

War in Iraq:
Comparative Coverage of *The Toronto Star* and *The New York Times*

Hanan Mian Ahmad

York University

ABSTRACT

This paper presents the coverage pattern of the front pages of *The New York Times* and *The Toronto Star* from March 1, 2003 to April 15, 2003 regarding: A-coverage of anti-war protests and B- the coverage of Iraq war. This study also examines the dependence of newspapers on the U.S. official sources in war and its impact on news coverage. Further, this study establishes the relationship between the press coverage and national interests. In addition, it also projects how far the Canadian newspaper- *The Toronto Star's* coverage is converged or diverged from the American Newspaper-*The New York Times*.

Keywords: War on Iraq, Coverage of anti-war protests, Coverage pattern of *The Toronto Star* and *The New York Times*, Government sources and its influence on media coverage, *The New York Times* support for war.

In modern foreign policy conflicts, media is dependent more upon official sources in its coverage. The relationship between the media and governments is varying from country to country and from government to government with changing political, economic, diplomatic and military environments respectively. There are various schools of thought (Berry 1990, 3) regarding the coverage of media and government relationships in foreign policy conflicts. One school of thought portrays the press as a player or participant in the foreign policy process. In this scenario, the press plays the role of fourth branch of the government, influencing the foreign policy. This group also acknowledges role of media as a watchdog, independent or adversarial in the foreign policy making process. The other school of thought holds that government manipulates

the press. The government officials stage the events, leak selective information, cover-up facts behind the wall of secrecy, overwhelm the media with barrages of press releases, and even lie occasionally to the point that the press becomes a tool in the hands of the president and his legion of media managers. Within this context, Altschul (1984) maintains that the press tends to support status quo and dominant political patterns, part of establishment or agent of its power (Altschul 1984, 254-56). Therefore, various organizational, governmental and structural factors play a vital role in shaping the coverage pattern of *The New York Times* and *The Toronto Star* regarding the Iraq war.

This paper presents the coverage pattern of the front pages of *The New York Times* and *The Toronto Star* from March 1, 2003 to April 15, 2003 regarding: A-coverage of anti-war protests and, B- the coverage of the Iraq war. This study examines to what extent newspapers depend upon government sources in foreign policy conflicts and its impact on news coverage. Further, it establishes the relationship between the press coverage and national interest and projects how far *The Toronto Star's* coverage is converged or diverged from that of *The New York Times*. In addition, it discusses the reasons of the press reliance on official sources during the Iraq war.

Significance of the Period of the Study

After the attack on Afghanistan in 2001, the U.S. increased pressure on Saddam Hussein to cooperate with the U.N. sponsored weapon inspectors. In 2003, the U.S. and its allies invaded Iraq to change the regime because it declared Saddam a threat to U.S. interests in the Middle East. Muslims around the world considered the U.S. attack on Iraq as a war against Muslims. This sentiment motivated the millions of Muslims around the world to protest against the U.S. invasion. In addition, millions of peace activists

from different parts of world also condemned the U.S. action. The French, Russian and German governments refused to support the resolution for the use of force against Iraq. The majority of nations were in the favor of giving more time to weapons inspectors instead of invading Iraq, despite political polarization in the world. These developments made this period important because (1) the majority of Muslim governments were against the U.S. attack. (2) This attack motivated millions of people to protest against the U.S. and it created the feelings of anti-Americanism among the Muslims around the world. (3) This war polarized the western world regarding the role of the U.S. as a super power in the new Millennium. (4) This war also increased the security concerns for many countries experiencing tensions with the U.S.

The front page coverage of a newspaper reflects the policy of its organization in nearly every case. The front page distinguishes one newspaper from another newspaper and it shapes the public opinion according to the policy of the newspaper. The front page of *The New York Times* has not been studied previously with reference to the war on Iraq regarding topics A & B.

The reason behind the selection of *The New York Times* for analyzing the coverage of anti-war protests and Iraq war is that it has a historical liberal tradition and is considered to be an editor's paper (Emery & Emery 1988, 14). "Its contents influence other newspapers, wire services, news magazines, television and radio news. In international affairs, *The New York Times* is a premier member of the elite press and plays an influential role in informing American leaders and interested members of the citizenry on international affairs" (Malinkina & McLeod 2000, 37-39). Grua (1976) speaks about the credibility of *The New York Times* as the "most frequently quoted

newspaper in congressional records” (p. 77). *The Toronto Star* is one of the most reputable Canadian newspapers with a long tradition of impartiality and objectivity. To sum up, following factors are important in the selection of *The Toronto Star & The New York Times*. Firstly, both newspapers have vast circulation and popularity among the readers and are playing an important role in the formulation of public opinion on national and international issues. Secondly, they became frequently quoted newspapers in congressional/parliamentary proceedings and also influenced foreign policy makers. Thirdly, the front pages of both newspapers gave maximum coverage to the Iraq war. Finally, these newspapers are representative of their country’s foreign policy posture on issues A & B respectively.

This study addresses the following questions. (1) To what extent have *The Toronto Star & The New York Times* depended upon official sources in their coverage regarding Iraq war? (2) How have *The Toronto Star & New York Times* portrayed anti-war rallies in their front pages news coverage? (3) Which news stories have been marginalized or magnified by *The Toronto Star & The New York Times* in their news coverage. (4) Which topic gained maximum attention in the coverage of *The Toronto Star & The New York Times*?

Literature Review

Entman and Page (1994) suggested that “a picture may be more noticed and better remembered than many words” (Entman and Page 1994, 27). In their preliminary analysis of the news media’s coverage of the 1990-91 Persian Gulf conflict, they found that even during the most intensive public discourse over the Gulf conflict “the visual rhetoric of the coverage [in leading U.S. newspapers] appear[ed] much more under

control of the administration than the verbal” (Entman and Page 1994, 7). Dickson (1992) performed a revealing content analysis of *The New York Times* and *Washington Post* for the years 1983 to 1987 and found that “these newspapers demonstrated a pattern of legitimating the U.S government policy in the United States-Nicaraguan conflict. About half of all sources named in both newspapers were government officials with a stake in the official view but ‘contra’ officials representing Nicaragua’s anti-government forces were seldom cited. There was some critical coverage, however centering primarily on the means of achieving the stated U.S. policy goals rather than on the appropriateness of the policy itself” (Dickson 1992, 562). The U.S. media appear to be working as a state propaganda organ because it underplays the voice of those suppressed by the Americans, American client states or friends. In this context Chomsky (2002) pointed out that

People can believe that when we [U.S.] use force against Iraq and Kuwait it is because we really observed the principle that illegal occupation and human rights abuses should be met by force. They do not see what it would mean if those principles were applied to U.S. behavior. That’s a success of propaganda of quite a spectacular type (Chomsky 2002, 53).

He revealed that the American media totally ignored the voice of the Iraqi democratic opposition when they demanded some kind of support from America for restoration of democracy in Iraq. They were totally rebuffed because the United States had no interest in it. This kind of support was due to the Bush [Senior] Administration’s close links with the dictatorial regime of Saddam in Iraq and Bush-Saddam friendship and trade partnership (Chomsky 2002, 54). When the U.S. turned against Saddam Hussein after the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait, and the U.S. sent troops to the Gulf region to liberate Kuwait, the U.S. media again ignored the voice of Iraqi democratic opposition who demanded a peaceful resolution to the crisis because they did not want their country

destroyed. As Chomsky quoted “we do not hear a word about Iraqi democratic opposition. If you want to find out about them, pick up German press, or British press. They do not say much about them, but they are less controlled than we are and they say something” (Chomsky 2002, 55). He concluded that the voices of Iraqi democrats were completely excluded and nobody noticed them.

Street (2001) revealed “it is clear that war pushes or leads states ever closer to using media for propaganda purposes. In the Persian Gulf War of 1991, the U.S. government promoted the idea that Saddam Hussein was a tyrant [‘the butcher of Baghdad’] and that protecting Kuwait was a cause worth fighting for. Stories about the atrocities were actively circulated and reproduced (Street 2001, 133-5). Keller (1995) treated the 1991 Gulf War as a “media construct” and “a cultural-political event as much as a military one” (Keller 1995, 187). He noticed the media was not covering the war, but was being used to create support for the U.S. government’s military strategy. News reporters were not neutral observers of events on the battlefield but products of a government public relations exercise (Keller 1995, 197). From the above mentioned studies it may be concluded that the U.S. media supported government policies in foreign policy related issues and relied almost exclusively on official sources.

The media reliance on government sources is not always the result of government influence, but rather many other factors are also important especially in war reporting. (1) The reporters were not allowed to enter in the war zone because of safety reasons. (2) The U.S. launched air and ground attacks together to achieve military objectives as early as possible that made it difficult for the reporters to cover all aspects of the war. (3) The U.S. government wanted to manage the news of casualties of American soldiers by

restricting reporters to enter in intense war zones to avoid the U.S. public criticism. (4) The need for information about the strategic and tactical U.S. achievements in the war increased the reliance on official sources. (5) It is inevitable that the media cover official statements; thus, this exercise may become manipulate the press involuntarily. (6) The press became a linchpin for the projection of the U.S. point of view and to counter international media criticism according to American perspective. (7) Anti-American sentiment among Iraqi publics also made it difficult for reporters to gather news from the war zone. (8) Many newspaper organizations did not have correspondents and representatives in Iraq to cover the war. (9) Sometimes the reporters have a limited understanding of the war related issues and they have to depend upon the experts from the government to interpret a particular point to them.

Media Coverage Regarding Iraq War and Anti-War Protests

There was a visible difference between the U.S. and the Canadian media coverage regarding the anti war protests and the war in Iraq.

A. Agenda setting/ Magnification of news

After the September 11 attacks, the U.S. media were dominated by the government agenda. The arrest of Khalid Shaikh Mohammed in Pakistan was highlighted by CNN as top gun of Al Qaeda's network. Debra Pickett, a columnist at the Chicago Sun-Times, pointed out that "he [Khalid Shaikh Mohammed] was not a big fish but U.S. media portrayed him as a 'Top Gun' in its coverage". In fact, Mohammed was still a relatively small fish as we were first told, but the news of his arrest was being hyped because the Bush administration needed "a victory in the war on terrorism before going to attack Iraq" (cited in Zerbisias 2003, A16).

Similarly, the U.S. media continuously presented stories regarding Saddam's weapons of mass destruction and the threat to the U.S. and its interests in the Middle East. CNN and *The New York Times* allegedly gave biased coverage of anti war protests. For instance, CNN marginalized the coverage of millions of anti war protesters by reducing the size and length and time of the clips of various rallies, while on the other hand, the coverage of the rallies of hundreds of pro-war supporters got more time in its coverage. The Canadian media like CBC and *The Toronto Star* gave more balanced coverage and also presented opposition's point of view. However, at the same time, the Canadian media showed its tilt towards the Canadian administration point of view which was against the U.S attack on Iraq.

B. Marginalized media coverage

Most of the CNN coverage and that of The New York Times of the Iraqi war was based on interviews of the Military Generals and the spokes person of Bush Administration. Very little coverage had been given to opposition's point of view. CNN also marginalized, even some times ignored the coverage about the casualties on Iraqi population as the result of the American bombardment.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Framing

The concept of framing is useful in explaining the coverage pattern of *The New York Times* and *The Toronto Star* regarding the anti war protests and the coverage of the Iraq war. Gitlin (1980) defined media frames as "persistent patterns of cognition, interpretation, and presentation of selection, emphasis, and exclusion, by which symbol-handlers routinely organize discourse, whether verbal or visual" (Gitlin 1980, 7). He

suggested that if the media are to be seen as mirrors, it ought to be as “mirrors in a fun house”. He says that the framing of an issue is influenced by many bits of information which are included in or excluded from a story. He maintained that

Media are mobile spotlights, not passive mirrors of the society; selectivity is the instrument of their action. A news story adopts a certain frame and rejects or downplays material that is discrepant. A story is a choice, a way of seeing an event that also amounts to a way of screening from sight (Gitlin 1980, 45-53).

Jamieson and Waldman (2003) suggested “the metaphor of a frame - a fixed border that includes some things and excludes others - describes the way information is arranged and packed in news stories. The story’s frame determines what information is included and what is ignored” (Jamieson and Waldman 2003, xiii). Entman (2004) defined framing as “selecting and highlighting some facts of event or issues, and making connections among them so as to promote a particular interpretation, evaluation, and/ or solution” (Entman 2004, 5). Furthermore, he gave two classes of framing: *substantive* and *procedural*. Substantive frames perform functions of (1) defining effects or conditions as problematic, (2) identifying/ focusing on causes, (3) communicating a moral judgment and (4) endorsing remedies or improvements in covering political and foreign policy issues and actors. In addition, the media framing plays a vital role in presenting, shaping or destroying the picture of an event or story. For instance, Herman and Chomsky (2000) revealed that

When the growing global opposition to policies of the WTO, the IMF, and the World Bank led to mass protests at WTO conference in Seattle in November and December 1999, and then at the annual meeting of IMF and World Bank in Washington D.C., in April 2000, media coverage of these events was derisive and hostile to the protesters and almost uniformly failed to deal with the substantive issues that drove the protests. The media portrayed the Seattle protesters as “all purpose agitators” (*U.S. News & World Report*), “terminally aggrieved” (*Philadelphia Inquirer*), simply against world trade (ABC News), and making

“much ado about nothing” (CNN), but the basis of the protesters grievances were almost entirely unexplored (Herman and Chomsky 2000, xiii).

In a nutshell, media frames played a role in intensifying or marginalizing the coverage pattern of a news story.

Altschull's Concept of Financer's influence on ideology of Media organization

According to Altschull, (1984) “the content of the press is directly co-related with the interests of those who finance the press. The press is the piper, and the tune the piper plays, is composed by those who pay the piper” (p. 254). He maintained that the relationship between the piper and his paymaster takes four different forms: *official*, *commercial*, *interest* and *informal*.¹ Therefore, no newspaper, magazine, or broadcasting outlet would exceed the boundaries of autonomy acceptable to the paymasters. Those boundaries were not carved in stone, they were very flexible indeed, and those boundaries have changed over the time (Altschull 1984, 255).

The Propaganda Model

The “Propaganda model” by Herman and Chomsky (1988) maintained that the American media frequently proclaimed their independence from government and other institutions, but in reality functioned virtually as an extension of state propaganda (p. 1). In addition, the media tended to “marginalize dissent and allow the government and dominant private interests to get their messages across to the public” in ways that promoted elite hegemony and suppressed opposition to the U.S. foreign policy.

The model presents five interactive and symbiotic filters through which media messages have to pass. These filters are both structural and ideological. They include: (1) the size, concentrated ownership, owner wealth, and profit orientation of dominant mass media firms; (2) dependence on advertising revenue; (3) media reliance on information

sources employed, funded or sanctioned by government and business; (4) pressure campaigns typically orchestrated by the government, corporations, and right wing think tanks seeking to discipline the media for perceived transgressions; and finally (5) anti-communism as a national religion and control mechanism (p. 3).

Marginalizing the opposition

Worthy and Unworthy victims

Herman and Chomsky (2000) compared media treatment of victims of enemy states and those of United States and U.S. client states and maintained that “the victims of enemy states will be found *worthy* and will be subject to more intense and indignant coverage than those victimized by the United States or its clients [states] who are implicitly *unworthy*” (p. xix).

Patriotism and National Interests

It is assumed that any news against national interests or patriotism [as defined by government/administration], especially in war or crisis situation, is usually marginalized in respective country press.

Magnify/Intensify the Issue

It is assumed that press magnifies/intensifies the news coverage when a nation’s foreign interests are directly involved in it.

METHODOLOGY

The indices of *The Toronto Star* and *The New York Times* and NEXIS data base information are the main sources for this study. It is based on quantitative and qualitative methods of content analysis. In this study, the unit of analysis and the unit of coding are the complete news stories published on front pages [including the remaining part of news

on other pages] of *The New York Times* and *The Toronto Star* on topics: A-the Anti-War Protests,² & B- the Coverage of the Iraq War.³ All news stories read carefully to determine and calculate number of sources including “U.S. officials,” “Iraqi sources,” “Other sources,” “Wire Services,” and “Bureau/ Staff sources” for quantitative analysis both in *The New York Times* and *The Toronto Star* under the period of consideration (March 1, 2003 to April 15, 2003).

FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

This part of study combines the quantitative and qualitative findings and also includes the analysis along with discussion of both.

Topic A

Coverage of anti-war protests in *The New York Times* and *The Toronto Star*

The September 11 attack on the World Trade Centre and the Pentagon has changed United States foreign policy towards Middle East, especially towards Iraq, because the U.S considered Iraq a security threat to it as well as its interests in the region. The U.S put pressure on the Iraqis to cooperate with U.N weapons inspectors unconditionally and declared that if Iraq did not comply with U.N resolution –1441, the U.S. would invade her. France, Russia and Germany condemned the U.S. and declared that they would veto the U.S. supported resolution in the UN for the authorization of the use of force against Iraq. These countries continuously condemned the U.S. attack on Iraq. This political polarization gave impetus to anti-war protesters to oppose the U.S. intervention. Further, developments like the U.S. decision not to give more time to weapons inspectors and the deaf ear to Mr. Blix’s report and its commitment to invade

Iraq for regime change motivated millions of people around the globe to protest against the war.

The Canadian and the U.S press covered these war protests in different ways. This study indicates that from March 1, 2003 to April 15, 2003 a total 4 news stories appeared in *The Toronto Star* & *The New York Times*. Among the 4 news stories, 3 News stories (75%) were published on front page of *The Toronto Star* and 1 news item (25%) appeared in *The New York Times* on topic A- Coverage of anti-war protests.

Table 1
Comparison Coverage

Issues	Total no. of News items (N)	The Toronto Star	The New York Times
Anti-War Protests	4 100%	3 75%	1 25%
Coverage of Iraq War	244 100%	76 31%	168 69%

The New York Times published only one single column news story on its front page, whereas *The Toronto Star* had three news stories along with pictures. Each story covered four-column space on this topic. Therefore, *The New York Times* intentionally marginalized the coverage of anti war protests. Moreover, the sentiments of ‘patriotism’ and ‘Americanism’ dominated the U.S. media coverage after the September 11, 2001 attacks, and it also motivated media organizations to support government policies. Besides this, officials’ statements regarding Saddam’s threat to U.S. interests further strengthened the media’s support for the war while diminishing coverage of the anti-war

rallies. On the other hand, *The Toronto Star's* coverage of anti-war rallies was much better than that of *The New York Times* because Canada was not directly involved in the war. Moreover, the Canadian government also opposed the U.S. attack on Iraq. Secondly, *The Toronto Star* represented significant Canadian public opinion since the majority of Canadians were against the U.S. attack on Iraq. Finally, *The Toronto Star* upheld the principle of objectivity and impartiality. In some news stories *The Toronto Star's* language was very bold and reflecting the anti-war sentiments of the protesters. In its news coverage *The Toronto Star* wrote “‘Keep Canadian hands clean of blood’ and ‘only stupid people drop Smart bombs’” (Welsh 2003, 15). While, *The New York Times* coverage was very mild and it only reported those slogans that reflected the soft tone.

Topic B

Coverage of Iraq war in *The New York Times* and *The Toronto Star*

The U.S.-Iraq war was one of the most important political crises, which has drawn the attention of world community in recent years. It was the first time in the post cold war history when the U.S. and its European allies divided on the issue of a possible U.S attack on Iraq. The French and the Russian governments condemned the U.S. attack. The Canadian government also refused to support the U.S invasion for two reasons: (1) The Canadian government was in the favor of a diplomatic solution of the U.S.-Iraq conflict and also supported the need to give more time to the U.N weapon inspectors for the search of Weapons of Mass Destruction in Iraq. (2) The ideological difference between Jean Chrétien's Liberal government in Canada and President Bush's Republican administration in the U.S. Therefore, both Canadians and Americans had different perceptions regarding the latter's attack on Iraq. The coverage patterns of the U.S and

Canadian press were, therefore, different regarding this issue and reflected policies of their respective governments.

Table 2

Comparison of Sources used in the Coverage of Iraq War

News Sources	Newspapers			
	The New York Times		The Toronto Star	
	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage
U.S. official sources	320	60.70%	60	37.50%
Iraqi sources	36	6.80%	21	13.10%
Bureau/Staff/correspondents	164	31.10%	32	20%
Wire services	2	0.40%	15	9.40%
Other sources	5	1%	32	20%
Total News Sources	527	100%	160	100%
Statistical Analysis of Dispersion	Standard Deviation 137		Standard Deviation 17.28	

On their front pages, *The New York Times* published 168 and *The Toronto Star* published 76 news stories regarding the Iraq war. Table 2 indicated that *The New York Times* quoted “U.S. official sources” were about 320 times (60.7%), “Iraqi sources” 36 times (6.8%), “Bureau/Staff/correspondents” 164 times (31.1%), “Wire services” 2 times (0.4%) and “Other sources” 5 times (1 %) in its front pages coverage. Whereas *The Toronto Star* quoted “the U.S. official sources” were about 60 times (37.5%), “Iraqi sources” 21 times (13.1%), “Bureau/Staff/correspondents” 32 times (20%), “Wire services” 15 times (9.4%) and “Other sources” 32 times (20%) respectively.

The coverage patterns of *The New York Times* and *The Toronto Star* were different because: firstly, *The New York Times* coverage of Iraq war was highly dominated by the statements from U.S government sources. From March 1, 2003 to April 15, 2003 *The New York Times* quoted 320 official sources (60.7%) compared to other sources in its coverage that showed it depended more on the U.S. government sources. While *The Toronto Star's* reliance on U.S official sources was only (37.5 %). Therefore, the use of standard deviation of sources revealed that *The Toronto Star* gave more balanced coverage than *The New York Times* (Table 2). Secondly, on the issue of Canadian refusal to support the U.S. led coalition against the war on Iraq, *The New York Times* seemed critical, while *The Toronto Star* published news stories in favor of Canadian government's position. This coverage revealed that both newspapers followed their government policies respectively. Thirdly, *The Toronto Star* gave more importance to Iraqi sources (20%) in its coverage, whereas *The New York Times* presented only (6.8%) coverage to the Iraqi's point of view. Therefore, this trend reflected *The New York Times* bias in its coverage. Fourthly, *The Toronto Star* gave due coverage to the deaths of Iraqi's civilian population, while *The New York Times* focused on U.S casualties and marginalized the deaths of Iraqis. In addition, the overall number of Iraqi and American casualties presented by *The New York Times* and *The Toronto Star* were also different. Fifthly, *The New York Times* over magnified the news of American POWs and the story of the rescue of Jessica Lynch, while *The Toronto Star* gave a balanced coverage. Sixthly, *The New York Times* gave a one sided view of the war and there was no coverage regarding Iraq's defense; whereas *The Toronto Star* also reflected the Iraqi perception of the war. Seventhly, although pictorial display is not the focus of this study it is important

to mention that *The New York Times* published only those pictures that reflected the Iraqi destruction, while *The Toronto Star* took lead to display some pictures that reflected Allied losses as well. Finally, *The New York Times* quoted more military sources while *The Toronto Star* cited more political sources.

RESULTS

This part of study provides answers to our research questions on the basis of qualitative and quantitative analyses of the news stories which appeared in *The Toronto Star* & *The New York Times* in the period under consideration on topics 'A' & 'B'

RQ1

On the whole, *The New York Times* relied more on official sources on topic 'B' (Table 2). *The New York Times* quoted official sources 320 times (60.7%), Iraqi sources 36 times (6.8%), Staff/Bureau 164 times (31.1%), Wire sources 2 times (0.4%) and Others 5 times (1%). The qualitative analysis reflected that *The New York Times* depended upon official sources in its war coverage. Therefore, *The New York Times* coverage was dominated by government on this issue. *The New York Times* support was enthusiastic, clear, focused and patriotic in nature because of the following reasons: (1) it focused on those parts of statements that reflected the U.S. military dominance. (2) It stressed that need to protect the U.S. national interests in the Middle East. (3) *The New York Times* ideology/policy was consistent with the U.S. government to invade Iraq to restore democracy and to establish a stronghold in the Middle East to support U.S. allies in the region. On the other hand, *The Toronto Star* quoted government sources 60 times (37.5%) which were far less than those of *The New York Times* (Table 2). This was the

result of the following factors. Firstly, Canada was not directly involved in the conflict, supported a diplomatic solution, and even disagreed with the U.S. to invade Iraq. Secondly, the Canadian media was not driven by any nationalistic fervor. To sum up, *The Toronto Star* gave more balanced coverage regarding the Iraq war. This finding supports the argument that when there is a high level of national interests involved the press usually depends upon government sources that also mentioned in this study's literature review in detail.

RQ 2

The New York Times published only one column news story (25%) on its front page while *The Toronto Star* published three 4-column stories (75%) on topic 'A' (Table 1). On the other hand, qualitative analysis indicated that *The Toronto Star* coverage was more vigorous and blunt while *The New York Times* consciously undermined anti war coverage on its front pages.

RQ 3

The qualitative analysis revealed that *The New York Times* marginalized the coverage of the news related to anti-war protests. Further, news stories related to civilian casualties in Iraq were also marginalized. Whereas the news and the sources quoted in the news stories related to the U.S. efforts to convince world community regarding Saddam's weapon of mass-destruction (WDM), including chemical and biological weapons, Saddam as a brutal military dictator and this war being for the liberation of the Iraqi people not for the U.S. strategic and economic interests in the region etc., were over emphasized. This was a deliberate effort to convince the American public and to provide justification to invade Iraq.

On the contrary, *The Toronto Star's* front-page coverage was more balanced and its stories contained a different point of view. *The Toronto Star's* front page coverage was much better than that of *The New York Times* on anti-war protests. In addition, *The Toronto Star* gave more coverage to Canadian government's position and quoted official sources including the Prime Minister, Foreign Minister and Government Spokespersons regarding this issue.

RQ 4

It was quite ostensible that topic B- Coverage of the Iraq war would get the maximum attention of both newspapers. The quantitative finding revealed that *The New York Times* published 168 news stories about the war while one story appeared on the front page focused on anti-war protests. Similarly, *The Toronto star* published 76 news stories related to topic-A and three stories about anti-war protests. The visible difference in coverage revealed that topic 'A' got the least press attention despite millions of people around the world including Americans protesting against this war. No doubt, the war was an important issue, but the down playing of the voices of anti-war protesters and peace activists support the argument that media buttresses the interests of the ruling class and works as a propaganda organ of the state.

Conclusion

A. *The New York Times* marginalized the coverage of the stories like anti war protests, the opposition of the world community to the U.S. attack on Iraq, the casualties of the civilian population in Iraq and presentation of wrong figures regarding the killing of American military personnel. Therefore, the findings of this study supported Chomsky's "The Propaganda model," and the concept of "marginalization of opposition"

and Gitlin's "concept of framing." This low level of coverage was due to following factors: firstly, *The New York Times*' intended to support the Bush administration for the protection of the U.S. interests in region and secondly, the influence of feelings of patriotism that were created in the post September 11, 2001 environment on the newspaper's organizational ideology. While, *The Toronto Star*'s coverage of anti-war protests and war related killings were more accurate and balanced in tone.

B. Overall topic 'B' - *Coverage of Iraq war in The New York Times and The Toronto Star* got extensive coverage in both newspapers. *The New York Times* published 168 news stories on the Iraq war, while 76 news stories appeared in *The Toronto Star* under the period consideration.

On the other hand, on topic 'A' - *Coverage of anti-war protests, The New York Times and The Toronto Star* published only four news stories on their front pages. *The New York Times* published only one story while *The Toronto Star* published three stories with pictures. Therefore, *The Toronto Star* paid more attention to anti war public sentiment. The qualitative analysis revealed that *The Toronto Star* used strong language in its news coverage compared to *The New York Times* in both topics.

C. Therefore, the quantitative and qualitative findings regarding topics 'A' and 'B' of this research also supported the studies of Herman and Chomsky, Altschull and Dickson that the U.S. press relied more on official sources while reporting foreign policy issues.

Future Research Hypothesis

- When the issue is of paramount importance in nature and is significant to the U.S. interests, the U.S. press tends to align with administration's policies.

- Greater the threat to the U.S. or its client states, the U.S. press has aligned with government policies.
- The U.S. press backed the U.S. foreign policy on issues discussed on the United Nations Security Council forum despite the opposition of domestic and international public opinion on that particular issue.
- The U.S. press usually supports the U.S. administration and marginalizes or discredits and some times ignores the opposition's point view on military operations.
- When a country is not directly involved in an issue, its press usually gives more balanced coverage to that issue.
- In an issue where the U.S. is directly involved, the Canadian press rallies more on the U.S. official sources in its news coverage.

Notes

¹ In the *official* pattern the content of newspaper, magazine, or broadcasting outlet is determined by rules, regulations and decrees. Some news media may themselves be state enterprises. Some may be directed through government regulations, or controlled under a network of licensing arrangements. No nation is free of official controls: the variation occurs to the degree of autonomy that is permitted. In the *commercial* pattern, the content reflects the views of advertisers and their commercial allies, who are usually found among the owners and publishers. Even under planned economies, some commercial influences can be detected although these are exerted only indirectly. In the *interest* pattern, perhaps a political party or a religious organization or any other body pursuing specific ends. In the *informal* pattern, media content mirrors the goals of relatives, friends, acquaintances, who supply money directly or who exercise their influence to ensure that tunes of the piper are heard.

² All news stories (including their remaining parts on other pages) published on front pages of The New York Times and The Toronto Star deal with anti-war protest, statements, slogans and peace related walks and talks etc., were considered as Topic 'A'.

³ All news stories (including their remaining parts on other pages) published on front pages of The New York Times and The Toronto Star dominantly related with 'Iraq war' with reference to the U.S. diplomatic efforts in the United Nations, U.S. talks at Security Council, Statements of the U.S official, Military Generals and the U.S attack on Iraq, Statements of Iraqi leaders, News

stories from correspondents/staff or from Bureau offices, officials from military bases and direct coverage of war from battlefield were considered as Topic 'B'.

References

- Altschull, H. J. (1984). *Agents of power: The role of the news media in human affairs*. New York, London: Longman.
- Berry, O, N. (1990). *Foreign policy and the press: An analysis of The New York Times coverage of U.S. foreign policy*. Westport CT: New York: Greenwood Press.
- Chomsky, N. (2002). *Media control: The spectacular achievement of propaganda* (2nd ed.).New York: Seven Stories Press.
- Dickson, S. H. (1992). Press and U.S. policy towards Nicaragua, 1983-1987: A study of *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post*. *Journalism Quarterly*, 69 (3), 562.
- Emery, M., & Emery, E. (1988). *The press and America: A interpretive history of mass media* (6th ed.). Englewood Cliffs ,NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Entman, R. M., & Page, B. (1994). News before the storm: The Iraq war debate and the limits to media independence. In W. L. Bennett & D. L. Paletz (Eds.), *Take to storm: The media, public opinion, and U.S. foreign policy in the Gulf war*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Entman, R. M. (2004). *Projection of power: Framing news, public opinion, and U.S. foreign policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gitlin, T. (1980). *The whole world is watching: Mass media in the making and unmaking of the New Left*. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press.
- Grau, C. H. (1976). *Journalism Quarterly*, Vol., 53.
- Herman, E. S., & Chomsky, N. (2000). *Manufacturing consent: The political economy of mass media*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Jamieson, K. H., & Waldman, P. (2003). *The Press effect*. Oxford University Press.
- Keller, D. (1995). *Media Culture*. London: Routledge.
- Malinkina, O. V., & McLeod, D. M. (2000). From Afghanistan to Chechnya: News coverage by *Izvestia* and the *New York Times*. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 77, 37-49.
- Street, J. (2001). *Mass media, politics and democracy*. London: Palgrave.

Welsh, M. (2003, April 6). And keep Canadian hands clean of blood. *The Toronto Star*, Retrieved on September 23, 2005
<http://nucnews.net/nucnews/2003nn/0304nn/030406nn.htm#360>

Zerbisias, A. (2003, March 3). Americans ill-served by own media, *The Toronto Star*.
p. A16.