and reactions from the U.S. military and political figures were given prominence in the coverage. Absence of investigations and the British administration's efforts to minimize the severity of abuse at the hands of their soldiers might have been the reason why the media were unable to cover the British abuse story and, more specifically, attribute it to the systemic failure. This once again confirms previous research findings that the political process in a country influences how the media construct their news reports--even on occasions when nations are faced with seemingly similar circumstances such as being coalition partners in the war in Iraq.[2]

Another significant framing device obscuring the media's ability to report on the British abuse were the fake photographs. Though little attention was given to the responsibility frame in the American newspapers, the *Daily Mirror* photographs were important in the coverage of the U.K. abuses. In utilizing publication of the *Daily Mirror* photographs as the main event of the conversation, the four newspapers successfully minimized the real abuse. The fake photographs were used to blame the *Daily Mirror*

---

[1] Ibid., 19.

[2] Frank Dardis, "Military Accord, Media Discord," *International Communication Gazette*, 68, no. 5-6 (2006): 419; Zengjun Peng, "Framing Antiwar Protests in the Global Village," *International Communication Gazette* 70 (2008): 375.

newspaper for damaging the army's good image and placing the soldiers in more danger. In short, the topic of the fake photographs overshadowed both the existence of actual photographs of British abuse as well as gave the government a chance to shift the media's attention to the individuals who were involved in the publishing of these fake photos. Both the government and military officials were portrayed by the newspapers as genuinely interested in investigating the story behind the fake photographs, especially when it was suggested that these image might capture a reenactment of the actual abuse. This resulted in the episodic nature of the coverage of the British abuse, which as literature suggests, often assigns blame to individuals rather than the system.[1]

Them versus Us: The Enemy as the "Other"

The media's ability to evoke empathy encouraged or discouraged audiences from identifying with the people in the abuse coverage. Thus, just as salience or designations of agency, humanized portrayals of victims or abusers were important aspects that needed to be examined in the coverage of detainee abuse stories. The study results showed that the human interest frame was applied differently in the coverage of the U.S. and U.K. events. When the four newspapers covered abuse by the American soldiers, the human interest framing was utilized to portray victims, soldiers, and other Americans caught up in the theater of war. The media devoted attention to Taguba, the general who was assigned to investigate the abuse, and a few other military officials.

The two American newspapers never used the human interest frame in the coverage of the British events, which may be a reflection of the fact that they gave little coverage to

---

[1] Shanto Iyengar and Adam Simon, "News Coverage of the Gulf Crisis and Public Opinion," *Communication Research* 20, no. 3 (1993): 370.

the British events overall. The British newspapers utilized the human interest frame mainly to portray British soldiers. However, they were not the soldiers accused of abuse, but rather were soldiers from the same regiment. The soldiers actually responsible for the abuse were covered utilizing an events frame. The papers also utilized human interest frames to tell the connected stories of the deaths of the two British soldiers. Only one story with the human interest frame focused on the victim who died at the hands of the British soldiers; this was prompted by an Iraqi court case against the British.

While the human interest frame was not the dominant frame in any of the four newspapers covering the U.S. abuse story, nevertheless, where it was used, it was a potent framing technique. When the coverage focused on Iraqis, the human interest frame was utilized to depict Iraqis as angry and a largely anonymous group. The newspapers focused on portraying the victims' fear and desperation after being abused by the American soldiers. Their testimony of abuse was often questioned in American newspapers by including commentary that their stories of abuse could not have been verified. The British newspapers focused a bit more on the innocence of Iraqis when compared to the American newspapers. Also, the *Times* utilized the human interest frame to compare American abuse with Saddam Hussein's abuse by featuring Iraqi victims who were imprisoned at Abu Ghraib both by Saddam's regime and by Americans.

When the human interest frame was utilized to cover Americans, the coverage was much different. All six American soldiers charged with abuse received quite a bit of attention from all four newspapers. Their life stories, dreams, and aspirations were told through the testimony of their family members and friends. The soldiers themselves were often quoted

defending their innocence. Headlines, such as "Accused Soldiers a Diverse Group,"[1] epitomize the human interest frame which presented the soldiers as a diverse group of individuals. All soldiers were portrayed as hard working and good natured human beings. Only Granier's violent history was utilized to suggest that he might have been the one who orchestrated the abuse. Other government and military officials received positive coverage. Taguba was elevated to hero status in the American newspapers. Darby received similar treatment in the *Washington Post*. When the human interest frame was utilized to cover the victim of Iraqi revenge--Nick Berg--the newspapers not only covered Berg's reasons for going to Iraq and his work history, he was also portrayed as someone who aspired to bring democracy to Iraq.

This suggests that the newspapers were propagating the "them versus us" mindset when constructing the human interest frames. The Iraqis were depicted as hurt and scared people and, most of all, they were angry and dangerous. The American soldiers who participated in the abuse were depicted as misguided but good natured individuals. The newspapers also featured other Americans as interesting, accomplished, and complex individuals; their life stories and their experiences were depicted with enough detail to give the audience a chance to connect with them.

A similar contrast emerged in the coverage of the British abuse. The articles featuring soldiers from the regiment accused of abuse focused on their good image, honor, good work ethic and professionalism to dismiss the possibility that the abuse pictures in the *Daily Mirror* were real. The deaths of the two British soldiers were featured to enlist sorrow and grief for the lives of honorable Britons. The two deaths also reminded readers of the constant

---

[1] Christian Davenport and Michael Amon, "Accused Soldiers a Diverse Group," *Washington Post*, May 9, 2004.

danger the soldiers find themselves in. When an Iraqi victim was featured utilizing the human interest frame,--poverty, hopelessness and anger become the key features of the story. The juxtaposition of professionalism and honor against poverty and anger again contributed to creating a larger context of the "them versus us" mentality of war.

This polarization confirms the findings of many previous studies which showed how the media during times of war portray the enemy as the inhuman "Other."[1] Depersonalized and dehumanized images of Iraqis coupled with emphasis on their anger towards Americans served to distance the readers from feeling empathetic towards the victims of abuse. Even though the media were outraged by the images of abuse and were critical of both the policies that led to the abuse and individuals who engaged in it, Iraqis were still the enemy. Whether it was indicative of post-9/11 attitudes or the war on terror mentality, the coverage of the abused Iraqis did not serve to evoke "an appeal for human solidarity in the midst of life's cruelest contingencies."[2] Quite the opposite, this dissertation found that the coverage of Iraqis served to evoke acceptance of their suffering. On the other hand, soldiers were excused for their cruelty and inhumanity. This dissertation confirmed the findings of many other studies that suggest war coverage is often presented within the "support for troops" frame that does not allow for any anti-war discourse.[3] The U.S. soldiers' behavior was excused and often portrayed as mistaken or misguided actions while coverage of the British soldiers focused on the army achievements and more importantly soldiers' heroic suffering in dangerous conditions of war. Given the strong anti-war attitude in the U.K., the coverage

---

[1] Erin Steuter and Deborah Wills, "Discourses of Dehumanization," *Global Media Journal: Canadian Edition* 2, no. 2 (September 2009): 18.

[2] James Stewart Ettema, "Discourse That is Closer to Silence Than to Talk," *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 11, no. 1 (March 1994): 18.

[3] [3] Stephen Reese and Bob Buckalew, "The Militarism of Local Television" *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 12 (1995): 48.

supporting troops seems to be indicative of the media's difficult position when covering

war.[1] Even if the media were critical of war, the support for troops discourse took precedence

over the need to report on the human rights violations that occurred during the war.

<div align="center">Naming the Problem: Labels and Diagnostic Frames</div>

Categorization or judgment incorporated into the coverage of any event is a powerful

framing strategy which can influence the readers' interpretation of events. Clearly, when

covering the prisoner abuse scandal in Iraq the four newspapers engaged in categorization by

utilizing certain kinds of labels and constructing several specific diagnostic frames. Even

though earlier research has criticized the media, particularly in the U.S., for relying too

closely on the administration's point of view on the events in Iraq, the examination of labels

used in the coverage of the abuse of Iraqis as well as construction of diagnostic frames

suggested that the media were able to apply various kinds of linguistic and framing

techniques in order to elicit or omit evaluation of events. At times, this evaluation was

concurrent with the administrations' points of view and at other times, the four newspapers

were providing interpretation of events independent from the official views.

In naming the U.S. events all four newspapers utilized the label abuse most

extensively. This was the dominant label, which appeared in more than 80 percent of the

American coverage. The British newspapers used the label abuse in more than 70 percent of

their coverage. Humiliation was the second most often utilized label for the American

newspapers and the *Times* (London) while torture was the second most often utilized label by

the *Guardian*. Mistreatment and adjectives or adverbs referencing the sexual nature of events

---

[1] See, for example, Pew Research Center for the People and the Press Survey Reports at http://people-press.org/reports/print.php3?PageID=885

were the two other categories used most to describe the U.S. events.

When covering the U.K. events, the two American newspapers used the label abuse most often. However, the two British newspapers used the term abuse in less than half of their coverage and, more importantly, they used the term torture just as often. Interestingly, none of the other labels were utilized by the *Guardian* as often as abuse or torture. Only the *Times* applied the terms mistreatment and force in about 40 percent of their articles covering the U.K. events.

Overall, examination of labels used demonstrates that the newspapers applied the language that reflected the nature of difficulty in defining of the events and this bears further scrutiny. Though abuse was the preferred label for both administrations and the four newspapers utilized it quite extensively, they also utilized the range of labels which included the harshest designation of torture as well as the most lenient designation of humiliation. It appears that when covering the U.S. events the two American newspapers selected a more abstract and vague language that promoted a less severe evaluation of events. The British newspapers, however, utilized the harsher judgment of the events by utilizing the label torture more considerably. These results are important for furthering understanding of media-government relationship. When the use of labels was concurrent with the administration's points of view the findings do support the media indexing model that suggests that the media follow the lead of the political elites and represent only those opinions that have already been voiced in political arenas.[1] However, the use of strong labels like torture may also be an indicator of the media's tendency to dramatize events. Scholars noted that western media rely on conflict and sensationalism to generate circulation and ad sales. When compared to the

---

[1] Lance Bennett, Regina Lawrence, and Steven Livingston. "None Dare Call it Torture," *Journal of Communication* 56 no. 3 (2006): 468.

newspapers in other countries, the *Times*, for example, has been found to utilize such linguistic strategies and techniques as questioning, skepticism and negative evaluation or speculation to fulfill its commercial function.[1]

Whatever the reason for the choice of labels used in each of the newspapers, the results provide another venue to examine the role of language in social construction of reality. Given that the abuse revelations generated a lot of public discussion of what constitutes torture and government denials that the pictures portray torture acts, the U.S. media's preference for the label abuse and proliferation of other labels that minimize the severity of detainee abuse--such as humiliation or mistreatment--is troubling and demonstrates the media's inability to serve a watchdog function to its full potential.

In addition, the choice of labels signals another important aspect of human rights reporting. Human rights reporting as a specific genre of journalism is affected by vagueness of terminology associated with human rights issues in general. Rosenbulm noted: "the word 'torture' means little by itself without some qualification. Nearly every police force in the world occasionally resorts to psychological hazing and rough treatment that might be stretched to fit under the rubric of torture."[2] He continued:

> for readers, the constant use of such general words as "torture," "human rights abuses" and "arbitrary arrest" have a numbing effect. The best human rights reporting goes immediately to the specific. With graphic testimony and precise description of individual cases. A well-phrased account of the persecution of a single family can have more impact than a general reference to the killing of thousands with nothing to help a reader to form a mental image.[3]

This means that even when the newspapers choose to use harsher labels they are not necessarily constructing effective human rights reports. The importance of linguistic choices

---

[1] Lily Chen, "Evaluation in Media Texts," *Language in Society* 33 (2004): 670.
[2] Mort Rosenblum, *Coups and Earthquakes* (New York: Harper & Colophon Books, 1981), 198.
[3] Ibid.

should not overshadow the ultimate goal of human rights reporting which is to provoke action against the culprits of abuse. In order to do that the media have to provide context so readers can interpret the events and their causes.

Labels as well as diagnostic frames serve the functions of providing "problem definition" and "causal interpretation."[1] The results of this dissertation showed that the diagnostic frames were used in only a fraction of the news stories about American abuse and more importantly, both American newspapers avoided applying the diagnostic frame to the coverage of the British abuse. This is in itself an important observation as the omission of diagnostic frames from the coverage of the British events in the U.S. media may suggest the media's unwillingness to articulate a moral judgment about the behavior of the British soldiers. This once again might suggest that given a strong anti-war sentiment developing in the U.K., the omission of moral judgment can be symptomatic of the U.S. media avoiding escalation of the negative attitudes of the British population.

When the diagnostic frame was applied to the coverage, the two explanations that received most attention for the coverage of the U.S. events were interrogation policies and procedures and lack of structure and discipline as culprits for the abuse. The application of these two diagnostic frames corresponds with the systemic responsibility frame. This finding once again challenges the criticism of the media being too susceptible to the official interpretation of the events. However, this conclusion has to be made carefully keeping in mind that in general, there were very few articles utilizing diagnostic frames. This means that the overall coverage still avoided making judgments that are in opposition to the official version of the events. The diagnostic frame that received the most attention in the coverage

---

[1] Robert Entman, "Framing: Toward Clarification of a Fractured Paradigm," *Journal of Communication*, 43 (1993): 52.

of the U.K. events was attributing abuse to individual soldiers exhibiting dominance. This means that in the coverage of the U.K. events the newspapers were siding with the individual responsibility frame.

The seemingly opposite moral judgments of the American and British scandals present an interesting opportunity to once again contemplate on the importance of media-government relationships in different nations. Given the fact that the U.K. media were able to use much stronger language when labeling the events, the avoidance of diagnostic frames may be attributed to the nature of the events in question. As scholars have observed, framing mechanisms can change and develop over time and frames are dynamic mechanisms constantly negotiated and renegotiated by journalists, their sources, and audiences.[1] Perhaps as the prisoner abuse story developed with time, the media in the U.S. and U.K. were able to apply diagnostic frames that afforded stronger moral judgment and interpretation.

Framing the Nature of the Two Nations and Their Media

Generalizations offered by the four newspapers in order to either distance the two nations and their people from the abuse or hold them accountable for it present another opportunity to evaluate the media's independence from their respective political and cultural contexts. Evaluations and judgments presented by the newspapers' use of image and prognostic framing highlight differences in how the four newspapers evaluated the damage done to the futures of the two nations and their reputation in an international arena. They also allowed for examination of the newspapers' abilities to offer recommendations for solutions that would prevent the abuse from occurring again. One finding that emerged from this

---

[1] Baldwin Van Gorp, "The Constructionist Approach to Framing," *Journal of Communication* 57, no. 1 (2007): 64.

dissertation is that generalizations about moral standing of the nations and their people provided by the newspapers were dependant on their identification of the agency or assignment of responsibility to either individuals or the system.

When covering the U.S. abuses the two American newspapers used framing that allowed them to distance the nation and its people from the events in Iraq. However, when the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post* are compared, the former was found to emphasize the idea that abuse does not represent America or its people. This evaluation was indicative of assigning responsibility to individuals, which, obviously, was the preferred judgment offered by the administration. Though the *New York Times* acknowledged the seriousness of the abuse for the future standing of the nation, it failed to seriously question the dominant administration's view of a "few bad apples" and applauded the swift and tough action by the administration to investigate and punish those responsible. Thus, the treatment recommendation that was offered in the coverage was dictated by agreement that blame for the abuse should be assigned to individuals.

On the other hand, though the *Washington Post* devoted attention to the government's attempts to distance themselves and the American people from the abuse, the newspaper contemplated how the images of abuse, nudity, and humiliation speak to the character of the U.S. nation and its people and more importantly U.S. policies of dominance and disrespect for other cultures. The newspaper was particularly aware of the nudity representing the biggest taboo in Muslim cultures. Furthermore, the *Washington Post* acknowledged serious consequences of the abuse for the nation's future role in an international arena and focused on demanding government transparency and disclosure of all information relevant to the abuse investigations as well as examination of detention and interrogation policies that

emerged after 9/11. Generalizations that emerged in the *Washington Post's* coverage provided a stronger opportunity to question the administration's preference to explain abuse as the doing of a few individuals. Given the *Washington Post's* stronger emphasis for the systemic responsibility frame, the moral judgment and treatment recommendations that focused on the system once again support previous research that investigative framing leads to a more contextualized exploration of issues.[1]

The U.K. newspapers offered even stronger evaluation of what the abuse in Iraq represented about the U.S. and its culture. The *Guardian*, though offering a fragmented construction of generalizations, was more vocal in attributing abuse to America as a whole nation. The newspaper suggested that the abuse is symbolic of America's intentions and attitudes towards the Middle East. It evaluated abuse as indicative of Western immorality. However, the newspaper seemed to be ambivalent in its suggestion of what should be done to remedy the situation as it reverted to the individual responsibility frame when contemplating future actions.

The *Times* offered the harshest judgments about the abuse at Abu Ghraib. The paper was also the most critical of the Bush administration's attempts to minimize the abuse as the actions of only a few individuals. The *Times* more than the other newspapers relied on the rhetorical power of language and editorialized the coverage of government reactions. The newspaper ultimately dismissed them as not being genuine. The abuse was generalized as "the American way to handle other humans."[2] The U.S. post-9/11 policies and strategies

---

[1] Shanto Iyengar and Adam Simon, "News Coverage of the Gulf Crisis and Public Opinion," *Communication Research* 20, no. 3 (1993): 370.
[2] Roland Watson and Anthony Loyd, "Bush Orders Punishment for Soldiers Over Abuse," *Times*, May 4, 2004.

were called "collective punishment" of all Muslims for the actions of a few on 9/11.[1] Though

not articulated very clearly, the newspaper seemed to be pointing to the irony that the U.S.

retaliated against all Middle Easterners for the actions of a few but was asking the world not

to judge the U.S. for the actions of a few soldiers at Abu Ghraib. This supports previous

research that found the British media and the *Times* in particular had a tendency to

editorialize war coverage.[2]

Inevitably, all four newspapers provided coverage that signaled serious damage for

the U.S. reputation abroad. The papers speculated whether the abuse would bring more

animosity from people in predominantly Muslim nations. Additionally, they questioned

whether the U.S. would loose its reputation as the defender of universal human rights.

Contrary to the narratives about U.S. above, when the image frame was applied to the

U.K. events, the focus was the damage done to the coalition forces, particularly, the image of

the British army, and not the U.K. as a nation. On many occasions the newspapers used

vague "coalition forces" when reporting on the abuse by the British soldiers to minimize the

U.K. responsibility in the scandal. Even more often, the newspapers portrayed the British

abuse as less severe than that at Abu Ghraib to minimize the future consequences of the

abuse scandal on the nation. Since all four newspapers tended to assign responsibility to the

individual soldiers rather than the system any further judgment interpretation and treatment

recommendations revolved around distancing the army and the nation from the abuse and

punishing the responsible individuals.

One of the major differences in how the British abuse was evaluated by the four

---

[1] Anthony Loyd and Ben Hoyle, "Search for Adventure that Ended in Death," *Times*, May 12, 2004.
[2] Zengjun Peng, "Framing Antiwar Protests in the Global Village," *International Communication Gazette* 70 (2008): 375.

newspapers was dictated by the coverage of the fake photographs. The *Daily Mirror* photographs allowed both the newspapers and the British administration to question whether abuse had actually occurred. The fake photographs also allowed the newspapers to focus on the damage that episode had done to the image of the army. All four newspapers utilized this discourse. In fact, for the American newspapers claims that false accusations can be placing innocent soldiers at harm overtook the discourse of the seriousness of the real abuse and the need for responsibility and accountability for the abuse at all levels, beginning with the individual and ending with policies and procedures set by policy makers.

The two British newspapers came to stronger conclusions and generalizations about the U.K. and its army in the light of the abuse revelations. The *Guardian* devoted some attention to the abuse as proof of war as a failing strategy in Iraq. A significant part of this discourse was the discussion of U.K. plans to withdraw from Iraq. Thus, the abuse was used to reiterate the already existing public contempt for the U.K. involvement in Iraq. This confirms the findings of previous studies that identified the *Guardian* as the newspaper taking a strong anti-war stance. [1]

The *Times* was the only newspaper that offered substantial coverage of the actual abuse photographs. Further, the newspaper proceeded to contemplate the reasons why the administration was hiding revelations of abuse and called for more investigations and government accountability. The *Times* stood out from the other four newspapers in that it did not attempt to minimize the seriousness of the British abuse and actually questioned if the British were any better than Americans. The call to withdraw the U.K. army from Iraq was emphasized as the most appropriate action and response to the abuse. These findings are in

---

[1] Susan Hansen, "Superiority Complex," *Columbia Journalism Review* 46, no. 1 (May 2007): 26. See also Narasimhan Ravi, "Looking Beyond Flawed Journalism," *Press/Politics* 10, no. 1 (2005): 60.

agreement with previous studies that identified the *Times'* anti-war stance as well as the

newspaper's tendency to editorialize the news when compared to its American counterparts.[1]

Generalizations and conclusions were also made when the media turned to report

about themselves. In the midst of examining the morality of the soldiers' behavior the media

also contemplated the role of media in covering abuses. In a sense, the media engaged in a

sort of meta-communication where they examined how their counterparts around the world

dealt with the abuse and what their coverage indicated about their nations relationships with

the U.S. and U.K. Interestingly, the *New York Times* and the *Guardian* offered a very similar

meta-narrative when reporting how the media around the world treated the Abu Ghraib

photographs. Both newspapers contextualized how the choice to print the photographs and

relating commentary reflected the attitudes the media and their nations had towards America

and its policies. The newspapers noted that the media outlets which were against the war

utilized the photographs in a more judgmental manner. The *New York Times* in fact blatantly

concluded that the pictures were serving the "political agendas" of many media. The

Guardian echoed the same sentiment by evaluating the nature of the coverage in Arab

countries as ranging from "disciplined" anger to sensationalism. The *Washington Post*, on the

other hand, took a completely different approach at offering meta-communication about the

media's role in reporting about Abu Ghraib abuse and the only story that utilized the

reflexivity frame portrayed the absurdity of how the media tend to sensationalize news

coverage and compete for non-stories which was the case of the media interviewing Darby's

relatives who had little to say about what actually happened in Iraq. The *Times* stood out in

---

[1] Craig Murray et al., "Reporting Dissent in Wartime," *European Journal of Communication* 23, no. 1 (March 2008): 16; Zengjun Peng, "Framing Antiwar Protests in the Global Village," *International Communication Gazette* 70 (2008): 374.

its construction of the meta-communication frame by focusing on examining the media's role

in bringing the abuse to light. It gave prominence to reporting about the leaked documents

obtained both by the *New Yorker* and the *Wall Street Journal* and the media's competition

amongst themselves to be the first to report on the story as the key parts of the Abu Ghraib

jigsaw puzzle.

These findings contribute to the growing field of scholarship examining media's

tendency to "mediatize" war coverage or the media's tendency to examine their own efforts

and efforts of other journalists in covering war.[1] It signals the change in how modern warfare

is being conducted and confirms the notion that the war in Iraq represents a true media war.

Having learned from the history of previous war coverage, military and political strategists

developed a good understanding of media practices and used them to their advantage by

embedding journalists with coalition forces and controlling the media's access to

information.[2] At the same time, new technologies and alternative views provided by

alternative media outlets, as well as newly established Arab TV networks like Al-Jazeera and

Al-Arabia, provided a greater variety of information and perspectives available to journalists

and their publics. As a result, the media covering war in Iraq developed a kind of self-

awareness that was not seen in the coverage of previous wars.[3] It is understandable that this

awareness led to the newspapers' examining the role of other media in reporting abuse in

Iraq. What is noteworthy in the findings of this dissertation is that there were significant

differences in how the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post* approached their

examination of the media's role in disclosing abuse at Abu Ghraib. The *New York Times* took

---

[1] Howard Tumber and Jerry Palmer, *Media at War* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2004), 7.
[2] Ibid., 16.
[3] Frank Esser, "'Metacoverage' of Mediated Wars," Paper presented at the International Communication Association, New York, NY, 2005, 5.

a defensive stance and blamed the media around the world for politicizing the coverage whereas the *Washington Post* avoided making these kinds of judgments. The *Times*, rather than the *Guardian,* took the opportunity to utilize the media self-reflexivity frame to explore the importance of human rights reporting.

When covering the U.K. events the four newspapers used self-reflection very differently than they did for the U.S. events because of the fake photograph discourse. The two American newspapers used the media reflexivity frame to criticize the *Daily Mirror's* rash decision to publish the fake photographs and reiterated how the other newspapers in the U.K. dealt with the revelations about the abuse photos being fakes. The two British newspapers were very similar to their American counterparts and framed their coverage by focusing more on the *Daily Mirror's* editor Piers Morgan bullish approach to producing news in general. Ironically, the newspapers did not notice their own hypocrisy. They criticized the *Daily Mirror* for publishing the fake photographs but did not see anything wrong with the fact that the media ignored the authentic photos of the British abuse. Only the *Times* had some coverage of the authentic photos of British abuse.

Furthermore, it is important to note that one of the key aspects of the reflexivity frame was built on highlighting fact checking as the major journalistic professional requisite. The newspapers called for Morgan to apologize for misleading the public and more importantly for placing soldiers in danger. The British newspapers also focused on news as a commodity by reporting on the money that was paid to the soldiers supplying the photos, later on the money that the *Daily Mirror* earned for selling the photos to the other media, and finally by reporting on the money the newspaper lost when its shares dropped because of the scandal. Thus, it appears that the newspapers used the reflexivity frame to place the fake photograph

discourse into the media market context, not necessarily questioning such topics as media freedom, accountability, sourcing, media routines, investigative journalism, or other possible issues relevant for the journalism profession. The focus on the photographs as commodities and the discussion of monetary damage for the shareholders signal the media's concern with profits rather than any other journalism functions. These findings add to the literature examining the realities of market driven journalism. They highlight that commercial pressures are driving the media's coverage of war which leads to diminishing attention to investigative journalism and emphasis on sensationalism and entertainment.[1]

---

[1] For general discussion on economic influences on media see Nicholas Garnham, *Capitalism and Communication* (London: Sage, 1992).

CONCLUSIONS

This dissertation compared how U.S. and U.K. media covered seemingly similar abuses perpetrated by American and British soldiers. The findings of this study shed light on the difficulties of reporting on war as a specific media genre and more importantly identified human rights reporting as a challenge that tests the media's ability to be autonomous from their governments. Even though the study examined the media coverage that occurred in 2004, the topic is still relevant for the U.S. and Great Britain's future goals and activities in the Middle East.[1] In March 2011, Germany's *Der Spiegel* magazine published more photographs of abuse and murder at the hands of U.S. soldiers in Afghanistan that allegedly took place in 2010. This suggests that publicity created by the Abu Ghraib coverage did not result in preventing additional abuse of innocent civilians at the hands of coalition forces. Thus, the media must continue to strengthen their ability to uncover and report on the misuse of power, and communication scholars bear responsibility for scrutinizing media coverage to better understand the intricate relationship between the media, their political and cultural contexts, and their ability to promote peace.

The study utilized the constructionist approach to framing which allowed for an in-depth reading of media coverage. It examined news framing not as an unproblematic media process of constructing the news, but rather as a way of exploring how media create the meanings which, if unquestioned, become commonly accepted interpretations of reality. This dissertation suggests that the media are not passive but active players in the complex process

---

[1] Paul Bartone, "Preventing Prisoner Abuse: Leadership Lessons of Abu Ghraib," *Ethics & Behavior* 20, no. 2 (March 2010): 161.

of political communication, and they are capable of constricting, manipulating, or simply forming readers' attitudes, values, and knowledge.

This dissertation furthered the study of framing from both theoretical and methodological perspectives. The study answered Entman's call for utilizing framing as a research paradigm that is built on explicit and common understanding of frames and examined how the four functions of framing--definition, diagnosis, evaluation, and prescription--manifest in the media coverage of detainee abuse in Iraq. Taking a comparative approach, the study examined how these functions are performed by different media organizations and more specifically, how various framing devices were used to select and highlight certain aspects of "perceived reality" in order to build arguments about "problems, their causation, evaluation, and/or solution."[1] The study found that all four functions of framing were fulfilled by the newspapers examined in the study. Therefore, the study confirmed the usefulness of examining the power of text by identifying the core functions of framing and measuring how selection and salience of certain aspects of reality result in the presence of frames in the text. The nine frames that were found to be utilized by the newspapers selected for analysis--events, investigations, individual responsibility, systemic responsibility, human interest, diagnostic, prognostic, image, and media reflexivity-- constitute the list of frames that could be utilized to examine the coverage of a multitude of events and issues. Thereby, this dissertation argues that these frames provide the theoretical framework to further examine the role of news media in political communication in global and local contexts.

---

[1] Robert Entman, "Framing: Toward Clarification of a Fractured Paradigm," *Journal of Communication*, 43 (1993): 53.

This dissertation also confirmed the utility of the framing approach for the study of news in different national contexts. Mass media scholars have been criticized for trying to impose U.S. concepts and theories onto media systems in different countries. Many theories of mass communication have been found invalid when applied to different cultural contexts.[1] Framing, however, offers flexibility in research design that would be relevant for the cultural context without sacrificing its theoretical rigor. The framing approach embeds comparison as a necessity. The underlying assumption behind the framing theory is that it is possible to tell many stories about the same events. Comparing how the same facts are used in different newspapers allows for a fruitful exploration of how manifest properties of media texts correspond to context-laden presuppositions or implicit cultural meanings. Thus, framing offers not only the opportunity to examine how the same events are reported by different newspapers, it facilitates theoretical development of alternative views of media professionalism, enhances understanding of the relationship between the media and a country's political elites, and illuminates diverse notions of newsworthiness.

Moreover, framing is concerned with not only how the media present facts but also examines how implicit cultural norms manifest in news texts. Thus, this dissertation calls attention to the notion that events and their cultural and political contexts dictate different ways that frames can be embedded within the coverage and make themselves manifest in news stories. In other words, the study highlighted the importance of culture as a "primary base to constitute knowledge, meaning and comprehension of the world outside."[2] As such, culture supplies a stock of frames that enable both journalists and audiences to make sense of their

[1] Sonia Livingstone, "On the Challenges of Cross-National Comparative Media Research," *European Journal of Communication* 18, no. 4 (2003): 482.
[2] Baldwin Van Gorp, "The Constructionist Approach to Framing," *Journal of Communication* 57, no. 1 (2007): 61.

environments. Journalists utilize culturally familiar language and images in order to evoke reactions from their audiences. When frames resonate with dominant notions of the political elite, they become power mechanisms that are difficult to challenge. Thus, it becomes imperative for journalists to be aware of the power of dominant frames so that they do not just provide criticism of the dominant frames but offer counterframing in such a way as it offers "alternative narrative, a tale of problem, cause, remedy, and moral judgment possessing as much magnitude and resonance as the administration's."[1] The media's ability to produce such counterframing is one of the measures of their independence.

However, when covering war the media face enormous challenges in producing these counterframes. By using a comparative approach to the study of news, this dissertation illuminated the complex media-government relationships during the time of war. The differences in how the U.S. and U.K. media approached the coverage of Iraqi abuse reflect how the papers are influenced not only by their own journalistic profiles and traditions but also by their political, economic, geographic, and cultural contexts. More than any other type of international news, war coverage requires the media to negotiate different interpretations of social reality shaped by events themselves and by the context surrounding them. This dissertation showcased how different political processes and existence or lack of official investigations influenced the media's ability to cover human rights abuses carried out by troops.

Therefore, this dissertation also contributed to furthering an understanding of human rights reporting as a separate journalistic genre. Human rights abuses can be difficult for both

---

[1] Robert Entman, "Cascading Activation," *Political Communication*, 20 (2003): 418.

journalists to uncover and audiences to follow.[1] The existence of the fake photographs in the

Daily Mirror served as a cautionary tale that abuses, even when depicted in photos, may not

be true. The fake photographs served as a reminder that the media have to follow their

professional standards and check their sources before publishing such dramatic events as

abuse. At the same time, the study also demonstrated that following journalistic routines

impedes the media's ability to serve their watchdog function. Specifically, the study

demonstrated how the media's preference for episodic reporting got in the way of their

ability to cover war as a multilayered phenomenon. The media had difficulty in placing abuse

in the larger context of war and calling attention to how the war in general was responsible

for setting up conditions for humanity to fail and show its worst attributes. Although the four

newspapers were critical of the American and British administrations' role in abuse, and

some coverage reported it as a systemic issue especially when covering the U.S. incidents,

they did not use the abuse to call attention to military solutions as something that should be

undesirable and avoided.

In addition, analysis of how the four newspapers covered the abuse of Iraqis by

coalition forces suggests that even though the media played an important role in bringing the

abuse in Iraq to light, they were deficient in their ability to cover the consequences of war,

especially when the troops were found to be responsible for harming innocent people.

Generally, this study found that when covering detainee abuse in Iraq the newspapers fell

back on the old tradition of the "support for troops" rationale which manifested in

dichotomous "them versus us" coverage. When done right, human rights reporting can be a

powerful genre of reporting, one capable of overcoming the ethnocentric views held by

---

[1] Mort Rosenblum, *Who Stole the News?* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1993), 200.

audiences, media practitioners, and politicians alike. However, journalistic routines and

traditions may have led the media to dehumanize Iraqi victims and therefore, fail to cover

abuse in such a way as to evoke empathy for those who suffered. It is understandable that

journalists in the U.S. and the U.K. might have had easier access to American and British

newsmakers; thus, there was more coverage of coalition members as opposed to Iraqis.

Nevertheless, the newspapers clearly had access to Iraqis who were abused, and many of

them spoke in their own voice, giving account of their torture experience. However, this

dissertation demonstrates that there was a clear tendency by the newspapers, especially, when

covering the Abu Ghraib abuse, to frame information in such as way as to discredit Iraqis and

distance readers from their experience by depersonalizing and dehumanizing Iraqis as well as

portraying them as an anonymous and angry group.

One of the key findings of this dissertation confirmed that official sources played a

big role in how the media framed the news. Official views and reactions were given

prominence in the coverage of abuse by both American and British soldiers in all four

newspapers. Interestingly, official sources or government investigations were also used to

build coverage arguing that systemic failures were responsible for the abuse. To some extent,

this dissertation supported the media indexing theory that suggests that the press challenged

official U.S. administration's versions of foreign policy issues only when opposing views

emerged among elite U.S. politicians.[1] If not for the existence of the investigative reports by

Taguba, Jones, Fay, and Helmly much of the coverage would not have been possible.

Moreover, it was the leaking of those documents as well as the Abu Ghraib photographs that

---

[1] Lance Bennett, "Toward a Theory of Press-State Relations," *Journal of Communication* 40, no. 2 (1990): 103–125.

led to widespread coverage of Iraqi detainee abuse. The leaked documents prepared by the

U.S. military and other reports by human rights organizations provided the newspapers with

information that allowed them to question the official version of the events. Thus, the study

once again reminded us that the media coverage is dependent upon access to information,

and it was not until the official reports by Taguba were leaked to the media that the coverage

of the Abu Ghraib abuse emerged. In addition, lack of government investigations of the

British abuse resulted in fragmented coverage of that abuse which largely supported the

British administration's point of view that abuse was perpetrated by a few bad individuals.

However, given the fact that it was the leaking of the documents that prompted the

widespread coverage of abuse revelations, this dissertation argues that the indexing model is

insufficient in explaining the complex and multifaceted relationship among the elites, the

media, and their publics. The coverage of the abuse of Iraqi detainees gives support to the

cascade activation model that considers a variety of players responsible for the emergence of

the counterframing of dominant views. The cascade activation model sees the media

coverage of issues and events as framing contests in which multiple levels of the system

participate: the administration, the other elites, news organizations, the texts they produce,

and the public.[1] The relationship amongst these players is non-linear and could be

fragmented. The cascade model also argues that information feeds back from the public to

officials which may influence their actions. Essentially, framing is about social interaction

among the media, their sources, and all other newsmakers relevant for a particular issue or

event.[2] The cascading model cautions that not all dissent among political elites will gain

---

[1] Robert Entman, "Cascading Activation," *Political Communication*, 20 (2003): 421.
[2] Baldwin Van Gorp, "The Constructionist Approach to Framing," *Journal of Communication* 57, no. 1 (2007): 64.

attention in the media. In addition, the cascade activation model takes into consideration that the media can be capable of both triggering and suppressing dissent among elites.[1] The difference in how the American and the British abuse were covered provides support for the cascading activation model rather than a more linear indexing model. Specifically, the fact that CBS delayed reporting on Abu Ghraib at the request of the U.S. military until the *New Yorker* was about to break the scandal shows that the media take into consideration a multitude of factors before deciding when and how to report on human rights abuse. At the same time, the British case shows that the media were quite capable of suppressing dissent from the elites by focusing on the fake photographs or even avoiding covering the British abuse.

Overall, this dissertation calls for a closer examination of the interaction among the media, political elites, and other newsmakers. It calls attention to the distinction between framing by the media and framing through the media.[2] The former implies that journalists have the upper hand in how to represent events to the public; the latter implies that the media are simply the purveyors of frames constructed by their sources and other political actors. Further studies should examine under which conditions the media are capable of being independent from their sources in conveying information to their publics.

As this dissertation demonstrates, gaining an understanding of the media's role in war-related coverage demands further attention from communication scholars. Modern warfare places the media themselves at the center of attention, as they can be used as instruments of war. However, the media are expected to contribute to peacemaking by simply

---

[1] Robert Entman, "Cascading Activation," *Political Communication*, 20 (2003): 421.
[2] Baldwin Van Gorp, "The Constructionist Approach to Framing," *Journal of Communication* 57, no. 1 (2007): 69.

covering war as a newsworthy event. The 1978 UNESCO Declaration charged the media

with the responsibility of strengthening peace and promotion of human rights by answering

the demand for "a free flow and a wider and better balanced dissemination of information."[1]

This declaration also envisioned that information should reflect the different aspects of the

subject matter. However, balanced reporting as well as representation of different aspects of

war pose challenges to the media in the context of the war against terrorism. One of the

solutions is proposed by the proponents of peace journalism who criticize the media's

fascination with violence and negativity at the expense of constructive and long-term

solutions needed to promote peace, resolution, and reconciliation.[2] Future research is needed

to examine how different political and media environments can contribute to the media

assuming a more constructive role in the peace process. This is an enormous task but

necessary for the further survival of humanity.

<div align="center">Limitations</div>

As noted in the method section, the study has limitations. The most important

limitations are reiterated here followed by suggestions for future research. The four

newspapers selected for analysis should not be considered as representative of all media in

their respective countries. Comparative studies frequently select one media organization or

another thereby inferring from the results to the country. Because of the methodological

constraints many comparative media research studies are subject to this limitation. This study

is no exception. Even if great care is taken not to generalize, nonetheless, an inference is

---

[1] *UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation, Declaration on Fundamental Principles Concerning the Contribution of the Mass Media to Strengthening Peace and International Understanding, to the Promotion of Human Rights and to Countering Racialism, Apartheid and Incitement to War*, 28 November 1978 http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/docid/3ae6b36f17.html (accessed 5 May 2011).
[2] Simon Cottle, *Mediatized Conflict* (Berkshire, UK: Open University Press, 2006), 103.

there. Therefore it is important to remember that any conclusions arrived at in this dissertation apply to the coverage found in the four papers during the 16 days covered by the sample.

In addition, the dissertation examined coverage in print media only, and it is impossible to say whether similar findings might apply to broadcast or online journalism. Moreover, the study's focus on textual analysis leaves open the possibility of research that examines the images themselves and, more importantly, the intricate relationship between the texts and their accompanying images. Previous research suggested that images might serve functions that range from expressing little relation with the text, to expressing close relation with the text, to serving functions that go beyond the meanings embedded in texts.[1] Still photographs of the Vietnam War have been noted to have long lasting effects on collective memory but the new digital media technologies and their pervasiveness in our everyday media practices require further exploration.[2] New digital media technologies changed the way news is produced, disseminated and consumed. Written texts are inevitably affected by visual modes of communication, and they require new kinds of skills from journalists and a different kind of engagement with the information from audiences.[3] Even though some research suggests that Abu Ghraib narratives rather than photos had stronger impact on audiences' reaction to abuse,[4] further studies are needed to examine multimodal nature of news production and consumption.

---

[1] Emily Marsh and Marilyn White, "A Taxonomy of Relationships Between Images and Text," *Journal of Documentation* 59, no. 6 (2003): 653; see also Ann Dally and Len Unsworth, "Analysis and Comprehension of Multimodal Texts," *Australian Journal of Language and Literacy* 34, no. 1 (2011): 62.

[2] Andrew Hoskins and Ben O'Loughlin, *War and Media* (Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 2010), 27.

[3] Gunther Kress, *Multimodality: Exploring Contemporary Methods of Communication* (London: Routledge, 2010), 172.

[4] John Fulwider, Kelly Greenhill, and David Weaver, "The Power of Pictures?" Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, IL, April 12-15, 2007.

The limited time period selected for analysis also presents a challenge particularly in the light of the fact that the British court-martial did not begin until January of 2005, and military investigation results were not completed until 2008. Lack of government and military investigations on the British side affected journalists' ability to report on the British abuse. Nevertheless, the time period immediately after the Abu Ghraib story broke was an important test of the media's independence and the media's ability to react to the human rights violations.

The constructionist approach also determined the in-depth manner of the presentation of the study results. The qualitative nature of the interpretivist research dictated the need to produce detailed descriptions of media texts. It also necessitated a selection of a shorter period of time chosen for analysis. Future studies should consider developing methods that would produce more succinct deconstruction of the media texts and, thus, would lend themselves better for longitudinal studies. As Reese notes, it is important to be able to associate certain text attributes with a particular frame and to evaluate how the attributes are organized in order to see the "larger tale than the manifest story."[1] This dissertation certainly attempted to look beyond how one frame is constructed in a particular story and examined how certain frames emerged and were built during the period selected for analysis by each of the four newspapers. Future studies are needed to evaluate if and how the frame characteristics discovered in this study were changing, how they were negotiated, and how they were impacted by further developments of events in Iraq.

Finally, the study was designed to explore word usage or discover the range of meanings that a word can have in everyday use. This research was not designed to verify if

---

[1] Stephen Reese, "The Framing Project," *Journal of Communication* 57 (2007): 151.

authors of the articles used these linguistic devices to portray the meanings that were highlighted in the study. Alternatively, such research would require checking if the sender of the message intended the meanings that were deconstructed.

Taken together, these limitations also suggest that there is a need for further studies to examine the interplay between media routines, their economic, political and cultural contexts, and their ability to cover such difficult topics as war and human rights abuses.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aitken, Robert. "The Aitken Report. An Investigation into Cases of Deliberate Abuse and Unlawful Killing in Iraq in 2003 and 2004." Cageprisoners Ltd., January, 2008. www.cageprisoners.com/download.php?download=686 (accessed April, 11, 2008).

Altheide, David L. "Media Hegemony: A Failure of Perspective." *Pubic Opinion Quarterly* 48, no. 2 (1984): 476-490.

Andén-Papadopoulos, Kari. "The Abu Ghraib Torture Photographs: News Frames, Visual Culture, and the Power of Images." *Journalism* 9, no. 1 (February 2008): 5-30.

Amnesty International. *Report on Torture*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1975.

Amnesty International. *Combating Torture: A Manual for Action*. London: Amnesty International Publications, 2003.

Amnesty International. "Iraq: Beyond Abu Ghraib: Detention and Torture in Iraq." *Amnesty International Report.* March 6, 2006, Index Number: MDE 14 /001/2006. http://www.amnesty.org/en/library/info/MDE14/001/2006/en (accessed August 15, 2010).

Amnesty International. "Iraq: One Year on the Human Rights Situation Remains Dire." *Amnesty International Report*. March 18, 2004, Index Number: MDE 14/006/2004. http://www.amnesty.org/en/library/info/MDE14/006/2004 (accessed August 15, 2010).

Associated Press. "Israel Patriot." *AP Archive*. March 30, 2003. http://www.aparchive.com/ (accessed May 13, 2010).

Apel, Dora. "Torture Culture: Lynching Photographs and the Images of Abu Ghraib." *Art Journal* 64, no. 2 (Summer 2005): 88-100.

Apodaca, Clair. "The Whole World Could Be Watching: Human Rights and the Media." *Journal of Human Rights* 6, no. 2 (April 2007): 147-164.

Auerbach, Yehudith, and Yaeli Bloch-Elkon. "Media Framing and Foreign Policy: The Elite Press vis-à-vis U.S. Policy in Bosnia, 1992-95." *Journal of Peace Research* 42, no. 1 (2005): 83-99.

Baker, Russ. "Comparing American and British War Coverage." *The Nation*. April 28, 2003. http://www.thenation.com/doc/20030428/baker (accessed September 9, 2007).

Bartone, Paul T. "Preventing Prisoner Abuse: Leadership Lessons of Abu Ghraib." *Ethics & Behavior* 20, no. 2 (March 2010): 161-173.

Beelman, Maud S. "The Dangers of Disinformation in the War on Terror." *Nieman Reports*

55, no. 4 (2001): 16-18.

Bennett, Lance W. "Toward a Theory of Press-State Relations." *Journal of Communication* 40, no. 2 (1990): 103–125.

Bennett, Lance, W. "Operation Perfect Storm." *Political Communication Report* 13, no. 3 (Fall 2003), under "Roundtable: Perspectives on Gulf II -- Retaken by Storm," http://www.ou.edu/policom/1303_2003_fall/index.htm (accessed September 9, 2007).

Bennett, Lance W. *News: The Politics of Illusion.* 6th ed. New York: Longman, 2004.

Bennett, Lance W, Regina G. Lawrence, and Steven Livingston. "None Dare Call it Torture: Indexing and the Limits of Press Independence in the Abu Ghraib Scandal." *Journal of Communication* 56 no. 3 (2006): 467-485.

Bennett, Lance W., Regina G. Lawrence, and Steven Livingston. *When the Press Fails: Political Power and the News Media from Iraq to Katrina*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007.

Berger, Peter, and Thomas Luckman. *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1966.

Berelson, Bernard. *Content Analysis in Communication Research*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press, 1952.

Bogert, Carroll. "Similar Paths, Different Missions: International Journalists and Human Rights Observers." *Nieman Reports*, 64, no. 3. (2010): 59-61.

Boyd-Barrett, Oliver. "Judith Miller, The New York Times, and the Propaganda Model." *Journalism Studies* 5, no. 4 (November 2004): 435-449.

Boyd-Barrett, Oliver. "Understanding the Second Casualty." In *Reporting War: Journalism in Wartime*, edited by Stuart Allan and Barbie Zelizer, 25-42. New York: Routledge, 2004.

Brossard, Dominique, James Shanahan, and Katherine McComas. "Are Issue-Cycles Culturally Constructed? A Comparison of French and American Coverage of Global Climate Change." *Mass Communication and Society* 7, no. 3 (2004): 359–77.

Brown, Anthony C. *Bodyguard of Lies: The Extraordinary True Story Behind D-Day*. Guilford, CT, HarperCollins Publishers, 2002.

Bybee, Jay. "Memo from Jay Bybee to Alberto Gonzales. Status of Taliban Forces under Article 4 of the Third Geneva Convention of 1949." Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legal Counsel, February 22, 2002. http://www.torturingdemocracy.org/documents (accessed September 9, 2007).

Cassara, Catherine. "U.S. Newspaper Coverage of Human Rights in Latin America, 1975-1982: Exploring President Carter's Agenda-Building Influence." *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly* 75, no. 3 (1998): 478-486.

Chang, Tsan-Kuo, Pamela J. Shoemaker, and Nancy Brendlinger. "Determinants of International News Coverage in the U.S. Media." *Communication Research* 14, no. 4 (1987): 396-415.

Chen, Lily. "Evaluation in Media Texts: A Cross-cultural Linguistic Investigation." *Language in Society* 33 (2004): 673-702.

Citizens for Global Solutions, "The Guantanamo Bay Detention Center" under "Issues" http://www.globalsolutions.org/guantanamo (accessed July 27, 2009).

Conboy, Martin. *Journalism: A Critical History.* London: Sage, 2004.

Combs, Barbara, and Paul Slovic. "Causes of Death: Biased Newspaper Coverage and Biased Judgments." *Journalism Quarterly* 56 (1979): 837-843.

Cook, Thimothy. "The Media as the Fourth Branch of Government," In *Governance IV: Problems, Process, and Interaction*. Edited by Kenneth W. Thompson, 105-127. New York: University Press of America, 1993.

Cookman, Claude. "An American Atrocity: The My Lai Massacre Concretized in a Victim's Face." *Journal of American History* 94 no. 1 (2007): 154-162.

Costigliola, Frank. "'Like Animals or Worse:' Narratives of Culture and Emotion by U.S. and British POWs and Airmen Behind Soviet Lines, 1944–1945." *Diplomatic History* 28, no. 5 (November 2004): 749-780.

Cottle, Simon. *Mediatized Conflict: Developments in Media and Conflict Studies.* Berkshire, UK: Open University Press, 2006

Croteau, David, and William Hoynes. *The Business of Media: Corporate Media and the Public Interest.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press, 2006.

Dally, Ann and Len Unsworth. "Analysis and Comprehension of Multimodal Texts." *Australian Journal of Language and Literacy* 34, no. 1 (2011): 61-80.

Danner, Mark. *Torture and Truth: America, Abu Ghraib, and the War on Terror.* New York: New York Review Books, 2004.

Dardis, Frank E. "Military Accord, Media Discord: A Cross-National Comparison of UK and US Press Coverage of Iraq War Protest." *The International Communication Gazette*, 68, no. 5-6 (2006): 409-426.

D'Angelo, Paul. "News Framing as a Multiparadigmatic Research Program: A Response to Entman." *Journal of Communication* 52, no. 4 (2002): 870-889.

De Bens, Els, Laurence Hauttekeete, and Heidi Lagast. "Disinformation in Coverage of the Kosovo War in the Flemish Daily Press. *Journalism Studies* 3, no. 2 (2002): 241-256.

Dimitrova, Daniela V., and Jesper Stromback. "Mission Accomplished: Framing of the Iraq War in the Elite Newspapers in Sweden and the United States." *Gazette* 67, no. 5 (2005): 399-417.

Downing, John D. H. *Internationalizing Media Theory: Transition, Power, Culture.* London, Sage, 1996.

Edwards, David and David Cromwell. *Guardians of Power: The Myth of the Liberal Media.* London, UK: Pluto Press, 2006..

Eilders, Christiane, and Albrecht Luter. "Research Note: Germany at War: Competing Framing Strategies in German Public Discourse." *European Journal of Communication* 15, no. 3 (2000): 415-428.

Eisenman, Stephen. E. *The Abu Ghraib Effect*. London, UK: Reakton Books, 2007.

English, Kathryn, and Adam Stapleton. *The Human Rights Handbook: A Practical Guide To Monitoring Human Rights*. Wivenhoe Park, Colchester: Human Rights Centre, University of Essex, 1995.

Entman, Robert, "Framing U.S. Coverage of International News: Contrasts in Narratives of the KAL and Iran Air Incidents." *Journal of Communication* 41, no. 4 (1991): 6-27.

Entman, Robert, "Framing: Toward Clarification of a Fractured Paradigm." *Journal of Communication*, 43 (1993): 51–58.

Entman, Robert. "Cascading Activation: Contesting the White House's Frame after 9/11." *Political Communication*, 20 (2003): 415-432.

Entman, Robert. *Projections of Power: Framing News, Public Opinion and U.S. Foreign Policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004.

Ernst, Josef. "The Structure of Political Communication in the United Kingdom, the United States, and the Federal Republic of Germany: A Comparative Media study of Economist, Times, and Der Spiegel." Vol. 116 of *European University Studies. Series XXXI. Political Science.* Frankfurt: Peter Lang Publishing, 1998.

Esser, Frank. "'Metacoverage' of Mediated Wars: Framing the News Media and Military News Management in the Gulf War Coverage of 1991 and 2003." Paper presented at the International Communication Association, New York, NY, 2005, 1-35.

Jones, Anthony R. and George R. Fay. Investigation of Intelligence Activities at Abu Ghraib. Department of Defense, Washington DC, August 23, 2004. *FindLaw.com* http://news.findlaw.com/hdocs/docs/dod/fay82504rpt.pdf (accessed June 29, 2010).

Fulwider, John, Kelly Greenhill, and David Weaver. "The Power of Pictures? Preliminary Evidence from the Case of Abu Ghraib." Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, IL, April 12-15, 2007.

Gamson, William A. "News as Framing." *American Behavioral Scientist* 33, no. 2 (1989): 157-161.

Gamson, William A., and Andre Modigliani. "Media Discourse and Public Opinion on Nuclear Power: A Constructionist Approach." *American Journal of Sociology* 95, no. 1 (1989): 1-37.

Garnham, Nicholas. *Capitalism and Communication: Global Culture and the Economics of Information*. London: Sage, 1992.

Gazzini, Tarcisio. "NATO Coercive Military Activities in the Yugoslav Crisis (1992-1999)." *EJIL* 12, no. 3 (2001): 391-435.

Gitlin, Todd. *The Whole World is Watching: Mass Media in the Making and in Making of the New Left*. Berkley, CA: University of California Press, 1980.

Goffman, Erving. *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience.* New York: Harper and Row, 1974.

Golding, Peter, and Graham Murdock. eds. *The Political Economy of the Media*. Edward Elgar Ltd: Chettenham, 1997.

Gourevitch, Philip, and Errol Morris. *Standard Operating Procedure*. New York, Penguin Group, Inc., 2008.

Graber, Doris A. *Processing the News: How People Tame the Information Tide*. New York: Longman, 1984.

Greenberg, Karen J., ed. *The Torture Debate in America*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Greenberg, Karen J., and Joshua L. Dratel, eds. *The Torture Papers: The Road to Abu Ghraib*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Greer, Edward. "'We don't Torture People in America.' Coercive Interrogation in the Global Village." *New Political Science* 26, no. 3 (2004): 371-387.

Gudykunst, William B., and Stella Ting-Toomey. "Communication in Personal Relationships

Across Cultures: An Introduction." In *Communication in Personal Relationships Across Cultures*, edited by William. B. Gudykunst, Stella Ting-Toomey, and Tsukasa Nishida, 3-18. Thousand Oaks, London: Sage, 1996.

Glasgow University Media Group. *War and Peace News.* Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press, 1985.

Global Policy Forum. "Detention and Prisons." Chapter 4 in Report: War and Occupation. Global Policy Forum, 2007.
http://www.globalpolicy.org/security/issues/iraq/occupation/report/detention.htm (accessed October 11, 2008).

Hackett, Robert A. "Decline of a Paradigm? Bias and Objectivity in News Media Studies." *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 1, no. 3 (1984): 229-259.

Hackett, Robert A., and Yuezhi Zhao. "Challenging a Master Narrative: Peace Protests and Opinion/Editorial Discourse in the US Press During the Gulf War." *Discourse & Society* 5, no. 4 (October 1994): 509-541.

Hall, Stuart. "Encoding/Decoding." In *Culture, Media, Language: Working Papers in Cultural Studies*, 1972-79, edited by Stuart Hall, Dorothy Hobson and Andy Lowe, 128-138. London: Hutchinson, 1980.

Hallin, Daniel C. "The Media, the War in Vietnam, and Political Support: A Critique of the Thesis of an Oppositional Media." In *We Keep America on Top of the World: Television Journalism and the Public Sphere*, edited by Daniel Hallin, 40-57. London: Routledge, 1994.

Hallin, Daniel C., and Paolo Mancini. *Comparing Media Systems: Three Models of Media and Politics.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Hansen, Susan. "Superiority Complex: Why the Brits Think they're Better." *Columbia Journalism Review* 46, no. 1 (May 2007): 26-27.

Hanson, Christopher. "The Power of the Story: Narrative Analysis as a Tool for Studying the News." Paper presented at the annual meeting of Association for Educators in Journalism and Mass Communication, New Orleans, Louisiana, August, 1999.

Hedges, James, and Marouf Hasian Jr. "Campaign Posturing, Military Decision Making, and Administrative Amnesias*." Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 8, no. 4 (2005): 694-698.

Herman, Edward S., and Noam Chomsky. *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media.* New York: Pantheon Books, 1988.

Hersh, Seymour M. "Torture at Abu Ghraib: American Soldiers Brutalized Iraqis. How Far up Does the Responsibility Go?" *New Yorker*. April 30, 2004.

Hersh, Seymour M. "Chain of Command. How the Department of Defense Mishandled the Disaster at Abu Ghraib Gray Zone." *New Yorker*, May 17, 2004.

Hersh, Seymour M. "The Gray Zone. How a Secret Pentagon Program Came to Abu Ghraib." *New Yorker*, May 24, 2004.

Hersh, Seymour M. *Chain of Command: The Road from 9/11 to Abu Ghraib*. New York, Harper Collins, 2004.

Hertog, James K., and Douglas M. McLeod. "Anarchists Wreak Havoc in Downtown Minneapolis: A Multi-Level Study of Media Coverage of Radical Protest." *Journalism & Mass Communication Monographs* 151 (1995): 1-48.

Hertog, James K., and Douglas M. McLeod. "A Multiperspectival Approach to Framing Analysis: A Field Guide." In *Framing Public Life*, edited by Stephan D. Reese, Oscar. H. Gandy, Jr., and August. E. Grantm 139-163. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers, 2001.

Holsti, Ole. R. *Content Analysis for the Social Sciences and Humanities*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1969.

Hoskins, Andrew and Ben O'Loughlin. *War and Media: The Emergence of Diffused War.* Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 2010.

Hsieh, Hsiu-Fang, and Sarah E. Shannon. "Three Approaches to Qualitative Content Analysis." *Qualitative Health Research* 15, no. 4 (2005): 1277-1288.

Icon Group International, *Censors: Webster's Quotations, Facts and Phrases*. Icon Group International, Inc., 2008.

Independent Panel. "Independent Panel Delivers Detention Operations Report." DoD News Reports, 2004. http://www.defenselink.mil/releases/2004/nr20040824-1160.html (accessed October, 18, 2008).

International Committee of the Red Cross. Report of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) on the Treatment by the Coalition Forces of Prisoners of War and Other Protected Persons by the Geneva Conventions in Iraq During Arrest, Internment and Interrogation. ICRC, 2004. http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/library/report/2004/icrc_report_iraq_feb2004.htm (accessed February 20, 2005).

Iyengar, Shanto. "Television News and Issue Salience: A Reexamination of the Agenda-Setting Hypothesis." *American Politics Quarterly* 7, no. 4 (1979): 395-416.

Iyengar, Shanto. *Is Anyone Responsible?: How Television Frames Political Issues*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.

Iyengar, Shanto, and Adam Simon. "News Coverage of the Gulf Crisis and Public Opinion: A Study of Agenda-Setting, Priming, and Framing." *Communication Research* 20, no. 3 (1993): 365-383.

Jensen, Klaus Bruhn, ed. *News of the World: World Cultures Look at Television News*. London; New York: Routledge, 1998.

Jones, Anthony R., and George R. Fay. Investigation of Intelligence Activities at Abu Ghraib. Department of Defense, Washington DC, August 23, 2004. *FindLaw.com* http://news.findlaw.com/hdocs/docs/dod/fay82504rpt.pdf (accessed June 29, 2010).

Kahneman, Daniel, and Amos Tversky. "Choice, Values, and Frames." *American Psychologist* 39 (1984): 341-350.

Kahneman, Daniel, and Amos Tversky. "Judgment under Uncertainty: Heuristics and Biases." *Science* 185, no. 4157 (1974): 1124-1131.

Kaid, Lynda L., Barbara Harville, John Balloti, and Maria Wawrzyniak. "Telling the Gulf War story: Coverage in Five Papers." In *Dessert Storm and the Mass Media*, edited by Bradley S. Greenberg and Walter Gantz, 86-98. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, 1993.

Kerrigan, Michael. *The Instruments of Torture, Revised and Updated*. New York: The Lyons Press, 2007.

Keshishian, Flora. "Political Bias and Nonpolitical News: A Content Analysis of an Armenian and Iranian Earthquake in the New York Times and the Washington Post." *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 14 (1997): 332-343.

Knightly, Phillip. *First Casualty. The War Correspondent as Hero and Myth-Maker from the Crimea to Kosovo*. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press, 2002.

Kohn, Melvin L, ed. *Cross National Research in Sociology*. Newbery Park, CA: Sage, 1989.

Kress, Gunther *Multimodality: Exploring Contemporary Methods of Communication.* London: Routledge, 2010.

Krishnaiah, Jothik, Nancy Signorielli, and Douglas McLeod. "The Evil Empire Revisited: New York Times Coverage of the Soviet Intervention in and Withdrawal from Afghanistan." *Journalism Quarterly* 70, no. 3 (1993): 647-655.

Lagouranis, Tony, and Allen Mikaelian. *Fear up Harsh: An Army Interrogator's Dark Journey Through Iraq*. New York, NY: NAL Caliber, 2007.

Lawrence, Regina G. "Seeing the Whole Board: New Institutional Analysis of News Content." *Political Communication* 23, no. 2 (2006): 225-230.

Livingstone, Sonia. "On the Challenges of Cross-National Comparative Media Research." *European Journal of Communication* 18, no. 4 (2003): 477-500.

Livingston, Steven, and Lance W. Bennett. "Gatekeeping, Indexing, and Live-Event News: Is Technology Altering the Construction of News?" *Political Communication* 20 (2003): 363-380.

Lyman, Rick. "Festivals of Certitude in Land of Red and Blue." National Desk, *New York Times*. May 11, 2004.

Malek, Abbas. "New York Times Editorial Position and U.S. Foreign Policy: The Case of Iran Revisited." In *News Media and Foreign Relations A multifaceted Perspective*, edited by Abbas Malek, 224-245. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 1996.

MacArthur, John R., and Ben H. Bagdikian. *Second Front: Censorship and Propaganda in The Gulf War.* New York: Hill and Wang, 1992.

Marsh, Emily and Marilyn White, "A Taxonomy of Relationships Between Images and Text," *Journal of Documentation* 59, no. 6 (2003): 653.

McCombs, Alan. "U.S. Holds Iraqi Journalist for 5 Months." United Press International, September 19, 2006 http://www.upi.com/SecurityTerrorism/view.php?StoryID=20060918-054630-7154r (accessed July 17, 2009).

McCombs, Maxwell E., and Donald L. Shaw. "The Agenda-Setting Function of Mass Media." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 36 (Summer 1972): 176-187.

McCoy, Kelley, and Rita Atwood. "The Portrayal of Israelis and Palestinians in the New York Times During the First Six Months of the Intifada, December 1987 – May 1988." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Educators in Journalism and Mass Communication, Anaheim, CA, August, 1996. http://list.msu.edu/cgi-bin/wa?S1=AEJMC (accessed April, 14 1999).

McLaughlin, Greg. "Rules of Engagement: Television Journalism and NATO's 'Faith in Bombing' During the Kosovo Crisis, 1999." *Journalism Studies* 3, no. 2 (2002): 257-266.

McQuail, Denis. *Mass Communication Theory*. 4th ed. London: Sage, 2000.

Menicucci, Gary. "Sexual Torture: Rendering, Practices, Manuals." *ISIM Review* 16 (2005): 18-19.

Merrill, John C. *Global Journalism: A Survey of the World's Mass Media*. New York: Longman, 1983.

Merrill, John C. "The Global Elite:" *Global Journalist*, January 1, 2000.

http://www.globaljournalist.org/stories/2000/01/01/the-global-elite/ (accessed August 10, 2006).

Merrill, John C, and Harold A. Fisher. *The World's Great Dailies: Profile of Fifty Newspapers.* New York: Hastings House, 1980.

Miles, Steven, H. "Abu Ghraib: Its Legacy for Military Medicine." *The Lancet* 9435 (2004): 725-729.

Miles, Steven H. *Oath Betrayed: Torture, Medical Complicity, and the War on Terror.* New York, NY: Random House, 2006.

Milgram, Stanley. *Obedience to Authority: An Experimental View.* New York, NY: Harper & Row, 1974.

Miller, David. *Introduction to Tell Me Lies: Propaganda and Media Distortion in the Attacks on Iraq*, edited by David Miller. London: Pluto Press, 2003.

Morales, Waltraud. "Revolutions, Earthquakes, and Latin America: The Networks Look at Allende's Chile and Samoza's Nicaragua." In *Television Coverage of International Affairs*, edited by William C. Adams, 79-116. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 1982.

Mowlana, Hamid. *Global Communication in Transition: The End of Diversity?* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1996.

Murray, Craig, Katy Parry, Piers Robinson, and Peter Goddard. "Reporting Dissent in Wartime: British Press, the Anti-War Movement and the 2003 Iraq War." *European Journal of Communication* 23, no. 1 (2008): 7-27.

Neuman, Russell W., Mariun R. Just, and Ann N. Crigler. *Common Knowledge: News and Construction of Political Meaning.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.

Nohrstedt, Stig A., Sophia Kaitatzi-Whitlock, Rune Ottosen, and Kristina Riegert. "From the Persian Gulf to Kosovo--War Journalism and Propaganda." *European Journal of Communication* 15, no. 3 (2000): 383-404.

Otterman, Michael. *American Torture: From the Cold War to Abu Ghraib and Beyond.* Carlton, Australia: University Press, 2007.

Pan, Zhongdang, and Gerald M. Kosicki. "Framing Analysis: An Approach to News Discourse." *Political Communication* 10 (1993): 55-75.

Papacharissi, Zizi and Maria de Fatima Oliveira. "News Frames Terrorism: A Comparative Analysis of Frames Employed in Terrorism Coverage in U.S. and U.K. Newspapers." *Press/Politics* 13, no. 1 (2008): 52-74.

Patterson, Thomas E. *Out of Order.* New York, NY: Vintage, 1994.

Peng, Zengjun, "Framing Antiwar Protests in the Global Village: A Comparative Study of Newspaper Coverage in Three Countries." *International Communication Gazette* 70 (2008): 361-377.

Pew Research Center. "Press Accuracy Rating Hits Two Decade Low. Public Evaluations of the News Media: 1985-2009." Pew Research Center, September 13, 2009. http://people-press.org/report/543/ (accessed July, 2, 2010).

Peterson, David. "Self-Censorship and Torture: Abu Ghraib, CBS and American Power." *Counter Punch*, May 4, 2004. http://www.counterpunch.org/peterson05042004.html (accessed May 19, 2006).

Peterson, Sophia. "International News Selection by the Elite Press: A Case Study." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 45, no. 2 (1981): 143-163.

Pfiffner, James P. "Torture and Public Policy." *Public Integrity* 7, no. 4 (2005): 313-329.

Porpora, Douglas, Alexander Nikolaev, and Julie Hagemann. "Abuse, Torture, Frames and the Washington Post." *Journal of Communication* 60, no. 2 (2010): 254-270.

Puar, Jasbir K. "Abu Ghraib: Arguing Against Exceptionalism." *Feminist Studies* 30, no. 2 (2004): 522-534.

Rajiva, Lila. *The Language of Empire: Abu Ghraib and the American Media.* New York, NY: Monthly Review Press, 2005.

Rantanen, Terhi. "The Cosmopolitanization of News." *Journalism Studies* 8, no. 6 (2007): 843-861.

Ravi, Narasimhan. "Looking Beyond Flawed Journalism How National Interests, Patriotism, and Cultural Values Shaped the Coverage of the Iraq War." *Press/Politics* 10, no. 1 (2005):45-62.

Reese, Stephen. "Prologue: Framing Public Life: A Bridging Model for Media Research." In Framing Public Life, edited by Stephan D. Reese, Oscar. H. Gandy, Jr., and August. E. Grant, 7-33. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers, 2001.

Reese, Stephen. "The Framing Project: A Bridging Model for Media Research Revisited." *Journal of Communication* 57 (2007): 148-154.

Reese, Stephen, and Bob Buckalew. "The Militarism of Local Television: The Routine Framing of the Persian Gulf War." *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 12 (1995): 40-59.

Rejali, Darius. *Torture and Democracy*. Princeton University Press, 2007.

Rhee, Woong J. "Strategy and Issue Frames in Election Campaign Coverage: A Social Cognitive Account of Framing Effects." *Journal of Communication* 47, no. 3 (1997): 26-48.

Riffe, Daniel, Stephen Lacy, and Frederick G. Fico. *Analyzing Media Messages: Using the Quantitative Content Analysis in Research.* Mahwah, NJ, 2005.

Ricchiardi, Sherry, and Melissa Cirillo. "Missed Signals." *American Journalism Review* 26, no. (2004): 22-29.

Rieder, Rem. "Toothless Watchdogs*." American Journalism Review* 26, no. 4 (2004): 6-6.

Robinson, Piers. *The CNN Effect: The Myth of News, Foreign Policy and Intervention.* London: Routledge, 2002.

Ross, Sherwood. "U.S. Doctors Approve Torture and Denied Medicine to Prisoners." *Pacific Free Press,* http://www.pacificfreepress.com/news/1/6540-doctor-approved-torture-and-denying-medicine-to-prisoners.html (accessed June 8, 2009).

Rosenblum, Mort. *Coups and Earthquakes: Reporting the World to America.* New York: Harper & Colophon Books, 1981.

Rosenblum, Mort. *Who Stole the News? Why We Can't Keep Up With What Happens in the World And What We Can Do About It.* New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1993.

Rosengren, Karl E. "Advances in Scandinavia Content Analysis: An introduction." In *Advances in Content Analysis*, edited by Karl E. Rosengren, 9-19. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1981.

Rosie, Michael; Pille Petersoo, John MacInnes, Susan Condor, and James Kennedy. "Mediating Which Nation? Citizenship and National Identities in the British Press." *Social Semiotics* 16, no. 2 (2006): 327-344.

Semetko, Holli A., and Patti M. Valkenburg. "Framing European Politics: A Content Analysis of Press and Television News." *Journal of Communication* 50, no. 2 (2000): 93-109.

Shah, Dhavan V., Nojin Kwak, Mike Schmierbach, and Jessica Zubric. "The Interplay of News Frames on Cognitive Complexity." *Human Communication Research* 30, no. 1 (2004): 102-120.

Scheufele, Dietram A. "Framing as a Theory of Media Effects." *Journal of Communication* 49, no. 4 (1999): 103-122.

Scheufele, Dietram A. "Agenda-Setting, Priming, and Framing Revisited: Another Look at Cognitive Effects of Political Communication." *Mass Communication & Society* 3, no. 2/3

(2000): 297-316.

Shoemaker, Pamela, Lucig H. Danielian, and Nancy Brendlinger. "Deviant Acts, Risky Business and U.S. Interests: The Newsworthiness of World Events." *Journalism Quarterly* 68, no. 4 (1991): 781-795.

Shoemaker, Pamela J., and Stephen D. Reese. *Mediating the Message: Theories of Influences on Mass Media Content.* 2nd ed. White Plains, N.Y.: Longman, 1996.

Silove, Derrick. "Challenges in Fighting Torture: From September 11 to Abu Ghraib." *The Lancet* 363 (2004): 1915-1916.

Silverman, Francine. "The Man Who Saved the Times." *Editor & Publisher*, 8 (June 1996) 16.

Soderlund, Walter C., and Carmen Schmitt. "El Salvador's Civil War as Seen in North and South American Press." *Journalism Quarterly* 63 (1986): 268-274.

Steuter, Erin, and Deborah Wills. "Discourses of Dehumanization: Enemy Construction and Canadian Media Complicity in the Framing of the War on Terror." *Global Media Journal: Canadian Edition* 2, no. 2 (September 2009): 7-24.

Strasser, Steven. ed. *The Abu Ghraib Investigations: The Official Reports of the Independent Panel and Pentagon on the Shocking Prisoner Abuse in Iraq*. New York: Public Affairs, 2004.

Stromback, Jesper. "Framing of the Iraq War in the Elite Newspapers in Sweden and the United States." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, New York, NY, July 27-31, 2005. http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p13376_index.html (accesses October, 10 2005).

Strobel, Warren. *Late-Breaking Foreign Policy: The News Media's Influence on Peace Operations.* Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press, 1997.

Stauber, John C. and Sheldon Rampton. *Toxic Sludge is Good for You: Lies, Damn Lies and the Public Relations Industry.* Monroe, Maine: Common Courage, 1995.

Taguba, Antonio. "Article 15-6. Investigation of the 800th Military Police Brigade. Report." Department of Defense, 2004. www.fas.org/irp/agency/dod/taguba.pdf (accessed February 18, 2008).

Tankard, James W., Jr. "The Empirical Approach to the Study of Media Framing." In *Framing Public Life: Perspectives on Media and our Understanding of the Social World*, edited by Stephen D. Reese, Oscar H. Gandy, and August E. Grant, 95-105. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2008.

Tankard, James. "PR Goes to War: The Effects of Public Relations Campaigns on Media Framing of the Kuwaiti and Bosnian Crises." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Educators in Journalism and Mass Communication, Chicago, IL, August 1997. http://list.msu.edu/cgi-bin/wa?S1=AEJMC (accessed July 24, 2004).

Taylor, Ann. "The Handling of Detainees by UK Intelligence Personnel in Afghanistan, Guantanamo Bay and Iraq," *Intelligence and Security Committee Report*, 2005. http://www.statewatch.org/news/2009/jun/uk-mi5-toture-intel-cttee-rep.pdf (accessed February 18, 2008).

Thompson, Harvey. "Iraq Occupation Makes Possible Record." *Global Policy Forum*. February 28, 2006. http://www.globalpolicy.org/component/content/article/168/35985.html (accessed May 13, 2010).

Thrall, Trevor A. *War in the Media Age*. Cresskill, N.J.: Hampton Press, 2000.

Tuchman, Gaye. *Making News: A Study in the Construction of Reality*. New York: Free Press, 1978.

Tumber, Howard and Jerry Palmer. *Media at War: The Iraq Crisis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2004.

Tversky, Amos, and Daniel Kahneman. "The Framing of Decisions and the Psychology of Choice." *Science* 211 (1981): 453 - 458.

Umansky, Eric. "Failures of Imagination." *Colombia Journalism Review* 45, no. 3 (September/October 2006): 16-31.

International Bill of Human Rights. "Universal Declaration of Human Rights," G.A. res. 217A (III), U.N. Doc A/810 at 71 (1948) http://www.un.org/en/documents/udhr/index.shtml (accessed August 9. 2009).

Declaration on the Protection of All Persons from Being Subjected to Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, G.A. res. 3452 (XXX). U.N. (December 1975) http://www2.ohchr.org/english/law/declarationcat.htm (accessed November 24, 2007)

United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs. "Iraq: Child Prisoners Left Without Support." *IRIN: Humanitarian News and Analysis*, July 30, 2006. http://www.irinnews.org/Report.aspx?ReportId=59903 (accessed October11, 2008)

United States Central Command. *CENTCOM News Releases*, January 16, 2004 http://www.centcom.mil/sites/uscentcom2/default.aspx (accessed November 11, 2007).

Van Belle, Douglas A. "Bureaucratic Responsiveness to the News Media: Comparing the Influence of the New York Times and Network Television News Coverage on U.S. Foreign

aid Allocations." *Political Communication* 20, no. 3 (2003): 263-286.

Van Dijk, Teun A. *News as Discourse*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1988.

Van Gorp, Baldwin. "The Constructionist Approach to Framing: Bringing Culture Back In." *Journal of Communication* 57, no. 1 (2007): 60-78.

Van Gorp, Baldwin. "The Influx of Refugees Bordered by Frames: A Frame Analysis of the Policy on Immigration." Paper proposal prepared for presentation at the theme session "Communication in Borderlands" of the 2003 annual meeting of the International Communication Association, May 23 – 27, at San Diego, CA, USA.

Vetter, Stefan. "Understanding Human Behavior in Times of War." *Military Medicine* 172, no. 12 (2007): 7-10.

Vincent, Richard. "A Narrative Analysis of U.S. Press Coverage of Slobodan Milosevic and the Serbs in Kosovo." *European Journal of Communication* 15, no. 3 (2000): 321-344.

Werder, Olaf. "Debating the Euro: Media Agenda-Setting in a Cross-National Environment." *Gazette* 64, no. 3 (2002): 219–33.

Winfield, Betty H., Barbara Friedman, and Vivara Trisnadi. "History as the Metaphor Through Which the Current World is Viewed: British and American Newspapers' Uses of History Following the 11 September 2001 Terrorist Attacks." *Journalism Studies* 3, no. 2 (2002): 289-300.

Whitlock, Craig. "CIA Ruse is Said to Have Damaged Probe in Milan." *Washington Post*. December 5, 2005.

Woolley, John T., and Gerhard Peters. "The President's News Conference with Prime Minister Tony Blair of the United Kingdom." *The American Presidency Project*. May 25, 2006. http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=46 (accessed June 29, 2006).

Wong, Edward, and Christine Hauser. "Militiamen Go on the Offensive in Two Southern Cities." *New York Times*, May 9, 2004.

Wolfsfeld, Gadi. *Media and Political Conflict: News from the Middle East.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Yang, Jin. "Framing the NATO Air Strikes on Kosovo across Countries: Comparison of Chinese and U.S. Newspaper Coverage." *Gazette* 65, no. 3 (2003): 231-249.

Zimbardo, Philip. *The Lucifer Effect: Understanding How Good People Turn Evil*. New York: Random House Trade Paperbacks, 2008.

Zimbardo Philip. *Stanford Prison Experiment: A Simulation Study of the Psychology of*

Imprisonment. Stanford, CA, Philip G. Zimbardo, Inc., 1972. http://www.prisonexp.org (accessed February, 1, 2008).

APPENDIX A

U.S. Convictions

Most of the convictions that arose from the Abu Ghraib abuse took place soon after the scandal broke. The Abu Ghraib investigation resulted in convictions of 11 soldiers, none of them with a rank higher than staff sergeant. Several officers received reprimands, but nothing more. Between May 2004 and September 2005, seven out of those eleven were court-martialed, sentenced to federal prison time, and/or dishonorably discharged from service. Spec. Jeremy Sivits who pleaded guilty was sentenced special court-martial to a one-year in confinement, discharged for bad conduct, and demoted. Spec. Armin Cruz of the 325th Military Intelligence Battalion was sentenced to eight months in confinement, reduction in rank to private, and a bad conduct discharge in exchange for his testimony against other soldiers.

Staff Sgt. Ivan Frederick, a military police officer, was the highest ranking officer punished. Frederick pled guilty in October 2004 to conspiracy, dereliction of duty, maltreatment of detainees, assault, and committing an indecent act. Frederick's offenses included making three prisoners masturbate and punching one prisoner in the chest so hard that he needed to be resuscitated. Frederick was sentenced to eight years in prison, forfeiture of pay, a dishonorable discharge, and a reduction in rank to private. He was paroled in October 2007 after serving approximately three years of an eight-year sentence.

Spec. Charles Graner was found guilty in January 2005 on all charges against him, including failing to protect detainees from abuse, cruelty and maltreatment, conspiracy to maltreat detainees, assault, indecency, adultery, and obstruction of justice. In January 2005

he was sentenced to ten years in federal prison.

Sabrina Harman was sentenced in May 2005 to six months in prison and received a bad conduct discharge after being convicted on six of the seven counts against her for allowing and inflicting sexual, physical, and psychological abuse on Iraqi prisoners of war. Megan Ambuhl was convicted in October 2004 of dereliction of duty and sentenced to reduction in rank to private, and loss of a half-month's pay.

Lynndie England, who became notorious for the photo taken of her with a naked prisoner on a leash and another of her posing with a pyramid of naked detainees, was convicted in September 2005 on one count of conspiracy, four counts of maltreating detainees, and one count of committing an indecent act. She was acquitted on a second conspiracy count. England had faced a maximum sentence of ten years, but was sentenced to three years. She received a dishonorable discharge and was released from prison only after about 16 months.

U.K. Convictions

The investigations into the Bread Basket incident began with discovery of photographs which belonged to Gary Bartlam. The photographs were discovered when Bartlam took them to be developed at a shop in his hometown of Tamworth, Staffordshire, where a shop assistant called in police. A set of photos included depiction of humiliation and simulated sexual acts as well as images of Iraqi who had been strung up in a cargo net made from thick rope and hung from a forklift truck.

The Bread Basket incident resulted in the conviction of four soldiers from1st Battalion the Royal Regiment of Fusiliers: Fusilier Gary Bartlam, Cpl. Daniel Kenyon, Ln. Cpl. Darren Larkin, and Ln. Cpl. Mark Cooley. According to the soldiers' testimony, the

Iraqis in the soldiers' custody had been accused of looting a humanitarian aid warehouse in May 2003. Joseph Giret, a lawyer who represented three of the soldiers held British commanding officer Maj. Dan Taylor accountable for ordering the widespread abuse of prisoners. Nevertheless, Bartlam had pleaded guilty to taking the pictures and aiding in the forklift incident. He received an 18-month sentence after admitting one charge of disgraceful conduct of a cruel kind and to two charges of disgraceful conduct of an indecent kind. More serious charges against him were dropped when he agreed to give evidence for the prosecution.

The other soldiers were tried in court martial in Osnabrück, Germany in February 2005. All three of them pleaded or were found guilty on several charges and were sentenced jail sentence of five months to two years and were dishonorably discharged from the Army.[1] Ln. Cpl. Mark Cooley appeared in photos hoisting a prisoner on a forklift while he simulated punching a detainee. Cooley was charged with two counts of conduct to the prejudice of good order and[2] military discipline contrary to section 69 of the Army Act 1955. He was also charged with disgraceful conduct of a cruel kind contrary to section 66 of the Army Act 1955.[3] Cooley was convicted on two assault charges: pretending to punch an Iraqi looter and putting a bound prisoner of the tines of a forklift truck and driving him around. He received the maximum two-year sentence.[4]

Ln. Cpl. Darren Larkin was photographed standing on an Iraqi who was laying on the ground bound with rope. He was charged with committing a civil offence contrary to section

---

[1] CNN World, "UK Soldiers Jailed Over Iraq Abuse," *CNN.com*, February, 26, 2004.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Tony Paterson, "Simulated Sex and a Forklift Hanging: A Catalogue of British Abuses in Iraq," *CounterPunch*, January 19, 2005 http://www.counterpunch.org/paterson01192005.html (accessed July 8, 2010).
[4] CNN World, "UK Soldiers Jailed Over Iraq Abuse," *CNN.com*, February, 26, 2004.

70 of the Army Act 1955, that is battery contrary to section 39 of the Criminal Justice Act 1988. Larkin pleaded guilty to assaulting an unknown male by beating him. Larkin was also charged with disgraceful conduct of an indecent kind contrary to section 66 of the Army Act 1955. The particulars were that Larkin "on or about 15 May 2003, forced two unknown males, being detained by British forces, to undress in front of others."[1] Larkin received five months jail sentence.

Cpl. Daniel Kenyon was charged with aiding and abetting Larkin to commit the two offences--battery and disgraceful conduct of an indecent kind. Kenyon was also charged with conduct to the prejudice of good order and military discipline contrary to section 69 of the Army Act 1955.[2] Kenyon pleaded guilty of aiding and abetting in the beating of a detainee, aiding and abetting in the assault of a male Iraqi, as well as failing to report the abuses. He received 18 months sentence.[3]

The court-martial proceedings for the eleven soldiers from Queen's Lancashire Regiment (QLR) took much longer. The court martial for Mousa's death reenacted by the *Daily Mirror* photographs lasted from September 4, 2006 to April 30, 2007 even though the incident took place in September of 2003, Gen. Michael Jackson ordered an internal army review of all alleged cases of Mousa's death and abuse against other Iraqi civilians only in February of 2005. On July 18, 2005, United Kingdom Attorney General Lord Goldsmith announced the charges,[4] Ln. Cpl. Donald Payne was charged with manslaughter, inhumane treatment of persons, and perverting the course of justice. Ln. Cpl. Wayne Crowcroft and

---

[1] Tony Paterson, "Simulated Sex and a Forklift Hanging: A Catalogue of British Abuses in Iraq," *CounterPunch*, January 19, 2005 http://www.counterpunch.org/paterson01192005.html (accessed July 8, 2010).
[2] Ibid.
[3] CNN World, "UK Soldiers Jailed Over Iraq Abuse," *CNN.com*, February, 26, 2004.
[4] Rachel Stevenson and Matthew Weaver, "Timeline: Baha Mousa Case: Key events since the killing of the Iraqi hotel clerk while in the custody of British soldiers," *Guardian*, July 13, 2009 http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk/2008/may/14/mousa.timeline (accessed August 13, 2010).

Private Darren Fallon were charged with inhumane treatment of persons. Sgt. Kelvin Stacey, also of the QLR, was alleged to have assaulted an Iraqi detainee and faced a charge of bodily harm. Col. Jorge Mendonca, the former commanding officer of the QLR, Maj. Michael Peebles and Warrant Officer Mark Davies, both of the Intelligence Corps, were charged with negligence of duty contrary to the Army Act of 1955.

On September 19, 2007, Ln. Cpl. Payne pleaded guilty to inhuman treatment of Mousa. Payne became the first British soldier to admit to a war crime. Payne denied charges of manslaughter and perverting the course of justice, he was cleared from the manslaughter charges. Payne was jailed for a year and dismissed from the army.[1]

In February 2007, all charges against four of the seven soldiers were dropped. Mendonca, the highest-ranking British serviceman ever to face a court martial, was among those cleared. Later that year Mousa's family opened a civil case against the MoD and in July of 2008, MoD agreed to pay almost 3 million pounds to Mousa's family.

Four additional soldiers from the Foot Guards, the British Army's élite infantry of the Household Division have been charged with the manslaughter of 15-year old Ahmed Kareem and beating of other detainees in May 2003. Sgt. Carle Selman, Guardsmen Martin McGing, Guardsman Joseph McCleary, and Ln. Cpl. James Stephen Cooke, were alleged to have forced Kareem into the Shatt-al-Arab canal in Basra, where he subsequently drowned. All four soldiers were found Not Guilty of Kareem's murder by court-martial in May/June 2006.

In some instances, the soldiers were actually innocent. British Lt. Cl. Tim Collins, the commanding officer of the 1st Battalion, Royal Irish Regiment of the British Army was alleged by U.S. Army Maj. Re Biastre to have been responsible for mistreatment of Iraqi

---

[1] Ibid.

civilians and prisoners of war. The charges included accusations that Collins pistol-whipped

prisoners, shot at their feet, and shot out the tires of civilian vehicles when there was no risk

to life. Collins admitted to shooting out the tires of looters' vehicles to stop them from

making off with essential supplies. He also admitted to shooting into the kitchen floor of a

senior Ba'ath party member to jog his memory about where he had hidden his weapons. He

argued that all these actions were part of a robust approach to dominate the enemy

psychologically as well as physically. However, he categorically denied pistol whipping or

beating prisoners. During the investigation it emerged that Biastre, a social worker in civilian

life, had not actually witnessed the incidents and was merely passing on allegations made by

the Ba'ath party member. In addition, it turned out that he had earlier been publicly dressed

down by Collins for distributing sweets to Iraqis during active operations. Collins was

cleared of all the charges by a tribunal in September of 2003 and later won substantial,

undisclosed libel damages from both the *Sunday Express* and the *Sunday Mirror*

newspapers.[1]

---

[1] Ben Lowry, "Colonel Tim Collins 'Set to be Cleared of Iraq Charges'," *Belfast Telegraph*, July 23, 2003.

APPENDIX B

Media Coverage of Detainee Abuse Prior to April of 2004

Norton-Taylor, Richard. "War in Afghanistan: Massacre: SAS Role in Fort Deaths Questioned: Footage shows British soldiers in action." *Guardian*, December 15, 2001.

Engel, Mathew, and Duncan Campbell. "Amnesty Dismisses New U.S. Line on Captives." *Guardian*, Foreign Pages, February 8, 2002.

Priest, Dana and Barton Gellman. "U.S. Decries Abuse but Defends Interrogations 'Stress and Duress' Tactics Used on Terrorism Suspects Held in Secret Overseas Facilities," *Washington Post*. December 26, 2002.

Gail, Carlotta. "Threats and Responses. U.S. Military Investigating Death of Afghan in Custody." *New York Times*, Foreign Desk, March 4, 2003.

Laville, Sandra. "Red Cross Criticises Allies Over Captives." *Daily Telegraph*, March 23, 2003.

Wells, Matt, and Duncan Campbell. "War in the Gulf: Coverage: Footage of Captives Puts News Channels Under Pressure From Pentagon: Rumsfeld Anger at Broadcast." *Guardian*, March 23, 2003.

Rozenberg, Joshua. "Why There are Two Sides to Every Picture? As Captives are Paraded on TV, the Iraq Conflict has Highlighted Inconsistencies in the Depiction of Prisoners of War." *Daily Telegraph*, March 27, 2003.

Lacey, Marc. "Aftereffects: Human Rights: Iraqi Detainees Claim Abuse by British and U.S. Troops." *New York Times,* May 17. 2003.

Norton-Taylor, Richard. "US Troops Accuse War Hero of Abuse**:** British Colonel who Made Rousing Speech Faces Inquiry." *Guardian,* Home Pages, May 22, 2003.

Norton-Taylor, Richard. "War on Terror 'Makes World More Perilous': Amnesty Condemns US and Britain on Human Rights." *Guardian*, May 29, 2003.

Britten, Nick, and Michael Smith. "Soldier Questioned over POW 'Torture' Photo." *Daily Telegraph*, May 31, 2003.

Norton-Taylor, Richard. "Soldier Arrested Over Iraqi Torture Photos: Amnesty Says Claims Must be Treated Seriously." *Guardian*, May 31, 2003.

Alvarez, Lizette. "After the War: British Troops: Photos Raise Allegations of Torture." *New York Times*, Foreign Desk May 31, 2003.

Lamb, David. "When MPs' Push Becomes a Charge." *Los Angeles Times*; August 18, 2003.

Foster, Peter. "My Father Died after Beating by British. Family of Iraqi Teacher Claims that he Was Hit Repeatedly by Black Watch Troops After his Arrest." *Daily Telegraph,* June 6, 2003.

APPENDIX C

Guided News Search Results

Table 16. LexisNexis Academic guided news search results using different keywords

Newspaper	Search Term(s)	# of News Articles	Editorials /Letters/ Commentary	Abuse not a Focus / Less Than 100 Words
Time Frame: 4/29/2004 – 5/14/2004				
New York Times	Iraq + prisoner + abuse	71		
Washington Post	Iraq + prisoner + abuse	76		
Guardian	Iraq + prisoner + abuse	45		
Times	Iraq + prisoner + abuse	31		
Time Frame: 4/29/2004 – 5/14/2004				
New York Times	Soldier+ prisoner +Iraq	69	29	17
Washington Post	Soldier+ prisoner +Iraq	72	31	6
Guardian	Soldier+ prisoner +Iraq	52	18	5
Times	Soldier+ prisoner +Iraq	62	35	14
Time Frame: 4/29/2004 – 5/14/2004				
New York Times	Abu Ghraib	104	74	
Washington Post	Abu Ghraib	81	58	
Guardian	Abu Ghraib	43	35	
Times	Abu Ghraib	44	40	
Time Frame: 4/29/2004 – 5/28/2004				
New York Times	Iraq + prisoner + abuse	138	131	
Washington Post	Iraq + prisoner + abuse	120	114	
Guardian	Iraq + prisoner + abuse	58	53	
Times	Iraq + prisoner + abuse	47	47	

APPENDIX D

Coding Instrument

Table 17. Frame identification instrument

Events Frame	☐ Was the focus of the news article events rather than issues? ☐ Did the news story utilize *who, what, when, where, and how* script structure ☐ Was the coverage *episodic* in its nature?
Investigative Frame	☐ Was the focus of the article large context of the events in Iraq? ☐ Did the news story utilize the *why* part of the news script? ☐ Was the coverage thematic in its nature?
Systemic Responsibility Frame	☐ Was responsibility attributed to the anti-terrorism policies rather than individual actions? ☐ Was abuse described as widespread systemic occurrence? ☐ Was abuse attributed to interrogation policies and procedures? ☐ Was abuse attributed to dismissal of Geneva Conventions? ☐ Was responsibility placed on the military and governmental leaders?
Individual Responsibility Frame	☐ Where individual soldiers blamed for abuse? ☐ Was abuse described as random action of a few individuals? ☐ Was abuse attributed to violent nature of soldiers?
Diagnostic Frame	☐ Did the article evaluate what happened? ☐ Did the article offer explanation(s) for why the abuse occurred? ☐ What where these explanations"_____
Prognostic Frame	☐ Did the article explore what will happen as a result of abuse? ☐ Did the article explore solutions to be implemented as a result of abuse? ☐ What solutions/recommendations were offered _____
Human Interest Frame	☐ Did the article focus on the people involved in the abuse? ☐ Did the article discuss victims of abuse? ☐ Did the article utilize stories that would add "human face" on the news? ☐ Did the article explore how individuals will be affected by events/issues discussed in the article? ☐ Did the article include personal vignettes that generate feelings of outrage, empathy, sympathy, or compassion?
Image Frame	☐ Did the article explore how the abuse reflected on the moral and symbolic standing of the coalition forces or their governments? ☐ Did the article explore moral implications for the people of the two nations?
Media Reflexivity Frame	☐ Did the article report on the media's role in exposing the abuse? ☐ Did the article report on the media and journalists involved in the coverage of abuse?