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ABSTRACT

GLOBALIZATION AND JUSTIFICATION OF WAR IN INTERNATIONAL MEDIA DISCOURSE: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF MEDIA DISCOURSES BETWEEN THE 1ST AND THE 2ND GULF WARS.

By Ayhan Akbulut

Dissertation Director:
Dr. Norman Samuels, University Professor and Provost Emeritus

For decades globalization has had enormous implications on almost every dimension of life. In examining these implications, this research addresses the relationship between globalization and international media discourse through the topic of justification of war. Accepting media as a tool of soft power, it attempts to study the function of media on people’s perception of realities. Based on this foundation, it aims to understand how soft power is composed and maintained through media in the new form of international affairs. More specifically this research first compares and contrasts the international media discourse on the two Gulf Wars through a two step framing analysis. Then, it contrasts the results with the Turkish national media discourse of war justification to see the impacts of international media discourse on national media. Finally, it
provides an evaluation of findings in relation to the globalization literature, reveals the implications of the findings in terms of the use of soft power, and make recommendations for policy makers and researchers. The results of the analysis prove the diffusion in international media discourse. According to findings, the 1st Gulf War was presented by only one news channel, CNN, with a hard pro-American discourse, while the 2nd Gulf War is presented by multiple news channels representing the both sides of the war. Reflections in the Turkish news media confirm the same stances with international media for both wars. In the 1st War, the unavailability of alternative news sources provided CNN with the ability to operate freely and basically control the international media domain. It gave a strong voice to the causes and successes of American policy, while offering very little perspective from to other views. In the 2nd Gulf War, however, diffusion in the discourse revealed the removal of a superpower monopoly on communication technologies and the emergence of alternative views in international media. The diffusion had enormous implications in terms of the use of soft power. It renders conventional tools and strategies obsolete, and requires new ones in terms of maintaining soft power due to newfound critical challenges.
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CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

1.1. Introduction

This dissertation aims to identify the relationship between globalization and international media discourse. Accepting media as a tool of soft power, it attempts to study the function of media on people’s perception of reality and examines the composition and maintenance of soft power through media in the new form of international affairs.

The information age has staged an unprecedented interplay between states and individuals, promoting asymmetric competition between individuals and states. Innovations in communication technologies, such as computer systems, satellites, cable systems, and particularly the internet sharply decreased transaction costs. Moreover, these innovations increased the speed, coverage, and the quality of international communication. In addition, individuals have gained access to those information sources independent from state supervision. Thus, individuals have been the beneficiaries of this process more so than states.¹

This revolution has not only created a more interconnected world, but it has also sparked a backlash against globalization. Regardless of geographical

destination, global technologies enhanced interactions among people of the same culture, same religion, and same cause. Enhanced interactions consolidated loyalty to an individual’s own culture and beliefs and triggered reactionary movements against globalization. Considering these incongruities, some scholars re-conceptualize globalization with their own mixed terms implying both courses such as glocalization or fragmegration.² Glocalization stands for the concepts of globalization and localization at the same time, whereas fragmegration implies the same mixture of the words fragmentation and integration. Put another way, on the one hand, globalization pushes the integration of social, political, economic and cultural life; on the other hand it stimulates and serves for the reaction to integration in the same dimensions.

Within this framework, this dissertation aims to determine whether globalization has impacted international media discourse like as it did the social, political, economic and cultural life. If yes, then it asks whether it increased the globalization of international media discourse or the empowerment of local discourses in the international realm.

Media discourse refers to the way the media represent events and ideas. The Media function as a very significant tool of soft power because information barriers between the public and the real event render it vulnerable to manipulation. Lipmann claims there exist control mechanisms on information channels that create information barriers between the public and the real event.

He argues that the availability of control mechanisms provide elites with an opportunity to manipulate information. Thus, previous studies claim that elites dominate media and manipulate discourse for their benefit. There are important studies in the literature confirming the existence of information barriers and the elites’ control on media discourse such as Tunstall’s “Media are American” and Herman and Chomsky’s “Propaganda Model”. Previous literature also claims a homogenization in international media. Kissinger, Schiller, Golding, and Tunstall are among the prominent scholars arguing that America dominates media. Tunstall suggests that the US’ media broadcasts and products dominate many parts of the world by infiltrating themselves into the local media. However, recent studies claim the contrary and argue a diffusion in media. According to Tunstall, the developments in the last several decades were unfavorable for the US, resulting in four media regions that are based on geography, religious and cultural tradition, and a main language or main language groups. Those regions are Euro-America (the whole of North and South America and most of Europe), China, India, and Arabic Nations. Tunstall’s

---

work mostly focuses on the structural elements of the global media. However, whether those structural changes introduced a change of discourse is still an unanswered question. Although several studies indicate diffusion in international media discourse, the relationship between globalization and international media discourse is still ambiguous, requiring further investigation. Therefore, this research attempts to find out whether contemporary communication technologies had an impact on global media discourse. If yes, it investigates the question: Does its impact remove the barrier between the public and real events? In other words, can people reach alternative information and perspectives, decreasing the distance between reality and perceived reality in the global media?

This research addresses these questions by analyzing and comparing the international media discourses in the 1 st and 2 nd Gulf Wars. It attempts to see if there is any change in the discourse that provides the public with differing information on the justification of the war. Then, it analyzes the Turkish National Media discourse in order to examine the reflections of international media discourse on grassroots populations. Lastly, it presents broader implications of findings and provides recommendations for policy makers and academics.

A descriptive content analysis and a detailed qualitative framing analysis are conducted on the samples of CNN, CNNI (CNN INternational), Al Jazeera, Hurriyet, and Sabah for this purpose. The analysis is made through a very detailed two step analysis, a descriptive content analysis and qualitative framing analysis. Descriptive analysis provides a general picture while qualitative framing
analysis reveals the real meanings deployed in the discourse and empowers the analysis.

The results of the analysis confirm that the effect of globalization on international media discourse is the empowerment of local discourses in the international realm and the unraveling of Western monopoly. According to findings, international media discourse in the 1st Gulf War is composed by only one news channel, CNN, with a hard pro-American discourse. The 2nd Gulf War is presented by multiple news channels representing the two sides of the war. CNNI represents the war in a highly pro-American manner while Al Jazeera has a predominantly anti-American discourse. The comparative results prove the change in the discourse of the Turkish media accordingly. Whereas the discourse in Turkish Media for the 1st Gulf War was a direct reflection of CNN, it was a balanced discourse standing in the midst of CNNI and Al Jazeera in the 2nd Gulf War.

This change introduces very significant implications in terms of international media, public perception of events, and the use of soft power. The implications on the use of soft power are of crucial importance for this research since it accepts media as a tool of soft power and attempts to understand the function of media on the composition and the maintenance of soft power in the new form of international affairs. The analysis of findings reveals several significant challenges in terms of the use of soft power in the new form of international affairs. Therefore, implications are discussed in broader context and
recommendations are made for policy makers to meet challenges and for researchers in further academic investigation.

In order to show the research process and provide a general outlook of the dissertation, an outline is submitted below:

Chapter 1 makes the general introduction to the study. It is composed of five parts. The first part provides the background of the study in terms of globalization, media, and the use of soft power and puts forward the basic research question. Then, it discusses the data and the methodology to address this question. Thirdly, it mentions the basic results of the research and their implications. Lastly, it draws a general outline of the dissertation. The second part provides the statement of the problem. The third part submits the purpose and the significance of the dissertation. The fourth part presents the research questions. The last part explicates the key terms and concepts.

Chapter 2 reviews the relevant literature of the globalization theory with a specific stress on media globalization. It is composed of four parts. The first part of the chapter defines globalization and offers a brief history of globalization in relation to communication and transportation technologies and their impacts on the process of globalization. This part ends with a brief discussion of the general impacts of globalization on social, political and cultural life. The second part reviews the literature on the relationship of globalization and media theories. This part is composed of three subparts. The first subpart reviews the general context of media globalization, while second substantially discusses the theory of
homogenization, and the third covers the theory of diffusion in detail. In the third part of the chapter CNN is examined. The difference of CNN and CNNI (CNN International) and the concept of ‘CNN effect’ is discussed substantially. The last part of the chapter examines Al Jazeera and provides a detailed discussion of the concept of ‘Al Jazeera effect’.

Chapter 3 is the methodology section, comprised of 6 parts. The first part explicates the concept of media framing and framing analysis. The second part presents the cases which are analyzed. The third part discusses probable concerns about limitations of the cases in terms of comparability, timing, and the general concept of the research, and reveals justifications eliminating those concerns. The fourth part submits the unit of analysis. The fifth discusses the sampling strategy and sampling process. The sixth part covers data analysis process.

Findings are submitted in three chapters. In each findings chapter, results are submitted through descriptive charts and detailed writing of the results. Chapter 4 presents the findings for international media discourse on the justification of the 1st Gulf War. This chapter contains the CNN sample findings and discusses the basic reasons and implications of the findings.

Chapter 5 submits the findings for international media discourse on the justification of the 2nd Gulf War. This chapter submits findings for CNNI and Al Jazeera samples, and a comparative presentation of the findings for both news
channels. Lastly a discussion of the basic reasons and implications of the findings are discussed.

Chapter 6 presents the reflections of International Media on Turkish national media. It presents findings for Hurriyet and Sabah samples and a comparative presentation of the findings for both news channels. Then it discusses the basic reasons and implications of the findings. The last part of the chapter provides a comparative presentation of findings for CNNI, Al Jazeera, Hurriyet, and Sabah to examine the reflections of international media discourse on Turkish National Media.

Chapter 7 is the conclusion, and it presents the research process and the broader implications of the findings for globalization discussions and the use of soft power. It is composed of four parts. The first part summarizes the findings. The second part presents the assessment on the effective factors behind the results and the implications of the findings to global media, public perception, and the use of soft power. The third part discusses the implications of the findings on the use of soft power in the broader context and reveals the challenges. It also discusses the case of the ‘2nd Gulf War’ in the light of the assessments. The fourth part presents recommendations for policy makers and academics to meet the challenges presented.
1.2. Problem Statement

The trend of glocalization is also obvious in media as well. The current literature on globalization and the media suggest that American media have been losing their popularity around the globe. Decreasing costs and increasing availability of information sources enabled the others to create their own media organs and disseminate information all over the world. In his book *Media were American* Tunstall stresses on this phenomenon by arguing that, the US media power around the globe peaked around the 1950’s, however, this is no longer the case.\(^\text{10}\) His basic premise switches the pendulum in favor of glocalization after the predominantly global era. For him, "*Most people around the world prefer to be entertained by people who look the same, talk the same, joke the same, behave the same, play the same games, and have the same beliefs (and world views) as themselves.*"\(^\text{11}\)

Tunstall’s work predominantly focuses on the structural elements of the media. However, there remains an academic discord on whether those structural changes introduced a change of discourse in the media. Some of the previous studies found that media have been dominated by elites and the discourse was manipulated by them in the way that they benefit. Lipmann claims that the information barriers between public and the incidents provide media with the

---


ability to manipulate the information. Those barriers are predominantly comprised of control mechanisms on the information channels. Lloyd George’s statements on WWI reinforces Lipmann’s findings. “If people really knew { the truth} the war (1914-1918) would be stopped tomorrow. But of course they don’t know and can’t know.” Herman and Chomsky’s propaganda model is a more current study showing the validity of the same barrier even in the 1990’s. In the “Manufacture of Consent” they argue that the media “depend heavily and uncritically on elite information source.”

In this context, the main question is whether globalization and contemporary communication technologies hit the “barrier” between the citizens and the real event. If yes, was it only damaged or devastated by the globalization? Put simply, can people reach alternative views that run counter to the dominant opinions in the main media? There is a gap in the literature at this point. Therefore, this research attempts to fill this gap by analyzing the impact of globalization on international media discourse on the subject of the justification of war over the cases of the 1st and 2nd Gulf wars. Then it will investigate whether there is an accordance or contradiction between the international and national media discourses on the two Gulf Wars. The core focus of this research is whether globalization served for a change in the international media discourse or it maintained the status quo.

1.3. The Purpose and the Significance of the Study

This research aims to identify the relationship between globalization and international media discourse. It accepts media as a tool of soft power and attempts to understand the function of it on people’s perception of events in the new form of international affairs.

The significance of the research stems from the criticality of soft power in international affairs. Soft power plays a central role particularly in today’s global political environment. Many scholars argue that for countries looking for the ability to mobilize foreign countries, persuasion is a much better instrument than coercion to lead the other states to behave in desired ways. Gramsci’s theory of hegemony puts forward the significance of non-coercive dominance through mass media in the international arena.\(^{15}\) Parallel to this view, Joseph Nye argues that:

“When you can get others to admire your ideals and to want what you want, you do not have to spend so much on sticks and carrots to move them in your direction. Seduction is always more effective than coercion, and many values like democracy, human rights, and individual opportunities are deeply seductive.”\(^{16}\)

When adapted to the war situation, the importance of foreign public support increases dramatically. This time, the need for foreign support is more

---


necessary and requires more assistance from others than any other situation. Harold Lasswell accentuates that “… every war must appear to be a war of defense against a menacing, murderous aggressor. There must be no ambiguity about whom the public is to hate.”

Lasswell’s statement is still applicable to contemporary war situations. The necessity of foreign public support became more apparent during the U.S. military interventions into Iraq. Turkish Parliament’s refusal to transport the US forces over Turkish homeland is probably the best example illustrating the importance of foreign public opinion on war preparation efforts. Despite the close alliance of Turkey and the US for decades and broad consensus among the chief executives, the Turkish Parliament refused the use of Turkish territories for logistical support of American troops in Iraq. This refusal was a big surprise for both sides and made the job extremely difficult for the US. The reason d’état of the parliament could be better understood through analysis of the Turkish public opinion on the Iraq war. Public surveys indicated that the public opposition rate against the war was 86% in December 2002, and 90% in January 2003 in Turkey.

The media’s role is considerably vital in shaping international public opinion, chiefly because the public mostly receives information related to international affairs through the mass media. Research on the media public

---

relations reveals that: exposure to news coverage increases the familiarity with, and can play a crucial role in shaping public opinion toward foreign countries.\textsuperscript{19} Entman states that in the area of international affairs where the public doesn’t have firsthand experience, leaders have a great potential to influence public opinion through mass media.\textsuperscript{20} Kern at al. accept media as a prism reflecting, focusing, and magnifying the lights of the political forces in its environment. “\textit{Political forces reflected in the press lens may be powerful enough to start a fire, to put constraints on a president, or conversely to assist him in the elimination of his opposition and the acquisition of power.}”\textsuperscript{21} All these arguments put forward the potential power of international media as an instrument of soft power. That is the basic reason for global actors to attribute considerable importance to international press coverage.

On the other hand, there is another argument that press coverage mostly reflects public opinion. The press can’t ignore the expectations of the public while covering events. However, this doesn’t contradict the previous argument. Taking into account the expectations of the public while designing the coverage increases the power and the significance of the discourse.


Therefore, this research is devoted to figure out the relationship between globalization and international media discourse. It attempts to understand the function of international media on people’s perception of events in this new form of international affairs. Looking at the two Gulf Wars from this point of view through CNN and Al Jazeera, and their reflections on national media organs such as the Hurriyet and Sabah newspapers will definitely help capture the changing/unchanging conditions of mass communication.

1.4. Research Questions

The major question of this research is: Did globalization have an impact on international media discourse? If yes, what kind of an impact did it have? The following subordinate questions will help answering the major research question:

- How was the 1st Gulf War represented in the international media and what were the reflections on the Turkish media discourse?
- How was the 2nd Gulf war represented in the international media and what were the reflections on the Turkish media discourse?
- What are the correspondences and differences of the discourses of the two wars in international and Turkish media?
- What is the relationship between the ultimate results of analysis and globalization theory?
1.5. Key Concepts

**Pro-American source/view/stance:** It is a source, a view, or a stance that accords with and favors the position of the US government in the war.

**Anti-American source/view/stance:** It is a source, a view, or a stance that contradicts and criticizes the position of the US government in the war.
CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Globalization

Globalization has been the buzzword of social sciences over the last couple decades. The popularity of the term has stemmed from its extensive implications on almost every dimension of modern life. However, there is not a consensus on the definition of the globalization yet. A majority of the scholars agree on the fact that globalization is a multidimensional process that leads the world to a dual form of affairs. This process on the one hand, pushes for the integration of social, political, economic and cultural life throughout the world; on the other hand, it stimulates the reaction to this integration at the same time in the same dimensions.

Therefore, the result has been very complex in many ways, at many levels, developing within an already complex social, economic and political context. Many varied dimensions of integration and fragmentation can and do coexist in this globalization practice.¹

In the economic domain, globalization shows its muscles with expansion of interconnected free markets that are propelled by the multinational corporations. This process includes free movement of money, labor, goods and

services. Capitalism has been spreading throughout most of the world in this way. However, the dislocation of people, the conquest of indigenous markets by multinational corporations, and the growing gap between the rich and the poor are other realities of economic globalization.²

In the cultural realm, the English language can be the best example of lingua franca. Western culture has been spreading all over the world via the English language and other means of modern communication. On the other hand, social movements to preserve the indigenous cultures, languages and customs, are growing exponentially.³

Globalization follows the same patterns in the technological sphere. Globalization and technology mutually reinforces one another. Technical innovations precipitate the spread of global culture and codes of conduct. Not only globalizing forces but also localized forces benefit from the means of technology, such as the Internet and the TV. Lundestad gives a good example on the effects of TV, on language:

Today in Whales more than a quarter of 10-14 year olds speak Welsh (in addition to English); in 1971 only 17% did. The explanation lies Welsh-language broadcasting which started in 1960s and was greatly

³ Ibid.
strengthened by the establishment of a separate Welsh TV channel in the 1980s.  

Similar contradictions are observed in the social, political, military, governmental, and environmental aspects of globalization. Globalization in one domain demonstrates spillover impacts over the other realms. Economic and technological globalizations probably result in political and cultural fragmentation also. Thus, it is not easy to claim that the same processes bring about the same consequences in this complex environment. Understanding this complexity is a prerequisite to comprehend the notion of globalization.

Of all the dimensions, communication technology and information revolution is the focus of this research. Therefore, in this part, I will first provide a definition and brief history of globalization. Second, I will explicate the interrelationship between globalization and communication. Third, I will explain the contributions of contemporary communications into the political, economic, commercial and cultural aspects of the process. Ultimately, I will stress the effects of globalization on the indigenous societies.

---


5 Ibid.
2.1.1. Definition

Globalization is a multidimensional process, resulting from micro and macro level interactions among individuals and groups. These interactions were in slow motion at the beginning but the process has been precipitated by technological advances. According to Yale Ferguson, globalization “involves additional governance, military, cultural, demographic, human rights, environmental dimensions as well as the world economy and technology.”

However, globalization is not taken for granted by all citizens of the world. It sparks significant counter hegemonic patterns at the national, regional and subregional levels. Thus, it produces very complex outcomes in many ways and at many levels, as it develops within an already complex political, social and cultural context. Many convergences and divergences can possibly coexist in various circumstances.” Therefore, the safest definition probably would define globalization as “an ongoing process and a contemporary condition, the result of that process.”

---


8 Ibid. pg.8


2.1.2. History

The history of globalization is a controversial topic since the scholars do not have a consensus on the definition and dynamic of the globalization. This brings some problems including mapping the history of the phenomenon. Different definitions generate different chronologies and periodizations.\textsuperscript{11} For example, for Giddens, globalization is one of the outcomes of modernization, therefore the onset of the globalization dates back to the onset of the modernization in 1800's.\textsuperscript{12} Tomlinson perceives globalization as an era coming after imperialism and he dates it back to the 1960's.\textsuperscript{13} This research accepts globalization as an outcome of interactions among individuals and groups; therefore, it dates globalization back to the ancient times when the first interactions started among people.

The interactions among the people of the world have been enjoying an upward spiral due to tremendous technological advances in the last couple of decades. However, this doesn’t mean that these interactions are relatively recent. As Ferguson and Mansbach stress “\textit{No contemporary phenomena lack historical roots or, at least, analogies.}”\textsuperscript{14}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{12} Anthony, G. (1990) \textit{The consequences of modernity}. Stanford, California, Stanford University Press.
\end{flushleft}
Earlier patterns of globalization can be observed on the interactions among different civilizations in the ancient times. The emergence of the first world religions was during the fifth and sixth centuries BC with Zoroastrianism and Buddhism. Development of the ancient Greek civilization on joint contributions of the Indo-European, Egyptian, Phoenician and Aegean cultures is an example of intercivilizational contacts. More or less continuous contacts between the people across Eurasia, from China to Spain, existed since the second century AD. Some of these interactions extended over the renowned Silk Road of transcontinental commerce from Ch`ang-an to Constantinople.\textsuperscript{15}

Limited interactions never stopped also in early modern times. Discoveries, slave trades between continents, gold and silver circulation across the globe and wars between civilizations (Crusades) may be regarded as the examples of early modern time’s global interactions.

\textbf{2.1.3. Global Transportation and Communications’ Effect}

Technological advances in communications increased the pace of globalization after the early-nineteenth century. There were early important improvements such as the invention and development of the printing press, sailing ships, the techniques of navigation, but it is the industrial revolution that started the rapid and continuous development in communication. Langhorne

evaluates this age in three main phases:  i) the combination of steam engine and electric telegraph, ii) the combination of telephone and orbiting satellites and, iii) the combination of telephone, orbiting satellites and computers.\textsuperscript{16}

The invention of the telegraph and telephone, and the application of the steam engine to land and sea transport were remarkable developments in globalization in the nineteenth century. Australia, China, Europe and Japan were linked together via telegraph by the end of the century. U.S. was involved in the chain in 1903. Information flow all over the world was achieved in only a few days. The telephone introduced distance-less voice communication. It was invented in 1876. The first call between countries was achieved in 1891. The first connection over the Atlantic was in 1926. The speed of information flow was virtually simultaneous.

Digital information transfer was the next very significant development in respect to globalization. The idea of sending data digitally by using the computer and telephone was born in 1962, at MIT, from the need to safeguard information in the case of a nuclear attack. Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency achieved the first form of contemporary internet. ARPANET (Advanced Research Projects Agency Network) was published in 1967. The development of ARPANET with the contributions of RAND Corporation in the U.K. and the National Physical Laboratory represents the prototype of contemporary

communication networks. APRANET used a combination of computer hard and software to compress messages into packets and send them over telephone lines. The internet, which is the World Wide Web, was established by expanding this system to the entire world. This was furthered by the emergence of search engines. Langhorne notes that “it represented the completion of the junction between the telephone facilities offered by the orbiting satellite, as well as existing ground based networks, and the computer networked system developed by ARPANET”. Although this was a communication revolution, the quantity of data sent over this network was very limited. The introduction of fiber optic cables was the solution of that problem.

2.1.4. Implications

The implications of these systems have been substantially important in terms of understanding the political and social changes around the globe. The first generation of these technical innovations played a key role on the bipolar strategic rivalry between the USA and the USSR. In a similar fashion, the second phase addressed various needs of the state apparatus throughout the Cold War. The difference was experienced in the third phase. The combination of telephone, orbiting satellites and computer systems served the interests of

individuals rather than that of states. States lost their control of the communication means at this phase. In this context, Langhorne maintains that:

“Many previously important, even formerly vital, systems of administration – political, economic and social – have been rendered increasingly redundant as a result. It may well also turn out that future historians will attribute the end of the cold war, at least in part, to the emergence of a self-propelling and universal communication system.”

All states were affected by these developments. They lost their power given by the first two phases, both at the international and domestic realms. State’s power to control the citizens had been on a downward spiral throughout this process. This power may be constructed in the new forms of institutions of human society in which global and local get stronger simultaneously. The collapse of the USSR and the taming power of the American state can be better understood with this explanation. The dynamics of the first two phases that facilitated and sustained the global dominance was not available during the third phase.

Because the last phase tremendously increased the pace of change in favor of individuals, some of the individual interactions, without any reference to nationality and territory, crossed the vertical divisions of the past. So, vertical
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relations have been replaced by the relations on a horizontal basis. This was achieved by the use of contemporary communication means, being used without control or permission of governments. The situation was also the same for commercial relations all over the world. The technical innovations enabled the financial exchanges and stock markets to operate on the horizontal axis. Thus, the ability of governments to run independent macro-economic policies has been impaired by this process. Governments’ fiscal and monetary politics were designed to attract and keep the global investments to their own territory. Sovereignty of state turned to some kind of servanthood during this era of contemporary communication.\footnote{Ibid.}

Similar consequences also can be seen in the cultural sphere as well as the political, economic and commercial ones. The basic tendency is the same, the squeeze of the familiar middle. The English language, in its North American form has become the language of global communications of horizontal relations. The culture of the USA and, to a much lesser extent of United Kingdom, spread all over the world, wherever the internet is available. English has been successful as being the language of global communication, because of its acceptance to neologism, grammatically plastic future, and rich and powerful literary tradition. However, the dominant global culture has not been welcomed as in the case of the English language.\footnote{Ibid.}
“The combination of rapid change accompanied by a comprehensible sense of unfamiliarity, rootlessness and dismay, emphasized by the decline of traditional political structures, with a sense of aggressive and implacable “westernization” at the hands of a dominant global culture, contributes to the rise of religious fundamentalisms and other forms of suspicious backlash, sometimes terrorist in form. Conspiracies of every kind, religious oddities, many predicting the end of the world, and various versions of violently extreme political views all populate the internet and gain global exposure thereby. And the fundamentalist response seems very particularly ungrateful and even dangerous to those who deeply believe that they are only purveying things that are good in equally fundamental sense.”

Another remarkable consequence of the technological revolution has been the rise of local and particularistic activities. Not only globalizing forces but also localized forces benefit from the virtues of technology. Local groups benefit from the communication means by propagating their values and approaches to the others. However, the situation is not so innocent every time. Crime groups and terrorist organizations also benefit from the virtues of communication means. The result has been the growth of the crime industry. Terrorist organizations and organized crime groups have gained greater means communication among each other. The technical innovations serve them to improve their skills to conduct crime. The Internet has served the needs of local groups in pursuing their interests as much as it has enhanced global activities. These effects squeezed

23 Ibid. pg.16
the middle class and weakened the older forms of loyalties and expectations of the medium size societies.

**2.1.5. Concluding Remarks**

Globalization is not a phenomenon that leads the world into a single direction. Because “it is the result of the endless interactions of micro and macro structures and the question of which predominates in any particular situation is a matter of perspective, of where one breaks into the interactive cycles.” The consequences of interactions seem to be impossible to be the same, every time, for every actor.

Yale Ferguson asserts that “The sheer pace of change makes this age most different from the earlier.” Because the interactions and the pace of change were much more limited, early precedents of globalization seem to have similar but not the same effects with the contemporary era. The combination of telephone, orbiting satellites and computer systems tremendously increased the interactions among individuals in recent decades. The new system was not under the control of states, it removed all barriers and borders among individuals, and gave them the ability to set relations without reference to nationality or
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territoriality. The result has been in favor of the individuals rather than the state. This time the state has been on the side of the losers. Langhorne notes that:

“The developments are having noticeable effects in two main areas: on the internal government of states because of the erosion of political legitimacy and because of structural changes required in the machinery of government; on the external relations between states, because they are no longer the sole players on the global stage and, by extension, on inter-state entities, because if the weakened position of their sponsoring bodies and because they, too, have to live in a more pluralistic world.”

The same pace of change has been experienced also in cultural globalization. Whereas Western culture is prevailing all over the world via the English language and communications means, movements against Western culture to preserve their own cultures of non-Westerners are growing everyday on the other side of the coin.

Globalization’s promotion of the local activities has often been appreciated. When globalization is strengthened, so is the fragmentation.

The increasing pace of change also increased the number of aspects, and the consequences of globalization. The limits of technological advances are not easy to guess, because everyday new advances of communications are
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introduced into the world. Those new devices will increase the pace of change and globalization.

2.2. Globalization and Media

The impact of globalization on media is mostly discussed in terms of structural issues and the directions of information flow. The chief motivation that leads media globalization has been the tremendously increasing speed and decreasing cost of information dissemination with the virtue of satellite technology.\footnote{Herman, E. S., & McChesney, R. (2001). The global media: The new missionaries of corporate capitalism: Cassell.} Satellite television is claimed to ‘usher in a global village’\footnote{Neumann, W.R. (2007). Globalization and the New Media, in Graber, D. A., McQuail, D., & Norris, P. (2008). The politics of news: The news of politics: Washington DC: Congressional Quarterly Press, pg 230-246.} by causing the potential ‘death of distance’.\footnote{Cairncross, F. (1997). The death of distance: how the communications revolution will change our lives: Harvard Business Press.} In addition to those, decreasing information control and dissemination has boosted the communication among the citizens of the world. Those advances rendered the statement defining the previous stage obsolete: “nation states in the periphery are mostly receiving the end of the public diplomacy because most lack the capacity to compete on the global basis.”\footnote{Gunaratne, S. A. (2005). Public diplomacy, global communication and world order: An analysis based on theory of living systems. Current Sociology, 53(5), 749. Pg.760.} Nowadays anyone can easily disseminate information for or against another one with no reference to its power. The result of those changes on the media is still controversial. Controversy is very similar to the impact of
globalization on other dimensions of life, whereas some say that globalization increased the level of homogeneity, some others claim that the major outcome has been diffusion of media all over the world.

2.2.1. Homogenization

Homogenization is the basic critique against globalization since the idea of homogeneity in media mostly stems from the perception that globalization eliminates cultural differences and leads humanity toward a Western-dominated single culture. From this point of view Kissinger suggests that globalization becomes the new name of the American dominance on the globe.\textsuperscript{33} According to Schiller, there is a close association between the US’ commercialized culture and its military-industrial structure. Schiller claims that the US used aggressive tactics in constructing its cultural empire and capitalized the media to extend its defense and empowerment.\textsuperscript{34} American transnational cultural domination, which was previously called culture imperialism, created a worldwide consumer class, the minority of the world population, with sufficient income and left others, the


majority, stuck in the poverty and thereby transformed the world into a shopping mall.\textsuperscript{35}

Like Schiller, an important number of scholars raised concerns related to the culture imperialism in the last couple decades of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century. Whereas the studies of Golding\textsuperscript{36} and Tunstall\textsuperscript{37} are among the supporters of the cultural imperialism theory in the 1970’s, Tunstall and Machin,\textsuperscript{38} McChesney, Dorfman,\textsuperscript{39} Dorfman and Mattelard,\textsuperscript{40} and Herman and Chomsky\textsuperscript{41} endorsed it in the 1980’s and 1990’s.

Tunstall argues that the US’ media broadcasts and products dominated many parts of the world by infiltrating themselves into the local media. He explicates that the styles and patterns of the US media were adopted and copied by most countries. The perception of a newspaper developed by this kind of duplication in those places.\textsuperscript{42}


“In most of the world’s countries the media are only there at all, on the present scale, as a result of imports in which the American media (with some British support) predominate. One major influence of American imported media lies in the styles and patterns which most other countries in the world have adopted and copied. This influence includes the very definition of what a newspaper, or a feature film, or a television set is.”43

This trend has been clearly observed until the advent of the Internet. However, the scene started to be ambiguous since the interaction of people from the same culture tremendously increased and so did the reaction to globalization. As Machin, D., & Van Leeuwen report, today, the US culture is still dominant; however, it is obvious that the US culture is also changing. Interaction among local cultures and values everywhere affects American culture as well.44

### 2.2.2. Diffusion

Diffusion is the localization side of the glocalization of the media. As a counterargument against the perception of homogenization, the opponents claimed that globalization creates the reaction to itself by feeding the feeling of own culture and beliefs. One of the most salient upshots of globalization has been the empowerment of indigenous cultures through increasing interactions of the people. In this vein, the virtues of cheap, fast and easily accessed communication means are undeniable. The theory of convergence explains this

43 Ibid. pg: 117.
process inarticulately. This theory can be defined as “The coming together of computing, telecommunications, and media in a digital environment.”

Convergence emerges as a result of the innovations in communication technologies. However, it has dramatic implications for the content of communication, the relationship between the public and media organizations, the structure of media, and the way that a communication professional does his/her job.

Another important step leading to the diffusion of media has been the privatization of media concomitant to the last decade’s liberalization and deregulation politics. Privatization of media has emerged from the idea that ‘free ownership better serve the democracy’ in recent decades. The US’ Telecommunications Act of 1996 has launched a massive commercialization of the media by removing the restrictions on media ownership, and opening the way for companies to make acquisitions and mergers across the media. The trend of privatization has been followed by the countries in Europe, Latin America and others respectively, and resulted in diffusion of media all over the globe.

Tunstall acknowledges this diffusion in his current work *Media were American*. He argues that the media have been under a massive change in the last forty years and those changes altered the balance of media power.
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unfavorably to the US. A global media does still exist; however, the role of American media is much smaller than national media. He suggests that the media nowadays comprises four major media regions. Those regions are Euro-America (the whole of North and South America and most of Europe), China, India, and Arabic-Language media. They are largely self-sufficient and based on geography, religious and cultural tradition, and a main language or a main language groups.49

In addition to Tunstall’s broad categorization of new media structures, there has been an emerging individual dissemination of information, creating diversity of voices, increasing the transparency, and so making media management a much more challenging business in this new era. ”New communication technology means a journalist is born every minute.” 50 The result is the phenomenon of “citizen reporters”. Helen Boaden, the BBC’s director of news, confirms that “We had 50 images within an hour” and describes this as a ”new world” and a ”gear change”.51

Appaduari maintains the claims of diffusion by stressing on the changing perceptions of the people of different cultures. He suggests that all global media products are not necessarily perceived in the same way everywhere in the world.

People from different cultures indigenize the global media products since they interpret and experience them in different ways.\textsuperscript{52}

Hjarvard leads attentions to the production of new discourses with the virtue of globalization. He describes the new international media as a loosely integrated, multilayered system and proposes that there is not only a differentiation of media, its content and audiences, but also an increasing interconnectedness among local, regional and global in this system. Therefore, this system does not exclude or threaten specific cultures; moreover, it provides each culture with the opportunity to represent its discourse and struggle against others to attract attentions in the globalized world.\textsuperscript{53}

Nye also accentuates that the diffusion of media is real and changed the conditions that determine information dissemination. He says that whereas CNN framed the 1\textsuperscript{st} Gulf War, the diffusion of media and so the rise of new media actors required a new strategy for the US to maintain its soft power in the 2\textsuperscript{nd} Gulf War.\textsuperscript{54}

Recent literature confirms Nye’s claims about the changing conditions of international media and the challenge for the US to maintain its soft power. Bennet, in his study in 1994,\textsuperscript{55} argues that at least in the short run, news


coverage of war and foreign policy echoes the official views rather than leading them. The argument of Bennet is proved by the studies of Dickson, Entman, and Entman and Page on the news coverage of the US invasion of Panama, 1983 Korean Airline shut down, and the 1st Gulf War respectively. However, recent studies by Jasperson and El-Kikhia, Powers and el-Nawawy, Aday at al, Nisbet at al, Wojcieszak, and Patrick and Thrall show the challenge for the US to maintain its soft power by revealing that alternate views are being offered. The study of Jasperson and El-Kikhia on the news coverage of the Afghanistan war proved that whereas CNN’s coverage was still reflective of US official positions, Al Jazeera took a position against the US official view by concentrating on the humanitarian frames and the devastation of the war.

According to Jasperson and El-Kikhia the availability of Al Jazeera as an alternate news source pushed western media to cover the war in a more balanced way than they did before.65

2.3. CNN

CNN (Cable News Network) is the first all news TV network produced in the USA, established by Ted Turner in 1980.66 The ownership of CNN passed from Turner Broadcasting to another American giant, Time Warner, the world’s largest media company in 1996 and it is still running as part of that company.67 The channel pioneered news media in the 1980’s and 1990’s through its coverage of events and use of technology.68 CNN expanded its capacity by starting numerous satellite and cable news network including CNN International (CNNI) and websites all over the world. Nowadays CNN reaches 2 billion people through 24 branded networks and services, 47 bureaus and more than 1,000 affiliates in more than 200 countries and territories.69 It has gained and maintained a privileged position as the most prominent news provider and a

model of an effective Western news network introducing itself as a global network rather than American."70

2.3.1. CNN and CNNI

Among other fractions CNNI has a very significant position, since CNN first attracted the attentions and maintained them with its international coverage. Although they are both fractions of CNN, CNNI is perceived as the CNN for all of the international viewers of the channel in more than 200 countries and CNN/US is perceived as the CNN for the American audience. The reason behind this is the separation of both channels in the 1990’s. CNN was first established as a news network composed of CNN and Headline News, however, increasing amounts of international coverage pushed the network to establish a separate international news channel in the 1980s and CNNI was launched in 198571 as a separate news channel and then the original CNN that became CNN/US. Therefore, the CNN brand stands as the umbrella network of under which all fractions fall. Whereas the rivals of CNN/US are national news channels in the US, CNNI competes with Al Jazeera and BBC World.

CNN’s coverage of international news, particularly of the 1st Gulf War, exploded the popularity of the channel and resulted in the emergence of the


network as an actor of international politics. Being inspired by CNN’s success, other news providers like BBC and NBC also started to establish their own international satellite news networks after CNN. The channel’s use of technology and the coverage of international events attracted limited attention from scholars and professionals until the late 1980’s. CNN’s coverage of the massacre at Tiananmen Square and the Humanitarian crisis in Somalia and Bosnia led scholars to accept the impact of satellite news providers on Chinese and Western Governments and suggest them as international actors. CNN’s coverage of the 1st Gulf War exploded its popularity and accordingly attracted greater attentions of scholars investigating the relationship between news media and foreign policy. Emerging from these discussions is the possible effects of news media on foreign policy, called the ‘CNN effect’.

2.3.2. CNN Effect

Media-government relations is one of the most controversial debates of communication studies. Some scholars claim that media pursue the interests of political elites. Bennet’s hypothesis of indexing, Herman and Chomsky’s Propaganda Model, Dickson’s study on the US invasion of Panama, 
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Entman’s comparative framing study on Korean Airline and Iran Air incidents,\textsuperscript{76} and Entman and Page’s research on the media bias in the 1\textsuperscript{st} Gulf War\textsuperscript{77} are among the studies claiming that news media echo the discourse of government. However, some others argue the contrary with the claim of the media’s impact on governmental politics especially on foreign policy issues. A last group of scholars stays in the middle and claims that there is an interaction between government and media. Putting the government in the center they claim that media can have the ability to effect government policies either in regards to specific conditions or in an indirect way. Robinson’s media-policy interaction model\textsuperscript{78} and Entman’s cascading activation model\textsuperscript{79} are among the studies explicating the interaction. The study of Kern, Levering, and Levering asserts that the issue is not whether the president dominates media or media exercise influence over the president, the question is whether competing forces are at work on an issue. They conclude that press is a reflective institution since “reporters, editors, and columnists are


\textsuperscript{78} Ibid.

affected not only by their professional settings, but also by their political environment.”

Among those ideas the concept of the “CNN effect’ stands for the idea that real time news media have expanded their capacity to the level that they can affect the conduct of policy through the ability to provoke responses from audiences and global elites to global events. According to Livingston “the impact of the new global real-time media are substantial, if not profound.” The end of the Cold War resulted in the US’ loss of an evident rationale to justify its foreign policy, and this gap was filled by global real time media through the management of international crisis. The US has mostly pursued a responsive foreign policy relying on the “impulse and image” after the cold war. Livingston accentuates his argument by differentiating the effects of media on specific foreign policy issues. Firstly, media functions as an accelerant by shortening the decision making time through live coverage during the time of the war. Secondly, media functions as an impediment in two ways: It inhibits the emotions of the public by broadcasting the unwanted views from the battle scene, like an American soldier being drugged through the streets of Mogadishu in 1993; and, it risks the operational security by exposing sensitive operations. Thirdly, media
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functions as an agenda setting agent by reordering the priorities of government with coverage. Livingston claims that US foreign policy agenda is sometimes an echo of media content.\textsuperscript{84}

In his more recent study with Eachus, Livingston claims that there is no question on the media’s capacity to impact policy through emotional or psychological impact. However, the question is“who controls this capacity?”. He claims that the capacity of media is controlled by reporters, producers and editors rather than policy makers to “the degree that foreign policy is reactive to news content.” \textsuperscript{85}

To sum up, the relationship with media and government is still a subject of controversy. Whether it is true or not, the fact that CNN’s coverage of international events has a very significant position within these discussions renders it a very critical actor in the realm of global media.

2.4. Al Jazeera

Al Jazeera was established as an Arabic News Channel by the Emir of Qatar Hamed bin Khalifa al Thani in 1996.\textsuperscript{86} The channel was launched as a part

\textsuperscript{84} Ibid.


of political reform in Qatar\textsuperscript{87} with the hopes of breaking the dominance of Western media all around the world through being the voice of the voiceless and the global south.\textsuperscript{88} Although the channel was launched with a onetime $137 million loan of the Emir of Qatar and dependent upon government money to survive,\textsuperscript{89} it did not function like state-owned national channels of the Arab world.\textsuperscript{90} The commitment of the Emir to transform the country to a liberal constitutional monarchy was the basic reason behind the editorial independence of the channel. He removed media censorship by abolishing the Ministry of Information and Culture as a part of his political reforms and provided Al Jazeera with independence from the government.\textsuperscript{91}

Al Jazeera has emerged as the most prominent voice of Arab populations in a very short time. The channel had an estimated audience population of 35-40 million within the Muslim world and almost 4.5 million in the Western world only five years after its debut.\textsuperscript{92} The popularity of the channel increased with the broadcasting of the Osama bin Laden tapes after 9/11 and exploded with the coverage of the US war in Afghanistan. On the contrary to CNN’s coverage reflecting the official views of the US, the coverage of Al Jazeera on the war in
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\textsuperscript{92} El-Nawawy, M., & Iskander, A. (2002). \textit{Al-Jazeera: How the free Arab news network scooped the world and changed the Middle East}: Basic Books.
Afghanistan mostly concentrated on the humanitarian frames and the devastation of the war.\textsuperscript{93} Therefore, the channel was criticized for increasing anti-US sentiments in the Muslim world and creating pressure on Muslim governments to behave against the US policy.\textsuperscript{94} The channel’s coverage maintained to reflect the Arab perception and to affect opinions and policies of the governments around the world after the Afghanistan war as well. The result has been the discussions of the ‘Al Jazeera effect’.

2.4.1. Al Jazeera Effect

The ‘Al Jazeera effect’ is a concept referring to the possible impacts of the news coverage of Al Jazeera on public opinion, other Arab media actors and their coverage, and ultimately the policies and opinions of governments across the world.\textsuperscript{95} Using the virtues of global communication technologies and the freedom provided by the government of Qatar Al Jazeera produced an Arab perception, contrary to that of CNNI and BBC World on the coverage of international events.\textsuperscript{96} The words of Riz Khan of Al Jazeera explicate the difference easily: "Other channels show the missiles being fired; we show them


\textsuperscript{96}Ibid.
This kind of coverage definitely produced several significant consequences.

Lynch claims that the coverage of Al Jazeera provided Arab populations with an open public discussion realm in an environment dominated by government voices for decades. The availability of oppositional ideas on sensitive and controversial issues on the scene resulted in the different interpretations of sociopolitical issues than the perceptions propagated by governments and encouraged public dialogue in Arab world. He also argues that increasing public dialogue among citizens challenged them to question the status quo.98

According to Alterman increasing public dialogue among citizens of the Arab world ultimately pushed the politicians to take public opinion into consideration, and provided the public with the power to shape government politics.99 El-Nawawy and Iskander claim that the coverage of Al Jazeera on the second Palestinian intifada triggered protests across the Middle East. The fact that those protests were the first unification of Arab populations for the same goal
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the first time since the early 1970’s rendered it very significant for the
governments of the region.100

Al Jazeera’s coverage also affected other Arab media, rendering the old style Arab journalism that echoed government ideology obsolete.101 According to Alterman, Arab Al Jazeera paved the way for Arab news media to have a more and more internationalist perspective. Some of the Arab media, abandoning the parrot role for the governments, become more challenging and exciting.102

In conclusion, similar to the ‘CNN effect’, the ‘Al Jazeera effect’ also composes a significant topic in terms of the effects of global communication technologies on media - government relations. Moreover, the ‘Al Jazeera effect’ is also claimed to have the capacity to change the perception and opinions of the Muslim populations of the events and mobilize them for common purposes.

CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY

3.1. Framing Analysis

This research suggests that the discourse of international news media emerge through the frames that they use while representing the events. A frame is “a story line or an organizing idea”¹ that “simplifies, priorities, and structures the narrative flow of events.”² According to Entman, framing is ‘selecting some aspects of a perceived reality and making 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 Put another way framing is the representation of events “in a way that promotes perceptions and interpretations that benefit one side while hindering the other.”⁴

Norris et al. suggest that a news frame in a society is mostly formed by three basic factors. These are “the basic facts surrounding the … event itself: and the way that these events are interpreted by official sources in the government …; and by communiqués, manifestoes, press statements, or interviews with spokespersons articulating the grievances or demands of
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dissident groups”. News media itself is also another factor with the dynamics (marketing, organizational structure, ideology, ownership etc.) having an impact on the composition of the frame. Credible sources generate alternative perceptions on the actors and the factors of the events in coherence with the incident. Whereas sometimes any incident is relatively neutral some others may be highly controversial in terms of the language used to depict the event, the choice, depiction and meaning of the iconic images, and of course the preference of the experts and authorities for evaluation.

The components of a frame can be selected in a news text by “their capacity to stimulate support of or opposition to the sides in a political conflict.” This capacity can be measured by ‘cultural resonance’ and ‘magnitude’. The more resonance with culture means the greater potential for influence. So, salient cultural terms and images, noticeable, understandable, memorable, and emotionally charged are preferred to evoke strong emotional responses to obtain more influence. Magnitude refers to the prominence and repetition of the words and images of the frame. Whereas magnitude increases the capacity of resonance to influence people, sometimes the prominence of a culturally resonant term or image removes the need for magnitude. Those terms or images have sufficient resonance to evoke public awareness of the event with no need
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for repetition such as the image of airplanes flying into the twin towers on September 11.\textsuperscript{10}

This research will attempt to analyze the discourse of international media on war justification through the identification of frames in the light of framing and reasoning devices. The process of analysis will be substantially discussed under the topic of data analysis.

3.2. Cases and Timing

To be able to figure out the impact of globalization on international media discourse, a comparison of the international media discourses of two similar events (before & after the contemporary globalization era) seems to be the best way. Here, the question comes to the fore about how to determine the before & after contemporary globalization era. Several arguments have been raised by the salient literature on the onset of globalization. However, for this research the most important corner stone is the explosion of the internet access to the masses, coinciding with the end of the 1990’s and afterwards.

According to NUA research, the total number of internet users in 1995 was about 26 million, 84% of which were Canadians and Americans. The number increased to about 179 million in 1999 but the overall proportion of Canadian & American user’s decreases to 57%. Over the same period, the percent of

\textsuperscript{10} Ibid.
European internet users increased to 24% and Asian users increased to 15%. Even if they don’t have a significant percentage, Latin America and the Middle East start to have room in the chart in 1999.\textsuperscript{11}

Internet World Statistics also gives similar information about the explosion in the number of internet users in the world. In this chart the turning point of the century again seems to be the corner stone of the mass access of the internet.

Of course the number of internet users has kept increasing after 2002 and reached almost 1.6 billion in 2010,\textsuperscript{12} and it still keeps increasing. In parallel to the

expansion of the numbers, the quality of the internet users have been changing. Internet access has been spreading from the upper spheres of societies to lower social classes. Reaching the number of almost 500 million people from upper social classes of their population means that this number has the power to compose public opinion in their environment. This also means that basic cornerstone for the internet was met at sometime around the year 2002.
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**Figure 2 Internet Users in the World since 1995**

Two similar events for comparison are the two Gulf Wars. They are comparable for the reasons that:

1. The time of the 1\textsuperscript{st} war is before and the 2\textsuperscript{nd} one is after our deadline.

2. The sides of the two wars are exactly the same (USA vs Iraq, West vs East, Crusades vs Crescent etc.)

The exact periods of both wars selected for this research are the periods starting with the launch of the US’ campaign against Iraq and, ending with the elimination of the arguments that provided the justification for both wars.

For the first war, this period starts with Iraq’s invasion of Kuwait on August 2, 1990 and ends with Saddam Hussein’s acceptance of the all UN resolutions on February 28, 1991. The entire period of the 1\textsuperscript{st} War is covered for the research.

For the second war, the research period starts with President Bush’s address on Jan 29, 2002 declaring Iraq as a part of an "axis of evil" and ends with the elimination of the US’ arguments to justify the war, the removal of Saddam Hussein’s regime and WMDs. Saddam was captured on Dec 13, 2003 and WMD allegations proved to be false on Jan 25, 2004.
3.3. Limitations and Strengths

There are a couple of things seeming to be significant limitations for this research. A clear explication of those issues removes those questions.

First, whereas the motivation for the 1\textsuperscript{st} war was preventive, the 2\textsuperscript{nd} one was preemptive. This may have a significant effect on the discourse of war. The fact that the level of international public support for the 2\textsuperscript{nd} war was not much weaker than the 1\textsuperscript{st} one, explicitly weakens this claim, if not eliminates it completely.

Second, whereas the 1\textsuperscript{st} war lasted for about 7 months, the 2\textsuperscript{nd} one is still current in its 8\textsuperscript{th} year with military presence in the target country. Since the research covers just the first two years of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} war, this may not be a significant limitation.

There are also strengths of the research. The first strength is the data. The transcripts of TV news, retrieved from LexisNexis and CNN web archives, web news from each news organizations’ own websites are definitely a kind of data which doesn’t invoke any controversy about the soundness of data.

Another strength is the framing analysis method, supported by content analysis. This method not only provides the frequency of the framing devices but also examines the reasoning devices over the text. Even in the absence of explicit reasoning devices within the text, it probes into the potential of the whole
text as a reasoning device. Therefore, framing analysis is a strong tool, increasing the validity and reliability of the findings.

The background of the researcher in both areas, globalization and communication studies, is another strength. A Master’s degree in Global Affairs and an almost completed Master’s degree in communication sciences, and a four year concentration of propaganda and public diplomacy literature definitely offer a significant strength to the research.

3.4. Unit of Analysis

This research analyzes the framing of CNN for the first war and CNNI and Al Jazeera for the second war.

Since CNN was the only news source for the first war, there is no other option.

For the second war, there have been more news sources covering the war; however, there is a necessity to make selections among them. Of all them, it is clear that CNNI is again one of the most dominant sources of the news and mostly accepted as the representative of the discourse of the US, a side of the conflict. Therefore, CNN International seems to be the best alternative for reflecting the discourse of the US. Among of all them Al Jazeera seems to have the potential to generate an alternative discourse to the dominant one, as an Arab international news channel.
3.4.1. Control Group

A control group is needed to determine the reflections of the international media discourse with national media. Turkey seems to be one of the best alternatives as a control group since it stands just in the middle of both sides both geographically and politically.

Two daily newspapers, Hurriyet and Sabah, are selected as units of analysis, since they are both among the most circulated, privately owned, and centrally positioned newspapers of the country. The reason for selecting newspapers from Turkish Media is the unavailability of TV news transcripts for Turkish TV stations. There are quite number of other studies in the literature comparing discourses of news media by analyzing TV news transcripts and press.

3.5. Sampling

The sample for the analysis is selected through the random sampling of the data. For this sake, two news transcripts from each unit of analysis are selected from the first day of every ten days beginning from the first day of the research periods for each war. The number of sample days is 21 for the first war while it is 73 for the second war. However, no transcript is found in some of the sample days particularly in the year 2002. This is mainly because the US-Iraq tension was in the initial step in 2002 and there was another hot topic on the
stage, the ongoing US war in Afghanistan. A review of the data confirmed that the attention of the international news media was mainly on the war in Afghanistan rather than the US-Iraq tension in the year 2002. Therefore, the sample days having no stories related to the 2\textsuperscript{nd} Gulf War are omitted. This way, for the 1\textsuperscript{st} war:

24 stories of CNN are collected from Lexis Nexis.

For the 2\textsuperscript{nd} war:

95 stories of CNNI are collected from Lexis Nexis and CNNI web archive.

84 stories of Al Jazeera are collected from Lexis Nexis and the Al Jazeera web archives. Whereas 36 (43\%) stories of the Al Jazeera sample are Al Jazeera TV transcripts, 48 (57\%) of them come from Al Jazeera Web News. Al Jazeera web news is added into the data because of the unavailability of a sufficient number of TV transcripts covering the research period. A two month test is conducted on Al Jazeera English TV and the Al Jazeera English website to check if both news sources have the same discourse on the justification of the war. The results confirm the same stance in both sources. Therefore, the sample is composed through random sampling of the data collected from both sources.

121 stories of Hurriyet are collected from the Hurriyet web archives.

84 stories of Sabah are collected from the Sabah web archives.
Most of the stories analyzed are very long and complex stories including multiple types of news in one story. Therefore, the complexities of the stories are explained in detail and submitted through story complexity charts at the beginning of the finding sections for each case.

An inter coder reliability check is made among three different coders. The results proved a reliability rate of 76%. The reliability check is made for the controversial nodes, like the stance of the story. Others are mostly objective sections like the number of the metaphors, concepts, or story types.

3.6. Data Analysis

Gamson and Lash define a frame as a media package consisting of all indicators or framing devices that helps to identify a frame.\(^\text{13}\) Those devices are metaphors, catchphrases, visual images, lexical choices, selection of sources, graphics, stereotypes, dramatic characters etc.\(^\text{14}\) He explains that in addition to framing devices, there are also reasoning devices that are associated with the four basic functions of framing; defining a problem, assigning responsibility, passing moral judgments and reaching possible solutions.\(^\text{15}\) Reasoning devices can be explicitly seen in the news text. However, framing theory assumes that


\(^\text{14}\) Ibid.

even if the reasoning devices are not manifested in the text, since the frame itself is a construction of an idea, they are still evoked by the reader in the interpretation process of the news as latent messages.

The analysis process proceeds in the light of the indicators written above. Thus, once the data is collected, first a categorization is made in accordance with the sampling instructions. Then, a two step analysis is conducted on the sample. First, a descriptive analysis (Quantitative content analysis) and then a qualitative framing analysis are done. Both analyses are conducted through a codebook providing the classification and measurement of the variables. Quantitative content analysis of the data is conducted through the coding sheet on the Excel workbook in order to figure out the frequency of framing devices in the texts and so to operationalize the qualitative framing analysis. Qualitative analysis is made to deepen the analysis and explore the real meanings in the discourse. The analysis is made with NVivo 8 Qualitative Research Software that increases the speed and efficiency of the analysis process by helping the researcher easily classify the materials, code them, and submit results. Coding conducted through the codebook and formulated in a way that allows the coder to interpret the real meaning of the text. Therefore, it is as possible as in the way that provides exploration of the framing and reasoning devices explicitly.

In the first step of the analysis the descriptive statistics for each variable are produced. For this purpose, a separate copy of the coding sheet is produced on an Excel workbook for each news channel. Each story in the sample is read word by word and recorded in the coding sheet accordingly with the coding
instructions. Coding sheet is designed as a chart and each story is given a segment for each variable. Through this way, each feature of each story is coded as 1 in the related segments. In the end all the segments for each variable are summed up and descriptive results are produced.

In the second step of the analysis, a separate file is created for each news channel and a separate node is created for each variable in each file in NVivo 8 software. The stories are coded in the related nodes through the coding instructions while being read. In the end, each node provided the coding results for each variable in the files of each news channel separately.

Consequently, the findings are submitted and interpreted.
CHAPTER 4 FIRST GULF WAR

A descriptive content analysis and then a qualitative framing analysis are conducted on the CNN sample in order to examine how international media justified the 1st Gulf War.

4.1. The Results of Analysis for CNN Sample

The sample is comprised of the 24 CNN stories, selected through a random sampling of CNN data covering the war. All of them are interview-news analysis stories and directly about the war.

The analysis of the sample shows that CNN has a predominantly pro-American discourse on the justification of the 1st Gulf War. This stance is clearly seen after the review of the descriptive content analysis results. The results of the qualitative framing analysis also confirm the same stance and help better understand the discourse by providing a more detailed outlook.

The results for each variable are submitted below and then a general review of the results is made.
I. Does the story favor any side of the war?

I.I. Source

Sources are the people present in a story with their comments or statements. They may be involved in the story as an interviewee, an analyst or a speaker.

Sources are coded in terms of their stance, cultural identity and relation to any government.

I.I.I. Sources by Stance

Coding results of sources by stance proved that 39 (75%) of 52 sources have a pro-American stance, 7 (13%) have an anti-American stance, and 6 (12%) are neutral.

Pro-Americans

Pro-American sources claim the invasion of Kuwait by Iraqi forces threatens peace in the Middle East and the world. They argue that this situation should be handled immediately by any means, and, this issue cannot be linked with any other issue in the Middle East.

Many liken Saddam Hussein to an evil like Hitler, citing his cruelty against his own people and Kurds. They claim that if he is not stopped he would lead the world into another World War, or, he could use WMDs against others.
Some of them offer the assassination of Saddam as a better way than having a war.

Another group claims that the war should not end until Iraqi forces leave Kuwait unconditionally. They claim that Saddam should be tamed by diplomatic and political ways (like embargo), rather than militarily, if he withdraws from Kuwait. Others claim that the war should not end until Saddam is removed from power in Iraq. They want the US army to wage a ground operation in Iraq to remove Saddam.

The softest group of pro-Americans does not perceive the war as the best solution to the problem. However, they stress that they support the US government, whatever its decision is.

They all call the process the liberation of the Kuwait and Iraqi people.

**Anti-Americans**

Like pro-Americans, anti-American sources claim that the invasion of Kuwait by Iraqi forces is an attack to the peace of the Middle East and the world. However, they argue that there have been other attacks to the peace of the world for years, especially Israel-Palestine or Israel-Lebanon issues.

According to anti-Americans, those problems should be taken into consideration together. They allege that peace in the Middle East cannot be obtained without considering the Israel Palestine issue; they blame the US for not
caring about peace in the Middle East but instead are interested in Iraq’s oil reserves.

They also perceive the existence of American soldiers in the Middle East as a threat to the security of the Middle East and argue that if this is a problem for the Middle East then it should be solved by Middle Easterners.

Another group of Anti-Americans do not link the issue with another one. However, they claim that the case doesn’t fit into Just War Theory, so the war is expected to bring more devastation than peace in this case. They argue that if the goal is to provide peace for people, the problem should be addressed through peaceful, diplomatic means.

The last group that should be mentioned as a part of Anti-Americans is the anti-war groups. Being against the war in any condition renders them naturally Anti-American.

Whereas some of them do not mention the cruelty of Saddam, most of them accept Saddam as a cruel leader. However, they do not believe that Saddam has the power, like Hitler, to challenge the peace of the world or to use WMDs against other countries.

Whereas pro-Americans claim that the US government is justified in its actions, most of anti-Americans argue that neither Iraq nor the US is justified with a stress on the latter.
Neutrals

Neutral sources are mostly the ones providing information about war related issues in terms of their expertise.

I.I.II. Sources by Culture

The sources are coded in terms of culture to be able to discern the salience of cultures in the discourse. Culture is coded through Huntington’s use of culture as a common denominator for the people of the world. Huntington suggests that the world is divided into 9 main cultures. Western and Muslim cultures are coded because they represent the conflicting sides of the war. Other cultures are coded as others. Whereas western culture is located in Northern America, Europe (excluding orthodox eastern and southeastern Europe) and
Australia, Muslim culture is situated on the Muslim countries of the Middle East, Northern Africa, and Asia\(^1\).

The results show that 48 of 52 (92\%) sources are Western and 4 (8\%) of them are Muslim.

Whereas 39 (81\%) of 48 Western sources have a pro-American stance, 5 (11\%) are neutral and 4 (8\%) have an anti-American stance.

---

Of the 4 Muslim sources, whereas 3 (75%) hold an anti-American stance, 1 (20%) has a neutral stance, and not a single Muslim source having a pro-American stance.
I.III. Government Officials as the Source:

The coding of sources by their relation to any government shows that at least one active/retired government official is hosted as the source in 20 (83.3%) of 24 stories. The total number of government officials as source is 30 with 26 (87%) from the US, 2 (7%) from Israel, 1 (3%) is from the Arab League, and 1 (3%) is from Turkey.

![Figure 7 Distribution of Government Officials by Country](image)

The distribution of government officials is as follows: Under Secretary of Defense 2 (7%), Assistant Secretary of Defense 1 (3%), Senators 7 (23%), Congressmen 6 (20%), former National Security Adviser 2 (7%), former CIA director 2 (7%), former chief of staff of Vice President Bush 1 (3%), former military officials 3 (10%), and former diplomats 2 (7%). Other government officials
are Israeli Ambassador to the US 2(7%), Arab League Ambassador to the UN 1 (3%) and Turkish Ambassador to the US 1 (3%).

**Figure 8 Distribution of Government Officials by Position Held**

I.II. Anchor

Anchors are coded in terms of their stances in each story separately. The term “anchor stance” is used to define the stance of the anchor based on their performance in each story, not on their personality. According to the coding results, 39 anchor stances are seen in the 24 stories. 32 (82%) of them have a pro-American stance, 5 (13%) are neutral, and 2 (5%) have an Anti-American stance.
Anchors sometimes clearly portray their pro-American views or behave in a pro-American manner by discussing different options with a pro-American scope. They are not likely to voice the views of anti-Americans as well as those of the pro-Americans.

There is no clear anti-American anchor stance. However, they sometimes may be accepted as partly anti-American in some specific cases. In fact, anchors take a more hawkish stance than the US government in these specific cases.

The first example is their harsh opposition against the alliance of the US with Syria. They blame the US government for being in the same bed with Hafez al-Assad, another dictator killing his own people.

“Anchor: .. what is so great about a new world order that puts us in the same bed with Syria?”
Jim Baker is off this Thursday to Damascus to beg Hafez al-Assad for help in this new world order. Now, here’s a man who arranged the blow up of the Pan Am jet over Lockerbie, who slaughtered 20,000 of his own citizens when a town made trouble for him. Isn’t he just as bad as Saddam Hussein?”

They also harshly criticize the statements of US officials, including Bush, when they mention a diplomatic solution to the problem. In those specific cases, anchors seem to be clashing with the American position by opposing diplomatic solutions while insisting on mentioning Saddam’s cruelty and the necessity of immediate military action.

Anchors having a neutral stance just ask questions to figure out the real situation with no indication of any pro or anti-Americanism.

I.III. References:

References are the sources seen in a short video or those quoted directly by the anchors. According to the coding results 46 references are made in the 24 stories. Whereas 38 (83%) of them have a pro-American stance, 7 (15%) have an anti-American, and 1 (2%) has a neutral stance.
All the references are coded by their specific positions for a detailed understanding of their stances. The distribution is as follows: President Bush 24 (53%), Vice President Cheney 3 (7%), Vice President Dan Quayle 1 (2%), Secretary of State James Baker 3 (7%), US Generals 2 (4%), Senators 2 (4%), Congressmen 2 (4%), Saddam 1 (3%), Tariq Aziz 3 (7%), King Hussein 1 (3%), and others (anti-American) 3 (7%).
I.IV. The Use of Metaphors, Concepts, Stereotypes, and Analogies

Hitler Analogy

The Hitler analogy is used in 8 (33%) of the 24 stories.

The Hitler analogy is used to depict Saddam's character and the potential threat posed by him. These critics refer to Saddam Hussein's cruelty against his own people and Kurds, and some even claim that he is an evil like Hitler. Some go so far as to claim that Saddam is crueler than Hitler, since he uses human shields to protect himself which even Hitler didn’t do.

The analogy is also used to depict the potential threat posed by Saddam. Saddam is accused of invading other Arab countries step by step Like
Hitler did in Europe. The invasion of Kuwait is perceived to be the first step of his expansionist policy. Saudi Arabia is perceived to be the second country in the way of Saddam, and unless he is stopped at this point, it will be bloodier to stop him after he invades other strategic Middle Eastern countries and has nuclear weapons. Therefore some claim he has the potential to lead the world into the 3rd World War if he is not stopped.

The analogy is substantially discussed in the stories and given credibility until the war starts. However, it loses its credibility after the military operation starts and Saddam’s military power is proven to be weaker than expected.

I.V. Human Interest Point

Results show that there is only one human interest story in the sample. It tells the story of an American woman escaping from Kuwait to the US after Saddam invades Kuwait. The story depicts the atrocity of Saddam from the standpoint of an American woman. She tells of how she escaped from Kuwait with the help of some Lebanese guys just after the invasion, and offers examples of atrocities perpetrated by Iraqi soldiers in Kuwait. One example is the rape of a British stewardess by an Iraqi soldier at the check point.

I.VI. Story Generally

Stories are coded by their general stance based on a total assessment of the stances of the anchors and the sources. According to the results of this coding, 16 (66.6%) of 24 stories show clear indications of pro-Americanism.
Whereas 8 (33.3%) of them are neutral, none of the stories show any clear indication of anti-Americanism.

I.VII. Does the story work for any party?

The stories are also coded in terms of their function for the parties of the war. Since a pro or anti-American story is already working for a side, this coding helps to better understand the discourse by determining the functions of neutral stories.

According to coding results, whereas the (75%) of 24 stories work for the US, 6 (25%) are neutral. None of the stories is proven to be working against the US.
Most of the stories have proven to be pro-American in stance. From this chart, it is clear that while a number of neutral stories have proven to be working for the US, none of them are going against the US.

II. The Themes

13 different themes are discussed 102 times in the sample stories. Military Action (19), WMDs (16), Justification of the War (16), International Politics (16) and Government Action (15) are the five most frequently discussed topics, respectively. Domestic Politics (7), the Cost of the War (5), Anti-War Movements (3), Humanitarian Action (1), Media (1), Civilian Causalities (1), Military Casualties (1), and the United Nations (1) are the others in the list.
Military Action

Military action is the most frequently discussed topic of the sample. The topic is a part of 19 stories out of 24 (76%).

The discussion on military action starts with the question of whether military operation is actually needed. If it is needed, then the question turns to what level of military operation is needed. Whereas all of the anti-Americans and a small percentage of pro-Americans oppose any military action, most of the pro-Americans support military action.
The most salient discussion about military action is among pro-Americans. Claiming that military action is necessary, they concentrate on the details of military action:

- The justification of a military operation,
- The probability of a military operation,
- Military capacities of both countries;
- The cost of military deployment in the region,
- The economic, human and prestige cost of military operation for the US and how to deal with that,
- And the tactics of military operation (air strike or ground attack and timing etc.)

**Justification of the War**

The justification of the war is one of the most salient topics, discussed in 16 of 24 stories with the frequency of 16.

In those stories, the basic argument that Saddam is an evil character is used to justify the war. His cruelty against the Kurds and Iraqi people in the past is used to prove his devilish character. Critics claim that Saddam’s military power, endeavor to have nuclear weapons, the invasion of Kuwait and his probable intentions to invade other Arab countries after Kuwait, make him the most dangerous threat against the peace of the World.
He is depicted with the analogy of Hitler. According to this analogy if Hitler had been stopped when he invaded Rhineland, the 2nd World War wouldn’t have started and millions of people wouldn’t have died. Likewise, if Saddam is not stopped at that point, it will be more difficult to stop him after he has nuclear weapons and invades other Arab countries. So, one of the possible outcomes will be the 3rd World War.

Oil is presented as another argument for the justification of the war. Referring to Carter Doctrine, Saddam is perceived as a person assaulting the vital interests of the US and should be stopped by any means, including military force. However, this argument is presented as a secondary reasoning for the war and not as notable as the previous one.

WMDs

WMDs is another salient topic, discussed in 16 stories out of 24.

In the stories, WMDs is presented in two ways. First, they are represented as a deterrent to avoid war in the hands of goods. More importantly it is agreed that WMDs is the worst potential threat against humanity. Saddam is presented as evil, having and using chemical and biological weapons against people. He is also said to be on the verge of having nuclear weapons.

The topic is mostly discussed among pro-Americans in detail. Pro-Americans cite that Saddam has used chemical weapons against his own people in the past, and they argue that he is close to nuclear weapons. If he gains them,
he would not hesitate to use them against others, so, stopping him from building nuclear weapons is presented as an immediate necessity for the peace of the world.

The question on the probability of the use of WMDs against Iraq by the US or Israel is also asked once by an anti-American source to a pro-American not representing the government. The answers to the question are ambiguous, simply indicating that the US and Israel never want to use WMDs; however, it is still an option in the war.

“Question : You don’t think for a moment George Bush is thinking about nuclear weapons in Iraq, do you?

Answer : War has a propensity of its own. He’ll want to win and he’ll want to expedite it and they did things in Vietnam that they never said in 1965 they were going to do and that the Holy Father recently said that, that war has a momentum of its own and people do-

Question: You do think that Israel might do it, don’t you?

Answer: I don’t know. Israel’s done well. They’ve won four wars against the Arabs.”

And, at the end of the war, in a story, it is announced by Sen. William Cohen of the Armed Services Committee that the US destroyed WMD facilities in Iraq.
“Sen. COHEN: But in the meantime, we would have inflicted tremendous damage upon his so-called 'NBC' - which is not your competitor, but is 'nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons production facilities.' That has been a major goal. We’ve accomplished that and that's going to be one of the major things that we've done.”

**International Politics**

International Politics, discussed in 16 of 24 stories with the frequency of 16 out of 102, is also one of the most salient topics in the discourse of CNN.

The most salient topic of international politics is the unshared economic, human costs along with the issues related to a country's image. European countries and Japan are chastised for not sharing the burden of the war and leaving the US alone to battle against the enemy of the world and an assaulter to the common interests of all of them.

Another salient topic related to international politics is the alliance of the US with Syria. Some critics claim that Hafez al-Assad is another devil, killing his own people, and they argue that the US government is in bed with a devil against another one. On the one hand, this alliance is presented as an example of hypocrisy; on the other hand, it is justified as the nature of international politics and a requirement for success against Saddam
The politics of other countries in relation to Iraq is another subject of international politics. However, it remains a very weak issue when compared to the first two.

**Government Action**

Government Action is the fifth most frequent topic of the sample at 15 out of 102.

Government actions are discussed in terms of the politics and the operations of the US government on the war related topics both domestically and internationally: diplomatic initiatives of the government to apply sanctions and push Iraq out of Kuwait, and the war budget and cost.

**Domestic Politics**

Domestic politics is the sixth most salient topic of the sample with the frequency of 7 out of 102.

The topics related to domestic politics are, firstly, the effects of the war on the budget and secondly, the politics between the government and Congress about the war-related issues.

**The Cost of the War**

The cost of the war is the seventh most salient topic of the sample with the frequency of 5 out of 102 stories.
The cost of war is not perceived in economics alone, but also in terms of the loss of human life and increasing enmity against the US.

The discussions are mostly about the unshared burden of the war. It is argued that the US is not the only country to be impacted by the invasion of Kuwait. In fact, Europe and Japan are more dependent on Kuwait oil than the US, yet they do not take any action against Iraq. Europe and Japan are blamed for not sharing the cost with the US.

**Anti-war Movements**

Anti-war movements are the eighth most salient topic in the discourse of CNN with the frequency of 3 out of 102.

In the discourse, anti war movements in the US, Europe, and most Muslim countries are presented as demonstrations of small groups, not a representation of the masses. Those groups are claimed to be the civil groups making demonstrations for every opportunity.

“Answer: Look, there’s an organized left. In San Francisco they interviewed the demonstrators. Ten percent were Earth Day demonstrators, 20 percent were anti-abortion demonstrators, 30 percent were people who’d been anti-nuclear power demonstrators. There’s a professional demonstration community in places like San Francisco for whom it’s a cheap date.”

“Answer: I don’t think first of all that you have to blow up the picture too much and this anti-Americanism in the Moslem world is not general. There are some local groups which do pretend that they are anti-American but I do not think it represents the totality of the population”
However, the demonstrations in Jordan are perceived to have a very serious effect on the discourse and the politics of King Hussein.

“Question: …, could the king of Jordan have survived if he said, I am with the Americans and the coalition when these mobs and crowds are demonstrating in the streets for Saddam Hussein? Wouldn’t that have been the end of the king? Didn’t he pretty much have to go with 70 percent of his people?

Answer: Well, that’s quite right. You put your finger on the point; 70 percent of his people are Palestinians. …”

Others

Media, Civilian Casualties, Military Casualties, the United Nations and Humanitarian Actions are lightly touched topics of the discourse of the CNN, each having a frequency of 1 out of 102.

III. Conclusion

To sum up, the predominance of pro-Americanism in each code clearly shows the pro-American stance of the discourse of CNN on the justification of the 1st Gulf War.

The themes of the stories mostly talk from the US point of view. The perspective of the US is at the center of all discussions, and all the topics are
discussed with relation to the US. For example, whereas the possible risks of the war are presented as risks against Americans and the world, there is almost no mention about the casualties of the war. Military action is mostly discussed in terms of its necessity as a tool for American strategy against Iraq rather than the devastating results of a war for humanity.

The coding for the stances of the stories and sources confirm the predominance of Westerners in the discourse. The Western point of view (mostly US government officials) as the source or the reference of the stories is another clear indicator of the predominant pro-American discourse.

The discourse of CNN has of course several root causes and implications:

The driving forces behind CNN’s harsh pro-American discourse on the justification of the 1st Gulf War can be explained by the fact that all of the elements composing the perception of the channel are American. The fact that CNN enjoys a great deal of freedom in the international media since there is no alternative media actor to cover the war is also an important factor affecting the very high volume and salience of pro-Americanism in the discourse.

There is a large body of research that depicts the basic factors that compose media discourse. Whereas most of them agree that ownership, financial resources, and the news resources are among the prominent factors composing the discourse, the media-government and media-public opinion relationships are always subjects for discussion. This study perceives that
although the direction of the relations may change case by case, overall, this is a multi directional relation, based on the convergence or divergence of the interests of the parties.

It is clear that the common denominator of all the elements composing the discourse of CNN is being American. CNN is a channel founded by an American tycoon and fed by American funds, that receives from its own correspondents from the battle scene under the control of American military, and addresses the American audience before the war starts. The discussion about the direction of media-government/public opinion relations remains insignificant in this case since the interests of the parties converge on pro-Americanism. Therefore, the predominant pro-American discourse is not surprising but predictable.

The second factor can be explained through the conditions of international mass communication in the very early 1990’s. The unavailability of alternate information sources and broadcasters provided CNN with the freedom to manipulate information during that period. This is not to say CNN manipulated the events in the war. CNN was the only news channel capable of broadcasting the war from the battle scene and occupying the international media domain free from any alternative voice. Thus it becomes clearer why pro-Americanism is so rampant in the presentation of the war.

Whatever the motivations, the implications of the discourse of CNN on the war were definitely good for the US government. The results of the analysis
prove that CNN functioned as a propaganda tool for the US government, intentionally or unintentionally. It strongly voiced the causes and the successes of American policy with its very high volume pro-American discourse.

Secondly, it had an enormous effect on the composition of international agenda as the sole source for information on the war. CNN’s coverage was found in many nations because of this information unavailability. This fact empowered the function of the channel by providing it with the ability to reach not only the elites of the world but also the grassroots and to have a significant effect on their opinions of the war.
CHAPTER 5 SECOND GULF WAR

A descriptive content analysis and then a qualitative framing analysis are conducted on the samples of CNNI and Al Jazeera in order to figure out the discourse of international media on the justification of the 2nd Gulf War.

5.1. The Results of Analysis for CNNI Sample

The sample is comprised of the 95 stories of CNNI, selected through a random sampling of the CNNI data covering the war.

Whereas 77 (81%) of the stories are directly about the war, 18 (19%) of them discuss war-related issues indirectly.

The stories are very long and complex; therefore, classification through a story complexity chart is definitely required for better understanding. According to the coding of the story types, although there are a total of 95 stories, there proved to be 118 different story types, since 23 (19%) of the stories include more than at least two different types of news. Among these 23, whereas 18 (78%) stories include both interviews and news analysis, 3 of them include news analysis and extended format, and 2 of them include news analysis, interview and extended format at the same time.
The analysis of the sample proves that CNNI has a predominantly pro-American discourse on the justification of the 2nd Gulf War in the research period. Although the ratio of pro-American sources and references decrease, and
neutrals increase in comparison to the 1\textsuperscript{st} Gulf War, anti-American sources and references still have very little representation. The distribution of stories by function, the extensive use of pro-American concepts and human interest stories clearly confirm the predominant pro-Americanism in the discourse.

The results of the descriptive content analysis and qualitative framing analysis, submitted below, provide a more detailed outlook of the discourse.

I. Does the story favor any side of the war?

I.I. Sources

Coding results show that a total number of 223 sources take place in the sample.

I.I.I. Sources by Stance

According to the coding results of the sources by stance, 100 (45\%) out of 223 sources have a pro-American stance, 27 (12\%) have an anti-American stance and 96 (43\%) have a neutral stance.
Pro-Americans

Pro-American sources perceive the war in Iraq as a front in a larger war, the War on Terror; they claim that the biggest threat of this age is terrorism. Using the analogies of Fascism and Communism, they define terrorism as a similar threat. Moreover, they claim that dealing with terrorism is a much more complicated task than the first two, since terrorists are able to hide themselves with the virtue of the new war strategy; asymmetric warfare. Therefore, they perceive that the War on Terror is a must in order to tackle this uncertain enemy.

The discourse of pro-Americans on the War on Terror articulates the three basic pillars of the strategy to meet the challenge of the uncertainty of the enemy. First, the distinction of “good and evil” helps uncover the enemy side by
introducing only two options, good or evil. According to this distinction, this is a war fought all over the world between good and evil, and whereas the US stands for the good side, terrorists compose the evil. So you are either with the good or the evil.

“There are nuances here, but essentially what we saw on September 11 and September 12 may be for the first time for some folks rather clearly, was the distinction between right and wrong and good and evil, nations that stood for things that were good and nations that stood for things that were not.”

Second, the strategy of preemptive action provides the good with the ability to destroy the evil before it attacks. According to this strategy, if one is defined as the enemy, then it should be defeated immediately, even in the absence of admissible evidence.

“\textit{I am familiar with the arguments against taking action in the case of Saddam Hussein. Some concede that Saddam Hussein is evil, power hungry and a menace, but that until he crosses the threshold of actually possessing nuclear weapons we should rule out any preemptive action. That logic seems to be deeply flawed.”}

Third, argue that the spread of democracy undermines terrorism and provides people with freedom and dignity that every human being deserves inherently. This is the ultimate level that can be reached through the use of either soft or hard power.
With this perception, pro-Americans claim that Iran, Iraq and North Korea are the countries on the evil side of the War on Terror. They call those countries the Axis of Evil and blame them for supporting terrorism and developing WMDs. Iraq is paramount for a couple of reasons. First, pro-Americans allege that Iraq has been in cooperation with the leading terrorist organization, Al Qaeda, since 1992. This argument relies on an unproven intelligence that claims high level Iraqi intelligence officers have had meetings with Osama bin Laden and his deputies from 1992 to September 2001. They also allege that Iraq not only knew of September 11, but also backed Al Qaeda for the attacks. Their proof is a newspaper article published six weeks before September 11. The article reveals that Saddam had been planning to attack the White House, the Pentagon and New York. In addition, the author was awarded by Saddam Hussein on September 1, 2001 for documenting the greatest achievement of Iraq.

Pro-Americans also believe that Iraq is developing WMDs for offensive purposes. Although the UN's inspection team has no evidence of WMDs in Iraq, they claim that Saddam does not really cooperate with the UN teams and successfully covers the WMD facilities. They argue that if Saddam has WMDs, he could be expected to take control of the world's most important energy supplies by dominating the Middle East, or, directly threatening the US and her allies with nuclear power. Therefore he has to be defeated by any means immediately and the escalating situation requires preemptive action.
The last argument of pro-American sources is that the US must finish the job that remains from the 1st Gulf War: topple Saddam’s regime and liberate the Iraqi people. According to this argument, even in the absence of any solid proof of Saddam’s Al Qaeda links or the development of WMDs, Saddam is still a terrorist dictator cruel to Iraqi people and must be taken out of power for the betterment of Iraqi people and the world.

**Anti-Americans**

Anti-Americans agree with pro-Americans on the struggle against terrorism. However, they do not approve the first two pillars of the strategy: the perception of good and evil and the tactic of preemptive action. According to anti-Americans, the challenge of asymmetric warfare and the ability of the terrorists to hide themselves do not justify the strategy of separating the good and the evil with a clear line. They claim that if the definite orchestrator of the September 11 attacks is Osama bin Laden, then the target should be Osama bin Laden and his terrorist organization, Al Qaeda. No one can be blamed for supporting global terrorism since they have opposing views to US politics. Therefore, they require clear evidence that a country is assisting and harboring global terrorism.

They are also against the tactic of preemptive action. They argue that the use of hard power requires two conditions: the existence of clear evidence of the supporting terrorism and the absence of any other deterrent. Thus, any action not fitting these conditions would result in terrible counterproductive effects and harm the common struggle against global terrorism since it lacks legitimacy.
For those reasons they claim that Iraq cannot be involved in the War on Terror on the evil side unless there is clear evidence proving the connection between Iraq and Al Qaeda or the 9/11 attacks.

They also have the same perception on the WMDs issue. They do not accept the allegation of Saddam’s endeavor to have WMDs as a justification for a military operation since there is no evidence. They argue that as long as Saddam obeys international law by cooperating with the UN’s WMDs inspection team, no one has the right to blame Iraq for developing WMDs. According to anti-Americans, the last decision on WMDs has to be made by the UN inspection team.

Anti-Americans accept that Saddam is a cruel dictator. However, they claim that he is not the only cruel in the world and Iraqi people are not the only nation suffering from the cruelty. Therefore, the solution to this problem should be handled for not only Iraq but also other countries and addressed with long-sighted politics. Anti-Americans also claim that even if there is any invasion of Iraq, it shouldn’t be unilateral, but with the approval of the UN.

**Neutrals**

Neutral sources talk about the war-related issues in terms of their expertise. They do not make any comments on the justification of the war.

**I.I.II. Sources by Culture**

According to the coding results of sources by culture, whereas 186
(83%) out of 223 sources are western, 33 (15%) of them are Muslim and 4 (2%) of them are from other cultures.

The distribution of western sources by stance proves that 91 (49%) out of 186 western sources have a pro-American stance, 75 (40%) are neutral in stance and 20 (11%) have an anti-American stance.
The distribution of Muslim sources by stance proves that 18 (55%) of 33 Muslim sources are neutral, 8 (24%) have a pro-American stance, and 7 (21%) have an anti-American stance.

![Figure 20 Distribution of Muslim Sources by Stance](image)

**I.I.III. Government Officials as the Source**

The distribution of the sources by their relation to any government shows that at least one active or previous government official is hosted as the source in the 44 (46%) of 95 stories. The total number of government officials as the source is 46 with 41 (73%) from the US, 3 (5%) are from the UK, 1 (2%) from Iraq, 8 (14%) from the UN, 1 (2%) from Japan, 1 (2%) Poland and 1 (2%) from the Arab League.
The distribution of government officials by position held is as follows:

The President of the US 6 (11%), the Vice President of the US 2 (4%), Secretary of Defense 2 (4%), Secretary of State 2 (4%), National Security Adviser 2 (4%), Generals from the US military 8 (14%), other US officials (including the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Head of Coalition Provisional Authority, Assistant Secretary of Defense, and others) 11 (20%), former US officials (including the Director of the CIA, top level diplomatic and military officials) 8 (14%), the Prime Minister of the UK 1 (2%), other UK officials 2 (4%), Iraqi officials 1 (2%), UN officials 8 (14%), the Prime Minister of Japan 1 (2%), the President of Poland 1 (2%), and the Arab League Ambassador to the UN 1 (2%).
I.II. Anchor

According to the coding results, 99 anchor stances are seen in the 95 stories. 29 (29%) have a pro-American stance, 70 (71%) have a neutral stance, and not a single source has an anti-American stance.
I.III. References

According to the coding results 194 references are made in the sample. 113 (58%) have a pro-American stance, 47 (24%) have an anti-American, and 34 (18%) have a neutral stance.
The distribution of references by their name and/or position held is as follows: President Bush 24 (13%), Tony Blair 5 (3%), other US government officials including (Vice President, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, the National Security Adviser, the director of CIA, Assistant Secretary of Defence, Deputy Secretary of State, the Head of Iraq Provisional Authority, Senators, Congressmen, Diplomats, Generals, and government Spokespersons) 29 (16%), Saddam Hussein 1 (1%), Osama bin Laden 1 (1%), Hezbollah Sec.Gen. Sheik Hassan Nasrallah 1 (1%), third party government officials (including South African President Thabo Mbeki, Turkish Prime Minister Abdullah Gul, French President Jacques Chirac, German Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder, Syrian Foreign Minister Farouk al-Shara, German Foreign Minister Joschka Fischer, Moroccan Information Minister Najib ben Abdallah, Angolan Ambassador to the UN Ismael Gaspar Martins, Guinean Ambassador to the UN

Figure 25 Distribution of References by Name and/or Position Held
Mamady Traore, Chilean Ambassador to the UN Herlado Munoz, Russian Ambassador to the UN Sergey Lavrov, French Ambassador to the UN Jean-Marc de la Sabliere), and unkown 96 (52%) 

I.IV. The Use of Metaphors, Concepts, Stereotypes, and Analogies

The Concept of the War on Terror

The frequencies of the most repeated concepts reveal the most common depiction of the US’s opposition. The concept of ‘the War on/against Terror/Terrorism’ is used to define the war with the frequency of 127 and ‘evil’ and ‘terror/terrorism/terrorist’ are used to define the enemy and its actions with the frequencies of 45 and 550 respectively. One of these concepts is used at least once in the 60 (63%) of 95 stories.

The presentation of the war in Iraq as part of the War on Terror and the use of these concepts at these frequencies automatically render the government of Iraq a terrorist and its actions terrorism in the discourse of CNNI on the justification of the 2nd Gulf War.
Hitler Analogy

The Hitler analogy is used to depict Saddam’s character and his evil dictatorship. Although the analogy is not seen in the sample as salient as in the sample for the 1st Gulf War, it still makes up a significant portion of the justification of the war.

According to the analogy, Saddam is as evil as Hitler, Stalin, and Milosevic and he can be expected to do anything that they would have done. The analogy is supported by detailed comparisons. For example, Saddam’s Special Republican Guards, situated in Baghdad to defend Saddam’s life, are presented like Hitler’s SS officials. The defense of Baghdad is also compared to the defense of Berlin in 1945. Therefore, the fight against Saddam is presented as a holy war like the war against Hitler for the betterment of the humanity.
“The possibility that the Americans might say "it's enough; we give up," is real to the average Iraqi on the street and probably will be until and unless we see Saddam Hussein's head on a plate.”

“… Churchill has said, like ‘We want to beat the life and the soul out of Hitler and Hitlerism.’ That was the right kind of rhetoric for that time. What Bush is saying now, ‘$25 million if we get Saddam Hussein's head and by the way, bring it on. We're professionals. We want to fight.’ is actually the right rhetoric.”

The longevity and the human cost of the war are also justified with the analogy. It is claimed that what is done in Iraq in 6 months by the US could be done in 6 years in the 2nd World War. The US lost thousands of lives in the 2nd World War. However, it was worth since Germany was stopped from invading other countries. Likewise, it is inevitable to lose lives also in the Iraq War and it is worth it to stop a dictator like Hitler.

I.V. Human Interest Point

The results prove that a total number of 18 human interest points are seen in 8 (8.4%) of 95 stories. All of the human interest stories have a pro-American stance.

Until the start of the war, the stories mostly talk about feelings of fear and uncertainty, the risk of increased violence and the necessity of the war for the good of all humanity. During the war, they mostly depict the sacrifices of the US soldiers for good of others and the grievances of their families in the US.
Among all stories, the rescue of Private Jessica Lynch and her sufferings is the most salient one. Jessica Lynch is a Private First Class soldier rescued by US Special Forces after being wounded and captured by Iraqi soldiers. Her story is told in detail as an example of heroism of US soldiers.

Other themes in the human interest stories are as follows:

Americans living in the US and concerned about their children’s psychological well being and future after the 9/11, and their endeavour to keep their children away from those things.

“Anchor: The new reality hit the … about a month after the attacks. October’s Disney World vacation is a priceless memory now.

Source: It was a magical place because you didn’t think about, you know, bin Laden or anthrax or anything and just had fun, no worries.

Anchor: But meeting Mickey almost didn't happen. Eight-year-old Emily worried the night before about a bomb on the plane.

Source: When she came and said to me, ‘Mom, I'm afraid to fly to Disney World, I don't want to fly’ then I knew that even - - I couldn't even protect her. You know, so I just wanted her to feel as safe as she could and kind of sheltered her for most of it.”

- The stories of the victims of 9/11 and their families,

- An Iraqi, living in the US, detained and tortured in Iraq before he escapes to the US.
- Arabic Muslim Americans talking about the good life Muslims have in the US.

- Examples of Iraqi people being happy with the US invasion like an Iraqi family naming their baby Dick Cheney because of his braveness in the Gulf Wars and other.

- A wounded Iraqi soldier being helped and taken to the hospital by American soldiers.

- An Iraqi family, being shot by US soldiers after passing a checkpoint without stopping and the extra-ordinary endeavor of the American soldiers to help the family.

- The stories of rescuing US soldiers.

- US soldiers being killed in the war and the grievances of their families.

---

![Figure 27 Distribution of Human Interest Stories by Stance](image)
I.VI. Story Generally

Distribution of the stories by stance shows that 33 (35%) of 95 stories have a clearly pro-American stance. 62 (65%) have a neutral stance, none of the stories is proved to have an anti-American stance.

![Figure 28 Distribution of the Stories by Stance]

I.VII. Does the story work for any party?

According to the coding results, the 58 (59%) of the 95 stories work for the US, 35 (37%) are neutral, and 4 (4%) work against the US.
II. The Themes

According to the coding of the themes, a total number of 18 different themes are discussed 378 times in the sample:

Military Action (55), International Politics (45), the Justification of the War (35), WMDs (33) and Government Action (31) are the five most frequently discussed topics respectively. Al Qaeda (30), United Nations (27), Iraq after the War (21), Public Opinion (20), Domestic Politics (15), the War in Afghanistan (15), Military Casualties (13), Civilian Causalities (10), Anti-war Movements (8), Media (8), Humanitarian Action (6), Economic Effects (5), and Islam (1) are the others in the list.
Military Action

Military action is the most salient topic of the discussions in the sample with the frequency of 55 (15%) out of 378.

The topics of military action change based on the stages of the conflict. Whereas the most salient topics before the start of the military strike are if a military operation is really justified and the military capacities of the two countries, the stories turn to live reports from the battle scene during the strike. Lastly, after the end of the strike the domestic security of Iraq becomes the most salient topic.
Other topics of the military action are as follows:

**Before the military strike:**

- Is a military operation really justified?
- Military capacities of the countries.
- The possible bases around Iraq that the US will use in the war and the military cooperation of the ally countries around the Middle East.
- The military deployment of the US in the region
- Possible challenges of military action.

**During the military strike;**

- Live reports from the battle scene.

**After the military strike;**

- The conflicts within the country with resistance groups and the challenge of providing security.
- Establishing an Iraqi military.

**International Politics**

International politics is the second most salient topic of the sample which has a frequency of 45 (12%) out of 378.
The most salient topic of section is the international support for the war. Whereas the US claims that the war is totally justified and attempts to include as many countries in the war effort as possible, opponent countries argue the contrary and require the approval of the UN Security Council for action. Whereas the UK, Israel, Australia, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Bulgaria, Romania, Albania, Croatia and Macedonia support the US position, France, German, Russia, China, Turkey, Saudi Arabia, Qatar, Lebanon and Palestine are among the opposing countries.

In that environment, pro-Americans claim that the US has sufficient international support for waging a war. They also claim, even in the absence of international support, that the US still has the right to make the decision for war since it is a crucial national security issue for the country.

Another salient topic of the sample is the discussions about the positions of the countries of the region, Turkey, Iran, Syria, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Qatar, Lebanon, and Israel. Within those stories, each country’s priorities and the possible impacts of the war on them are discussed substantially.

**Justification of the War**

Justification of the war is the third most discussed topic of the sample with the frequency of 35 (9%) out of 378.

The war is justified by three basic arguments which all rely on the evil character of Saddam Hussein. First, the war is claimed to be a part of the War on
Terror since Saddam is argued to harbor Al Qaeda and have been a part of 9/11 attacks. Thus, the military attack to Iraq is presented as an immediate and inevitable action since the strategy of the War on Terror requires a preemptive strike on the evil after the identification of good and evil.

Second, Saddam is claimed to be developing WMDs for terrorist aims. Although there is an ongoing inspection by the UN’s representatives in Iraq, Saddam is blamed for successfully covering up WMD facilities. Using the analogy of Hitler, if he has WMDs Saddam is claimed to invade neighboring countries and dominate the region that has strategic oil supplies, and then, directly threaten the peace of the world with nuclear power.

The last argument is that Saddam has a dictatorship in Iraq and is brutal towards the Iraqi people. According to this argument, the liberation of Iraqi people has not been met yet, one of the goals of the 1st Gulf War. There is an unfinished job to be done. Even if the first two justifications cannot be proven, military action is required to complete this job in order to defeat the evil dictatorship of the Saddam and liberate Iraqi people.

WMDs

WMDs is the fourth most salient topic of the sample with the frequency of 33 (9%) out of 378.

WMDs is mostly discussed in relation to Saddam’s intention to use them as a tool for his evil politics. Saddam is claimed to have pushed the UN
inspectors out of Iraq in 1998 in order to develop his WMD program more freely. Because of the absence of UN inspectors in Iraq for three and a half years after 1998, it is claimed that there is no information about the advancement of Saddam's nuclear program.

Although the UN weapon inspectors report that Iraqi government officials are cooperating with them and they have no indicator of WMDs in Iraq, pro-Americans claim that Saddam successfully misleads the inspectors and covers up WMD facilities. The anti-American view is to give enough time to the inspectors to complete their job and make the decision based on their report.

Another salient topic on WMDs is the White House's admittance of false intelligence that Saddam sought uranium in Africa to build WMDs. This information was provided by British Intelligence to the CIA and announced by President Bush in his State of the Union Address to justify the war decision. This topic is mostly discussed in terms of CIA Director George Tenet’s performance on his job. President Bush and other higher administrators make statements supporting Tenet’s performance and telling that this is just a simple mistake and should not be taken into this much consideration.

The discussions turn to the search for WMDs in Iraq after the invasion. They focus mostly on where the WMD facilities are and why the US army could not find any WMDs after the invasion.
**Government Action**

Government Action is the fifth most discussed topic, with the frequency of 31 (8%) out of 378.

The US government actions in the War on Terror are discussed in terms of the impacts of those actions to government related domestic issues, especially to the elections and congressional issues like the war budget and the authorization of the government.

**Al Qaeda**

Al Qaeda is the sixth most discussed topic of the sample, with the frequency of 30 (8%) out of 378.

Al Qaeda is presented as the major, but the elusive, enemy of the War on Terror. It is claimed to be a new kind of very powerful global terrorist organization that could be anywhere at anytime. The threat posed by Al Qaeda is submitted as the largest concern in global security efforts. Therefore, the topic is discussed with a variety of subtopics:

- The strength of Al Qaeda.
- The ideology of Al Qaeda.
- The damage that was done to Al Qaeda in Afghanistan.
- The attacks of Al Qaeda in the US, Turkey, and Saudi Arabia.
- The possible targets of Al Qaeda.
- The alleged relationship of Al Qaeda with Iraq.
- The arrests of suspected Al Qaeda members.

**United Nations**

The UN is the seventh most discussed topic of the sample, with the frequency of 27 (7%) out of 378.

The UN is present in three main discussions: the WMD inspections in Iraq, Security Council politics regarding the war, and the internal security of Iraq after the invasion.

The WMD inspections in Iraq are the most discussed topic of the sample since WMDs is submitted as one of the most important justifications for military action by the US. UN officials declare that they do not have any indication of WMDs in Iraq. Iraqi officials are in cooperation with them, and they are doing the inspections in the proper way. However, they also state that they need more time to make sure that Iraq is clear of WMDs. Whereas anti-Americans claim that the inspectors should be given as long as they need and should be allowed to make the last decision, pro-Americans argue that Iraq has definitely an ongoing WMD program but, Saddam successfully covers it up. They also claim that the extension of the inspection process would benefit Saddam since he will gain time to complete his WMD program.
Another salient topic of the section is the Security Council politics regarding Iraq. All parties desire a resolution by the Security Council. Opponent countries claim that the resolution of the Security Council is required for any military action, while the US just needs it for the involvement of other countries. The US also claims that even without a Security Council resolution, military action would be a legitimate decision since it has sufficient justifications.

The internal security of Iraq after the invasion is another focus of the discussions of the UN. While the US wants the UN to take responsibility of Iraq’s internal security by, establishing a multinational security force, the UN rejects it because the internal security is the responsibility of the occupier of the country.

**Iraq after the War**

The situation of Iraq after the war is the eighth most discussed topic of the sample, with the frequency of 21 (6%) out of 378.

The focus of most discussions on the topic is the challenge of the postwar political and security situation.

The postwar political situation is discussed in terms of the political impacts of the war inside Iraq and in the region. The major question is whether Iraq will be a unified country or whether will it be divided along ethnic lines. Whereas the challenge presented of the former is the difficulty of keeping diverse ethnic groups together under the same roof without a new dictatorship, for the latter it is the political impacts of separation on neighboring countries.
The postwar security situation is another big topic of Iraq after the War. The chaos after the invasion and the ability of the US soldiers to provide security are discussed substantially. The challenge of postwar conditions, cultural differences, language, the establishment of a new Iraqi security force, and the attacks by the resistance are presented as the main difficulties.

Public Opinion

Public Opinion is the ninth most discussed topic of the sample, with the frequency of 20 (5%) out of 378.

Public opinion is mostly discussed in terms of its impact on governments and as a justification for politics. Public support is submitted as of crucial importance for the success of politics. Public opinion polls and demonstrations are referred to as indicators of public opinion.

Whereas public opinion is used to justify government policies in the US, it is presented as the main driving force behind why government oppose to the war especially in Germany, France, and Turkey.

The US’ efforts to create public support for the War on Terror among Muslim populations, especially Iraqi people, are another salient topic of the discussions. The US is claimed to try to win hearts and minds of people all over the world and it also argued to pay attention to the opinions of Iraqi people as crucial determinants for shaping policies within the country.
The impact of striking events on public opinion is also another topic of the section. For example, whereas the false intelligence on Saddam’s search for uranium in an African country is claimed to decrease the credibility of Bush administration, the capture of Saddam Hussein is perceived as a victory in the effort to win hearts and minds.

**Others**

Domestic Politics is discussed 15 (4%) times in terms of the impact of on the US’ domestic politics, especially with the elections.

The war in Afghanistan is discussed 15 times, as the first big step of the War on Terror. It is submitted as a big success, devastating the most important camps of Al Qaeda.

Military Casualties are discussed 13 times in the sample. The human interest stories of US soldiers and a couple of stories about military casualties comprise the discussions.

Civilian Causalities are discussed 10 times. The discussions are dominated by the stories of the civilian death tolls in resistance attacks and the Human Rights Watch report alleging that US soldiers killed 100 civilians.

Anti-war Movements, Media, Humanitarian Action, Economic Effects of the War, and Islam are the other topics, which make up 2% or less portion on the discourse of CNNI.
III. Conclusion

The results show that CNNI has a predominantly pro-American discourse on the justification of the 2nd Gulf War, however, with a less volume and salience than it the 1st Gulf War.

Despite the fact that an important number of themes are discussed with a neutral stance, the American perspective is still central in most of the stories. The salience of the themes is a clear indicator of this stance. Topics that justify the War or convey the focus to political matters rather than the devastation of the war like Military Action, International Politics, Justification of the War, WMDs, Government Action and Al Qaeda compose the most discussed themes with a salience ratio of 61%. Themes about the devastating effects of the war like Iraq after the War, Military Casualties, Civilian Casualties, Anti-war Movements, Humanitarian Action, and Economic Effects of the War are only slightly touched upon topics in the discourse, with a ratio of 11%.

The distributions of sources by stance, stories by stance and stories by function, and references by stance also confirm the pro-American stance. Though the ratios of neutral sources and references show a relative increase in comparison to the 1st Gulf War, anti-American sources and references still do not have a significant representation in the discourse. Although the ratio of pro-American sources and views decrease in quantity, the pro-American discourse is empowered by an extensive use of pro-American concepts like
‘terror/terrorism/terrorist’ or ‘the War on Terror/Terrorism’ and pro-American human interest stories.

These changes in the representation of pro-Americanism indicate a moderation in the discourse. The reasons behind this moderation should be sought within the changing factors affecting the composition of the discourse of CNN. The changes can be revealed through a comparison of those factors with CNN in the two wars.

At the first glance, it looks like that there has been a couple of changes in terms of CNN’s ownership, finance, news resources, and the circumstances of mass communication in the time between the 1st Gulf War and the 2nd Gulf War. Whereas the first three of those factors do not seem to introduce a discourse change, since they are still as American as before, the latter seems to have an important effect on the discourse.

The ownership of CNN passed from Turner Broadcasting to another American giant, Time Warner, in 1996. The channel’s major funding continues to come from American sources. News resources enlarge parallel to the increasing number of news agencies around the world. However, the biggest change, this time is that CNNI is no longer the sole international news provider and broadcaster.

The new circumstances of the mass communications, increasing technology and the decreasing costs provide others with the ability to set up their own media and disseminate information to the entire world. The result is an end
to the CNN monopoly by the introduction of new news sources and perceptions in the international media. Moreover, this new environment removes the freedom of CNN and produces a challenge in terms of composing a credible discourse.

CNNI’s function in the research period for the 2nd Gulf War seems to be similar to that for the 1st Gulf War. According to the results, CNNI again draws a picture that acts a propaganda tool for the US government, whether intentionally or unintentionally. It has a dominant pro-American discourse, voicing the causes and the successes of the American policy with a little less volume and salience than the 1st Gulf War.

The implications of the discourse of CNNI in the 2nd Gulf War is definitely not as deep as it was in the 1st Gulf War, since there are a lot of alternate news sources, -including opponents-, gathering the information from different sources and broadcasting the war news all over the world from their own point of views. Whereas it was only CNN composing the discourse of entire International during the 1st War, there is now a variety of media organizations besides CNNI. Therefore, the determination of the discourse on the Justification of the 2nd Gulf War requires the analysis of the discourse of opponents as well as that of CNNI.
5.2. The Results of Analysis for Al Jazeera Sample

The sample is comprised of the 84 Al Jazeera stories. Whereas 36 (43%) stories of the sample are Al Jazeera TV transcripts, 48 (57%) of them are Al Jazeera Web News texts.

Al Jazeera web news is added into the data because of the insufficient number of TV transcripts covering the research period. A two month test is conducted on Al Jazeera English TV and the Al Jazeera English website to check if both news sources have the same discourse on the justification of the war. The results confirm the same stance in both sources. Therefore, the sample is composed through random sampling of the data collected from both sources.

Whereas 79 (94%) of the stories are directly about the war, 5 (6%) of them discuss war related issues indirectly.

An important number of the stories include more than one type of news. This situation requires the classification of the story types through a story complexity chart. The coding of the story types reveals that there is a total number of 162 story types in the 84 stories since 64 (76%) of the stories include more than one story type. Among those stories, 30 (47%) of them include news analysis and extended format, 3 (5%) of them include straight news report and extended format, 22 (34%) of them include interview and news analysis, and 9 (14%) of them include interview, news analysis and extended format in one story.
The analysis of the sample reveals that the discourse of Al Jazeera on the justification of the 2nd Gulf War is predominantly anti-American in the research period. Although the distribution of sources by stance reveals nearly an equal number of sources having pro and anti-American stances, the distribution of stories by stance, the distribution of references by stance, the distribution of
stories by function, the use of anti-American concepts, the extensive use of anti-American human interest stories, and the qualitative analysis results clearly confirm the predominant anti-Americanism in the discourse.

The results of the descriptive content analysis and qualitative framing analysis, submitted below, provide a more detailed outlook of the discourse.

I. Does the story favor any side of the war?

I.I. Sources

Coding results show that there are a total number of 137 sources in the sample.

I.I.I. Sources by Stance

The distribution of the sources by stance reveals that 49 (36%) of 137 sources have an anti-American stance, 48 (35%) take a pro-American stance, and 40 (29%) of them are neutral.

Figure 33 Distribution of Sources by Stance
Pro-Americans

There is no discussion in the sample concerning the American position from a general point of view, but there are short statements from American officials mentioning the justifications of the war or denying the allegations against the US on specific events in the war. Those statements are the basic elements composing the pro-American view in the discourse. Therefore, although the frequency of pro-American sources is almost the same with that of anti-American sources, the presentation of pro-Americanism is incomparably weaker than that of anti-Americanism in the sample.

Pro-American claims concerning the justifications of the war are presented very superficially and without any supporting discussions. They are terrorism as the threat of the century, the allegations of WMDs, and Saddam’s cruelty against the Iraqi people.

“Each of you now has a part in protecting America against the threats of the new era,”

“In my opinion Saddam Hussein has in the past used terrorist organizations, and if he used weapons of mass destruction then he would be increasing the level of damage to us, and it is clear this is a grave thing that we cannot be silent about.”

The statement of the Pentagon spokesman is an example of pro-American sources rejecting allegations against the US. The statement comes after the allegations arguing that the rescue of Jessica Lynch is deliberately hyped by the US government and media to boost support in the war time.
"The thing that is most insulting is the suggestion that we would put U.S. service members at risk to stage such an event. This was a real rescue under a combat situation."

The representation of pro-Americanism does not go beyond this level in any story in the sample, in spite of the high frequency of Pro-American sources.

**Anti-Americans**

Anti-Americans perceive the war as unjust since there is no real evidence to prove Saddam’s alleged WMD program and links to Al Qaeda.

They claim that the US and the UK use the WMDs issue in order to persuade others in their cause. Using former weapons inspectors and former intelligence officers as the source, they argue that the US and the UK deliberately used false intelligence on WMDs and coerced intelligence analysts to portray Iraq as a threat.

"I worked in the counter proliferation department in 1995 and I saw the intelligence we had on Iraq. At that time, all our reliable sources were telling us that there were no WMD programmes of any strategic significance.

… a deliberately deceptive propaganda campaign."

Anti-Americans argue that the Iraqi government refutes the allegations on WMDs by accepting the WMD inspectors to the country and cooperating with them.
They also claim that the allegations of an Al Qaeda-Iraq connection comes to the fore without any clear evidence since the WMD allegations proved to be groundless. According to anti-Americans, the US backed Al Qaeda against the former Soviet Union, and now, Iraq is accused of having connections to the group because the US public lives in fear following the 9/11 attacks. Rejecting the existence of Al Qaeda members in Iraq, they say that even if Al Qaeda is in Iraq, it is in the Northern part of the country that is under US control.

“We said there’s a need for inspectors to go to Iraq, but we see no new evidence suggesting the presence of Al-Qaeda in Iraq, except for the disappearance of some Al-Qaeda members in Northern Iraq in the areas under U.S. Embassy’s control.”

Anti-Americans believe that American policy in the Middle East is unjust and is the prime reason behind terrorism. They claim that US politics are pro-Israel and ignore the rights of Arabs both in Iraq and Palestine.

Some of the anti-Americans announce that the war to defend Iraq is a holy war for all Iraqi people and all Muslims. Moreover they denounce Muslim countries keeping their relations with the US.

Another group of anti-Americans claims that they were pro-American, with the hope of liberation, before the war started. However, the fact that the US soldiers acted not as liberators but as occupiers completely altered their perception.
“I don't like Osama bin Laden and don't want to fight jihad against America. The Iraqi people just want the Americans to leave our country.”

**Neutrals**

Neutral sources talk about the war related issues in terms of the topics requiring expertise. They do not make any comments on the justification of the war.

**I.I.II. Sources by Culture**

Coding results show that 77 (56%) of 137 sources are Western, 48(35%) are Muslim and 12 (9%) are from other cultures.

![Figure 34 Distribution of Sources by Culture](image-url)
The distribution of western sources by stance shows that 40 (52%) out of 77 western sources have a pro-American stance, 21 (27%) of them have an anti-American stance and 16 (21%) of them have a neutral stance.

![Figure 35 Distribution of Western Sources by Stance](image)

The distribution of Muslim sources by stance reveals that whereas 25 (52%) out of 48 Muslim sources have an anti-American stance, and 23 (48%) have a neutral stance. There is no Muslim source having a pro-American stance.
The distribution of sources from other cultures by stance shows that 3 (25%) out of 8 sources have an anti-American stance, 8 (67%) have a pro-American stance, and 1 (8%) of them is neutral.
I.I.III. Government Officials as the Source

The distribution of the sources by their relation to any government shows that at least one active/retired government official is hosted as the source in 44 (52%) of 84 stories. The total number of government officials as the source is 67, with 35 (52%) from the US, 7 (10%) from Iraq, 6 (9%) from Japan, 4 (6%) from the UK, 4 (6%) from the UN, 3 (4%) from Australia, 2 (3%) from France, 1 (1%) from the Philippines, 1 (1%) from Spain, 1 (1%) from the Arab League, 1 (1%) from the World Bank, 1 (1%) from Egypt, and 1 (1%) from Syria.

The distribution of government officials by position held is as follows:
The President of the US 4 (6%), the Head of Coalition Provisional Authority 3 (4%), US military officials 16 (24%), other US officials (including the Secretary of
Defense, Assistant Secretary of Defense, and others) 12 (18%), The General Secretary of the UN 1 (1%), the UN’s Chief Weapons Inspector 1 (1%), the Prime Minister of Australia 2 (3%), the President of the Philippines 1 (1%), the Prime Minister of Spain 1 (1%), the Prime Minister of Japan 3 (4%), the President of Iraq 1 (1%), the Vice President of Iraq 1 (1%), other Iraqi officials 5 (7%), the Deputy Secretary of the Arab League 1 (1%), others (different levels of government officials from the UN, France, the UK, and Japan) 15 (22%).
I.II. Anchor

According to the coding results, 33 anchor stances are seen in the 84 stories. Whereas 13 (39%) of them have an anti-American stance and 20 (61%) of them have a neutral stance, none of them has a pro-American stance.

![Figure 40 Distribution of Anchors by Stance](image)

I.III. References

Most references in the stories hold an anti-American context in spite of the clearly known pro-American stances of the subjects. For example, President Bush is the most-referred subject in the sample as the leader of the US invasion of Iraq. However, on some occasions, his pro-American statements are submitted with an anti-American meaning since they are referred to as the leading cause of increased violence and terror. Therefore, those kinds of references are coded as an anti-American reference like the one below. In that
reference, Bush’s statement is pro-American in stance and stresses the determination of US troops to stay in Iraq in any condition. However, it turns to be an anti-American reference when it is submitted as the provocateur of the increasing violence in an anti-American story.

“At least 10 US soldiers were wounded and three Iraqis killed in four incidents in Iraq on Thursday, a day after US President George W Bush defiantly vowed that resistance attacks would not drive out American troops.”

The distribution of references shows that a total of 102 references are made in the sample. 70 (68%) have an anti-American stance, 18 (18%) have a pro-American stance, and 14 (14%) are neutral.

The distribution of references by name and/or position held is as follows: President Bush 11 (11%), Tony Blair 3 (3%), other US government officials (including Vice President, the Secretary of Defence, Assistant Secretary of
Defense and others) 12 (12%), UN Secretary General Kofi Annan 1(1%), the UN’s Chief Weapons Inspector Hans Blix 1(1%), other UN officials 1(1%), other UK officials 2 (2%), Australian government officials 2 (2%), Hezbollah Secretary General Sheik Hassan Nasrallah 1(1%), Japanese Prime Minister 1(1%), other Japanese government officials 1(1%), and others 66 (66%).

I.IV. The Use of Metaphors, Concepts, Stereotypes, and Analogies

There is no frequent usage of any metaphors, concepts or stereotypes in the sample. However, there are some usages of them defining the war and the sides of the war in some stories.

The concept of the War on Terror is presented as a War on Islam, where US is blamed for pursuing an ideological war against Islam. In this war, the US
soldiers are viewed negatively as occupation soldiers, whereas Iraqi groups fighting against the US are positively depicted as resistance fighters.

President Bush is called a terrorist in some stories, accused of being a madman for launching the war and creating more hostility with the challenge of “either with us or against us”. The War on Terror is seen as a big policy failure, even as an example of terrorism, since it results in the death of Iraqi civilians, increases hostility and aggrandizes the risk of new terrorist attacks.

I.V. Human Interest Point

The results show that there are 8 human interest stories in 6 of the 84 articles. All of the human interest stories have an anti-American stance.

Human interest stories in the sample mostly present the grievances of the Iraqi people because of the security precautions of US soldiers and the poverty resulting from the war. The most striking example is probably the story of a little Iraqi girl with the US soldiers.

“A little Iraqi girl, no more than eight years old, squatted beside the road with tears of humiliation streaming down her cheeks.

Twenty feet away, three American soldiers had their rifles aimed at her as she was forced to relieve herself in full view of a long line of parked cars.”

After this opening, the story provides details of the incident with pictures of the little girl among American soldiers.
The story of the rescue of Jessica Lynch is also discussed in the sample, but in an anti-American manner. In that story, the US is denounced for using the event as a psychological instrument to increase support for its soldiers.

There is also a human interest story of a female US soldier, kept in the military for two years beyond her normal release date. The problems that she experienced because of this are told in detail in the story.

![Figure 43 Distribution of Human Interest Stories by Stance](image)

I.VI. Story Generally

The distribution of the stories by stance shows that 41 (49 %) of the 84 stories have an anti-American stance, 40 (48 %) have a neutral stance, and 2 (3%) have a pro-American stance.
I.VII. Does the story work for any party?

According to the coding results, 55 (65%) of the 95 stories work against the US, 25 (30%) are neutral, and 4 (5%) work for the US.
II. The Themes

According to the distribution of themes, a total of 16 different themes are discussed 291 times in the sample.

Military Action (42), International Politics (37), Iraq after the War (30), Government Action (29), and Public Opinion (22) are the five most frequently discussed topics respectively. Military Casualties (19), Domestic Politics (19), United Nations (18), Justification of the War (17), WMDs (16), Civilian Causalities (12), Anti-war Movements (11), Al Qaeda (7), Economic Effects (5), Media (4), Humanitarian Action (2) are the other themes discussed in the sample.

![Figure 46 Distribution of Themes](image-url)
Military Action

Military Action is the most salient topic of the sample, with a frequency of 42 (14%) out of 291.

The discussion on military action is dominated by news reports of military and civilian casualties resulting from US and Iraqi military activity.

Other topics of the Military Action are as follows:

- The military strategies of both sides.
- The reports on military attacks, especially from Iraqi groups against US soldiers.
- The US government’s search for military support from the UN and other countries since the beginning of the war.
- The insulting treatment of the US soldiers to the Iraqi civilians and prisoners at the hands of US soldiers.
- The problems of the US government within the military because of the war, like the recruitment problem and the problem of soldiers kept longer than their anticipated release dates.

International Politics

International politics is the second most salient topic of the sample with a frequency of 37 (13%) out of 291.
The most notable topic of the section is the international support for the war. The issue is presented mostly from the perspective of opposing parties. The US is blamed for not reaching an international consensus on the war decision because the Iraqi government complied with UN resolutions.

International opposition to the war is also presented as an international initiative to prevent the war. The roles of the Iraqi government, anti-war European countries like Germany and France, and Arabic countries are discussed substantively within this initiative.

Other topics of International Politics are as follows:

- Discussions about the politics of neighboring countries to Iraq, especially Turkey, Iran, and Syria.
- International initiatives to transfer power from US led occupation forces to an Iraqi government.
- International reactions to the US appointed Iraqi Governing Council.
- Increasing anti-Americanism in the world.
- The reactions to the controversial decision of the US government to exclude countries opposing the war from the rebuilding process in Iraq.

Iraq after the War

Iraq after the War is the third most salient topic of the sample with a frequency of 30 (10%) out of 291.
The most pertinent discussion of Iraq after the War is the sufferings of Iraqi people in the post-war country. The biggest problem presented is the harsh treatment of Iraqi people by American soldiers. Claims are made that American soldiers oppress the Iraqi people through humiliation and exercise power over them for security reasons. The suffering of the Iraqi people is submitted through news reports and human interest stories.

The harsh economic conditions and unstable security of post-war Iraq are submitted as other challenges for the Iraqi people. Each story presents the frequent bomb explosions, the poverty that people face, and the shortage of resources to depict the challenges for the Iraqi people.

There is also a discussion of the political situation in the post-war period. The disappointment of the Iraqi people due to the unexpected oppression of US soldiers, the desire to exclude the US led forces from the establishment of a new Iraqi government, and the rebuilding process of the country compose the political discussions in the section.

**Government Action**

Government Action is the fourth most discussed topic of the sample with a frequency of 29 (10%) out of 291.

The topic is discussed in terms of war-related government actions, not only in the US and Iraq, but also the UK, Japan and Turkey. The reconstruction of the new Iraqi government is the most salient subtopic of the section. The
decisions of governments of other countries on war-related issues also have some part in the discussions.

Public Opinion

Public Opinion is the fifth most salient topic of the sample with the frequency of 22 (8%) out of 291.

Public Opinion is used to demonstrate the increasing feeling of uncertainty among the American and Iraqi public, and increasing anti-Americanism all over the world during the war period. Public opinion polls, demonstrations, and the statements of opinion leaders are used as indicators of public opinion.

Public opinion in Iraq is shown to be mostly anti-American because of the oppressive politics of the US. Even the segment of the population that desired US intervention before the war is said to have changed their ideas after the invasion. One of the examples of events changing public opinion is the alleged defilement of the Quran by US soldiers.

"Eyewitnesses told Aljazeera TV soldiers threw the Quran, Islam’s holy text, on the floor during the raid. Thousands of people in Baquba took to the streets."

The US government is also accused of scaring the American public in order to increase support for the war and justify its politics. It is blamed for using media to propagate its lies and manipulate public opinion. Sources claim that the fear of a new terrorist attack increases the support of the American people.
The striking events affecting public opinion are also presented in the discourse. For example, whereas the appearance of Saddam Hussein in Baghdad streets during the first days of the military strike is claimed to lift the spirits of Iraqis, the revelation of the false intelligence on WMDs is discussed to discredit the US and the UK governments.

**Military Casualties**

Military Casualties is the sixth most discussed topic of the sample with a frequency of 19 (7%) out of 291.

The death tolls of US soldiers, and sometimes those of Iraqi resistance groups, are given in the news reports as the main subtopic of Military Casualties. The stories of wounded soldiers are viewed as the successes of the Iraqi resistance groups.

**Domestic Politics**

Domestic Politics is the topic with the same frequency as Military Action: 19 (7%) out of 291.

The impact of the war on the domestic politics of the US, especially on the elections, is the main topic of the section.

**United Nations**

The United Nations is the seventh most discussed topic of the sample with a frequency of 18 (6%) out of 291.
The two main subtopics of the section are UN initiatives to prevent the war and inspections for WMDs.

Sources claim that opposing nations, and the American public, require a UN resolution to justify military action. The initiatives taken by the Iraqi government to prevent the war are also discussed substantially as a last resort. Iraq is presented as being open to all inspections and abiding by all UN the resolutions. The US is requested to behave in the same manner.

The statements of WMD inspectors revealing there is no indicator of WMDs in the country and their confirmation that Iraqi officials are cooperating, are also discussed in the sample. The return of WMD inspectors to the country and the completion of the inspections are submitted as the requirement for the solution to the problem.

**Justification of the War**

Justification of the War is the eighth most discussed topic of the sample with a frequency of 17 (6%) out of 291.

The topic is predominantly discussed from the perception of anti-Americans, and according to this perception, there is no justification for the war.

The WMDs issue is claimed to be the false argument of the US and the UK to justify the war. The inspections and the cooperation of Iraq with the inspection process are shown to refute this argument. Therefore, the allegations of WMDs viewed as incapable of justifying war.
The sources claim that the alleged Al Qaeda-Iraq connection is fabricated by the US. The basic argument is that the US covertly established Al Qaeda in Afghanistan so that it would fight against the Soviet Union. Al Qaeda however, lost its function after the collapse of the Soviet Union, and the US started to use the group as a means to justify military campaigns like the War on Terror and the 2\textsuperscript{nd} Gulf War. The sources argue that there is no evidence connecting Al Qaeda to the Iraqi government, and Al Qaeda members exist only in the US controlled areas of Iraq.

**Others**

WMDs is discussed 16 (5\%) times in the sample and claimed to be a false argument to justify the war since the Iraqi government opens the country to the inspections and cooperates with the inspectors.

Civilian Causalities is discussed 12 (4\%) times in the sample. The death tolls and the number of wounded civilians are submitted in the stories.

Anti-war Movements is discussed 11 (4\%) times in the discourse. The public protests and the demonstrations in Iraq against the US forces compose the section.

Al Qaeda, Economic Effects of the War, Media, and Humanitarian Action are the topics appearing with a frequency of 2\% or less.
III. Conclusion

The analysis of the sample proves that Al Jazeera has an anti-American discourse on the justification of the 2nd Gulf War.

Despite the high frequency of the pro-American and western sources in the stories, qualitative analysis results reveal that the volume and the salience of pro-Americanism are much less than that of anti-Americanism in the sample. The results of the descriptive content analysis for other nodes, the use of anti-American concepts, the extensive use of anti-American human interest stories and the qualitative analysis results also confirm the predominant anti-American stance of the discourse.

Despite the fact that an important ratio of the themes is discussed in neutral stance, anti-Americanism is still at the heart of most discussions. For example, they do not submit the arguments that the US presents to justify the war and they simply say that war is unjustified. Or, Military Action as the most salient topic is presented from the perception of an anti-American Arab citizen perceiving the US soldiers as the enemy and Iraqi people as the victim. The dehumanizing behaviors of the US soldiers to the Iraqi people, and the devastating results everyday military conflicts are presented under the topic.

The distribution of the themes also confirms anti-Americanism. The ranking of the most discussed themes indicates that the focus in the discourse of Al Jazeera is very different than that of CNNI: the devastating results of the war rather than its justification. Whereas Military Action, International Politics, and
Government Action are still among the most discussed topics in the sample, similar to that of CNNI, Iraq after the War, Public Opinion, and Military Casualties are the topics replacing Justification of the War, WMDs, and Al Qaeda in the CNNI sample.

The root causes of the anti-American discourse of Al Jazeera can be best explained by Arabism, the common denominator of the factors composing the news channel and its perception. The circumstances of global communications are definitely another significant factor affecting the discourse of the channel.

The Arabic identity and perspective of the channel can be revealed through a short review of the elements composing it. Al Jazeera was established with a $137 million loan of the Emir of Qatar as an Arabic News Channel in 1996. The expectation was that the channel be self-financing in 2001. However, this expectation was not met and the financial dependency to the Emir of Qatar continued for several more years including the research period. Despite strong links with the government of Qatar, Al Jazeera is the first Arab news channel to enjoy the editorial independence after the removal of media censorship in Qatar by the Emir. The aim of the channel was to break the dominance of western media all around the world. Its target audience was the Arabic speaking population of the world in the research period. Therefore, the Arabic perspective (and so the anti-American discourse of the channel) is no less than an expectation.
Al Jazeera was born in an era when thousands of new media emerged as a result of new circumstances of mass communication, increasing technology, decreasing costs and media deregulation. Those virtues provided different actors with the ability to set up their own media and disseminate information to the entire world. The explosion of the internet promoted all those abilities incredibly just after the beginning of the 21st century. Al Jazeera has emerged as one of the voices of Arab populations in the world and has gained the ability to challenge the dominant voices of the international media.

The coverage of Al Jazeera has had very significant effects on the composition of the international media discourse, especially after 9/11.

The results of the analysis prove that Al Jazeera has produced an alternative voice in the international media. This voice introduced a change in the composition of the global media discourse. The global media discourse had been produced by just the western media until Al Jazeera started to color it with an Arab perspective. This step can also be perceived as paving the way for the others.

The introduction of multiple voices into the international media domain definitely challenges the freedom of the dominant western media and pushes them to give a second thought about their coverage of events, since there are rivals on the scene with a different perspective. The comprehension of this change helps to better understand the root causes behind the moderation of CNNI’s pro-American discourse in the 2nd Gulf War.
The change in the composition of the international media discourse should also be discussed in terms of its effects on the composition of the world public’s perception of the war and its implications on the foreign policies of the countries. However, this discussion can be better made after examining sample the discourses from Turkish media actors on the justification of the 2nd Gulf War.
5.3. General Assessment

The analysis of samples from CNNI and Al Jazeera proves that, contrary to the 1\textsuperscript{st} Gulf War, the 2\textsuperscript{nd} Gulf War is presented from different points of view in the international media. Whereas CNNI is proved to have a predominant pro-American discourse, Al Jazeera consistently submits the contrary views. They do share some similarities in terms of the representation of the discourses. A comparative review of the results will help determine the differences and similarities in both discourses.

First, the story complexity charts indicate that most of the stories in both samples include more than one type of news. Although this seems to be a complexity at first glance, it actually increases the power of the discourse since different types of supporting data is provided in one story. For example, news analyses are supported by interviews, or straight news reports are empowered with news analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CNNI (%)</th>
<th>AL JAZEERA (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interview &amp; News Analysis</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News Analysis &amp; Extended Format</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview, News Analysis &amp; Extended Format</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 Comparison of Story Complexity Charts

Second, the analysis of sources by stance shows that although both samples include significant ratios of neutral positions (CNNI 43% and Al Jazeera 29%), CNNI and Al Jazeera pursue different strategies to dominate one position
over another. In the CNNI sample, anti-American views have nearly the same volume and salience with pro-American views, however, they have much less ratio (12%) than pro-American views (45%). In the Al Jazeera sample, both positions have almost the same ratio (pro-American 35% and anti-American 36%), however, this time the salience and volume of pro-American views are incomparably less than that of anti-American positions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNNI (%)</th>
<th>AL JAIZERA (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pro-American</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-American</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2 Comparison of the Distributions of Sources by Stance**

Third, the distribution of sources by culture proves that the Al Jazeera sample includes a more diverse source population than the CNNI sample does. Western sources are the most popular one in both samples (CNNI 83% and Al Jazeera 56%); however, the Al Jazeera sample gives a 35% ratio to Muslim sources and a 9% ratio to sources from other cultures, while CNNI gives only 15% to Muslim sources and 2% to sources from other cultures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNNI (%)</th>
<th>AL JAIZERA (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Cultures</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3 Comparison of the Distributions of Sources by Culture**
Fourth, the distribution of government officials by country shows that the Al Jazeera sample includes significantly more governments than CNNI. Whereas the US government officials dominate 73% of CNNI sample, Iraqi government officials have only a 2% portion in this distribution, and only 5 other governments are represented in the sample, with a ratio of 25%. The US government officials also dominate the Al Jazeera sample with a ratio of 52%, while Iraq has a 10% portion in the distribution and 12 other governments are represented with a ratio of 38%. The high ratio of US government officials, and the low representation of Iraqi government officials in both samples, can be explained by the availability and accessibility of US government sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CNNI (%)</th>
<th>AL JAZEERA (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The US</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The UK</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The UN</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab League</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The World Bank</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 Comparison of the Distributions of Government Officials by Country
Fifth, anchors mostly have a neutral stance in both samples; however, none of the anchors have a contrary position to the general stance of the discourse of each channel. In the CNNI sample, 71% of the anchor stances are neutral, 29% are pro-American, and none of them is anti-American. In the Al Jazeera sample, 61% of the anchor stances are neutral while 39% of them are anti-American, and none of them is pro-American.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CNNI (%)</th>
<th>AL JAZEERA (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pro-American</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-American</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 Comparison of the Distributions of Anchors by Stance

Sixth, the distribution of references by stance proves that the use of references is in accordance with the general discourse of each channel and empowers them by adding virtual or literal supports to the arguments. Whereas 58% of references have a pro-American stance, 24% of them have an anti-American stance, and 18% of them have a neutral stance in the CNNI sample. In the Al Jazeera sample 70% have an anti-American stance, 18% have a pro-American stance, and 14% are neutral in stance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CNNI (%)</th>
<th>AL JAZEERA (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pro-American</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-American</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 Comparison of the Distributions of References by Stance
Seventh, the results of the analysis show that the use of metaphors, concepts, stereotypes, and analogies also accords with the general stances of the discourses of each channel and empowers them to persuade their audience’s perception about the target people or incidents. Whereas a frequent use of concepts and analogies is seen in the CNNI sample, no frequent use is seen in the Al Jazeera sample. In the CNNI sample, the concepts of ‘the war on/against terror/terrorism’ and ‘terror/terrorism/terrorist’ are used with very high frequencies to define the enemy, while the Hitler Analogy is used to depict Saddam and the threat posed by him. Al Jazeera sample, although there is no use of any concepts with significant frequencies, ‘the War on Terror’ is defined as ‘the War on Islam’ and President Bush is called a terrorist in some stories.

Eighth, human interest stories are also used in both samples in accordance with the general stances of the discourses of each channel. They increase the power of the discourse by adding a very significant emotional element to it. There are 18 human interest stories in the CNNI sample and 8 of them in the Al Jazeera sample. Whereas all CNNI samples have a pro-American stance, all human interest stories have an anti-American stance in the Al Jazeera sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CNNI (%)</th>
<th>AL JAZEERA (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pro-American</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-American</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 Comparison of the Distributions of Human Interest Stories by Stance
Ninth, the distributions of the stories by stance prove that both samples are dominated by neutral stories and the stories in accordance with the general discourse of each channel. Contrary positions have either no representation or insignificant ratios. Whereas 65% of CNNI stories have a neutral stance, 35% of them have a pro-American stance, and none of them has anti-American stance; 48% of Al Jazeera stories have neutral stance, 49% have an anti-American stance and 3% have a pro-American stance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CNNI (%)</th>
<th>AL JAZEERA (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pro-American</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-American</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 Comparison of the Distributions of Stories by Stance

Tenth, the distributions of the stories by function clearly confirms the stances and reveals the positions of both news channels in the war situation. 59% of the stories in the CNNI sample work for the US, 37% are neutral, and 4% work against the US; 65% of the stories in the Al Jazeera sample work against the US, 30% remain neutral, and 5% work for the US.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CNNI (%)</th>
<th>AL JAZEERA (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>for the US</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>against the US</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 Comparison of the Distributions of Stories by Function
Eleventh, the analysis of the themes shows that the themes in both samples are presented in accordance with the general stances of the discourses of each channel. Whereas the pro-American point of view is at the heart of the discussions in the CNNI sample, the anti-American point of view shapes the discussions in the Al Jazeera sample. The ranking of the most discussed themes also reveals the difference. In the CNNI sample discussions focus on the themes justifying the war, while the Al Jazeera sample concentrates on the devastating results of the war. Military Action, International Politics, and Government Action are among the most discussed topics in both samples; however, Iraq after the War, Public Opinion and Military Casualties are the other most discussed topics of the Al Jazeera sample replacing the Justification of the War, WMDs, and Al Qaeda in the most discussed topics list of the CNNI sample.
The comparative results prove the representation of both positions in the war in the international news media. The tables of comparative results show that the frequencies in the columns of Al Jazeera balance that of CNNI at most of the nodes. It is also the same for the salience and the volume of the topics. The topics in the Al Jazeera sample are discussed with an anti-American perspective just as a pro-American perspective, prevails in the CNNI sample. Moreover, Al Jazeera increases the diversity of sources in discourse. This is because it
includes more sources from Muslim nations and other cultures, and government officials from a wider variety of countries than CNNI.

From this analysis we can conclude that CNNI represents a strongly pro-American perspective. We can also say that CNNI has found its match in Al Jazeera during the 2nd Gulf War. Al Jazeera represents an equally strong anti-American point of view.
CHAPTER 6 TURKISH MEDIA

The discourse of the Turkish media on the justification of the 1st Gulf War is not analyzed in this dissertation since CNN was the major news channel providing the war news to the Turkish public through the state owned TV channel TRT 1 (Turkish Radio and Television 1) with simultaneous translation. Therefore, the discourse of CNN is accepted as being totally reflected in the Turkish Media.

For the 2nd Gulf War: A descriptive content analysis and then a qualitative framing analysis are conducted on the samples of Hurriyet and Sabah in order to classify the discourse of Turkish news media on the justification of the 2nd Gulf War.

6.1. The Results of Analysis for Hurriyet Sample

The sample is comprised of the 121 stories of Hurriyet, selected through random sampling of Hurriyet data covering the war.

One hundred and nineteen (98%) of the stories directly discuss the war while 2 (2%) of them discuss war-related issues indirectly. Whereas 46 (38%) stories are news analysis, 75 (62%) of them are both news analysis and extended format.

The results of the analysis prove that Hurriyet has a mostly neutral discourse on the justification of the 2nd Gulf War. The newspaper stands almost
at the same distance from both positions in the war. It reports news mostly in a neutral stance with a soft tone and avoids the use of a hard discourse on the justification of the war. Distribution of the stories by function also confirms a balanced representation of both sides. However, it’s discourse appears superficial since it presents the positions without submitting any supporting arguments in the stories.

The results of the descriptive content analysis and qualitative framing analysis, submitted below, provide a more detailed analysis of the discourse.

**Does the story favor any side of the war?**

**I.I. Sources**

Coding results show that a total number of 223 sources take place in the sample.

**I.I.I. Sources by Stance**

The distribution of sources by stance shows that, 64 (45%) of 143 sources have a pro-American stance, 46 (32%) have an anti-American stance and 33 (23%) have a neutral stance.
Pro-Americans

The discourse of the pro-American sources is composed of short and superficial statements explaining the justification, and the goals of the war, mostly in relation to Turkey’s position.

Pro-Americans claim that Iraq is the most important threat for peace in the Middle East.

They build their argument on the evil personality of Saddam and claim that he aims to create chaos in the world. Referring to Saddam’s past, they claim that he had a very problematic youth which resulted in the creation of a psychologically impaired man. Therefore, it is expected that he will use WMDs when he feels threatened.

Pro-Americans argue that the policy goal of the US in Iraq is to change the regime and end the threat posed by this country. They perceive military
action as the only way to remove Saddam from power and establish a democracy. They claim that the beneficiary of the establishment of a democracy in Iraq would not only be the people of Iraq, but also the neighboring states, especially Turkey.

Pro-American sources also try to eliminate the Turkish concerns about the ambiguity of the political situation in the region after the war. They clearly state that the US shares Turkey’s concerns about the establishment of a Kurdish state after the war, and confirm that this is not what the US desires.

Pro-American sources acknowledge the harsh living conditions for the people in post-war Iraq, but they claim that the US has the power to meet those challenges and bring democracy to Iraq.

**Anti-Americans**

The discourse of anti-American sources is also superficial, lacking deep discussions supporting the main arguments.

Anti-Americans claim that Iraq does not have any WMDs; moreover, Iraq is the leading country standing against the proliferation of WMDs in the region. They add that the US lies about the WMDs issue in order to justify the war.

They argue that the US aims to supersede the UN and does not acknowledge the diplomatic process that the UN is trying to establish. According to them, Iraq has fulfilled its commitments to the UN, however, the UN has not removed the embargo as the requirement of its commitment because of the
impact of the US on the UN decision making process.

Some anti-American sources refer to the US use of the atomic bomb, and the strategy of the war on terror, as proof that the US government is the biggest terrorist in the world. They also claim that the politics of the US are counterproductive to the terrorism and uncertainty present in the region.

Iraqi government sources allege that the US is not only targeting Iraq but all Arab countries. They claim that neighboring country governments must stand against the US as the requirement of their own security and International Law.

Some of the neighboring government leaders confirm that there is a definite need for a regime change in Iraq; however, they claim that this change should not be made by external forces but by the Iraqi people. They require UN approval for military action, and state that they would never allow the US to use their territories for military action against Iraq, despite their alliance with the US.

Anti-American sources deny allegations that the Iraqi people would welcome US soldiers as liberators. They argue that all Iraqi people are brave and ready to fight against the US, and if the US attacks it would become an even a worse disaster than 9/11.

Anti-Americans also allege that the US military uses ball bombs in Iraq. Ball bombs are claimed to be composed of 404 thousand small mortal bombs spreading with the explosion. Whereas some of those small bombs explode after the first shoot, some may explode in the uncertain future. They allege that these
bombs were used by the US in the 1st Gulf War and resulted in the killing of the civilians, especially children, after the war was completed.

**Neutrals**

Neutrals are sources commenting on war related issues in terms of their expertise. They do not make any comments on the justification of the war.

**I.I.II. Sources by Culture**

The coding results of sources by culture prove that whereas 92 (64%) out of 143 sources are western, 46 (32%) are Muslim, and 5 (4%) are from other cultures.

![Distribution of Sources by Culture](image)

Figure 48 Distribution of Sources by Culture

The distribution of western sources by stance proves that 58 (63%) out of 186 western sources have a pro-American stance, 21 (23%) have a neutral stance and 13 (14%) have an anti-American stance.
Results indicate that of 46 Muslim sources, 31 (67%) have an anti-American stance and 10 (22%) have a neutral stance, while only 5 (11%) have a pro-American stance.

Figure 49 Distribution of Western Sources by Stance

Figure 50 Distribution of Muslim Sources by Stance
I.I.III. Government Officials as the Source

The distribution of the sources by their relation to any government shows that at least one active/retired government official is hosted as the source in 77 (63%) of 121 stories.

The total number of government officials as the source is 119, with 58 (49%) from the US, 16 (13%) from Iraq, 13 (11%) from Turkey, 8 (7%) from the UN, 7 (6%) from other international organizations (the EU, NATO, UNICEF, Red Cross, and Arab League), 3 (3%) from the UK, 3 (3%) from Germany, 3 (3%) from France, and 8 (7%) from other countries (Spain, Japan, Russia, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, and Czech Republic).

![Figure 51 Distribution of Government Officials by Country](image)

*Figure 51 Distribution of Government Officials by Country*
The distribution of government officials by position held is as follows:

The President of the US 6 (5%), the Head of Coalition Provisional Authority 6 (5%), (the Vice President of the US, Secretary of Defense, Secretary of State, National Security Adviser, Assistant Secretary of Defense, Assistant Secretary of State, and others) 25 (21%), US military officials 21 (18%), the President of Iraq, Deputy Prime Minister of Iraq 4 (3%), other Iraqi officials 6 (5%), Turkish Prime Minister 5 (4%), other Turkish officials (including Foreign Minister, Defense Minister, Head of Turkish General Staff and others), the General Secretary of the UN 2 (2%), other UN officials (including Chief Weapons Inspector) 6 (5%), and others (including the Secretary General of NATO, the Head of the European Convention, the High Representative for the Common Foreign and Security Policy of the EU, the General Secretary of the Arab League, the President of France, the President of Russia, the President of Egypt, the President of Czech Republic, the Prime Minister of the UK, the Chancellor of Germany, the Foreign Minister of Germany, the Prime Minister of France, the Prime Minister of Spain, the Prime Minister of Japan, the Defense Minister of Kuwait, the Foreign Minister of Saudi Arabia, and others) 24 (21%).
According to the coding results, a total number of 40 references are made in the sample. 21 (52%) have an anti-American stance, 17 (43%) have a pro-American stance, and 2 (5%) have a neutral stance.

Figure 52 Distribution of Government Officials by Position Held

Figure 53 Distribution of References by Stance
The distribution of references by their name and/or position held is as follows: President Bush 6 (15%), Vice President Cheney 1 (2%), Saddam Hussein 2 (5%), Taha Yassin Ramadan 1 (2%), Uday Hussein 1 (2%), Turkish Prime Minister Tayyip Erdogan 1 (2%), Turkish Foreign Minister 1 (3%), the Head of ISAF 1 (3%), The head of Coalition Provisional Authority Paul Bremer 1 (3%), US Senator Hillary Clinton 1 (3%), and others 22 (55%).

Figure 54 The Distribution of Government Officials by Name and/or Position Held

I.III. The Use of Metaphors, Concepts, Stereotypes, and Analogies

There is no significant use of any concepts, metaphors, stereotypes or analogy in the sample.

I.IV. Human Interest Point

The results prove that a total number of 2 human interest stories
are seen in the (1, 6 %) 121 stories. Whereas one of the human interest stories has a pro-American stance, the other one has an anti-American stance.

The first human interest story is about the background of Saddam and his problematic childhood and teenager years. In the story, a former CIA expert on psychoanalysis tells the story of Saddam and concludes that he is a psychologically impaired person having the potential to use WMDs when he feels threatened.

The second one is a picture of an Iraqi detainee kneeling on the floor with a hood over his head. The story depicts the humiliation and despair of an Iraqi in the picture. It is presented in a story to critique the use of hoods by US soldiers on detainees.

I.V. Story Generally

The distribution of stories by stance shows that 101 (84%) of 121 stories have a neutral stance, 15 (12%) have an anti-American stance, and 5 (4 %) have a neutral stance.
I.VI. Does the story work for any party?

According to the coding results, 45 (37%) of the 121 stories work against the US, 44 (36%) work for the US, and 32 (27%) are neutral.
II. The Themes

The distribution of themes proves that a total number of 16 different themes are discussed 268 times in the sample.

Military Action (74), International Politics (47), Iraq after the War (28), Justification of the War (19), Government Action (18) and the UN (18) are the six most discussed topics of the sample respectively. WMDs (15), Public Opinion (13), Military Casualties (9), Domestic Politics (7), Civilian Casualties (4), War in Afghanistan (4), Al Qaeda (3), Anti-War Movements (3), Economic Effects of the War (2), and Humanitarian Action (1) are other topics of the sample.

Figure 57 Distribution of the Themes
Military Action

Military action is the most salient topic of the sample with a frequency of 74 (28%) out of 268.

Military action is discussed in the sample through a variety of topics based on the stages of the military operation. Whereas negotiations among government and military officials dominate the section before the major attack, attention shifts to news from the war scene at the time of the attack. The most salient subtopics after the attack are the resistance attacks and the negative attitudes of US soldiers against the Iraqi people. Other topics are as follows:

Before the Major Attack:

- The necessity of military action against Iraq.
- International support for military action.
- The strategy and timing of the attack.
- Military preparations.
- The probability of the use of chemical and biological weapons by Saddam in the war situation.
- The military capacities of the both sides.
- Turkey’s position in a probable military operation.
- The military preparations of Turkey.
- The negotiations between the US and Turkish government officials.
- The statements of Turkish Government officials.
- The statements of government officials from both sides.
During the Major Attack:

- The phases of the attack.
- The reports from the war scene.
- The claims concerning the US' use of ball bombs.
- Military casualties.
- The statements of government officials from both sides.

After the Major Attack:

- Resistance attacks.
- The negative behaviors of US soldiers against the Iraqi people, like the searching of Iraqi females by male soldiers or the use of hoods.
- Military and civilian casualties.
- The killing of Uday and Qusay.
- The capture of Saddam.

International Politics

International politics is the second most salient topic of the sample with a frequency of 47 (18%) out of 268.

The disagreement of countries on the war is the most noted topic of international politics. The US claims it has the right to conduct military action, even in the absence of international support, since all diplomatic solutions were exhausted. Opposing countries however, argue that the war is not justifiable and they require UN Security Council approval for action. Whereas the UK, Israel,
Poland, Hungary, Australia, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Bulgaria, Romania, Albania, Croatia and Macedonia are presented as supporting countries, France, Germany, Russia, China, Turkey, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Lebanon and Palestine are presented among the opposing countries.

The statements of the Turkish government officials on Turkey’s position, and their initiatives to avoid the war, are prevalent in the sample. Despite a strong alliance with the US, the Turkish government and military officials try to avoid the war through negotiations with both sides. Without mentioning the justifications of the US side, they state that all efforts should be made to avoid war because of its devastating results.

**Iraq after the War**

Iraq after the War is the third most salient topic of the sample with the frequency of 28 (10%) out of 268.

The most striking topic of the section is the unstable security situation in of the post-war country. The increasing number of military and civilian casualties (especially children) in resistance attacks, and the failure of US forces to avert those attacks are thoroughly discussed. Intelligence failures and the penetration terrorists into the country are submitted as basic reasons behind internal security problems.

Another noteworthy topic of the section is the reestablishment of an Iraqi government and military force, and the role of the US in this process. All parties
desire an independent Iraqi government; however, most of them claim that the
government of Iraq is under the control of the US authority in the country. The
same discussions also are made for the military.

The recovery of Baghdad is another significant topic. The investments of
the government to reconstruct the city’s social areas and living spaces dominate
these discussions.

**Justification of the War**

Justification of the War is the fourth most discussed topic of the section
with a frequency of 19 (7%) out of 268.

The allegation is against Iraq’s WMD program is presented as the most
conspicuous justification for the war in this section. The allegations are submitted
with weak arguments without any discussions about the details. According to
these arguments, Saddam is a cruel leader trying to develop WMDs, and if he
gains WMDs, he will use it against the allies of the US especially those
neighboring Iraq. Therefore, he should be stopped by military action before this
becomes a reality.

Opposing parties claim the contrary, arguing that military action cannot
be justified as long as Iraq complies with UN resolutions. They require a UN
resolution to support military action in any condition. A small group claims that
Saddam is a devil dictator posing a significant threat against the peace of the
world; however, military action is not the best solution to the problem since it poses risks to the stability of the region.

**Government Action**

Government Action is the fifth most prominent topic of the sample with the frequency of 18 (7%).

Government Action is mostly discussed in terms of the politics and initiatives of the Turkish and Iraqi governments on war-related issues. The prevention of the war is the most salient subtopic of the section. The reconstruction of the new Iraqi government and its politics also enters into the discussions.

**United Nations**

The United Nations is the sixth most salient topic of the sample with a frequency of 18 (7%) out of 268.

The initiatives of the US to get approval from the Security Council compose the most prominent subtopic of the section. The US government tries to persuade the members of the Security Council for a war decision in order to increase support for the war; France and Russia clearly state that they would reject war as permanent members of the council.
The statements of the WMD inspectors compose another salient subtopic of the section. They confirm Iraqi officials by reporting the absence of significant evidence toward the development of WMDs in Iraq hitherto.

**WMDs**

WMDs is seventh the most salient topic of the sample with the frequency of 16 (6%) out of 268.

The US’ allegations of WMDs and the rejections of Iraq and other opposing parties are discussed in the sample. Whereas the latter is presented with stronger arguments, the former remains weaker in the discourse because of the lack of evidence.

An interesting topic on WMDs is claims that Iraq could use chemical weapons against US soldiers. The US is blamed, not only for overlooking but also for assisting Iraq in the development of chemical weapons during the Iran-Iraq War. The US is also accused of being aware that Iraq used them against Iran. Moreover, the US is also accused of blaming Iran when Iraq used chemical weapons against Kurds in the northern part of the country.

**Public Opinion**

Public Opinion is the eighth most discussed topic of the sample with a frequency of 13 (5%) out of 268.
The discourse on Public Opinion fixates on the negative reaction of the Iraqi people to the invasion and increasing anti-Americanism all over the world, especially in Muslim countries. Public opinion polls, demonstrations and individual interviews are used as the indicators of public opinion.

Sources claim that the Iraqi people support Saddam. They perceive him as the only leader standing against the US and defending the rights of Arabs, especially Palestinians. Other Muslim populations are said to hate the US because of its unjust policies in the Middle East.

Increasing anti-Americanism all over the world is claimed to have a significant impact on the politics of the governments. It is claimed that the governments supporting the US are risking their positions because of the increasing anti-Americanism in their populations. This fact is argued as one main reason behind the international split over the war decision.

Turkish public opinion is also discussed in this section. 99% of the Turkish population is claimed to be against the war.

Others

Military Casualties is discussed 9 times in the sample. The section is composed of reports on death tolls of US soldiers and Iraqi resistance groups. The reports on wounded soldiers also have an important part as a subtopic.

Domestic Politics is discussed 7 times in the sample. The topic is mostly discussed in terms of Turkish and US' internal governmental politics related to
war, such as parliamentary or congressional politics and internal military preparations.

Civilian Casualties, War in Afghanistan, Al Qaeda, Anti-War Movements, Economic Effects of the War, and Humanitarian Action are other topics having only a 1% portion in the sample.

III. Conclusion

According to the results of the analysis, Hurriyet has a predominantly neutral discourse on the justification of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} Gulf War. The discourse is also a very superficial one, presenting only the very basic arguments of the sides in a simple way without any further discussions.

The results of the descriptive content analysis confirm that the discourse of Hurriyet stands in the middle of CNNI and Al Jazeera. The distributions of stories by stance, sources by stance and references by stance prove that anti-American and pro-American views have almost equal representation in the discourse. Moreover, the distribution of sources by culture, references by name/position held, and government officials by country prove that the representation of Muslim sources in Hurriyet is larger than those of CNNI and almost equal to those of Al Jazeera. The distribution of stories by function more powerfully reveals the stance of Hurriyet in the middle as providing both sides
with almost equal contribution. 45 (37%) of the 121 stories work against the US, and 44 (36%) of them work for the US.

The distribution of themes also supports the stance. Whereas the topics justifying the war dominate the discussions of CNNI from a pro-American perspective and the topics discussing the devastating results of the war dominate Al Jazeera from an anti-American perspective, Hurriyet presents both topics from differing views almost at the same ratio. The list of most discussed topics also reveals this stance. Military Action, International Politics, Iraq after the War, the Justification of the War, Government Action, and the UN are the most discussed topics, covering 70% of all discussions. They all mention the justifications and the devastations of the war. For example, Military Action as the most discussed topic not only incorporates discussions on the negative attitudes of US soldiers to the Iraqi people, but also their successful operation stories for the liberation of Iraqi people.

An understanding of the reasons behind the discourse of Hurriyet definitely requires a review of the factors composing the discourse: political identity, ownership, finance, and the circumstances of mass communications. Hurriyet has been a central-positioned newspaper, owned by Dogan Holding, one of the largest business groups in the country, since 1994. The owner of the group is Aydin Dogan. He is very well known for his close relations with the military, judiciary, bureaucracy, and almost all governments as the owner of the biggest media group of the country. He pursues a conjectural policy among those pillars of the state when he has problems with the government. However, the
research period was one in which he had positive relations with the newly established AKP government. Therefore, his position on the 2nd Gulf war cannot be expected to be very different from the government’s position: on the one side, there exists a half century alliance with the US, and on the other side the Muslim identity and a dominant public perception against the war. The financing of Hurriyet relies mostly on commercials, and of course Dogan Holding as the owner. The fact that Dogan Holding is one of the largest bidders of government contracts makes the group’s proximity to the governments more meaningful.

It is obvious that the circumstances of mass communications in the research period also have an important effect on the discourse of Hurriyet. The availability of multiple news sources in the research period, on the one hand, provides the news media with various news sources. On the other hand however, it produces a challenge to media in terms of composing a credible discourse. Therefore, like the international news media, the national news media are also expected to submit its discourse in a moderate way to maintain its credibility.
6.2. The Results of Analysis for Sabah Sample

The sample is comprised of 84 stories of Sabah, selected through random sampling of Sabah data covering the war.

81 (96%) of the stories directly discuss the war and 3 (4%) of them are indirectly about the war. 39 (46%) stories are news analyses, 44 (60%) are both news analysis and extended format, and only 1 (1%) includes three types in one story: news analysis, extended format, and interview.

The results of the analysis prove that, Sabah similar to Hurriyet also has a mostly neutral discourse on the justification of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} Gulf War. The newspaper submits stories without any specific stress on the position of any party. Very similar to Hurriyet, it reports news mostly from a neutral stance and avoids the use of high tones in the discourse. Distribution of the stories by function also confirms this stance by providing both sides similar ratios of contribution.

The presentation of the arguments in the stories remains very weak since almost no supporting arguments is discussed or at least mentioned. Therefore, the discourse of Sabah on the justification of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} Gulf War emerges as superficial, because it lacks serious analysis of the situation.

The results of the descriptive content analysis and qualitative framing analysis, submitted below, provide a more detailed outlook of the discourse.
I. Does the story favor any side of the war?

I.I. Sources

According to the coding results, a total number of 129 sources take place in the sample.

I.I.I. Sources by Stance

The distribution of sources by stance shows that 56 (43%) out of 129 sources have a pro-American stance, 38 (29%) have a neutral stance, and 35 (27%) have an anti-American stance.

Figure 58 Distribution of Sources by Stance
Pro-Americans

The discourse of the pro-American sources is composed of short and superficial statements from US government officials concerning the justifications and goals of the war, mostly in relation to Turkey’s position.

Pro-Americans claim that Saddam is the most significant threat for the world, particularly for its neighboring countries. They argue that Saddam cooperates with Al Qaeda and if he can develop WMDs, he won’t hesitate to use it for terrorist aims. Therefore, he has to be removed from power and the current regime in Iraq has to be replaced by democracy immediately.

According to pro-Americans the only way to remove Saddam from power is military action since he is not open to political solutions. For this reason, they try to persuade others, especially neighboring countries in the Middle East, to cooperate with the US in military action.

They argue that Turkey should cooperate with the US in this war, since Saddam poses a very important threat to the region. They claim that, regardless of Turkey’s cooperation, this war will be fought and Saddam will be removed from power. Turkey therefore, must cooperate with the US from the beginning in order to have a word in the reconstruction process of a new regime in Iraq. Pro-American sources also try to pacify the concerns of The Turkish people relating to the possible establishment of a Kurdish state in the region after the war. They claim that this option will not be permitted by the US, since it is not for the interest of its allies and Iraqi people.
Anti-Americans

The discourse of anti-Americans in the sample is also composed of short and superficial statements rejecting the claims of the US. They have several arguments without any supportive discussions.

Anti-Americans do not think that the US has real justifications for military action since Iraq abides by UN resolutions and there is no admissible evidence regarding the alleged Al Qaeda-Iraq connection.

They perceive the war not only against Iraq but also all Arab countries, and argue that US policy will only increase instability and uncertainty in the region.

Some anti-Americans claim US’ war decision is unilateral and unjust, and will never approve the war, while others require the approval of the UN Security Council in order to assist the US in military action.

A group of anti-Americans claims that Saddam was created by the US. The US not only assisted Saddam in the Iran-Iraq war, but also provided him with the materials to build chemical and biological weapons. The US also ignored Saddam’s use of chemical weapons against the Kurds in Northern Iraq; Thus, the US does not have the right to blame Saddam for developing WMDs.

Another group of anti-Americans is composed of anti war activists who claim that war cannot solve the problems of the Iraqi people but instead will only deteriorate the country further.
**Neutrals**

Neutral sources discuss the war-related issues in terms of their expertise. They do not make any comments on the justification of the war.

**I.I.II. Sources by Culture**

According to the coding results of sources by culture, whereas 91 (70%) out of 129 sources are western, 37 (29%) are Muslim and 1 (1%) is from other cultures.

The distribution of western sources by stance proves that 50 (55%) out of 91 western sources have a pro-American stance, 25 (27%) have a neutral stance and 16 (18%) have an anti-American stance.
The distribution of Muslim sources by stance proves that 19 (51%) out of 31 Muslim sources have an anti-American stance, 12 (33%) have a neutral stance, and 6 (16%) have a pro-American stance.
I.I.III. Government Officials as the Source

The distribution of the sources by their relation to any government reveals that at least one active/retired government official is hosted as the source in 45 (53%) of 84 stories. The total number of government officials as the source is 66, where 29 (73%) of them represent the US, 3 (4%) are from the Iraq Provisional Authority, 11 (16%) are from Turkey, 1 (1%) is from Egypt, 3 (4%) are from the UN, 5 (7%) are from Iraq, 6 (9%) are from the UK, 4 (6%) are from Germany, 3 (4%) from France, 1 (1%) is from Spain, 1 (1%) is from Saudi Arabia, 1 (1%) is from Brazil, and 1 (1%) is from Russia.

![Figure 62 Distribution of Government Officials by Country](image)
The distribution of government officials by position held is as follows:
The President of the US (6%), other US officials (including the Vice President,
the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, National Security Adviser, the
Secretary of Homeland Security, Assistant Secretary of Defense, and others) 25
(36%), the Prime Minister of Turkey 3 (4%), other Turkish officials (including the
Deputy Prime Minister, Foreign Minister, and others) 8 (12%), Saddam Hussein 2
(33%), the President of France 2 (3%), the Chancellor of Germany 2 (3%), the
Prime Minister of the UK 2 (3%), the General Secretary of the UN 1 (1%), the
President of Egypt 1 (1%) and others 19(27%)

Figure 63 Distribution of Government Officials by Name/Position Held
I.II. References

According to the coding results 65 references are made in the sample. 29 (44%) have a neutral stance, 20 (31%) hold an anti-American stance, and 16 (25%) are pro-American in stance.

The distribution of references by their name and/or position held is as follows: President Bush 10 (15%), other US government officials, (including Vice President, the Secretary of State, the director of CIA, Deputy Secretary of State, and the US ambassador to Turkey) 6 (9%), the Prime Minister of Turkey 3 (5%), the President of France 1 (2%), the Foreign Minister of France 1 (1%), the Chancellor of Germany 1(2%), Queen Elizabeth 1 (2%), Tony Blair 2 (3%), Saddam Hussein 7 (11%), Other Iraqi officials 5 (8%), the Brazilian Minister of Culture 1 (2%), Hitler 1 (2%), and unknown 26 (40%).
I.III. The Use of Metaphors, Concepts, Stereotypes, and Analogies

There is no significant use of any concepts, metaphors, stereotypes or analogy in the sample.

I.IV. Human Interest Point

The results prove there are 2 human interest stories in 1 of (1 %) of 84 stories; both human interest stories work for the US.

The stories tell of Saddam Hussein’s sons, Uday and Qusay, providing information about the life and devilish personalities of the two
brothers. Their cruelties are also told in the stories thoroughly.

I.V. Story Generally

Distribution of the stories by stance shows that 70 (83 %) of the stories have a neutral stance, whereas 9 (11 %) of 95 have a pro-American stance and 5 (6%) have an anti-American stance.

![Figure 66 Distribution of the Stories by Stance](image)

I.VI. Does the story work for any party?

According to the coding results, 42 (50%) of the 84 stories work against the US, while 28 (33%) work for the US, and 14 (17%) are neutral.
II. The Themes

According to the coding of the themes, a total number of 15 different themes are discussed 185 times in the sample.

Military Action (55), International Politics (29), Iraq after the War (17), Government Action (13), and the Justification of the War (12), are the five most frequently discussed topics respectively. WMDs (10), United Nations (10), Military Casualties (9), Domestic Politics (8), Civilian Casualties (5), Anti-war Movements (5), Public Opinion (5), Economic Effects (3), Media (2), and Al Qaeda (2) are the others in the list.
Military Action

Military Action is the most discussed topic in the sample with a frequency of 55 (30%) out of 185.

The section is dominated by detailed reports of US military operations and resistance attacks of Iraqi groups. Those stories are told like action movies. The military capacities of both sides are also told in the same manner. Whereas some of those stories have a pro-American stance, others have an anti-American stance. Other subtopics of the section are as follows:

- Possible strategies of military action.
- The probability of military action.
- The politics of the Turkish Government regarding military action.
- Military capacities of both countries.
- Military preparations.
- The US’ military assistance to Iraq in the past.
- Military spy stories.
- The rescue operations of the US soldiers.

**International Politics**

International Politics is the second most salient topic of the section with a frequency of 29 (16%) out of 185.

The most significant subtopics of the section are the international split on the war followed by the efforts of US government officials to gain support for the war. France, Russia, and Germany are submitted as countries strongly opposing the war decision. The tension between these opposing government officials and US government officials is reflected in the discourse.

US’ efforts to persuade Turkey to support military action is another significant topic of the section. US government officials offer two arguments to gain support of Turkey: Firstly, they claim that Turkey is at risk of a possible attack from Iraq, and secondly, if Turkey wants to have a word on the reconstruction process of Iraq, it is required to support military action from the
beginning. Turkish officials however, clearly state that they won’t support military action unless it is approved by the UN. The Turkish Parliament’s rejection of the US military’s request to use Turkish military bases is alleged to have disappointed US officials, causing important changes in US military strategy.

The international efforts of the Turkish government to avoid war are also discussed in the sample. The Turkish government tries to persuade both sides to avoid the war through negotiations; however, the efforts remain fruitless.

**Iraq after the War**

Iraq after the War is the third most salient topic of the section with a frequency of 17 (9%).

The topic is mostly discussed in terms of the political process of the reconstruction of the country, the possible stay of the US military in Iraq after the war, and the security problem inside the country.

The reconstruction of an Iraqi government is viewed as a big challenge in the sample because of the demands of the different ethnic groups in the country. Whereas Shiite groups allegedly desire the establishment of an Islamic government with the support of Iran, the Kurds argue that they should occupy some of the most important positions of the government since they compose 20% of the Iraqi population.

The possibility that US soldiers will remain in Iraq is another subject of the section. Sources argue that due to the high economic cost, soldiers will not
be able to remain in Iraq for very long. This situation is regarded as another challenge because the withdrawal would create an authority gap and cause more destruction in the post-war country.

The security situation in Iraq is also submitted as a big challenge for the Iraqi people. Everyday increasing attacks and death tolls are offered as evidence of a deteriorating situation. Sources claim children wounded because of the attacks die because of the lack of medicine in hospitals, and the coalition authority is blamed for not providing necessary medical equipment and medicine for the Iraqi people.

**Government Action**

Government Action is the fourth most discussed topic of the section with a frequency of 13 (7%).

The topic is mostly discussed in terms of the Turkish, the US’ and the UK’s government policies on issues regarding the war, such as the decisions made by governments and congressional/parliamentary decisions.

**Justification of the War**

Justification of the War is the fifth most discussed topic of the sample with a frequency of 12 (6%).

The justifications of the war are submitted through superficial arguments without any further details. The US claims that Saddam is a terrorist posing the
biggest threat against the peace of the world. They argue that if Saddam can produce WMDs, he will use it for terrorist aims. For this reason, they require immediate military action to eliminate him as a threat.

**Others**

WMDs is the sixth most salient topic of the discussions with a frequency of 10 (5%). The section is composed of superficial allegations of Saddam's efforts to stockpile WMDs and use them for terrorist aims.

The United Nations is the seventh most salient topic of the discussions with a frequency of 10 (5%). The topic is mostly discussed in terms of Security Council politics regarding the war. France, Germany and Russia are submitted as the countries opposing the war in Security Council. Another subtopic of the section is the attack against the UN building in Baghdad. The attack is condemned and the incident is reported in detail.

Military Casualties is the eight most salient topic of the sample, with a frequency of 9 (5%). The section is composed of the death tolls and the reports of wounded soldiers.

Domestic Politics is the ninth most discussed topic of the sample with a frequency of 8 (4%). The topic is mostly discussed in terms of how war-related issues impact domestic politics in the US, the UK, Turkey, and Iraq. The effect of the war effort on US elections, for example, is examined in relation to domestic politics.
Civilian Causalities, Anti-war Movements, Public Opinion, Economic Effects of the War, Media, and Al Qaeda are other topics having 3% or fewer portions in the sample.

III. Conclusion

The analysis of the coding proves that Sabah has a predominantly neutral discourse on the justification of the 2nd Gulf War. The discourse is very similar to that of Hurriyet: a superficial one that lacks story criticism. It presents the main arguments from both sides in a simple way, but, it does not include any further discussion.

The descriptive content analysis results indicate that Sabah has a stance in the middle of CNNI and Al Jazeera. The distribution of stories by stance, sources by stance, and references by stance prove that anti-American and pro-American views have close ratios of representation in the sample despite the fact that pro-American views in each node are slightly better represented than anti-American views. However, the distribution of stories by function favors the anti-American side. The distribution indicates that 42 (50%) of the 84 stories work against the US, while 28 (33%) of them work for the US. The distribution of sources by culture, references by name/position held, and government officials by country also prove that the representation of Muslim sources in Sabah is larger than those of CNNI and almost equal to those of Al Jazeera.
The same stance is also obvious with the distribution of themes. On the contrary to CNNI and Al Jazeera, Sabah submits news from both points of view almost at the same ratio. Military Action, International Politics, Iraq after the War, Government Action, and the Justification of the War are the five most frequently discussed topics covering 68% of all discussions. They mention both the devastations and justifications of the war in the same tone. For example, Iraq after the War is discussed in terms of not only the problems of the post war country, but also the challenges of reconstruction and the efforts of US officials to meet those challenges.

The review of the several factors that may have a significant impact on the composition of the discourse of Sabah helps to better understand the driving forces of the discourse. Political identity, ownership, finance, and the circumstances of mass communication should be taken into consideration for review. Sabah was a central-positioned newspaper owned jointly by Dinc BILGIN and Turgay CINER in the research period. Both men were among the richest businessmen of the country, but were having problems with the newly established AKP government during the research period because a bank owned by Dinc Bilgin was summoned by the government on allegations of credit corruption in 2003. The companies of Turgay CINER were among the largest recipients of those credits. This situation also meant that the financial resources of Sabah, relying mostly on commercials and the owner companies, were at serious risk. Therefore, Sabah is not expected to accord with the government in that term.
The circumstances of mass communications are another significant factor that should be taken into consideration to determine the driving forces behind the discourse of Sabah on the justification of the 2nd Gulf War. Like other actors of the news media, Sabah is also expected to be more thoughtful and moderate while composing its discourse because of the availability of various news sources providing and submitting alternate details of any incidents.

6.3. General Assessment

The results of the analysis for Turkish news media prove that Hurriyet and Sabah have very similar discourses on the justification of the 2nd Gulf War. They both have mostly neutral discourses and submit differing views on the war at similar ratios.

The discussions of the factors composing the discourses of Hurriyet and Sabah reveal some differences and commonalities about the motivations of the discourses. Whereas both are centrally positioned newspapers, addressing an audience dominantly against the war, and broadcasting news under the same circumstances of mass communication, their ownership and financial situations differ in terms of the relations to the government. One of them has close relations with the government while the other is in a struggle with it. Yet, this situation does not cause a difference in their discourse on the 2nd Gulf War. Therefore, ownership and financing are not significant and the central identity of both newspapers, expectations of the audience, and the circumstances of the mass
communications comes to the fore as significant elements in terms of the composition of the discourse on the war.

The discourses of Hurriyet and Sabah on the justification of the 2nd Gulf War has very significant implications because they offer the arguments of both sides almost in the same tone. The superficiality of arguments and the low quality of the representation in both newspapers are significant factors reducing the level of overall quality and the impact of those discourses. Despite this weakness of the discourses, the fact that they still serve the plural voices renders them significant in terms of the purpose of this research.
6.4. The Reflections on the Turkish National Media

The analysis of all samples for the 2\textsuperscript{nd} Gulf War reveals that whereas the discourse of CNNI favors pro-Americanism and Al Jazeera promotes anti-Americanism, the Turkish media stand between these two, providing both points of view almost with the same salience and volume, even if it remains more superficial than these two in terms of content. A comparative review of the results will help better see the reflections in Turkish media.

First, the analysis of sources by stance shows that Hurriyet and Sabah give significant frequencies and salience to sources from both positions, contrary to reporting of CNNI and Al Jazeera. Pro-American sources appear almost as frequently as that of CNNI, and the ratio of anti-American sources are also very close to that of Al Jazeera. The salience and volume of both positions are almost at the same level with both samples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>CNNI (%)</th>
<th>Al Jazeera (%)</th>
<th>Hurriyet (%)</th>
<th>Sabah (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pro-American</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-American</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11 Comparison of the Distributions of Sources by Stance

Second, the distribution of sources by culture proves that the frequencies with Sabah and Hurriyet in each node remain in between CNNI and Al Jazeera. The frequency of western sources in both samples is very close to the midpoint of CNNI and Al Jazeera while the frequency of Muslim sources is
very close to that of Al Jazeera. This situation may be explained with the availability of Muslim sources in Turkey, a country with a 99% Muslim population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CNNI (%)</th>
<th>Al Jazeera (%)</th>
<th>Hurriyet (%)</th>
<th>Sabah (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Cultures</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 12 Comparison of the Distributions of Sources by Culture*

Third, the distribution of government officials by country shows that Turkish media samples, especially Hurriyet, provide significantly more views from various governments officials than that of CNNI and Al Jazeera. Whereas US officials dominate both samples with frequencies much less than that of CNNI and very close to that of Al Jazeera, Iraqi officials are more seriously represented than that of CNNI and close to that of Al Jazeera. Turkish government officials are also represented with more significance in both samples as a natural result of being national newspapers.
Table 13 Comparison of the Distributions of Government Officials by Country

Fourth, the distribution of references by stance confirms the stance of the Turkish Media between CNNI and Al Jazeera by providing the frequencies between those of CNNI and Al Jazeera.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>CNNI (%)</th>
<th>Al Jazeera (%)</th>
<th>Hurriyet (%)</th>
<th>Sabah (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The US</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The UK</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The UN</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab League</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The World Bank</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Cross</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14 Comparison of the Distributions of References by Stance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stance</th>
<th>CNNI (%)</th>
<th>Al Jazeera (%)</th>
<th>Hurriyet (%)</th>
<th>Sabah (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pro-American</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-American</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fifth, the results of the analysis show that there is no use of metaphors, concepts, stereotypes, and analogies in the samples of the Turkish news media. This manner can be accepted as an indication that they are avoiding being more supportive of one side than the other.

Sixth, the frequencies of human interest stories in both samples are much less than that of CNNI and Al Jazeera. The samples have a total number of 4 human interest stories working for both sides. 3 of them talk of Saddam and his sons’ cruel personalities after they are captured. Although those stories work for the US, the fact that they are told from a neutral point of view moderates their emotional impact. One of the human interest stories, depicting an Iraqi detainee kneeling on the floor with a hood over his head, works harshly against the US.

Seventh, the distributions of the stories by stance prove that both samples are mostly dominated by neutral stories and both positions in the war are given close ratios at low levels. However, contrary positions have either no representation or insignificant ratios in the samples of CNNI and Al Jazeera.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CNNI (%)</th>
<th>Al Jazeera (%)</th>
<th>Hurriyet (%)</th>
<th>Sabah (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pro-American</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-American</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15 Comparison of the Distributions of Stories by Stance
Eighth, the distribution of the stories by function more clearly confirms the balanced stances of the Turkish media, since it considers the overall function of the stories even though they are in neutral stance. Whereas the stories in the CNNI sample dominantly work for the US, and stories in Al Jazeera work against the US, Turkish media samples have a more balanced function that gives time to both sides.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CNNI (%)</th>
<th>Al Jazeera (%)</th>
<th>Hurriyet (%)</th>
<th>Sabah (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>for the US</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>against the US</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16 Comparison of the Distributions of Stories by Function

Ninth, the analysis of the themes also proves the balanced discourse of the Turkish media on the 2nd Gulf War. Whereas the central point of view for discussion is pro-Americanism in the CNNI sample and anti-Americanism in the Al Jazeera sample, both views are represented at similar levels in the samples of Turkish media. The ranking of the most discussed themes also confirms the stance. Whereas discussions focus on themes justifying the war in the CNNI sample, and the devastating results of the war in the Al Jazeera sample, the samples from the Turkish media provide a balanced representation of both views.
## Table 17 Comparison of the Distributions of Themes

The comparative results prove that the Turkish media reflect the discourses of CNNI and Al Jazeera almost at the same level. The distribution of stories by stance, sources by stance, and references by stance prove that anti-American and pro-American views have close levels of representation in the Turkish media discourse. The frequencies of both views stand in between those of CNNI and Al Jazeera. The distributions of sources by culture and government officials by country are other signs of the stance. They prove that the representation of Muslim sources and third parties in the Turkish Media are
larger than those of CNNI and close to those of Al Jazeera. No use of metaphors, concepts, stereotypes, and analogies and very little use of human interest stories may be accounted as another indicator of neutrality since the frequent use of those elements push the discourse to one side. The distribution of stories by function is the last indicator approving the balanced discourse of Turkish media by providing both sides with almost equal contribution.
CHAPTER 7 CONCLUSION

The goal of this research is to examine the relationship between globalization and international media discourse. The project acknowledges media as a tool of soft power and attempts to understand how media impact people’s perception of events. It also aims to analyze how soft power is composed and maintained through media in the new form of international affairs.

Past studies have claimed that the elite dominate media and manipulate discourse to serve their own benefit. According to Lipmann there are control mechanisms on information channels. Those mechanisms generate information barriers between the public and the real event, offering elites an opportunity to manipulate how information is disseminated.\(^1\) Tunstall’s ‘Media are American’\(^2\) and Herman and Chomsky’s ‘Propaganda Model’\(^3\) are among prominent studies confirming the existence of information barriers. However, recent literature reveals that the balance of global media has shifted. Tunstall argues that this shift has unfavorably impacted the US during the last several decades. He cites four media regions that are based on geography, religious and cultural tradition, and a main language or main language groups: Euro-America (North and South America and most of Europe), China, India, and Arabic Nations.\(^4\) Tunstall’s work

---

mostly concentrates on the structural elements of the global media. However, the question remains whether those structural changes introduced a change of discourse. Although there are several studies indicating a diffusion in media discourse, there remains a need for further investigation. Globalization’s impact on international media discourse is still ambiguous. Therefore, this research attempts to determine whether contemporary communication technologies had an impact on global media discourse. If the answer is yes, then it investigates the question: Does the percussion destroy or weaken the barrier present between the public and real events? Put simply, can people reach alternative information about events that can eliminate the barrier between reality and perceived reality in the global media?

This research attempts to answer this question by analyzing and comparing international media discourses in the 1st and 2nd Gulf Wars. It tries to uncover any significant change in the discourse that serves as alternative information on the justification of the war. Then, it examines the Turkish National Media discourse to determine whether international media discourse is reflected in the news of grassroots populations.

A descriptive content analysis and a detailed qualitative framing analysis are conducted on the samples for this purpose. The results of the analysis confirm the barrier between the public and actual events in the case of the 1st Gulf War, but in the case of the 2nd Gulf War, the research reveals a partial loss of control for international news outlets.
In order to depict the research process, and the broader implications of the findings, the projects findings are summarized in the opening. Secondly, an assessment of the effective factors behind the results is presented, followed by the implications of these findings to global media, public perception, and the use of soft power. Thirdly, the implications of the results on the use of soft power are discussed in the broader context: the challenges are submitted, and the case of the ‘2nd Gulf War’ is discussed in light of the assessments. Lastly, recommendations are made for policy makers to meet new challenges and for academics to further research.

7.1. Summary of the Results

The analysis proves that international media discourse in the 1st Gulf War is almost entirely pro-American due to the fact that coverage was dominated by only one news source—CNN. The 2nd Gulf War is covered with much more perspective because multiple news channels represent both sides of the war.

In the 1st Gulf War, CNN pursues a predominantly pro-American discourse. The distributions of sources by stance, stories by stance, references by stance, anchors by stance, and stories by function reveal that anti-American views were not significantly represented when compared to pro-American discourse. The distribution of government officials by country proves that there is no significant rate of representation for government officials outside the US. Qualitative framing analysis shows that at the heart of all discussions is the US
perspective. The possible risks of the war, for example, are presented in terms of risk for Americans and the world. There is, however, no mention concerning the Iraqi people and war casualties. In addition, military action, the most salient topic, is usually discussed as a necessity of the American strategy for war against Iraq, but little is said about the probable devastating results for humanity. The extensive use of the Hitler analogy to depict Saddam Hussein, and the threat posed by him, is another clue into this matter.

In the 2nd Gulf War, the discourse in international media is composed of two different points of view. CNNI again provides a predominantly pro-American discourse, but in a more moderate way of representation, while Al Jazeera produces a predominantly anti-American discourse. The moderation in the discourse of CNNI is confirmed by the distributions of sources by stance, stories by stance, references by stance, anchors by stance, and stories by function. While neutral positions take more place in comparison to the 1st Gulf War, anti-American positions are still not significantly represented in the discourse. The distribution of government officials by country shows that CNNI provides only slightly more perspective from government officials not from the US in comparison to the 1st War. Iraqi government officials and five other governments are represented in small ratios. Although the ratios of pro-American positions decrease in distribution, qualitative analysis proves that pro-Americanism is enhanced by an extensive use of pro-American concepts, such as ‘terror/terrorism/terrorist’, ‘the War on Terror/Terrorism’ and pro-American human interest stories. The analysis of the themes also confirms the same. The
distribution of themes proves that the most discussed topics are those justifying
the war in political terms rather than those conveying the devastation that war
would cause. Qualitative analysis reveals that the pro-American perspective is
still central to most of the discussions.

In the 2nd Gulf War, CNNI maintains its pro-American discourse, while Al
Jazeera emerges as the representative of anti-American discourse in
international media. Al Jazeera provides pro-American sources in nearly the
same ratio as anti-American sources; however, qualitative analysis proves that
the pro-American position is not as significant and appears less frequently than
the anti-Americans in the stories. The results of the descriptive content analysis
for other nodes, the use of anti-American concepts, and the extensive use of
anti-American human interest stories also confirm the predominantly anti-
American stance of the discourse. Al Jazeera also provides representation to
more governments than does CNNI in the discourse. A total number of 12
governments other than the US have representation and Iraq has a relatively
significant ratio. An analysis of the themes reveals that, contrary to CNNI, topics
concerning the devastating results of the war are discussed more frequently than
topics justifying the war, and anti-Americanism is at the heart of most of the
discussions. For example, military action is presented from the viewpoint of an
anti-American Iraqi who perceives US soldiers as the enemy and Iraqi people as
the victim. The dehumanizing behavior of US soldiers to Iraqi people, everyday
military conflicts, and their devastating results are presented as the most
noteworthy subtopics on military action.
**Reflections in Turkish Media**

In the 1st Gulf War, CNN was the most dominant news provider of war news for Turkey. Most of the Turkish people received the war news from CNN through the state owned TV channel TRT1 (Turkish Radio and Television 1) with simultaneous translation. At that time, there was only one newly established private TV station that had very small coverage in Turkey. Therefore, there was no reflection of the International media discourse in Turkish media, but instead it was CNN itself.

In the 2nd Gulf War, the Turkish public received war news from a variety of different news sources. Hurriyet and Sabah, among the most circulated, central positioned, and privately owned newspapers of Turkish Media, compose the samples for this research. After the analysis of each newspaper, a comparison is made to track reflections in the Turkish Media.

The comparative results prove that the Turkish media have a balanced discourse standing in the midst of CNN and Al Jazeera. The distributions of stories by stance, sources by stance, references by stance, and stories by function prove that anti-American and pro-American views have similar ratios. The frequencies of both views stand in between those of CNN and Al Jazeera. The distributions of sources by culture and government officials by country are other signs of the stance. They prove that the representation of Muslim sources and third parties in the Turkish Media are larger than those of CNN and close to those of Al Jazeera. The lack of metaphors, concepts, stereotypes, analogies
and very little use of human interest stories are another indication of their balanced position, since the frequent use of those elements pushes the discourse to one side. The analysis of themes also provides similar results. Both pro and anti-American views have nearly identical ratios of representation. The distribution of themes shows balance—topics justifying the war and those revealing its devastation are equally represented.

The results of the analysis confirm the monopoly in international media discourse on the justification of the 1st Gulf War and the diffusion in that of the 2nd Gulf War. CNN itself, as the only news source, composes the international media discourse in the 1st Gulf War and the fact that CNN news is aired in national TVs with simultaneous translation enhances the monopoly and so the impact of the discourse of CNN. However, in the 2nd Gulf War, Al Jazeera emerges as a component of international media and breaks the monopoly of CNN by introducing an opposing discourse to that of CNNI. Moreover, the fact that national news media in Turkey provides both perceptions with almost equal representation in their coverage further confirms the splintering of CNN’s monopoly and the increasing impact of the opposing views.

7.2. Effective Factors on the Composition of the Discourses

This research suggests that the most effective factor behind the change in the composition of international media discourse is the availability/unavailability of different perceptions on the stage. In the 1st war, CNN
was the only news channel and offered only a pro-American perception, which became available not only for the audience of international media but also the local public of different countries. Therefore, it would be fair to say that the unavailability of alternative information sources and broadcasters provided CNN with the freedom to manipulate information. This is not to say CNN manipulated the events in the war. However, the reasons behind the very high volume and significance of pro-Americanism can be better traced with this reality at hand.

Other reasons behind the harsh pro-American discourse of CNN can be revealed through the review of the elements composing the discourse. Most of the scholars agree that ownership, financial resources, and news resources are among the prominent factors composing the discourse of news media. However, the relationships shared between the media/government and the media/public opinion has always been a controversial subject in the literature. This study suggests that this is a multi-directional relationship between media-government/public opinion based on the convergence or divergence of the interests of the parties. Therefore, the direction may change case by case.

The American identity is the common denominator of all the elements composing the discourse of CNN. This is a news channel established by an American tycoon and fed by American funds that collects news through its own correspondents from the battle scene under the control of American military, and addresses the American audience until the war starts. The discussion about the direction of media-government/public opinion relations remains insignificant in this case since there is a consensus on pro-Americanism. From this point of
view, the predominant pro-American discourse of CNN is not surprising but predictable.

The comparison of the factors reveals that the availability of different actors in international media is the most significant difference in the composition of the discourse in the 2nd war. This time, CNNI is as American as it was in the 1st war. However, the availability of other views in international media definitely breaks the monopoly of CNN and produces a challenge in terms of its credibility. Therefore, the discourse is still predominantly pro-American but in a more moderate way. In this case Al Jazeera is probably the most powerful news channel emerging with a clearly anti-American discourse as an actor of international media. The composition of Al Jazeera’s discourse is the natural result of the Arabic identity of the channel. The channel is set up by an Arab, financed by Arab money, having its own correspondents on the scene, and given an editorial independence to challenge the western media. However, what makes the difference is not only the Arabic perspective of the channel or the desire to break a western monopoly, but the conditions allowing Al Jazeera to produce and disseminate information all around the world: The availability of information technology for everyone rather than only for the powerful. Although satellite technology was used by only CNN as an American news channel in the early 1990s, it became available also for 2nd and even 3rd world countries at the end of the 20th century. The prevalence of the internet in the entire world has been another important technological step that gives individuals the skills to collect and disseminate information independent from state control. An Arabic news channel
could not be expected to become a major news channel challenging the super power of the world with its opposing discourse in an era where information dissemination is under the control or monopoly of the superpower.

Concomitant to international media, national media also benefits from the changing trends and has gained the skill to collect and broadcast differing views. The analysis of Turkish newspapers reveals that both provide their audiences with differing views on the war. The discussions of the elements composing the discourses of Hurriyet and Sabah reveal the importance of the availability of differing views in the media. They are both centrally positioned newspapers, addressing an audience dominantly against the war. However, their ownership and financial situations differ in terms of the relations with the government. One of them had close relations with the government while the other is in a struggle with it. Therefore, relations with the government and the financial situation seem to be less significant. The expectations of the audience are not completely addressed, because their central positions and the availability of alternate sources compel the Turkish newspapers to submit differing views in their discourses.

7.3. Implications

The international media discourses had enormous implications in both wars in terms of international media, public perception of events, and the use of soft power.
In the 1st war, the unavailability of alternative news sources provided CNN with the ability to operate free from any control in the international media domain. It gave a strong voice to the causes and successes of American policy while giving very little representation to other views. The result was the monopoly of CNN and pro-Americanism in the international media. Because of this monopoly, most of the world’s public did not have any chance to learn any alternative views or facts to those aired in CNN during the war. Moreover, the fact that the coverage of CNN was directly reflected by the National TVs in most countries with simultaneous translation enhanced the impact of the discourse by conveying it to not only the elites of the world but also the grassroots populations all over the world. From a soft power perspective, this situation definitely confirms the barrier between the real event and the public. The significance of CNN’s function dramatically increases as the unique news provider in an environment where the public lacks other sources to get news. There are several arguments about the functions of the mass media. Entman mentions the mass media as an instrument of political leaders to affect public opinion and claims that this barrier provides the political leaders with a great potential to influence public opinion through mass media. Livingston claims that global real time media impacts government policies in several ways, rather than having the media controlled by the government. Kern et al. do not specify a direction to media-

government/public opinion relations and suggests that press coverage is reflective of the production of competition among different powers. In all conditions the uniqueness of CNN in international media makes the difference in terms of its impact in the 1st Gulf War. This situation increases the significance of CNN as an unavoidable tool for the justification of the U.S. policy to the world.

In the 2nd Gulf War, the removal of a superpower monopoly on communication technologies, and the emergence of alternative views in international media, had enormous implications. For global media, the involvement of an Arab perspective not only broke the monopoly of Western media by sharing an important portion in the composition of international media discourse but also imposed a moderation in their discourses by producing a constraint. The availability of other views on the stage definitely removed the freedom of Western media and pushed them to be more cautious while covering the events. One of the reasons lying behind the moderation of CNNI’s discourse was definitely the capacity of Al Jazeera to show the other side of the coin almost simultaneously while CNNI was reporting its version.

For public perception of events, the multiplicity of the differing views reduced the distance between the public and the real event by offering the public a chance to receive news from different sources and make their own judgments by comparing and contrasting those alternatives. The reflections of differing views in the national media empowered the impact of alternate discourses.

---

Therefore, not only the audience of the international media but also the grassroots populations started to interpret the events from their own points of view and question the status quo.

Lastly, from the propaganda point of view, the advancement of communication technologies strongly hit and damaged, if not totally removed, the barrier between the real event and public by seriously reducing the control of elites on information channels. Almost every person having a cell phone or access to the Internet gained the ability to function like an international media correspondent. Therefore, manipulation of events does nothing but damage the credibility of the media in this environment.

7.3.1. Implications in terms of Soft Power

The diffusion of international media discourse is clear evidence of the very significant, broader implications of the advancement of global communication technologies in terms of the use of soft power. It confirms the removal of state control on information channels. That leads to two important challenges for the states to maintain their soft power: First, states can no longer select a target audience and send target specific messages because of the availability of internet access almost all over the world. Second, states are no longer the sole disseminator; because the internet provides individuals with a relative power against states with the ability to disseminate information without state control. Therefore, the new conditions of information dissemination render
the conventional tools and strategies obsolete, and require new ones in terms of maintaining soft power. The U.S., once on the advantageous side of previous age, could not meet the challenges in the case of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} Gulf War.

States no longer have the ability to determine the target audience and send audience specific messages because the internet provides easy access to information channels all over the world. Conventional propaganda techniques require a separation of the audience. Target audience can be examined in three basic categories: home audience, enemy, and third parties. It is very important for a government to convince her own people of the existence of the threat, the unavoidability of the war, and her power to beat the enemy. It is necessary to convince the home population of these elements because it provides justification for the war, and thus the people are more likely to support the government and the troops in their decision-making processes. If the home population does not believe the cause is just, and in the supreme power of their military, it becomes nearly impossible to win a war. The second category of the target audience is the enemy. The enemy must be convinced that they are at fault and are too weak to win the war. The third category of the target audience is the third parties consisting of the neutrals, or other countries and organizations not involved in the war. Throughout history, the support of neutrals has been very important, whether in terms of getting their assistance, or at least preventing them from assisting the enemy. During the last several decades, however, this group has gained more significance than in other time periods. With the effects of globalization, the world turned into a small village. Every conflict and even
debates in this village affect almost all residents and the international community is much more powerful. Without the support of third parties it is hard to wage a war, even if the nation’s cause is just. Therefore, messages are composed and delivered specifically to each target group. The home audience is subjected to the messages saying they are right and powerful, while the enemy side is sent messages leading them to the feeling of weakness. This prompts them to reconsider fighting because they fear losing their families and everything valuable to them. The third parties, of course, are led to believe in the justification of war and the rightness of the sender.

Target specific messages, however, do not work in this era because each group receives the messages sent for the other one. The result is confusion in the target groups about the causes and the results of the war. Yet this reality is not taken into consideration by most states. The best example is perhaps the USA. Section 501 of the US Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 prohibits the domestic dissemination of information produced for outside consumption. This provision covers Voice of America, a radio and TV network broadcasting worldwide outside of the US; Alhurra, satellite TV broadcasting to the Middle East; Radio Farda, a radio station targeted at Iran; Radio Free Asia, a radio network broadcasting in Asia; Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty, a radio network based in Europe and the Middle East; Radio Martí and TV Martí, a radio and TV network broadcasting in Cuba; and Radio Sawa, a radio station broadcasting in the Middle East. Yet in this age of instant and global

---

communication, how can it be possible to prevent Americans from acquiring such public information? It is unrealistic and technologically impossible.\textsuperscript{10}

Another challenge for maintaining soft power is the ability of opponents to counter propaganda through easy access to information channels at a very small cost. This can be achieved without reference to the level of their hard power and at very little cost in several ways. Firstly, people have the option to disseminate information through their own websites, e-mail groups and even cell phones. The concept of “Citizen Reporters” is born as a result of this ability. Helen Boaden, the BBC’s director of news, confirms that after London bombings they had 50 images within an hour and describes it as a "new world" and a "gear change".\textsuperscript{11} According to Google search results, opponents of the War on Terror use the internet better than the US as a means of soft power. When clicking on the Google search with the word “Abu Ghraib” 1,320,000 results appeared in April 2010.\textsuperscript{12} None of the websites in the first page of the search offers a positive connotation to Abu Ghraib. Or, when searching the words “Jessica Lynch” 1,330,000 results appeared in April, 2010\textsuperscript{13} and none of the websites tell the story of Jessica Lynch like CNNI did. Secondly, each individual has the chance of


\textsuperscript{13}Google. (2010). retrieved on April 27, 2010, from http://www.google.com/#hl=en&source=hp&q=jessica+lynch&rlz=1W1DKUS_en&aq=f&aqi=g10&aql=&oq=&gs_rfl=&fp=9118ce00d2da0f08
publishing their own views on the websites of newspapers. Nowadays, almost all news sites have a column named blogs to provide individuals with the chance to discuss their own views on the issue published. The New York Times, CNN, BBC, and Al Jazeera are among prominent news sites with blogs. Thirdly, opposing parties have the ability to set up their own media and compose their own discourse against U.S. politics. Al Jazeera is the most prominent example of the news media standing against the western dominance. The results of this research prove the function and the significance of Al Jazeera’s opposing discourse.

The loss of support for the U.S. in the War on Terror has showed that the U.S. failed to meet the challenges of maintaining soft power. The U.S. representation of the enemy and its justifications for the war didn’t work well, mainly due to the speed at which counter arguments and proofs were disseminated. The message from the U.S.—that the war would spread democracy and cease the spread of fascist violence in Iraq—was converted by opposition groups to a message of increasing uncertainty and continued violence.

---

Public Opinion on the 2nd Gulf War

Public opinion on the 2nd Gulf War is determined by the clash of two contrasting presentations of the war. The U.S. has applied her own psychological warfare to the target groups through global media; but perhaps for the first time in history, the opponents of the war are using effective soft power tools that are independent from state control. Indicators show that opponents are more successful than the USA in this job.

Public opinion polls in the USA are indicators of performance for both sides in terms of the use of soft power. According to polls conducted by CNN/USA Today/Gallup in March 2003 and March 2005, and by CNN/Opinion Research Corp. in 2007, the support for the war was 72% in March 2003. By May of 2005 it had decreased to 57%, and by November of 2007 it plummeted to 31%. Meanwhile, opposition to the war increased from 25% in March 2003 to 41% in May 2005 and 68% in November 2007.18 Public polls by Gallup19 and PEW Research Center20 also provide similar results.

---

March 2003(%) | March 2005(%) | November 2007(%)  
---|---|---
For the War | 72 | 47 | 31  
Against the War | 25 | 47 | 68  
No Opinion | 3 | 6 | 1  

Table 18 The US’ Public Support for the 2nd Gulf War

The results clearly show that the U.S. has lost the very serious battle of gaining public support in the period of war. That means whatever the real situation, the government couldn’t convince even its own people of the significance and the success of the war and failed to maintain its soft power.

7.4. Recommendations

Policy makers should give more value to academic research and advice in order to stay with the current trends, determine the challenges, provide solutions, and apply policies accordingly. Recognition of the challenges is the first step in trying to work on the challenges themselves. A solid determination of the current trends requires a serious amount of academic work. However, executives mostly build strategies based on their own evaluations developed from personal knowledge and experience rather than professional research. These kind of evaluations are more likely to miss significant variables when identifying the problem, and accordingly, in the production of solutions since they lack academic methodology and sufficient data. Academic research is more
reliable because it is based on a sound methodology and data; therefore, it provides a better identification of the problems and the alternative solutions.

Policy makers should make reliable policy decisions and be consistent and honest in representing them because information barriers no longer provide the protection to manipulate as they once did. They should be able to clearly state what their objectives are and how they are accomplishing them, and this requires them to justify their policies to the public. Therefore, they should build their policies on sound information and take into consideration the expectations of the public while making policy. However, policy makers may not state explicitly what they want for three basic reasons. First, they may not value public opinion and soft power. In this case, they run the risk of losing the public. Second, they may have a secret agenda that would not be welcomed by the public, but the new avenues of information dissemination do not give secret agendas much of a chance to last for long. Third, they may fail to meet their objectives and may try to hide the failure. In this case, there is again a secret agenda, this time to hide the failure. The U.S. government started a very comprehensive campaign against terrorism after 9/11 and included the 2nd Gulf War within this campaign. The goal of military action was declared to be the spread of democracy to Iraq. However, immediately after the U.S. government made its arguments they were called into question through the dissemination of counter arguments by opposing parties. In the end, the justification for the war proved to be false and Iraq has been depicted by the media as a nation suffering from greater violence than before.
The result has been an increase of anti-American sentiment all over the world and a loss of support even within the US.

Policy makers should not use false or unconfirmed information to justify their policies and to get support. False information is revealed faster than before and the credibility of the disseminator is lost. Moreover, opponents do not forget false statements and remind them whenever needed to maintain the impact. For example, one justification of the U.S. government for military action in the 2nd Gulf War was the alleged relationship between Al Qaeda and Iraq. The allegation was represented in CNNI as a strong argument that required immediate military action. Al Jazeera proved that the allegation was relying on unconfirmed intelligence assessments, and aired the counter argument that the alleged Al Qaeda-Iraq connection is a production of the U.S. because the American people feared al Qaeda. Since the American people were fearful of another terrorist attack by al Qaeda, it became easier to justify the war to the public. According to this argument there is no evidence proving the relationship between Al Qaeda and the Iraqi government, and if there is any possibility that al Qaeda is in Iraq, they exist in the U.S. controlled part of the country. The allegation of the U.S. government could never been confirmed and remain as one of the false arguments that damaged its credibility. Moreover, Al Jazeera continues to remind the public of these false allegations to continue to damage U.S. credibility. For example, Al Jazeera’s English website broadcasted a report from the Center for
Public Integrity in 2008\textsuperscript{21} that claims that George Bush and other top US officials deliberately made a total of 935 false statements in the escalation that led to the Iraq war as part of a campaign to spread erroneous information to justify military action in Iraq. Al Jazeera provided detailed information about those statements.\textsuperscript{22}

Policy makers should take into account that target specific messages do not work in this era. All of the different audiences are the recipients of all the messages. Messages should therefore be designed to address all target groups by using overlapping codes instead of target specific ones. Mentioning the justness of the war and one’s power is seen to be better than sending enemy soldiers messages reminding them of their families. Because the nation’s own soldiers may also receive those messages, they can be affected in a negative way similar to the enemy’s soldiers. In addition, messages delivered to the home audience intended to increase hatred against an enemy may be perceived as a power play by the opposition (for example, messages revealing the brutality of the enemy against captured soldiers).

Policy makers should benefit from the new communication means and take into account the changing culture of news gathering. Although TV and newspapers are still among the most important information sources for people,

\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
there are new and diverse information tools emanating from the convergence of computing, telecommunications and media in a digital environment. Cell phones and internet-accessible devices are the basic tools that people use to collect information. SMS news services to cell phones, web news, video sharing sites, e-mail groups, and social networking sites like Facebook and Twitter are among the new sub-domains of information dissemination. The new tools provide people with easy access to information and permanent updates second by second. Some of them, like web news and video sharing sites, still provide detailed news like TV and newspapers; while others, like SMS news and Twitter, send short texts to the recipients. Therefore, the management of the content of this news requires the determination of potential recipients, their expectations, and the potential impact of this news on public opinion so that they can be effectively used as the means of soft power.

Lastly, further academic research should be conducted on the function of mass communication means with updated data to confirm and specify the impact of globalization in international media discourse.


APPENDIX: CODEBOOK

CODING INSTRUCTIONS:

1. **Story Id**
   
   Id given to each story by the researcher

2. **Story date and time**
   
   The date and time that the story was aired or published

3. **What type of a story is it?**
   
   Story types are interview (Int), news analysis (NA), or straight news reports (SNR)

4. **Is the story directly or indirectly about the war?**
   
   Is the story all about the war or is it mentioned in the story as being one of the components’ of the whole thing?

5. **What is the main theme of the story?**
   
   What is the story about?

**Examples**:

- Government action (GA)
- Military Action (MA)
- Humanitarian Action (HA)
- Media (M)
- War and Domestic politics, issues (DP)
- United Nations (UN)
International Politics (INTP)
The future of Iraq after war (F of I)
Al Qaeda (AQ)
Pre-war diplomacy (PWD)
Anti war movements (AWM)
Justification (Probability, necessity, and justness) of the war (JUST)
The addresses of and talks with government officials (AGO)
Press briefings, meetings (PM)
Civilian Casualties (CC)
Military Casualties (MC)
Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMDs)
Economic Effects of the War (EEW)
Public Opinion (PO)
The War in Afghanistan (War in AF)

6. **Does the story favor any side of the war?**

If the sources in the story entirely accord with the position of any side of the war or uses metaphors, concepts, or stereotypes hinting at one side, then it favors that side.

If the side of the story is ambiguous in the stories having more than one actor (anchor and sources), a general conclusion is not made, however, the standing of each actor and also the origin of the source are given separately.
Pro-American (PA)
Anti-American (AA)
None of them (NON)

6.1. **The use of metaphors, concepts and stereotypes**

Look for metaphors, concepts and stereotypes that give an idea of the discourse and determine the number of those used in each story.

Examples:

- the War on/against Terror/Terrorism
- terror/terrorism/terrorist’

6.2. **References in the Story**

These are videos or voice recordings referenced in the story. The names of the references and their stances are important in terms of the discourse.

6.3. **Sources**

In the stories having sources, the origin and the standing of the source is determined for analysis.

In case there is more than one source in a story, each segment of the coding sheet for sources is divided into four small parts to use each of them for each source separately within the same segment. This helps avoid unnecessary enlargement of the coding sheet. The parts of each segment are reserved for the first, the second, the third, and the fourth source from left to right respectively.
6.4. **Does the story work for any side of the war?**

If the story favors any side of the war, then, it works for the same side. However, even in the condition that the story doesn’t favor any side, it may still be good for one side and so bad for the other.

For example, the story may be a straight news report which is naturally bad for a side in the war situation. Like the loss of life in an attack.

6.5. **Is there a mention for human interest in the story?**

If a story mentions about a person by presenting his/her problems, sufferings, concerns, etc. then it is counted as mentioning human interest.
## Coding Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Story</th>
<th>Is the Story Directly About the War?</th>
<th>What is the Main Theme of the Story?</th>
<th>Does the Story Favor Any Side of the War?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The war of M.C.Z.A.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>References in the Story</th>
<th>AA</th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>NON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>NON</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Anchor**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AA</th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>NON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>NON</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Is the story work for any party?**

- Human
- Interest Point
- Western
- Non-Western
- Unknown

**Does the story favor any side of the war?**

- Anchor
- Reference

**The use of M.C.Z.A.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>War on/against Terror</th>
<th>Evil</th>
<th>Terror</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**References in the Story**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AA</th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>NON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>NON</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Anchor**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AA</th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>NON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>NON</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Is the story favor any side of the war?**

- Anchor
- Reference

**The use of M.C.Z.A.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>War on/against Terror</th>
<th>Evil</th>
<th>Terror</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**References in the Story**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AA</th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>NON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>NON</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Anchor**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AA</th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>NON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>NON</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Is the story favor any side of the war?**

- Anchor
- Reference

**The use of M.C.Z.A.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>War on/against Terror</th>
<th>Evil</th>
<th>Terror</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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