AN ANALYSIS OF THE PARALLEL FRAMES IN THE

MEDIA USED TO DESCRIBE COMMUNISM IN THE EARLY

COLD WAR AND TERRORISM IN THE POST-9/11 ERA

By:

SAVANNAH CARTER

A THESIS

An Abstract of the Thesis of

Savannah Carter for the degree of Bachelor of Arts
in the Department of Journalism to be taken June 2015

Title: An Analysis of the Parallel Frames in the Media Used to Describe Communism in
the Early cold War and Terrorism in the Post-9/11 Era

Approved: _____

Suzanne Clark

In both the early years of the Cold War and the years immediately following the
9/11 attacks leading up to the Iraq War, a persistent rhetorical pattern can be seen in
both periods. Specifically, this pattern consists of portraying both the threat of
Communism and the threat of Terrorism in contrast to the United States using dualistic
terms of good and evil. This thesis examines the origins of this rhetoric, which can be
found in both time periods in Presidential speeches of each era, and its subsequent
adoption by various media outlets. The result of this deep-rooted rhetoric is failure in
the marketplace of ideas in both eras. This failure is not simply a result of one
administration or institution, but rather the mutual reliance of the media and elites on
one another for success within a marketplace that values financial and personal
prosperity above all else. In conclusion, within the current economic and political
systems, the media and elites will continue to benefit one another at the expense of a
healthy, democratic marketplace of ideas.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Professors Suzanne Clark, Jane Cramer, and Gretchen Soderlund for their patience and insights, which aided immensely in allowing me to delve into not just one, but two crucial periods in American history. In addition, I am sincerely grateful to all of the members of the Robert D. Clark Honors College, specifically Thesis Coordinator Miriam Jordan and my past professors for their guidance in the research and thesis development process. Without their help this undertaking would not have been possible.

And finally, I would like to acknowledge my amazing family, in particular my parents Larry and Cheryl as well as my sister Victoria Carter for being patient with me this past year. From talking sense into me during countless tearful phone calls, to reading through my hundred page drafts and listening to me rant about even the most mundane aspects of the process, I couldn't be more grateful for all of their love and support. Truly this thesis is for them.

Table of Contents

Key Terms

Manichean: the dualistic perspective of one side versus the other, a definite separation of identity as 'good' or 'evil'

Threat Inflation: "the attempt by elites to create concern for a threat that goes beyond the scope and urgency that a disinterested analysis would justify"[1]

Individualism: The idealistic American principle which relies on the idea that America and its people must preserve their independent, democratic, and capitalistic culture above all else.

Framing: The use of specific terms, visual elements, or other agenda setting ways in which the media contextualizes a subject or topic.

East: The Eastern Bloc, all countries influenced by Russian government and culture during the years 1950-53.

West: Specifically the U.S. and its democratic allies post WWII (Britain, Germany, etc.)

Early Cold War: 1950-54

Cold War Era: 1947-1991

Post 9/11 era: 2001-2004

The Marketplace of Ideas: The marketplace of ideas theory stands for the notion that, with minimal government intervention—a laissez faire approach to the regulation of speech and expression—ideas, theories, propositions, and movements will succeed or fail on their own merits.[2]

---

1 Thrall, A. Trevor., and Jane K. Cramer. American Foreign Policy and the Politics of Fear: Threat Inflation since 9/11. London: Routledge, 2009. 1.
[2]Pinaire, Brian K. "Marketplace of Ideas Theory." Civil Liberties. June 26, 2014.
http%3A%2F%2Fuscivilliberties.org%2F.

Introduction

In researching the links between threat inflation and the persistence of manichean rhetoric in the portrayal of foreign policy conflicts abroad, the similarities between the U.S.'s responses to the Soviet threat during Cold War and the U.S. response to the 9/11 terrorist attacks in the early 2000s are uncanny. At one point in my initial research, I used a speech given by President Reagan at the end of the Cold War and G.W. Bush's initial 9/11 address and rewrote them to fit the context of the other time period. I found the ease with which the rhetoric and language fit unsettling. As I continued to see similar aspects of rhetoric portrayed by both politicians and the media in the two separate periods, I began to wonder why a time so notorious as the Cold War for violating civil liberties was so incredibly similar to the recent 9/11 era, specifically in regards to the subsequent Iraq War?

Yes, these manichean frames and rhetoric clearly persisted, but *why* had they persisted? The obviously similarities that came to mind were that like the Cold War, the geopolitical parameters of the Iraq War were hard to define both at home and abroad. And yes, in both eras, popular media and the government encouraged American citizens to be wary of threats on home soil. But on another level, were elites manipulating the media and thus public opinion in both eras, or did public opinion simply reinforce beliefs of the elites as they were projected in the media? My approach was to focus on this variety of questions, keeping in mind specifically manichean rhetoric and framing, and delve into research that dealt with the first few years of the Cold War and the years leading up to the Iraq War.

As my research continued, I found that in both time periods, media framing of the individual enemy was directly linked to the rhetoric of elites, specifically the President. In addition, each brief time period could be broken down into fairly parallel chronologies. First and foremost, each time period had at least a prior decade of dualistic, good versus evil rhetoric in use by both media and the elites to frame international conflicts and to identify characteristics of the threat or enemy at hand. For example, during WWII this us versus them language was used in propaganda against Germany and in the 1990s, Presidents Bush and Clinton both used words like "evil" to describe Saddam Hussein and other terrorist groups. Next, I was able to find specific catalysts for subsequent militarization in response to conflicts of the Cold War and the 9/11 attacks; for the Cold War, it was the 1947 Truman Containment speech, whereas for the Iraq War it was 9/11 and Bush's immediate response. The next part of my examination into each time period dealt with the construction of a national narrative. More specifically, I analyzed how news media and journalists drew upon these elite responses and adopted the rhetoric of each President in terms of media depiction of historical events and the framing of the enemy. Ultimately, the next step was an analysis of the interaction of the two, historically distant national narratives as they had been established by historical context, Presidential influences, and media dissemination of administration ideas within the American democratic marketplace of ideas.

What I found throughout my research was not just that the press and the presidency mutually played a role in establishing the national narratives of both the Cold War and the post-9/11 era, but that they were mutually beneficial in a way that resulted in the overall failure of the marketplace of ideas. Concerns over social and

financial sustainability present for both politicians and media outlets ultimately resulted in this failure. Fears of being labeled "unpatriotic," of losing traction with constituents, and decreased viewership all contributed to the large absence of credible, popular dissenting opinions and criticism from both the "fourth estate" and elites. The final section of this thesis discusses conclusions based on a variety of evidence from other researchers, scholars, news archives, and media outlets on the topic.

Chapter 1: The Early Cold War Years

I. Post World War II and the Official Start of the Cold War

A. Brief Historical Context

It is important to note the implications of the 1917 Bolshevik Revolution, the 1941 Atlantic Conference and Charter between Great Britain's Prime Minister Churchill and the United States' President Roosevelt, and Russia's acts of noncompliance following the termination of WWII.

The Bolshevik Revolution in 1917 "launched an international movement of revolutionary parties."[3] During the revolution, the Communist Party denounced capitalism and imperialism, rather than espousing centralized, authoritarian government.[4] During the second World War, the Ally's need for Stalin's manpower coupled with the weakening state of Germany led to the expansion of Soviet Russia's control over Eastern Europe.[5] At the end of WWII, the U.S. also found itself not only a top world power but much more economically and politically sound than its allies. Russia too was gaining power and their beliefs almost inherently contradicted those of the U.S. Thus, when efforts came to revitalize a war-torn Europe, Soviet Russia and American policies were almost completely misaligned.

Flash back to 1941, in the midst of WWII— the Atlantic Conference and Charter. One of the main goals of this conference was to convince Americans to enter

---

[3] Whitcomb, Roger S. "Containment: Misreading Soviet Russia." *Global Dialogue*, 1st ser., 3, no. 4 (November 2001): 59-79. http://connection.ebscohost.com/c/articles/57385907/containment-misreading-soviet-russia.

[4] Whitcomb, "Containment: Misreading Soviet Russia," 59-79.

[5] Whitcomb, "Containment: Misreading Soviet Russia," 59-79.

into WWII and or to further support the British war effort.[6] Although the conference did not accomplish either of these aims, Churchill and Roosevelt did outline eight shared principles each country would follow after the end of the war. Particularly important was the commitment to the "restoration of self-governments for all countries that had been occupied during the war and allowing all peoples to choose their own form of government."[7]

Then, between 1945 and 1947, a variety of events contributed to mounting tensions between the two superpowers of the U.S. and Soviet Russia. In 1945, Stalin promised to allow democratic elections in Poland. Yet, even after meeting with an American representative sent to ensure compliance, Russia continued to prohibit full democratic elections in a number of Eastern European countries.[8] Another such conflict occurred in 1946, when Russia ignored the Treaty of 1942 made between the Allies and Iranian Shah Muhammad Reza Palahvi to remove troops from Iran 6 months after the war's end.[9] The Middle Eastern country had been a strategic holding ground for the Allies during the war. Rather than evacuate troops as Britain and the U.S. did, Russia instead sponsored multiple Communist revolutions within the country in order to gain some control over their Iranian neighbors and their resources.[10] The Iranian government

[6]"The Atlantic Conference & Charter, 1941 - 1937–1945 - Milestones - Office of the Historian." US Department of State: Office of the Historian. November 8, 2013. https://history.state.gov/milestones/1937-1945/atlantic-conf.
[7] "The Atlantic Conference & Charter, 1941 - 1937–1945 - Milestones - Office of the Historian."
[8]Bostdorff, Denise M. Proclaiming the Truman Doctrine: The Cold War Call to Arms. College Station: Texas A & M University Press, 2008. 12.
[9]Erkan, Suleyman. "The Invasion of Iran by the Allies in WWII." Facultatea De Istorie și Geografie- Karadeniz Technical University, Trabzon. February 11, 2014. http://atlas.usv.ro/www/codru_net/CC16/2/iran.pdf. 17.
[10] Erkan, Suleyman. "The Invasion of Iran by the Allies in WWII." 122.

sought assistance from the U.S. and Britain, thus initiating the 1946 Iran Crisis and solidifying growing conflict between the East and the West.[11]

B. The Cold War Begins-Pivotal Speeches of 1946-1947

Three crucial speeches by Stalin, Churchill and Truman in 1946 and 1947 reflected the mounting global tensions between two main ideologies: Communism and Democracy. Together, these political statements would establish a rhetorical precedent, the foundation of a national narrative and international policy agendas throughout the Cold War. Although each of these speeches by world leaders sought to define their own country's principles in contrast to the principles of the other, what they really did was to give immense insight into how each of these countries saw the post-war world, and perspective into its individual identification of the declared enemy. In his analysis of Stalin's election eve "Two Camps" speech, Stefan Schwarzkopf of the Copenhagen Business School concluded that in creating "the allegory of the other," Stalin, "did not reflect contemporary reality, but exposed its creators' perceptions of the postwar climate."[12] Through an examination of all three speeches, it becomes clear that Schwarzkopf's analysis holds true for each individual leader.

i. Stalin's 1946 "Two Camps" Speech

In February of 1946, the first of the aforementioned speeches, Stalin's "Two Camps" speech was given on the eve of Soviet elections. Stalin immediately sets the tone of the speech by blaming capitalism for the devastation of WWII, saying the war

---

[11] Erkan, Suleyman. "The Invasion of Iran by the Allies in WWII." 122.
[12] *Cold War Cultures: Perspectives on Eastern and Western European Societies*. Edited by Annette Vowinckel and Marcus M. Payk. By Thomas Lindenberger. Oxford, New York: Berghan Books, 2012. 223.

was "…in reality as the inevitable result of the development of the world economic and political forces on the basis of monopoly capitalism."[13] He elaborates, saying that due to the uneven development and distribution of resources, "the capitalist world is sent into two hostile camps and war follows…Thus, as a result of the first crisis in the development of the capitalist world economy, the First World War arose, The Second World War arose as a result of the second crisis...."[14] He declares that the WWII victory is a testament to the validity of the Communist lifestyle, saying "The Red Army heroically withstood all the adversities of the war, routed completely the armies of our enemies and emerged victoriously from the war." He concludes with a 5-year plan of Soviet restoration and the mention of increasing scientific research.

Although translations vary and do not hold the same powerful effect in this language as they do in their original, there are a few themes in Stalin's speech which make it worth analyzing further. At the start, he uses the term *comrade* to address his constituents, setting a tone of camaraderie and respect for his audience. He acknowledges the devastation of the recent wars and names Germany and Japan as the aggressors. From there, Stalin clarifies the facts as he sees them—namely claiming the role of capitalism in triggering WWI, a common musing in Marxist theory.[15] He presents his evidence, citing observations of scarce world resources fought over by a variety of countries seeking control of these resources. This piece of evidence is irrefutable—but he frames it as a capitalist, rather than universal problem. In fact he

---

[13]"Message From Stalin to Truman, April 24, 1945 & Stalin's Election Speech, February 9,1946." *Http://history.jburroughs.org*, March 8, 2011. http://history.jburroughs.org/cfront/us45/readings/stalin.htm.

[14]"Message From Stalin to Truman, April 24, 1945 & Stalin's Election Speech, February 9,1946."

[15]Thompson, Nicholas. The Hawk and the Dove: Paul Nitze, George Kennan, and the History of the Cold War. New York: Henry Holt, 2009. 55.

continues on to say that the war could have been avoided if a Communist doctrine had been employed by the conflicting nations, once again appealing to his supporters and reinforcing the success of the state. Stalin provides similar evidence for the reasons behind WWII and once again frames the conflicts leading up to the war as direct results of capitalism.

The next evidence, namely struggles which Stalin's peoples endured during the wars, is justified he says by their victory. In fact, this victory proves the undeniable success of the socialist lifestyle, Stalin says. Once again, he frames the state's ideologies and followers as triumphant and blameless in the recent conflicts. He has clearly stated his opposition to the faults and doctrines of capitalist countries without acknowledging their role in winning the war. He received a standing ovation from the audience, a clear indication of their support.

In this speech, Stalin attempts to explain the world wars by blaming former allies with opposing ideologies—thus transitioning them into the role of an enemy. Lauding Socialism as successful and unifying, while denouncing capitalism as a divisive doctrine, Stalin is able to separate the two in manichean terms. With this rhetoric he effectively denounces capitalist countries as allies and instead equates them to *war*, while equating the Soviet system with *peace*. It is in this way that Stalin uses this election speech to frame the immediate past and present as, ironically, a manichean struggle.

However, this message is ironically compounded with the chronology of the steps leading up to the current, successful state Stalin says the Soviet Union is in. As Thompson says, the message of Stalin's *Two Camps* speech "was clear: war was the

locomotive of history."[16] According to his foreign minister Vyacheslav Molotv, Stalin maintained that "the First World War pulled one country out of capitalist slavery. The Second World War created a socialist system, the third will put an end to imperialism once and for all."[17] Even more contrary to his message that the Socialist system brings peace, at the end of his speech Stalin hints at further scientific research to "outstrip the achievements of science beyond the borders of our country," intimating to many outsiders a Soviet plan for the development of arms concurrent with that of the U.S.'s atomic bomb.

Ultimately, however, this speech's importance lies in outside interpretations. American and British perceptions of the "Two Camps" speech further intensified the complexities of events and decisions leading up to the commencement of the Cold War. President Truman, for example, saw this speech as merely "an address directed at an internal audience purely for political purposes."[18] Many westerners, including many members of the Truman administration, took much of Stalin's speech as a major threat, however.

These fears and varying interpretations led to the well-known telegram from George Kennan at the Moscow Embassy, which envisioned the Soviet doctrine as a monumental threat to U.S. national security. [19] Kennan, who spent much of his life and the war in Soviet countries, sent the State Department a lengthy telegram based on his own personal analysis of Russia and the Kremlin. Although for many years there was little evidence to support the fact that President Truman ever read the telegram, his

---

[16]Thompson. The Hawk and the Dove. 55.
[17]Thompson. The Hawk and the Dove. 55.
[18]Bostdorff. Proclaiming the Truman Doctrine: The Cold War Call to Arms. 19.
[19]Bostdorff. Proclaiming the Truman Doctrine: The Cold War Call to Arms. 20-21.

Secretary of State James F. Byrnes called it a "splendid analysis."[20] The telegram basically outlined Moscow as a militant entity with the ultimate goal of undermining the U.S. in any way possible.[21] At the end, Kennan "offered a solution for combating the Soviet threat, concluding with a vague call for national unity and moral uplift."[22] According to Thompson, the real power of Kennan's telegram lay in its timing. Conflict with Communist influences in the Middle East were escalating and, just two weeks later, Winston Churchill's "Sinews of Peace" speech added another layer of opposition and bolstered adversarial U.S. sentiments towards Stalin and Soviet aggression.

ii. Churchill's 1946 "Sinews of Peace" or "Iron Curtain" speech

On March 5, 1946, Winston Churchill delivered his *Sinews of Peace* (or *Iron Curtain)* speech at a Missouri college. He lauded the current political power of the U.S. and contrasted it with the dark imagery of an "Iron Curtain" separating the liberated west with the currently under attack east. He emphasized that the once-small Communist factions in various countries were flaring up, as shown by the Iran Crisis and general unrest in Turkey. These revolutionaries caused angst amongst citizens, prevented free elections and threatened the recent peace achieved.[23] Ultimately, Churchill asked the American people to adhere to the principles set forth by the UN Charter and warned them of aggressions from Soviet Russia.

---

[20] Bostdorff. Proclaiming the Truman Doctrine: The Cold War Call to Arms. 22.
[21] Thompson. The Hawk and the Dove. 60.
[22] Thompson. The Hawk and the Dove. 60.
[23] "The Sinews of Peace ("Iron Curtain Speech")." The Churchill Centre. Accessed May 09, 2015. http://www.winstonchurchill.org/resources/speeches/1946-1963-elder-statesman/the-sinews-of-peace.

During his speech Churchill says that " two giant marauders" face the security

of the U.S. at home: war and tyranny.[24] He emphasizes the urgency and immediacy of

these two threats by framing them in terms of their recent effects on Europe, namely the

physical destruction and poverty caused by each of the World Wars. This urgent tone is

especially present when Churchill compares the post-war world to that of Germany

before WWII, saying: "Last time I saw it all coming and cried aloud to my own fellow-

countrymen and to the world, but no one paid any attention….We surely must not let

that happen again. This can only be achieved by reaching now, in 1946, a good

understanding on all points with Russia…"[25] This comparison serves to reinforce the

fear of that which threatens stability and newfound peace, and identifies that threat as

the Soviet Union and its Communist ideologies. To prevent war from recurring,

Churchill calls for "the fraternal association of the English-speaking peoples."[26] By

identifying Britain and the U.S. in terms of their main commonality, language, he

emphasizes to his audience the special bond between the two allies. He continues to

explain that such a partnership provides "mutual security," something threatened by the

two "marauders."[27]

It isn't until about halfway into his speech that Churchill brings up the ominous

"shadow" which "has fallen upon the scenes so lately lighted by the Allied victory."[28]

Then, like Stalin, Churchill takes the time "to state the facts as I see them to you, to

place before you certain facts about the present position in Europe."[29] These facts are,

---

[24]"The Sinews of Peace ("Iron Curtain Speech")."
[25]"The Sinews of Peace ("Iron Curtain Speech")."
[26] "The Sinews of Peace ("Iron Curtain Speech")."
[27]"The Sinews of Peace ("Iron Curtain Speech")."
[28]"The Sinews of Peace ("Iron Curtain Speech")."
[29]"The Sinews of Peace ("Iron Curtain Speech")."

according to Churchill, aggressive Soviet policies which "are seeking everywhere to obtain totalitarian control "[30] over Germany, various Eastern states, and the Middle East. He famously declares "an iron curtain has descended across the Continent," effectively using imagery to divide the continent into one dark, imprisoned Eastern region juxtaposed with a celebrated and victorious West. The dark forces don't stop there according to Churchill; they are present worldwide.

More than once does Churchill associates Britain and the U.S. with high morality. If the two countries unite "in the air, on the sea, all over the globe and in science and in industry, and in moral force," then the global balance of power will remain. In another instance, Churchill emphasizes another commonality between the two: religion. He says, "Except in the British Commonwealth and in the United States…the Communist parties or fifth columns constitute a growing challenge and peril to Christian civilisation." Note the identification of British and American societies collectively as 'Christian civilisation,' aligning the countries with accepted moral values over the threatening, Communist forces.

Interestingly enough Churchill uses adjectives like "friends" and "valiant" to describe Stalin and the Russian people, juxtaposed with his facts stating Soviet militancy and noncompliance with peace terms. He acknowledges them as one of the "leading nations of the world" whose power must be checked in order to prevent the termination of recently achieved peace. Perhaps this friendly word choice was meant to appeal to American ambivalence regarding Britain's plea to join forces against their former Soviet allies, but to no avail. According to Wooster College's Department Chair

---

[30]"The Sinews of Peace ("Iron Curtain Speech")."

12

and Professor Dr. Denise Bostdorff, author of *Proclaiming the Truman Doctrine: The Cold War Call to Arms*, despite mixed reviews of Churchill's speech in the media and Congress, "public opinion appeared overwhelmingly against Churchill's proposition and against the president's apparent approval of it."[31] President Truman would remain silent on the matter for almost exactly another year.

iii. Truman's 1947 "Truman Doctrine" speech

Both Stalin and Churchill's speeches occurred nearly on top of one another; however, Truman's response to perceived threats would remain largely internal until the famed Truman Doctrine Speech given March 12, 1947. In the midst of recovery, a civil war had broken out in Greece between communist factions (called the Democratic Army) and the national government following corrupt elections in 1946. Refusing to become directly involved in the conflict, the American government was continuously entreated by Britain to help maintain democracy in the Greek state so as to keep a balance of democratic and communist powers worldwide.[32] In the week leading up to his special address to Congress on sending aid to Greece and Turkey, news outlets provided important context for the speech. A *Newsweek* editorial declared that losing Greece to Communism would give Russia control of the Eastern Mediterranean. Both the *New York Times* and ABC radio host Earl Godwin encouraged audiences that it was time for the U.S. to act in defense of the West.[33] The American people had yet to be persuaded, however.

---

[31] Bostdorff. Proclaiming the Truman Doctrine: The Cold War Call to Arms. 26.
[32] Leonard, Kelsey. "The Greek Civil War." Cold War Museum. August 20, 2008. http://www.coldwar.org/articles/40s/GreekCivilWar1945-1949.asp.
[33] Bostdorff. Proclaiming the Truman Doctrine: The Cold War Call to Arms. 10.

According to Bostdorff, "Truman's address articulated a new policy—The Truman Doctrine—and marked a turning point in U.S. foreign policy…"[34] In fact, this speech marks what many historians today say was the real beginning of the Cold War. In terms of media, this speech was extremely important because it gave various news outlets an identifiable threat—Communism and Soviet Russia.

His word choice frames the Greek situation in manichean terms. For example, early in the speech he identifies Communism with terrorism and chaos: "The very existence of the Greek state is today threatened by the terrorist activities of several thousand armed men, led by Communists, who defy the government's authority…"[35] Shortly thereafter, he states that "Greece must have assistance if it is to become a self-supporting and self-respecting democracy," and continues on to say, "The United States must supply this assistance."[36] By framing the Communist-led revolutions as defying "the government's authority" and declaring that, "there is no other country to which democratic Greece can turn,"[37] Truman turns an instance of geographically removed political conflict into a battle between sanctioned democratic governments and terrorizing dissidents, further creating a manichean situation in which the U.S. and its democratic system is the savior.

Later in the speech Truman depicts U.S. intervention in Greece and Turkey in terms of broader policy goals. In fact, Truman departs from pre-World War American isolationist policy. Instead he develops a declaration founded on the "fundamental issue

---

[34]Bostdorff. Proclaiming the Truman Doctrine: The Cold War Call to Arms. 12.
[35]Bostdorff. Proclaiming the Truman Doctrine: The Cold War Call to Arms. 2.
[36]Bostdorff. Proclaiming the Truman Doctrine: The Cold War Call to Arms. 3.
[37]Bostdorff. Proclaiming the Truman Doctrine: The Cold War Call to Arms. 2-3.

14

in the war with Germany and Japan,"[38] an issue which was solved through victory over

"countries which sought to impose their will, and their way of life, upon other

nations."[39] In line with the goals of the UN, President Truman asserts that, "One of the

primary objectives of the foreign policy of the United States is the creation of

conditions in which we and other nations will be able to work out a way of life free

from coercion."[40]

The rhetoric used in the speech clearly defined the threat to Turkey and Greece

in manichean terms. Initially, Truman says the militant minority threatening Greece is

led by Communists; however, that is the first and only time he mentions the party—and

Russia is not mentioned at all.. And yet, Truman continues to describe aggressors along

Greece's frontier, namely the countries of Albania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia, as well as

violations of the Yalta agreement in Poland, Romania, and Bulgaria—all countries

under the influence of Soviet Russia. Rather than outright blaming Soviet reign, Truman

instead refers to the perpetrators of dissidence as "totalitarian regimes"[41] (used at least 4

times) and an "armed minority"[42] (used at least 3 times). Although from the outset it is

clear to whom the West attributes these threats to democracy, the titles and descriptors

Truman uses to identify these peoples again frame them as the enemy, in very dualistic

terms.

In fact, Truman's speech ultimately poses Communism and its ideology as the

antithesis of the U.S. and its principles. Truman presents both the U.S. and the militant

---

[38]Bostdorff. Proclaiming the Truman Doctrine: The Cold War Call to Arms. 4.
[39]Bostdorff. Proclaiming the Truman Doctrine: The Cold War Call to Arms. 4.
[40]Bostdorff. Proclaiming the Truman Doctrine: The Cold War Call to Arms. 4.
[41] Bostdorff. Proclaiming the Truman Doctrine: The Cold War Call to Arms. 5,7.
[42]Bostdorff. Proclaiming the Truman Doctrine: The Cold War Call to Arms. 2, 5-6.

minority against each other, clearly stating that "every nation must choose between alternative ways of life."[43] From this perspective, there is no middle ground between the two, faintly reminiscent of Stalin's "Two Camps" speech.

This first way of life he says: "is based upon the will of the majority, and is distinguished by free institutions, representative government, free elections, guarantees of individual liberty, freedom of speech and religion, and freedom from political oppression."[44] Although he does not specify this lifestyle as 'American', these are ultimately all facets of the Constitution and principles of American democracy. The alternative lifestyle supported by these minorities is "forcibly imposed upon the majority. It relies upon terror and oppression, a controlled press and radio, fixed elections, and the suppression of personal freedoms." Throughout his speech Truman uses words like "coercion" in juxtaposition with American ideals of "freedom," framing the political unrest in Turkey and Greece as more than an internal issue. Rather, he puts the conflict in terms of the bigger picture, as a crisis threatening national and international peace. At the close of his speech, Truman plainly presents U.S. involvement in Turkey and Greece's issues in terms of extreme dualism:

The seeds of totalitarian regimes are nurtured by misery and want. They spread and grow in the evil soil of poverty and strife. They reach their full growth when the hope of a people for a better life has died. We must keep that hope alive. The free peoples of the world look to us for support in maintaining their freedoms. If we falter in our

---

[43]Bostdorff. Proclaiming the Truman Doctrine: The Cold War Call to Arms. 5.
[44]Bostdorff. Proclaiming the Truman Doctrine: The Cold War Call to Arms. 5.

leadership, we may endanger the peace of the world—and we shall surely endanger the

welfare of this Nation.[45]

All of the rhetoric and the themes of this speech convey one common message: urgency

in the face of a crisis. Whether or not this crisis was occurring on American soil, the

deliberateness of Truman's language certainly evokes that exact sentiment. The speech

is largely in the present and present perfect, evoking a definite sense of urgency even

though the conflict is geographically far-removed from the U.S. Truman frames the

conflict in vague, dualistic terms, pitting this overseas issue as a broader struggle

between good and evil, democracy and totalitarianism—all playing on the fears of a

congress and constituency still recovering from two major World Wars, and using the

same, familiar rhetoric to persuade his audience.

iv. Concluding Analysis of Speeches

All three of these speeches are not solely important from a governmental or

public policy standpoint. Each of these speeches, two of which were delivered in the

U.S. to American citizens, played an immense role in shaping media outlooks at the

beginning of the Cold War. The complexity of events following WWII was

compounded by the multitude of interpretations of each event, those events being

Communist support of revolutionaries in Middle Eastern countries and Soviet

noncompliance with U.N. peace treaty terms. Each of these three speeches can be seen

as an attempt by each world leader to define their country's global role in an expanding

international community.. According to Bostdorff, the rhetoric of Churchill, Kennan,

and other politicians "shaped an increasingly narrow interpretive framework through

---

[45]Bostdorff. Proclaiming the Truman Doctrine: The Cold War Call to Arms. 7.

which [U.S.] administration officials viewed Soviet behavior."[46] The dualistic depictions of East and West, as declared by Stalin and Churchill, set the stage for imminent conflict and, more importantly, set the tone for Truman's speech—the speech which is the historically acknowledged start of the Cold War.

There were many factors that went into Truman's decision to engage and he outlines most of them in his speech. For example, faced with the knowledge that there was a distinct possibility of a third war, along with foreign and domestic political pressures, pressure from media outlets to make a statement, and facing the newer challenge of adhering to the UN's charter for global peace, Truman reacted. One of his self-admitted greatest fears was that of a domino effect regarding political upheaval in Greece and Turkey. Truman said "Should we fail to aid Greece and Turkey in this fateful hour, the effect will be far reaching to the West as well as to the East." He went even further to say, "The free peoples of the world look to us for support in maintaining their freedoms. If we falter in our leadership, we may endanger the peace of the world—and we shall sure endanger the welfare of this Nation."

Although the president sought to reconcile the UN framework and mutual principles of the Atlantic Conference, Soviet actions were continuously deemed adversarial to each aforementioned charter. Compounded by the staunch manichean identities of each country set forth initially by Stalin and Churchill, continued actions by the Soviets ultimately forced Truman's hand to engage in alliance with Britain. The extremely dualistic framing of each country and its goals within these three speeches leaves no room for a middle ground, according to each speaker.

---

[46] Bostdorff. Proclaiming the Truman Doctrine: The Cold War Call to Arms. 58.

Thus, using the principles of the UN and the ideology of American democracy, Truman forged a new era of foreign policy doctrine saying, "I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures. I believe that we must assist free peoples to work out their own destinies in their own way." It is this uncompromising rhetoric that would mark media interpretations and U.S. foreign policy during the early years of the Cold War, and beyond.

II. Media constructs the narrative

One of the most crucial ways in which media affects public opinion is through the intersection of cultural media and government. Although examinations of media may not always give concrete causal evidence for cultural behaviors, as Dr. Marcus Payk said: "…one can read media products as both the expression and the representation of cultural constellations in shifting historical contexts."[47] At the end of WWII, American society was experiencing radical shifts in politics, culture, and technology. By analyzing some of the popular media and their messages as Americans shifted into the atmosphere of the Cold War it is possible to identify some of the key paradigms that would persistently influence the American psyche well into the decades to come.

A. Hollywood's roots in propaganda

A well-known component of the foundations of 20th century media was the use of propaganda during the first and second World Wars. As Elmer Davis, director of the Office of War Information (OWI) said, "The easiest way to inject a propaganda idea into most people's minds is to let it go in through the medium of an entertainment picture when they do not realize that they are being propagandized."[48] Let's begin before the end of WWII—1942, the founding of the OWI. According to Koppe and Black, the OWI "was an organization designed to not only disseminate information and to clarify issues but also to arouse support for particular symbols and ideas."[49] Founded

---

[47]Vowinckel and Payk. *Cold War Cultures*. 94.

[48] Koppes, Clayton R. "What to Show the World: The Office of War Information and Hollywood, 1942-1945." http://www.jstor.org/stable/1888275. 88.

[49] Koppes, Clayton R. "What to Show the World." 88.

by an executive order in June of 1942, the OWI was a consolidation of a variety of pre-war information groups, such as the office's predecessor the Office of Government Reports (OGR) and the Bureau of Motion Pictures (BMP).[50] It is with the BMP and government interference in the late wartime film industry that our story begins.

As one of the most influential industries in the world, Hollywood produced almost 500 films annually during WWII and reached eighty million foreign audience members, making it more impactful than any other medium.[51] Up until OWI's founding, the film industry had actually "avoided 'message films' in favor of romances, musicals, murder mysteries, and westerns—'pure entertainment' in Hollywood parlance."[52] Knowing the power of the medium, following the establishment of the OWI, in 1942 Nelson Poynter was appointed as a liaison between government and the film industry. At that time, Hollywood had "in consideration or under production 213 films" related to the war effort.[53]

Of these 213 movies, Poynter and the OWI found that 40 percent "focused on the armed forces" and "less than 20 percent dealt with the enemy."[54] Rather than contextualizing or interpreting real elements of the war, OWI found that a majority of these films simply used the war as plot theme. Realizing this, Poynter and the OWI released the "Manual for the Motion Picture Industry."[55] This manual lauded the United States and it's way of life, naming democracy and civil rights progress as facets of U.S. life which would be demolished if the fascist enemy won WWII. Although the film

---

[50]Koppes, Clayton R. "What to Show the World." 88.
[51]Koppes, Clayton R. "What to Show the World." 89.
[52]Koppes, Clayton R. "What to Show the World." 90.
[53]Koppes, Clayton R. "What to Show the World." 90.
[54]Koppes, Clayton R. "What to Show the World." 91.
[55]Koppes, Clayton R. "What to Show the World." 91.

industry was one of the least censored during the war, the Bureau of Motion Pictures

(BMP) worked to review scripts and became involved in production as much as

possible in order to influence film content. An example of this influence can be seen in

RKO's film, *Bombardiers*. While the film initially focused on a pacifist-thinking

bombardier, OWI recommended a revision which changed the focus to the idea of a

'just war.'[56] Between 1943 and 1944, the number of Hollywood scripts read by the

OWI increased by 60 percent. Issues of race, themes of corruption, military or political

distortions, and instances of Americans oblivious to war were all characteristics 'fixed'

by the OWI and the BMP.[57] The control these government agencies held over the

industry was, according to Koppes and Black "an influence over an American mass

medium never equaled before or since."

As the war began to come to a close, however, these war-entrenched plots and

themes began to decrease in popularity, and messages revolved more around pure

entertainment and religion. With Truman's ascension to the Presidency and the war

coming to a definite close, the OWI was disbanded by late 1945.[58]

Following the OWI's reign, two distinct and yet related themes gathered

extreme popularity across various media in the U.S. These two themes, espionage and

brainwashing, served to reinforce the manichean frame established by the rhetoric of

Truman and Churchill. Although espionage plots in film were present before the Cold

War, they were often just vehicles by which to tell an entertaining story.[59] During the

---

[56]Koppes, Clayton R. "What to Show the World." 95.
[57] Koppes, Clayton R. "What to Show the World." 103.
[58] Strand, William. "Truman Elects Biddle To War Crimes Tribunal." *Chicago Tribune*, September 13, 1945. http://archives.chicagotribune.com/1945/09/13/page/7/article/truman-names-biddle-to-war-crimes-tribunal#text.
[59] Koppes, Clayton R. "What to Show the World." 91.

1950s specifically, however, these two concepts took on significant weight for the American people, influencing their perceptions of the Communist threat both abroad and at home.

B. Print Journalism: framing the enemy and the origins of brainwashing and espionage

In 1950, the term *brainwashing* first appeared publicly in a Miami News article written by Edward Hunter, a foreign news correspondent with ties to the CIA.[60] Although the term was used earlier that year in a secret CIA report, it wasn't until Hunt's article titled "'Brain-Washing' Tactics Force Chinese Into Ranks of Communist Party"[61] was published that the term really gained traction in the minds of the American people. The popularity of the concept throughout the duration of the 1950s can be shown by the fact that the term *brainwashing* appeared in the *New York Times* in 251 occasions.[62] Even before Hunter's article popularized the term, the concept of mind control was a hot topic amongst government officials and the general public. In fact this and other speculations about Communist subversive ideological warfare techniques had entered the mainstream in the 1940s through public trials, literature, and film.

Rumors of psychological warfare used by Nazi Germany and the subversive effects of propaganda both at home and abroad were issues at the forefront of concerns for both the U.S. government and the American people. In fact, throughout the World Wars propaganda and psychological persuasion techniques were a large part of

---

[60] Dunne, Matthew W. *A Cold War State of Mind: Brainwashing and Postwar American Society*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2013. 3.
[61] Weiner, Tim. "Remembering Brainwashing." The New York Times. July 05, 2008. http://www.nytimes.com/2008/07/06/weekinreview/06weiner.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0.
[62] Dunne, Matthew W. *A Cold War State of Mind: Brainwashing and Postwar American Society*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2013. 23.

government strategy in swaying public opinion for U.S. involvement. The rise of mass advertising and an increase in studying the psychological effects of subversive and subliminal messaging coincided with the changing climate of international relations. This, combined with the fear-provoking rhetoric used by world leaders and a series of real historical events set the framework for the American obsession with brainwashing and Two significant events which perpetuated the credibility of brainwashing and espionage, both in Communist countries and specifically on American soil, were the trial of Joseph Mindszenty and the convictions of the Rosenbergs in 1951. As Cold War historian Ellen Schrecker asserted, these two trials were pivotal in changing "the vague and largely ideological threat of Communism into something much more concrete: real people taking real actions that seemed to be a part of a Moscow-led conspiracy."[63]

In 1949, political activist and Hungarian Catholic official Mindszenty was tried and convicted of treason. He was extremely outspoken against the Communist regime and yet when he was tried, he confessed to the crimes which he had consistently denied.[64] This, along with his feeble demeanor at the trial gave many reason to surmise that he had been tortured, brainwashed, or even--according to the *New York Times*--had a 'lobotomy' performed.[65] A 1949 article published in *Time* called "Their Tongues Cut Off" questioned Mindszenty's radical change in tune, saying "Somehow they [Russia] broke Joseph Mindszenty, man of burning courage. Somehow they made him say things

---

[63]Dunne. *A Cold War State of Mind*. 53.

[64]Shaw, Tony. "Martyr, Miracles, and Martians: Religion and Cold War Cinematic Propaganda in the 1950s." *Journal of Cold War Studies* 4, no. 2 (2002): 18.

[65]Johnson, Jenell M. *Echoes of the Soul: A Rhetorical History of Lobotomy*. ProQuest, 2008. http://books.google.com/books?id=gH3K96CmqI0C&dq=Josef+Cardinal+Mindszenty+and+brainwashing&source=gbs_navlinks_s. 65.

he had denied with the utmost vehemence, and with full knowledge of the consequences, until his arrest 40 days before."[66]

Then, in 1950, two American citizens living in New York City named Julius and Ethel Rosenberg, were arrested over accusations of espionage. Although Julius was deemed the main conspirator of the two, the evidence reflected that the Rosenbergs had in fact been involved with a series of other pro-Soviet Americans in smuggling information about the workings of the "Manhattan Project," a top-secret program tasked with the development of the atomic bomb. . After a 3 year-long trial the Rosenbergs were executed, survived? by their 2 young children. According to Matthew Dunne, author of *A Cold War State of Mind: Brainwashing and Postwar American Society*, the trials effectively emphasized the Communist threat at home. He says, "the trials also blurred the lines between foreign, Communist others and apparently normal American citizens…Communism was a political party with totalitarian aspirations; it was a subversive and un-American idea" and above all: "it could be practiced by your next-door neighbor."

The press interpretations of the trial are especially important in understanding its effect on the American psyche at the time. Many headlines and print stories labeled the two as the "Atom Spy Couple," and direct quotes from those involved successfully sensationalized the trial without much need for exaggeration from the press. In general, "newspapers throughout the country ran editorials condemning the Rosenbergs for their crimes and expressing confidence that they were being treated fairly by the American

---

[66] Johnson. *Echoes of the Soul.* 66.

judicial system."[67] For example, two articles which were run just months apart in the *Los Angeles Times* each denounced the couple and sought to place their crimes as a part of the larger picture in the minds of the public. The first titled "Communists and the Rosenberg Case" stated "such extremes of individual conceit as they and [British atomic spy] Dr. [Alan Nunn] May have shown cannot be tolerated. Not even here, in the citadel of freedom, can one person arrogate to himself the moral right to jeopardize all."[68] The second, titled "They May Have Condemned Millions," asserted: "…many Americans and others in the free nations still remain blithely oblivious of the magnitude of the threat implicit in this international conspiracy and strangely unmoved by the depravity of those who willingly served and continue to serve its godless and inhuman goals."[69] Another article published in 1951 by the *New York Times* quoted the presiding Judge Kaufman as having "described the defendant's crime as "worse than murder" and "a sordid, dirty business.""[70] A variety of quotes from participants in the trial, jurists and observers alike, were published nationwide, echoing Kaufman's sentiment.

In summation, press coverage of both the Mindszenty and Rosenberg trials not only mirrored the manichean rhetoric of world leaders like Churchill and Truman but also indicate that the press itself was picking up on this type of language. becoming a real trend. From the presiding judge's use of manichean language and its adoption by the press, the developmental path towards a persistent dualistic frame used by both the government and journalists to describe the Communist threat clear. Thus, a dualistic,

---

[67]"History of the Federal Judiciary." History of the Federal Judiciary. Accessed May 09, 2015. http://www.fjc.gov/history/home.nsf/page/tu_rosenberg_doc_15.html.
[68]"History of the Federal Judiciary."
[69] "History of the Federal Judiciary."
[70] Conklin, William R. "Atom Spy Couple Sentenced to Die; Aide Gets 30 Years." Editorial. *New York Times*. 2010. http://www.nytimes.com/learning/general/onthisday/big/0405.html

manichean perception of Soviet Russia and its aims continued to be reinforced at both local and governmental levels of American life during the Cold War.

C. In Film: reinforcing manichean interpretations through science-fiction plots

The prevalent American belief that "Communist governments systematically manipulated and controlled their civilian populations"[71] on U.S. soil, reinforced by such cases as Mindszenty and the Rosenbergs and by the manichean rhetoric of both the media and prominent politicians, can be seen by the development of certain genres in Hollywood films at the time. During the early years of the Cold War, the largely Christian U.S. population was presented with film portrayals of good citizens versus totalitarian regimes. These films, like Cecil B. DeMille's popular *The Ten Commandments,* utilized the concept of 'free will under god' to juxtapose to the anti-religious sentiments and totalitarian government present in the East. Although many times, villains and their country of origin in these films were not explicitly stated, there was a definite implication that they were representations of Communists based on character features, storyline, setting, etc. By understanding this aspect of American culture, it is logical that the manichean rhetoric initially presented by leading political figures would be incorporated into the everyday vocabulary of the largely Christian Americans. This black-and-white morality was reinforced time and time again by the cinema, which was one of the most popular media outlets of the era.

It is important to note that more popular, mainstream depictions of themes of mind control, espionage, and broader conflicts between manichean forces can be observed in a multitude of genres and media touched upon, but not fully discussed here.

---

[71]Dunne. *A Cold War State of Mind.* 70.

I chose to focus this next section on one single subset of plots of films, which at the time were not the most popular, for a reason. I posit that the rise of specific plots within the genre of science fiction can be analyzed as a reflection of the most hyperbolic manifestations of very real Cold War fears present in the minds of the American public. By using the vehicle of science fiction, I show that the resulting outlandish and nonsensical portrayals of the Communist threat are indicative of the most extreme interpretations of the persistent framing techniques used to identify the manichean powers at play during the early Cold War. As Matthew W. Dunne says in his book "A Cold War State of Mind: Brainwashing and Postwar American Society," "Nowhere was the theme of the superhuman and subhuman Communist enemy more prevalent than in the science fiction and horror films of the 1950s."[72]

Within the genre of science fiction, plots involving mind-controlling alien invaders posing as American citizens were portrayed by a variety of films. Productions like *Invaders from Mars* (1953), *It Came from Outer Space* (1954), and later films produced around the same time and or based on already popular stories like *Invasion of the Body Snatchers* (1956) and *The Brain Eaters* (1958) all contained elements of foreign invasion and mind control. According to Peter Biskind, cultural critic and journalist, "possession by pods—mind stealing, brain eating, and body snatching— [was] an overt metaphor for Communist brainwashing…"[73] In each of these films, enemy invaders "who had the ability to mimic normal American citizens, control their minds, and turn them into cold, inhuman slaves" used their superior inhuman powers to conquer their targets. These adversaries more often than not were fully detached from

---

[72]Dunne. *A Cold War State of Mind*. 70.
[73]Dunne. *A Cold War State of Mind*. 70-71.

their bodies, reinforcing their inhumanness through their physical lack of a human body

with the exception of their brains. This view of detached, subversive entities seeking

control over intellect is an example of some of the most extreme depictions of the

reality of American fears. As Dunne said of his analysis of such films:

> If the films' alien invaders represented the unchecked and insane
> intelligence of the superhuman Communist hierarchy, the cold inhuman
> townspeople who were turned into unwilling but complicit slaves
> represented the subhuman, brainwashed disciples of Communism the
> world over.[74]

As a result, through these science-fiction depictions of brainwashing and alien invasion,

fears already expressed by journalists and government agents were voiced to their

absolute extremes. The fear of a two-pronged threat of internal, subversive enemies and

the possibility of foreign invasion were prevalent aspects of science fiction films in the

1950s.

One of the most important roles that these films played in building perceptions

of the Communist threat are their unique, multi-layered portrayals of good and evil. On

the one hand, many of the plots of these films mirrored popular religious themes in a

non-mainstream manner. Although they use large-scale extraterrestrial battles between

'good' American townspeople and 'evil' alien invaders, the themes conveyed are

remarkably similar to the depictions of morality in more popular films like *The Ten

Commandments.* The stark, often cheaply portrayed contrasts between good and evil in

these science-fiction films can easily be compared to both propaganda-entrenched films

at the end of WWII and the Oscar-winning films of the early 1950s.[75] On a lower

intellectual scale, these films offered audiences "effective propaganda by offering

---

[74]Dunne. *A Cold War State of Mind*. 71.
[75]Shaw. "Martyr, Miracles, and Martians." 21.

simple, easily digestible, emotive messages in highly charged, usually action-driven formats."[76] Furthermore, the heroes of these films "frequently championed the folksy wisdom and resourcefulness of the American townspeople…"[77] Along with religion-centric movies like *The Ten Commandments* and *The Prisoner* (a film based on the trial of Mindszenty), common thematic elements which often hinged on dualistic perceptions of morality "helped to endow the Cold War with the black-and-white moral clarity that most people and official propagandists sought."[78] Altogether, the bizarre hyperbolic portrayals of the Communist threat in science-fiction films reflected just how "expansive the image of the Communist enemy was in American popular culture,"[79] from the most mainstream of genres to the fringes of the film industry.

D. Broadcast News

While the origins of how the Communist threat was framed in popular media hold significant weight in the discussion of identifying the common national narrative that developed at the start of the Cold War, it is equally important to investigate how manichean rhetoric was used to frame Communism in the realm of broadcast journalism. Following Prime Minister Churchill and President Truman's lead, a variety of broadcast outlets picked up on their dualistic, manichean language in everyday disseminations of world and national news. The importance of radio, and eventually television news, in daily American life during the 1950s and beyond is undeniable. As such, its content warrants an examination of the persistence of manichean rhetoric as it

---

[76]Shaw." Martyr, Miracles, and Martians." 21.
[77]Dunne. *A Cold War State of Mind*. 71.
[78]Shaw. "Martyr, Miracles, and Martians." 21.
[79]Dunne. *A Cold War State of Mind*. 73.

continued to reinforce the national narrative through which American and Soviet forces were framed in the U.S..

i. Radio: Origins and Voice of America

Throughout the 1930s and 1940s, radio experienced a Golden Age as one of the most popular news and entertainment outlets in America. By 1934 "60 percent of the nation's households had radios," and "One and a half million cars were also equipped with them."[80] During WWII, the amount of news broadcasted increased significantly and in 1940, the number of total radio stations was at an all-time high of 765 in the U.S.[81] In fact, "Before the the first truly successful television broadcasts early in the 1940s, radio was the only broadcast medium…For two decades radio was king."[82] Although the end of the war would herald a transition from network radio to a new age of network television as the most popular source of broadcast news and entertainment, radio would remain a prominent medium throughout the Cold War.

During the late 1940s and early 1950s, this transition from radio to television was marked by increases in "network reporters…doing double duty, being heard on radio as well as being seen on TV."[83] As a result, although TV was gaining momentum as the preferred news platform, "radio was still important, especially at the local level, where stations often found it beneficial to maintain a strong news department to keep

---

[80]Scott, Carole. "History of the Radio Industry in the United States to 1940″. EH.Net Encyclopedia, edited by Robert Whaples. March 26, 2008. URL http://eh.net/encyclopedia/the-history-of-the-radio-industry-in-the-united-states-to-1940/

[81]History of the Radio Industry in the United States to 1940″.

[82]Bondi, Victor. "Radio: The End of a Golden Age." In *American Decades: 1940-1949*, 375. Detroit: Gale Research, 1995.

[83]Vaughn, Stephen. *Encyclopedia of American Journalism*. New York: Routledge, 2008. 435.

the community informed."[84]

One of the most influential wartime radio programs that remained viable during the Cold War was the government initiated Voice of America (VOA), which in fact ran from 1942 to 2006.[85] Initiated by the OWI in 1942, John Chancellor, broadcast journalist and 1965 VOA director said that the program functioned "at the crossroads of journalism and diplomacy."[86] This description, according to Stephen L. Vaughn's *Encyclopedia of American Journalism,* encapsulated the principal goals of the program, which more specifically was used to "inform listeners in other nations about life in the United States."[87] On the other hand, its Charter (P.L. 94-350) states that VOA serves to "present the policies of the United States clearly and effectively and will also present responsible discussion and opinion on these policies."[88] As a government-sponsored program, the interpretation of "responsible discussion and opinion" is vague, and reporting unbiased to the aims and agendas of the federal government seemed unlikely. As Vaughn says, in counter to Chancellor's statement, "In such a situation, journalism and diplomacy may operate at cross-purposes…"[89]

VOA's very first transmission in February of 1942 began thus: "Daily, at this time, we shall speak to you about America and the war. The news may be good or bad. We shall tell you the truth."[90] Identifying VOA and America with 'the truth', this statement can immediately imply that other news sources at the time were dishonest. In reality, VOA did report American wartime losses and other military challenges;

---

[84]Vaughn. *Encyclopedia.* 435.
[85]Vaughn. *Encyclopedia.* 435.
[86]Vaughn. *Encyclopedia.* 569.
[87]Vaughn. *Encyclopedia.* 569.
[88]Vaughn. *Encyclopedia.* 569.
[89]Vaughn. *Encyclopedia.* 569.
[90]Vaughn. *Encyclopedia.* 569.

however, it often failed to report controversies at home, especially in regards to growing

civil disobedience in the name of racial equality. The phrase "lying by omission" comes

to mind. Furthermore, at the close of the war many Americans were skeptical that VOA

would separate from its propagandist roots, and it was in fact generally viewed

negatively as a mouthpiece for the Democratic administration. Following WWII, the

VOA was absorbed by the State Department and suffered from budget cuts, partly as a

result of its unfavorable origins. Relatively soon thereafter, "Associated Press and

United Press withdrew their services, not wishing to be linked with a 'propaganda

operation.'"[91]

Then, in 1948 as a response to growing concern over the rise in anti-Western

propaganda from Soviet countries, the Smith-Mundt Act was passed. This act "made

United States government international informational and educational services

permanent." The subsequent "war of words between West and East" sparked the

creation of even more of these informational radio programs, like Radio Free Europe,

Radio Liberty, and more.[92] The VOA's journalistic approach to educational

programming during the early years of the Cold War remained, as some skeptics had

feared, similar to the American propaganda efforts of the war. Broadcast content

focused heavily on "strong attacks on the enemy (Communist governments), support for

their long-suffering people, positive treatment of democratic institutions, and emphasis

on U.S. military and economic strength."[93] Specifically in attempts to reach third-world

countries feared to be vulnerable to Communist ideologies, "VOA broadcasts

---

[91]Vaughn. *Encyclopedia.* 569.
[92]Vaughn. *Encyclopedia.* 569.
[93]Vaughn. *Encyclopedia.* 569.

emphasized U.S. financial and technological aid to the emerging nations…They

criticized dictatorial practices of Communist governments, while highlighting U.S.

economic and military strength"[94] abroad and in a multitude of languages.

In 1953 the VOA fell under the United States Information Agency (USIA) and

was still heavily influenced by the State Department. These influences affected the

VOA on a variety of levels, from guidelines regulating personnel to censorship of

"sensitive issues."[95] Throughout the early years of the Cold War, VOA programming

content was determined by "guidance" from government agents.[96] One example of such

guidance can be seen in the VOA handling of the 1949 Chinese Revolution, which

involved a regime change from Nationalist powers to Communism in the Asian country.

VOA was internally conflicted, with policy makers trying to balance the need to

maintain credibility with the Chinese people while at the same time remain true to their

aims of refuting Communism. As a result, VOA got caught in the middle of domestic

policy debates and more often than not was seen at home as favoring the administration

and its aims.[97]

Similar to the reflexive implications of the first few words spoken in VOA's

initial 1942 broadcast, one significant aspect of its programming during the early years

of the Cold War were the implications of its content. Using Voice of America to

broadcast U.S. policy and culture abroad, declarations of the "truth" and freedom of

press reporting served to emphasize the goodness of America, while simultaneously

---

[94]Vaughn. *Encyclopedia.* 569.
[95]Vaughn. *Encyclopedia.* 570.
[96]Krugler, David F. *The Voice of America and the Domestic Propaganda Battles, 1945-1953.* Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2000. 94.
[97]Krugler. *The Voice of America and the Domestic Propaganda Battles, 1945-1953.* 95.

putting down foreign press practices, either by implication or direct accusation. One major example of this propagandist tactic can be seen in Truman's 1950 "Campaign of Truth." As a result of the increase in American propaganda broadcasts behind the Iron Curtain, a variety of Soviet efforts focused on jamming transmission of VOA to the Eastern Bloc. The CIA estimated that in 1950, during the time of these jamming efforts, VOA effectiveness rate was between only 15 and 20 percent.[98] Announced through a speech given to the American Society of Newspaper Editors, Truman declared this campaign as a response to Soviet jamming, asserting that "VOA was often the only source of news for captive peoples" behind the Iron Curtain.[99] Furthermore, Truman called for a campaign which "Through the truth, the United States and the free world would refute lies and deliver positive messages about the American people and their nation's policies."[100] Truman and his supporters continued frame VOA as an honest news outlet devoid of efforts of subversive influence, differentiating it from the so-called propagandist broadcasts employed by the Soviets. As a result, VOA was a government tool used to build upon and extend the reach of the pre-established national narrative, which used manichean rhetoric to frame the growing conflict between the two international superpowers, both domestically and abroad.

ii. Television News Broadcasts: Murrow and CBS vs. McCarthy

One of the most prominent American reporters of both WWII and the Cold War era was Edward R. Murrow. According to Vaughn's *Encyclopedia of American Journalism,* by "1950 Murrow was among the nation's most dominant broadcast

---

[98]Krugler. *The Voice of America and the Domestic Propaganda Battles, 1945-1953*. 95.
[99]Krugler. *The Voice of America and the Domestic Propaganda Battles, 1945-1953*. 96.
[100]Krugler. *The Voice of America and the Domestic Propaganda Battles, 1945-1953*. 96.

newsman."[101] During WWII he and his team revolutionized the news game by changing radio reporting from an in-studio production to on-the-spot reporting in war zones. Furthermore, Murrow had his own weekday evening radio report beginning in 1947 and spanning 12 years called "Edward R. Murrow and the News." His next concurrent venture would be into the exponentially rising realm of television broadcast news. According to Thomas Rosteck, author of *See It Now Confronts McCarthyism: Television Documentary and the Politics of Representation,* "Where in 1947 only roughly 1 in 100 homes had television receivers, by 1955 nearly 80 in 100 owned at least one receiver."[102] In light of the obvious influence television had over the American public, it is no wonder the already popular Murrow became an active part of the nascent medium's entry into journalism. In 1951, CBS President Fred Friendly and Murrow created the now-famous documentary news series *See It Now*, which aired from 1951 to 1958. The next section analyzes CBS's *See It Now* and Murrow's role in contesting the activities and accusations of rising Senator Joseph McCarthy to bring to light some of the struggles of broadcast news which affected their role in the marketplace of ideas during the Cold War.

In the very first broadcast of *See It Now*, Murrow said: "No journalistic age was ever given a weapon for truth with quite the same scope of this fledgling television." This statement would be reinforced by Murrow's later 4-series telecast, the most well-known content of *See It Now,* which dealt with the growing accusations and hypocrisies of Wisconsin Senator Joseph R. McCarthy. Although personally a staunch anti-

---

[101]Vaughn. *Encyclopedia.* 315.
[102]Rosteck, Thomas. *See It Now Confronts McCarthyism: Television Documentary and the Politics of Representation*. Tucaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1994. 23.

Communist, Murrow was well-known for presenting the news without his own political or social biases. Although he did offer audiences his own interpretations and commentary, as a journalist he was committed to presenting the facts and letting viewers form their own opinions. Murrow felt very strongly that the growing accusations against prominent individuals, accusations including complaints against government officials, military men, and a variety of other players by McCarthy and the House of Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC) were largely unfounded. McCarthy and his supporters continuously asserted knowledge of secret Communist activity at all levels of government and in the field of journalism, and their public attacks often led to ruined reputations and public embarrassment for the accused. As a popular public figure, journalist and American citizen, Murrow firmly believed that many of McCarthy's accusations lacked substantiation and violated the accused's civil liberties.

For a time, Murrow kept his discontent over McCarthy and his actions quiet, or addressed them in more abstract terms. The first notorious public HUAC congressional hearings, mirroring the accusations and tactics of McCarthy, occurred in 1947 and were mainly centered around rumored Communist activity within Hollywood. A total of 43 Hollywood writers, producers, and directors were publicly called to testify, a majority of whom used the trial to denounce the investigation and were ultimately sent to prison and or blacklisted from the industry.Discussing the 1947 HUAC investigations, Murrow commented that Congressional committees tend to focus on individual's actions rather than "what individuals think."[103] Then, in 1949, Alger Hiss, a U.S. diplomat, was found

---

[103]Vaughn. *Encyclopedia.* 315.

guilty of denying his role in passing secret U.S. documents to a former Communist

agent. In 1950, the Rosenbergs were also accused of passing American secrets on to

Soviet agents. Although these defamatory trials and public accusations predated

McCarthy's election to public office, they would set the stage for his like-minded

attacks on a variety of American people.

The senator's role and the so-called start of "McCarthyism," which occurred

during the early years of the Cold War, began at a dinner party when McCarthy stated

he had a list of 205 employees in the U.S. State Department with known ties to

Communism. Over the next four years he would play a prominent role in creating a

period of civil rights violations and sensationalist accusations against a variety of well-

known and often innocent American officials. Two crucial aspects to McCarthy's

success were his knowledge of the press and its advantages, as well as his powerful

allies in the media.[104] He began mornings with "press conferences to announce

afternoon press conferences in which he promised to reveal startling new information

thus grabbing the afternoon headlines without providing any actual information. Often

the afternoon press conferences would never take place."[105] His role as a Senator

classified his statements as factual news, thus newspapers didn't go the extra mile to

substantiate his claims. His allies included the powerful Hearst chain and Colonel

Robert McCormick's *Chicago Tribune* and *Washington Times-Herald,* all of who were

"champions of anti-Communist efforts and supported McCarthy's contributions to that

cause."[106]Outspoken critics of McCarthy included the *Milwaukee Journal,* the *Capital*

---

[104]Vaughn. *Encyclopedia.* 314.
[105]Vaughn. *Encyclopedia.* 314.
[106]Vaughn. *Encyclopedia.* 314.

Times of Madison, Wisconsin, the *Washington Post*, the *Christian Science Monitor,* as well as figures such as the columnists Drew Pearson, Joseph Alsop, Stewart Alsop, radio commentator Elmer Davis, and Edward Murrow.[107] Despite the number and stature of his critics, McCarthy and his anti-Communist efforts were sustained for many years. According to Rosteck*,* McCarthy was successful in being highly publicized in the press nationwide. Rosteck says that reports on the Senator's activities reached "a peak in 1954, when it was not unusual for a paper to carry fifteen to twenty stories a day in which McCarthy was the central figure. A like proportion of McCarthy stories figured in radio and television news."[108]

McCarthy's strategy towards the press was twofold in that he used the medium of TV to his advantage, and yet also continuously accused citizens in the field of broadcast journalism of having communist ties and sympathies. In 1950 he first appeared on national television in the midst of the Tydings Subcomittee, a Senate committee tasked with investigating McCarthy's very first claims of Communist activity in the State Department. Ultimately this investigation failed to reach conclusions or indict anyone, largely because McCarthy's accusations were inconsistent and their direction changed constantly.[109] Although he continued to appear on national television, some stations refused to air some of his speeches due to their libelous nature.[110] Despite the fact that in one of the initial 1951 broadcasts of *See It Now* Murrow pointed out the hypocrisy of McCarthy's ongoing claims and actions using McCarthy's own words, the Senator continued to gain immense popularity with the

---

[107]Vaughn. *Encyclopedia.* 314.
[108]Rosteck. *See It Now.* 16.
[109]Rosteck. *See It Now.*17.
[110]Rosteck. *See It Now.* 17.

general public, while simultaneously gathering enemies in the broadcast world and within political parties—his own party included.

McCarthy continued to attack both public officials and broadcast journalism. In May of 1952, McCarthy announced, "We have a vast number of communists in the press and radio," and he demanded lists of State Department contracts with radio-TV newsmen."[111] He went even further when, in February of 1953, he accused the government-funded, largely propagandist *Voice of America* of "mismanagement and subversion,"[112] with he and his witnesses "taking the position that anything less than complete denunciation of Communists and enthusiastic praise for anti-Communists was subversion."[113]

The irony in attacking VOA was that many politicians did in fact see the program as incredibly propagandist, and yet McCarthy accused the content of not going far enough. McCarthy's increasing role as a public figure and intervention activities within the realm of broadcast journalism served to effectively silence the majority of dissenting opinions. According to Rosteck and research by founding dean of the Graduate School of Journalism at the University of California, Berkeley Edwin Bayley:

> …the networks were subject to strict government regulation, and executives in the industry reasoned that the McCarthyites had influence among the regulators and regulatory commissions. Moreover…the tradition of the sponsor system, under which at the time an advertiser was held responsible for the content of programs, further weakened the industry's resolve. Extreme pressure was mounted in many cases by advertisers who were fearful of negative publicity and subsequent market

---

[111]Rosteck. *See It Now.* 17.
[112]Rosteck. *See It Now.* 18.
[113]Rosteck. *See It Now.* 18.

problems should any of their sponsored programs or associated celebrities be "exposed" as suspect.[114]

As Vaughn asserts, these fears of financial, government, and publicity repercussions "led to the failure of the press to provide readers with complete information."[115] Through an examination of the most famous *See It Now* telecasts, only three of which will be analyzed here and which dealt specifically with the growing trend of McCarthyism, and their impact on the CBS network and its employees, it is possible to understand how Murrow and Friendly's attack on the senator played out in real-life and in regards to the aforementioned fears of broadcast journalists.

See It Now aired its first of four telecasts regarding McCarthyism and the increasing trend of "guilt by association" in October of 1953, sparking a series of broadcasts, which were at the time extremely risky and largely unheralded. "The Case of Milo Radulovich" was at face-value the tale of an unknown Air Force Reserve lieutenant who faced dismissal after being deemed "security risk." As Murrow and Friendly would present it, this became a story of McCarthyism and a case of guilt by association. The story centered around Lt. Milo Radulovich, who had been "asked to resign from the Air Force Reserves because his father and sister were accused of having Communist sympathies." Murrow interviewed Radulovich, his accused family members, and residents of his hometown in defense of the lieutenant. Murrow concluded with "a personal appeal: "And it seems to us that—that is, to Fred Friendly and myself—that this is a subject that should be argued about endlessly.""[116] Following public disapproval of Radulovich's treatment, a few weeks later on *See It Now* the Air

---

[114]Rosteck. *See It Now.* 19.
[115]Vaughn. *Encyclopedia.* 314.
[116]Vaughn. *Encyclopedia.* 315.

41

Force announced that the lieutenant was reinstated in good favor with the military. Although Murrow did not directly attack McCarthy, this evidently successful telecast was the first real investigation of civil rights violations in response to reckless anti-Communist sentiment and rising, often unsubstantiated accusations from McCarthy and his followers.

One month after the Radulovich episode, Murrow and Friendly aired the second telecast piece called "An Argument in Indianapolis", covering the cancellation of a meeting to establish a chapter of the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU, protector of American civil rights) due to its "controversial" nature[117]. Rosteck notes that the second broadcast, "An Argument in Indianapolis," was an examination into "the suspicion and fear attendant on anything 'controversial'. "[118] Vaughn said this of the first two *See It Now* telecasts: "Neither the Radulovich nor Indianapolis stories mentioned McCarthy's name, but Murrow's message was clear: The excesses of McCarthyism were stripping individuals of their rights as American citizens."[119] The months following this episode gave rise to both an increase in criticism from McCarthyof a variety of issues within the field of broadcast news, as well as controversial events involving the senator's public accusations against a decorated military official. Also in the coming months, CBS' Friendly and Murrow were planning an attack on McCarthy. They approached the McCarthy program cautiously, choosing to use McCarthy's own words as the focus of the content and waiting for the optimal

---

[117]Rosteck. *See It Now.* 87
[118]Rosteck. *See It Now.* 23.
[119]Vaughn. *Encyclopedia.* 315.

42

time to air it.[120]

Four months after this broadcast on March 9, 1954, the third and one of the most

controversial telecasts aired, titled "A Report on Senator McCarthy." Murrow opens the

episode saying:

> Good evening. Tonight *See It Now* devotes its entire half hour to a report
> on Senator Joseph R. McCarthy told mainly in his own words and
> pictures… Because a report on Senator McCarthy is by definition
> controversial… If the Senator feels that we have done violence to his
> words or pictures—and desires, so to speak, to answer for himself—an
> opportunity will be afforded him on this program.[121]

The bulk of the program is then revealed, with clips of McCarthy on the offense, in

trials, public statements, and other recorded instances. The screen alternately pans back

to Murrow, who reads from a script the blatant contradictions in McCarthy's statements

over time and correcting facts that the senator got wrong. Although the title of the

episode and Murrow's opening statements speak of objectivity, the segment itself is

clearly biased against McCarthy. Murrow famously concludes:

> The actions of the junior Senator from Wisconsin have caused alarm and
> dismay amongst our allies abroad, and given considerable comfort to our
> enemies. And whose fault is that? Not really his. He didn't create this
> situation of fear; he merely exploited it—and rather successfully. Cassius
> was right. 'The fault, dear Brutus, is not in our stars, but in ourselves.
> Good night, and good luck.[122]

Acknowledging the extremely controversial nature of the broadcast, this

particular segment was not advertised by CBS, and in fact, like the previous Radulovich

segment, Murrow and Friendly pooled their personal funds to advertise it. The episode

wasn't aired by many affiliates, broadcasted in a total 36 cities with just 9.2 percent of

---

[120]Vaughn. *Encyclopedia.* 315.
[121]Rosteck. *See It Now.* 112.
[122]Vaughn. *Encyclopedia.* 316.

all Americans with TV receivers watching.[123] The response, however, was as overwhelming as it was unprecedented. With 2.4 million people watching, a majority of responses were in Murrow's favor.[124] According to Rosteck's research:

> CBS received more than 12,000 telephone calls in the twenty-four hours after the broadcast, and those praising the telecast outnumbered those who were critical by fifteen to one. At CBS affiliates across the country the ratio was much the same. Over 3,200 complimentary telegrams arrived, along with fewer than 250 negative responses.[125]

See It Now continued to reveal to audiences gaping holes in McCarthy's accusations and logic and the Senator's response was to accuse Murrow of being a Communist sympathizer and leader of the "jackal pack which is always found at the throat of anyone who dares to expose individual Communists and traitor." McCarthy's rebuttal was largely unfavorable and did more damage to his public appearance, especially during a tense time in which McCarthy was still dealing with the repercussions of his accusations of an army general. As a result of the negative publicity accrued by televised hearings in which McCarthy argued against decorated army officials, in tandem with the negative light cast upon him by the *See It Now* fiasco, he ultimately lost favor with the American public and was censured by the Senate in December 1954.

Despite the popularity and obvious success of Murrow and Friendly's attack on Senator McCarthy, tensions behind the scenes of CBS led to *See It Now* being cut down, marginalized, and ultimately cancelled in 1958.[126] The decline of Murrow's favor within CBS largely had to do with the station's relationships with sponsors and the commercialized direction network television was headed. The text paired with an

---

[123]Rosteck. *See It Now.* 133.
[124]Vaughn. *Encyclopedia.* 315.
[125]Rosteck. *See It Now.* 134.
[126]Vaughn. *Encyclopedia.* 316.

archival collection from Tufts University notes that "Over time, the broadcasting industry increasingly passed over news and education broadcasts in favor of more lucrative entertainment programs."[127] Murrow, an adamant critic of the role advertisers played in the successes or failures of TV and radio shows, often wouldn't allow commercials or sponsor announcements to interrupt his programming. The sponsor of *See It Now*'s "A Report on Senator McCarthy," an aluminum producer named ALCOA, refused to fund the costs of the awaited reply from Senator McCarthy and eventually cancelled its sponsorship as a result of the increasingly controversial specials for which Murrow became famous. Thus, the award-winning *See It Now* was cancelled and Murrow cast out of favor with CBS due to the demands of its corporate sponsors and internal conflict.

E. National narrative within the marketplace of ideas

According to the website ***uscivilliberties.org***, the marketplace of ideas is defined as: "…the notion that, with minimal government intervention—a laissez faire approach to the regulation of speech and expression—ideas, theories, propositions, and movements will succeed or fail on their own merits."[128]

In the U.S., the concept of the marketplace of ideas has become a crucial factor in keeping the government in check and keeping democracy alive and well over the years. One of the greatest historical threats to the success of the marketplace of ideas has been *threat inflation*, a process that occurred during the early Cold War and beyond as

---

[127] Belovari, Susanne. "Murrow at CBS, USA." Murrow at CBS, USA. June 24, 2010. http://dca.lib.tufts.edu/features/murrow/exhibit/cbsusa2.html.
[128] Pinaire, Brian K. "Marketplace of Ideas Theory." Civil Liberties. June 26, 2014. http://uscivilliberties.org/themes/4099-marketplace-of-ideas-theory.html.

evidenced by the words and actions of primary participants of the era, from politicians and press alike.

In the introduction of *American Foreign Policy and the Politics of Fear: Threat Inflation Since 9/11,* editors Jane K. Cramer and Trevor Thrall define threat inflation as: "the attempt by elites to create concern for a threat that goes beyond the scope and urgency that a disinterested analysis would justify," with the added caveat that, "Many scholars, including several in this volume, do not find this definition a perfect one to describe the process."[129] There are four primary explanations for threat inflations recognized by scholars and noted in the collection. A brief understanding of these four will allow us to better analyze how the national manichean narrative of "us versus them" functioned, both successfully and as a failure, in the American marketplace of ideas during the early Cold War.

The first of these, as set forth by Cramer and Thrall on pages 3-4 of the introduction, is a *realist explanation,* and can be summed up as a situation in which "…what appears to be "threat inflation" is really the result of leaders attempting to cope with uncertainty. For realists, overestimations of threats are the inevitable, regular consequence of insufficient intelligence and the opacity of other states' intentions."[130] The second is a *psychological explanation,* which asserts that threat inflation *"*begins with the observation that people often interpret facts in ways that support their expectations and in ways that support plausible arguments about potential threats even

---

[129]Thrall, A. Trevor, and Jane K. Cramer. *American Foreign Policy and the Politics of Fear: Threat Inflation since 9/11*. London: Routledge, 2009. 1.
[130]Thrall and Cramer. *American Foreign Policy and the Politics of Fear.* 4.

when the facts do not warrant such conclusions."[131] The third is a *domestic political explanation,* asserting that threat inflation results either as the "sincere efforts to act in the public interest or manipulative strategies to gain political advantage, increase institutional budgets, or to advance other goals kept hidden from the public and political opposition."[132] This explanation also deals heavily with the media's role in contributing to the rise of public fear and exacerbating threat inflation domestically. The fourth and final theory is the *constructivist explanation,* which can be summarized as "threats are what we make of them…national and cultural identities, norms, and myths will heavily color threat perceptions and the success of elite threat inflation efforts."[133] It seems as though in discussing threat inflation during the Cold War, aspects of all four of these theories play a role. The next section, however, will focus on the *constructivist explanation,* as it is also a unique "take on the standard domestic political understanding of the role of the marketplace of ideas in the threat inflation process,"[134] along with an examination of the media's role in threat inflation during the early years of the Cold War. I assert that the constructivist perspective that "symbolic politics and framing efforts based on world-views and values" are critical to the development of public opinion,[135] coupled with a definite lack of credible and alternate factual news sources domestically during the early Cold War prevented effective discussion in the marketplace of ideas. What little credible opposition that was present in the news,

---

[131]Thrall and Cramer. *American Foreign Policy and the Politics of Fear.* 5.
[132]Thrall and Cramer. *American Foreign Policy and the Politics of Fear.* 6.
[133]Thrall and Cramer. *American Foreign Policy and the Politics of Fear.* 10.
[134]Thrall and Cramer. *American Foreign Policy and the Politics of Fear.*10.
[135]Thrall and Cramer. *American Foreign Policy and the Politics of Fear.*10.

specifically evidenced by the example of *See It Now,* failed because of the capitalist economic structure to which influential media outlets were and are bound.

i. Constructivist Explanations and Myths of Empire

According to Cramer and Thrall, a constructivist view asserts that the general public is "most responsive to threat inflation efforts when leaders use rhetoric that highlights cultural and national differences."[136] These types of "social-psychological arguments"[137] often will ring most true amongst everyday people because it plays upon some of the strongest facets of American identity, such as the emphasis of individualism and freedom during the Cold War in the face of a Soviet-Communist ideology of collectivism and a totalitarian regime. The persistence of language which highlights such cultural and national differences is ever-present in the rhetoric and arguments printed in daily newspaper articles, in radio programming, and in TV broadcasts—as evidenced in the previous sections of Part II. The origins of this rhetoric is chronologically clear: in the major speeches and language used by leaders at the highest levels of government.

Part of this rhetoric holds roots in a series of myths of empires that persisted in the beliefs of elites and thus persisted in the beliefs of the general public. Primarily, the strongly-held American beliefs in manifest destiny, the domino theory, big stick diplomacy, and offensive advantage significantly affected the rhetoric of these leaders and were pervasive in the media. Although many scholars maintain that in hindsight these beliefs are and were false, it is still important not to discredit their weight for

---

[136]Thrall and Cramer. *American Foreign Policy and the Politics of Fear.*10.
[137]Thrall and Cramer. *American Foreign Policy and the Politics of Fear.*10.

decision-makers at the time.[138] Although presently scholars and politicians alike can see

the improbability of the domino theory, for example, our current faults with the theory

should not get in the way of our knowledge that this belief of many politicians held

strong influences over decision-making during the Cold War.[139] As a result, according

to Robert Jervis:

> During the Cold War, members of the political and economic elite who
> incorrectly said that the establishment of revolutionary regimes
> anywhere in the world would menace American security interests were
> not lying. Rather, the knowledge that such regimes would adversely
> affect their economic interests led them to believe that American national
> security was at stake as well.[140]

This is one example of a sincere belief in the importance of the American economic

framework aimed at protecting the common good, but nonetheless driven by personal

interest. Although it may be incorrect, it's these types of beliefs and their context that

ultimately led to President Truman, McCarthy, and other key politicians to believe that

the Communist threat they faced was in fact a conflict of epic manichean proportion not

to be taken lightly. Furthermore, in a process which Stephen Van Evera calls

"blowback," "the myths of empire may become ingrained in the psyche of the people

and the institutions of their state."[141] All of the aforementioned myths of empire— big

stick diplomacy, the domino theory, etc.— were all theories predating the Cold War,

and yet they continued to play a significant role in shaping the decision of policy

makers at the time. Thus, Van Evera's theory appears to hold true regarding key beliefs

which influenced leading public figures during the early Cold War, yet which now

---

[138]Thrall and Cramer. *American Foreign Policy and the Politics of Fear.*20.
[139]Thrall and Cramer. *American Foreign Policy and the Politics of Fear.*18.
[140]Thrall and Cramer. *American Foreign Policy and the Politics of Fear.* 29.
[141]Thrall and Cramer. American Foreign Policy and the Politics of Fear. 51.

appear misguided and false.

ii. Militarized Patriotism and Self-Censorship

Two other key ideas crucial to understanding how the national narrative of a manichean conflict between Communist and democratic ideologies functioned in the early Cold War are the concept of "militarized patriotism" and resulting self-censorship by the press. Professor Jane Cramer argues, similar to some of the arguments in this thesis, that:

> …the rise of militarism during the Cold War, caused by perceived large external threats and the growth of a very large military industrial complex, led to the distorting of "ordinary patriotism" into "militarized patriotism" where citizens or leaders who questioned or opposed maintaining strong military forces or questioned or opposed reflexively using military force to defend or promote national interests were labeled as "unpatriotic." Hence, "militarized patriotism" is the causal mechanism through which a militarized political culture is manifested and affects behavior in the marketplace of ideas.[142]

As a result, politicians and news media outlets "were constrained in their individual behavior by cultural norms of behavior." Fears of being publicly deemed "unpatriotic" resulted in both politicians and the press self-censoring themselves in order to not be seen as "weak" or unpatriotic in a time of national crisis.[143] In Vaughn's *Encyclopedia of American Journalism,* in his section on censorship, he notes that the U.S. has a history of relatively free press as compared to other countries. However, mainstream American press, again viewed comparatively, reflects less diversity of coverage and interpretation than that of its largest, most powerful democratic peers.[144] Lack of diverse coverage in the U.S., stemming as far back as radio programming, is largely a

---

[142]Thrall and Cramer. *American Foreign Policy and the Politics of Fear.*147.
[143]Thrall and Cramer. *American Foreign Policy and the Politics of Fear.*147.
[144]Vaughn. *Encyclopedia.* 87.

result of a combination of financial aspects. In particular, large newspapers, radio and TV broadcast stations, and other dominant news outlets are owned by the affluent and elite. As evidenced by the situation in which CBS found itself due to the controversial nature of *See It Now*'s content, these wealthy owners, whose focus is on increasing ratings and profits, would rather not challenge the status quo—even if keeping the status quo comes at the expense of a well-informed public. We can see the public benefits of programs broadcasting verifiable argumentative content which challenges popular norms, as can be seen by McCarthy's ultimate downfall following Murrow and Friendly's report. However, the failure of *See It Now* and the lack of similar programming during the early years of the Cold War reflect the success of financial prosperity and the largely failed marketplace of ideas as a result of a media industry increasingly focused on profits over informing the public. As the second half of this thesis will show, the persistence of both manichean rhetoric in framing threats and failure in the marketplace of ideas, specifically in media institutions, is still a hugely important issue facing American government and the public today.

Chapter 2: Post-9/11 and the Age of Terrorism

I. The 9/11 Attacks

A. Historical Context

i. Origins of the term and a brief history of Islamic terrorism in the 1990s

The word "terrorism" was born of the 18th century French Revolution's "Reign of Terror." Initially, the term meant state-sponsored acts of violence meant to squash opposition.[145] In a 1999 30-year retrospective FBI publication exploring counter-terrorism threat assessments, one of the first pages defines terrorism:

> Terrorism is defined in the Code of Federal Regulations as "...the unlawful use of force and violence against persons or property to intimidate or coerce a government, the civilian population, or any segment thereof, in furtherance of political or social objectives." (28 C.F.R.Section 0.85)[146]

Since its inception during the French Revolution, terrorism has most commonly been linked to political aims.[147] For example, one of the most well-known acts of terror in the 20th century was the assassination of Austro-Hungarian Archduke Ferdinand by a Serbian nationalist, an act which triggered WWI.[148]

In a 1998 *New York Times* article called "Terrorism's New (and Very Old) Face; It's Not the Kind of War the West Fights Well," author Stephen Engelberg analyzes the

---

[145]"What Is Terrorism?" Supercourse. Accessed March 20, 2015. www.pitt.edu/~super7/6011-7001/6651.ppt.

[146]*Terrorism in the United States 1999.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Dept. of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation, 1999. Accessed February 5, 2015. http://www.fbi.gov/stats-services/publications/terror_99.pdf

[147]"What Is Terrorism?"

[148]Engelberg, Stephen. "Terrorism's New (and Very Old) Face; It's Not the Kind of War the West Fights Well." The New York Times. September 11, 1998. Accessed May 10, 2015. http://www.nytimes.com/1998/09/12/arts/terrorism-s-new-and-very-old-face-it-s-not-the-kind-of-war-the-west-fights-well.html.

differences between past terrorist threats to the U.S. as compared to the then-recent

threats sponsored by Osama bin Laden. According to Engelberg, past terrorist activity

could be directly linked to tangible political gains. For example, the Serb assassin in

1914 was aligned with Bosnian Serbs, who "wanted to escape Austro-Hungarian rule

and join Serbia," or Irish attacks sought freedom from British rule in the late 20th

century.[149] According to Walter Laqueur, historian and author of the 1987 book "The

Age of Terrorism,'' Osama bin Laden, his followers and other terrorist groups within

the past 25 years are motivated by something other than politics. He says "If you look at

books written about terrorism 25 years ago, religion doesn't appear. Statistics today

show that more than half of terrorist activities are committed for religious or pseudo-

religious reasons.''[150] Although this statement makes it seems as though this type of

terrorist motivation was recent to the 1990s, he cites professor and political analyst

Bruce Hoffman who indicates that bin Laden and his contemporaries are actually

aligned with the earliest forms of terrorism, "when religion was the main justification

for what another scholar has termed "holy terror.'"[151]

During the years leading up to the 9/11 attacks, one of the biggest issues that the

U.S. had with Al Qaeda and its aims were its abstractness. Engelberg wrote, "Experts

say it is part of a significant trend in which terrorist groups espouse millennial or

religious ideologies that transcend politics or national borders."[152] These vague

geographic parameters can be seen through the multiplicity of locations in which attacks

---

[149]Engelberg, "Terrorism's New (and Very Old) Face." 1.
[150]Engelberg, "Terrorism's New (and Very Old) Face." 1.
[151]Engelberg, "Terrorism's New (and Very Old) Face." 1.
[152]Engelberg, "Terrorism's New (and Very Old) Face." 1.

by Al Qaeda occurred throughout the 1990's. In 1992 the first documented act of Al

Qaeda against the U.S. occurred against American troops in Somalia. Throughout the

rest of the 1990s terrorist-led espionage and attacks against the U.S. continued to occur

in New York, the Philippines, and other locations. According to the *New York Times*

article, these attacks occurred "without state sponsors and specific goals." The extreme

vagueness and broad geopolitical parameters of such terrorist groups created a situation

in which the U.S. initiated a series of attacks over different time periods and within

different areas of the world, adding to the general mayhem already caused by the

lawlessness of groups like Al Qaeda. Then, in August of 1996, Osama bin Laden

declared holy war against the U.S. in a document called: *"Message from Osama bin*

Laden to His Muslim Brothers in the Whole World and Especially the Arab Peninsula:

Declaration of Jihad Against the Americans Occupying the Land of the Two Holy

Mosques."[153]

ii. Rhetorical background

In addition to the history of the actual terrorist attacks on various U.S. entities

both abroad and domestically, it is important to note the origins of the rhetoric used to

describe such circumstances leading up to G.W. Bush the younger's official declaration

of a national "War on Terror" narrative. For one, the president has immense influence

over the media to deliver his own rhetoric and agenda to the American public. He has

the administration and coordinated efforts of staff to deliver messages while opponents

don't have this organizational advantage. Thus, the language used by a President in

press releases and policy speeches are often directly quoted and widely disseminated.

---

[153]Engelberg, "Terrorism's New (and Very Old) Face." 2.

In reference to the theories of threat inflation discussed in part 1, persisting beliefs in certain myths of empire came into play in regards to the strategies and rhetoric used by leading American politicians in the decades before the 9/11 terrorist attacks. One of the most interesting facets of American policymakers during the latter half of the 20th century was the proliferation of the metaphor of "war" used to describe policy initiatives. Whether it was the "War on Aids," the "War on Drugs," or the "War on Crime," the metaphor was used as a vehicle by which to motivate public participation in a variety of efforts in times of general peace. Defense spending mirrored this militarized language and despite the absence of a Soviet threat, "…throughout the 1990s, even before Osama bin Laden declared his jihad against America, U.S. defense spending remained at Cold War levels…"[154] In his novel *In the Shadow of War: The United States Since the 1930s,* author Michael S. Sherry points out: "That it [the war metaphor] stuck revealed how political culture remained militarized even as war itself seemed to recede."[155] The manichean nature of this American war metaphor and rhetoric persisted, even in times of peace. The use of this metaphor, Sherry says:

> …presumed that Americans found purpose only in war, that their state functioned effectively only in a warlike mode, and that the nation knew triumph only in warfare…But if there was something good about war, why should Americans settle for a substitute—why not the real thing, which would mobilize and rejuvenate Americans even more? That was the implicit logic of the war metaphor, one that worked powerfully because it was unspoken.[156]

As the theory of threat inflation, under the title *domestic political explanation,* asserts, initiating the 1991 Gulf War was potentially a reaction from former President Bush Sr.,

---

[154]Bacevich, Andrew J. *The New American Militarism: How Americans Are Seduced by War.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2005. 86.

[155]Sherry, Michael S. *In the Shadow of War: The United States since the 1930's.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995. 461.

[156]Sherry, *In the Shadow of War.* 461-462.

both in response to growing conflict in the Middle East, as well as the hope that a successful war "would guarantee his reelection."[157] Whatever the real motives, the United States entered into war following Iraq's invasion of Kuwait in 1990. Former President Bush Sr.'s response to this threat is especially important in contextualizing the development of manichean rhetoric used to frame future conflicts with terrorist groups and the Middle East. After Hussein's aggression, Bush Sr. received immense support from allies abroad in forming a coalition against Iraq. Following in the path of the Cold War politicians before him, Bush Sr. said this after the Gulf Crisis began "I would not call [the United States] the world's policeman…But we have a disproportionate responsibility for the freedom and the security of various countries."[158] This statement is distinctly reminiscent of the "manifest destiny" myth of empire, one of the main beliefs which shaped the international policies of the Cold War.

Furthermore, the former president asserted that the Iraqi threat in the early 1990s was synonymous to the threat of Hitler in the time of WWII. He used words like "blitzkreig" to describe Hussein's war tactics and even said that there had been no other threats "of this moral importance since World War II."[159] According to Sherry, "Bush's Hitler analogy was unpersuasive to many Americans," including members of his own administration.[160] Again, we see another American president using terminology mirroring the great dualistic conflict of WWII, an era which, in combination with language used during the Cold War, firmly established a precedent of manichean framing of conflict in the American psyche. This time however, the frame was used to

---

[157]Sherry, *In the Shadow of War.* 462.
[158]Sherry, *In the Shadow of War.* 463.
[159]Sherry, *In the Shadow of War.* 464.
[160]Sherry, *In the Shadow of War.* 465.

describe the threats and conflicts present in the Middle East with a distinctive binary, black-and-white morality.

With the support of 79 percent of the American public,[161] Congress granted Bush the right to enter into war. The United States headed an international coalition, initiating what was called "Operation Desert Storm." On paper, this retaliation successfully accomplished its aims, with the exception of Hussein's survival in power. From here on out, however, the U.S. would remain entangled in a series of Middle Eastern conflicts, declaring as a result a new policy of "containment." According to Andrew J. Bacevich's book, *The New American Militarism: How Americans Are Seduced By War,* "A contingent of approximately twenty-five thousand U.S. troops remained after Desert Storm as a Persian Gulf constabulary…"[162] As a result Bacevich says, "What U.S. policymakers called containment was really an open-ended quasi-war."[163] Thus, U.S. presence in the Middle East led to exactly what former President Bush said he did not see as America's international role—that of a policeman abroad.

After the apparent success of Operation Desert Storm, as noted by journalist and former White House Aide Sidney Blumenthal, "his [G.W.H. Bush] popularity rating hit ninety percent, the highest ever recorded for a President."[164] The general public was incredibly happy with the results, with one columnist saying U.S. troops "fought for the just and moral cause of freeing the enslaved, brutalized people of a helpless country." The *New York Times* too said, "It is as if all the confusion and pain of recent decades

[161]Newport, Frank, David W. Moore, and Jeffrey M. Jones. "Special Release: American Opinion on the War." Special Release: American Opinion on the War. Accessed April 28, 2015. http://www.gallup.com/poll/8068/special-release-american-opinion-war.aspx.
[162]Bacevich, *The New American Militarism.* 195.
[163]Bacevich, *The New American Militarism.* 195.
[164]Sherry, *In the Shadow of War,* 467.

have melted, leaving the nation with its reassuring images from World War II intact."[165] Again, the invocation of World War II and the general view that the U.S. had been a savior against totalitarian regimes was reinforced by its successes in the Middle East. This unification would prove only temporary, however, and the first Bush left office handing off a series of difficult situations abroad to the next President, Bill Clinton.

With Clinton in office, the containment policy established by G.W.H. Bush remained largely intact, and at times even more militant. Bacevich says that in fact during the last 2 years of Clinton's term, "the United States bombed Iraq on almost a daily basis, a campaign largely ignored by the media and thus aptly dubbed by one observer "Operation Desert Yawn.""[166] Throughout the next few years, Saddam Hussein and Iraq faced a series of investigations by the UN into claims of possessing nuclear weapons of mass destruction (WMD) and biological weapons. According to Chaim Kaufman, Hussein's post-war behavior reflected that he could be deterred, as evidenced he says by Hussein's acquiescence to the destruction of his nuclear weapons programs and his eventual halt of biological and chemical weapons programs. Kaufman says, "Iraq cooperated with intrusive inspections to a degree rarely seen in a country not militarily occupied."[167] Kaufman also asserts that:

> Although Hussein may still have been interested in acquiring nuclear weapons, evidence available both inside and outside the U.S. government throughout the mid-1990s…showed beyond a reasonable doubt that by 2002 Iraq had not had an active nuclear weapons program for more than a decade…[168]

---

[165]Sherry, *In the Shadow of War.* 472.
[166]Bacevich, *The New American Militarism.* 196.
[167]Thrall and Cramer, American Foreign Policy and the Politics of Fear. 101.
[168]Thrall and Cramer, American Foreign Policy and the Politics of Fear. 103.

Some historians dispute this, arguing that discoveries of biological weaponry and testimony from former members of Hussein's regime prove otherwise. However, mounting evidence points to the fact that indeed, Saddam Hussein was more deterrable than the administration and press led the general American public to believe, partly as a result of President G.W.H. Bush's own policies and rhetoric and their influence throughout the subsequent Clinton administration.

Terrorist attacks both on U.S. soil and abroad against American citizens and institutions, specifically in the Middle East, continued mostly at the hands of Osama bin Laden and his al Qaeda affiliates. U.S. responses to these various attacks were as vague as their origins often were. The spottiness of information available to the White House is mirrored in attempts to identify a coherent threat and resulting actions of the U.S.. During his term, Clinton referred to militant combatants as "the bin Laden network," and Bacevich remarks that another such term commonly used by the administration was the use of the "disembodied" term "terrorists."[169] The result was a war, continuing on from the earlier Operation Desert Storm, but yet a war in which the U.S. had no single target or consistent tactical approach. Ultimately, Bacevich says: "The various episodes constituting the war's major engagements remained inexplicable, unfathomable, and seemingly unrelated."[170] Thus, at the end of the decade, the vague threat of terrorism against the U.S. continued to loom in very real attacks on the U.S. and its peoples, but was often interchangeably linked to Saddam Hussein, Osama bin Laden, the country of Iraq and or the Middle East at large.

---

[169]Thrall and Cramer, American Foreign Policy and the Politics of Fear. 197.
[170]Thrall and Cramer, American Foreign Policy and the Politics of Fear. 197.

B. Catalyst: The 9/11 Attacks and Declaring the War on Terror

i. The 9/11 Attacks

September 11, 2001 is a day that will remain burned into the memory of the American people for decades to come. On that morning, 19 Islamic militants with associations to al Qaeda hijacked 4 planes in suicide missions aimed at high-profile targets in the U.S.. New York City watched helplessly as two of the airlines flew into the World Trade Center and soon after a third plane was flown into the Pentagon. The fourth was diverted from its path, crashing into a field in Pennsylvania and killing all 45 people on board.

These attacks, known by the date 9/11, were reportedly carried out in retaliation against U.S. military occupation of Middle Eastern states, participation in the earlier Persian Gulf War, and American support of Israel. More than 3,000 people died during the attacks— over 400 policemen, fireman, and thousands of innocent civilians.[171] Thousands of others were treated for injuries and many people still suffer from long-term health issues as a result of debris and toxic dust from the affected buildings. The attacks were reportedly financed by Osama bin Laden and the al Qaeda group, and the U.S.'s response to these threats would define the policy and practices of President George W. Bush and his administration over the next few years.

---

[171]History.com Staff. "9/11 Attacks." History.com. Accessed May 10, 2015. http://www.history.com/topics/9-11-attacks.

ii. Analysis of President Bush's Initial Address

In the evening following the devastating 9/11 attacks, President Bush addressed the nation at approximately 8:30 p.m. EST via TV broadcast.[172] His speech, which would set a precedent for politicians, journalists, and the public at large, used a rhetoric to describe the attacks in extreme, manichean terms. He begins by saying, "Today our fellow citizens, our way of life, our very freedom came under attack in a series of deliberate and deadly terrorist acts."[173] Similar to the speeches by Truman and Churchill analyzed in Part 1, the President asserts that American values, along with the targeted American people, are being threatened. He continues on to describe the attacks as "evil, despicable acts of terror."[174] He uses the term "evil" in fact four separate times throughout his short speech to describe the events, the last of which is a part a quote from Psalm 23, "The Lord is My Shepherd," which says: "Even though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I fear no evil, for You are with me." The invocation of God and the specific use of Christian values against the evil of the attacks once again frames the situation as a clear-cut, dualistic moral dilemma.

Furthermore, in explaining the reasons for the sudden strike Bush states: "America was targeted for attack because we are the brightest beacon for freedom and opportunity in the world. And no one will keep that light from shining."[175] The imagery of "brightest beacon" and "light" contrasts against the unspoken implication and

[172]"Fighting on Two Fronts: A Chronology." PBS. Accessed April 3, 2015. http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/campaign/etc/cron.html

[173]Peters, Gerhard, and John T. Woolley. "George W. Bush: Address to the Nation on the Terrorist Attacks." George W. Bush: Address to the Nation on the Terrorist Attacks. September 21, 2013. http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=58057..

[174]Gerhard and Woolley, "George W. Bush."

[175]Gerhard and Woolley, "George W. Bush."

archetypal framing of threats and "evil" as dark contrasting with the luminosity of all that is good. After setting up this manichean, black-and-white explanation of the events, halfway through the speech President Bush states the priorities of the state as he sees it:"Our first priority is to get help for those who have been injured, and to take every precaution to protect our citizens at home and around the world from further attacks." He later says:"America and our friends and allies join with all those who want peace and security in the world, and we stand together to win the war against terrorism."[176]

Besides the clear establishment of a narrative which frames the situation at hand in extreme manichean terms, there are a few aspects of this speech which make them worth noting. For one, although the attacks occurred domestically, the President includes protection for those abroad next to the number one priority of protecting U.S. citizens in his list of priorities following the events. In light of the fact that Islamic militants made the attacks—outsiders seeking gains for their own aims abroad—it appears hypocritical that the response from Bush would list protecting non-Americans abroad from similar attacks.,attacks which reportedly were in retaliation for U.S. intervention abroad. Furthermore, by framing the 9/11 attacks in the context of the bigger picture of international peace and security, President Bush turns the conflict into something much more widespread than the reality. This reality, which already sent the nation into crisis-mode, contributed to the establishment of a national narrative in which the U.S. was cast as the blameless hero defending the world against evils. Bush's framing of the conflict, with its characteristics of threat inflation and rhetoric, are all uncannily similar to the language and aims of Cold War politicians seeking to mobilize

---

[176]Gerhard and Woolley, "George W. Bush."

the general public into militant conflict by playing up the fears surrounding a single incident, turning it into a manichean battle in which violence is wholly inevitable. For example, the Tonkin Gulf incident that propelled us into the war in Vietnam. Thus, by interpreting the 9/11 attacks as an event which forced the U.S. to respond to violence with violence against an irreconcilable, evil enemy, President Bush successfully set the stage for future conflict by interpreting a very complex, devastating event into a neat us-versus-them framework which would support later offensive initiatives abroad.

iii.   *Declaring the War on Terror*

On September 14th, a mere 3 days after the attacks, Congress authorized President Bush to ""to use all necessary and appropriate force" against the perpetrators of the Sept. 11 attacks, their sponsors, and those who protected them."[177] The resolution passed with overwhelming majorities of 98-0 in the Senate and 420-1 in the House. Then, on September 20th, President Bush affirmed the "War on Terror" and its narrative frame through a speech to a joint session of Congress and the entire U.S. in which he outlined his war aims. His speech, which he compares to a State-of-the-Union address despite the unusual timing, is organized in such a deliberate-seeming way that even a *Time* magazine article published just after it was given called it: 'The Bush Speech: How to Rally a Nation." In this article, author Frank Pelligrini breaks the speech down into 5 main organizational categories based on a list of semi-rhetorical questions Bush himself poses at various points throughout the speech: "Step One: Explain it all….Two: Distinguish, for the sake of not only peace at home but diplomacy abroad, between the faith and the men….Three: Get down to brass tacks….Four: Give

---

[177]PBS, "Fighting on Two Fronts."

63

the marching orders….Five: Rise to the occasion."[178] Following in the footsteps of this article and the framework laid out by Pelligrini, this next section will describe elements of Bush's argument for a "War on Terror" and how it contributed to the establishment of a continuing manichean narrative and the mobilization of a nation.

The first step, according to Pelligrini, is: "Explain it all," leading with the quote, "Americans are asking, "Who attacked our country?"[179] Bush begins immediately by invoking the will of the American public. He says: "…in the normal course of events, presidents come to this chamber to report on the state of the union. Tonight, no such report is needed; it has already been delivered by the American people."[180] By speaking for the public at large Bush successfully creates a foundation sanctioned, as he says, by his constituents, for the rest of his intentions in response to the attacks. Indeed, polls taken immediately after the attacks asking the American public about their views on launching into war were as "high as 74 percent supporting this in November" of 2001.[181]

Another successful tactic is rather than casting the U.S. as the aggressor initiating a war, he declares, "On September the 11th, enemies of freedom committed an act of war against our country. Americans have known wars, but for the past 136 years they have been wars on foreign soil, except for one Sunday in 1941…" He reinforces the immediacy of the situation by restating the fact that the attacks occurred on American soil and by likening the attack to Pearl Harbor, he establishes a connection

---

[178]Pellegrini, Frank. "The Bush Speech: How to Rally a Nation." Time. September 21, 2001. Accessed May 10, 2015. http://content.time.com/time/nation/article/0,8599,175757,00.html.
[179]"Text: President Bush Addresses the Nation." Washington Post. 2001. http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/nation/specials/attacked/transcripts/bushaddress_092001.html
[180]Pellegrini, "The Bush Speech."
[181]Thrall and Cramer, American Foreign Policy and the Politics of Fear. 105.

between the two. Notably, he links 9/11 to the single event which mobilized public sentiment and ultimately pushed the U.S. into the war. In referring to Pearl Harbor he frames it as a precedent for sending the U.S. into war, an event similar to the catalyst of the recent 9/11 events. By connecting the two events Bush further sets the stage for the launching of a defensive, preventive war based on past events and the urgency of the situation.

Next, Bush is able to establish a more tangible identity for the "collection of loosely affiliated terrorist organizations known as al Qaeda." He connects them with past terrorist attacks and substantiates the threat of the organization further by analogizing al Qaeda to the Mafia—again creating a familiar connection in the minds of Americans. In this way he is able to establish a coherent threat out of a very inconsistent enemy. As Pelligrini says:

> Then he set about replacing a shadowy, stateless organization with something Americans are more used to dealing with: the villainous leadership of a country, a leadership we can despise, a Milosevic, a Saddam. Someone we can threaten — and if necessary, punish — before frustration sets in.[182]

After establishing a tangible threat linked with historically familiar enemies, Bush then defines them in even more concrete terms. as Afghanistan and the Taliban. He says, "These demands are not open to negotiation or discussion. They will hand over the terrorists, or they will share in their fate."[183] By naming the Taliban and Afghanistan as the ones responsible for responding to the 9/11 attacks, Bush effectively identifies them as the enemies.

---

[182]Pellegrini, "The Bush Speech."
[183]Pellegrini, "The Bush Speech."

The second step, according to Pelligrini, is to "Distinguish, for the sake of not only peace at home but diplomacy abroad, between the faith and the men."[184] Like his initial 9/11 address, Bush seeks to outline the conflict as a broader, manichean issue between good and evil worldwide rather than stick to the particulars. He appeals to Muslims by saying that these extremists are perverting "the peaceful teachings of Islam," in a brief appeal to dissuade prejudices at home from flaring up against Muslim U.S. citizens and a nod to allies abroad.

Interestingly enough, he once again states the incoherency of the terrorist threat by reminding us of bin Laden's links to organizations in over 60 countries. He declares: "It will not end until every terrorist group of global reach has been found, stopped and defeated." The vagueness and unrealistic extent of this statement cannot be overlooked. Then, Bush puts the terrorist threat in a historical framework, comparing it to Nazism and totalitarian regimes of the past. He puts this conflict in the perspective of the evil despots who ran these regimes. He also likens them to the historical wars that were won over long periods of time—once again setting the foundations for a war that, like the familiar ones of the past, won't be won easily.

The third step Pellegrini writes is "Get down to brass tacks," leading with the question: "'How will we fight and win this war?'"[185]Again, the hypocritical elements appear in the speech as Bush describes the government tools that will be used to defeat the terrorist threat: "every means of diplomacy, every tool of intelligence, every instrument of law enforcement, every financial influence, and every necessary weapon of war." Using "diplomacy" on the same playing field as "every necessary weapon of

---

[184]Pellegrini, "The Bush Speech."
[185]The Washington Post, "Text: President Bush Addresses the Nation."

war" is counterintuitive. Rather than exhaust peaceful means of negotiation, Bush's speech goes immediately to the extreme of fighting violence with violence, making the first part of his statement seem like a pretense. He continues to warn the American people of the consequences of this war, but in a way that does not ask or recommend, but rather in a way that tells the public of the inevitable loss of life, time, and financial investment:

> Now, this war will not be like the war against Iraq a decade ago, with a decisive liberation of territory and a swift conclusion. It will not look like the air war above Kosovo two years ago, where no ground troops were used and not a single American was lost in combat. Our response involves far more than instant retaliation and isolated strikes. Americans should not expect one battle, but a lengthy campaign unlike any other we have ever seen. It may include dramatic strikes visible on TV and covert operations secret even in success.

The above quotation, similar to his 9/11 address and other aspects of his speech, once again leaves no middle ground and no alternative to war. The ultimate illustration of this extreme dualistic frame is reflected in this statement: "Every nation in every region now has a decision to make: Either you are with us or you are with the terrorists." Bush then announces the creation of a cabinet-level position head of the Office of Homeland Security. This is, as Pelligrini puts it, "some concrete news, a visible, tangible step, a man we can turn to and Bush can delegate to."[186] This is one example of the tendencies of this speech to provide brief, seemingly concrete historical links and tangible responses to a vague and abstract threat.

Step four leads with Americans asking the question, "'What is expected of us?'"[187] His very first response is this: "I ask you to live your lives and hug your

---

[186]Pellegrini, "The Bush Speech."
[187]The Washington Post, "Text: President Bush Addresses the Nation."

children."[188] He then continues to give a variety of answers, most of which follow long

the lines of: live up to American values, pray for survivors and law enforcement, and

especially don't stop supporting the economy. His statements ask for patience and

comfort for those defending the nation as well as those most vulnerable. He

acknowledges the increased security measures that the nation will face as a result of the

attacks, giving tangible responses to these threats like: "We will come together to

improve air safety, dramatically expand the number of air marshals on domestic flights

and take new measures to prevent hijacking."[189] Still, many of these statements are

vague, especially when it comes to the war itself, simply calling for patience and

"Prayer," which Bush says "has comforted us in sorrow and will help strengthen us for

the journey ahead."[190] As Pelligrini says: "This is the call of the president beginning a

mysterious war. Be very, very patient."

　　　Pellegrini's final and fifth organizational step of this speech is Bush's call to

"Rise to the occasion."[191] Again, Bush lauds the role of America in this conflict saying:

"Great harm has been done to us. We have suffered great loss. And in our grief and

anger we have found our mission and our moment."[192] The magnitude of this proposed

"mission" is global, and again the US. is cast in terms of international policeman and

savior of freedom—protection from, as Bush stated earlier, the loosely-affiliated

terrorist threat. In so many instances at the close of this speech does Bush frame the

recent and ensuing conflicts in broad manichean terms. In one instance, he combines the

---

[188]The Washington Post, "Text: President Bush Addresses the Nation."
[189]The Washington Post, "Text: President Bush Addresses the Nation."
[190]The Washington Post, "Text: President Bush Addresses the Nation."
[191]Pellegrini, "The Bush Speech."
[192]The Washington Post, "Text: President Bush Addresses the Nation."

dualistic morality of the universal conflicts between good and evil, the conflict at hand, and Christian morality in one encompassing statement: "The course of this conflict is not known, yet its outcome is certain. Freedom and fear, justice and cruelty, have always been at war, and we know that God is not neutral between them." He then continues on to say, "Fellow citizens, we'll meet violence with patient justice, assured of the rightness of our cause and confident of the victories to come."[193] The irony of meeting "violence with patient justice" after this speech deliberately declares war on a variety of loosely linked threats and asserting that "Americans should not expect one battle, but a lengthy campaign unlike any other we have ever seen"[194] is an obvious contradiction. Furthermore, the invocation of "the rightness of our cause" reflects the myth of empire of manifest destiny, a myth which has strong ties to American individualism and has historically been a reasoning behind imperial expansion.

Altogether, although this was one of the earliest speeches advocating for a "War on Terror," the rhetoric used established the idea of preventive war as a crucial response to the 9/11 attacks. As written in Cramer and Thrall's *American Foreign Policy and the Politics of Fear: Threat Inflation Since 9/11:*

> Within days, Bush and his advisers consistently portrayed the attacks as the latest stage in a terrorist "war" on "America" and its "values." Deploying a series of binaries, they contrasted the goodness and virtue of America with the "evil" of her terrorist adversaries, the freedom that Americans prized with the despotism that her enemies represented, the victims' commitment to civilization with the "evildoer" perpetrators' barbarism. "Evil" could not be negotiated or reasoned with, violence had to be met with violence, and a "war on terror" was proclaimed.[195]

---

[193]The Washington Post, "Text: President Bush Addresses the Nation."
[194]The Washington Post, "Text: President Bush Addresses the Nation."
[195]Thrall and Cramer, American Foreign Policy and the Politics of Fear. 122.

The invocation of the will of the American people and the justness of their cause, the declaration of conflict in universal manichean terms "did not reflect a sober appreciation of the American predicament, but instead echoed point by point the disastrous strategic ideas of those earlier keepers of imperial order."[196] Those early imperial orders strongly resemble the justifications behind U.S. Cold War policy.

In no way does Bush admit to foreign policy faults for causing the attacks. In fact, "The United States was thus cast as a victim, blameless for the perpetrated outrage: the horrific attacks were not a response to its deeds and misdeeds abroad," and rather he 9/11 attacks were seen "as a backlash against globalization, as rooted in popular frustration with repressive government at home, and as a part of an intra-Arab and Muslim civil war."[197] As a result, this unexpected attack facing a newly won administration needed a perpetrator to whom justice would be served, and as a result "US elites unsurprisingly fell back on older tropes."[198] These tropes, rooted Cold War rhetoric, consist of ideas such as manifest destiny, offensive advantage, big stick diplomacy, and no trade-offs, all of which can seen in the aforementioned statements and rhetoric of Bush's address to Congress just over a week after the 9/11 attacks. Thus: "At the core of these contending accounts lay a common narrative element: "we" were attacked because of "who we are," not because of "what we have done."[199] The rhetoric established by the two speeches described in parts *ii* and *iii* would continue to be at the center of the developing "War on Terror" narrative and motivating the nation into war with Iraq.

---

[196]Thrall and Cramer, American Foreign Policy and the Politics of Fear. 41.
[197]Thrall and Cramer, American Foreign Policy and the Politics of Fear. 122.
[198]Thrall and Cramer, American Foreign Policy and the Politics of Fear. 121.
[199]Thrall and Cramer, American Foreign Policy and the Politics of Fear. 122.

II. Constructing the Narrative

A. Print Press immediately after 9/11

Immediately following the 9/11 attacks, news of the events inevitably exploded across print media. One of the most common attributes of these print stories were their similarities to if not exact quoting of the President's first national address. A *Huffington Post* article posted in the year 2011, almost exactly 10 years after the attacks, showcases 50 headlines the day after 9/11. The following is a list of just 16 of these headlines: *New York Daily News:*"It's War"*; New York Post:* "Act of War-World Trade Center Destroyed; many dead"*; New York Times:*"U.S. Attacked: Hijacked jets destroy twin towers and hit pentagon in day of terror"*; Washington Post:* "Terrorists Hijack 4 Airliners, Destroy World Trade Center, Hit Pentagon, Hundreds Dead"; *USA Today:* "'Act of War': Terrorists strike; death toll 'horrendous'"; *The Miami Herald:* "'Evil Acts': Bush vows revenge for attacks"; *Hartford Courant:*"Act of War: with chilling precision, terrorists deliver death as America watches helplessly"; *The Seattle Times:* "TERROR: Trade Center destroyed by hijacked jets"; *Richmond Times-Dispatch:*"America's Darkest Day"; *The Cleveland Plain Dealer & the Houston Chronicle:* "Terror Hits Home"; *The Syracuse Post-Standard: "*President Bush-'Mass Murder': Towers crumble, Pentagon burns, hunt begins; police report cell phone calls from rubble"; *Detroit Free Press:* "America's Darkest Day: Terrorists will be hunted down, Bush tells the nation"; *The Honolulu Advertiser:* "America's Bloodiest Day-'This is the second Pearl Harbor'"; *The Dallas Morning News:* War at home; *Albany*

Times Union: "Freedom under Siege"; *The Daily Telegraph:* "War on America."[200] A

majority of these headlines use direct quotes from President Bush—namely his

portrayal of the attacks as "evil" and an "act of war," specifically a "war on freedom."

Freedom, in this case, is synonymous with the United States of America..

Bush's declaration of evil was supported by the use of such phrases as "darkest

day," "bloodiest day," and "mass murder." Similar to Bush's September 20 address,

news outlets likened the attacks to Pearl Harbor, and reinforced the alarming sense of

fear and urgency with statements like "Terror Hits Home" and "War on America."

Newspaper's adoption of this rhetoric was reinforced by later Bush speeches declaring a

"War on Terror" and, as polls would show, reflected U.S. public opinion on the

necessary responses to the attacks.

One of the main differences between the 9/11 attacks and the Pearl Harbor

attacks, however, lie in the definition of the threats at hand. Although as in WWII

propagandist efforts the 9/11 conflict at large was also defined in terms of duty to

principles and manichean conflict, there was really a lack of a coherent threat in 2001.

Pearl Harbor ignited the U.S. entering into a war with major allies against the

aggressors of Japan, Germany, and other countries as a part of the Axis Powers. In this

declaration of war, the enemy was best described as "loosely affiliated" and scattered

across 60 different countries. Going forward, the establishment of a national narrative to

frame the War on Terror which could define a tangible and strategic course of action

became increasingly important to the Bush administration.

---

[200]Fung, Katherine. "9/11: Newspaper Front Pages From The Day After The Attacks (PHOTOS)." The Huffington Post. Accessed May 10, 2015. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/09/09/september-11-newspaper-front-pages_n_940867.html.

B. The White House shapes the national narrative

One of the key aspects of the years following 9/11 and leading up to the Iraq War is the transformation of the national "War on Terror" narrative from that of containment of terrorist factions to that of regime change in Iraq, and in particular, the evolution of the threat. Though the 'enemy' was framed initially as all terrorists affiliated with al Qaeda, training cells in Afghanistan, and bin Laden, this definition evolved over a short period of time. Through heavy campaigning the Bush administration shaped the aims of the War on Terror to identify Saddam Hussein and Iraq as targets necessary to declare war upon for a regime change, along with the still-present threat of al Qaeda and bin Laden.

Initially, there was widespread support for entering into war by both the American public and Congress. This support is illustrated by the almost unanimous passage of war by Congress and the November 2001 Gallup poll in which 74% of Americans supported the war. This swell of support for war was short-lived, however. Losing traction in public opinion polls, the Bush administration sought to slightly alter the established narrative. In order to perpetuate the "War on Terror" narrative and motivate public approval of a continued war in the Middle East, the Bush administration would need to shape its underlying narrative to provide effective reasoning for war, despite sketchy evidence and behind-the-scenes doubts.

One of the most significant successes of the millennial Bush Administration in swaying public opinion for war was the creation of a direct link between the country of Iraq and Al Qaeda. Even though today's evidence continues in hindsight to cast doubt on Hussein's relationship with al Qaeda and bin Laden, establishing this connection in

the minds of the American people was key to getting the public support necessary to continue into war in the early 2000s. As early as Bush Sr.'s administration, the use of phrases like the "Iraqi regime" invoked an association with "evil."[201] Consistent use of the term 'democratic' in reference to the U.S. and 'totalitarian' in reference to Iraq created a dualistic frame for each government, similar to past descriptions of the Soviet "regime" in contrast with American "democracy." Since Bush Sr.'s analogy of Hussein and his regime in Iraq to Hitler's Third Reich in 1991, this view persisted. Citizen polls[202] and statements even by Clinton administration officials continued to uphold this view. This persisting frame reinforcing the role of terrorist leader and evil dictator Hussein would come to play in Bush's millennial campaign for war in Iraq. The G.W. Bush administrations often emphasized links between Saddam Hussein and Osama bin Laden despite a lack of evidence, reasoning that "their [Hussein and bin Laden's] organizations reflected their leaders' political programs and personal pathologies, in contrast to democracies in which law, not personal whim, ruled."[203] Because acts of terrorism, like the 9/11 attacks, eschew the logic of state and even international laws which seek to regulate global conflicts, targeted states like the U.S. "consequently respond by asserting anew their territorial identity, reimposing a geopolitics of identity and difference, and emphasizing the primacy of territorial defense." Thus, in response to both terrorist attacks and declining public support for war, the Bush administration shifted the frame of conflict using the already manichean rhetoric historically rooted in the minds of everyday Americans and linked to Saddam Hussein's regime.

---

[201]Thrall and Cramer, American Foreign Policy and the Politics of Fear. 10.
[202]Thrall and Cramer, American Foreign Policy and the Politics of Fear. 125.
[203]Thrall and Cramer, American Foreign Policy and the Politics of Fear. 124.

After the November 2001 polls, public opinion in favor of war declined "to about 50 percent in August 2002…"[204] The turning point in this decline coincides with the Bush administration's campaign to remove Saddam Hussein by force, with public support reaching 66 percent in March 2003. Between June 2002 and August 2002, the percent of Americans "favoring invasion even without UN sanction or allied cooperation" rose 25 percent, reaching a high of a total of 55 percent of Americans in favor in March of 2003.[205] According to Cramer and Thrall, this evolution matched "the evolution of the administration's public positions."[206] An interesting aspect of these polls was how they themselves framed questions regarding the war in the post-9/11 period. "Public opinion surveys over the coming years questioned not whether the United States should engage in a War on Terror, but rather how that war might be most effectively waged."[207] As a result, as political scientist Dr. Ian Lustick concludes, "The War on Terror has thus achieved the status of a background narrative.'"[208]

C. Broadcast Media picks up the narrative

i. Broadcast and the administration

It is well known that the media aids in disseminating policy agendas of the elite. News outlets report on public policy proposals, political campaign platforms, White House announcements, and a variety of other topics related to the agendas of various

---

[204]Thrall and Cramer, American Foreign Policy and the Politics of Fear. 122.
[205]Thrall and Cramer, American Foreign Policy and the Politics of Fear. 124.
[206]Thrall and Cramer, American Foreign Policy and the Politics of Fear. 122.
[207] Put this info in a footnote: On page 122 of Cramer and Thrall's collection, it is asserted that:
[208]Thrall and Cramer, American Foreign Policy and the Politics of Fear. 122.

politicians. One of the most important aspects of the relationship between press

discussion and policy agenda lies in the very nature of hard news gathering. As Nelson,

Clawson, and Oxley say: "Journalists' common reliance on elite sources for quotes,

insight, analysis, and information means that the media often serve as conduits for

individuals eager to promote a certain perspective to a broader public audience."[209]

Thus, the use of direct quotations, which oftentimes can themselves be analyses of

certain topics by political elites, leads to media usage of specific rhetoric surrounding a

subject. Furthermore, according to an article in the *Stanford Journal of International*

Relations, during the Iraq war: "86 percent of viewers received their news about war

from television and more specifically, 70 percent from cable television."[210] Based on

the nature of the medium, quotes in various forms including sound bites and video clips,

are broadcast, making it an effective public policy tool. The next few paragraphs detail

the transformation of the Bush administration's campaign to frame the War on Iraq

from a policy of containment to that of regime change, and describe especially how this

campaign evolution was picked up by broadcast TV news.

     Before 2002, U.S. policy towards Iraqi aggression was that of containment.

Condoleezza Rice believed that Hussein and Iraq could be contained, as she said in the

2000 presidential campaign:"the first line of defense should be a clear and classical

statement of deterrence—if they [Iraq] do acquire WMD, their weapons will be

---

[209]Nelson, Thomas E., Rosalee A. Clawson, and Zoe M. Oxley. "Media Framing of a Civil Liberties Conflict and Its Effect on Tolerance." *The American Political Science Review* 91, no. 3 (1997): 568. doi:10.2307/2952075.
[210]Tuosto, Kylie. "The "Grunt Truth" of Embedded Journalism: The New Media/Military Relationship." *Stanford Journal Of International Relations* X, no. 1 (2008). https://web.stanford.edu/group/sjir/pdf/journalism_real_final_v2.pdf. 23.

unusable because any attempt to use them will bring national obliteration"[211] In 2001

Secretary of State Colin Powell also agreed that the containment policy would be

successful in Iraq.[212] In 2002, however, deterrence became impossible, according to the

Bush administration. That year, Bush declared a National Security Strategy (NSS)

which favored preventive war and preemptive strikes, saying: "Given the goals of rogue

states [and] the inability to deter a potential attacker" of this kind, said the document,

"we cannot let our enemies strike first."[213] This NSS document "sought to redefine

Hussein as not an ordinary regional despot careful to protect his power, but an evil

madman bent on the destruction of the United States and willing to run virtually any

risk to himself or his country to fulfill his goal."[214] The arguments in favor of a

preventive war by conservative elites were picked up by the media, and thus the

reinvented frame of the War on Terror was publicized during 2002 and 2003.

    One of the arguments of the administration was that Saddam Hussein was now

closer to acquiring WMD than ever. During NBC's *Meet the Press* on September 8,

2002, Vice President Cheney said that Iraq had "reconstituted its nuclear weapons

program" and that "many of us are convinced that Saddam Hussein will acquire nuclear

weapons fairly soon. Just how soon, we cannot really gauge."[215] The *New York Times,*

also in September of 2002, reported that "…Bush and other officials contended that

because Iraq already possessed a design for a nuclear weapon, "with [imported] fissile

material [it] could build [a bomb] within a year."[216]

---

[211] Thrall and Cramer, American Foreign Policy and the Politics of Fear. 49.
[212] Thrall and Cramer, American Foreign Policy and the Politics of Fear. 100.
[213] Thrall and Cramer, American Foreign Policy and the Politics of Fear. 49.
[214] Thrall and Cramer, American Foreign Policy and the Politics of Fear. 100.
[215] Thrall and Cramer, American Foreign Policy and the Politics of Fear. 104.
[216] Thrall and Cramer, American Foreign Policy and the Politics of Fear. 104.

Although these claims were made by a variety of administration officials, it is the omission or release of certain information by these elites that holds major influence over media coverage. Both the President and his administration's wide access to intelligence means they have the power to release or omit key pieces of information that may be used by media outlets to sway or detract from public support of an issue. Thus, they could release statements such as the quote mentioned above in the *New York Times*, yet simultaneously suppress or not release another piece of information. As a result, the administration has direct power in influencing the media's coverage of certain aspects of intelligence information and as a result, holds some power over public opinion. This occurred throughout the Bush administration, and in particular during the 2002-2003 campaign for support of the Iraq War. One example of this is cited in *American Foreign Policy and the Politics of Fear*: "For instance, shortly before the congressional votes in October 2002 giving President Bush the authority to go to war against Iraq, the administration released part of a Special National Intelligence Estimate on Iraq to support its claims about nuclear, chemical, and biological programs, but kept secret 40 distinct caveats or official dissents."[217] Thus, media portrayal of the Iraq conflict was often skewed by the omission of facts and dissents withheld in attempts to increase support for the Iraq War.

ii. Growing conservative bias in broadcast news

As previously mentioned, the role of President and the influence of his administration often results in a monopoly over media coverage. Regardless of whether or not the mainstream media outlets themselves are aligned with the same political

---

[217]Thrall and Cramer, American Foreign Policy and the Politics of Fear. 109.

ideologies or agendas, the Presidential administration still holds power over media programming based on its access to intelligence and its national importance. As a result of "ideological fragmentation…even the most egregious administration promoted myths will receive support from friendly media," and even neutral broadcast networks become in many ways a mouthpiece for the President and his views.

Furthermore, one of the common characteristics of broadcast journalism in the 1990s and 2000s is the portrayal of typically hard news as soft news. Soft media blurs the lines of hard-news reporting and entertainment. Often, these two intersect. In Matthew A. Baum's *Soft News Goes to War,* he says that characteristics of "soft news" include a focus on human-interest pieces and a sensationalized portrayal and emphasis on dramatic content, like disaster and crime.[218] As a result of the increase in military operations during the 1990s and post 9/11 period, the media has begun to use the popular framework of human-interest stories in the depiction of foreign crises and military operations.[219] In *American Foreign Policy and the Politics of Fear*, page 352 describes a "domestic prism," which influences foreign news. This "domestic prism" deals primarily with an emphasis on localizing hard news topics, similar to the incorporation of soft news frames into depictions of foreign crises. The idea of localizing, of providing hard news in a context more digestible to small-town, soft-news-loving Americans is one of the founding principles of the notoriously conservative Fox News program.

---

[218]Baum, Matthew. *Soft News Goes to War: Public Opinion and American Foreign Policy in the New Media Age*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2003. 6.
[219]Baum, *Soft News Goes to War.* 7.

One of the journalistic phenomena of the late 1990s-the 2000s is the "Fox News effect," a phrase coined by researchers at UC Berkeley and Stockholm University. These researchers found evidence linking the success of the rising conservative network to Bush's success in the 2000 elections.[220] In fact just six years after its founding, in 2002 Fox News viewership exceeded CNN in the U.S.[221] In June of 2004, a survey "showed that one in four Americans claimed to "regularly watch" Fox news; higher viewership than any over the air or cable network."[222] By spring of 2006, the number of Fox Network's prime time watchers exceeded the viewership of CNN, CNBC, and MSNBC combined.[223]

Growing success of the network led to accusations of Republican bias, and indeed 52% of all Fox News viewers identified as conservative.[224] According to Vaughn: "One-third of all Republicans claimed to regularly watch the network while only one in four Democrats watched. And only one in four Democrats said they believed "all or most" of what they saw on Fox News, the lowest number for any news network."[225] The program and the administration had similar perspectives, espousing the ideals of militarized patriotism and of the Iraq War. One example of this can be seen in the contrast between the more neutral CNN's coverage of the conflict versus Fox's coverage. What CNN called the "War in Iraq," Fox called "Operation Iraqi Freedom"— the same wording used by President Bush and his administration to describe the war. Fox's use of the administration's language to describe the war attracted criticism from

---

[220]Vaughn. *Encyclopedia.* 177-178.
[221]Vaughn. *Encyclopedia.* 177.
[222]Vaughn. *Encyclopedia.* 177.
[223]Vaughn. *Encyclopedia.* 177.
[224]Vaughn. *Encyclopedia.* 177.
[225]Vaughn. *Encyclopedia.* 177.

its peers. For example, columnist Clarence Page criticized the network "for embracing the language of the Bush administration in its newscasts. It calls suicide bombers 'homicide bombers' and refers to the war to unseat Saddam Hussein as America's war to 'liberate Iraq.'"[226] Viewers and competing networks alike found that Fox News was biased towards the Bush Administration and favored the military; however, it remained a popular source of news throughout the Iraq War.[227]

Although Fox News is the main example of conservative bias in post-9/11 media, studies have shown that even those networks considered most neutral often adopted a conservative tone. One of the possible results of the conservative bias may have been increased self-censorship during the war. Cramer and Thrall say: "…during the war, numerous reporters signed agreements allowing the military to vet their stories. The impact of this on the content of reporting is uncertain."[228] Embedded journalism was one crucial component of the Iraq War which influenced media coverage of the conflict at home. During this time period, the Pentagon established a network of embedded reporters within military operations abroad. These reporters were deemed: "a media representative remaining with a unit on an extended basis – perhaps a period of weeks or even months."[229] Although the government stated that the role of embedded journalists was to maximize extensive coverage of the war, a policy section in an unclassified 2003 report asserted;

> Media coverage of any future operation will, to a large extent, shape
> public perception of the national security environment now and in the
> years ahead. This holds true for the US public, the public in allied

---

[226]Tuosto, "The "Grunt Truth." 24.
[227]Tuosto, "The "Grunt Truth." 24.
[228]Vaughn. *Encyclopedia.* 113.
[229]Tuosto, "The "Grunt Truth." 21.

countries whose opinion can affect the durability of our coalition, and publics in countries where we conduct operations, whose perceptions of us can affect the cost and duration of our involvement.[230]

As the Bush administration sought to define themselves through public policy responses to the terrorist attacks of 9/11, they also sought to establish a mutually beneficial relationship between the military and the press. This relationship, they hoped, would positively frame military operations abroad and set a precedent for press coverage of future conflicts. Indeed in a study cited in an article on "How Arab television coverage of the 2003 Iraq war was used and framed on Western international news channels," it was found that: "Embedded reports were more favorable in tone and displayed more trust in the military, thus conforming to the intentions of military public relations strategy." One possible reason behind this bias towards the military in U.S. embedded reporting may be related to another characteristic of journalistic structure—that of editor rewrites.[231] Editor of *The Los Angeles Times* Marjorie Miller spoke to the successes and downfalls of embedded journalism, saying: "The embeds were valuable as mosaic pieces. But they could only see as far as they could see and it was up to Tracy and Tyler [rewrites] to begin the process of putting some of those little pieces of the puzzle into perspective."[232] The result is another layer of filtering, diluting first-hand information and rewrites which may not convey content as accurately as possible.

In line with the theory of the "domestic prism" and humanistic soft news portrayals, the study found that embedded reports consisted of "episodic framing," meaning:

---

[230]Tuosto, "The "Grunt Truth." 21.
[231]Tuosto, "The "Grunt Truth." 23.
[232]Tuosto, "The "Grunt Truth." 23.

> …they focused more heavily on individual cases and occurrences than non-embedded news stories. This is particularly relevant because episodic framing leads television viewers to attribute responsibility to individuals rather than society as a whole or structural conditions…[233]

As a result, this fragmented, often biased view of the war by broadcast TV reports reinforced presidential claims and the framework of the threat.

Additionally, the issue of self-censorship as it relates to embedded journalists arises. Tuosto explains:

> …the bias inherent in an embed's inability to see the larger picture of war contributes to a stratified filter of information that exemplifies the limitations inherent not only in the biases explored here, but in the restrictions placed on embeds as well. Despite necessary militaristic regulations, journalists wary of audience and public opinion practice self-censorship.[234]

Embedded reporters are biased based on their inability to get all the facts due to military secrecy, as well as their inability oftentimes to place individual coverage in the context of the bigger picture. Thus, unintentional biases of embedded reporters based on the limitations imposed by the military, editors and their inherently fragmented view of the war at large all contribute to various forms of self-censorship which prevent the American public's full access to information.

Limited access to information and self-censorship also relates to aspects of the American public and their preference for soft news over hard news. In Wessler and Adolphson's study *Contra-flow from the Arab world?,* they report for example that Fox News, unlike some of its Western network competitors, framed a majority of their

---

[233]Wessler, H., and M. Adolphsen. "Contra-flow from the Arab World? How Arab Television Coverage of the 2003 Iraq War Was Used and Framed on Western International News Channels." *Media, Culture & Society* 30, no. 4 (2008): 443. doi:10.1177/0163443708091176.
[234]Tuosto, "The "Grunt Truth." 23.

reports in a slant favorable to the U.S. military and the Bush administration.[235] A distinct caveat to this finding, however, lies in the main differences between the aspects of war that American outlets cover versus foreign outlets. Evidenced in an article by Aday et al., for American audiences "in particular, the portrait of war offered by the networks was a sanitized one free of bloodshed, dissent, and diplomacy but full of exciting weaponry, splashy graphics, and heroic soldiers."[236] The proliferation of soft news frames used to describe military conflict reinforces this finding.

Growing conservative bias in news media of the early 2000s influenced and was mutually affected by the Republican Bush administration. Additionally, some evidence points to the hierarchal structure of broadcast networks and journalistic methods of gathering news affecting the credibility and objectivity of reporting during the Iraq War. Networks run by private owners are subject to their desires and biases, which in turn creates biases in reported subjects and journalistic methods. These and other practices by news outlets mirrored conservative networks like Fox news through their self-censorship and reinforcement of the manichean rhetoric of the Bush administration.

The successful effects of this administration's campaign to frame the Iraq War as one which was necessary to prevent Saddam Hussein from deploying WMD against the U.S. and linking his regime to the 9/11 attacks can be illustrated by Gallup poll results in 2002 and 2003. In late 2002, "70-90 percent of the American public believed that Hussein would sooner or later attack the United States with weapons of mass destruction" (Gallup, 13-16 Sept and 10-12 Dec 2002). In August 2002, "Between 45 percent and 66 percent also believed that he had assisted the September 11 attackers."

---

[235]Wessler and Adolphson, "Contra-flow." 444.
[236]Wessler and Adolphson, "Contra-flow." 444.

(Gallup, 19-21 Aug 2002). Furthermore, in polls taken by Fox News in 2002 and CNN in 2003, "69 percent believed that Iraq already had nuclear weapons, and in another, 80 percent thought this likely."[237] Americans supported key arguments to go to war with Hussein and Iraq, arguments which were exaggerated interpretations portrayed by Bush administration members and the media as fact.

D. The Marketplace of Ideas

The Bush administration's success in convincing both elites and the public to engage in a war which was founded upon shaky evidence and decades of pre-established rhetoric were compounded by the absence of dissent from a majority of Democrats and the news media. *American Foreign Policy and the Politics of Fear* reports the results of a study on network TV coverage of Iraq during a period of two weeks early in 2003, which found that:

> …more than half of the 393 sources quoted were U.S. officials. Only 17 percent of sources quoted expressed skepticism about administration policy, most of whom were Iraqi or other foreign government officials. Only 4 percent were skeptical expressions by Americans, and only half of these had any affiliation to advocacy or expert organizations (FAIR 2003).

There are countless arguments as to why there was such a lack of dissenting ideas during the period leading up to the war with Iraq. The next few paragraphs discuss some of these arguments, all related to the weaknesses of the news media as discussed in the previous section.

---

[237]Thrall and Cramer, American Foreign Policy and the Politics of Fear. 105.

One of the main arguments which aligns with persistence of manichean rhetoric in both the media and discussion by elites is that of "rhetorical coercion."[238] In this case, rhetorical coercion means the absence of socially and politically sustainable discussion against the Iraq War. Bush's rhetoric, which aligned Hussein and his regime with the terrorist attacks of 9/11, was largely based on the historical characterization of Hussein as a leading terrorist and led to a 'logical' path to 'inevitable' war. This rhetoric and narrative effectively barred opposition from Democrats, the media or other contesting voices from the discussion because the rhetoric of the time guaranteed that these sources not only had weak arguments in the face of the dominant narrative, but would also undoubtedly be dealt harsh political and social backlash. Although there was an alternative discourse arguing that the U.S. was in fact attacked because of its actions "financially and politically assisting repressive regimes, giving Israel unquestioned political support and implicitly sanctioning its occupation of Palestinian territory, spreading neoliberal economic policies and threatening traditional ways of life," in general public opinion "remained steady between 2001 and 2004 in denying that US wrongdoing abroad was primarily responsible for the September 11 attacks."[239]

One of the reasons for this Ronald R. Krebs says, in opposition to Chaim Kaufman's claim that rhetorical coercion occurred largely because of the presidency's dominant access to the media, was the deep psychological effect of the 9/11 attacks on the American psyche.[240] As a result of a largely unprecedented attack on home soil, the urgent fear felt by Americans caused them to focus "on what was possible, not what

[238]Thrall and Cramer, American Foreign Policy and the Politics of Fear. 127.
[239]Thrall and Cramer, American Foreign Policy and the Politics of Fear. 122.
[240]Krebs, Ronald R., and Chaim Kaufmann. "Selling the Market Short? The Marketplace of Ideas and the Iraq War." *International Security* 29, no. 4 (2005): 201. doi:10.1162/isec.2005.29.4.196.

was probable."[241] Thus, the thought of a nuclear invasion from Iraq was something so terrifying to the public that the threat was naturally inflated and plausible in the wake of the recent attacks. The sense of crisis and urgency, which can be seen by the rapidly occurring decisions and campaigns to mobilize the country for war, prevented opposition from taking the time to really analyze and develop effective counter evidence. As Krebs says, "They were the victims of successful rhetorical coercion."[242] As a result, high-profile Democrats "whose national profiles might have bolstered the opposition to war,"[243] either remained silent or as Krebs said joined the bandwagon of war. The result was a trend of unifying "behind the executive branch during this uncertain period that could be perceived as a period of crisis (although they [elites] recognized this crisis did not emanate from Iraq)."[244]

The reasoning behind this bandwagon and silencing effect is arguably similar to the reasons why media also failed to ask the hard-hitting questions in the discussion leading up to the Iraq War. Ultimately, it comes down to social sustainability and individual success. For Democrats and other dissenting politicians, vocal opposition may well have severely damaged their reputations. With the possibility of damaging their careers in the minds of their constituents, it is no wonder a majority of major politicians remained neutral or joined in the Bush administration's war cries. Similarly, the successes of broadcast networks depend largely on ratings and follow the lead of their superiors. When the success or failure media institutions, like Fox News for example, hinges largely on popularity translated into viewership or the demands of a

---

[241]Krebs and Kaufmann, "Selling the Market Short?" 201.
[242]Krebs and Kaufmann, "Selling the Market Short?" 201.
[243]Thrall and Cramer, American Foreign Policy and the Politics of Fear. 123.
[244]Thrall and Cramer, American Foreign Policy and the Politics of Fear. 150.

corporate leader, the likelihood that they will aggressively challenge the status quo is

slim. Combined with the gravity and devastation of the 9/11 attacks and their effects on

the American psyche, it is understandable that hard counter-arguments would be largely

omitted from media coverage.

Chapter 3: Conclusions

Based on my research on this thesis, it is hard not to believe that the U.S. marketplace of ideas is ineffective. It was easy to find opinions that support my claims; however, I think it is important to note that specifically in regards to the conclusions drawn on the media and its role as watchdog may indeed be too specific to the period rather than a status-report of the American marketplace of ideas as it operates today. The psychological effects of certain contextual events during each studied time period cannot be overlooked. Although it is largely agreed that threat inflation occurred during both the Cold War and the Iraq War, the events leading up to each are uniquely important. The mixture of relief and intense fear of nuclear attack coming out of WWII in the late 1940s and early 1950s, as well as the horror of the 9/11 attacks at home were felt strongly by the American people during each time. Thus, genuine public sentiments of extreme fear undoubtedly played a reciprocal role in the threat inflation and framing of conflict that was depicted by elites and the media. That being said, I affirm that in these different time periods, although the threats were unique, the number of parallels between reactions and coverage from the government and journalists are too frequent to be overlooked as coincidence. In effect, the fact that two very damning histories repeated themselves in the U.S. in such similar ways demands analysis and attention in order to illuminate and hopefully correct for the future the failure of the marketplace of ideas in both eras.

One of the issues that must be addressed is that in both time periods, a large reason behind the incredible threat inflation was due to the portrayal of interpretations made by administration members as facts. Regardless of whether or not there was

89

absolute evidence to support claims that the Soviet Union or Iraq were constantly on the verge of launching a nuclear attack, elites interpreted information which was usually only partially released to the public. Thus, the threat interpretations based on government intelligence were portrayed as fact by the media. Whether information was limited to the public for security reasons or for agenda-setting, in both the Cold War and the post 9/11 era the press was simply not given the full picture, and thus had only the intelligence provided by elites to analyze and criticize.

Although the immediate post-WWII international community was more than ever connected by radio and communication between countries had increased, there remained a lack of reliable or mainstream news outlets, which voiced differing, credible international opinions. Following WWII, state-run communications outlets were suspicious to some as they retained the stigma of being associated with propaganda. Print and broadcast networks too had restrictions as a result of private ownership and the need for commercial sponsors. U.S. involvement in the World Wars coupled with successful fear-based propaganda efforts which swayed public opinion towards a newfound policy of prevention by intervention created many obstacles for the press. Popular media (books, radio, film) continued to provide moral and cultural reinforcement of American 'traditions' in the face of the enemy, who was defined by extreme contrast and juxtaposition to U.S. culture and ideals, even after the close of the second World War. Manichean rhetoric used by key politicians, such as Churchill and Truman, was used to frame the Communist threat as 'evil' and Americans as a 'savior.' This language was picked up and expanded upon by U.S. news sources nationwide, in print, radio and early TV broadcasts. Although American journalists were less limited

by government regulation than many other nations, self-censorship was largely imposed

to prevent government and public retaliation. The fear of retaliation in the form of

financial penalties, content restrictions, and public disapproval all contributed the

imposition of self-censorship.

And yet, many of these things can also be said of the portrayal of information

surrounding the 9/11 attacks. The repetition of myths of empire and other rhetorical

tropes founded in the Cold War throughout the Bush administration resulted in [a

repetition of Cold War rhetorical coercion: "A cultural domestic environment

established in an earlier period in response to a different international environment

embodied a set of norms that later constrained the behavior of rational political

actors."[245] Picking up on the rhetoric used by Bush to describe terrorists, notably the

evil they embody compared to the strength of American resolve, U.S. TV news

broadcasts and print media often reinforced this dualistic framework in their language

and interpretations. Many of the reasons for self-censorship during the early 2000s were

the same as during the Cold War. According to Stephen L. Vaughn's *Encyclopedia of

American Journalism*, Bush's agreed-upon terrorist frame effectively served to prevent

"explicit criticism out of concern for damaging public morale or fear of a public

backlash," which "left little room for democratic deliberation and debate." Although

there was in fact a large number of vocal anti-war elites, the U.S. engaged in a war,

which in hindsight the majority now sees as hugely flawed. Thus, rhetorical coercion

was one aspect in both time periods which prevented the proliferation of dissent in the

media or from elites.

---

[245]Thrall and Cramer, American Foreign Policy and the Politics of Fear. 146.

The main difference between the immense impacts of these media frames on the American public in each individual era, however, is that post-9/11 newsmakers had the advantage of pulling withheld American government information from external international news sources. BBC, Al Jazeera, and others provided alternate footage and coverage of events occurring in Afghanistan, giving the American public much-needed opposing viewpoints. The persistent negative framing of Al Jazeera in many American broadcasts, for example, reflects a lack of unbiased framing of Middle Eastern news sources as viable alternative outlets. However, Al Jazeera's integration into domestic platforms reveals one of the most important aspects of the shifting field of journalism in the U.S.: an evolving global and democratic media landscape.

Furthermore, fear of the 'other,' namely that abstract enemy 'terrorism,' was not nearly as long lasting as the fear of Communism was in the early 1950s. One reason for this was American citizens no longer had to rely solely on information preselected and neatly framed to promulgate the aims and agenda of the federal government, as they often did in the early years of the Cold War. Although there were opposing viewpoints discussed in both American and foreign media and elites, the Bush's war agenda won out and this criticisms were obsolesced for the time being.

Based on the evidence presented in this thesis I argue that one of the major issues at play here is the historical bias of the majority of American news outlets towards their own successes. The Director of *Project Censored,* an extensive survey on American media published in 1997, reported that significant stories were ignored because of "media self-censorship rather than governmental restraints."[246] This self-

---

[246]Vaughn, *Encyclopedia.* 87.

censorship was enacted to protect "the media's bottom line" as these stories "are contrary in some way to the financial interests of publishers, owners, stockholders or advertisers."[247]

As a result, when news agencies espouse the aims of their own popularity and profits over living up to the standards of the fourth estate, the consequences are felt by the American people. During the Cold War and the post 9/11 years, print and broadcast journalism frequently fell victim to the agendas of the elite. These elites could be media conglomerate CEOs, editors seeking to increase ratings or viewership, or the U.S. President himself seeking public support to engage in war. These powers more often than not dictated content and the framing of information during both the Cold War and the post 9/11 era. This is not a problem in which a single person or factor is to blame, but rather it is an issue stemming from the structure of the industry itself.

In a country whose culture has so vehemently espoused proud ideals of independence, individualism and freedom, the ability of the press to serve the public without bias is sometimes impeded by the system within which it operates. This system, which thrives on the power of the majority and rewards the financially successful, does not match up with the historical definition of journalism as the fourth estate, especially when faced with external threats, like Communism and terrorism, which expose the nation's vulnerabilities. In a lecture given by Dr. Hugo Slim on Terrorism in the Age of Human Rights, he explained terrorism as an action meant to trigger a reaction—a way for the opposition to expose the target's vulnerability leave it with only two, binary choices: retaliate or remain idle. The underlying goal, Slim says, is to draw the target to

---

[247]Vaughn, *Encyclopedia.* 87.

retaliate and ultimately self-destruct, as these adversarial factions continue to exploit the target's vulnerabilities. Based on the evidence presented, I believe that one of the major, longtime vulnerabilities of the U.S. is the belief in American cultural and military superiority. Quoted in Bacevich's book is historian, political commentator and leading neoconservative Robert Kagan, who delves into this mindset asking:

> If the United States is founded on universal principles, how can Americans practice amoral indifference when those principles are under siege around the world? And if they do profess indifference, how can they manage to avoid the implication that their principles are not, in fact, universal?[248]

Bacevich responds saying that the answer to these questions, according to Kagan and his neoconservative peers, is this: "indifference to the violation of American ideals abroad was not simply wrong; it was un-American."[249] Media too often becomes entrenched in beliefs of American superiority, yet it reacts in different ways. Rather than give the public a variety of outside resources and insights to arm ourselves with education and broaden our scope, journalism has evolved into an institution which more often than not reinforces these common themes within American society, without providing enough outside viewpoints from which we may evaluate ourselves.

Drawing parallels in different media forms between the two time eras reflects persisting tropes in the American psyche and political rhetoric. Its persistence is clear, however the way Americans interpret and digest these persisting tropes changes from situation to situation. Despite the changing political climates and public skepticism, manichean rhetoric persists amongst the media and elites. Threat inflation and identifying the enemy as "evil" worked in the Cold War, as well as immediately post-

---

[248]Bacevich, *The New American Militarism.* 87.
[249]Bacevich, *The New American Militarism.* 87.

9/11. In the years leading up to the Iraq War, however, there was more skepticism about the claims made by the Bush administration. Despite this increase in questioning of elites, war was carried out and it was only later that the reality of the threat became clear. Do elites continue using this narrative because it has already been established by their predecessors, or because they have seen it proven to work? As the party line of the U.S. as "good" and enemies as "evil" persists, it seems as though the public is somewhat aware of it's staleness and yet remains fairly apathetic. Minorities begin to sway majorities, and the press becomes entangled in the conflict of power when it comes to foreign affairs. It is important, for the future function of media as the fourth estate, to become aware of these persisting tropes and consciously identify when they are justified. Altogether, this research hopes to alert readers of the presence and often detriment of manichean rhetoric used by media and elites in the hopes that a better informed public will aid in a more beneficial discussion of foreign threats in the American marketplace of ideas.

Bibliography

"The Atlantic Conference & Charter, 1941 - 1937–1945 - Milestones - Office of the Historian." US Department of State: Office of the Historian. November 8, 2013. https://history.state.gov/milestones/1937-1945/atlantic-conf.

"The Atlantic Conference & Charter, 1941 - 1937–1945 - Milestones - Office of the Historian." US Department of State: Office of the Historian. November 8, 2013. https://history.state.gov/milestones/1937-1945/atlantic-conf.

Bacevich, Andrew J. *The New American Militarism: How Americans Are Seduced by War*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Bacevich, Andrew J. *The New American Militarism: How Americans Are Seduced by War*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Baum, Matthew. *Soft News Goes to War: Public Opinion and American Foreign Policy in the New Media Age*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2003.

Baum, Matthew. *Soft News Goes to War: Public Opinion and American Foreign Policy in the New Media Age*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2003.

Belovari, Susanne. "Murrow at CBS, USA." Murrow at CBS, USA. June 24, 2010. http://dca.lib.tufts.edu/features/murrow/exhibit/cbsusa2.html.

Belovari, Susanne. "Murrow at CBS, USA." Murrow at CBS, USA. June 24, 2010. http://dca.lib.tufts.edu/features/murrow/exhibit/cbsusa2.html.

Bondi, Victor. "Radio: The End of a Golden Age." In *American Decades: 1940-1949*, 375. Detroit: Gale Research, 1995.

Bondi, Victor. "Radio: The End of a Golden Age." In *American Decades: 1940-1949*, 375. Detroit: Gale Research, 1995.

Bostdorff, Denise M. *Proclaiming the Truman Doctrine: The Cold War Call to Arms*. College Station: Texas A & M University Press, 2008. 12.

Bostdorff, Denise M. *Proclaiming the Truman Doctrine: The Cold War Call to Arms*. College Station: Texas A & M University Press, 2008. 12.

Cold War Cultures: Perspectives on Eastern and Western European Societies. Edited by Annette Vowinckel and Marcus M. Payk. By Thomas Lindenberger. Oxford, New York: Berghan Books, 2012. 223.

Cold War Cultures: Perspectives on Eastern and Western European Societies. Edited by Annette Vowinckel and Marcus M. Payk. By Thomas Lindenberger. Oxford, New York: Berghan Books, 2012. 223.

Conklin, William R. "Atom Spy Couple Sentenced to Die; Aide Gets 30 Years." Editorial. *New York Times*. 2010. http://www.nytimes.com/learning/general/onthisday/big/0405.html.

Conklin, William R. "Atom Spy Couple Sentenced to Die; Aide Gets 30 Years." Editorial. *New York Times*. 2010. http://www.nytimes.com/learning/general/onthisday/big/0405.html.

Dunne, Matthew W. *A Cold War State of Mind: Brainwashing and Postwar American Society*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2013.

Dunne, Matthew W. *A Cold War State of Mind: Brainwashing and Postwar American Society*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2013.

Engelberg, Stephen. "Terrorism's New (and Very Old) Face; It's Not the Kind of War the West Fights Well." The New York Times. September 11, 1998. Accessed May 10, 2015. http://www.nytimes.com/1998/09/12/arts/terrorism-s-new-and-very-old-face-it-s-not-the-kind-of-war-the-west-fights-well.html.

Engelberg, Stephen. "Terrorism's New (and Very Old) Face; It's Not the Kind of War the West Fights Well." The New York Times. September 11, 1998. Accessed May 10, 2015. http://www.nytimes.com/1998/09/12/arts/terrorism-s-new-and-very-old-face-it-s-not-the-kind-of-war-the-west-fights-well.html.

Erkan, Suleyman. "The Invasion of Iran by the Allies in WWII." Facultatea De Istorie şi Geografie-Karadeniz Technical University, Trabzon. February 11, 2014. http://atlas.usv.ro/www/codru_net/CC16/2/iran.pdf.

Erkan, Suleyman. "The Invasion of Iran by the Allies in WWII." Facultatea De Istorie şi Geografie-Karadeniz Technical University, Trabzon. February 11, 2014. http://atlas.usv.ro/www/codru_net/CC16/2/iran.pdf.

"Fighting on Two Fronts: A Chronology." PBS. Accessed April 3, 2015. http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/campaign/etc/cron.html.

"Fighting on Two Fronts: A Chronology." PBS. Accessed April 3, 2015. http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/campaign/etc/cron.html.

Fung, Katherine. "9/11: Newspaper Front Pages From The Day After The Attacks (PHOTOS)." The Huffington Post. Accessed May 10, 2015. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/09/09/september-11-newspaper-front-pages_n_940867.html.

Fung, Katherine. "9/11: Newspaper Front Pages From The Day After The Attacks (PHOTOS)." The Huffington Post. Accessed May 10, 2015. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/09/09/september-11-newspaper-front-pages_n_940867.html.

"History of the Federal Judiciary." History of the Federal Judiciary. Accessed May 09, 2015. http://www.fjc.gov/history/home.nsf/page/tu_rosenberg_doc_15.html.

"History of the Federal Judiciary." History of the Federal Judiciary. Accessed May 09, 2015. http://www.fjc.gov/history/home.nsf/page/tu_rosenberg_doc_15.html.

History.com Staff. "9/11 Attacks." History.com. Accessed May 10, 2015. http://www.history.com/topics/9-11-attacks.

History.com Staff. "9/11 Attacks." History.com. Accessed May 10, 2015. http://www.history.com/topics/9-11-attacks.

Johnson, Jenell M. *Echoes of the Soul: A Rhetorical History of Lobotomy*. ProQuest, 2008. http://books.google.com/books?id=gH3K96CmqI0C&dq=Josef+Cardinal+Mind szenty+and+brainwashing&source=gbs_navlinks_s.

Johnson, Jenell M. *Echoes of the Soul: A Rhetorical History of Lobotomy*. ProQuest, 2008. http://books.google.com/books?id=gH3K96CmqI0C&dq=Josef+Cardinal+Mind szenty+and+brainwashing&source=gbs_navlinks_s.

Koppes, Clayton R., and Gregory D. Black. "What to Show the World: The Office of War Information and Hollywood, 1942-1945." http://www.jstor.org/discover/10.2307/1888275?uid=3739856&uid=2&uid=4& uid=3739256&sid=21106345560411.

Koppes, Clayton R., and Gregory D. Black. "What to Show the World: The Office of War Information and Hollywood, 1942-1945." http://www.jstor.org/discover/10.2307/1888275?uid=3739856&uid=2&uid=4& uid=3739256&sid=21106345560411.

Koppes, Clayton R. "What to Show the World: The Office of War Information and Hollywood, 1942-1945." http://www.jstor.org/stable/1888275.

Koppes, Clayton R. "What to Show the World: The Office of War Information and Hollywood, 1942-1945." http://www.jstor.org/stable/1888275.

Krebs, Ronald R., and Chaim Kaufmann. "Selling the Market Short? The Marketplace of Ideas and the Iraq War." *International Security* 29, no. 4 (2005): 201. doi:10.1162/isec.2005.29.4.196.

Krebs, Ronald R., and Chaim Kaufmann. "Selling the Market Short? The Marketplace of Ideas and the Iraq War." *International Security* 29, no. 4 (2005): 201. doi:10.1162/isec.2005.29.4.196.

Krugler, David F. *The Voice of America and the Domestic Propaganda Battles, 1945-1953*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2000. 94.

Krugler, David F. *The Voice of America and the Domestic Propaganda Battles, 1945-1953*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2000. 94.

Leonard, Kelsey. "The Greek Civil War." Cold War Museum. August 20, 2008. http://www.coldwar.org/articles/40s/GreekCivilWar1945-1949.asp.

Leonard, Kelsey. "The Greek Civil War." Cold War Museum. August 20, 2008. http://www.coldwar.org/articles/40s/GreekCivilWar1945-1949.asp.

""Message From Stalin to Truman, April 24, 1945 & Stalin's Election Speech, February 9,1946." *Http://history.jburroughs.org*, March 8, 2011. http://history.jburroughs.org/cfront/us45/readings/stalin.htm.

""Message From Stalin to Truman, April 24, 1945 & Stalin's Election Speech, February 9,1946." *Http://history.jburroughs.org*, March 8, 2011. http://history.jburroughs.org/cfront/us45/readings/stalin.htm.

Nelson, Thomas E., Rosalee A. Clawson, and Zoe M. Oxley. "Media Framing of a Civil Liberties Conflict and Its Effect on Tolerance." *The American Political Science Review* 91, no. 3 (1997): 567. doi:10.2307/2952075.

Nelson, Thomas E., Rosalee A. Clawson, and Zoe M. Oxley. "Media Framing of a Civil Liberties Conflict and Its Effect on Tolerance." *The American Political Science Review* 91, no. 3 (1997): 567. doi:10.2307/2952075.

Newport, Frank, David W. Moore, and Jeffrey M. Jones. "Special Release: American Opinion on the War." Special Release: American Opinion on the War. Accessed April 28, 2015. http://www.gallup.com/poll/8068/special-release-american-opinion-war.aspx.

Newport, Frank, David W. Moore, and Jeffrey M. Jones. "Special Release: American Opinion on the War." Special Release: American Opinion on the War. Accessed April 28, 2015. http://www.gallup.com/poll/8068/special-release-american-opinion-war.aspx.

Pellegrini, Frank. "The Bush Speech: How to Rally a Nation." Time. September 21, 2001. Accessed May 10, 2015. http://content.time.com/time/nation/article/0,8599,175757,00.html.

Pellegrini, Frank. "The Bush Speech: How to Rally a Nation." Time. September 21, 2001. Accessed May 10, 2015. http://content.time.com/time/nation/article/0,8599,175757,00.html.

Peters, Gerhard, and John T. Woolley. "George W. Bush: Address to the Nation on the Terrorist Attacks." George W. Bush: Address to the Nation on the Terrorist Attacks. September 21, 2013. http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=58057.

Peters, Gerhard, and John T. Woolley. "George W. Bush: Address to the Nation on the Terrorist Attacks." George W. Bush: Address to the Nation on the Terrorist Attacks. September 21, 2013. http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=58057.

Pinaire, Brian K. "Marketplace of Ideas Theory." Civil Liberties. June 26, 2014. http%3A%2F%2Fuscivilliberties.org%2F.

Pinaire, Brian K. "Marketplace of Ideas Theory." Civil Liberties. June 26, 2014. http%3A%2F%2Fuscivilliberties.org%2F.

Pinaire, Brian K. "Marketplace of Ideas Theory." Civil Liberties. June 26, 2014. http://uscivilliberties.org/themes/4099-marketplace-of-ideas-theory.html.

Pinaire, Brian K. "Marketplace of Ideas Theory." Civil Liberties. June 26, 2014. http://uscivilliberties.org/themes/4099-marketplace-of-ideas-theory.html.

Rosteck, Thomas. *See It Now Confronts McCarthyism: Television Documentary and the Politics of Representation*. Tucaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1994. 23.

Rosteck, Thomas. *See It Now Confronts McCarthyism: Television Documentary and the Politics of Representation*. Tucaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1994. 23.

Shaw, Tony. "Martyr, Miracles, and Martians: Religion and Cold War Cinematic Propaganda in the 1950s." *Journal of Cold War Studies* 4, no. 2 (2002): 18.

Shaw, Tony. "Martyr, Miracles, and Martians: Religion and Cold War Cinematic Propaganda in the 1950s." *Journal of Cold War Studies* 4, no. 2 (2002): 18.

Sherry, Michael S. *In the Shadow of War: The United States since the 1930's*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.

Sherry, Michael S. *In the Shadow of War: The United States since the 1930's*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.

"The Sinews of Peace ("Iron Curtain Speech")." The Churchill Centre. Accessed May 09, 2015. http://www.winstonchurchill.org/resources/speeches/1946-1963-elder-statesman/the-sinews-of-peace.

"The Sinews of Peace ("Iron Curtain Speech")." The Churchill Centre. Accessed May 09, 2015. http://www.winstonchurchill.org/resources/speeches/1946-1963-elder-statesman/the-sinews-of-peace.

Strand, William. "Truman Elects Biddle To War Crimes Tribunal." *Chicago Tribune*,
September 13, 1945.
http://archives.chicagotribune.com/1945/09/13/page/7/article/truman-names-
biddle-to-war-crimes-tribunal#text.

Strand, William. "Truman Elects Biddle To War Crimes Tribunal." *Chicago Tribune*,
September 13, 1945.
http://archives.chicagotribune.com/1945/09/13/page/7/article/truman-names-
biddle-to-war-crimes-tribunal#text.

"Terrorism - Google Search." Terrorism - Google Search. Accessed May 10, 2015.
http://www.google.com/cse?cx=partner-pub-6825533572199708%3A3eh78k-
ui1b&q=terrorism&siteurl=www.pitt.edu%2F~super1%2F&ref=&ss=1111j163
201j9#gsc.tab=0&gsc.q=terrorism&gsc.page=1.

"Terrorism - Google Search." Terrorism - Google Search. Accessed May 10, 2015.
http://www.google.com/cse?cx=partner-pub-6825533572199708%3A3eh78k-
ui1b&q=terrorism&siteurl=www.pitt.edu%2F~super1%2F&ref=&ss=1111j163
201j9#gsc.tab=0&gsc.q=terrorism&gsc.page=1.

Terrorism in the United States 1999. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Dept. of Justice, Federal
Bureau of Investigation, 1999. Accessed February 5, 2015.
http://www.fbi.gov/stats-services/publications/terror_99.pdf.

Terrorism in the United States 1999. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Dept. of Justice, Federal
Bureau of Investigation, 1999. Accessed February 5, 2015.
http://www.fbi.gov/stats-services/publications/terror_99.pdf.

"Text: President Bush Addresses the Nation." Washington Post. 2001.
http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-
srv/nation/specials/attacked/transcripts/bushaddress_092001.html.

"Text: President Bush Addresses the Nation." Washington Post. 2001.
http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-
srv/nation/specials/attacked/transcripts/bushaddress_092001.html.

Thompson, Nicholas. *The Hawk and the Dove: Paul Nitze, George Kennan, and the
History of the Cold War*. New York: Henry Holt, 2009. 55.

Thompson, Nicholas. *The Hawk and the Dove: Paul Nitze, George Kennan, and the
History of the Cold War*. New York: Henry Holt, 2009. 55.

Thrall, A. Trevor., and Jane K. Cramer. *American Foreign Policy and the Politics of
Fear: Threat Inflation since 9/11*. London: Routledge, 2009.

Thrall, A. Trevor., and Jane K. Cramer. *American Foreign Policy and the Politics of
Fear: Threat Inflation since 9/11*. London: Routledge, 2009.

Thrall, A. Trevor., and Jane K. Cramer. *American Foreign Policy and the Politics of Fear: Threat Inflation since 9/11*. London: Routledge, 2009.

Thrall, A. Trevor., and Jane K. Cramer. *American Foreign Policy and the Politics of Fear: Threat Inflation since 9/11*. London: Routledge, 2009.

Tuosto, Kylie. "The "Grunt Truth" of Embedded Journalism: The New Media/Military Relationship." *Stanford Journal Of International Relations* X, no. 1 (2008). https://web.stanford.edu/group/sjir/pdf/journalism_real_final_v2.pdf.

Tuosto, Kylie. "The "Grunt Truth" of Embedded Journalism: The New Media/Military Relationship." *Stanford Journal Of International Relations* X, no. 1 (2008). https://web.stanford.edu/group/sjir/pdf/journalism_real_final_v2.pdf.

Vaughn, Stephen. *Encyclopedia of American Journalism*. New York: Routledge, 2008. 435.

Vaughn, Stephen. *Encyclopedia of American Journalism*. New York: Routledge, 2008. 435.

Weiner, Tim. "Remembering Brainwashing." The New York Times. July 05, 2008. http://www.nytimes.com/2008/07/06/weekinreview/06weiner.html?pagewanted =all&_r=0.

Weiner, Tim. "Remembering Brainwashing." The New York Times. July 05, 2008. http://www.nytimes.com/2008/07/06/weekinreview/06weiner.html?pagewanted =all&_r=0.

Wessler, H., and M. Adolphsen. "Contra-flow from the Arab World? How Arab Television Coverage of the 2003 Iraq War Was Used and Framed on Western International News Channels." *Media, Culture & Society* 30, no. 4 (2008): 443. doi:10.1177/0163443708091176.

Wessler, H., and M. Adolphsen. "Contra-flow from the Arab World? How Arab Television Coverage of the 2003 Iraq War Was Used and Framed on Western International News Channels." *Media, Culture & Society* 30, no. 4 (2008): 443. doi:10.1177/0163443708091176.

"What Is Terrorism?" Supercourse. Accessed May 10, 2015. www.pitt.edu/~super7/6011-7001/6651.ppt.

"What Is Terrorism?" Supercourse. Accessed May 10, 2015. www.pitt.edu/~super7/6011-7001/6651.ppt.

Whitcomb, Roger S. "Containment: Misreading Soviet Russia." *Global Dialogue*, 1st
  ser., 3, no. 4 (November 2001): 59-79.
  http://connection.ebscohost.com/c/articles/57385907/containment-misreading-
  soviet-russia.

Whitcomb, Roger S. "Containment: Misreading Soviet Russia." *Global Dialogue*, 1st
  ser., 3, no. 4 (November 2001): 59-79.
  http://connection.ebscohost.com/c/articles/57385907/containment-misreading-
  soviet-russia.